The Destabilization Doctrine: ISIS, Proxies and Patsies

by Brandon Martinez via jake - ICH Wednesday, Feb 25 2015, 12:18am international / prose / post

And "lone wolf" useful nutters

"Islam and the West at War," <u>reads</u> a recent New York Times headline. It would certainly seem that way if one were to take at face value the putrid assertions of Western governments that are not particularly known for their honesty or integrity. But astute observers of history and geopolitics can spot a deception when they see one, and the latest theatrical performances being marketed to the masses as real, organic occurrences remind one of a Monty Python sketch.

In the past week we have witnessed a number of expedient events that were designed to legitimize the West's imperialist foreign policies in the minds of the masses. On Feb. 15 the Islamic State (also known as ISIS) released another highly choreographed and visually striking video allegedly depicting the beheading of 21 Egyptian Coptic Christians. Shortly following the video's release, the Egyptian dictator Abdel Fattah el-Sissi launched air strikes against ISIS targets in Libya where the execution video was allegedly filmed, although experts are now saying that the production was faked.

ISIS's continued provocations in the form of carefully crafted, emotionally impactful execution videos (real or faked), such as the recent immolation of a caged Jordanian pilot, cannot possibly be the work of rational actors seeking a military victory in any capacity. The videos only ever work to ISIS's disadvantage, solidifying the resolve of their current 'coalition' opponents as well as creating new enemies upon every release.

Sixty-two countries and groups are presently fighting in the dubious 'coalition' against ISIS, most of which have modern militaries with advanced air and ground forces. Why in the world does ISIS continue to entice more countries to join the already over-crowded alliance against them? Why a group that purports to want to establish a 'state' which will ostensibly govern millions of people is deliberately seeking more and more enemies and a constant state of war with them beggars belief.

Does ISIS think it can do battle with the whole planet and achieve victory, culminating in world domination? How do people who harbor such ridiculous delusions have the wherewithal and resources at their disposal to organize and recruit thousands of fighters from around the world to an utterly ludicrous cause doomed to sheer failure? How can this be anything but a contrived prank of an operation?

The only logical conclusion that many analysts have come to is that ISIS does not represent a grassroots, organic movement, but rather operates entirely as a cat's paw of Western foreign policy in the Middle East and North Africa, which is concurrently under the domination of Israel. ISIS's actions expressly benefit Muslims least of all and Israel/the West most of all, the extent of which increases with every new atrocity and outrage ISIS inflicts upon innocents in Iraq and Syria that gets endless play in Western media. In fact, the Western media's obsession with ISIS is in and of itself an effective form of PR for the group. Western media outlets are consciously performing an unqualified service for ISIS's recruiting efforts by affording the terrorist group 'premium level branding' that will attract criminally-inclined degenerates, Wahhabist religious zealots and

disaffected, suicidal lowlifes from around the world to join a cause predestined to abject failure.

This senile 'ISIS vs. The World' spectacle is little more than a melodramatic screenplay engineered in a boardroom by professional propagandists and marketing aficionados. It resembles a classic 'problem, reaction, solution' dialectic of deceit. Who in their right mind believes the rancid mythology surrounding this orchestrated 'good vs. evil' Hollywood blockbuster?

Proxy Warriors: Cannon Fodder for the Empire

The West is not sincerely at odds with ISIS nor is it seeking to "degrade and destroy" the group, as US President Barrack Obama claims. One piece of information that undermines this good cop/bad cop puppet show is the West's clandestine support of ISIS beginning with the artificial uprising in Libya. In 2011, the West openly sought to depose Libyan strongman Muammar Gaddafi, and did so by backing ISIS and al-Qaeda-affiliated rebel groups to do it. The maniac rebels who sodomized and then murdered Gaddafi in the street like a dog were hailed as 'freedom fighters' by the repellant thugs in Washington, Paris and London, and were fully aided and abetted with NATO air strikes against Gaddafi's forces. The rebel victory in Libya was only made possible through Western military intervention. "We came, we saw, he died," said Obama's former Secretary of State Hilary Clinton in reference to the assassination of Gaddafi by Washington's foot soldiers, cackling like a witch at the demise of the Libyan potentate.

In a Nov. 19, 2014, article for Global Research, analyst Tony Cartalucci noted that the "so-called 'rebels' NATO had backed [in Libya] were revealed to be terrorists led by Al Qaeda factions including the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG) and Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM)." During the manufactured 'uprising' Gaddafi routinely declared in public speeches that al-Qaeda was leading the way. "Gaddafi blames uprising on al-Qaeda," read one Al Jazeera headline from February 2011. A March 2011 Guardian report spoke of how "hundreds of convicted members of the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG), an al-Qaida affiliate, have been freed and pardoned" under a "reform and repent" program headed by Gaddafi's son Saif al-Islam. The same article acknowledged that the LIFG, which was established in Afghanistan in the 1990s, "has assassinated dozens of Libyan soldiers and policemen" since its founding and that Britain's MI6 had previously supported the group. That group formed the backbone of the anti-Gaddafi insurgency, and received all manner of support from the West and allied Gulf sheikhdoms.

In the aforesaid Global Research article, Cartalucci outlines how the synthetic insurrection in Libya was spearheaded by al-Qaeda franchises that were later subsumed into ISIS. A February 2015 CNN report titled "ISIS finds support in Libya" revealed that since the fall of Gaddafi, ISIS has established a large and menacing presence throughout the North African country. "The black flag of ISIS flies over government buildings," according to CNN's reportage. "Police cars carry the group's insignia. The local football stadium is used for public executions." It adds that, "Fighters loyal to the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria are now in complete control of the city of Derna, population of about 100,000, not far from the Egyptian border and just about 200 miles from the southern shores of the European Union."

NATO effectively carpet-bombed Libya into rubble, paving a path of blood for ISIS and al-Qaeda death squads to seize power and institute their medieval ideology. That's the reward for falling afoul of 'the West' and whatever drives it. Cartalucci further proved in another report titled "Libyan Terrorists Are Invading Syria" that as soon as Gaddafi's regime collapsed and rebel gangs emerged triumphant, thousands of battle-hardened and fanatical jihadist fighters took their Western training and weapons over to Syria to fight Bashar al-Assad in accordance with Washington's 'bait and switch' scheme. Apparently, these hired mercenaries behave a lot like wild dogs chasing a piece of

raw meat.

An absolutely identical scenario unfolded in Syria where Washington and its regional puppets led by Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Turkey have been subsidizing the Islamist guerrillas from the outset. "Do you know of any major Arab ally of the US that embraces ISIL?" US Senator Lindsey Graham facetiously asked General Martin Dempsey at a Senate Armed Services Committee in 2014. To Graham's surprise, Dempsey responded: "I know major Arab allies who fund them." US Vice President Joe Biden himself confirmed this in an October 2014 speech wherein he told students at Harvard University that America's Gulf allies – the Saudis and Qataris especially – were backing ISIS and Jahbat al-Nusra (an al-Qaeda affiliate) with substantive sums of arms and funds. Another US General, Thomas McInerney, told Fox News that the US government helped "build ISIS" by "backing some of the wrong people" and by facilitating weapons to al-Qaeda-linked Libyan rebels which ended up in the hands of ISIS militants in Syria. Retired US General and former NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Wesley Clark, repeated this view in a February 2015 interview with CNN, saying that "ISIS got started through funding from our friends and allies [in the Gulf]" who sought to use religious fanatics to assail the Shia alliance of Syria, Iran and Hezbollah. "It's like a Frankenstein," he concluded.

A June 17, 2014, World Net Daily <u>report</u> highlights how Americans trained Syrian rebels who later joined ISIS in a secret base located in Jordan. Jordanian officials told WND's Aaron Klein that "dozens of future ISIS members were trained [in a US run training facility in Jordan] at the time as part of covert aid to the insurgents targeting the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad in Syria." Reports in Der Spiegel, the Guardian, Reuters and other mainstream outlets all confirmed that the US, Britain, France and their regional allies were training militants in secret bases in Jordan and Turkey as part of the West's proxy war against the Assad regime.

The West has attempted to cover-up its support of ISIS and al-Qaeda elements by running a 'two degrees of separation' gambit. Washington claims to only provide support to 'moderate, vetted' rebel groupings, namely the Free Syrian Army (FSA), but this amounts to a calculated ruse to confound the credulous masses. FSA is the nom de gerre of a loose collection of rebel bandits who don't operate under a central command framework or authority, rather acting independently or under the umbrella of other factions. Aron Lund, an expert on Syrian rebel groups, discerned in a March 2013 article titled "The Free Syrian Army Doesn't Exist" that from the very beginning the FSA has been nothing more than a fictional branding operation.

During the initial stages of the insurgency, any militant faction in Syria looking for Western military aid called itself FSA and then took the weapons they received from the West straight to ISIS and Jahbat al-Nusra. The FSA functions as a conduit between Western governments and the Takfiri terrorists fighting Assad as well as an arms distribution network for them. In the aforesaid article, Lund explains that the FSA's General Staff was set up in Turkey in 2012 "as a flag to rally the Western/Gulf-backed factions around, and probably also a funding channel and an arms distribution network, rather than as an actual command hierarchy." Thousands of militants fighting under the FSA rubric have since joined or pledged allegiance to ISIS and al-Nusra.

Western governments know this and are apparently totally comfortable with it, revealing their bare complicity and collaboration with the Takfiri insurgents hell-bent on beheading their way to power in Syria and Iraq.

The Counterfeit Campaign

This inevitably creates confusion for people not studied in imperial geopolitics, especially after the

West and its Gulf allies 'declared war' on ISIS in late 2014. The counterfeit campaign cannot be seen as anything other than a convenient, disingenuous volte-face maneuver designed to whitewash all of the aforementioned facts about the West's dirty hands behind ISIS. Average plebs who receive all of their information from TV news channels won't know about the West's clandestine activities that effectively spawned ISIS and facilitated its rise to prominence in Iraq, Syria and Libya, so they will naturally take the West's phony confrontation with ISIS at face value.

The West's crusade to "degrade and destroy" ISIS is a preposterous hoax. In fact, evidence suggests that the West continues to covertly support ISIS with airdrops of weapons and supplies, whilst concurrently 'bombing' them in sketchy and deliberately ineffective air strikes.

Iran's President Hassan Rohani <u>called</u> the US-led anti-ISIS coalition 'a joke' considering how many of its participants significantly helped bolster the terrorist group since its inception. In a January 2015 report, Iran's Fars News Agency <u>quotes</u> a number of Iranian generals and Iraqi MPs who believe that the US is continuing to surreptitiously support ISIS with airdrops of weapons caches and other supplies. General Mohammad Reza Naqdi, a commander of Iran's Basij (volunteer) Force, said that the US embassy in Baghdad is the "command center" for ISIS in the country. "The US directly supports the ISIL in Iraq and the US planes drop the needed aids and weapons for ISIL," General Naqdi told a group of Basij forces in Tehran. Fars News cited Majid al-Gharawia, an Iraqi Parliamentary Security and Defense Commission MP, who said that the US are supplying ISIS with weapons and ammunition in a number of Iraqi jurisdictions.

An Iraqi security commission spoke of unidentified aircraft making drops to ISIS militants in Tikrit. Another senior Iraqi lawmaker, Nahlah al-Hababi, echoed these claims about US planes and other unidentified aircraft making deliveries to ISIS. She opined that, "The international coalition is not serious about air strikes on ISIL terrorists and is even seeking to take out the popular Basij (voluntary) forces from the battlefield against the Takfiris so that the problem with ISIL remains unsolved in the near future." General Massoud Jazayeri, the Deputy Chief of Staff of Iran's Armed Forces, called the US-led coalition against ISIS a farce. "The US and the so-called anti-ISIL coalition claim that they have launched a campaign against this terrorist and criminal group – while supplying them with weapons, food and medicine in Jalawla region (a town in Diyala Governorate, Iraq). This explicitly displays the falsity of the coalition's and the US' claims," the general said.

The US military <u>claims</u> these air deliveries are mistakenly ending up in ISIS's possession and that they were intended for Kurdish fighters, but such a ridiculous assertion rings hollow among the true opponents of ISIS – Iran, Syria, Hezbollah and Shiite volunteers in Iraq. Meanwhile, the laughable nature of Washington's anti-ISIS gambit is underscored by the fact that its initial air strikes against ISIS's stronghold in Raqqa, Syria, in September 2014 did little more than destroy a bunch of empty buildings. CNN let slip that ISIS fighters had evacuated their command centers in the city 15 to 20 days before US air strikes commenced, indicating that they were probably tipped off. A Syrian opposition activist told ARA News that "the targeted places [in Raqqa], especially refineries, were set on fire, pointing out that IS militants evacuated their strongholds in the last two days to avoid the U.S.-led strikes."

The Hidden Hand of Zionism

The sham rebellion in Syria was devised and executed by outsiders to serve a nefarious anti-Syrian agenda. All of this seems very confusing if one doesn't take into consideration the destructive proclivities of the state of Israel in the region.

Israel has essentially used the United States as a cat's paw in the Middle East, manipulating

America's Leviathan military to smash up her enemies. The formidable Israeli lobby inside the US and its neoconservative lackeys who are a dominant force in the war-making apparatus of the US Military Industrial Complex is a key factor driving the Washington foreign policy establishment's intransigent approach to the Middle East. When it comes to Middle East policy, the Israelis always get their way. "America is a thing you can move very easily... in the right direction," Israeli PM Benjamin Netanyahu once bragged. "Don't worry about American pressure on Israel. We control America," the former Israeli PM Ariel Sharon boasted.

The destruction of Iraq, Syria, Iran, Lebanon, Libya, Egypt and other Middle Eastern and North African states is a long-standing Zionist policy plan dating back to the 1950s. In 1982 a stunning Israeli strategy paper was published which outlined with remarkable candor a vast conspiracy to weaken, subjugate and ultimately destroy all of Israel's military rivals. The document was called "A Strategy for Israel in the 1980s," authored by Oded Yinon, a prominent thinker in Israeli Likud circles. In the vein of the Ottoman millet system, Yinon envisioned the dissolution of Israel's neighbors and a new Middle East made up of fractured and fragmented Arab/Muslim countries divided into multiple polities along ethnic and religious lines. In Yinon's mind, the less unified the Arabs and Muslims are the better for Israel's designs. Better yet, have the Arabs and Muslims fight each other over land and partition themselves into obscurity. Yinon suggests a way to accomplish this, primarily by instigating civil strife in the Arab/Muslim countries which will eventually lead to their dismemberment.

In the document, Yinon specifically recommended:

Lebanon's total dissolution into five provinces serves as a precedent for the entire Arab world including Egypt, Syria, Iraq and the Arabian peninsula and is already following that track. The dissolution of Syria and Iraq later on into ethnically or religiously unique areas such as in Lebanon, is Israel's primary target on the Eastern front in the long run, while the dissolution of the military power of those states serves as the primary short term target. Syria will fall apart, in accordance with its ethnic and religious structure, into several states such as in present day Lebanon, so that there will be a Shi'ite Alawi state along its coast, a Sunni state in the Aleppo area, another Sunni state in Damascus hostile to its northern neighbor, and the Druzes who will set up a state, maybe even in our Golan, and certainly in the Hauran and in northern Jordan. This state of affairs will be the guarantee for peace and security in the area in the long run, and that aim is already within our reach today.

He later singled out Iraq as Israel's most formidable enemy at the time, and outlined its downfall in these terms:

Iraq, rich in oil on the one hand and internally torn on the other, is guaranteed as a candidate for Israel's targets. Its dissolution is even more important for us than that of Syria. Iraq is stronger than Syria. In the short run it is Iraqi power which constitutes the greatest threat to Israel. An Iraqi-Iranian war will tear Iraq apart and cause its downfall at home even before it is able to organize a struggle on a wide front against us. Every kind of inter-Arab confrontation will assist us in the short run and will shorten the way to the more important aim of breaking up Iraq into denominations as in Syria and in Lebanon. In Iraq, a division into provinces along ethnic/religious lines as in Syria during Ottoman times is possible. So, three (or more) states will exist around the three major cities: Basra, Baghdad and Mosul, and Shi'ite areas in the south will separate from the Sunni and Kurdish north. It is possible that the present Iranian-Iraqi confrontation will deepen this polarization.

Yinon's vision seems to be unfolding rapidly in Iraq which is today on the verge of partition with the Sunni extremists of ISIS seizing vast swaths of territory for their 'caliphate' and the Northern Kurds

still battling for independence from Baghdad which is ruled by a Shia clique headed by Haider al-Abadi and Nour al-Maliki. Syria too looks to be falling victim to Yinon's venomous whims as ISIS has wrested control of large chunks of Syrian territory and presently enforces its brutal sectarianism on the Eastern population of the country.

The themes and ideas in Yinon's Machiavellian manifesto are still held dear today by the Likudnik rulers in Israel and their neocon patrons in the West. Pro-Israel neocons basically replicated Yinon's proposals in a 1996 strategy paper intended as advice for Benjamin Netanyahu, although in less direct language. Their report titled "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm" spoke of "removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq" as an "important Israeli strategic objective" that serves as a means of weakening Syria. The Clean Break authors advised that Israel should militarily engage Hezbollah, Syria and Iran along its Northern border. They go on to suggest air strikes on Syrian targets in Lebanon as well as inside Syria-proper. They also stipulate that, "Syrian territory is not immune to attacks emanating from Lebanon by Israeli proxy forces."

These neocon recommendations seem to be playing out today like a perfectly gauged game of chess. The Syria crisis has unveiled Israel's plans for destabilizing the region to their benefit. At many points since the unrest in Syria began in 2011, Israel has conducted air strikes on Syrian military sites, just as the Clean Break criminals encouraged. In a January 2015 interview with Foreign Affairs magazine, Syria's President Bashar al-Assad made note of Israel's incessant attacks against Syrian army installations during the conflict: "[Tel Aviv is] supporting the rebels in Syria. It's very clear. Because whenever we make advances in some place, they make an attack in order to undermine the army." Assad further described Israel as "al-Qaeda's air force."

Israel's support of the Takfiri militants inside Syria goes beyond periodic air strikes in their favor. According to a 2014 UN report, Israel has been providing sanctuary and hospital care to thousands of anti-Assad terrorists, including those of ISIS and al-Nusra, and then dispatching them back into the fight. A Russia Today report on the issue headlined "UN details Israel helping Syrian rebels at Golan Heights" noted: "Israeli security forces have kept steady contacts with the Syrian rebels over the past 18 months, mainly treating wounded fighters but possibly supplying them with arms, UN observers at the Israeli-Syrian border reported."

Israel's gains in this situation are manifold. Tel Aviv has been using the fog of war to weaken its primary adversary in Damascus and consequently draw its other foes – Iran and Hezbollah – into the quandary, thereby diminishing their collective resolve to fight Israel itself. The Zionist regime not only views the Takfiris of ISIS and al-Nusra as a "lesser enemy," but also as proxy mercenaries against Damascus, a strategy explicated in the neocons' Clean Break document. In fact, Tel Aviv doesn't view the Takfiris as much of a threat at all; a point that was validated by ISIS itself which declared that it is "not interested" in fighting Israel. "ISIS: Fighting 'Infidels' Takes Precedence Over Fighting Israel," reads an August 2014 headline in Arutz Sheva, an Israeli news outlet.

The former Israeli ambassador to the US, Michael Oren, substantiated all of this in a September 2013 interview with the Jerusalem Post. "'Bad guys' backed by Iran are worse for Israel than 'bad guys' who are not supported by the Islamic Republic," he told the Post, adding that the "greatest danger" to Israel is "the strategic arc that extends from Tehran, to Damascus to Beirut. And we saw the Assad regime as the keystone in that arc. That is a position we had well before the outbreak of hostilities in Syria. With the outbreak of hostilities we continued to want Assad to go." Oren further remarked with glee about the total capitulation of the Gulf sheikhdoms – Saudi Arabia, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates – to Israel's itinerary vis-à-vis Syria, Iran and the Palestinian issue, observing that "in the last 64 years there has probably never been a greater confluence of interest between us and several Gulf States. With these Gulf States we have agreements on Syria, on Egypt, on the

Palestinian issue. We certainly have agreements on Iran. This is one of those opportunities presented by the Arab Spring."

Roland Dumas, France's former foreign minister, confirmed Israeli intrigue behind Syria's internal woes. In a June 15, 2013, article for Global Research, journalist Gearóid Ó Colmáin quotes Dumas who told a French TV channel that the turmoil in Syria, which has cost the lives of more than 100,000 Syrians, was planned several years in advance. Dumas claimed that he met with British officials two years before the violence erupted in Damascus in 2011 and at the meeting they confessed to him "that they were organizing an invasion of rebels into Syria." When asked for his support in the endeavor, Dumas declined, saying, "I'm French, that doesn't interest me." Dumas further pinpointed the architects of the madness as Israeli Zionists, suggesting that the Syria destabilization operation "goes way back. It was prepared, preconceived and planned [by the Israeli regime]." Dumas noted that Syria's anti-Israel stance sealed its fate in this respect and also revealed that a former Israeli prime minister once told him "we'll try to get on with our neighbours but those who don't agree with us will be destroyed."

"Israel planned this war of annihilation years ago in accordance with the Yinon Plan, which advocates balkanization of all states that pose a threat to Israel," writes Gearóid Ó Colmáin in the aforesaid piece. "The Zionist entity is using Britain and France to goad the reluctant Obama administration into sending more American troops to their death in Syria on behalf of Tel Aviv."

Ó Colmáin argues that the West "are doing [Israel's] bidding by attempting to drag [the United States] into another ruinous war so that Israel can get control of the Middle East's energy reserves, eventually replacing the United States as the ruling state in the world. It has also been necessary for Tel Aviv to remain silent so as not to expose their role in the 'revolutions', given the fact that the Jihadist fanatics don't realize they are fighting for Israel."

ISIS: A Repository of Patsies for the False Flaggers

At long last, this brings us to the 'second phase' of the ISIS psyop: scaring Westerners into submission.

It's no coincidence that the notorious belligerence of ISIS in its quest for a 'caliphate' aligns perfectly with the neocon agenda which aims to inculcate in the minds of the masses the myth of a 'clash of civilizations' between the West and Islam. In its official magazine, Dabiq, ISIS ideologues advanced a parallel attitude with the neocon desire for a civilizational conflict. Is that merely happenstance? Or has ISIS been manufactured by the neocons to serve as the ultimate boogeyman and straw man caricature of 'Islamic radicalism'?

The godfather of neoconservatism, Leo Strauss, espoused a dogma of deception, stipulating that in order to corral society behind the wishes of an elite vanguard an 'external enemy' must be fashioned. This 'enemy' could be real, but enemies usually exist in the eye of the beholder and in the minds of those seeking opposition. Strauss made it clear that if this societal 'enemy' did not exist or was not formidable enough to generate an adequate amount of fear required to paralyze and manipulate the masses, then one should be invented or inflated and then advertised to the populace as a real, pressing danger.

For the neocons, this phantom nemesis forms the crux of their strategy of subjugation. Without it, the public would never consent to their lunatic foreign policies, nor would anyone feel threatened enough to willingly relinquish their freedoms in the name of security. This is what ISIS is all about.

As demonstrated earlier, ISIS was cultivated by our own governments to destabilize and ultimately overthrow various regimes in the Middle East and North Africa that fell astray of the Globalist-Zionist program. The Western media has purposely marketed the ISIS 'brand' across the globe, making it a household name. The Zionist globalists built up ISIS to do their bidding abroad, but despite media sensationalism the group is not nearly strong enough to pose any serious threat to Western countries. So while ISIS represents no legitimate military threat to the West, its global reputation for brutality and obscene violence is seen as a fantastic propaganda tool to frighten Western populations into consenting to the extirpation of their freedoms at home.

The Zionist globalists have put that carefully crafted ISIS image to work, fabricating a series of perfectly timed 'terror events' inside Western countries which have been used to curtail freedoms under the guise of 'keeping us safe from the terrorists.' What the gullible commoners don't realize is that these 'terrorists' are controlled by our own governments and are being wielded against us to vindicate the construction of an Orwellian police state.

The string of 'lone-wolf' attacks that hit Ottawa, Sydney, Paris and now Copenhagen over the past five months since the West first 'declared war' on ISIS are all part of an organized neocon strategy of tension. The intelligence agencies of the West and Israel stand behind them all. In every case, the 'terrorists' had long histories of mental illness and/or frequent run-ins with the law; the standard rap-sheet of a patsy whose innumerable weaknesses are exploited by government agents to produce a type-cast 'fall guy' to play the part of the 'wily gunman' who 'hates our freedoms.' ISIS therefore in effect provides the false flag con artists who control our governments with an inexhaustible wellspring of patsies for their operations.

As the researcher Joshua Blakeney pointed out, "Some peasant in Yemen may be angry [enough at the West to want to harm it] but he [could] never [physically carry out] such an attack without it being made possible by the false-flag planners." A 'let it happen' or a 'made it happen' scenario amounts to the same thing – without the connivance of the government in question there is no 'attack' to even discuss. Since ISIS is a 'global' phenomenon, according to our controlled media, authorities don't even have to prove that these deranged individuals are even members of the group. All they have to say is that they were 'inspired' by the group's message which can be accessed online, and that's enough to indict them in the court of public opinion. Even if all that were true, it still wouldn't eliminate potential state involvement, which usually comes in the form of equipping the dupe with the necessary armaments to execute the plot and preventing well-meaning police and intelligence people from intervening to stop it. These are the kinds of queries the West's big media patently refuses to pursue, knowing full well that the state is almost always complicit with, and keen to exploit, whatever tragedy befalls their population.

All of the latest traumatic terror events in Western capitals have been instantly branded by lying, cynical politicians as attacks on 'free speech' and the 'values of Western civilization,' a familiar trope first trotted out by George W. Bush and his neocon puppet masters after the false flag attacks of 9/11.

However, what many are starting to realize is that whatever threat some mind controlled junkie might pose to our lives, our own governments are a markedly more dangerous menace to our liberties, well being and way of life. They prove this point every single day with a manifold of new freedom-busting laws that they pass using the comical excuse of protecting us from their own Frankenstein.

That's the simple truth of the matter that the neocon false flaggers seek to suppress at all costs as they desperately hold up the façade of their artificial power which will inevitably collapse under its

own weight.

Author retains copyright.

http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article41093.htm

Jungle Drum Prose/Poetry. http://jungledrum.lingama.net/news/story-1487.html