CRESCENT OF BETRAYAL

DIRECTOR'S CUT (v. 1.0)

CRESCENT OF BETRAYAL

Dishonoring the Heroes of Flight 93

ALEC RAWLS

World Ahead Publishing, Inc.

Published by World Ahead Publishing, Inc., Los Angeles, CA

Director's Cut Edition

ISBN 10-Digit: 097467012X
ISBN 13-Digit 9780979045127
LCCN: 2006938849

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

PART FOUR

OUR NATIONAL DIVIDE

CHAPTER TWO

THE ARC OF TRUTH SUPPRESSION

When the leaders of the Memorial Project and the editors of the *Post-Gazette* get so caught up in rationalizations that they actively abet our terror war enemies, they are not doing anything particularly unusual. For the last four years, a powerful minority of Americans have waged a full-on war against even the most obviously necessary measures that have been taken to defend the nation against terrorist attack. In June 2006, to take one example, the *New York Times* exposed what may be our most important terror fighting tool: our tracing of terrorist financing in cooperation with the international financial clearing-house SWIFT.[1]

The *Times* report admitted that there was not a whiff of illegality or overreach about the SWIFT program. The only thing remarkable was its effectiveness, identifying numerous terror financiers and terror plots. Exposure threatened to shut this crucial terror-fighting program down entirely, according to the *Times*' own reporting.

"By 2003," wrote reporters Eric Lichtblau and James Risen, "the cooperative's officials were discussing pulling out because of their concerns about legal and financial risks if the program were revealed." According to the *Times* it took "a full court press" by U.S. officials to keep the program running. Secrecy was crucial, and so the Bush administration pleaded with the *Times* not to expose the program. "The central argument we heard from officials at senior levels," said *Times* Editor Bill Keller, "was that international bankers would stop cooperating, would resist, if this program saw the light of day."[2]

Keller was unmoved, exposing one of our most closely held terror-fighting secrets on the grounds that:

> … the administration's extraordinary access to this vast repository of international financial data, however carefully targeted use of it may be, is a matter of public interest.[3]

How can it be in the public interest to sabotage a crucial terror fighting tool? Just as divorced from reality is Keller's sense of prerogative. We elect the *president* to determine what it is in the national interest to keep secret. "[N]o one voted to put Bill Keller in charge of our national security," thumped Blogger-of-the-Year Ed Morrissey, "and the laws covering classification of materials do not have an option for journalists to invalidate their clearance level."[4] Ditto for the "[n]early 20 current and former government officials and industry executives," who the *Times* claims "discussed aspects of the SWIFT operation with *The New York Times* on condition of anonymity because the program remains classified."

This is the most blatant treason, and it follows a long list of similar treasonous exposures of national security secrets by our leading center-left newspapers. In November 2005 the presence of U.S. prisoner of war camps in sensitive foreign locations was exposed by anti-war Democrats in the CIA, leaking to Dana Priest at *The Washington Post*.[5] In December 2005, U.S. monitoring of al Qaeda phone calls in and out of the country was exposed by the same anti-war cabal, leaking again through Risen and Lictblau at *The New York Times*.[6]

The list goes on and on and on, as long as the list of Islamic and *jihad*ist features in the Flight 93 memorial. It shouldn't be this way. A healthy society should be able to support constructive differences of opinion without descending into betrayal of common interests, but this is what we are up against.

Our National Divide

Leaking signals intelligence is just one front of the war that our media elites and our Democratic Party elites have waged against the nation's terror-war efforts. Their objectives are plain: to bring down a president and lose a war. The modern Democratic Party was created by those who fought desperately for American defeat in Vietnam. Success in that effort gained them control of the party, forming their template for political success, which they are out to reprise today.

As this book nears completion, the new Democratic majority in Congress is perfectly explicit that it will accept nothing less than American defeat in Iraq. "There will be resolution after resolution, amendment after amendment . . . just like in the days of Vietnam,"

says Senator Chuck Schumer (D-NY). "The pressure will mount, the president will find he has no strategy, he will have to change his strategy and the vast majority of our troops will be taken out of harm's way and come home."[7]

Schumer *wants* Iraq to be "another Vietnam," and will do everything in his power to make it one, but he and his cohorts have to hurry, because our military is mopping up the enemy at a terrific rate. Senator Joe Biden (R-Del) came up with the simplest plan to stop our troops from winning: just make it illegal for them to win by undeclaring the war. Pass a new and more limited authorization of force and *voilà*: "That would constitutionally render the first authorization of use of force null and void."[8]

Western Pennsylvania Representative Jack Murtha came up with the most ruthless plan for American defeat, seeking to defund our troops in the middle of the fight: "They won't be able to continue," promised Murtha, "they won't be able to do the deployment. They won't have the equipment, they don't have the training and they won't be able to do the work."[9] And on it goes, as Senator Schumer promised. American defeat in Iraq is the foremost objective of our Democratic Party leadership.

Our military has not lost a battle in Iraq, and it never will. In four years, we have lost half as many men as we lost in one month at Iwo Jima. The enemy's only hope is that if it can keep terrorizing the Iraqi population, the Western media can parlay this "continuing violence" into anti-war sentiment, and so far this alliance is succeeding, with the party of retreat and defeat winning the last election.

It is not actually in the interest of Democrat leaders for America to hand Iraq to al Qaeda and Iran, any more than it is in the interest of the Memorial Project to build a terrorist memorial mosque in Shanksville, but such is the nature of partisan dishonesty. When people subordinate reason and evidence to presumption, the resulting divorce from reality means that their presumptions can only be wrong, yet they never feel a qualm. Ensconced within their presumptions, they always see themselves as acting for right. The resulting moral blindness is total. People who think backwards in this way, seeking advantage in manipulative dishonesty instead of following reason and evidence, consistently twist all the way around to directly abetting our terrorist enemies.

The Alternate Media Revolution

The first answer to partisan dishonesty is to be part of the solution instead of part of the problem. Just trust in truth, as exemplified by the passengers and crew of Flight 93, who confronted their harsh reality and made the most of it. Love of truth is most people's starting point, Democrat and Republican alike. But in a world where partisan dishonesty is a leading power, trusting in truth requires learning *not* to trust unreliable information sources.

Since 2001, a vast fact checking apparatus has grown up across the conservative blogosphere. What this fact checking effort has uncovered is unimaginable dishonesty, perpetrated on a daily basis by our leading news outlets, particularly on terror-war issues. When the radical left succeeded in snatching defeat from the jaws in victory in Vietnam, it wasn't just rewarded with control of the Democratic Party. It also cemented power over the media institutions that were so instrumental in achieving defeat in Vietnam.

Manipulative unreason has established control over the main channels of information flow in America, and with this leverage has achieved majority control of government. This is the story of our age. Partisan dishonesty has become a force second to none, and at the national level is is behaving the same way we see in the memorial debacle, where the moral blindness inherent in this cognitive style readily abets an existential enemy.

It is beyond the scope of this book to provide encyclopedic document of partisan dishonesty on terror war issues, but it is possible to measure it dimension by dimension, which is the subject of this "National Divide" portion of the book. One dimension to be measured is the proportion of our media industry that engages in partisan dishonesty. Here one glaring example is sufficient to measure the behavior of every news outlet: the "Bush lied" lies of Joseph C. Wilson the 4th.

Wilson is another Paul Murdoch. Presented with an opportunity to strike a devastating blow against the nations' war effort, Wilson attacked with the most malicious disinformation he could concoct, claiming that his trip to Niger in 2002 had debunked President Bush's State of the Union claim that Saddam Hussein had tried to buy uranium in Africa, when in fact Wilson's trip had confirmed that Saddam did try to buy uranium in Africa.

Wilson deceit was exposed by CIA Director George Tenet within a week, and 99.9% of the press simply chose not to report it. For four years running, virtually the entire mainstream media has continued to

abet Wilson's "Bush lied" lies, even after numerous authoritative exposures of Wilson as a liar. The next chapter documents this dishonesty in detail. Four years of systematic lying about lying, from the one group we pay to tell us the truth. If we don't fix this, we are going to get ourselves killed.

The rest of Part IV documents the range of terror-war issues on which our media elites are dishonest (all of them), and the consequences of their growing success. Four years of dishonest attacks on our war efforts have now won an election and are on the verge of losing a war. The memorial debacle affords an up-close look at the truth avoiding mindset, but this exposure is all for naught if we don't carry the lesson outwards to the larger phenomenon of manipulative unreason that threatens our survival. In the Pennsylvania sky, trust in truth won the first battle of our war with Islamic fascism. That spirit is needed to overcome the partisan dishonesty that right now is actively seeking political gain through American defeat.

Our World Divide

It isn't just the West that is afflicted by partisan dishonesty. Sacrifice of truth for manipulative advantage is the way of wrongdoers everywhere, including our Islamofascist enemies. Part Five turns to this second pincer arm of our worldwide crescent of betrayal.

Typical of repressive societies, the Islamic World's mechanisms of truth-suppression are ruthlessly simple. Totalitarian Islamic theocrats use Islamic blasphemy laws to kill or intimidate every domestic critic and to threaten every foreign one. But like all truth suppressors, Islamic totalitarians are vulnerable to the truths they are suppressing. To expose the problem is to expose the answer.

The most glaring truth that totalitarian Islam has suppressed is the radical contradiction between Islam's claim to Abrahamic and Mosaic foundations and the murderous essence of established *sharia* law. The ineluctable core of the Mosaic law is the Ten Commandments, while established sharia law commands in a hundred ways: thou shalt steal, thou shalt murder, thou shalt commit adultery.

Sharia is the law of conquest established over centuries of violent Islamic expansion. That expansion was propagated by murder, looting, slaving and woman stealing. Not that there is anything unusual about such systematic violation of the Ten Commandments. The Romans did the same thing. So did the Vikings. So did the Mongols who invaded the Islamic empire. It is not even unusual for murder to be

religiously approved. The Aztecs murdered by the thousands just to offer fresh organs to their Gods. In the case of Islam, however, the Mosaic law, with its condemnation of murder, is the proclaimed founding stone. Thus violently imperialistic Islam is hoist on its own petard.

Muhammad's claim to legitimacy was his claim to be a prophet of the God of Abraham, Moses and Jesus. His claim to *sole* legitimacy was his charge that Christians and Jews had lapsed in their adherence to the Mosaic law. Thus Islam is committed to a literalist reading of the old laws. When Jesus was challenged to adhere to the merciless laws of the Torah by condemning an accused adulteress to stoning, he replied: "Let he who is without sin cast the first stone." Muhammad took up the opposite role. In a key incident, recorded in the reported sayings of Muhammad and alluded to in the Koran, Muhammad casts the Jews as unbelievers precisely because of their reluctance to stone accused adulterers to death.[10]

This reactionary essence of Islam has a silver lining. There is no way in the world that even the most radical Islamofascist can claim any exemption from the Ten Commandments, even as their every ambition is to commit the most extreme violations of the Ten Commandments that they can concoct. They are living the baldest possible lie. To claim the God of the Jews while rejecting the Jews, the Koran declares over and over that those who forget the law of Moses will burn in Hell forever.[11] The Islamofascists just have to hope that nobody notices.

So notice. Not only is violently imperialistic Islam hoist on the petard of its claim to Abrahamic and Mosaic foundations, but its reactionary character sets the hook. The Ten Commandments cannot be escaped. The Koran cannot be escaped, however much the Islamofascists try. All the West has to do is reel this fish in.

Without ruthless suppression of internal criticism, totalitarian Islam could never get away with the glaring contradiction between its murderous practices and its claim to Abrahamic foundations. There are many truly moderate Muslims who want to interpret Islam consistent with the Ten Commandments, but if they point out contradictions between *sharia* law and the Ten Commandments, they are subject to prosecution, like the Afghan reporter who was jailed in 2005 for denying that the Koran requires the death penalty for apostasy.[12]

For Islam to obey the Ten Commandments, it must *forbid* the death penalty for apostasy. People in Muslim countries may not be able to say it, but Westerners can, and we have to. *We* are the one's who have the freedom to speak the truth that can set the Muslim world free. Is-

lam has never undergone a reformation, but it is eminently susceptible to the most profound reform. Its own reactionary nature can be used to drag it forward from a pre-Ten-Commandments religion to a Ten Commandments religion, which is all that civilization requires.

When the Flight 93 families chose what they knew to be a symbol of Islam for the shape of their memorial, they were trying to reach out with goodwill to the good people of the Islamic world. These family members were betrayed by information gatekeepers who did not trust in truth and let the Flight 93 memorial be hijacked by what is evil in the Islamic world. But if we do trust in truth, and speak the truths that the Islamofascists are suppressing, then our goodwill can help the good people of the Islamic world to overcome the bad. Thus can the Crescent come full circle, and the intent of the families be served.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

ANOTHER MURDOCH

THE STORY OF THE MEMORIAL DEBACLE is so outlandish that many will think it must be a bizarre fluke (if they believe it at all). No fiction writer who wanted to maintain a semblance of realism would ever postulate systematic misfeasance on the part of person after person who one would expect to behave responsibly. Who could have imagined that the editors of the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* would decide as a group not to publish the Mecca orientation of Murdoch's crescent, at the very moment when controversy over this local story was making national headlines? Not only does it make no sense (local reporters passing on the story of a lifetime?) but one never even hears of such things. It *has to be* a fluke, doesn't it?

Blog readers know better. The *New York Times* tells bigger lies of omission or commission every day. The press doesn't even have a horse in the Memorial Project story. They don't actually *favor* the building of a terrorist-memorial mosque. In this case, suppression of information that is not congenial to the media's presumptions is just pure knee-jerk habit. But elsewhere, the press has big goals. They have a war to lose, and a president to bring down.

Joe Wilson's Treasonous Gambit

In laying out his reasons for pursuing regime change in Iraq, President Bush's 2003 State of the Union Address included sixteen words that pointed to Saddam Hussein's nuclear ambitions:

> The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.[1]

There was nothing crucial about this particular bit of information. It was known from post-Gulf War inspections that Saddam Hussein

already had 550 tons of uranium oxide.[2] If his refusal to abide by the Gulf War cease-fire agreement made it ominous that he was seeking uranium ore, it made it even more ominous that he already *had* uranium ore.

Still, there was no reason not to give a tip of the hat to the British, given that we had our own reasons to believe that Saddam had try to buy additional uranium from Africa. In February 2002, an ex-ambassador from the Clinton administration, one Joseph C. Wilson the 4th, had been sent to Niger by the CIA to investigate an Italian claim to have found the bill of sale from an Iraqi purchase of Nigerien uranium.

Talking to Nigerien officials, Wilson found it highly unlikely that a deal could have been consummated (casting serious doubt on the Italian information), but he also learned that Iraq had indeed tried to buy uranium. He learned from Nigerien Prime Minister Ibrahim Mayaki that an Iraqi trade delegation had come calling in 1999, asking to expand trade, which Mayaki interpreted as an attempt to buy uranium, just as the President Bush's "sixteen words" asserted.[3]

If our intelligence agencies were prescient (wouldn't that be nice), they might have seen a warning in the mixture of good and bad intel about the Iraq-Niger uranium link. Joe Wilson's intel was good (as was some earlier reporting on Iraq-Niger uranium links), but that bad Italian intel had the potential to muddy the water, especially if some well placed individual decided to start lying about what he found in Africa.

In March of 2003, the International Atomic Energy Agency (the IAEA) announced that some documents it had received from the United States about an Iraq-Niger uranium deal had been identified as forgeries. Joe Wilson had never seen the Italian documents that were behind his trip to Niger (they did not actually come into U.S. possession until October 2002, eight months after Wilson's trip), but he immediately deduced that the forged documents must have been the documents behind his trip.

Two months later, about the time that Wilson began to working as a foreign policy advisor for John Kerry's presidential campaign, Wilson started telling reporters, on condition of anonymity, that he had been sent by the CIA to Niger to investigate a possible Iraq-Africa uranium link.[4] He claimed to have discovered that the supposed link was based on forged documents, saying that he reported this back to the CIA, and that the White House knew the intel was phony for ten

months before including it in the State of the Union as a trumped up pretext for war.

Wilson's first vehicle was Nicholas Kristof at the *New York Times*:

> In February 2002, according to someone present at the meetings, that envoy reported to the C.I.A. and State Department that the information was unequivocally wrong and that the documents had been forged.[5]

Another was Walter Pincus at the *Washington Post*:

> Among the envoy's conclusions was that the documents may have been forged because the "dates were wrong and the names were wrong," the former U.S. government official said.[6]

Here is how Wilson told the story to John Judis and Spencer Ackerman at the *New Republic*:

> He [the unnamed ex-ambassador] returned after a visit to Niger in February 2002 and reported to the State Department and the CIA that the documents were forgeries. The CIA circulated the ambassador's report to the vice president's office, the ambassador confirms to TNR. But, after a British dossier was released in September detailing the purported uranium purchase, administration officials began citing it anyway, culminating in its inclusion in the State of the Union. "They knew the Niger story was a flat-out lie," the former ambassador tells TNR.[7]

Contrast all these claims about having identified forged documents with what Wilson actually reported after his Niger trip, as related by CIA Director George Tenet:

> There was no mention in the report of forged documents—or any suggestion of the existence of documents at all.[8]

According to the 2004 SSCI report on pre-war intelligence:

> The only mention of Iraq in [Wilson's] report pertained to the meeting between the Iraqi delegation and former Prime Minister Mayaki.[9]

Mayaki had *supported* the presiden't "sixteen words." What about Wilson's claim that "the dates were wrong and the names were wrong" on the Italian documents? "The former ambassador told

Committee staff that he, in fact, did not have access to any of the names and dates in the CIA's reports."[10]

In an article he wrote for the *Nation* just before the IAEA report exposed the forgeries, Wilson vituperated wildly against the Bush administration, but expressed no qualms about President Bush's State of the Union claims.[11] If he had really "reported to the State Department and the CIA that the documents were forgeries," as he told Judis and Ackerman, he would have had his negative reaction to President Bush's "sixteen words" immediately upon hearing them. His reaction would not have to wait until the IAEA clued him in to the phony documents.[12]

What an opportunity the IAEA's announcement provided. All Joe Wilson had to do was suppress what he actually found in Africa (that Saddam *had* tried to buy uranium), then claim that he had personally identified and reported the documents to be forgeries back in 2002 (in for a dime, in for a dollar). With this nifty two step, he could level the most damaging possible allegation: that the Bush administration had knowingly used forged documents to phony up grounds for going to war in Iraq. As Wilson put it in the July 2003 *New York Times* op-ed where he shed his anonymity: "a legitimate argument can be made that we went to war under false pretenses."[13]

Like Paul Murdoch, Wilson saw a treasonous opportunity and pursued it with all the imagination, nerve and skill that he could muster, attacking the legitimacy of our nation's war effort by spreading malicious disinformation about classified intelligence. That's the background. The subject of particular interest for this book is the whole industry of abettors without whom Wilson's gambit would not have gone anywhere.

The Press Knew the Truth at the Time

Five days after Wilson's *Times* op-ed, CIA Director Tenet revealed what Wilson actually found in Africa, but with a strange twist. Tenet referred to Wilson, not by name, but as "an individual with ties to the region" who had been asked "to make a visit to see what he could learn."[14] It was a peculiar use of indirect language, given that Wilson had just proclaimed in the *New York Times*: "Those news stories about that unnamed former envoy who went to Niger? That's me."[15]

Here is the key part of Tenet's July 2003 statement to the press:

> He reported back to us that one of the former Nigerian officials he met stated that he was unaware of any contract being signed

> between Niger and rogue states for the sale of uranium during his tenure in office.
>
> The same former official also said that in June 1999 a businessman approached him and insisted that the former official meet with an Iraqi delegation to discuss "expanding commercial relations" between Iraq and Niger.
>
> The former official interpreted the overture as an attempt to discuss uranium sales.

Thus within a week of Wilson's coming out party, every reporter covering the story knew that Wilson's evidence actually supported the president's "sixteen words." What could they do to rescue the "Bush lied" story line they had been tearing at like a pack of hyenas since the anonymous Wilson started making his accusations three months earlier? Their whistle-blower just had the whistle blown on him.

Tenet's odd decision not to identify Wilson by name left the press an out. They could simply pretend that they did not know that Tenet was referring to Wilson, and this in fact is what they did, *en masse*. The one mainstream-media exception was *Time Magazine*, which came out with a strong piece on Wilson's towering deceits.[16] Good for *Time*, but the vast majority of reporting abetted Wilson's lies.

Typical was the one report on Tenet's statement that got by far the widest distribution: John Solomon's AP report, carried by Fox News, CBS, *USA Today*, the *San Francisco Chronicle* and hundreds of other large and small news outlets.[17]

Solomonic Judgment

John Solomon's AP report quoted Tenet's statement about the unnamed "individual with ties to the region" whose trip to Niger had confirmed the president's State of the Union claims, but he never identified this individual as Wilson, even as Solomon added further information about this un-named individual that depended on his knowing that it *was* Wilson. Solomon described the un-named individual as a "former diplomat" who "has alleged he believed Vice President Dick Cheney's office was apprised of the findings of his trip." This allegation about Cheney's office being apprised was included in Joe Wilson's *New York Times* op-ed. Thus John Solomon used Joe Wilson's non-anonymous public statements to fill out his story about the unnamed official in Tenet's statement, and *still* he did not let his readers know that this un-named official was Wilson.

This was the biggest scoop that Solomon will *ever* have a chance to report. One of the most dramatic accusations in history was exposed as the baldest lie, and Solomon chose to abet the liar by hiding the liar's identity, even though that identity is assumed in Solomon's own assertions of fact. Is fully conscious complicity with treason treason? I don't see how John Solomon is any better than Joe Wilson.

Solomon abetted Wilson in other ways as well, describing the subject of Tenet's statement as: "President Bush's false allegation about an Iraqi nuclear deal." President Bush had not made *any* allegation about an Iraqi nuclear deal. Eliding the distinction between making a deal and seeking a deal was one of Wilson's tricks, and Solomon repeated it.

Solomon also knew well that Bush's actual allegation was not "false." Solomon might not have known that Prime Minister Blair was loudly backing the British dossier that Bush had cited, because that news was embargoed by the American media even after it was front-page news across Europe.[18] But Solomon at least knew that Wilson *himself* had provided evidence of Iraqi attempts to buy uranium in Niger, having just used such a clever ruse to hide Tenet's exposure of this fact from his readers.

Sotto Voce

A year later, in July 2004, the British "Butler Report" concluded that the British dossier referred to in President Bush's State of the Union address was indeed untainted by the forged documents.[19] That same month, the 2004 SSCI report detailed Wilson's lies about what he found in Africa. What was the media reaction to these authoritative reports?

Howard Kurtz at the *Washington Post* ran a tally of press coverage from the first weeks after the SSCI report was released (the period when the press might feel some obligation to report the Senate's findings), and compared it to previous coverage. Kurtz found that when the story was "Joseph C. Wilson IV's allegations that President Bush misled the country about Saddam Hussein seeking uranium from Africa," the numbers were impressive:

> NBC carried 40 stories, CBS 30 stories, ABC 18, The Washington Post 96, The New York Times 70, The Los Angeles Times 48.[20]

His tally for stories about "a Senate Intelligence Committee report that contradicts some of Wilson's account and supports Bush's State of the Union claim," not so impressive:

> NBC Nightly News and ABC's World News Tonight have each done a story. But CBS hasn't reported it –despite a challenge by Republican Chairman Ed Gillespie on CBS's Face the Nation, noting that the network featured Wilson on camera 15 times. A spokeswoman says CBS is looking into the matter.

Kurtz found that the *Washington Post* had run two stories, the *New York Times* two stories, and the *L.A. Times* two stories. (I found a third for the *Post*.[21])

After reporters tiptoed past the SSCI and Butler Reports, they resumed their "Bush lied" story-line as if these reports had never been issued. For the next three years, the press would find hundreds of opportunities to recap Wilson's accusations against the president, without letting on that they were known lies.

Wilson-Plame

Joe Wilson's moment in the spotlight was extended to multi-year duration by the role of his CIA employee wife, Valerie Plame. When reporters found out that Joe Wilson's wife had recommended him for his Niger trip, Wilson issued angry denials. "Valerie had nothing to do with the matter," he declaimed in his ironically titled memoir *The Politics of Truth*, "[s]he definitely had not proposed that I make the trip."[22] This too was revealed by the SSCI report to be a lie: "…interviews and documents provided to the Committee indicate that his wife, a CPD employee, suggested his name for the trip."[23]

A special prosecutor investigation into who leaked Plame's identity was something everyone could agree on. The Bush administration wanted to start investigating leaks, and the anti-Bush forces wanted an investigation into this "bad leak" of information that suggested something fishy about their hero Joe Wilson's trip to Niger.

After three years, it would turn out that Special Prosecutor, Patrick J. Fitzgerald, knew who the leaker was, and that the leak was innocent of any criminal wrongdoing, before his criminal investigation ever began. Richard Armitage, an anti-war partisan in the State Department, told the Department of Justice in October 2003 that he had let Valerie Plame/Wilson's CIA employment slip. When Fitzgerald received the case two months later, he asked Armitage to stay quiet,

which Armitage did: "the special counsel, once he was appointed, asked me not to discuss this and I honored his request."[24]

Whether Fitzgerald committed a crime of his own by going on a three-year fishing expedition under false pretenses is a matter yet to be settled, but the whole affair rovided Wilson and his media abettors with endless new opportunities to dishonestly attack the Bush administration.[25] In August of 2003, Wilson claimed to know that it was President Bush's top political advisor, Karl Rove, who had told the press about the role played by Wilson's wife. "It's of keen interest to me," said Wilson, "to see whether or not we can get Karl Rove frog-marched out of the White House in handcuffs, and trust me, when I use that name, I measure my words."[26]

Fitzgerald's prosecutorial efforts would later reveal that (according to Richard Armitage) it was Joe Wilson himself who brought attention to his wife's CIA employment. Here is the relevant part of the Bob Woodward's recording of his conversation with Armitage:

> WOODWARD: But it was Joe Wilson who was sent by the agency. I mean that's just — ARMITAGE: His wife works in the agency. WOODWARD: — Why doesn't that come out? Why does — ARMITAGE: Everyone knows it. WOODWARD: —that have to be a big secret? Everyone knows. ARMITAGE: Yeah. And I know [ ] because Joe Wilson's been calling everybody. He's pissed off because he was designated as a low-level guy, went out to look at it. So, he's all pissed off. … WOODWARD: But why would they send him? ARMITAGE: Because his wife's a analyst with the agency.[27]

Wilson's wife had been involved in Wilson's publicity campaign from the beginning. Vicky Ward at *Vanity Fair* interviewed both Wilsons and discovered that Mrs. Wilson was present when Joe Wilson first talked to Nicholas Kristof (the first person to report the anonymous Wilson's allegations). The setting was a Democratic Party policy conference:

> In early May, Wilson and Plame attended a conference sponsored by the Senate Democratic Policy Committee, at which Wilson spoke about Iraq; one of the other panelists was the New York Times journalist Nicholas Kristof. Over breakfast the next morning with Kristof and his wife, Wilson told about his trip to Niger and said Kristof could write about it, but not name him.[28]

Even without Mrs. Wilson's up-front presence, it is obvious that it was Wilson's shenanigans that brought exposure to his wife. Wilson had in fact been recommended for the Niger trip by his wife, so when he started telling high profile lies about his Niger trip, the unavoidable effect was to point the finger at his wife. What is impressive, in a Paul Murdoch like way, is how Wilson used the attention he brought on his wife as another opportunity to dishonestly attack the integrity of the Bush administration.

By denying his wife's role and pointing the finger at others, Wilson was able to engineer the charge that the administration was out to intimidate whistle blowers. "The attack on [my wife] and by extension the attempts to launch attacks on me or discredit my credibility," said Joe Wilson in a September 2003 interview, "are clearly intended to intimidate others from coming forward."[29] It was the perfect complement to his original whistle-blower claim that "we went to war under false pretenses."

Wilson had a daring new lie to fit every new circumstance, and he could always count on the media to exploit his deceptions for maximum effect. For the multi-year duration of the Plame-leak investigation, every update would provide the media with another opportunity to introduce Joe Wilson by repeating some version of his disinformation, generally casting him as the heroic whistle-blower who exposed the Bush administration's phony grounds for going to war.

Four Years of Conscious Lying about Joe Wilson's "Bush Lied" Lies

From an *Associated Press* article about Scooter Libby's possible involvement in leaking Plame's name:

> Wilson's revelations cast doubt on President Bush's claim in his 2003 State of the Union address that Niger had sold uranium to Iraq to develop a nuclear weapon as one of the administration's key justifications for going to war in Iraq.[30]

No, President Bush did *not* claim that Niger sold uranium to Iraq. He claimed evidence that Iraq had *tried* to buy uranium ore, a claim that Wilson himself had found evidence for, as settled by authoritative Senate investigation.

When Karl Rove's name came up in the Plame-leak investigation, *Bloomberg News* began its coverage with:

> Two-year-old assertions by former ambassador Joseph Wilson regarding Iraq and uranium, which lie at the heart of the contro-

> versy over who at the White House identified a covert U.S. operative, have held up in the face of attacks by supporters of presidential adviser Karl Rove.[31]

This is true. Wilson's proven lies *have* held up, in the press, as evidenced by this typical *Times* fare from 2006:

> Two months ago, Italian intelligence officials concluded that a set of documents at the center of the supposed Iraq-Niger link had been forged by an occasional Italian spy.[32]

No, the forged documents were *not* at the center of the supposed Iraq-Niger link. They were bad information that had been mixed in with good information, and our intelligence agencies did a reasonably good job of separating the two, as the Wilson's treasonous gambit was to try to establish that the forged documents were of the basis of the Iraq-Niger link by telling sensational lies about having identified the forgeries himself while hiding the real Iraqi attempt to buy uranium that he discovered. All of this is laid out in the SSCI and Butler reports. If reporters want to contest these exhaustive reports, have at it, but to ignore them is foul.

In April of 2006, Ed Bradley of *60 Minutes* laid out the supposed facts of the Wilson case. Not only did Bradley claim that Wilson's trip to Niger found no signs of "a secret deal to send [uranium ore] to Iraq," (true enough). He also claimed that Wilson's trip "found no evidence that Iraq had even been interested in buying uranium."[33] Except for that tidbit about reporting back that the Iraqis had tried to buy uranium from Prime Minister Mayaki.

In May 2007, Bill Moyers began an interview with Italian conspiracy theorist Carlo Bonini by asserting: "Those sixteen words in the President's State of the Union Address… well it wasn't true."[34] Yes it was true. Saddam *did* try to buy uranium in Africa, but why should the press tell *you* the truth? As far as they are concerned, they have won this battle. Everyone thinks Bush lied. All they have to do now is make sure that no one forgets it. The truth does not serve their partisan interest so they don't tell the truth, and as Paula Ward so endearingly put it, *they never will*.

When it came out that Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald had conducted his entire investigation in bad faith, it took the *New York Times* ten days to say anything, then it came to them: a silver lining. At least this was another opportunity to abet Joe Wilson's treason:

> Mr. Wilson debunked the claim that Saddam Hussein tried to buy uranium from Niger to make nuclear weapons.[35]

No. He came back from Niger with evidence that *supported* that claim. His pretense to the contrary is a lie that the editors of the *New York Times* are intimately familiar with, having gone to extraordinary lengths to propagate and protect it.

When Patrick Fitzgerald nevertheless went ahead with perjury charges against Scooter Libby for testifying imprecisely about things that Libby said he did not remember well, web journalist Roger Simon noted on *Meet the Press* that: "there's no underlying crime here that anyone has been indicted for. This is just a show trial."[36] "But, Roger," said Howard Kurtz, "it's a show trial that has put the spotlight on the Bush administration's attempt to make a case about prewar intelligence that turned out not to be true. That matters."

No, it was a show trial about pre-war intelligence that turned out to be *correct*, and Howard Kurtz knows this as well as anyone. It was Kurtz, recall, who documented the failure of leading media outlets to let the public know that the SSCI report had exposed Joe Wilson as a liar whose Niger evidence actually supported the president's State of the Union claims.[37] Now here he was supporting Wilson's accusations. Kurtz is as honest as the mainstream media's Washington Press corps gets. He will actually tell the truth once in a while (as opposed to keeping mum about it), but he is still a rabid partisan.

The above examples could be multiplied dozens of times. For four years running, virtually every newspaper in the country has systematically abetted Joe Wilson's treason. Every reporter covering the story has known the truth. A normal person, upon realizing that she has conveyed false information, will seek to correct it. Not our postmodern press, who constantly suppress the truth in an effort to gain maximum partisan advantage for their Democrat-left agenda. Their only guiding star is to do as much damage as possible to our president and to our war effort.

This is why partisan dishonesty is not in general a Democrat vs. Republican issue. No one blames ordinary Democrats for believing what they read in the newspaper. When for four years running, practically every newspaper and television station in the country portrays Joe Wilson as a heroic whistleblower and supports his accusations that President Bush is a liar, how are readers supposed to know that Wilson is known by every political reporter in the country to be an ambitious traitor, telling proven lies about classified intelligence?

At some point, yes, letting oneself continue to be duped by our partisan media does become blameworthy. After witnessing the serial treason committed by the *New York Times*, publishing leak after leak about our terrorist surveillance methods, there is really no excuse for continuing to accept the *Times* as an honest broker. But gaining an inkling that something is wrong does not by itself accomplish very much. The only way to understand the magnitude of mainstream media dishonesty is to connect with the massive fact-checking conducted on a daily basis by the conservative blogosphere, which is the purpose here.

Wilson lies, the Press Club Laughs (*Director's Cut*)

At any other time in America's history, anyone who told high profile lies in an attempt to undermine the nation's war effort would be a candidate for execution as a traitor. The British executed "Lord Haw Haw" after World War II simply for spreading obvious enemy propaganda, never mind the much greater crime of spreading malicious disinformation about classified intelligence.[38] Wilson should at best be universally reviled, yet he is to this day embraced as a champion by the very people who are most aware of his treason: the many reporters who have covered his story.

A revealing moment came at a Press Club luncheon in October 2005 where Wilson was the featured speaker. Wilson repeated every one of his long exposed lies, still claiming that his trip to Niger had debunked rather than supported the president's State of the Union speech, still claiming that the Bush administration had gone to war on the basis of what it knew to be forged documents. The Washington press corpse was in its version of heaven. Every earnest proclamation of speaking truth-to-power was answered by the luncheoneers with the most heartfelt applause and cheers. Every jocular aside was met with adoring laughter.

The curtain dropped entirely during the question-and-answer period with Press Club President Rick Dunham. Every question was a setup for Wilson to produce the next portion of his prepared screed: "Have you been threatened?" "Should Bush be impeached?" At the outset of this travesty, Wilson let slip that he knew the next question:

> Joe Wilson: …Now with respect to the second question? Was Rove resign? [Sic.] Was that there?
>
> Rick Dunham [sotto voce]: That's coming up.

> JW [sotto voce]: Oh, that's coming up. [Then in full voice, realizing everyone has heard]: I read the question.... I read it over his shoulder.
>
> RD: That's... right-heh…Should Karl Rove resign and… [Interrupted by audience laughter][39]

And on they go through the rest of the charade, with the assembled media professionals laughing, clapping, groaning and otherwise commiserating at every Wilson cue.

This is the same press corps that only days before had made a front-page scandal out of American soldiers "caught on tape" working out who would answer questions on what subjects when they went live with President Bush.[40] None of the soldiers were told what to say, but the *Associated Press* still charged that the teleconference was "staged," while numerous talking heads used the incident to bolster their "twisted intel" storyline: not only is Bush lying to us about the Iraq war, now he is enlisting American soldiers into his deception. All because a group of soldiers practiced passing a mike around!

When these same reporters were faced with an actual staged question-and-answer, involving someone they all knew to be telling the most serious lies about the nation's war effort, the Press Club was ecstatic. Halleluiah. It was the post-modern left's pre Ten Commandments religion of false witness, congregating in full devotion.

From the grand to the petty, from abetting a traitor to abusing our troops, our media refuses to ever miss a partisan trick. These are the people who we are paying as a professional class to check facts and report honestly. They have been lying about lying, systematically and *en masse*, for four years. The great majority of them need to be fired, and we can easily do it. Just vote with your pocketbook, and most importantly, with your time. Don't patronize dishonest news sources. Pay enough attention to the alternate media to discover who is honest and who isn't, and spend your news time with the honest sources.

CHAPTER TWELVE

STRIVING FOR DEFEAT

COLUMNIST Charles Krauthammer, whose training is in clinical psychology, coined the term "Bush Derangement Syndrome" to describe the mania amongst our Democrat-left elites for finding ways to interpret any story as anti-Bush, regardless of the facts.[1] Such a descent into oppositionalism is the predictable result of a culture of partisan dishonesty. Bush is a particular nemesis because he defeated the left electorally for six years, but they would show the same antagonism towards any opposition leader.

The derangement comes from the fact that the left's backwards thinking (starting with preferred conclusions and finding excuses to dismiss contrary reason and evidence) has purged them of the substantive views that come from thinking frontwards (following reason and evidence). By sacrificing truth for manipulative advantage for so long, the left no longer *has* any views that are based on reason and evidence. All they have is oppositionalism itself, fueled by ever more inchoate anger.

President Bill Clinton was attacked too, but with a crucial difference. He was not attacked dishonestly, and when he acted in the nation's interest, Republicans always supported him. Everything Clinton achieved—welfare reform, NAFTA, stopping Slobodan Milošević—was accomplished through his famous "triangulation": working with Republicans against Democrat resistance. If he had not waged war on gun rights, he might even have avoided the honest attacks over his innumerable petty corruptions. But Republican hostility to President Clinton was always limited to honest criticism, and was always motivated by substantive understanding of the national interest, not by inchoate oppositionalism.

Democrat opposition lacks this moral character. Any misrepresentation that can be used to attack Republicans and conservatives is em-

braced, especially when there is a chance to attack America's war effort. Why should our war effort be a particular target? Just remember how ideological leftists came to dominate the Democrat party in the first place.

Vietnam Syndrome

The left gained control over the Democrat party on the strength of two great successes. They succeeded in bringing about the resignation of President Nixon, and they succeeded in bringing about America's defeat in Vietnam. Both were huge feats.

The war on the ground was largely won by the United States and South Vietnam by the end of the 1968 Tet offensive, where the communist forces in South Vietnam (the Viet Cong) gambled all of their assets in a direct assault on South Vietnamese towns and cities protected by South Vietnamese and American troops. Like the insurgency in Iraq, the Viet Cong's effectiveness had come from guerilla tactics. Imagine if al Qaeda in Iraq, the remnants of Saddam Hussein's Baathist regime and the many Iranian infiltrators in Iraq, all decided to rise up in frontal assault against our military. They would be wiped out, which is exactly what happened during the Tet offensive.

With American assistance, the South Vietnamese military killed an estimated 50,000 Viet Cong during Tet, to 6,000 South Vietnamese lost, marking the end of the South Vietnamese communists as an effective fighting force. The American media, however, misreported the Tet offensive as a terrible turn of events for America and the South.[2] The ferocity of the attack was reported as an indication of Viet Cong strength. The Viet Cong had raised the level of fighting, which was taken to imply that we would thus have a harder fight on our hands henceforth.

Walter Cronkite looked out from the roof of his hotel, saw ferocious fighting in areas that had hitherto been calm, and famously reported that the best America could hope for was a stalemate:

> The nature of the war has changed. It is no longer a series of small engagements, fought for local areas against small bands of communists. It is no longer to be fought primarily in the sparsely occupied countryside. It is now more along the classic Western fashion of war: large armies, locked in Combat, moving toward a decision on the battlefield.[3]

If only Cronkite had reported the truth: that the enemy's attempt to fight "along the Western fashion of war" was a total failure and they were being annihilated. Instead, his famous telecast concluded that whatever we could throw at the enemy, they could throw back at us, be it hundreds of thousands of men, or nuclear arms! He presented a photo-negative of the actual situation on the ground, and the effect was devastating.

Democrat President Lyndon Johnson—the one civilian who knew better than any other that Tet was a disaster for the enemy—had no will to fight his own political base, and five weeks later declared his own personal defeat. He would not run for re-election. The illiberal "liberal" media took down its first president, just as victory on the ground had been largely achieved.

With the Viet Cong broken, the war became from that point on a pure invasion of the South by the North, conducted via long supply lines through Laos and Cambodia. If only we could interdict these supply lines, the situation would be manageable. We were already bombing the Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos, albeit belatedly, and under burdensome self-imposed restraints.[4] To evade this bombing, the Communists were routing more and more of their supplies through Cambodia. Newly elected Republican President Richard Nixon responded (with the acquiescence of the Cambodian monarchy) by bombing supply lines in Cambodia, but with a twist that would come to define "Nixonian": the Cambodian bombing strategy was kept secret.[5]

When this expansion of the war was revealed, paroxysms of rage exploded across the anti-war left and the mainstream media, both of which strove desperately to grab out military by the wrists. Hadn't the media already reported that the war was lost? We needed to be getting out of Vietnam, not expanding the battlefield. Thus the enemy was allowed to expand the battlefield into Cambodia, but every effort to pursue him there met with massive domestic resistance.

The American people did their part for victory. In 1972, in an election that had become a referendum on the war, President Nixon won re-election in the greatest landslide in American history. In what may be the gravest *failure* of representative government in American history, the will of the people was not honored.

With President Nixon weakened by the Watergate scandal, the press was able to spread enough negative war reporting to stampede a cowardly Democrat-controlled Congress into de-funding our South

Vietnamese allies, even after they had proved that they could win on their own by crushing the North Vietnamese Easter offensive in 1972, killing seventy thousand communist invaders with not much more than funding and strategic bombing assistance from the United States.[6]

The last U.S. ground troops were removed from Vietnam during this several months long battle, but even with American troops out of harm's way, the Democrats would accept nothing less than communist victory. Thus did our left elites in the media and in the Democratic Party succeed in snatching defeat from the jaws of victory in Vietnam, validating their longstanding contention that the war had been a mistake. For that accomplishment, the disloyal opposition was rewarded with control of the Democratic Party.

Interregnum (*Director's Cut*)

From 1976 to 1980, Democrat President Jimmy Carter threw off American influence and power with all the zeal of a million-mom-marcher tossing guns in a smelter: Nicaragua to the Sandinistas, the Panama Canal to the Chinese, Iran to the *mullahs*. America was the problem, according to Jimmy Carter. If only we would disarm, we would be safe. If we would just stop trying to be so influential in the world, we would see that the Communists were not so bad after all.

Republican President Ronald Reagan turned things around by winning the Cold War, then our next Democrat president, Bill Clinton, resumed the million-mom "get that gun away from me," approach to power and defense. When terrorists almost succeeded in bringing down the Trade Towers in 1993, blowing a five-story hole in the Trade Center's parking basement, Clinton used the fact that they hadn't succeeded to pretend that it hadn't happened.

9/11 was *not* the first Islamofascist strike on American soil. '93 was (with strong evidence that Saddam Hussein had colluded with "blind sheik" Omar Abdel Rahman, who was convicted in the plot) but Bill Clinton was too busy disarming America to be willing to notice.[7] The Cold War was over. Military spending could be diverted to domestic goals like Hillary Clinton's plan to socialize medicine, but only by treating the '93 bombing, not as an act of war, but as a criminal case.

Massachusetts Senator John Kerry, the 2004 Democratic presidential candidate, wants to treat *9/11* as a criminal case. "[T]his war on terror is far less of a military operation and far more of an intelligence-gathering, law-enforcement operation" he said in a 2003 presidential

debate.[8] Funny that he is also against intelligence gathering, claiming that President Bush broke the law by intercepting al Qaeda signals intelligence in time of war without first getting permission from a judge.[9]

It is telling that Kerry became the Democrat's nominee for president because Kerry's 1971 Senate testimony (where he passed on false testimony from the anti-war movement's phony "winter soldier investigations," accusing his fellow soldiers in Vietnam of committing war crimes) was one of the keys to creating the disaffection that ultimately cost us the Vietnam War.[10] Thirty plus years later, the Democrats are doing the same thing, seeking to gain power at home by securing American defeat abroad.

Vietnam in Somalia

Western Pennsylvania Representative John Murtha, a leading anti-war Democrat, is explicit in calling for U.S. defeat in Iraq. After the death of al Qaeda-in-Iraq chieftan Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, when intelligence gathered from Zarqawi's computers was enabling a massive rollup of the al-Qaeda-in-Iraq network, Murtha expressed in a CNN interview his extreme frustration with the Bush administration's continued refusal to cut and run:

> MURTHA: The thing that disturbed me and worries me about this whole thing is we can't get them to change direction. And I said over and over in debate, if you listen to any of it, in Beirut President Reagan changed direction, in Somalia President Clinton changed direction…[11]

His examples of "changing direction" make clear that Murtha means declaring defeat and turning tail, according to the Vietnam template. Al Qaeda is explicitly counting on cut-and-runners like Murtha to secure victory for them. In a 1998 interview with John Miller, Osama bin Laden listed our Vietnam, Beiruit and Somalia changes of direction as the basis of his thinking that America would fold in the face of aggression:

> We have seen in the last decade the decline of the American government and the weakness of the American soldier who is ready to wage Cold Wars and unprepared to fight long wars. This was proven in Beirut when the Marines fled after two explosions. It also proves they can run in less than 24 hours, and this was also repeated in Somalia.[12]

Like Vietnam, Somalia in 1993 was actually a military victory, as far as it went. Even lured into an ambush, and operating under absurd restraints, designed to keep up the fiction that Somalia remained a "humanitarian" mission, 140 Army Rangers and a handful of Delta Force commandos fought their way back to base, killing a thousand attackers to eighteen Americans lost. But even against tenth-rate opposition, President Clinton was unwilling to stay the course, heedless again of the costs of defeat.

In Vietnam, the much derided "domino theory" of communist takeover proved correct, at the costs of millions slaughtered in Vietnam and Cambodia and totalitarian dictatorship that continues to this day. In Somalia, our unwillingness to contend with the elementary-school junior varsity culminated in the June 2006 takeover of Somalia by the Islamofascists. Thankfully Ethiopia picked up the slack and at the end of 2006 routed the Islamofascists from Somalia in a couple of days.

Before the Islamofascists were driven out of Somalia, Democrats in Congress were agitating for the United States not to back an Ethiopian attack, but to accept the Islamofascist takeover instead. Here is the *New York Times*, reporting to the faithful on the progress of the Democrats' "change of course" strategy for American defeat, just before the Ethiopians ruined their plans:

> A growing number of Democrats in Congress are urging the Bush administration to change course and deal with the Islamists for what they are: the power on the ground. "The Islamists aren't going away, so the sooner we talk to them, the better," said Representative Donald M. Payne, the New Jersey Democrat who is expected to become the chairman of the House subcommittee on Africa when his party takes control of Congress in January.[13]

When Payne said "the Islamists aren't going away," he meant, if the Democrats got their way. The Democrats lost Somalia, but they are still hoping to win American defeat in Iraq.

Al Qaeda sees the Western Media as Their Most Important Ally

Our Democrat-dominated press may not see itself as on the side of al Qaeda, but al Qaeda is perfectly clear in understanding that the Western media is not just their ally, but their only possible hope of victory. This was detailed by al-Qaeda "number two," Ayman al-Zawahiri, in

a letter to al-Qaeda-in-Iraq leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi in October of 2005. "[H]owever far our capabilities reach," wrote Zawahiri, "they will never be equal to one thousandth of the capabilities of the kingdom of Satan that is waging war on us."[14] But there was another possibility. Al Qaeda could achieve victory, not through military effectiveness, but by winning the battle for media perceptions:

> I say to you: that we are in a battle, and that more than half of this battle is taking place in the battlefield of the media. And that we are in a media battle in a race for the hearts and minds of our Umma.

All they had to do was hang on and the American media would do their work for them:

> Things may develop faster than we imagine. The aftermath of the collapse of American power in Vietnam-and how they ran and left their agents-is noteworthy.

Zawahiri concedes that al Qaeda does not have a shadow of a prayer of military victory in Iraq. All rests on the efforts of the Western press to create the illusion of defeat in Iraq, which both Zawahiri and the Western press are counting on to create an actual defeat through withdrawal, as happened in Vietnam.

This joint strategy by our Democrat-dominated media and by al Qaeda has been extraordinarily effective. A top al Qaeda military assessment, captured in April of '06, states flatly that the only battle al Qaeda has won in Iraq is the media battle:

> The policy followed by the brothers in Baghdad is a media oriented policy without a clear comprehensive plan to capture an area or an enemy center. Other word, the significance of the strategy of their work is to show in the media that the American and the government do not control the situation and there is resistance against them. This direction has large positive effects…
>
> At the same time, the Americans and the Government were able to absorb our painful blows, sustain them, compensate their losses with new replacements, and follow strategic plans which allowed them in the past few years to take control of Baghdad as well as other areas one after the other. That is why every year is worse than the previous year as far as the Mujahidin's control and influence over Baghdad.[15]

Al Qaeda's assessment is right. They *have* been winning the media battle. An NBC/WSJ poll from September 2005, 58 percent disapproved of the president's handling of the war, suggesting they thought the war was going badly, at the very time when al Qaeda, by its own admission, was being systematically defeated.[16] That takes systematic misreporting.

The media's anti-war disinformation can be divided into two categories. One is the undermining of the legitimacy of the war. Here the abetting of Joe Wilson's "Bush lied" lies is only one of a long list of Iraq war hoaxes, propagated by Democrat party leaders and their mainstream media allies, all charging that the Iraq war has been fought on illegitimate pretenses. Second is the misreporting of the progress of the war effort itself, only reporting negative war news.

Here is a short list of on the legitimacy of our war effort

The Imminent Threat Hoax

When it was discovered that pre-war intelligence assessments had overestimated Saddam's WMD activities, a number of hoaxes sprang up to exploit this intelligence failure. One is the claim that our rationale for going to war was the imminent threat posed by Saddam Hussein. "There was no imminent threat," said Senator Ted Kennedy: "This was made up in Texas, announced in January to the Republican leadership that war was going to take place and was going to be good politically. This whole thing was a fraud."[17] "This was a preemptive war," said Florida Democrat Senator Bob Graham, "and the rationale was that there was an imminent threat."[18]

The claim that the war had been justified on grounds of "imminent threat" was backed by numerous media outlets:

> The justification for going to war against Iraq was the imminent threat its weapons of mass destruction posed to the safety and security of Americans.
>
> *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, June 5, 2003[19]

> The public was told that Saddam posed an imminent threat. If that claim was fraudulent, the selling of the war is arguably the worst scandal in American political history - worse than Watergate, worse than the Iran-contra affair. Indeed, the idea that Americans were deceived into war makes many commentators so uncomfortable that they refuse to admit the possibility.

Paul Krugman, The New York Times, June 3, 2003[20]

But it was all lies, and they all knew it. President Bush had been perfectly explicit, in the biggest speech of the year, that he *rejected* "imminent threat" as a condition for war against Iraq:

> Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late. Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option.[21]
>
> State of the Union Address, January 29, 2003

One should also note that, while Saddam's WMD programs may have been in remission, he was simply biding his time until U.N. sanctions came to an end, at which time he would start developing WMD in earnest again. One of the intelligence windfalls from the Iraq war is the exposure of Saddam's successful bribery of France, Russia and China through the U.N. administered Oil for Food program.[22] With the Russians and Chinese in his corner, the sanctions regime would soon have been lifted and Saddam would soon have had his WMDs. Only the Iraq war stopped this plot, belying the claim that Saddam's WMD threat was overblown.

The Iraq war also kicked over A.Q. Kahn's black market in nuclear bomb technology. Kahn is the Pakistani scientist who stole nuclear bomb secrets in Europe and, with the help of the Chinese, led the development of Pakistan's "Islamic A-Bomb." In the wake of the Iraq war, Libyan dictator Moammar Gadhafi took seriously America's threat to act against looming conspiracies and agreed to turn over what he had acquired from Khan. With this exposure of Kahn's network, we were able to put Kahn out of business. If not for the Iraq war, Kahn would still be spreading nuclear bomb technology to Islamofascist regimes.[23] Thus even if Saddam's nuclear programs were quiescent, the Iraq war has still been highly effective in interdicting "gathering threats."

The "All About WMD" Hoax

Another popular hoax, in the wake of our failure to find WMD in Iraq, is the myth that the only reason for regime change in Iraq was to in-

terdict Saddam's WMD threat. "The president now says that the war is really about the spread of democracy in the Middle East," claimed House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi in March 2005: "This effort at after-the-fact justification was only made necessary because the primary rationale was so sadly lacking in fact."[24]

A month later, the *New York Times* was dutifully carrying the Democrat talking point:

> The only plausible reason for keeping American troops in Iraq is to protect the democratic transformation that President Bush seized upon as a rationale for the invasion after his claims about weapons of mass destruction turned out to be fictitious.[25]

But before the left knew that there would be an intelligence failure to exploit, they were singing a different tune. In February of 2003, before the war started, the editors of *The New York Times* waxed eloquent about the breadth of America's war aims:

> President Bush sketched an expansive vision last night of what he expects to accomplish by a war in Iraq. Instead of focusing on eliminating weapons of mass destruction, or reducing the threat of terror to the United States, Mr. Bush talked about establishing a "free and peaceful Iraq"...[26]

Imagine writing both of those editorials? Those who are fixated on manipulative advantage don't even see the contradiction. They just fabricate whatever can be used to mount an effective attack.

The "Saddam Hussein had no Ties to Terrorists" Hoax

There is not room to document the whole litany of Iraq War hoaxes here. A more comprehensive expose is available at *CrescentOfBetrayal.com*. Discussion of the "no ties to terrorists" hoax is particularly heavy on documentation, from the actual intelligence about Saddam's terror ties, to false statements made by leading Democrats about this intelligence, to dishonest reporting of the entire subject. If you have the appetite for these details, you can find them at the Crescent of Betrayal website.

The Accusation that Intelligence Analysts were Pressured to Phony-up their Reports (*Director's Cut*)

Joe Wilson started the "Bush lied" hoax, but it continued with broad accusations that the Bush administration pressured intelligence ana-

lysts to bias their Iraq WMD assessments so as to phony-up support for the war. As Senator Kennedy charged in January of 2004:

> The advocates of war in Iraq desperately sought to make the case that Saddam was linked to 9/11 and Al Qaeda, and that he was on the verge of acquiring a nuclear capability. … They bypassed the traditional screening process and put pressure on intelligence officers to produce the desired intelligence and analysis.[27]

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence was highly concerned about such charges and investigated them thoroughly, doing extensive interviews and issuing several separate calls for anyone who had been pressured to come forward. Their results were stark:

> The Committee was not presented with any evidence that intelligence analysts changed their judgments as a result of political pressure, altered or produced intelligence products to conform with Administration policy, or that anyone even attempted to coerce, influence or pressure analysts to do so. When asked whether analysts were pressured in any way to alter their assessments or make their judgments conform with Administration policies, not a single analyst answered yes. Most analysts simply answered, "no" or "never," but some provided more extensive responses.[28]

The report then goes on to list several analysts describing the actual pressure they felt: to get their analyses right, and not be responsible for yet another devastating intelligence failure, like 9/11. The March 2005 Silberman-Robb Commission Report came to the same conclusion:

> The analysts who worked Iraqi weapons issues universally agreed that in no instance did political pressure cause them to skew or alter any of their analytical judgments.[29]

These reports did not inhibit Democrat accusations, which got so bad that President Bush was finally compelled to speak out against them. In a November 2005 speech at the Tobyhanna Army Depot, he offered two rebuttals: that Senate investigation found no evidence of analysts being pressured to alter their intelligence assessments, and that the accusing Congressmen had access to the same intelligence he did, and came to the same conclusions, voting overwhelmingly to authorize the use of force to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

"While it's perfectly legitimate to criticize my decisions or the conduct of the war," President Bush insisted, "it is deeply irresponsible to rewrite the history of how the war began."[30]

The AP report on President Bush's rebuttal speech (attributed to Deb Reichmann) omits both of the President's rebuttals while quoting several repetitions of the charges that the President had rebutted.[31] Reichmann quotes Democratic Presidential Candidate John Kerry charging that the Bush administration, "… misled a nation into war by cherry-picking intelligence and stretching the truth beyond recognition." Reichmann also hands the job of characterizing the President's rebuttals over to Kerry, who accuses the President of "playing the politics of fear and smear," adding that "it's a dangerous day for our national security when an Administration's word is no good." Senator Kennedy is quoted proclaiming "the clear manipulation of intelligence in the run-up to the Iraq war," and charging that the President's rebuttals (unreported) "[revert] to the same manipulation of facts to justify a war we never should have fought." So much for the President of the United States trying to answer his critics.

Two weeks later blogger Bill Hobbs caught the *L.A. Times* pulling the same ruse with another of President Bush's Iraq-war speeches: repeating the criticisms the President was addressing while omitting his response to his critics.[32]

A new book by Jim Kuypers, a communications professor at Virginia Tech, examines the media coverage of all of President Bush's terror war speeches.[33] He found mainstream media reporting to be so systematically biased as to make it impossible for the President to communicate his message to the American people. What the media doesn't want people to hear, it simply omits, leading Kuypers to the conclusion that the media has become an "anti-democratic institution."

A morally competent democracy requires an informed electorate, but our main channels of communication have been usurped by a media class that fully believes in distorting information flow for partisan advantage.

Some Actual Biasing of Intelligence Reporting (*Director's Cut*)

In early 2007, some evidence did come out that our intelligence agencies had engaged in politicized pre-war reporting. Anti-war partisans in the CIA were deliberately suppressing intelligence about links be-

tween Iraq and bin Laden for explicitly political purposes. Here is an anecdote provided by the undersecretary of defense:

> Sometime in early 2002, in the course of her work, [a DoD analyst] came across a finished 1998 CIA report on Iraq's [redacted]. The report mentioned that Usama bin Laden had requested and received certain training from an Iraqi [redacted] service. On her own initiative, she requested and received through CIA channels the underlying information on which the item was based, consisting of two Memo Dissems, and subsequently obtained additional CIA reports from DIA and CIA on the issue of Iraq and al-Qaida. … She recommended that the [Joint Intelligence Task Force] publish the [intelligence community] reporting data "so that it would be available to the entire [intelligence community] because reports published previously did not contain this important data" and that, without it, "analysis of the subject would be incomplete and inaccurate in the future." …
>
> The J-2 analyst responded that "putting it out there would be playing into the hands of people like Wolfowitz," that the information "was old" and "only a tid-bit," asked how did she "know that the information was true," made a comment about trying to support "some agenda of people in the building," and bucked the issue of publication back to the JITF chief. The JITF chief took no further action on the recommendation to publish the information, as far as we know.[34]

Here was an anti-war analyst, suppressing information out of politicized concern that it favored the policy views of his political opponents. If there was a systematic bias in pre-war intelligence, it was certainly in this direction. Institutional rules were in place that kept terror leads from being followed. President Clinton did not want to fight the war that al Qaeda was waging against us so he defined terrorism as a law enforcement issue, then insured that this "law enforcement issue" would be sealed off from the apparatus of national security by erecting a "wall of separation" between law enforcement and intelligence.[35]

How far this institutional bias went is revealed by the fact that, shortly before 9/11, higher-ups in the FBI chastised field agents for trying to get the CIA to examine the computer of detained "20th hijacker" Zacarias Moussaoui.[36] This was a gross failure to do what was allowed under rules that themselves went "beyond what is legally required."[37] The established culture in the intelligence agencies was to

embrace the *spirit* of the crazy rules that sought to handcuff them. They shied away from terror leads instead of acting as aggressively as they could within the letter of the rules. In contrast, there is no evidence that the Bush administration wanted our intelligence services to do anything but produce sound intelligence.

We Can't Side with Democracy over Islamofascism: it's a "Civil War"

A longstanding Democrat strategy for de-legitimizing our war effort in Iraq has been to brand the conflict a civil war, thereby playing into another Vietnam war "lesson": that we should never take sides in civil wars, as if murder ceases to be a matter of right and wrong when it is just a man bludgeoning his wife to death. As California Senator Dianne Feinstein put it in October 2005:

> We are in the middle of two factions, Shiite and Sunni, attempting to settle their differences by mostly violent means. Drawing down our troop strength will not only take our service men and women out of harm's way, but it will also force Iraq's religious and political leaders to confront the insurgency and find a balance of power acceptable to Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds. The alternative—a continuation of this slaughter of innocents—will only continue to grow with the inevitable result: a drift into a civil war.[38]

Got that? The way to stop the "slaughter of innocents" is to stop defending Iraq's fledgling democracy from those who slaughter innocents.

Of course the media cannot resist abetting this no-civil-wars strategy for defeat, and of course al Qaeda plays it for all it is worth. One particularly glaring sequence was documented by milblogger Greyhawk. *The New York Times*' front page headline for March 27, 2006 read: "30 Beheaded Bodies Found; Iraqi Death Squads Blamed":

> BAGHDAD, Iraq, March 26—The bodies of 30 beheaded men were found on a main highway near Baquba this evening, providing more evidence that the death squads in Iraq are becoming out of control.[39]

Two days later, in a press conference in Iraq, Major General Thurman exposed the story as a hoax.[40] The *New York Times* buried its retracted headline in paragraph seventeen, where it was hedged with fresh accounts of supposed sectarian violence:

> The police in western Baghdad discovered 14 bodies on Tuesday, all killed execution-style with gunshots to the head, apparently the latest victims of sectarian bloodletting. On Monday, Iraqi forces found 18 bodies near Baquba with similar wounds. Earlier reports of 30 beheaded bodies found in that area were wrong, the Interior Ministry official said.[41]

The further fourteen bodies were "apparently the victims of sectarian bloodletting," but not *actually* the victims of sectarian bloodletting. On April 2 *Stars and Stripes* reported that the eighteen victims near Baquba had been murdered by al Qaeda terrorists dressed up to look like Iraqi military. Al Qaeda was trying to make it *look* like the country, and the Iraqi military, were descending into "sectarian bloodletting"[42]

This was a game of footsie between the *New York Times* and al Qaeda, with the *Times* credulously piping every propaganda ploy exactly as al Qaeda scored it, even when it became clear that al Qaeda's whole strategy was to feed disinformation about "sectarian violence" to the Western media. Instead of a front page apology: "We were duped by al Qaeda," the *Times* just kept reporting each new al Qaeda gambit as straight news, a ploy that continues to this day.[43]

In terms of public opinion, this al-Qaeda/Democrat-left gambit has been very successful. A March 2006 poll found a full 80 percent of Americans thought Iraq might be falling into civil war, and they were responding just as the defeatists wanted:

> In the face of continuing violence, half—52 percent—of those surveyed said the United States should begin withdrawing forces.

But al Qaeda's shift to civilian targets was actually moving the facts on the ground in the opposite direction. To create the appearance that its Saudi-funded proxy war was an Iraqi civil war, al Qaeda was bombing the Sunni minority that had always been their base of support, and was inducing revenge attacks against Sunni civilians by attacking Shiite civilians.[44] As a result, Sunni tribes started shifting their allegiance to the government. By the end of the summer of 2006, twenty-five of thirty-six tribes in the dangerous "Sunni triangle" province of Anbar had joined the Anbar Salvation Council, dedicated to driving al Qaeda and other foreign fighters out of Anbar.[45]

The al Qaeda strategy of attacking civilians has actually gone a long ways toward *reducing* the danger of civil war in order to create the *appearance* of civil war for the Western media. That appearance, as

both al Qaeda and our media know, can be more important than reality. Democracies ultimately make their decisions based on the perceptions of the electorate. Create the appearance of illegitimacy and disaster, and you can break the will of the nation, which is all that our enemies need.

Iran in Iraq

All of this looking away from reality in search of political advantage creates obliviousness to the existential threat posed by Iran. As al Qaeda's war-fighting capacity in Iraq has been ground down, Iran has stepped in to fill the void. There may not be a lot of civil war going on in Iraq, but the proxy war took off in 2006, with Shiite Iran playing an ever larger role in arming, funding and training the radical Shiite militias that have been attacking coalition forces and fomenting civil war from the Shiite side.

It is Iran that supplies the advanced "shaped charge" explosives that make the war much more dangerous for our troops.[46] It is Iran that is supplying Austrian made sniper rifles to insurgents in Iraq, and is manufacturing rifles for the "mahdi army" of Iraq's Khomeini-ist militia leader Muqtada al-Sadr.[47] Iran is actually supporting *both* sides in the Iraqi "civil war," not just Sadr's army, but also the Sunni al Qaeda and their Baathist allies.[48] The only answer is to "bomb Cambodia." We cannot fight only one front of a two front war, but must expand the war to fight who is fighting us.

The parallel to Vietnam is strong. Just as the destruction of the Viet Cong during the Tet offensive turned the Vietnam War into a straightout invasion by the north, so too the steady destruction of al Qaeda in Iraq is giving way to ever more direct conflict with Iran. Let's just not make the same mistake we did in Vietnam. "Cambodia" cannot be a safe haven from which the enemy is allowed to attack.

In December 2006, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad issued a traditional Islamic declaration of war against the United States for the third time in a year, the ultimatum to convert or die: "Rest assured that if you do not respond to the divine call, you will die soon and vanish from the face of the earth."[49] Add that Iran is the quintessential terror-supporting state, that its people are the most educated and Western looking in the Muslim world, and that a large majority of Iranians have been trying to throw off the *mullahs* electorally for fifteen years, and there could not be a more propitious target for regime change.

Knock out a couple of pillars and this most hated regime will collapse. As Michael Ledeen keeps saying: "faster, please."[50]

Unfortunately, the Bush administration has been acting much like Nixon in Vietnam, maintaining limited war aims out of what seems to be a political calculation that a more limited war is easier to support politically than a wider war. But ideological appeasement is as much a mistake as military appeasement, and it is as much a mistake at home as it is abroad. Every concession to the disloyal opposition strengthens their ideological position and weakens our military position. That's how we lost Vietnam: by limiting our war effort in an attempt to ease conflict with domestic proponents of American defeat. Just fight to win, and the disloyal opposition be damned.

If we fight the battles that need to be fought then the Islamofascists don't have a prayer. As Zawahiri puts it, their power "will never be equal to one thousandth of the capabilities of the kingdom of Satan." Only if the Democrats can succeed in pinning back the arms of our military, as they did in Vietnam, can the Islamofascists get their knife in, which assistance the Islamofascists are very explicitly counting on.

Commitment to Victory (*Director's Cut*)

After we routed the Taliban from Afghanistan in the fall of 2001, we still needed regime change in the three "axis of evil" countries: Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. All the backbiting and second-guessing about going after Iraq first is like second-guessing the decision to invade North Africa in World War II, or the choice of Normandy over Calais for the D-Day landing.

President Bush chose to undertake regime change where our use of force was backed by U.N. resolutions, in line with the thinking of most of today's Iraq War critics. The pre-existence of an actionable U.N.-recognized casus belli (Saddam's failure to abide by the Gulf War cease-fire conditions) made Iraq the obvious first-bite to take out of "the axis of evil," and it remains an excellent starting point, so long as we don't stop there, or God-forbid, retreat.

Constructive criticism is oriented on the objective of victory. Then there is what we have gotten from the Democrats, where every trumped-up claim of errant strategy is used as an excuse to declare defeat and hand victory to the enemy. Most criticisms of the conduct of the war amount to some kind of claim that the insurgency could have been avoided if only we had done such and such. Nonsense. The Islamofas-

cists understand that if Iraq succeeds, they fail. They have no choice but to fight, and that's good for us. It gives us a chance to kill them. We don't need peace. We need war. As in World War II, we have a lot of enemies to kill, and we had better get on with it.

They Love Death (*Director's Cut*)

On December 11th 2001, President Bush insisted that: "we must keep the world's most dangerous technologies out of the hands of the world's most dangerous people."[51] Three days later, former Iranian president Ali Akhbar Hashemi Rafsanjani expained why. The Muslim world can survive an exchange of nuclear weapons, he declared, but Israel cannot:

> …the use of a nuclear bomb in Israel will leave nothing on the ground, whereas it will only damage the world of Islam.[52]

Of course that same reasoning extends to nuclear exchange with the United States. If Iran sets off nuclear bombs in a dozen American ports, all we will be able to do is retaliate, but against whom? Are we going to nuke every Muslim state from North Africa to Indonesia? In truth, we would probably not retaliate very hard even against Iran. We have a well established principle in this country of not retaliating against innocents, and the vast majority of people living under a fascist dictatorship are innocent. If we retaliate at all, we will at most only "damage the world of Islam," which is the Islamofascist conception of victory. They declare it every day. "You love life. We love death."[53]

The Islamofascists only care about the survival of the Muslim *umma*, or collectivity, while we will not retaliate against the *umma*, meaning there can be no stable calculus of nuclear deterrence with the Islamofascists, even when they are state actors. Iran in particular is a suicide state. They are going to sacrifice themselves and their fellow Muslims in whatever numbers are necessary to destroy the West, *unless* we interdict them. Survival of the West depends on stopping the Islamofascists from getting weapons of mass destruction, period, and that gets harder and harder to do in an era of accelerating technological advance. We have only a window in which to destroy the Islamofascists. We cannot dawdle.

In an October 2006 speech, Ahmadinejad declared that Iran has only "one step remaining before we attain the summit of nuclear technology."[54] Ayatollah Mahmoud Hashemi Shahroudi, chief of the Ira-

nian judiciary, followed with a declaration that America and Israel are "on the threshold of annihilation."[55]

Not only is Iran working hard to develop nukes, but it is working hard to expand its delivery system. In November 2006, London's *Daily Telegraph* revealed that, as bin Laden's health fails, Iran is angling to install its own man as the next al Qaeda leader.[56]

War is always a race to kill the enemy before he can kill you. Our enemies are racing full tilt, but thanks to our partisan divisions, we are mostly sitting still, trying to maintain limited wars in the face of withering media attack. If we let our hands be tied until the Iranians get nuclear weapons then there will soon be nuclear bombs smuggled into who knows how many American cities and we will have lost, not just "another Vietnam," but everything.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

"IF WE CAN STAY TOGETHER"

THE 2006 MID TERM ELECTIONS were a great victory for partisan dishonesty. The numerous Iraq war hoaxes, pushed by the media every week for three years in an all out effort to de-legitimize our war effort, succeeded in creating enough disaffection for the war to give the Democrats a majority in Congress. Compared to other western societies, America still shows a great capacity to vote against the media slant. The slant is total, yet the country is divided straight down the middle. That is a great feat. It is just not enough.

Election and polling data here in California suggests that media bias is good for about a twenty point electoral swing. In recent years, a bevy of conservative ballot measures have passed in California by about a 60-40 margin. Proposition 209, banning government use of racial preferences, passed 60-40. Nearly identical majorities passed Prop. 227, ending bilingual education in the public schools; Prop. 187, curtailing state services to illegal aliens; and Prop. 22, defining marriage as between a man and a woman. All of these measures were *opposed* by state legislators by at least a 60-40 margin.[1]

That is a systematic 20 point disparity between the views of the people and the views of their representative. The only way that could happen is if the people are getting bad information, and the obvious culprit is the California media. The *L.A. Times*, the *San Jose Mercury News*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and the *Sacramento Bee* are all relentlessly left wing, stacked every day with partisan dishonesty.

To the extent that this disinformation actually changes people's views (instead of getting them to vote for people who do not represent their views) the media-bias effect is worth *more* than 20 points. Thus for America to still be split down the middle is pretty amazing. Bravo.

But in our winner-take-all electoral system, that moral semi-victory translates into retreat and defeat in the war on terror.

Elections always roll all election issues into one choice, but with the economy going like gangbusters and populist issues like border enforcement and runaway entitlement spending being even more of a liability for the Democrats than the Republicans, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the nation voted in November 2006 for retreat from the first fronts of what was always going to be a long war against Islamic fascism. What other conclusion is possible, when in the run up to the election Democrat party leaders were directly calling for retreat and defeat?

House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, who rose to Speaker of the House after the election, started calling for immediate withdrawal from Iraq back in 2005.[2] In August 2006, a dozen top Democrats, including most of the party leadership of both houses, united in calling for pull-out to begin by the end of the year.[3] Just before the election, Senator Kerry promised that: "Winning [the 2006 election] means forcing an end to the disastrous war in Iraq..."[4]

Electing anti-warriors makes it all but certain that, instead of expanding the Iraq war to take on the Iranian regime that is fighting us in Iraq, we are now going to lay off Iran, pretending that it is okay for this suicide state to get nuclear weapons, until the day they start going off. The only question will be how many, and we won't be counting buildings this time, we will be counting cities. As the number mounts, the horrific realization—like watching bullet after bullet rip through your own body—will not be of what has begun, but of what has ended. What part of 9/11 does America not understand?

At least we can understand how this has happened. When the entire mainstream media industry spends three years undermining the legitimacy of our war effort with a host damning Iraq war hoaxes, the electorate is going to be misled, and the hoaxes are only half of it. Just as misleading has been the media's reporting from the front.

Fauxtography

While the Israeli-Lebanon-Hezbollah "July War" flared briefly in the summer of 2006, a new word entered the blogger lexicon: fauxtography. *Reuters*, AP, *USA Today* and the *New York Times* were caught again and again publishing staged or doctored war photos, always with an anti-Israel slant.

How much damage can phony photographs do? The most inflammatory reporting of the entire July War claimed that Israel had attacked a Red Cross ambulance from the air. Accompanying photos, supplied by the Red Cross itself, showed a dilapidated ambulance with a round hole in the center of its roof, but it was all a hoax.

Zombie (the same Zombie who posted Etaoin Shrdlu's Mecca-orientation graphic) analyzed the photo evidence and showed that the hole in the roof was the hole for the ambulance's flashing bubble-light. The news services all had the same photo evidence Zombie did. They all knew that the supposed ambulance attack was a Hezbollah hoax, and they all went along, to devastating effect on Israel's war effort.

Israel's left-leaning Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, craving international approval as much as any American Democrat, could not stand up to the condemnation and acceded to a cease-fire at a time when the Israelis had their enemies completely at their mercy but had not yet achieved any of their war aims. It was another triumph for the left-wing media, snatching Western defeat from the jaws of victory.

Insurgent Stringers in Iraq

In Iraq, the employment of photographers who are in the enemy camp has been unabashed. "Journalists have always had relationships with people that others might find unsavory," says AP Executive Editor Kathleen Carroll: "We're not in this to choose sides; we're to report what's going on from all sides."[5] But even AP's claim of neutrality is a sham, since it accepts clearly staged propaganda photos of the enemy side that it would never accept if they were pro-Coalition.

A glaring case is AP photographer Bilal Hussein, whose ouvre is full of jihadists in proud stance, about to fire machine guns or RPGs. One of his photos shows two masked terrorists posing for the camera with rifles pointed at the corpse of murdered Italian hostage Salvatore Santoro. Another shows the same group posing with Santoro's passport in front of a propaganda banner.[6]

One of Bilal Hussein's jihadist-amigo photos even won a 2005 Pulitzer prize for "breaking news photography." A year later, Hussein's ties to al Qaeda were confirmed when he was captured along with two other insurgents, including al-Qaeda-in-Iraq leader Hamid Hamad Motib. General Jack Gardner, who oversees detainees in Iraq, said that Hussein:

> …has close relationships with persons known to be responsible for kidnappings, smuggling, improvised explosive device (IED) attacks and other attacks on coalition forces.[7]

Chances are you never read about Bilal Hussein in the newspaper, since AP refused to report his capture for five months. Finally, after repeated thrashings by columnist Michelle Malkin, AP president Tom Curley came out swinging, insisting that Hussein either be charged with a crime or released. Holding Hussein as an enemy combatant, Curley charged, was a violation of his rights.[8]

Of course! Bilal Hussein is a *victim*! The only surprise is that it took AP five months to think of it. After all, trumped-up claims of victimization are the semi-official religion of the multi-culturalist left, and what could be more multi-culturalist than AP's refusal to take sides against those who seek to annihilate Western civilization?

Hussein wasn't the only insurgent photographer to win the highest stamp of approval that our media elite bestows: the Pulitzer Prize. Another Pulitzer winning photograph shows al Qaeda operatives executing two Iraqi election workers in the middle of the street. An AP insider admitted that the unnamed stringer who took the execution photograph had been "tipped off to a demonstration that was supposed to take place on Haifa street," but called it "ridiculous" to think that anyone would know that an al Qaeda "demonstration" would involve murder.[9]

Those who were following the insurgent photography scandal online were waiting for the other shoe to drop. Native stringers were being relied on in Lebanon and Iraq, not just for photographs, but also for news reporting. If AP's ideology of reporting "from all sides" applied to photography, it was probably being applied to text reporting as well, and just as surreptitiously, but if insurgent propaganda *was* being reported as straight news, how could it be proved?

Blogger Brian Duffy, posted an email from a soldier in Ramadi who claimed that an air attack reported by the Los Angeles Times never took place.[10] Another blogger, an assistant district attorney in Los Angeles who blogs under the name of Patterico, started pestering CENTCOM for more information and found out that the Times story (packed with claims of civilian casualties and heartless behavior by U.S. troops on the ground) was indeed bogus.[11] But most importantly, a way to identify insurgent stringers was pioneered, with bloggers taking conflicting reports to CENTCOM for more information.[12]

Jamil Hussein

A couple of days after Patterico's revelations, another blogger—Curt at *Flopping Aces*—came across another inconsistent news report.[13] An AP story contained charges that the Iraqi military was complicit in a massacre of Sunni civilians, along with a conflicting report from the U.S. military:

> Baghdad was quieter than it had been on Friday, when rampaging militiamen burned and blew up four mosques and torched several homes in the mostly Shiite neighborhood of Hurriyah, witnesses and police said. Iraqi soldiers at a nearby army post failed to intervene in the assault by suspected members of the Shiite Mahdi Army militia or subsequent attacks that killed as many as 25 Sunnis, said police Capt. Jamil Hussein.
>
> The U.S. military said Saturday that Iraqi soldiers securing Hurriyah found only one burned mosque and were unable to confirm residents' and police accounts that six Sunni Arabs were dragged from Friday prayers and burned to death.[14]

So who was this "Capt. Jamil Hussein" whose claims were contradicted by CENTCOM? Curt did some Google searching and found that Jamil Hussein was consistently cited in reports of atrocities against Sunni civilians, so he pulled a Patterico and pestered CENTCOM for what they knew.

This time CENTCOM was more than forthcoming. Lieutenant Michael B. Dean not only denied that there was any Iraqi Police captain named Jamil Hussein. He also provided the names of more than a dozen other individuals, commonly cited in news accounts as holding various positions in the Iraqi government, whose legitimacy was in question.[15]

Googling of these sources by *Flopping Aces*, *Gateway Pundit*, and a host of other investigators quickly turned up dozens of the highest profile stories of civilian atrocities, all reported as straight news by AP. Jamil Hussein himself had been cited in 60 previous AP stories, raising the possibility of longstanding deception.[16] Given the multitude of possible spellings when Arabic names are transliterated into the Roman alphabet, it will take some doing to sort out which of the suspected frauds may be legitimate under a different spelling, but Jamil Hussein at least has proved to be a conduit for bad information.

When the Hurriyah story came under scrutiny, AP quietly dropped the earlier claim from Hussein that four mosques had been burned, yet AP upheld Hussein's reliability as a source for the story of the six burned Sunni worshippers. "He is an officer at the police station in Yarmouk, with a record of reliability and truthfulness," asserted AP's International Editor John Daniszewski. Even as AP tacitly acknowledged that Hussein was lying about the burned mosques, Daniszewski described questions about Hussein as "ludicrous" and "desperate."[17]

Daniszewski went on to claim that the burned bodies had been verified by hospital and morgue workers, but the AP's own follow up article reported that the bodies had been taken directly from the mosque to the graveyard.[18] As AP's contradictions piled up, Executive Editor Kathleen Carroll continued to insist that its sources were beyond reproach, noting that in two years of reliance on Hussein: "No one—not a single person—raised questions about Hussein's accuracy or his very existence in all that time."[19]

A little searching by blogger SeeDubya proved Carroll's statement incorrect.[20] AP's own reporting had earlier contradicted Hussein's claims. This from a June 2006 report from AP writer Kim Gamel:

> According to Capt. Hussein of the al-Yarmouk police station, gunmen opened fire on a minibus in Dora's predominantly Sunni Arab Mahdiya neighborhood. He said 11 people were killed, but Al-Yarmouk hospital reported receiving only two bodies from a shooting.[21]

At the same time as Kathleen Carroll retained absolute confidence in the blatantly unreliable Jamil Hussein, she insisted that the U.S. military and the Iraqi Ministry of Information cannot be trusted, characterizing them as: "… official spokesmen saying the story cannot be true because it is damaging."[22] This goes beyond "not taking sides." Carroll explicitly accuses *our* side of favoring partisan disinformation over truth, while exempting sources of unfavorable news from skepticism, even when al Qaeda's explicit strategy is to fake bad news. The side that believes in truth, she assumes is lying. The side that declares itself for the lie, she assumes is telling the truth. That is just abetting the lie, and AP has been doing it consistently through four years of dishonestly negative war reporting.

Pick a day, any day. 12/12/2006: Curt from Flopping Aces posts a comparison between AP's report on the previous day's war news and

CENTCOM's list of the previous days incidents from across Iraq. AP reported all of the negative news and none of the positive news. "29 terrorists were captured," summarizes Curt, "23 hostages saved, 7 IED's found in the last 24 hours and what did we hear about it from the AP? Nothing, nada, zip.....not a damn thing."[23]

The media's relentless disinformation about the legitimacy and productivity of our war effort has had the desired effect. A majority of Americans are now convinced that the Iraq war is a dishonest waste, and have voted accordingly.

Declaring Defeat

In late November 2006, at the very moment when the amount of enemy propaganda in mainstream media war reporting was being exposed, the media made a grand play to parlay this disinformation into American defeat. Swayed by all the (mis)reporting of sectarian violence and civilian deaths, NBC made *itself* the story-of-the-day by proclaiming its decision to start calling the Saudi and Iranian proxy war in Iraq a "civil war." This new lingo was immediately wedded to the Vietnam "lesson" that we should never be involved in a civil war:

Figure 69. The screen-caption on NBC's Today Show made clear that NBC saw its declaration of "civil war" as a declaration of U.S. defeat.[24]

Iranian terror-masters, who were supporting both Sunni and Shiite terror attacks in an effort to create the appearance of civil war, must have been elated to see their media allies completing the touchdown play. MSNBC's Keith Olbermann rejoiced in the "Walter Cronkite moment," likening NBC's declaration of civil war to Walter Cronkite's declaration of defeat in Vietnam (after the South Vietnamese communists had just destroyed themselves).[25] That is a very accurate analogy Mr. Olbermann. Almost exact.

Other networks were doing their bit to claim defeat as well. Lara Logan at CBS's *60 Minutes* told General Abizaid: "We hear very little about victory in Iraq these days. We hear a *lot* about how to manage the defeat." Abizaid could hardly believe that this dainty little bird was trying to *tell* him about the war in Iraq instead of *ask* him about it. "What defeat?" he demanded: "That is *your* word."[26]

Figure 70. Logan: "Manage the defeat." Abizaid: "What defeat?"

"We have not failed yet," said Abizaid a week earlier at Harvard, "and we will not fail if we all understand what we have to do. *If we can stay together* nothing can stop us and we can make the world a better place." [My emphasis.][27]

But defeat is not just Logan's word. Talk of anything else is *verboten* at the big three networks. Days after the election, MSNBC's Chris Matthews was livid that "the word 'victory' is still used by the president." "He, he still talks like he won the election," Matthews fumed:

> The Democrats who control both houses of Congress want to start withdrawing our troops. … It's a lot like Vietnam was when we had the Tet offensive in 1968 and the American people saw we couldn't get victory out of that country.[28]

The nerve of that Commander in Chief, not wanting to surrender after the media had deflated the country by misreporting another Tet offensive. Democrat party leaders followed NBC's lead, piling onto the civil-war equals defeat talking-point. Senator Harry Reid used it to call directly for American retreat:

> The President needs to put forth a plan as soon as possible, one that reflects the reality on the ground in Iraq and that withdraws our troops from the middle of this deadly civil war.[29]

Hillary Clinton was on the same page:

> I'm for redeploying our troops out of Baghdad and eventually out of Iraq so we can make sure that they're not in the midst of a civil war.[30]

Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi claimed that the American people would only accept retreat. When President Bush decided that the increase in Iranian backed proxy-war called for a surge of troop levels in Iraq, Nancy Pelosi insisted that the American people had voted for a weaker war-fighting effort, not a stronger one. "If the president chooses to escalate the war," said Pelosi, it would be "contrary to, of course, the will of the American people– they have spoken on this subject…"[31]

Silence About the Consequences (*Director's Cut*)

So close to their cherished goal of securing American defeat, the press was careful to avoid any consideration of the consequences for the country of such a disaster, for fear that the public might balk at the prospect. Listen to UPI reporter Pamela Hess describe the media's decision to report Democrat opposition to the President's "troop surge" in Iraq purely in terms of domestic politics:

> We're getting distracted by the shiny political knife fight. What we need to be asking is, what happens if we lose? And no one will answer that question. If we lose, how are we going to mitigate the consequences of this?
>
> It's so much easier for us to cover this as a political horse race. It's on the cover of The New York Times today, what this means for the '08 election. But we're not asking the central national security question, because it seems that if as a reporter you do ask the national security question, all of a sudden you're carrying Bush's water. There are national security questions at stake, and we're ignoring them and the country is getting screwed.[32]

She is talking about the entire mainstream media press corps. All of them are refusing to write articles that look at what is best for the country because if they look at what is best for the country, the impli-

cations will support President Bush, while the goal of the press is to undermine President Bush.

In answer to Pamela's outside-the-bubble viewpoint, co-panelist Steve Roberts (ex Washington Bureau Chief for the *New York Times*), exampled the Bush-hating mentality that Pamela had just described:

> I think still in the press corps there's a sense of failure having in the early days of the war not revealed and not been able to call to account an administration which we now know was fabricating intelligence, was wrong on weapons of mass destruction, wrong on the presence of al Qaeda. There is a sense of failure in the press corps for having not been tough enough then. I think they're making up for it.[33]

Roberts is *still* doing everything he can to support Joe Wilson's treasonous lies about President Bush "fabricating intelligence." He and his cohorts did everything in their power to support the whole list of Iraq war hoaxes, and while they did succeed in making these lies stick in many people's minds, they failed to make them stick sufficiently to bring down President Bush. He has not been impeached. The press failed to enmesh him in legal tangles or otherwise destroy his presidency, and so, according to Steve Roberts, they naturally feel a great sense of failure.

The Big Lie (*Director's Cut*)

Claiming defeat is the final step of the Big Lie: if you can get enough people to believe four years of dishonestly negative news, then it becomes "the truth." After all, such is the academic post-modernist ideology from which our media class is spawned. "Truth" is always in quotes. There is no such thing as actual truth, only interpretation, and with the 2006 election victory, the media won the battle for interpretation. As *Washington Post* media critic Howard Kurtz put it:

> Is it time to stop blaming the media on Iraq? Have we reached the point where the reality--the objective, unvarnished reality, as best we can discern it--is universally recognized as pretty bad? Can 70 percent of the country really have turned against the war because of the nattering nabobs of negative journalism?[34]

Kurtz was responding to the large increase in terror attacks over the Fall of 2006 (timed demoralize U.S. voters in the run up to the election, and to secure U.S. defeatism in the wake of the election). So if the en-

emy's media-focused attacks actually succeed in making things seem "pretty bad," years of dishonestly negative war reporting are somehow vindicated?

Kurtz knows the dishonesty of the media's anti-war reporting as well as anyone. Again, recall that it was Kurtz who documented the failure of leading media outlets to let the public know that the SSCI report had exposed Joe Wilson as a liar.[35] But by Kurtz' reckoning, that and a thousand other media deceptions are all irrelevant now. In true postmodernist fashion, every lie becomes true, once it achieves its objective of being perceived as true.

Actually, the Iranian decision to join the fight in Iraq is the best development we could hope for. We now have what we didn't have four years ago: an immediate *casus belli* for effecting regime change in the most dangerous "axis of evil" state, but as usual, those who think in terms of manipulative advantage have everyone looking in the wrong direction. Stop Hitler from getting nukes? When there is a chance to attack the president instead? Are you crazy?

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid actually understands that we have a golden opportunity to kick over the mullahcracy in Iran, but he sees it as a Republican opportunity. That is why, in the wake of numerous revelations about Iran fighting on the ground in Iraq, he is determined to stop President Bush from fighting back:

> This morning, I'd like to be clear: The president does not have the authority to launch military action in Iran without first seeking Congressional authorization. The current use of force resolution for Iraq does not give him such authorization.[36]

The president *always* has the constitutional authority to fight who is fighting us, and under the War Powers Act, he also has *statutory* authority to engage for 60 days without congressional approval. Ideally, of course, Congress would declare war against a country that has declared war against us many times and is actively waging war against us. But Reid's statement, seconded a couple of weeks later by Senator Hillary Clinton and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, is really about intentions more than about legal authorities.[37] They are stating that Democrats will fight to tie President Bush's hands if the president tries to fight who is attacking our troops.

The Tuesday after Senator Reid's declaration in defense of Iran, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinijad responded to the Bush administration's refusal to rule out military force if Iran does not agree to back

off its nuclear efforts. He said that Iran need not limit its ambitions because "wise men" like Senator Reid won't let President Bush attack, deftly invoking the Democrats own talking points: "Mr. Bush is interested in making a rumpus in order to save himself, but the conditions [Senator Reid et. al.] do not let him."[38]

How well he knows our disloyal opposition, repeating their constant slander: that it is President Bush who trades the national interest for partisan advantage. This is exactly what the Democrats and our newspapers will be full of if the president does go for regime change in Iran: accusations that he is "making a rumpus in order to save himself." Does anyone doubt it? Ahmadinijad could soon be starring as the Democratic Party's leading speechwriter.

The same day he praised "wise men" like Senator Reid, President Ahmadinijad was quoted telling Syria's foreign minister that: "the United States and the Zionist regime of Israel will soon come to the end of their lives."[39] Three days earlier, the secretary of Iran's Expediency Council declared that Iranian as on the verge of launching devastating terror attacks against America: "the Iranian nation will strike 10 slaps to the face of America, in such a way that it will no longer be able to get up on the stage."[40] (To hear any of this, you had to go to the Israeli press or to MEMRI, the invaluable translation service that lets English readers see what Islamic spokespeople are saying to the Muslim world in Arabic and Farsi).

In February 2007 the Bush administration formally presented its mountain of evidence that Iranian weapons and assistance are killing American soldiers in Iraq. Democrat Senator Christopher Dodd was having none of it: "I've been around long enough to know this administration has tried in the past to sort of doctor the numbers, to cook the books, to serve their policy goals. We've seen that in the Iraq conflict. So I'm looking at this report with a degree of skepticism."[41] This is the Big Lie in action. Every Iraq war hoax, every "Bush lied" lie, is now seen by the Democrats as conquered territory that they can use to hem in our military and secure defeat.

Patriotism (*Director's Cut*)

Representative Murtha's plan to defund our troops in Iraq so that: "They won't have the equipment, they don't have the training and they won't be able to do the work," is just one of several explicit plans put forward by the Democrats in early 2007 to force American defeat in Iraq. Hillary Clinton picked up Biden's "undeclare the war" idea as

her new presidential campaign pitch, posting a videotaped deadline for defeat on her website: "Now it's time to say the redeployment should start in 90 days or the Congress will revoke authorization for this war."[42] Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi hammers at every opportunity that in electing the Democrats, the people were demanding change in Iraq, which to her means a change from seeking victory to admitting defeat.

In an interview with ABC News, Vice President Dick Cheney was so rude as to point out how declaring defeat would mean victory for our enemies: "The al-Qaida strategy is to break the will of the American people…try to persuade us to throw in the towel and come home, and then they win because we quit." "If we were to do what Speaker Pelosi and Congressman Murtha are suggesting, all we will do is validate the al-Qaida strategy."[43]

Nancy Pelosi complained that Vice President Cheney was questioning her patriotism. "I didn't question her patriotism," Cheny corrected, "I questioned her judgment."[44] But he *should* have questioned her patriotism. When Nancy Pelosi and other left-wing Democrats call themselves patriotic, they are referring to their efforts to save the soul of America from those who they regards as America's real enemy: the Republicans.

Victory in Iraq would boost Republican electoral prospects while defeat in Iraq would damage Republican prospects, so the Democrats seek defeat. The Iraq war is "lost" and the Democrats will "pick up Senate seats" because of it, says Senate Majority leader Harry Reid, as he works feverishly to de-fund the war in time to insure these outcomes. Different views of how to attain victory are patriotic. A determination to achieve defeat (in a war that most Democrats voted for) is not.

You might think there is no way that the Democrats would willfully abet the Iranian and al Qaeda monsters that we are fighting in Iraq, but such behavior is no more extraordinary than Superintendent Joanne Hanley willfully abetting the building of a terrorist memorial mosque on the Flight 93 crash site, or the entire mainstream media willfully abetting the blatant treason of Joe Wilson. In each case, the same cognitive process is at work. People think it can be to their advantage to avoid the truth, but all it does is create divorce from reality, so that they become oblivious to the harm that they do, and America is now sicker with this disease than it has ever been.

Here is a measure of our moral weakness: a nation that lost 8,000 soldiers a month in World War II (with half of our current population)

now finds 50 a month unsustainable in a war that is steadily achieving its aims of a self-reliant and democratic Iraq. After watching all the post-election defeatism, Sergeant T.F. Boggs penned his disappointment:

> I feel like all of my efforts (30 months of deployment time) and the efforts of all my brothers in arms are all for naught. I thought old people were supposed to be more patient than a 24 year old but apparently I have more patience for our victory to unfold in Iraq than 99.9 percent of Americans.[45]

Actually, it is more like 25.1% who don't have patience for victory, influenced by another 25.1% who are absolutely desperate for defeat.

Our Democrat and media elites believe that they *earned* defeat when the Democrats won Congress, and that no one can take that prize away from them. They may be right. If the electorate was unable to withstand the media's anti-war propaganda, what counterforce is left? All the mainstream media needs to worry about now is keeping people away from that pesky alternate media, before too many Americans figure out that they have been getting half their news from *Al Jazeera* for the past four years.

Of course it doesn't make sense that American power should be entrusted to those who despise it, but making sense is not what leftists do. They sacrifice truth for manipulative advantage. The result can only be nonsense, but just because they don't make any sense doesn't mean that they cannot succeed in manipulating their way to power. It just means that we will all be very sorry if they do.

NOTES

Chapter Ten Notes

[1] "Bank data secretly reviewed by U.S to fight terror," Eric Lichtblau and James Risen, *The New York Times*, June 22, 2006.
[2] "Letter from Bill Keller on the *Times's* banking records report," Bill Keller, *The New York Times*, 6/25/2006.
[3] "Bank data secretly reviewed by U.S to fight terror," Eric Lichtblau and James Risen, *op cit*.
[4] "NYT reveals secret banking anti-terrorism program," Ed Morrissey, *Captain's Quarters*, June 23, 2006, <http://www.captainsquartersblog.com/mt/archives/007288.php>.
By voting of blog readers, Morrissey won the Weblog Awards "Conservative Blog of the Year" for 2004.
[5] Priest exposed the prisons in her article: "CIA holds terror suspects in secret prisons," *The Washington Post*, November 2, 2005**.** The leak came from Mary McCarthy, who was fired from the CIA when she was discovered to be the leaker. ("NBC: CIA officer fired after leak," By Robert Windrem and Andrea Mitchell, MSNBC, April 21, 2006, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/12423825/>.) McCarthy was a protégé of Sandy Berger, President Clinton's National Security Advisor.
[6] "Bush Secretly Lifted Some Limits on Spying in U.S. After 9/11, Officials Say," James Risen and Eric Lichtblau, *The New York Times*, December 15, 2005.
[7] "Senate Democrats promise 'relentless' flood of anti-war legislation," Margaret Talev, McClatchy Newspapers, February 17, 2007, <http://www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/news/politics/16723415.htm>.
[8] "Senator Biden's Opening Remarks Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Business Meeting on the Bipartisan Resolution on Iraq (transcript)," Senator Joseph Biden Jr., January 24, 2007, <http://biden.senate.gov/newsroom/details.cfm?id=267914&&>.
[9] "Rep. Murtha touts way to choke off Iraq war," Richard Cowan and David Alexander, Reuters, February 15, 2007, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/02/15/AR2007021500877.html?nav=hcmodule>.
[10] The incident is recorded in the hadiths of Bukhari, volume 4, book 61, number 3635. The Koranic verse that reportedly refers to this incident is 5.43. For a discussion, see Robert Spencer's *The Truth About Muhammad*, Regnery, 2006, p. 102.
[11] A partial list of Koranic verses that condemn those who forget what God has revealed: 2.64, 2.75, 2.79, 3.187, 5.12-16, 7.50, 13.25, 15.90, 16.63 and 47.26.
[12] "Conversion a thorny issue in Muslim world," by Rachel Morarjee and Dan Murphy, *The Christian Science Monitor*, March 27, 2006.

Chapter Eleven Notes

1 "State of the Union, 2003," GPO Access, February 28, 2003, <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/sou/index.html>.
[2] 2004 SSCI report, op cit, chapter II, F, PP 3.
[3] 2004 SSCI report, op. cit., chapter II, part B, PP 17.
[4] In October 2003, Wilson told AP reporter David Tirrell-Wysocki that he had been "advising Kerry on foreign policy for about five months." ("Former Ambassador Wilson Endorses Kerry In Presidential Race," The Associated Press, October 23, 2003,

<http://www.usatoday.com/news/politicselections/nation/2003-10-23-kerry-endorsement_x.htm>.)

5 "Missing in action: truth," by Nicholas Kristof, The *New York Times*, May 6, 2003.

6 "CIA did not share doubt on Iraq data," Walter Pincus, The Washington Post, June 12, 2003.

7 "The Selling of the Iraq War," by John Judis and Spencer Ackerman, The New Republic, June 30, 2003.

8 "Statement by George J. Tenet, Director of Central Intelligence," CIA press release, July 11, 2003, available at:
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/library/news/2003/intell-030711-cia01.htm>.

[9] 2004 SSCI Report, chapter 11, B, PP 20.

[10] 2004 SSCI Report, Additional Views of Chairman Pat Roberts, joined by Senator Christopher S. Bond and Senator Orrin G. Hatch, Niger subsection, conclusion 2.

11 "Republic or Empire," by Joseph Wilson, The Nation, March 3, 2003, <http://web.archive.org/web/20040210010941/www.johnkerry.com/honesty/nation.html>. In this article, Wilson's charge was that the Bush administration was pursuing imperialistic ambition: "Nothing short of conquest, occupation and imposition of handpicked leaders on a vanquished population will suffice." President Bush, of course, has pursued a very different course, and was clear about it from the beginning: that we would bring liberty and democracy to Afghanistan and Iraq. But the point here is that Wilson was in high dudgeon, launching everything he had at the Bush administration. If he actually had anything substantive to throw, one would think he would have thrown it first, instead of not at all.

[12] For a detailed timeline of Wilson's turn from backing the CIA's view of Saddam's WMD threat to attacking it, see: "When and why Joseph C Wilson IV outed Valerie Plame," Sweetness and Light, Steve Gilbert, March 17, 2007, <http://www.sweetness-light.com/archive/when-and-why-joseph-c-wilson-iv-outed-valerie-plame>.

13 "What I didn't find in Africa," by Joseph C. Wilson 4th, The *New York Time*s, July 6, 2003.

[14] "Statement by George J. Tenet, Director of Central Intelligence, July 11, 2003," op cit.

15 "What I didn't find in Africa," by Joseph C. Wilson 4th, op. cit.

16 "A war on Wilson?" by Matthew Cooper, Massimo Calabresi and John F. Dickerson, Time Magazine, July 17, 2003. Over the next several years, there would be a few other truth-telling stories in the mainstream media, but they would remain exceedingly rare. *The Washington Post* finally detailed Wilson's lies in the wake of I. Lewis Libby's conviction on perjury charges ("The Libby Verdict," the editors, The Washington Post, March 7, 2007), but note that this admission by the *Post* did not come until three years of Wilson's "Bush lied" lies had been instrumental in creating a Democratic majority in Congress.

17 "CIA director takes the blame for Iraq flap," John Solomon, Associated Press, July 12, 2003,
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CBS307A.html>. See also, "CIA chief admits 'mistake' on Bush speech," John Solomon (without attribution), USA Today, July 11, 2003, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2003-07-11-tenet-mistake_x.htm>, and "CIA takes blame for WMD flap," John Solomon (without attribution), CBS/AP, July 11, 2003, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/07/12/iraq/main562965.shtml>,

and "Tenet takes blame for State of the Union miscue," John Solomon (without attribution), AP, July 12, 2003,
<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,91717,00.html>.

18 Newsmax ran a story on this embargo on August 10, 2003 at the link: <http://www.newsmax.com/showinside.shtml?a=2003/7/10/104919>. Unfortunately, Newsmax changed the urls on their archived news stories sometime between 2003 and 2006 and their old urls can no longer be accessed. Websites should learn from this. If you change your links, you must put forwarding addresses on your old links, or else your value as a source of documentation is down the drain. Luckily, I can personally verify that this story was in fact embargoed by the U.S. press because I wrote an expose of the "Bush lied" lie in July 2003 ("Special report: Media bias in California," Alec Rawls, Rawls.org,< http://www.rawls.org/special_report_ca_media_bias.htm>.) The focus of this expose was misreporting in California newspapers, but to find Blair's affirmation of the British dossier I had to go to the British media. Interestingly, I also had to go to the British media to find the full text of Tenet's statement, exposing Joe Wilson as a liar ("Text of the Tenet statement," BBC News, July 12, 2003, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/3060633.stm>.)

19 The full citation for the Butler Report is: "Review of Intelligence on Weapons of Mass Destruction," Lord Butler, The Stationary Office, London, 2004, <http://www.butlerreview.org.uk/report/report.pdf>.

20 "Media Notes: Wilson, take 2," The Washington Post, July 25, 2004.

21 Kurtz cited for the Post an editorial and an ombudsman's column. Thus he seems to have missed Susan Schmidt's article, "Plame's input is cited on Niger mission" (The Washington Post, July 10, 2004 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A39834-2004Jul9.html>), which exposes several of Wilson's lies.

22 Joseph Wilson, The Politics of Truth, op cit, page 5.

23 According to the SSCI report: "… interviews and documents provided to the Committee indicate that his wife, a CPD employee, suggested his name for the trip." Op cit., Part II, section B, p. 39.

24 "Armitage on CIA leak: 'I screwed up'," CBS News, September 7, 2006, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/09/07/eveningnews/main1981433.shtml>. Further details Michael Isikoff's article: "The man who said too much," MSNBC, September 4, 2006, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/14533384/site/newsweek/>.

25 Fitzgerald's bad behavior is summarized in a lengthy article by Clarice Feldman: "The case of the missing crime," The Weekly Standard, September 25, 2006. Feldman also sent the Justice Department a list of grounds for investigating Fitzgerald's behavior ("Letter to DoJ office of Professional Responsibility," The American Thinker, September 19, 2006, <http://www.americanthinker.com/articles.php?article_id=5870>. A.J. Strata points out central lies told by Fitzgerald to both the federal appeals court and the Supreme court in his post: "Is Fitzgerald on a personal vendetta?" A. J. Strata, The Strata-Sphere, February 27, 2007, <http://strata-sphere.com/blog/index.php/archives/3271>. See also "The lies of Fitzgerald," A.J. Strata, The Strata-Sphere, August 29, 2006, <http://strata-sphere.com/blog/index.php/archives/2389>.

26 "Did Rove blow a spook's cover," Timothy Noah, Slate Magazine, September 16, 2003, <http://slate.msn.com/id/2088471/>.

27 Bob Woodward's tape of his interview with Armitage was entered into evidence at the perjury trial of I. Lewis Libby. Recording and partial transcript available at the

abracadabrah blog ("Speaking about Joe Wilson," Alcibiades, abracadabrah, February 12, 2007,
<http://abracadabrah.blogspot.com/2007/02/speaking-about-joe-wilson.html>. Hat tip to A.J. Strata: "Fitzgerald's disaster: Wilson outed Plame," The Strata-Sphere, February 12, 2007, <http://strata-sphere.com/blog/index.php/archives/3352>. The transcription as I have quoted it is not quite identical to abracadabrah's. I added the "because" after the "[ ]" (which abracadbrah used to denoting a brief garble sound) because, on listening to the audio, I could make out the "because." abracadabrah evidently couldn't and left it's sound in the parentheses.

Rick Ballard has found numerous other ways that Joe Wilson acted to publicize his wife's identity. See "Serious Questions for Henry Waxman's Show Trial," Real Clear Politics, March 15, 2007, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/03/serious_questions_for_henry_wa.html), where Ballard writes that: "Mr. Wilson casually disclosed his wife's maiden name in the preparation of numerous biographical sketches beginning with Who's Who and including Corporate and Public Strategy Advisory Group, the Middle East Institute and the EPIC Forum. Twenty people provided biographical sketches as participants in the antiwar EPIC Forum on June 14, 2003, some three weeks prior to the publication of Wilson's fable on the New York Times editorial page. Joseph Wilson was the only forum participant to include even a mention of a spouse, let alone her maiden name."

28 "Double exposure," Vicky Ward, Vanity Fair, January 2004, <http://www.vanityfair.com/politics/features/2004/01/plame200401?printable=true&currentPage=all>. (Ward's grammar does not clarify whether the "wife" in this quote is Wilson's wife or Kristof's, but the context seems to imply that she is referring to Valerie Plame.)

29 "Cheney claims again Iraq tried to acquire uranium from Niger," Amy Goodman interview with Joseph Wilson, Democracy Now, September 16, 2003, <http://www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=03/09/16/1555209>. The "attack on whistleblowers" charge is also a central theme of Wilson's book, *The Politics of Truth*, op cit. This thesis is set up in Wilson's first chapter, pages 4-7.

30 "Libby loses bid for documents in CIA case," Tony Loci, Associated Press, February 10, 2006. As sometimes happens after bloggers point out their lies, AP a few days later altered the version of this story that appears in their archives, with no note made of the original falsehood. See Rand Simberg: "The big lie continues," Terrestial Musings, February 10, 2006, <http://www.transterrestrial.com/archives/006459.html#006459>; and "Down the memory hole," Terrestial Musings, February 10, 2006, <http://www.transterrestrial.com/archives/006475.html#006475>. Of course the version that appeared in newspapers was the errant one.

31 "Wilson vs. Rove: African trip lies at heart of controversy," Holly Rosenkrantz and William Roberts, The Seattle Times, July, 2005. Hat tip Powerline: "Journalistic Malpractice again," John Hindraker, Powerline, July 17, 2005, <http://powerlineblog.com/archives/011068.php>.

32 "2002 memo doubted uranium sale claim," by Eric Lictblau, The New York Times, January 18, 2006. Powerline dissects further misrepresentations in Lictblau's

report in: "Disinterring a dead horse, and beating it some more," John Hindraker, Powerline, January 18, 2006, <http://powerlineblog.com/archives/012866.php>.

33 "A spy speaks out," *60 Minutes*, April 23, 2006, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/04/21/60minutes/main1527749.shtml>.

[34] "Bill Moyers talks with Carlo Bonini," Transcript, *Bill Moyers Journal*, May 4, 2007, http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/05042007/transcript1.html. Carlo Bonini is co-author with Giuseppe D'Avanzo of the 2007 book *Collusion* (Melville), about the Italian forgeries that confused the Iraq-Niger unranium intelligence. Bonini is another Joe Wilson. His whole book is elaborately crafted disinformation, falsely accusing the Bush administration of knowingly using phony intel as a justification for war, when like Joe Wilson, he knows full well that there was solid evidence that Saddam had indeed tried to buy uranium from Niger. My review of *Collusion* ("Carlo Bonini in *Collusion* with Joe Wilson's treason,") will be posted on my *Error Theory* blog during the summer of 2007.

35 "Time for answers," editorial, The *New York Times*, September 6, 2006.

36 "MTP manuscript for Feb. 11, 2007," Meet the Press with Tim Russert, February 11, 2007, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/17065119/page/6/>.

37 "Media Notes: Wilson, take 2," The Washington Post, 7/25/2004.

38 The treason statute (18 U.S.C. §2381), provides up to the death penalty for anyone who, "owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort." Spreading malicious disinformation about the nation's war efforts would seem to fit the "aid and comfort" category.

39 Transcribed from my tape of the Press Club event. Fuller account available in my post, "Wilson lies, Press Club laughs," Error Theory, October 31, 2005, <http://errortheory.blogspot.com/2005/10/wilson-lies-press-club-laughs.html>.

40 "Bush teleconference with soldiers staged," Deb Riechmann, Associated Press, October 13, 2005, <http://www.breitbart.com/news/2005/10/13/D8D7I5C83.html>. The implication in AP's headline is that the soldiers had been told what to say, which was not the case. Michelle Malkin has a roundup on the media's coverage of this event ("Lights, Camera, Projection!" October 14, 2005, <http://michellemalkin.com/archives/003720.htm>.

Chapter Twelve Notes

1 "Bush Derangement Syndrome," Charles Krauthammer, December 5, 2003, <http://www.townhall.com/opinion/columns/charleskrauthammer/2003/12/05/160406.html>.

2 "A mini-TET offensive," Arnaud De Borchgrave, The Washington Times, April 16, 2004, <http://www.washtimes.com/commentary/20040415-090923-9426r.htm>. A thorough review of the mis-reporting of the TET offensive is provided by Peter Baestrup's book Big Story (Presidio Press, 1994).

3 Transcribed from videotape of Cronkite's reporting included in the PBS documentary: "Witness to History: Walter Cronkite," *American Masters*, PBS, 2006, <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/americanmasters/database/cronkite_w.html>

[4] See Mark Moyar, *Triumph Forsaken: the Vietnam War, 1954-1965* (Cambridge, 2006). One of Moyar's theses is that, even after undercutting the South by backing the assassination of Diem, the U.S. could have won by aggressive interdiction of Communist supply lines into the South, but our policy was hampered by self-imposed restraints (chapters 13 and on). The same argument can be made with even more force after the South Vietnamese communists were destroyed in the Tet offensive, making the communist war effort even more dependent on infiltration and supply from the north.

5 In a 1969 meeting with Montana Senator Mike Mansfield, Cambodia's Prince Sihanouk discussed his openness to the bombing of Vietnamese communist sanctuaries and supply lines in Cambodia. See Semour Hersh's book *The Price of Power: Kissinger in the Nixon White House* (Summit Books, 1983). According to Hersh (p. 177): "Sihanouk went on to say that he knew of American bombing of the sanctuaries and would not protest such bombing as long as the areas under attack were not inhabited by Cambodians. 'It is in one's own interest, sometimes, to be bombed,' he said, 'in this case, the United States kills foreigners who occupy Cambodian territory and does not kill Cambodians.'"

6 "A mini-TET offensive," Arnaud De Borchgrave , op. cit.

7 For the evidence of Saddam's involvement in the '93World Trade Center attack, see Study of Revenge, by Laurie Mylroie, American Enterprise Institute Press, 200/2001. In her book The Third Terrorist (Nelson Current, 2004) Jayna Davis amassed compelling evidence that Saddam Hussein was also involved in the 1995 bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City.

8 "Transcript: Democratic presidential debate in Detroit," The Washington Post, October 27, 2003. The Republican National Committee later posted a list of Democrat-left statements that evidenced Rove's assessment: "RNC Chairman Ken Mehlman Statement On The Democrat Attacks Of Karl Rove," June 23, 2005 <http://www.gop.com/News/Read.aspx?ID=5578>.

9 "Kerry criticizes NSA wiretaps," Audrey Hudson, The Washington Times, January 23, 2006.

10 Kerry delivered to the Senate the testimony of the anti-war movement's "Winter Soldier" investigation. Research into the testimony found much fraud, and no evidence that any of the charged war crimes had ever occurred. For a summary of the investigations into charges made at the Winter Soldier and other anti-war "tribunals," see Stolen Valor, B. G. Burkett and Glenna Whitley, Verity Press, 1998, Chapter 6, p. 130 - 137.

11 Murtha's CNN comments are transcribed by Stephen Spruiell, author of NRO's Media Blog ("Murtha: change directions, like Clinton did in Somalia," June 16, 2006, <http://media.nationalreview.com/post/?q=NGIwMzZlYjk3MzgxY2I5ZDJlNTcxNjBmNjNkNzE2MDA=>.

12 "An exclusive interview of Osama bin Laden: talking to terror's banker," interviewed by John Miller, ABC News, May 28, 1998. ABC no longer has the transcript online, though it is cached in a couple of places (see <http://www.robert-fisk.com/usama_interview_john_millerabc.htm> and <http://pws.prserv.net/hosaka/shuji/osama/abc0.htm>). Interestingly, Frontline deletes this key Osama bin passage from its version of the Miller transcript, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/binladen/who/interview.html>, even though it was quoted in a presidential speech ("President Commemorates 60th Anniversary of V-J Day," text of President Bush's speech at the North Island Naval Air Station, San Diego California, White House press release, August 30, 2005,

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/08/20050830-1.html>).

13 "Somali Islamists and Ethiopia gird for war," Jeffery Gettleman and Mark Mazetti, The New York Times, 12/14/2006. (Hat-tip to Ed Morrissey, who credits "Roger H" ("Final Islamist Collapse in Somalis," Captain's Quarters, January 13, 2006,
<http://www.captainsquartersblog.com/mt/archives/008911.php>). Typical of the Times, Gettleman and Mazetti blame the evil deeds of the Islamofascists on the opposition of The United States: "All the talk of slaughtering Ethiopian invaders and their American sponsors, though, seems to have brought out a harsher side of the Islamic administration. Nearly every day, rings of people gather on Mogadishu's streets to watch lashings, and the crowds cheer as leather whips cut canals into flesh. One Islamic leader in a town north of Mogadishu recently issued an edict threatening that anyone who did not pray five times a day would be beheaded."

14 "English translation of Ayman al-Zawahiri's letter to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi," The *Weekly Standard*, October 12, 2005,

<http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/006/203gpuul.asp?pg=1>.

15 Document captured April 16, 2006, translated May 3, 2006, attached to U.S. Central Command Press Release, "Coalition forces discover key AQIZ documents in April raid," May 8, 2006,
<http://www.centcom.mil/sites/uscentcom1/Shared%20Documents/Extremist%20Page/Baghdad%20State%20of%20Affairs.aspx>. Translated document at separate link:
<http://www.centcom.mil/sites/uscentcom1/Shared%20Documents/Extremist%20Page/full_translation_done_may_3.aspx>. Hat tip Ed Morrissey: "Captured AQ documents: 'every year is worse than the previous year'," May 8, 2006,
<http://www.captainsquartersblog.com/mt/archives/006943.php>.

Another document, allegedly captured from Zarqawi's safe-house after he was killed, also suggests that al-Qaeda-in-Iraq's primary strategy is to use the Western media to try to win politically a war that they are rapidly losing militarily. The provenance of this document, however, is questionable. ("Text of al-Zarqawi safe house document," AP, June 15, 2006,
<http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/06/15/D8I8LJBG0.html.> Hat tip, Ace of Spades, "Zarq docs," June 15, 2006, <http://ace.mu.nu/archives/181880.php>.

16 "Bush approval at lowest level of his presidency," Mark Murray, MSNBC, September 14, 200, <(http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/9332076/>.

17 "Kennedy's 'Texas' remark stirs GOP reaction," CNN, October 18, 2003,
<http://www.cnn.com/2003/ALLPOLITICS/09/18/kennedy.iraq/>.

18 "Remember 'weapons of mass destruction'? For Bush they are a non-issue," Richard W. Stevenson, The New York Times, December 18, 2003,
<http://www.commondreams.org/headlines03/1218-08.htm>.

19 "Truth test for war's justification," Seattle Post-Intelligencer Editorial Board, June 5, 2003,
<http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/opinion/125046_wmded.html>. This quote, and the Kennedy and Krugman quotes that follow, are from a much larger compilation rounded up by Stefan Sharkansky, "A brief history of the imminent-threat canard," Shark Blog, October 21, 2003,
<http://www.usefulwork.com/shark/archives/001158.html>.

20 "Standard operating procedure," Paul Krugman, The New York Times, June 3, 2003

<http://www.commondreams.org/views03/0603-03.htm>.

21 "State of the Union address: full text," January 29, 2003, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/2704365.stm>.

22 Claudia Rosett has been responsible for much path-breaking exposure of the oil-for-food scandal. For a primer see her 2004 article: "The Oil-for-Food Scam: What Did Kofi Annan Know, and When Did He Know It?" Commentary Magazine, April 16, 2004,
<http://www.commentarymagazine.com/SpecialArticle.asp?article=A11705017_1>.

23 "How Gadhafi lost his groove," Judith Miller, The Wall Street Journal, May 16, 2006,
<http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110008381>.

24 "Pelosi statement on supplemental funding request for Iraq," Nancy Pelosi, March 16, 2005,
<http://www.house.gov/pelosi/press/releases/March05/supplemental.html>. Hat tip to White House assistant Peter Wehner, "Revisionist history," The Wall Street Journal, May 23, 2006,
<http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110008415>.

25 "Losing ground in Iraq," Editorial Desk, The New York times, April 27, 2005.

26 "President Bush's nation building," Editorial Desk, The New York Times, February 27, 2003. .For a critique of this flip flop, see "Out and out dishonesty," by Glenn Reynolds, Instapundit, April 27, 2005, <http://instapundit.com/archives/022681.php>.

27 From a January 2004 statement by Ted Kennedy, posted on TedKennedy.com by Crystal Patterson in: "A 'cabal' that has 'courted disaster'," October 2005, <http://www.tedkennedy.com/journal/293/a-cabal-that-has-courted-disaster>.

28 "Report on the U.S. intelligence community's prewar intelligence assessments on Iraq," Select Committee on Intelligence, United States Senate, July 7, 2004, chapter XIV, p. 357,
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/library/congress/2004_rpt/iraq-wmd-intell_chapter14.htm>.

29 "Commission on the intelligence capabilities of the United States regarding weapons of mass destruction," Silberman-Robb Report, March 31, 2005, Overview section, <http://www.wmd.gov/report/report.html#overview>.

30 "Bush fires back against Iraq war critics," Liza Porteus, Fox News, November 13, 2005, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,175296,00.html>. President Bush could have stated the case even more strongly. Congress did not just have the same information that Bush did. It had better information. According to the 2005 Silberman-Robb report, the President's Daily Briefs "were, if anything, more alarmist and less nuanced than the NIE [the National Intelligence Estimate provided to Congress]." (Charles S. Robb And Laurence H. Silberman, "The Commission On The Intelligence Capabilities Of The United States Regarding Weapons Of Mass Destruction, March 31, 2005," Overview section; Looking back; Lessons learned; PP8, <http://www.wmd.gov/report/report.html#overview>.)

31 Deb Reichmann's original article is no longer at the link I had for it, but a snapshot of the original web page is posted with my blog entry about Reichmann's disinformational report. See "Bush rebuts accusations, AP re-

peats accusations, omits rebuttal," Alec Rawls, *Error Theory*, November 11, 2005, <http://errortheory.blogspot.com/2005/11/bush-rebuts-accusations-ap-repeats.html>. My post notes that a second version of Reichmann's story included the president's rebuttals, so it seems likely that it is AP editors who are responsible for the anti-Bush version, not Reichmann.

[32] L.A. Times ignores key points of Bush's Iraq speech," Bill Hobbs, *Bill-Hobbs.com*, November 30, 2005, <http://billhobbs.com/2005/11/la_times_ignores_key_points_of.html>.

[33] *Bush's War*, Jim A. Kuypers, Rowman and Littlefield, 2006.

[34] The anecdote is from the a rebuttal, issued by the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense, to a February 2007 report from the Inspector General. Powerline blog posted this excerpt from the undersecretary's rebuttal in: "The undersecretary responds" (John Hindraker, *Powerline*, 2/14/2007, http://powerlineblog.com/archives/016781.php). In June 2007, a career intelligence analyst named Christina Shelton described briefing CIA Director George Tenet on the need to get background information about Saddam's ties to terrorists into the intelligence assessments, since they were not being mentioned. ("Iraq, al Qaeda, and Tenet's equivocation," Christina Shelton, The Washington Post, June 30, 2007.) It seems likely that Shelton is the unnamed analyst in the undersecretary's rebuttal. Tom Joscelyn notes that the "regional analyts" who Shelton describes as downplaying Saddam's terror ties would be a reference to Paul Pillar, a highly partisan top level regional analyst. ("Paul Pillar, the CIA, the DIA and 'The Connection'," Tom Joscelyn, June 30, 2007 (http://thomasjoscelyn.blogspot.com/2007/06/paul-pillar-cia-dia-and-connection.html.)

[35] "Instructions on Separation of Certain Foreign Counterintelligence and Criminal Investigations," Jamie Gorelick, Deputy Attorney General, 3/4/1995, http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/testimony/2004/1995_gorelick_memo.pdf. This memo was prompted by the then ongoing investigations of the 1993 World Trade Center bombings. Attorney General John Ashcroft's testimony before the 9/11 Commission in April 2004 framed Gorelick's memo in its historical context. See the Wall Street Journal editorial: "Gorelick's Wall" (4/15/2004, http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110004956).

[36] "FBI flaws alleged by field staff," Dan Eggen and Bill Miller, *The Washington Post*, 5/24/2002, http://www.propagandamatrix.com/fbi_flaws_alleged_by_field_staff.htm.

[37] From the Gorelick memo. Op. cit.

38 "A war worth fighting?" Dianne Feinstein speech, October 27, 2005, <http://feinstein.senate.gov/05speeches/war-oped.html>.

39 Greyhawk's post is "Headless in the headlines," Mudville Gazette, April 1, 2006, <http://www.mudvillegazette.com/archives/004344.html>. The New York Times article is "The reach of war: military; Shiite fighters clash with G.I.'s and Iraqi forces," Jeffery Gettleman, March 27, 2006.

40 "DoD News Briefing with Maj. Gen. Thurman from Iraq," Department of Defense, March 31, 2006, <http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/2006/tr20060331-12734.html>.

41 "Bush opposes Iraq'a premier, Shiites report," Edward Wong, Thom Shanker, Steven Weisman, The New York Times, March 29, 2006.
42 "U.S., Iraqi troops nab insurgents suspect in mass slaying," Andrew Tilghman, Stars and Stripes, April 2, 2006,
<http://www.estripes.com/article.asp?section=104&article=35326&archive=true>.
43 A 2007 al Qaeda innovation has been to start launching chemical warfare attacks on Shiite civilians, exploding chlorine trucks in crowded areas in an attempt to get Shiites to retaliate against Sunnis. Instead of fomenting civil war, the effect has been to get native Iraqi Sunni insurgent groups to start fighting al Qaeda. (They have no interest in seeing the Sunni minority slaughtered by the Shiite majority.) But where al Qaeda is failing to foment civil war, the Western press has still been able to complete the al Qaeda objective by reporting al Qaeda's attacks themselves as "civil war." (See "The troop surge vs. al Qaeda in Iraq," Back Talk, April 13, 2007, http://engram-backtalk.blogspot.com/2007/04/troop-surge-vs-al-qaeda-in-iraq.html).
44 According to The Iraq Study Group Report, "Funding for the Sunni insurgency comes from private individuals within Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States." ("The Iraq Study Group Report," James A Baker III, et al, December 2006, p.25,
<http://www.usip.org/isg/iraq_study_group_report/report/1206/iraq_study_group_report.pdf.>)
45 The Anbar Revenge Brigade began in early 2006 as Sunni tribesmen in Anbar province (part of the Sunni triangle, where most Iraqi violence has occurred) to fight back against al Qaeda attacks. See Lydia Khalil's March 2006 report for The Jamestown Foundation: "Anbar Revenge Brigade Makes Progress in the Fight Against al-Qaeda," March 28, 2006,
<http://jamestown.org/terrorism/news/article.php?articleid=2369940>. This development has continued, until by the end of the summer of 2006, 25 of 36 Anbar province tribes joined in forming the Anbar Salvation Council, dedicated to driving al-Qaeda and other foreign fighters from Anbar. ("The Anbar tribes vs. al-Qaeda, continued," Bill Roggio, The Fourth Rail, November 22, 2006,
<http://billroggio.com/archives/2006/11/the_anbar_tribes_vs.php>.)
46 Iran was first caught supplying the Iraqi insurgency with shaped charges in the Summer of 2005 ("Shipment of high explosives intercepted in Iraq," Jim Miklaszewski, MSNBC, August 4, 2005, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/8829929/>. The more advanced EFP's started appearing in 2006 ("Evidence of Iran supplying weapons, expertise, to Iraqi insurgents," Bill Roggio, The Fourth Rail, February 22, 2007, http://billroggio.com/archives/2007/02/evidence_of_iran_sup.php). Bob Woodward's book State of Denial (Simon and Schuster, 2006), amasses a variety of evidence of Iran's state of war against the United States. Michael Ledeen extracts a compilation in: "Iran and W." National Review Online, October 30, 2006,
<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=NGIzYmRmZTMwOGRhMGYzYzcxZGUxNDQzZjE4YzY2NDU=>. In November 2006, The New York Times compiled an update on Iranian involvement in the Iraq war ("Hezbollah said to help Shiite army in Iraq," Michael R. Gordon and Dexter Filkins, The New York Times, November 28, 2006.
47 "Exclusive: Iranian weapons arm Iraqi militia," Jonathan Karl and Martin Clancy, ABC News, November 30, 2006,
<http://abcnews.go.com/International/IraqCoverage/story?id=2688501>. "Iraqi insur-

gents using Austrian rifles from Iran," Thomas Harding, Daily Telegraph, February 13, 2007,
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2007/02/13/wiran13.xml>.

48 "Iran's secret plan for mayhem," Eli Lake, The New York Sun, January 3, 2007, <http://www.nysun.com/article/46032>.

49 "Follow God or vanish, Ahmadinijad tells West," Agence France-Presse, December 6, 2006,
<http://www.breitbart.com/news/2006/12/06/061206101357.8mjamnal.html>. Ahmadinijad's first formal call to invitation to the United States to convert to Islam was less explicitly a declaration of war, but it satisfied the formal conditions of an Islamic declaration of war, where the Koran and the hadiths require that a community must be offered an invitation to convert before it can be attacked. See Robert Spencer's discussion: "Ahmadinejad's letter a call to accept Islam?" Jihad Watch, May 9, 2006,
<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/011363.php>. The second formal such declaration came at the end of November 2006: "Iran's Ahmadinijad: America's new pen pal," Kenneth R. Timmerman, Newmax, November 30, 2006,
<http://newsmax.com/scripts/printer_friendly.pl?page=http://newsmax.com/archives/articles/2006/11/29/154329.shtml?s=lh>. Of course Iran has been issuing declarations of war against the United States every year since 1979 (and waging it too). Public such pronouncements are made every year at Iran's state sponsored Qud's Day rallies (the Iranian equivalent of the Nuremburg Rallies) where Iranian zealots are lead in chanting: "Death to America! Death to the Great Satan!" In 2006, Iran got progressively more specific. In August Amahdinejad threated to use nuclear weapons against America to orchestrated chants of "Death to America." (See: "Ahmadinejad: Iran has nuclear technology," Robert Spencer, Jihad Watch, August 2, 2006,
<http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/012511.php>. At the same time, Iranian Supreme Leader, the Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, vowed that the US will receive a "destructive punch" for its support of Israel. ("Iran warns U.S. of 'destructive punch' and annihilation of Israel," Gateway Pundit, August 3, 2006,
<http://gatewaypundit.blogspot.com/2006/08/iran-warns-us-of-destructive-punch.html>.) In September, Khamenei called for attacks against America in response to Pope Benedicts faith-and-reason speech. (Iran's top mullah calls for attacks on U.S.," Charles Johnson, Little Green Footballs, September 18, 2006,
<http://littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/?entry=22622_Irans_Top_Mullah_Calls_for_Attacks_on_US&only>.) As for Iran's actual acts of war against the United States, these are reviewed by Michael Ledeen in "Iran and W.," National Review Online, October 30, 2006,
<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=NGIzYmRmZTMwOGRhMGYzYzcxZGUxNDQzZjE4YzY2NDU=>.

50 Ledeen's blog Faster, Please! provides regular updates on Iranian threats and acts of war, <http://pajamasmedia.com/xpress/michaelledeen/>.

51 "Remarks by the President at the Citadel [Military College], Charleston, South Carolina, December 11, 2001," White House transcript, December 11, 2001,
<http://www.acronym.org.uk/docs/0112/doc02.htm>.

52 From Rafsanjani's December 14, 2001 Al-Qod's Day sermon: "Former Iranian President Rafsanjani on Using a Nuclear Bomb Against Israel," MEMRI, Special Dispatch No. 325, February 3, 2002,
<http://www.memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Area=sd&ID=SP32502>.

53 This favorite aphorism appeared most famously in a tape left by the al Qaeda terror bombers who cowed the Spanish into electing the appeasement-promising José Luis Rodríguez over the pro-war incumbent José María Aznar in March 2004. ("Tape find that casts doubt on west's spy network," Ewen MacAskill, Richard Norton-Taylor, Giles Tremlett in Madrid and Ian Black, The Guardian, March 14, 2004, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4879911-103681,00.html>.
54 From Ahmadinejad's pre-Qod's-Day address. See: "MEMRI, Special Dispatch Series #1328," MEMRI, October 19, 2006, <http://memri.org/bin/articles.cgi?Page=archives&Area=sd&ID=SP132806>.
55 From Shahroudi's Qod's Day speech. ("Western press ignores Iran's hate-filled Qud's Day," Steven Stalinsky, New York Sun, October 25, 2006, <http://www.nysun.com/article/42232?page_no=1>.)
56 "Iran plotting to groom Bin Laden's successor," Con Coughlin and George Jones, Daily Telegraph, November 15, 2006, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/11/14/wiran14.xml>. In April 2007, the Times of London reported a leak about Iran harboring al Qaeda terrorists that are plotting major attacks on Europe. See "Al Qaeda 'planning big British attack'," Dipesh Gadher, *London Times*, April 22, 2007, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article1687360.ece.

Chapter Thirteen Notes

1 "Special report: Media bias in California," Alec Rawls, Rawls.org, 2003, <http://www.rawls.org/special_report_ca_media_bias.htm>.
2 "Pelosi endorses Murtha's pullout call," Brian DeBose, Washington Times, December 1, 2005,< http://www.washtimes.com/national/20051201-121430-4414r.htm>.
3 "Hill Democrats unite to urge Bush to begin Iraq pullout," Charles Babington and Jim VandeHei, Washington Post, August 1, 2006.
4 "It's all been for this moment!" John Kerry, November 6, 2006, <http://www.johnkerry.com/emails/2006_11_06/>.
5 "AP chief calls on U.S. either to charge or release photographer," Robert Tanner, Associated Press, September 18, 2006, <http://www.freespirit.org/news.aspx?id=17403>.
6 Bilal Hussein's Santoro photos were analyzed by a number of bloggers. See posts by Michelle Malkin: "Associated Press and the Bilal Hussein case," Michelle Malkin, September 18, 2006, <http://www.michellemalkin.com/archives/005941.htm>, and Dan Riehl: "Bilal Hussein: is there blood on his hands?" Riehl World View, September 18, 2006, <http://www.riehlworldview.com/carnivorous_conservative/2006/09/bilal_hussein_i.html>.
7 "AP chief calls on U.S. either to charge or release photographer," Robert Tanner, op cit.
8 Ibid.
9 "The Associated Press 'insurgency'," Mark Follman, Salon, December 22, 2004, <http://dir.salon.com/story/opinion/feature/2004/12/22/executions/index.html>. The AP insider quoted by Follman only said it was "likely" that the unnamed stringer was tipped off that a "demonstration" would occur, but the detail he provides about the unreasonableness of the stringer knowing exactly how to interpret the meaning of "a demonstration" suggests that the specific language used for the tip-off was known to the insider, making the tip-off a fact.

10 The Times story: “Iraqi residents say U.S. airstrike kills 30,” Solomon Moore, The Los Angeles Times, November 15, 2006, <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-shootings15nov15,1,6824170.story?coll=la-headlines-world&ctrack=1&cset=true>. Duffy’s counter: “Why most Americans hate the MSM: more lies about Iraq,” Brian Duffy, One Oar in the Water, November 17, 2006, <http://oneoarinthewater.blogspot.com/2006/11/why-most-americans-hate-msm-more-lies.html>.

11 “Is the L.A. Times repeating enemy propaganda?” Patterico’s Pontifications, November 24, 2006, <http://patterico.com/2006/11/24/5419/is-the-la-times-repeating-enemy-propaganda-or-is-there-another-reason-the-paper-is-getting-basic-facts-wrong-and-failing-to-report-the-militarys-side/>.

12 As I am finalizing this Director’s Cut, another example of this cooperation between bloggers and CENTCOM has just emerged. When AP reported a massacre of 20 beheaded civilians, citing distant Iraqi police as their sources, blogger Bob Owens asked CENTCOM what they knew about it. CENTCOM did some checking and reported back that the massacre was a hoax. It never happened. (“DeCapiGate,” Confederate Yankee, June 30, 2007.) At the same time, all the large media outlets refused to cover a real massacre of Iraqi civilians by al Qaeda operatives, thoroughly documented by independent imbedded reporter Michael Yon. (“Update on ‘Bless the Beasts and Children’,” Michael Yon: Online Magazine, July 3, 2007, http://www.michaelyon-online.com/wp/update-on-bless-the-beasts-and-children.htm.) The phony hoax fits AP’s storyline that Iraq is consumed by civil war, with Iraqis killing Iraqis. The real massacre was conducted by al Qaeda, so our media doesn’t report it.

13 “Getting the news from the enemy,” Curt, Flopping Aces, November 25, 2006, <http://www.floppingaces.net/2006/11/25/getting-the-news-from-the-enem/>. Curt describes himself as “a street cop in South-Central Los Angeles… a lifelong Reagan Republican and former Marine who doesn't sit idly by when our media attempts to spin their liberal fantasies.” (“Blog of the Week: Flopping Aces,” John Hindraker, Powerline, December 12, 2006, <http://powerlineblog.com/archives/016187.php>.)

14 “Iraq PM struggling ahead of Bush visit,” Thomas Wagner, Associated Press, November 25, 2006, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,231877,00.html>.

15 “Getting the news from the enemy,” Curt, Flopping Aces, op cit

16 Flopping Aces has a full list of AP stories citing Jamil Hussein at: <http://www.floppingaces.net/wp-content/JamilHussein.txt>.

17 Daniszewski’s remarks were in email response to USA Today. See: “On Deadline,” Mark Memmontt, USA Today, November 28, 2006, <http://blogs.usatoday.com/ondeadline/2006/11/us_military_and.html>.

18 “Witnesses detail immolation attack on six Sunnis in Baghdad last week,” Stephen R. Hurst, Associated Press, November 28, 2006, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2006-11-28-iraq-fire_x.htm>.

19 “AP Statement,” Kathleen Carroll, December 8, 2006, <http://www.ap.org/response/response_112806a.html>.

20 “The tale of the wires: ‘Capt. Jamil Hussein’ has done this before,” SeeDubya, Junkyard Blog, December 17, 2006 <http://junkyardblog.net/archives/week_2006_12_17.html#006317>.

21 "Dozens kidnapped in Baghdad in new challenge to government," Kim Gamel, Associated Press, June 5, 2006, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2006-06-05-iraq_x.htm>.
22 "Iraqi official calls AP's atrocity story a 'rumor;' AP stands by its work," On Deadline, *USA Today*, November 30, 2006, <http://blogs.usatoday.com/ondeadline/2006/11/iraqi_official_.html#more>. Michelle Malkin would later confirm the dishonesty of Jamil Hussein's reporting by making her own trip to Iraq, where she verified that the "destroyed" mosques were still standing, and heard from U.S. troops in the area that no Sunnis had been burned. ("Destroyed—Not: Lurid AP report on Iraq outrage doesn't check out," Michelle Malkin, New York Post, January 21, 2007.
23 "What's newsworthy," Curt, Flopping Aces, December 12, 2006, <http://www.floppingaces.net/2006/12/12/whats-newsworthy/>. Howie at The Jawa Report ran a similar test for the same date, but examining all media outlets. He came up with similar results. ("A simple test," Howie, The Jawa Report, December 12, 2006, <http://mypetjawa.mu.nu/archives/185704.php>. A couple of weeks later, Curt ran another survey, this time covering a week's news, with similar results: "The successes not reported," Flopping Aces, January 7, 2007, <http://www.floppingaces.net/2007/01/07/the-successes-not-reported/>.
24 Screen capture by *Newsbusters*: "'Today' tips its hand: 'Civil War' label key to encouraging cut-and-run from Iraq," Mark Finkelstein, *Newsbusters*, November 28, 2006, <http://newsbusters.org/node/9298>.
25 "Olbermann suggests NBC's Iraq 'Civil War' is a 'Walter Cronkite Moment'," Brian Wilmouth, Newsbusters, November 27, 2006, <http://newsbusters.org/node/9290>.
26 Powerline video has the clip: "Manage the defeat," John Hinderaker, Powerline, November 27, 2006, <http://powerlineblog.com/archives/016039.php>.
27 "Abizaid warns of looming world war," Dout Gavel, The Harvard Gazette, November 30, 2006, <http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2006/11.30/15-abizaid.html>, reporting Abizaid's speech at the Kennedy School of Government on November 17, 2006.
28 "Chris Matthews hostile to 'victory' in Iraq," Geoffry Dickins, Newsbusters, November 14, 2006, <http://newsbusters.org/node/9078>.
29 "The clock is ticking Mr. President," Senator Harry Reid, The Huffington Post, December 19, 2006, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sen-harry-reid/the-clock-is-ticking-mr_b_36752.html>.
30 Clinton's remarks are from here appearance on the CBS Early Show, as quoted by The New York Times ("Senator Clinton calls Bush plan 'a losing strategy'," Patrick Healy, The New York Times, January 17, 2007.
31 From Nancy Pelosi interview with Bob Schieffer on CBS' Face the Nation, January 7, 2007, <http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/pdf/F1-7-7.pdf>.
32 Pamela Hess and Steve Roberts (below) were interviewed by Howard Kurtz on CNN's Reliable Sources, January 14, 2007, <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0701/14/rs.01.html>.
33 Ibid. For an elaborated statement of media frustration for failing to bring down the Bush presidency over charges of lying and other anti-Iraq-war hoaxes, see Carl Bernstein's remarks in: "Carl Bernstein: Bush administration has done 'far greater damage' than Nixon," Editor and Publisher staff, Editor and Publisher, January 24, 2007,

<http://www.editorandpublisher.com/eandp/news/article_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=1003537212>.

34 "The finger pointing game," Howard Kurtz, The Washington Post, 12/20/2006.

35 "Media Notes: Wilson, take 2," The Washington Post, July 25, 2004.

36 "Reid stands between Bush and Iran," Sarah Wheaton, The Caucus (NYT political blog), January 19, 2007, <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/01/19/reid-stands-between-bush-and-iran/>.

37 "Hillary Clinton warns Bush about Iran action," Associated Press, February 14, 2007, <http://www.newsmax.com/archives/ic/2007/2/14/154119.shtml>. "House Speaker Pelosi says Bush has no authority to invade Iran," Associated Press, February 15, 2007, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,252262,00.html>.

38 "Wise Americans will bar any attack on Iran," Fars News Agency, January 24, 2007, <http://english.farsnews.net/newstext.php?nn=8511040299>. Also reported by Reuters: "Iran says 'wise' Americans will bar any attack," Reuters, January 23, 2007, <http://today.reuters.com/news/articlenews.aspx?type=topNews&storyID=2007-01-23T211414Z_01_BLA375434_RTRUKOC_0_US-IRAN-USA.xml>..

39 "Iran: Israel, US will soon die," Yaakov Lappin, YNet News, January 23, 2007, <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3356154,00.html>.

40 "Top Iranian Official: Iran Will Strike U.S. with '10 Slaps' So 'It Will No Longer Be Able to Get Up On the Stage'," Mehr (Iranian news agency), via MEMRI, January 20, 2007, <http://www.thememriblog.org/blog_personal/en/408.htm>. The Expediency Council secretary's name is Mohsen Rezai. Hat tip to Little Green Footballs for this citation, and for the previous two Ahmadinijad citations. ("Ahmadinijad: 'wise' Dems will prevent attack," Charles Johnson, Little Green Footballs, January 23, 2007, <http://littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/?entry=24115_Ahmadinejad-_Wise_Dems_Will_Prevent_Attack&only>.

41 "The World Today, transcript, February 12, 2007," Emily Bourke, Australian Broadcasting Corporation, February 12, 2007, <http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2007/s1845971.htm>.

42 "Clinton urges start of Iraq pullout in 90 days," Jim Wolf, Reuters, February 17, 2007, <http://abcnews.go.com/US/wireStory?id=2884209>.

43 "Cheney slams Iraq plan advocated by Dems," Terence Hunt, Associated Press, February 21, 2007, <http://apnews.myway.com/article/20070222/D8NEFOUG0.html>.

44 "Cheney won't back down on Pelosi statement," Associated Press, February 23, 2007, <http://www.newsmax.com/archives/ic/2007/2/23/213429.shtml?s=ic>.

45 "Sergeant Boggs dissents," Scott Johnson, Powerline, December 6,2006, <http://powerlineblog.com/archives/016135.php>.