

The Rise and Continued Influence of the Neocons. Media Narratives Enabling War, Militarism and the Decline of Civil Liberties

Part II. Anthrax Attacks and Control of the Media

By [Michael Welch](#), [Scott Price](#), [Robbie Martin](#), and [Robert Parry](#)

Global Research, August 14, 2018

Region: [Middle East & North Africa](#), [Russia and FSU](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [GLOBAL RESEARCH NEWS HOUR](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [Militarization and WMD](#), [Police State & Civil Rights](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

He aired a free block of programming over public airways in 2014 in Eastern Europe. Who does that? Who does that at the very beginning stages of like a new Cold War run up? ... And, you know, that sounds very similar to the way that the BBC and Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty operated is broadcasting content adversarial against Russia and Eastern Europe. - Robbie Martin, from this week's interview.

LISTEN TO THE SHOW

[Click to download the audio \(MP3 format\)](#)

The neocon architects behind **George Bush's** War on Terrorism did not rely solely on the shock of the 9/11 attacks to galvanize public opinion and support.

Largely forgotten now is the dissemination in the days following the World Trade Center attacks, of [letters containing deadly anthrax spores](#) to media outlets and two U.S. Democratic Senators. The anthrax letters played a crucial role not only in galvanizing support for the military offensive against **Saddam Hussein** and his supposed 'weapons of mass destruction,' but also in helping propel the passage of the U.S.A. Patriot Act. Interestingly, the U.S. Senators targeted in the anthrax mailings, **Patrick Leahy** and **Tom Daschle**, were both Democrats, and [stalling passage of the Patriot Act](#).

Another critical accomplice in enabling the neocon agenda right through the **Obama** years has been a compliant media. However, this does not just include the mainstream giants that a broad section of the public has begun to distrust, but supposedly edgy, and hipsterish media like *Vice*. All pretenses aside, as with *Democracy Now* in its coverage of the Syrian conflict, *Vice* appears to be aligning its news coverage with the goals and aims of U.S. foreign policy agendas.

As journalist and film-maker **Robbie Martin** has addressed in his documentary film series [A Very Heavy Agenda](#), the neocons largely faded from public view in the post Bush era, but have remained influential in shaping the media narratives enabling war, militarism and the decline of American civil liberties.

In the conclusion of a special two part interview by Global Research News Hour guest contributor **Scott Price, Robbie Martin** explores the anthrax attacks in the context of the larger neocon agenda, he exposes the charismatic media outlet *Vice* as a tool of the neocons' foreign policy agenda, and he offers advice on how the public can confront the cynical agenda and disinformation being directed at them without being paralyzed by it.

Following this discussion, we hear a repeat broadcast of a December 2017 interview with the recently deceased award-winning investigative journalist **Robert Parry**. In one of his last interviews before his untimely death at the age of 68, Parry describes how and why journalistic standards have declined since he first started in the field in the mid-70s, he discusses the consequences for democracy, and briefly explains the importance of reader-financed news outlets, such as Consortiumnews.com

Robbie Martin is a journalist, musician and documentary film-maker. He is co-host with his sister **Abby Martin** of [Media Roots Radio](http://MediaRootsRadio.com). *A Very Heavy Agenda* can be streamed or purchased [here](#). Soundtrack for film and music for these series from [Fluorescent Grey](http://FluorescentGrey.com) (Robbie Martin).

The late **Robert Parry** broke many of the Iran-Contra stories for *The Associated Press* and *Newsweek* in the 1980s. He founded consortiumnews.com in 1995 and served as the online investigative news outlet's editor until his death in January of 2018.

LISTEN TO THE SHOW

[Click to download the audio \(MP3 format\)](#)

Transcript - Interview with Robbie Martin, July 2018

Global Research: (INTRO) Through the late 20th and early 21st century, the neoconservatives loomed large in American foreign policy...the war on terror, the war in Iraq, the Bush administration. In 2018, it may seem that their power and influence has waned, but in fact, many of these neoconservatives still hold influence, and their legacy has had a much larger impact on politics and society.

In this *Global Research News Hour* special, we talk with journalist, filmmaker, and musician Robbie Martin on his 3-part documentary, *A Very Heavy Agenda*. This film series covers the rise and continued influence of the neoconservatives. In Part 2 of his *Global Research News Hour* special, Robbie Martin talks about the anthrax attacks and how they were used to frame the war on terror and how *Vice* became the conduit for US foreign policy propaganda.

Global Research: The second thing I want to talk about is those anthrax attacks and of course that's a whole can of worms also in and of itself. And I believe you have a whole documentary specifically on this, correct?

Robbie Martin: I do yeah. It's much shorter. I made it before *A Very Heavy Agenda* but it's about a 45-minute documentary.

GR: Right, but the other thing too is, when I was watching this, how it was used in a way to justify kind of a war in Iraq in a way because then that connects with WMDs. And, you know, so, could you just ...and again, big can of worms here, but could you just kind of like explain this a little bit about what happened there with the anthrax attacks? Because also, just as a comment, I totally forgot about that. Completely. And then when watching the documentary

and then hear you talk about it like on your podcast and stuff, all this stuff kept flooding back and I was oh, right, that was... Early on in that period, that was a huge talking point and I was like how did I...how did I... this is odd to me that I would have...I somehow totally forgot about this. But anyways just kind of explain that a little bit.

RM: Well, first I just wanted to say I'm really happy to hear you say it all came flooding back for you because that was kind of one of my intentions. It wasn't even really an artistic choice, it was... I'm a believer in the idea of like state-dependent memory... And most of the time you hear that has to do with drugs or psychedelics, but when it comes to traumatic incidents, I think it's also very important and key.

So I went into this documentary after I made American Anthrax. When I made A Very Heavy Agenda, I knew that most of the people don't even remember the anthrax attacks, that I just randomly encounter. So, my goal was, if I put a chronological timeline of it and sort of re-immersed the viewer into this memory that they probably lived through and watched on TV but don't even remember it, then maybe some of those memories will come flooding back. So I'm really glad to hear if it had that kind of effect on you.

Because I feel that that's something that if you just expose people to just video clips of the anthrax attacks and sort of show them how it linked to Iraq and these things, then it would really shock most people, but they would also not just be shocked but it would... they would anchor them back to a different part of their life where they're remember, and they'd be like, oh, wow, now I remember that trauma and sort of that fear, that heightened experience.

And you brought up Iraq. I'm a personal believer, and this is something that Glenn Greenwald and other journalists have also posited, the idea that the Iraq War wouldn't have been possible to sell to the American public if it was not for the anthrax attacks. I am a strong believer in that being the reality. I see anthrax, the anthrax attacks, as the knockout punch.

9/11 was an isolated incident, sorry, well it took place in two... multiple cities, but it was mostly on the east coast in a very small relative geographical area. It happened on a single day, but it wasn't just the 9/11 attacks themselves that enabled the hysterical climate for the Iraq War... The idea that terrorism would keep happening, that terrorists would try to use biological weapons, you know because Al-Qaeda was so crazy, they said, that they're going to try to kill us using bio weapons and chemical weapons.

And the anthrax attack essentially provided that, provided that narrative. Because if 9/11 just happened by itself, and nothing else happened after that, the Bush Administration and the rest of the Homeland Security Department and the media class wouldn't have been able to really sell us on the idea that terrorism was going to be a regularly occurring thing.

Having the anthrax attacks happen, and I should mention also it wasn't just a single anthrax letter that was sent in the mail, there were four letters that were found, there were five deceased, and there were also dozens infected, but that's...that's...that might sound small, and it might sound like I'm exaggerating this idea that there was this much hysteria and fear over it, but if you actually read...there are some actual interesting stats in... and I can't remember the title of it but it was an anthrax book that I just read...one of the last ones I managed to pick up a copy of...actually goes through, it does a statistical analysis of all the copycat anthrax letters that were sent to the country at the time. And there was something

like thousands of cases of this happening. So what you had on top of the real letters was piggybacking of all these hoaxers and pranksters and people all across the country sending copycat letters too.

So the climate at the time was so amped up, so heightened, that it appeared that a terrorist or a group of terrorists was sending hundreds of letters through the mail. And this is maybe in a 3 or 4-month period starting in October.

It was discovered later that there were really only four letters found that actually contained anthrax. And they were sent to media and government figures. The two government figures that they were sent to, oddly, were two of the only people who were delaying the passage of the USA Patriot Act during the Bush Administration: Tom Daschle and Patrick Leahy. That's a very odd... two people to be selected for that attack, I think. And other people have speculated that perhaps this was actually the work of someone in the Bush Administration who desperately wanted to pass the Patriot Act, to strip us all of civil rights...it's even hard to quantify how much our civil rights were stripped with that Patriot Act.

So, in terms of how it got us to the Iraq War, I should stress that if you look at every other Iraq WMDs hoax story, because all of them were either cooked up intelligence, doctored intelligence, or leaked lies of omission to the media about aluminum tubes, about Mohammed Atta's meeting with Iraqi officials in Iraq or Baghdad or Hamburg... I forgot where they said they met.

If you look at all the other...connect the other things that connect Iraq to Al-Qaeda, where this idea of WMDs, they had a nuclear program, you know, they had chemical weapons, they had sarin, none of these things actually turn out to be true. And none of them actually had any effect over here. But one of the remaining Iraq war WMD narratives that stuck was that Iraq had a biological weapons program. They had anthrax stockpiles. That was something you heard the Bush Administration say. Colin Powell even held up the vial at the UN. And that was about 2 years after the anthrax, or less maybe two and a half years after. But in between that period where Colin Powell held up the vial and the anthrax being sent through the mail, there was an ongoing anthrax attack happening in the country.

So when you had the Bush Administration all of a sudden going out saying Saddam has WMDs, anthrax stockpiles, he doesn't have to spell it out a hundred percent, because this is how the Bush Administration was so clever about it. They never directly blamed Saddam Hussein for the attacks. What they did was, they continually put out propaganda about how Saddam has anthrax stockpiles during the attacks. Without actually telling the American public who was behind them. And, actually, Bush speculated that it was probably Al-Qaeda.

But it's very important because everyone really forgets, I think, how this 3-way connection was created between Saddam Hussein, Al-Qaeda, and 9/11. How did they manage to get that to sink in? It wasn't just because the Bush Administration lied about the meetings and all that stuff. None of that stuff ended up having any real concrete proof. The only thing that really affected us here were the anthrax attacks. Psychologically speaking, without spelling it out, that's how the Bush Administration got that idea to sink in. WMDs was a real thing. It wasn't just a talk of foreign policy makers, it was because it was being sent to the mail and killing us at the time.

So, then, and of course, there are people leaking to media figures like Brian Ross on ABC,

that it had hallmarks of Saddam Hussein's biological weapons. So you had that propaganda coming out too, but the neocons and Bush were clever enough to not spell it out a hundred percent. And Bush had neocons like Robert Kagan and Bill Kristol and people who were running the administration kind of connecting the rest of the dots in the media, like Charles Krauthammer, other people, alleging that this is probably the work of Saddam Hussein.

GR: And on to sort of the re-branding of the neoconservative hawkish positions. I think, to me, your political analysis on *Vice* news is one of the sharpest and useful there is. I mean, there's a lot of people who've talked about *Vice*, but I think you have, you base it in like a political analysis, and basically how now *Vice* pretty much echoes US foreign policy positions. You look at *Vice* coverage of Ukraine, Venezuela, Russia, North Korea, they've all pretty much taken, like full-blown hawkish positions, but they hide it under layers of irony and feigning that they are non-ideological just in the style that they produce these things.

So could you talk about that shift with *Vice*? I mean, I think there was always a reactionary political bent to it, but I mean now it's just, over the last several years, it's just full-blown hawkish positions. So how does that happen, and why is *Vice* the perfect vehicle for US foreign policy propaganda?

RM: Well, it's... they're all very valid questions, and I guess I'll just start with something that... I don't know if I... I think it's revealed in Part 3 of *A Very Heavy Agenda*, but it's something that's been well known for a while, is that the founder of neoconservatism, Irving Kristol, Bill Kristol's father, was actually the editor, co-editor, for a magazine that was popular in Europe called *The Counter*. It was made for liberal intellectuals. It wasn't a super popular magazine, it wasn't meant for people on the right side of the spectrum. It was meant for like artists and intellectuals and stuff like that in Europe.

And it turned out that this magazine was being primarily fronted by the CIA. And Irving Kristol said he didn't know it was being funded by the CIA, that he was annoyed when he found out. I don't believe any of that. I think he was actually part of a.... part of working for the CIA. I think that was actually his job. I didn't put that in my movie because that's more speculation on my part, but, that being said, I think that this type of thing has been done by American foreign policy propagandists and information war types and intelligence agencies for a very long time.

This was a magazine that was being printed and distributed in the 1960s. So you go all the way to now, something like *Vice* magazine is almost kind of the perfect conduit to pass the threshold of the young cynical mind, and to get them basically to believe whatever they're telling them. Because it's, you know, *Vice* magazine started as edgy, sex positive, drug positive... You know, really edgy sort of culture magazine, and people fell in love with it. I mean it became a big thing.

In the United States, I remember, even in the early aughts, it was very, very popular. It was also free, freely distributed, which I'm still kind of confused about how they afforded to do that, just getting enough advertising money to print it for free. I think that needs to be closer examined.

But just that aside, they eventually started their own HBO show. I think it was around... it was around when Obama got in office, maybe it was around 2010 or a little later. So *Vice* actually started their own TV show on HBO, and it started just like Shane Smith himself, the owner of *Vice*, doing this sort of adrenaline junkie adventure tourism, going around all these

places in the world that seemed really dangerous. And, like, the one I remember most is them going to Haiti, and then him just talking about all the s*** on the beach in Haiti. And that was like a *Vice* news segment.

It was a very popular, sort of edgy show at the time. But what I didn't know about it is that it was being co-produced by, and their main consultant was Fareed Zakaria of the Council on Foreign Relations and also CNN guys, you know he's one of these neoliberal think tank quasi journalists, and Bill Maher you know famous politically correct comedian he has *Real Time with Bill Maher*, and he actually produced it and helps fund it. So he helped bring this *Vice* news show to HBO.

And Bill Maher has always sort of been this guy who pretends to be some kind of libertarian free speech, you know, real liberal guy, but he's quite the bigot. I mean he's quite an Islamophobe, he seems to subscribe to a lot of terrible foreign policy platforms. What I noticed is, even just with already knowing that, that Bill Maher was involved and all that kind of stuff, the part that really started to bother me was seeing their dishonest coverage of the Sochi Olympics and the Ukraine Civil War essentially. And from there I was kind of like well I'm just going to start looking at this more closely, and really try to figure out what their narrative is.

Like what is the narrative they're putting out? Because as you said, they act like they don't have an editorial slant on this show. It's usually a younger reporter who's just going out, you know, kind of seemingly naively covering a story and just along for the ride. A lot of it's just kind of fly on the wall. The reporters aren't asking very adversarial questions. It's mostly just like a documentary kind of thing. But I started noticing something very specific, very early on when I started looking at this. It's ...their foreign policy slant seem to be almost identical to the Obama Administration and the US State Department foreign policy slant.

And once I started noticing that and how consistently true that was for *Vice*, I started noticing other strange things such as the *BBG*. The *Broadcasting Board of Governors* is the US State media arm that we have all these branches all around the world putting out US State sponsored content, similar to *RT Russia*. I noticed that the *BBG* seemed like they were especially excited about *Vice*, running a lot of their content in their reports, and on their *Vice* news segments. And you could actually see this on the *BBG's* auditing reports from the years 2014 two around 2016. They seem particularly proud of *Vice* and the eagerness that *Vice* had to share their content. So that's not just *Vice* mirroring the content of this Obama State Department. It's *Vice* literally using stories and segments from literally US State funded State Department produced media. And that State Department produced media arm posting on their own website, on their government website, about how excited they are about *Vice* for using all their content.

So that was something else I noticed, and I thought that's awfully strange that this supposedly edgy millennial news outlet that's just started their own show not too long ago is this eager to use all this US State funded media content. And that's similarly that branch of the US state government was very excited about that relationship as well. So, you know, that was the second thing I noticed that was really strange. And then I just started noticing that Obama seemed to be giving all this exclusive access to *Vice*, which says something in and of itself. There's definitely ways that you can perceive what kind of favouritism is given to certain media figures. I mean just look at Trump, you know, only giving these long interviews to people like Sean Hannity and Tucker Carlson and no other people from... no other household name media figures.

Obama was giving exclusive access to Biden and different people from his cabinet to Shane Smith of *Vice*! Seemingly more than ...he was giving to other media networks. And, you know, you could look at this and say, oh, well the Obama Administration, their people have traditionally always been good at tapping into this millennial hipster media circuit. I mean look at Obama going on Marc Maron. Look at him going on *Between Two Ferns*. But what I saw with *Vice* was much deeper than that, where it was the Obama Administration not only giving them extremely good access but also trying to put out these narratives on *Vice* news.

And this all sort of culminated with the strange final *Vice* news special with Obama... It wasn't actually the final one. I think it was the second to last one they did with him... where Obama was literally the host of the segment, and Obama takes Shane Smith to a prison, a maximum-security prison to talk to prisoners about how deplorable prison life is. And I don't know what to make of that other than it being a White House sponsored *Vice* news segment. If you watch it you can understand what I'm saying, but it's very surreal because what other media network, especially one marketed towards millennials, would get away with doing something like that? You know, have the President of the United States host a segment. I mean it just looks bad, it looks funny, it smells funny.

So the fact that they would do that so nakedly, it really showed me that they actually don't care, and that maybe in some ways they're trying to rebrand this idea of a liberal government being linked arm-in-arm with this hipster media outlet, and that's actually a good thing. It's cool. It's not something bad.

And then, I guess I'll, the last thing I'll mention is that Alyssa Mastromonaco, one of the people who spent the most time with Obama in the White House, she was with them on Air Force 1 taking his notes, constantly shadowing him, becomes the COO of *Vice* after she leaves her White House spot. It's a very strange transition there. So, there's more I can go in to. I mean Rupert Murdoch own something like 15 per cent of *Vice* now, Disney owns a large chunk. But there's a lot more strange stuff with it. I mean, Simon Ostrowski, the host of *Russian Roulette*, they're serious about Ukraine actually whitewashes Azov Battalion's Neo-Nazi ties multiple times throughout the series, and we now know how brutally and openly Neo-Nazi they are. There's no hiding it anymore. So, *Vice* was trying to hide that. And I've been accused of being paranoid and crazy for even pointing this out.

GR: Yeah...

RM: I mean...And it's interesting... I've actually tried to talk to people who've left *Vice* about this and they're kind of like, yeah, you know...I can see what you're saying, but I didn't notice while I was there. It's like... I just don't see how they didn't notice it. I mean, to me it was just so obvious from the very beginning that something smelled funny about their foreign policy coverage but there were just other things they found during the making of my film, Scott, that like, Shane Smith says on video that they aired a free block of programming over public airwaves in 2014 in Eastern Europe. Who does that? Who does that at the very beginning stages of like a new Cold War run up? What - what media company does that? And you know, that sounds very similar to the way that the BBC and Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty operated is broadcasting content adversarial against Russia in Eastern Europe. That's what they already do.

GR: Yeah

RM: So I found that very odd. That he would admit to doing that and just act like, and just

say it in passing. You know like that was one of their marketing is tragedies. And also, they have branches in over a hundred, something like 120 countries. I mean they are embedded all over the world now. I mean they have so many stringers and freelancers, there are giant operation. So if someone wanted to use them like an intelligence network even, or for surveillance or whatever,...they seem like they're kind of... It's kind of a perfect setup actually in a way. Even just for... in terms of their reach and their amount of translators they have for Intelligence.

GR: Yeah, and so... and then kind of talking like the second part about Vice and sort of their position like we were just talking about, the access that they get and their kind of lines that they pushed through their media empire basically what they have now, this is one thing I was thinking. Do you think there's a connection between the lack of an anti-war movement and news outlets like Vice, who speak and do really well with younger audiences? Do you think like this is, I don't know, I don't know how intentional it is, but it seems like it's really good in neutralizing principled anti-war positions because of what we were just sort of talking about.

RM: No, I think it's absolutely...you just hit on something totally true that's happening. There's all these...people won't seek out...They believe that they have all these alternative voices in places like *Vice* or *BuzzFeed* or *Daily Beast*, but in fact if you look at all three of those outlets' slant on US foreign policy, it's virtually always the same, they're almost always towing US foreign policy line, at least during the Obama Administration. Things have changed since Trump got an office. That's a whole other can of worms.

But yeah, I think that you're, it's completely true to say is that the anti-war movement, at least in any mainstream sense, has been pretty much completely neutralized. And even like the sub mainstream anti-war movement, that you know you used to hear about anti-war protests, I mean I think the last one was a large group of people protesting the White House when Obama threatened to bomb Syria because they crossed the red line. That was one of the last major groundswell protests that the anti-war movement was really a part of. That like I think kind of penetrated at least partly to the mainstream.

Since then though, I think that it has been largely neutralized. Even the idea that we are perpetually bombing ISIS in Syria, even people on the anti-war left who were journalists who do work in that area, they don't even really write about how that's, you know, part of the endless war on terror. It's kind of like just accepted that we need to eradicate ISIS and keep bombing Syria and Iraq over and over again until you know, killing unknown scores of civilians.

So, I think that unfortunately, the anti-war movement is largely disappeared. The drone wars have increased under Trump, more civilians are being killed, more bombs are being dropped under Trump than were under Obama, he's doing it at a higher rate. You don't really hear much outcry really. It just seems like mostly the consensus, even from the, I don't want to say the left, but the liberal side of the spectrum, is calling for world war and how we should overthrow Assad, how maybe we should squeeze Putin more, maybe we should sanction North Korea and starve North Koreans more.

That's sort of the rhetoric from the left right now. Unfortunately, there's not, I mean the anti-war stuff, saying that we should keep our hands off of those countries and maybe not sanction Venezuela or talk about overthrowing them. It's very few voices out there saying that kind of stuff right now. Even shows like *Democracy Now* in the United States have

shifted more towards a regime change perspective in countries like Syria. Which is really shocking. But that's where we are now.

- Intermission -

GR: I guess one of the last things... kind of one of the last things about *A Very Heavy Agenda* is that one of the major takeaways that I really got from the film and what I really appreciate it is that you kind of show that there aren't really secret conspiracies and that many of these elites and these sorts of people are very open about what they want and what they want to do. And you show that through their own words, and you kind of let these people, you give them, you know, you use the own rope that they have to kind of hang themselves with in a way.

But, yet, people are still really attracted to the more cartoonish kind of conspiracy theory kind of things. And I think about that, and I also think about, at the same time, we are really living and one of the most propagandized times. And it is becoming harder and harder to discern what is happening in the world because you know these neocons, they don't actually, like, as you kind of establish in the film and what we talked about, they don't really care about what the facts are. It's just whatever they can bend, whatever they can rewrite history into.

And we just talked about, like *Vice* and how they portray things. So, I mean, I'm just wondering about someone who is really kind of like yourself, who's tuned into this. How do you stay focused on what matters, and how do you kind of keep sanity and a sort of decent mental health? I mean, what are your thoughts about this? Because it seems we're getting... things are getting more surreal and even more propagandized than I even thought, you know, in the lead up to the Iraq War. I think, we're in a way, we're staged now.

RM: Yeah that's a really hard one. I mean, gosh. I mean, I think just for myself, I try to make the world smaller in terms of my, what I focus on. If I tried to look at everything at once that bothered me, and tried to make sense of it, and tried to address it and fight against it, I think I would... there'd be no way to do it. I mean I would just probably be a depressed mess all the time. I wouldn't be able to do anything. I'd be paralysed by it. So, I guess just for my own personal strategy is...and the work that I do is to narrow things down to where I think I can do the most damage, I guess.

GR: Right.

RM: Other than fighting against it. For me, I've chosen some, you know, very specific areas. So I will continue to do work and dig the subject of the 2001 anthrax attacks, but you know, in terms of just charting what the neocons are doing and what their plans are, like you said, a lot of this stuff is being talked about out in the open. I mean, you know, even if, you know, it depended on... you don't have to be a Truther to think it's valuable information, but the fact that the *Project for the New American Century* in the year 2000 talked about their eagerness for needing a new Pearl Harbor, perhaps tracking that back then might have prepared you better for the era to come in terms of, you know, what their propaganda was going to be like after 9/11 and things like that, and where it was going to go.

You know, because a lot of this stuff, at least for me, it used to be playing catch-up. I would be looking at documents that were written very, a while ago, you know, years ago, to try to understand the present. So, for me I try to read documents as they come out in the present

to understand what's going to happen in the future, and to try to at least, you know, get a better handle on what that might be so that when it happens, I can be better prepared to address it, I guess. And one of those ways that shaping up now is this build-up to what seems like Trump's Administration beating the drums for war with Iran. And that's something that, you know, I've been looking at very closely for the last couple of years.

So, it hasn't been a surprise to me I guess is partly what I'm trying to say. But I think for regular people out there, I don't blame people for wanting to unplug and not being able to follow what's going on, because I agree with you that it's one of the most challenging and intense propaganda eras in human history. And so, I don't want to leave people with a cynical note or suggestion on my part, but if you want to do this kind of work, and you want to pay attention to it, I would try to narrow it down to something. Because otherwise it is going to drive you crazy.

GR: You have been listening to the *Global Research News Hour* special with journalist, filmmaker, and musician, Robbie Martin, on his documentary series, *A Very Heavy Agenda* that explores the rise and continued influence of the neoconservatives on US foreign policy and society. You can buy or stream *A Very Heavy Agenda* at averyheavyagenda.com. Music for this special provided by Fluorescent Gray, AKA, Robbie Martin. For *The Global Research News Hour*, I'm Scott Price.

- end of transcript -

Global Research News Hour Summer 2018 Series Part 6

LISTEN TO THE SHOW

[Click to download the audio \(MP3 format\)](#)

The [Global Research News Hour](#) airs every Friday at 1pm CT on [CKUW 95.9FM](#) in Winnipeg. The programme is also podcast at globalresearch.ca. Excerpts of the show have begun airing on [Rabble Radio](#) and appear as podcasts at rabble.ca.

The Global Research News Hour now airs Fridays at 6pm PST, 8pm CST and 9pm EST on Alternative Current Radio (alternativecurrentradio.com)

Community Radio Stations carrying the Global Research News Hour:

CHLY 101.7fm in Nanaimo, B.C - Thursdays at 1pm PT

Boston College Radio [WZBC 90.3FM NEWTONS](#) during the Truth and Justice Radio Programming slot - Sundays at 7am ET.

[Port Perry Radio](#) in Port Perry, Ontario -1 Thursdays at 1pm ET

[Burnaby Radio Station CJSF out of Simon Fraser University](#). 90.1FM to most of Greater Vancouver, from Langley to Point Grey and from the North Shore to the US Border.

It is also available on 93.9 FM cable in the communities of SFU, Burnaby, New Westminister, Coquitlam, Port Coquitlam, Port Moody, Surrey and Delta, in British Columbia, Canada. - Tune in at its new time - Wednesdays at 4pm PT.

Radio station [CFUV 101.9FM](#) based at the University of Victoria airs the Global Research News Hour every Sunday from 7 to 8am PT.

[CORTES COMMUNITY RADIO CKTZ 89.5](#) out of Manson's Landing, B.C airs the show Tuesday mornings at 10am Pacific time.

[Cowichan Valley Community Radio CICV 98.7 FM](#) serving the [Cowichan Lake](#) area of Vancouver Island, BC airs the program Thursdays at 6am pacific time.

Campus and community radio [CFMH 107.3fm](#) in Saint John, N.B. airs the Global Research News Hour Fridays at 10am.

Caper Radio CJBW 107.3FM in Sydney, [Cape Breton](#), Nova Scotia airs the Global Research News Hour starting Wednesday Morning from 8:00 to 9:00am. Find more details at www.caperradio.ca

RIOT RADIO, the visual radio station based out of [Durham College](#) in Oshawa, Ontario has begun airing the Global Research News Hour on an occasional basis. Tune in at dcstudentsinc.ca/services/riot-radio/

Radio Fanshawe: [Fanshawe's 106.9 The X \(CIXX-FM\)](#) out of London, Ontario airs the Global Research News Hour Sundays at 6am with an encore at 4pm.

Los Angeles, California based Thepowerofvoices.com airs the Global Research News Hour every Monday from 6-7pm Pacific time.

The original source of this article is Global Research

Copyright © [Michael Welch](#), [Scott Price](#), [Robbie Martin](#), and [Robert Parry](#), Global Research, 2018

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Michael Welch](#),
[Scott Price](#), [Robbie
Martin](#), and [Robert Parry](#)

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