

The Pope's Resistance to the "Unjust War" on Iraq

The Vatican's Divisions At the Beginning of World War IV

By [Pasquale Maria Aliberti](#)

Global Research, April 02, 2005

2 April 2005

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

Pope John Paul II's Resistance to the "Unjust War" on Iraq

Forward

April 2 2005

After 26 dramatic years of pontificate, His Holiness John Paul II died today. His last years were characterized by a courageous and principled opposition – on religious, moral, and political grounds – to the US led war on Iraq and its ideological foundations. The latter consisted in justifying the “war on terrorism”, as a legitimate response to the so-called “Clash of Civilizations”, between the West predominantly Christian on the one hand the Muslim world on the other hand.

Following his death, we now see many world leaders — starting with George W. Bush — who maliciously attempted to thwart Pope John Paul's antiwar stance, pouring gallons of crocodile tears over the TV cameras.

However, this media propaganda cannot overshadow the fact that John Paul II's last big battle was against the Bush administration's “preemptive war” doctrine. The Pontiff and his closest collaborators resisted an unprecedented assault by the men of the would be new roman emperor on the Potomac and told directly Bush and his minions that their war was an “unjust war.”

Needless to say, Pope John Paul II's rejection of America's military agenda contributed immensely to weakening the Pentagon's propaganda campaign. The issue of his succession in the Vatican is, therefore, a matter of paramount importance for Catholics and non-Catholics. Will John Paul's principled stance prevail or will his successor succumb to the political pressures of the Bush administration?

What will be criteria for selecting his successor? Will the new Pope be chosen as a result of US pressures? Or will the successor of John Paul II follow and broaden his moral strategy of defending humanity from the imperial predators?

Will the successor accept the proposal to become the “chaplain of the new world order” that, reportedly, Bush senior made unsuccessfully to the Pope during the first Gulf war? Or will he draw — from the root of Christianity and the experience of the Church — the language and the strategy to evoke the resistance of the quasi totality of the peoples of the world to the new US led empire?

Will he be an *instrumentum regni* or an *instrumentum Christi*?

The world has entered now into a critical and momentous period filled with existential dangers of apocalyptic proportions; but, at the same time, we have the possibility to create a concrete alternative to this descent into the *Inferno*.

In this context, and as a contribution to clarifying what is at stake, we bring to the attention of Global Research readers, a private memorandum written in April 2003, by someone apparently familiar with the “geo-religious” situation in the Vatican, at the time of the war against Iraq.

The memorandum was written originally in Italian and was made available for private circulation among political and religious leaders including high ranking members of the clergy inside the Vatican .

The memorandum was specifically addressed to the leadership of the Vatican , which was under tremendous pressure from Washington . The Bush administration’s goal was to enlist Pope Paul II and the Vatican Curia, as key supporters of the US-led “crusade.”

The Vatican leadership refused to accept the role Washington wanted it to play in the intended religious war. The Pope not only rejected the war but did everything possible to prevent it.

The Pope had stated that the war on Iraq would be a defeat for humanity. He sent one of the most important prelates of the Vatican , Cardinal Pio Laghi (former Pro Nuncio in Washington and a friend of the Bush family) on a special mission to President Bush carrying a letter signed by the Pope, stating that this was a truly “unjust war”. The White House had its spokesman Ari Fleischer declare in a provocative way, while the meeting and negotiations were still ongoing, that Bush would not be influenced by the Pope’s appeals.

In fact, every major Cardinal in the Vatican intervened explicitly to denounce the war, even if this was never reported adequately by the US media. The Vatican’s “Foreign Minister” Archbishop Jean-Louis Tauran stated that the war would be “a crime against the peace” and a “war of aggression.” Archbishop Renato Martino, who had for many years been the Vatican’s ambassador to the UN, labeled the threatened US intervention as “a crime against peace that cries out for vengeance before God.” Cardinal J. Francis Stafford, president of the Pontifical Council for the Laity, and former Archbishop of Denver and the highest-ranking U. S. Bishop in Rome , denounced the U.S. intervention as morally unjustified and a further alarming example of increased global use of violent force.

The Pope, on whose agony and death George W. Bush is shedding crocodile tears, did not relent even after the war had started. After the assault was announced, John Paul II said:

“When war, as in these days in Iraq, threatens the fate of humanity, it is ever more urgent to proclaim, with a strong and decisive voice, that only peace is the road to follow to construct a more just and united society,”

This resistance from the Vatican provoked the fury of the Administration and the Neocons. Condoleeza Rice was sent to Rome, the key “Catholic” neo conservative, Michael Novak (the author of the so-called “theology of capitalism”) was sent as a representative of the US President to teach the Pope and the Cardinals the new theological foundations that made the attack on Iraq a “just war.” As a guest of James Nicholson, the then US ambassador to the Vatican (and since Dec 9 2004 Secretary of Veterans Affairs), Novak’s presence and lecturing attitude was forced on the Vatican inner circle.

It was a continuous provocation, and a triumph of theological ignorance, that the Vatican accepted hoping that a dialogue with the “theologian of Bush” could have brought some results. Novak, the Cardinals thought, was “unable to listen.” Novak moving always under the personal protection of Ambassador Nicholson and of the US ambassador in Italy , Mel Sembler accused the Cardinals of the Curia of encouraging the Pope’s hostility to the war. Novak’s position was that the “old” theological doctrine concerning “just war” was to be revised radically in order to accommodate the war on Iraq and the theory of “preventive war”. Why? Because — Novak argued — first, we live now in a period of “asymmetrical warfare” and, second, because the US intelligence has information about the weapons secretly owned by Iraq that the Vatican does not have. At the same time, the US is not at liberty to reveal this information. In other words, Novak and his sponsors lied directly in the face of the Vatican leadership.

On Feb 9 2003 , Novak was received by the Vatican ’s Secretary of State (the Nr. 2 after the Pope) Angelo Sodano as well as by Msgr. Tauran and Msgr. Martino. On the 12th, Nicholson and Sembler presented Novak in a conference hosted by the head of Rome ’s Black Nobility, Princesses Elvina Pallavicini in her Palace. It was the Princess, a protector of the most rightwing extreme pseudo catholic groups, that hosted in 1977 the famous conference with the fundamentalist bishop Marcel Lefebvre who launched an open attack against the then Pope Paul VI who was responsible of promoting diplomatic, economic and social initiatives that the US neo-conservatives of that time, did not like.

It is interesting to re read now - while the Pope is dying — the speech delivered there by Ambassador Nicholson, who was already engaged at that time, in creating what many call a “fifth column” inside the Vatican to weaken the resistance to the imperial policy of Washington and to promote more docile prelates. The speech was trying to promote George W Bush as a religious leader able to challenge the Vatican ’s old “prejudices” concerning war and peace. The speech and the connected propagandistic offensive did not achieve the goal of forcing Pope John Paul II to justify a war that he has declared unjust until the end.

From the [Ambassador Nicholson’s Remarks to](#) the Principessa Pallavicini Conference -Palazzo Pallavicini, Rome February 12, 2003 :

*...Just this week, our two bilateral Embassies hosted here in Rome a series of meetings with moral philosopher Michael Novak. Novak eloquently analyzed how traditional just war theory ought to be applied to the new phenomenon of asymmetrical warfare — of international terrorists striking “out of the clear blue sky” at the heart of civilization. September 11 proved that many of **the ad bellum considerations of just war theory need to be rethought** - terror cells, beholden to no nation-state, strike without warning and with devastating consequences for thousands of innocents. At the same time, rogue states develop weapons that can kill tens of thousands....*

Sometimes, therefore, a military response is not only justifiable but also a moral obligation when society is confronted with evils of sufficient magnitude. This is basically the challenge confronting President Bush and the rest of the free world. As a leading voice for peace and security, the United States must seek to define a response to that evil, and one that achieves the result we all seek - a foundation for genuine peace...

*As **Secretary Powell told the Security Council February 5**, the nexus of **international terrorism and weapons of mass destruction** poses an unacceptable risk that could kill many thousands of our people. This is a life issue that requires a resolute and united response. It presents us with a new paradigm in which to consider the traditional theories of just war. In our view, the moral response is the one that will help achieve the Pope’s four pillars of peace, end the suffering of the Iraqi people, and ensure the safety and dignity of human beings throughout the world. (<http://vatican.usembassy.it/policy/speeches/speech.asp?id=sp030005>)*

APRIL 2ND, 2005

Confidential Ad Personam Memorandum

April 23 2003

The Vatican’s Divisions

At the Beginning of World War IV

“The Pope? How many divisions does the Pope have?”

(Stalin, 13 May 1935)

“I do not understand this position (of the Pope who considers the pre-emptive strike strategy as immoral)...I don’t understand how the use of force against a regime of this type can be considered immoral.....Inaction could allow even more immoral actions to occur...”

(Condoleeza Rice, Bush Counselor, 13 February 2003)

THE WOLF AND THE LAMB

A wolf sees a lamb near a stream drinking from the water,

and he decides that he would like to eat the lamb, but he needs to find a pretext.

So, standing upstream, the wolf begins to accuse the lamb of dirtying the water, so that he is not able to drink there.

The lamb responds that when he drinks, he barely touches the surface of the water, and that, being downstream, he could not possibly dirty the water that was upstream.

Having lost that pretext, the wolf said: "You are the one who, last year, insulted my father!"

The lamb explains that last year he had not even been born yet,

"Well", exclaimed the wolf, "since you are so good at finding excuses, I cannot in any way refuse to eat you".

The fable shows that just defenses do not work against someone who has already decided to do wrong. Even Heads of State, when they want to win by using force, invent false pretexts, and it is not possible to change their minds with just and well-founded arguments.

(Freely taken from an original attributed to Aesop, VIII B.C)

On the 13th of May 1935 – according to what was recorded by various sources, including *The Gathering Storm* from Winston Churchill – Stalin answered to a desperate request by the French Foreign Minister, Pierre Laval, with the now famous phrase: "The Pope? How many divisions does the Pope have?"

Laval had tried everything to convince Stalin to create an opening with the Vatican at the moment in which the Nazi military machine was starting up, and at the moment in which the unity of European forces (religious, ideological, political, State, and military) which was being immediately, or at least potentially, threatened by Hitler was a *sine qua non*.

The existential effort to find a concerted action against the growing Nazi threat did not truly emerge until the apocalyptic launching of the blitzkrieg (Hitler's expedited war) against a series of weak countries (Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc.). These countries were crushed by the superiority of the Nazi military machine in terms of technology, organization, espionage, and psychological warfare; above all, however, they were victims of their own fears and of the cynical-masochistic calculations of the international community.

Many powerful nations of the time, above all the elite in Great Britain, had placed their bets on the possibility of a German attack against Russia which, according to their calculations, was to be handed over to Hitler on a silver platter. At the same time, the German-Russian war would wear out Germany, thus creating a classic case of "killing two birds with one stone" scenario. This explains the consent, or even the encouragement, of Hitler on behalf of the hegemonic Anglo-Saxon nations that saw in him a brutal, yet effective instrument for reaching their goals.

The U.N. of that time, known as The League of Nations, although certainly not an example of a sinless or fearless Round Table, was still cast aside without any hesitation because, just as

in the case of today's U.N., it was the only global forum where weak countries, in order to save their sovereignty and territorial integrity, could count on the protective principles of international law.

We will not, in this report, go further into the strategic details (which are still vastly unknown) of the Second World War. A disquisition on the genesis of that War is not among the goals of this report. The references to Stalin, and to the "divisions of the Pope," as well as the final dialogue about the wolf and the lamb, have a much more direct scope: to call attention to the frightening (in the literal sense of the word) strategic situation that exists in this April of 2003.

Fear: the main obstacle

After the war against Iraq and the propositions of "an endless, quick war" expressed by the instigators of that war, it is no longer possible to close our eyes and hope that the monster will go away. As was well-illustrated by Francisco Goya, the opposite is true: **the sleep of reason produces monsters**, or, giving in to fear produces monsters. If there is no change in international dynamics, this parade of monsters will represent only the beginning of what is already being called - see the statements by former head of the CIA R. James Woolsey - the Fourth World War (considering the Cold War as the Third).

For those in positions of leadership and responsibility it must be clear that, little by little, accepting small and then bigger lies, we have arrived at an existential crisis. A moment in which the future existence of the nations of the world, based on the principles that governed them, for better or worse, up until this moment are in doubt. Until now, the vast majority of world leaders have tacitly accepted the idea that **it is better to commit suicide than to face the fear** provoked by a force which is perceived as being incalculably superior. Now, the alternative between suicide and facing the fear is a very concrete choice. Purely "objective" solutions do not exist.

Every person that is in a position of leadership must begin to face his or her own fears, and **he or she must confront them individually**. Only then will that leader be able to help free the people he is responsible for from their own fears. Unfortunately, many so-called leaders "have faked it" up until now. They pretended - but only pretended - to personify those principles of courage and wisdom that they rhetorically refer to continuously. And this is not surprising to the majority of Italians who "are well-informed", even if only verbally. Nonetheless, we have now arrived at the **test of fire**. The shepherd that has more fear of the wolf, than of betraying the duty he has to his flock, will end up with an exterminated flock. And then, the wolf will attack the shepherd as well.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this subjective problem and of the connected problem of individual fear. This is the starting point to re-emerge from the inferno that the world - and Italy - is falling into very, very rapidly. Any strategic or tactical consideration must start from there: from the will to confront the wave of irrational fear.

In reality, the ability to instill fear, to confuse and paralyze a victim, thus forcing them to surrender without a fight is the ultimate goal of psychological warfare and, in fact, of war *tout court*. The classic *modus operandi* of the British colonial wars was known as the "Gunboat Diplomacy".

The recipe was simple: you choose a country or a city to conquer, the best being one that is willing to defend itself, and is respected by other territories that you intend to conquer. You subject the territory to cannon fire of the Navy, whose technological superiority the victim cannot possibly counter, (the equivalent of today's Air Force) and you bombard them at a methodical pace for as long as is deemed necessary, after doing everything to isolate, infiltrate and break down the government of that territory with internal wars and sabotaging of their logistical capacities. The exercising of brutality against the population was not only directed at the immediate victims, but also to serve as a lesson for those observing.

It was **a way to create fear** and induce impotency. The "lesson" had the scope of softening large areas to be conquered. After the "lesson," the dictates of the colonial power were accepted without the need for a war. It is not a coincidence that this is the guiding principle behind that branch of unorthodox warfare commonly known as terrorism (strike one to educate one hundred).

Without the element of fear and intimidation, it would be **impossible** for the colonial Empire to conquer and, above all, to maintain conquered areas with a population and geographical area hundreds of times larger than the conquering nation. Only the collaboration (involuntary but iron-clad) of the victims made the existence of the Empire possible. If the mechanism of intimidation had been obstructed, even for a moment, the entire edifice would have collapsed.

The weapon of truth

The first step towards emerging from the abyss, and neutralizing the effects of psychological warfare, is **to tell the truth**. For the pragmatic politician that lives day by day, this could seem trivial. For him, the truth is merchandise which is to be used sparingly and only in the form of dossiers or "warnings". For a historic leader that intends to defuse the strategic time bomb that was activated on September 11, 2001, the truth is the only realistic means by which to mobilize the precious resource on which a credible counterattack depends: the minds of the population. The truth is the unique basis from which to free citizens from the cloud of confusion and fear that prevents them from thinking and reacting.

From a military point of view: this is the only way to gain a strategic advantage against an enemy whose power is based on fear and confusion. Furthermore: this is an enemy who counts on the certainty that no one will have the courage to publicly speak the truth. This certainty in the power of intimidation reassures the aggressors and disheartens the leaders of victim countries.

These disheartened leaders don't find the courage to expose and denounce to their people the plots of which they are victim, even under the most ferocious attacks by the enemy. The details of the conspiracy can be discussed in private, or can become a profound conviction of a large portion of the population, but it can never emerge as an official truth. The result is that without even the need to mention it, the population becomes convinced that its leaders have betrayed them and that they gave in without a fight.

For example: it is clear that the events of September 11th were the starting point of a semi-original coup d'état in the United States. With the pretext of September 11th and the succeeding intimidation of the American Congress using anthrax, the American people were

forced to swallow a monstrous politics of wars “without end” as foreign policy, and police state measures as domestic policy. But this can only be whispered.

Spokesmen for the families of the victims of the World Trade Center in New York recently protested that no real inquiry was ever carried out to discover who launched those terrorist attacks. But no institution has the courage to pick up on this cry of pain from the victims.

The theory that Osama Bin Laden could be capable of organizing and carrying out, without complicity at the highest level, the events of September 11th from his Afghani cave is a macabre joke to anyone having professional competence in this field. In fact, no serious inquiry has been permitted up until now, even after two wars have been launched (with many others in the planning stages) on the basis of this theory which has never proven.

What about the groups of Israeli “students” who were arrested in the context of the first investigations (including in the vicinity of the World Trade Center), and who wound up being tied to the Israeli Military Service? The news of these arrests was simply made to disappear. Those that know are not speaking.

At this moment a large number of American citizens are convinced that there is definitive proof that Iraq was behind the September 11th attacks. This is why they supported the American “retaliation”. The fact that this is false does not have much importance, because the truth did not find institutional legs on which to stand.

And what can be said about the arms of mass destruction? And the famous chemical weapons? Just another macabre game. Iraq, tormented and exhausted from 12 years of ferocious sanctions, did not even launch a bomb of tear-gas. Almost all of the American prisoners were freed without a scratch, whereas the American authorities have made known that they have no intention of carrying out, or even permitting, an investigation to determine the number of Iraqi civilian casualties, nor even less, the military ones. American representatives have lied publicly to the U.N., but no one has “called their bluff”. So that, those lies have now become “the truth”.

On 27th February 1933, the Reichstag, the building of the German Parliament in Berlin, was destroyed by an act of arson. The police captured Marinus van der Lubbe, a Dutch citizen who confessed. Yet, the successive investigations were not able to find the organizer. The suspected “accomplices” of van der Lubbe, arrested under Hitler’s orders, were found not guilty by the German Supreme Court. Yet, the German President Paul von Hindenburg immediately granted Hitler “dictatorial powers”. The march towards Nazism had begun.

One year later, Hitler took his revenge against the German Supreme Court – which had refused to back the theory of the fire – as well as against German Law. The Court was deprived of cases regarding treason, in favor of a special Court, in which the judges were to be members of the Nazi party. The German Parliamentarians (those that potentially could have reacted) were intimidated and forced to accept the *fait accompli*.

Following September 11th 2001, the Attorney General, John Ashcroft, on the wave of a frantic, chauvinistic campaign, began to implement “reform measures” of the court system that would subvert the system of American rights. There were no institutional protests. Many American congressmen lived in the fear of the moment, of being accused of “anti-patriotism” if they dared to speak freely.

It is also known that both the war against Iraq and the one against Afghanistan were prepared, in detail, long before the September 11th attacks.

The American congressmen are not the only ones being intimidated and forced into silence. The vast majority of American military leaders (those in uniform) were opposed to the war, just as a large part of the State Department, and even many elements within American intelligence agencies, such as the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the National Security Agency (NSA). Some diplomats presented their resignation.

In the Pentagon, the fanatics of these imperial wars were commonly called chicken-hawks. The common characteristic of the chicken-hawks is having escaped, thanks to sponsorships from above, military service in war zones, starting with George W. Bush who avoided the war in Vietnam, thanks to "friends of the family". The young Bush preferred to enlist for an alternative service, with attendance at his discretion, in the National Guard in Texas.

While the chicken-hawks, having established themselves in the control room, were preparing computer-model plans for the war in Iraq, an apparent split occurred in the high ranks of the American elite. For the moment this split is only "apparent". The jury is still out on that. It could be true, or it could be a "division of labor".

The President (who, rumors say, is often drunk on the job and apparently uses scurrilous language against any employee that is unlucky enough to be in his presence) has turned out to be a docile instrument for the chicken-hawk conspirators. And he is falling more and more under the influence of the religious fundamentalists, such as the tele-evangelist, Franklin Graham, an anti-Islamic fanatic.

On the other hand, a group tied to Bush Sr., including James Baker, Brent Scowcroft, Lawrence Eagleburger and others, have criticized the war with apparent conviction. In fact, the former American Secretary of State, Lawrence Eagleburger openly threatened Bush with impeachment in an interview to BBC on 13th April. Among other things, Eagleburger said that "if George Bush were to decide to launch his troops against Syria and Iran he would not remain in office for more than 15 minutes. If he were to try something like that I, myself would be in favor of his impeachment".

The Conspirators

We will not go further into the details of the colossal staging of September 11th. The point is that, by using that very sophisticated unorthodox war operation, a group of actual conspirators (unfortunately this is the truth) took power in the White House, the Pentagon, and have placed their men throughout the Administration, and in the academic decision making centers, as well as in the media and think-tanks that shape the strategic thinking (so to say) of Washington. Grotesque characters, full of hatred, megalomania and racism, often coming from the extreme Left and moving to the "neo-conservative" right-wing filled with Nietzschean ideology such as "Might makes right". Almost all of them are tied by a double (or triple) cord to the Israeli elites of Sharon and Nethanyau. In some cases they even have double citizenship, American and Israeli.

Nevertheless, with George W. Bush, this group has assumed power. The group prefers the position of "influential advisor". The image that fits Washington is that of an emperor, such as Tiberius, Caligula or Nero, seated on his throne, drunk with power but incapable of any

intellectual activity, surrounded by counselors that inject verbal venom into his ears, stimulating his narcissistic instincts.

What is the Bush plan? It has been ready for quite some time, and was prepared by the conspirators: to transform the U.S. into a modern empire based on a privileged axis with Israel and England. The conspirators have written openly that any country refusing to abide by the rules of the new empire, or any attempt to compete with it, will be crushed without mercy.

Who are the conspirators?

Let's name some names: the Deputy Minister of Defense, Paul Wolfowitz. The mentor of Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, who was, until a few days ago, the President of the Defense Policy Board which advises the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, on which policies to adopt. Perle was forced to resign from the Presidency due to a financial scandal. Yet, the Bush Administration supported him after the scandal. Then there is the Chief of Staff of Vice President Dick Cheney, Lewis "Scooter" Libby, who is a protégé of Wolfowitz. Then there is Douglas Feith, another protégé of Perle, who is Undersecretary of Defense for Policy.

Also parts of the clique are two high ranking executives of the Pentagon, Dov Zacheim and Peter Rodman. It should be mentioned that the Israeli and Syrian/Lebanese sectors of the Pentagon are domains of the members of this group. In the State Department the presence of the group is more limited. One name that stands out is the Undersecretary for Arms Control, John Bolton, and his special assistant, David Wurmser. Wurmser, along with Perle and Feith prepared two crucial and strategic documents for the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, back in 1996, which "predicted" exactly that which occurred in Israel from the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin until today.

We must not forget the former Director of the CIA, R. James Woolsey (apparently not very popular within CIA itself) who recently launched an appeal for the Fourth World War. Nor must we forget the theorist of universal fascism, Michael Ledeen or Eliot Cohen, member of Richard Perle's Defense Policy Board, and whose book was read by President Bush (or at least that's what Bush has said). The book explains how a real leader is capable of pushing recalcitrant Generals into war in the name of a superior ideal.

The group of "influential advisors" has been on the rise since the war in Iraq. Bush recently nominated Daniel Pipes, one of the most notorious anti-Muslim racists in Washington, to the leadership of the U.S. Peace Institute. While the Republican demagogue Newt Gingrich was just put into action by Washington against "those traitors" in the State Department that do not accept the policies of the White House. The unleashing of a repulsive character like Gingrich signals, according to well-informed sources, the decision to arrive a settling of accounts- and a Stalinist-style purge - with those opposing, even partially, the nazi party-line.

It is remarkable that the "influential counselors" are united, often explicitly, by a neo-conservative and messianic ideological link that spills over into religious, or cultist, fundamentalism. It is even more remarkable that these fanatics are the inventors of "war on fundamentalism" in the name of "democracy".

The Plan

But September 11th, although being the most dramatic moment - the fuse - in the organization of this highly technological coup d'état, was not the most important part. The preparation goes back many years, to a scholarly and pain-staking work that included a technical part and an ideological-cultural one. The project of World War IV - an instrument to create the new empire - with which mysteries R. James Woolsey and the other conspirators have indoctrinated ("molded") a young Bush who came from a life of artificial paradises, was not a project born yesterday.

Now in certain Washington circles it has become almost commonplace to tie the genesis of the American coup to neo-conservative think-tanks, like the Project for a New American Century (PNAC) which, in September 2000 produced a report for the future leaders of the Bush Administration. Among the recipients of that report were, the future Vice President Dick Cheney, the future Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, the future number two of Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, the "brother", Jeb Bush and the future Chief of Staff of the Vice President, Lewis Libby. The report described in detail the military strategy adopted in the Middle East and Asia after September 11th. Clearly that report renders unsustainable the theory that the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, etc. were the result of the so-called anti-terrorist emergency that followed September 11th.

The report ("Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategies, Forces and Resources for a New Century"), fixed some firm points for the future Bush Administration (which was "inaugurated" in January 2001).

<http://www.americancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>

<http://home.earthlink.net/platter/common/misc/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>

These are the main points of the report:

A) The United States must take possession of the Gulf region with or without Saddam Hussein. Quote: "While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides an immediate justification, **the necessity of a substantial American presence in the Gulf** transcends the question of the regime of Saddam Hussein.

B) The United States must be capable of "combating and decisively winning multiple and simultaneous wars in different locations".

C) The U.S. Forces are "the cavalry of the new American frontier".

D) The report mentions the infamous draft known as the "Defense Planning Guidance" from 1992, which sustained that Washington "**must discourage industrialized nations from challenging our leadership and to aspire at a more ample global or regional role**". (This point is clearly directed at Europe).

E) Permanent American bases must be established in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait whether Saddam Hussein is in power or not.

F) China must be forced into a "regime change"

G) "It is time to increase the presence of American Forces in Southeast Asia". This will facilitate "the U.S. and its allied powers in its operation to stimulate China's process of

democratization”.

H) The creation of U.S. Space Forces that can dominate space, and at the same time establish a total control over cyberspace”, which is the only way to stop its enemies from utilizing the Internet against the U.S.

I) “**Biological warfare** (and other new arms) could become a **politically useful instrument**“. This point is particularly frightening if one considers the sudden spreading of the incurable SARS, which started in China, at the same time as the war in Iraq. Due to the importance of the subject, we are printing the remaining portion of the text. “New methods of attack – electronic, non-lethal, biological – will be more widely available....combat likely will take place in new dimensions, in space, cyberspace, and perhaps the world of microbes....advanced forms of biological warfare that can target specific genotypes may transform biological warfare from the realm of terror to a politically useful tool”.

J) The creation of a “system of command and control”, to “contain”

regimes such as Iran, North Korea, Libya, Syria (that’s right, Syria!).

This is the immediate plan that has guided the revolutionary “reforms”, especially in the Pentagon and the Bush Administration.

We must add that the gang of chicken-hawks has continued to elaborate, practically in public, their conspiracy. On 10th July 2002, the entire Defense Policy Board – the group of high level experts and notables, presided over by the head conspirator, Richard Perle, which is preparing the “line” for the Pentagon – participated in mass in a session of indoctrination by one Laurent Murawiec, one of the Perle boys. The meeting had been organized by Perle to convince the Board to accept his war policy towards Iraq.

The slides of the presentation ended up in the Editor’s office of a famous American newspaper (this is always a sign of a factional fight within the elite), which published an article. After a smattering of cheap, anti-Islamic racism, Murawiec, encouraged by Perle, said that the sacred sites of Islam – Mecca and Medina – had to be threatened if Washington’s geopolitical plans were to run into resistance. The goal must be the taking direct possession, militarily, of the oil wells in the Gulf area, including Saudi Arabia: the conquering of Iraq must be only the starting point. The arrival point, on the other hand, is Egypt, which means, the entire Middle East. A slide literally said:

Iraq is the tactical pivot

Saudi Arabia the strategic pivot

Egypt the prize

The new French Revolution for “Democracy”

One of the ideological points underlined by Murawiec, as well as by the other conspirators,

was that the imperial war plans were a way to export “democracy”, which is the magic word that would justify any variety of the new nazism. The pretense is obscenely funny. Yet, before laughing it off, the Europeans or those clever Italians (who “know everything”) should think about what their governments have done and said during the preparation and realization of the war in Iraq. Did perchance anyone challenge the improper use of the word “democracy” made by the Bush Administration while they were experimenting, *in corpore vili*, the latest and most deadly weapons of the US arsenal of the post-Revolution In Military Affairs ?

No! No one challenged its intentions. There were some slight remarks, some ironic statements, but **no one dared speak the truth**. No one dared organize their population, their citizens on the basis of that truth. And now that the law of the jungle has been de facto accepted, we will all pay the consequences if we do not wake up from this nightmare of impotence.

Listen to what is being prepared. It is only a taste, but it demonstrates that words are important and that not reacting to the lies can create very devastating consequences. The revolution of the chicken-hawks, this macabre clown act of the “wars for democracy”, just like other precedents, such as the “vital space” (Lebesraum) from Hitler, or even the contemporary variation (for example, the “security of Israel”) will not bite the dust because it is too sickening a fraud.

These plans of lucid criminal folly will be stopped only when somebody stops them. Otherwise they will go forward. No illusions. Bush had already told a delegation of Senators that the decision to smash Iraq had been taken at least one year before the war. With the typical approach of a born-again Christian, the President stuck his head into the office, where the Head of the National Security Council, Condoleeza Rice was discussing with a Congressional delegation on what to do with Iraq, and pronounced the famous phrase: “Fuck Saddam! We’re taking him out”. Neither Tiberius, nor Caligula could have done better in terms of relations with the Senate!

For one year the entire American political and economic world argued, Europe protested, the world disagreed, the debate at the U.N. demonstrated how almost every country in the world was against that war. Result: the war happened anyway, and the intention is to push forward their plans.

If the resistance is what we have seen up until now, then it is certain: the Hitlerian-“democratic” revolution will advance. First the Middle East will be subject to coup d’etats favored by arms and covert operations by the Anglo-Israeli-Americans. Middle Eastern governments will be accused of corruption, despotism, feudalism, in a sort of Procrustean bed of provocations, the governments that have any popular support will be accused of fundamentalism and of possession of arms of mass destruction. Those that do not have popular support will be accused of usurping democracy and will be ousted.

Is the truth the exact opposite? Aren’t the accusers exactly those who own those weapons of mass destruction and, in fact, are using them? **It is not important**. The truth needs the arms, minds and courage of individuals and institutions in order to assert itself. Without these, the truth can be crushed with impunity.

Then the “revolution” will expand to Asia. China will be targeted and Russia will be looted.

Both of these countries – responsible not of “anti-democracy”, but of being a potential obstacle to the installation of the new empire (the Fourth Reich?) — will be demographically mauled. The raw materials, above all oil, will be placed under control, willing or nilling. As the chicken-hawks in Washington say, the oil, wherever it is, is a priority for “**national security**” of the United States.

Already the blueprint for South America and Africa – with a complete and ruthless plan for re-colonization with the final goal of looting the raw materials – is ready and signed off on. Find out, for example, what is being planned for Colombia or Nigeria.

African oil has already been weighed, counted and put in the revenue column. In Italy, it is practically unknown that an American-Israeli think-tank, based in Jerusalem and Washington, held on January 25, 2002 a symposium in Washington that has all of the characteristics of being a self-fulfilling prophecy that came true in a very short period of time. The title of the symposium? “**African Oil: A priority for the National Security for the United States** and the African Development”. (<http://www.israeleconomy.org/strategic/africawhitepaper.pdf>)

What was the name of the Israeli think-tank? The Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies (IASPS). The manifesto of the influential Israeli think-tank starts with quotes from Vice President Cheney (who was already head of the multinational military logistic and extraction firm, Halliburton), from the Republican Congressman Ed Royce, President of the Under-Committee on Africa, from the Assistant of Secretary of State, Walter Kansteiner, and others.

Royce says: “**African oil should be treated as a priority for U.S. national security post-9-11**, and I think that post-9-11 it’s occurred to all of us that our traditional sources of oil are not as secure as we once thought they were.” Kansteiner: “**African oil is of national strategic interest to us**, and it will increase and become more important as we go forward”.

The Report on the National Energy Policy (of May 16, 2001), which Vice President Cheney wanted to be directly under his jurisdiction, gets to the point: “Along with Latin America, West Africa is expected to be one of the fastest growing sources of oil and gas for the American market. African oil tends to be of high quality and low in sulphur, making it suitable for stringent refined product requirements and giving it a growing market share for refining centers on the East Coast of the United States.” Meaning: “That oil is good and we want it for ourselves.”

The IASPS plan for African oil is to be savored. To be read and to be circulated, cowardice permitting. It is nothing less than a declaration of intentions according to which the African states must “privatize” their oil in favor of Anglo-American oil companies. In return, these companies, with the support of the American (and naturally, Israeli) Government, will use their control over the oil to supply a minimum portion (*panem et circenses*) directly to the population, depriving the elected governments and, through this massive corruption, rendering the population dependant on their will.

As is already known, a very similar plan is what the new, Deputy King of Iraq, the American General Jay Garner, will apply to that country. Speaking of corruption, Garner, who is tied to the chicken-hawks by a double thread (Cheney and Wolfowitz), had a career developing missile systems for Israel and did business with the Secretary of Defense, Rumsfeld. He also

made money with the missiles that were then tested on Iraq. But the scandals, even the most obscene, do not exist if the persons in charge of denouncing them are paralyzed by infantile fears.

Why the attack against Europe

So, these Americans are implementing a looting war against Africa, the Middle East and Asia! We Europeans, we Italians are safe! Maybe we could prostitute ourselves a little bit more and they will give us some extra juicy crumbs! We can always say that we are in favor of freedom and democracy and that we don't like the French (we can repeat the fascist scheme and stab the French in the back, who deserve it because they are unpleasant and speak with a funny accent), but we like Bush because he is brave and wise. So Berlusconi has been clever and now: we are on the side of the winners. We will never be sent to the concentration camps; this is a problem only for others... What a relief.... Right?

Wrong! This is not simply cowardice. It is also a **colossal and suicidal mistake!** The war in Iraq, as well as all of the other wars of the chicken-hawks, are, in fact, **wars against Europe!** Let's be clear, they are not wars against France or Germany, because they refused to join the just war for "democracy". No! The wars for raw materials are not simply wars with which America grabs resources for its economy. No way!

That is not the point. Otherwise we would have already developed more advanced energy sources (which today are possible, but "forbidden") than the out-of-date oil. The wars for raw materials are **wars to prevent Europe - as well as Japan, China, and other countries - from gaining access to those raw materials** without having to get the permission and without having accepted the conditions imposed by the U.S.

As a matter of fact, to say it like it is, we are not even talking here of the United States as a country. We are speaking of a clique that carried out a coup in the U.S. against the very vital interests of the American nation and its people. It would be, in fact, in the interest of the United States to find its way out of the present economic depression with a program of economic development. Instead, the approach of "wars abroad and police state at home" is exactly the way to control the entire American population. To control it and to regiment it right when the economic crisis starts. The response by the coup-ists was to launch the most violent chauvinist campaign (known as patriotism) in man's recent history. "Are you starting to get hungry? Then eat the chauvinism and military marches! And...join the Army!"

In this way, paradoxically, we have in the United States, at this point, a huge force that could literally crush, politically and electorally, the small gang of conspirators. We are talking about the great majority of Americans. An alliance between Europe and this America would be the most natural solution. "Therefore, it must be stopped." And it is here that we can see the true strength behind the ideology and the psychological warfare! The Press has been placed under complete control and it will be even more so once the Congress approves the dictatorial measures included in the Patriot Act.

Well-organized, private groups linked to Cheney and Bush have launched one of the most violent, racist campaigns - that against France - ever witnessed. Lists of products to be boycotted have been publicized by televisions, radios and newspapers that are literally controlled or influenced by the offices of psychological warfare. This experiment - to place

specialized military personnel in the editing room of the most important media – which had already started during the war in 1991, has now reached levels of perfection that would make even Goebbels or Albania’s Enver Hoxa turn white with shame. The new method of conducting “warfare journalism” has brought about the transformation of journalists, already weakened in their moral views, to become an integral part of the propagand machine.

It is not a secret, yet one cannot mention it. The show of Americans, which, for love or for intimidation, follow the orders of the propagand, is intended as a warning to Europe.

“You see, we can manipulate Americans as we wish. There is no limit, and there is no international law that we cannot break; the population will follow us. If you were afraid of Hitler, you now have reason to be even more afraid!”

Therefore, the real objective of this coup and of the “Fourth World War”, is not the particular regime that is accused of despotism or of being gang-like, nor is it the “Axis of Evil”, but the American population and European countries, perceived as being a potential obstacle to the imperialist dream. The American population and the Europeans must become docile hosts of the nazi parasite raised by the chicken-hawks.

In fact, at the time in which the American coup took place, the world was on the verge (and, in some ways, still is) of an epic change. The countries of Western Europe, first of all, France, Germany, but also Italy, were establishing a tight web of economic, political and cultural ties with the major countries of the Eurasian continent, in particular, with Russia, China and India. Even the mere proposal of the integration of this vast area, with unimaginable development and investment possibilities, was radically changing the strategic geometry of the world. The most extreme group within the Anglo-American elite had been put in a position that kept it from causing harm. It was quickly losing the initiative.

Add to this the fact that the EU, even in its “half man, half beast” state, had emerged as a semi-independent financial institution. All of those countries that had undergone, with a growing resentment, the whipping of a crazed dollar, had found a point of coagulation; an alternative!

For example, on the question of oil payment, it is known that the payments are made in dollars and that, due to the mechanism that began when the dollar was “freed” from the price of gold. Every barrel of oil carries with it a tax paid to the “dollar men”. It is less known, however, that Iraq had decided – and announced – that it would accept payment in Euros for its oil. The same thing had been decided by Venezuela before the series of “made in Washington” coup attempts. And many others were in line to do the same, including large oil producing countries.

This process was well under way when a machination, with a military, technological, logistical and intelligence complexity without precedence, led to the attacks of the 11th of September 2001. The American people would never have accepted the “endless war” and the “police state measures” without that new type of Pearl Harbour.

Why the attack against the Vatican

The strategy of “endless war” (look at a map) is bringing about a progressive siege of

Europe. Look at the area of production and the transportation route of raw materials, first of all oil – the vital lymph for the European economy. The Persian Gulf oil risks being placed under the total control of the Anglo-Israeli-Americans.

In the Balkans and in Southeast Asia, a well-planned march is conquering directly or indirectly the oil production area in and around the Caspian Sea. The same strategy is aimed at taking over the potential sea or land transportation routes. Seen from this point of view, Chechnya is the crucial geographical point to checkmate Russia's ability to transport its oil to Europe. And this explains the terrorist insurgency in Chechnya, more than a whole library of sociological studies.

Furthermore, after a period of formal support for the European efforts to unite, now the American coup-ists are explicitly playing the dividing card. They are promoting a split between the new member candidates of the European Union in the South East and the North and the Franco-German bloc. And at the same time, they are promoting a split between this same Franco-German bloc and Italy-Spain-Great Britain. They are also working hard to create animosity between the European Union and Russia.

It does not matter how, the goal is the neutralization of this potential Eurasian alternative. Such an alternative that would be a life-saver for all of the participating countries, but also for the American continent and for the entire Third World. However, it would be the bitter end for this click, which is basing its power on financial speculation and the cruel division of the world.

This group has identified in the current Vatican and in the Catholic Church the biggest potential obstacle to overcome. And this not simply for what the Vatican has done, but mainly because of what it could do. This group is convinced that people in the Vatican do not realize that such an institution represents today.

The moral power of the Church could give cohesion (a soul) to Europe, it could prevent a Clash of Civilizations between Christians and Muslims, that the American coup-ists have selected as an essential element in their power game. Some well-placed observers have recalled the public's attention to the 1981 assassination attempt against John Paul II; in particular, they notice how the instigators made sure that the assassination attempt was executed by a Turk, Mehemet Ali Acga, who then was supposed to show his "Islamic hatred" towards the Pope: a clash of civilizations *ante litteram*! The mechanism did not work because some astute Vatican officials did not hide what they thought about that attempt and on who were the real instigators.

The conflict of civilizations that the "endless war" intends to provoke risks making Europe, even those nations that opposed the war in Iraq, the target of terrorist operations. As described by an original observer, it is like hitting someone in order to induce him to attack the mediator.

The Vatican under John Paul II has carried out a crucial role in avoiding, until now, that the clash took place. The coup-ists had prepared a very different role for the Vatican: that of an organizer of anti-Islamic crusades. They have failed thus far. Let's hope that they do not prevail (*Non Prevalebunt*).

In the context of this criminal game, we have to find the real cause of the ferocious campaign of "homosexual scandals" that has hit the American Church. What is absurd is

that when Rome insisted on putting an end to the “sexual *laissez-faire*” that was being pushed in the American seminaries; the Vatican was accused by the main American media of being “homophobic” and dictatorial. Homosexuality was praised as a sign of democracy and openness. Then suddenly everything changed: those same newspapers were suddenly filled with scandals.

The goal was to break the Catholic hierarchy as well as to break the link (in reality, already not so solid) between the American Church and Rome. If one observes the activities of nominally Catholic groups, like the Voice of the Faithful, which claimed the merit of having provoked the resignation of Boston’s Cardinal Bernard Law, it is evident that the intention is to provoke a real protestant-like split between the hierarchy and a large number of the faithful.

Furthermore, the scandal has been maneuvered in a way to favor a confused antagonism between “right” and left”. Such a debate recalls to mind the scheme used to split and weaken the Catholic Church in Latin America in the beginning of the 70’s. The split was the philosophical base for the artificial left-right clash which made the Latin American countries weak and vulnerable to the attacks from the North.

At the end of that cynical operation, there was the loss, to a significant extent, the national sovereignty of those countries and a drastic increase in misery and social destruction. Argentina is a perfect example: from a rich and prosperous nation to a fourth world state. Or one can consider the examples of Colombia, Mexico, and many others. The normal *modus operandi* was to divide a country between military forces trained by the United States and with coup-ist tendencies: and on the other side, violent, terrorist or narco-terrorist gangs that lead the country to an endless war of gangs, progressively destroying the idea of sovereignty and territorial integrity. Yet, even the narco-terrorists are necessarily linked to North American agencies, their *raison d’etre*, the feeding of the colossal narcotics market of the United States.

The scheme worked perfectly: the narco-terrorists supply the raw material, which is indispensable for many American banks. Who cannot forget the famous hug between the head of the Colombian narco-terrorists known as FARC, and the President of the New York Stock Exchange in a demilitarized zone of the country in June of 1999? The narco-terrorists even provided the threat to “national security” which – just as 9/11 clearly demonstrated – justified the militarization of the society and an increasing control by the Washington Big Brother.

According to documents from March of 1970, originally classified as “SECRET/SENSITIVE”, the then Presidential National Security Advisor, Henry Kissinger wrote a memorandum for President Richard Nixon entitled “Study on Subversion in the Catholic Church”. It explained that the banker David Rockefeller (of the powerful Chase Manhattan Bank) had delivered to Kissinger (both non-Catholics) a document, which described the existence of a Communist conspiracy within the South American Catholic Church. The memo was an appeal to the defense of the Catholic religion against “progressive subversion”. It proposed the creation and the financing of a semi-clandestine network inside the Church in order to defend it from the subversives.

At the same time, other groups – which through intertwining routes worked for the same North American circles – were involved, for quite some time, in the creation of what would eventually become the famous Theology of Liberation. The two groups – with typical

gang/counter-gang dynamics – had one single target, even if most of its members were totally unaware of it. The target was the strategy announced by Paul IV in 1967 with the encyclical *Populorum Progressio* and its central point: “Development is the New Name for Peace”. Economic development was conceived as the basis for a true peace and a true national sovereignty: it would have made the countries prosperous and thus stable and independent. Paul IV had mainly two areas in mind: the Middle East and South America.

The response by the groups, threatened by this Christian and human strategy, was to contaminate the minds of the youth with the cult of “revolutionary violence” – which unjustly took over the name of the Theology of Liberation. Simultaneously, the plan, as discussed by Kissinger and Rockefeller, for the creation of a “anti-subversive” counter-gang was launched.

Michael Novak and the lions of the Colosseum

Although the events of the last 30 years in South America represent a defeat, they did demonstrate, nonetheless, the amount of fear that a firm word from a high moral institution, such as the Church, provokes in the groups that today carried out the American coup. Thirty-three years later, in 2003, these same men have sent to the Vatican, under the protection of the American Ambassador, James Nicholson, their “theologian” of choice, Michael Novak. Novak, who is nominally a Catholic, and a close collaborator of Richard Perle at the American Enterprise Institute, was supposed to explain to those ignoramuses over at the Vatican that the war in Iraq was a “just war” that should be supported.

Novak was not able to convince anyone except those already contaminated by the financial-speculative paganism. Nevertheless, from that moment on, the Vatican became the target of a well-financed operation aimed at the recruitment of so-called “conservative elements” that were then unleashed to preach about the religiosity of George W. Bush and his anti-Islamic crusade. It seems that the work of persuasion involves a miraculous multiplication of dollars. These great Catholic conservatives tell you that the Pope does not understand, but Michael Novak does, and, after all, it is not a good idea to go against Bush and his “circus lions”.

Are we witnessing the creation of the fifth column of neo-conservatives that will be pitted against the “liberationist” groups and, in this way, destabilize what remains of the Church? Such an attempt would not be surprising.

The Divisions of the Vatican

Let’s get back to Stalin’s mocking question: “How many divisions does the Pope have?” echoed by Condoleeza Rice, who reproached the Pope for being against the use of American divisions. It should be remembered that Stalin was convinced that Hitler would never attack Russia and he did not take into account the report by an intelligence officer, Richard Sorge, a.k.a. Ramzaj, which presented precise information about the day of the attack.

The idea of “might makes right” is behind both of these conceptions, and an unarmed Pope does not count for much: he can be ignored. Naturally, millennia of human history have proven that Stalin and Rice are wrong and that ideas are what, at the end of the day, makes

the armies march.

But there is a “but”. These ideas and conceptions must be incarnated in the world through men and institutions, and must produce fruits in the real world. When a war explodes, and brutal and irrational forces clash, then the idea of justice and the common good, the Christian idea, must find an arm and an institution capable of implementing it. Otherwise, Stalin and Rice would be right.

What does this mean in this April of 2003? It means that the moment has arrived to create an institution that can represent that arm. The moment to act and to create an alternative has come. The Vatican, despite everything (and despite what many inside the Vatican think), is in a unique position, to inspire a united front of all forces of humanity.

It’s true that there is not much time, but time, as we all know, is subjective. Time multiplies whenever one thinks that there is little way out. Time multiplies once the fear to challenge the emperor and his lions is overcome. Of course, one could always give in to the new Nero, but it would be the death of ideas even before the physical death. We are not yet at a moment similar to that in which the German Bishops were forced (too late) to read from the pulpits the denunciation of the Nazi paganism at the time of the 1937 encyclical *Mit Brennender Sorge*. Now there is more time; but an even bigger potential danger. The illusions must be abandoned.

The Catholic Church, not by itself, but with a special role, must transform the great hope and faith that has awakened in many people during the war in Iraq, into a solid mobilization of minds and arms. A mobilization that can create the conditions so that the elite in countries all over the world — including in the United States of America - lift again their heads up high and find the courage to do subjectively, what is objectively rather easy, since they would represent the overwhelming majority of the citizens of the world. And the enemy, aside from the terror he inspires, does not represent anything more than a small, wretched group of criminals surrounded by a crowd of opportunists and corrupt characters who think they are betting on the winning horse.

If the Church uses **its** weapons, that horse will lose.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Pasquale Maria Aliberti](#), Global Research, 2005

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Pasquale Maria Aliberti](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are

acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca