

Washington's Consensus Al Qaeda Deception

Al Qaeda: "stronger than ever"--- or not?

By [Larry Chin](#)

Global Research, July 19, 2007

19 July 2007

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Terrorism](#)

The "war on terrorism" is a foreign policy weapon favored by an elite and ironclad Anglo-American consensus, supported equally by Washington's political factions. The surge of ["Al-Qaeda" covert operations and "terrorism" propaganda](#) over the past three weeks, and reports of "renewed Al-Qaeda power", marks the beginning of intensified false flag deception.

Al-Qaeda: "stronger than ever"— or not?

It is not clear if the new crescendo of "Al-Qaeda" signals intent by the Bush-Cheney covert operations machine to inflict their long-planned ["next 9/11"](#) before relinquishing power in 2008, or if this noise is routine political maneuvering by rival Washington factions engaged in election-year posturing. Nevertheless, a most perfect of perfect storms is being whipped up, with major players on all sides regurgitating and reinforcing the same bombastic assertions.

The initial wave of US fear mongering was triggered by the latest [National Intelligence Estimate](#) (produced by Bush-Cheney intelligence) declaring that "Al-Qaeda" has regrouped to ["pre-9/11 levels"](#). This was quickly followed by [new "terror" tapes](#) of "Al-Qaeda" masterminds Osama bin Laden and il-Zawahiri, each demonstrating, according to Bush-Cheney, that "Al-Qaeda is even more high-tech and sophisticated than ever imagined".

The initial "Al-Qaeda stronger than ever" blast was then followed by rounds of equivocation and backpedaling. Reports from Washington reporters, such as Rowan Scarborough, quoted "unnamed counterterrorism officials" who say that Al-Qaeda has rebuilt cells in the tribal areas of Pakistan (an old and familiar claim), but "is not at the same strength exhibited in Afghanistan before Sept.11"—and taking issue with how the National Intelligence Estimate was initially spun.

Homeland Security "czar" Michael Chertoff declared that "Al-Qaeda" was [not at pre-9/11 strength](#), boasting about the Bush administration's success killing or capturing two-thirds of "Al-Qaeda" leaders, then adding that he has a "gut feeling" that "Al-Qaeda" [will strike the US again](#), perhaps this summer.

The most inconvenient truth

Neocons, neoliberals, and "anti-war progressives" continue to enthusiastically embrace and reinforce the myth of the "ever-more powerful, ever-more cunning outside 'terrorist' threat to America"—and will continue to do so ad nauseum, as they have for nearly six years since 9/11. Meanwhile, the long-standing and enduring relationship between Islamic "terrorists",

“Al-Qaeda”, Osama bin Laden, etc. and Anglo-American and US-allied intelligence agencies (CIA, FBI, MI-6, Pakistani ISI, Mossad, etc.) and their [ongoing use and manipulation of these “terrorist” groups](#) on behalf of Anglo-American geostrategy remains completely ignored, and the focus of ongoing cover-up, media silence and academic obfuscation.

Ignorant distortions about “terrorism” are now routine and deeply embedded fixations in news coverage, and in pop culture monstrosities such the television series *24*, as well as the film *The Mighty Heart*, which the Daniel Pearl murder gloss-over starring the Council on Foreign Relation’s newest member, Angelina Jolie. *Esquire* magazine’s [Al-Qaeda: The Global Brand](#) by Thomas Barnett is a perfect example of how the Washington consensus deception is swallowed without question, and reiterated compliantly.

There is no better example of Washington’s consensus than the bipartisan Capitol Hill complicity behind 9/11, including the still-unaddressed [meetings between high-level Republicans and Democrats, and Pakistani ISI chief Mahmoud Ahmad](#) prior to, and on the morning of, 9/11, and the unanimous and enthusiastic support for the [“war on terrorism” lie](#) since the day.

Bush-Cheney’s supposed critics have complained about the administration’s “squandered opportunity” and Iraq blunders, but have never wavered in their support for the “war on terrorism”. Slippery variations on the “war on terrorism” theme include (but are not limited to) the following:

- “The Bush administration has failed to fight the ‘real war on terrorism’ begun after 9/11”
- “Mismanagement and blunders of the war in Iraq have created radical jihadist insurgencies that wish to destroy the United States”
- “The Iraq mistake has distracted us from fighting the ‘real’ war on terrorism”
- “We should declare war on Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, which harbor the real ‘terrorists’ who attacked us on 9/11”
- “The Iraq distraction has prevented us from capturing Osama ”
- “The world was united after 9/11, but Bush squandered it all”

There is obvious disillusion with the Bush administration, but the widespread call for a “change in strategy” does not include any letup of the “war on terrorism”. In fact, the voices most stridently demanding “change” are cementing years of criminal lies under new layers of deception. They want to ramp up Bush’s false flag wars, not end them.

US presidential candidates feast on “Al-Qaeda” propaganda meat

The latest “Al-Qaeda” headlines have prompted each of the 2008 US presidential candidates have fall over each other to push the “tough on terrorism” card.

“Al-Qaeda” war politics blossomed during the Bill Clinton administration with the use of Al-Qaeda/militant Islamic mercenaries in Kosovo and Bosnia, and what is arguably the true

start of today's "war on terror"—the identification of Osama bin Laden as "enemy number one" (at the height of the Monica Lewinsky scandal) in 1998, followed by the bombing of Sudan. The cooperative role that the deeply corrupt Clinton faction played alongside the Bush "crime family", in virtually all of the major US government crimes from the 1980s to the present, can fill several libraries. It goes without saying that a Hillary Clinton presidency would [continue the Bush-Cheney agenda](#), and return Anglo-American criminality to its 1990s glory.

What about the others? Contrary to his image as a "progressive", Barack Obama's foreign policy agenda is virtually [identical to that of the Bush administration](#), including his approach to the "war on terrorism". Obama has promised a robust US military-intelligence presence in Iraq and the Middle East to "root out Al-Qaeda". To defeat Al-Qaeda, Obama will build a "twenty-first-century military and twenty-first-century alliances" in order to "stay on the offensive everywhere from Djibouti to Kandahar", and "revamp intelligence agencies far beyond post-September 11 reforms". Another analysis of Obama's aggressive war policy can be found [here](#).

Obama promotes the false notion of ["blowback"](#). Like other members of Congress, Obama has access to classified material. He and others are complicit in hiding the fact of Anglo-American intelligence connections behind both the "terrorism" and the "insurgencies".

The "anti-terror" platform of John Edwards [is equally malodorous](#). It was Edwards who promised on national television, during the 2004 vice presidential debate with Dick Cheney, that he would "kill the terrorists". So would Joe Biden (one of the many who [met with the ISI "money man" before 9/11](#)), Chris Dodd, Bill Richardson, and other longtime Democratic Party fossils. (Two Democratic Party candidates who are more stridently critical of Bush-Cheney's agenda, Dennis Kucinich and Mike Gravel are routinely shut out by the Democratic Party apparatus, and stand no chance of nomination.)

It goes without saying that the Republican candidates fully support Bush-Cheney's geostrategy and war policies, from Mitt Romney to Sam Brownback (the lone critic of Bush policy, Ron Paul, stands no chance). Given the fact that these "loyal Bushies" have been instrumental in making the global slaughter possible, and covering up the rampant criminality led by the Bush administration, it is no surprise to find these candidates aggressively peddling the "terrorism" propaganda. Rudy Giuliani, whose active criminal role on 9/11 was exhaustively exposed in Michael Ruppert's *Crossing the Rubicon*, is essentially an extension of Dick Cheney. [Mitt Romney](#) promises to "combat radical Islam" with a war agenda [identical to Obama's](#) (which is identical to Bush-Cheney's). Romney's provocative [speech at the Herzliya Conference](#) speaks for itself.

The bloodthirsty John McCain has routinely fronted for Bush-Cheney. There is no better crystallization of McCain's depravity than his post-9/11 Wall Street Journal op-ed, ["War is Hell. Now Let's Get On With It"](#), in which McCain openly calls for "ruthless" murder. The piece is also a perfect presentation of Bush-Cheney's lie.

What is clear is that the next US president will not only continue but also expand the "war on terrorism" and the "war against radical extremists". Both Republican and Democratic Party factions stand to gain from false flag terror and propaganda. Anglo-American geostrategy, and the expansion of the war and global resource conquest, would not be possible without them.

Al-Qaeda: perpetual covert operation and cover-up

As previously noted in "[Al-Qaeda:the eternal covert operation](#)", "Islamic terrorism" is a Anglo-American geostrategy, and "Al-Qaeda" is military-intelligence asset and a leading brand of war propaganda.

Official "war on terrorism" disinformation is repeated ad nauseum, accepted as fact by the mass populace, and used as the justification for ever-expanding Anglo-American war and ever-deepening criminality, virtually no attention is paid to the Anglo-American support and management of "Al-Qaeda" and other "terror" groups, or the criminally fabricated nature of modern "terrorism". Every major "terrorism" event in recent times has been a US or US-allied covert operation, followed by political manipulation and cover-up. No credible proof has been provided to prove any official assertion made about the true nature of "Al-Qaeda", Osama bin Laden, 9/11, etc.

Whereas it is a documented fact that Washington's [support and management of "Militant Islamic Network"](#), including "Al-Qaeda", has been continuous since the Carter administration. A [recently declassified French intelligence report](#) details the extent to which "Al-Qaeda" and Osama bin Laden ran operations for the CIA. "Al-Qaeda" as well as Al-Qaeda "foreign fighter hordes" propaganda is a key component of the Pentagon's [Iraq](#) occupation and pacification program. Also see "[Who is Osama bin Laden?](#)" and "[Al-Qaeda:the database](#)".

Planned covert operations and false flag operations using "terrorists" in direct and indirect military-intelligence roles are of imperial design. Such operations (exemplified by 9/11), and their predictable propaganda results ("the war on terrorism") are now routine events.

Even though the notion of false flag terror has more recently been supported by the likes of activist [Cindy Sheehan](#), the vast majority of Americans remains in absolute denial and ignorance, or fully endorse violent "anti-terrorism" agendas.

The idea of "blowback", the notion that terrorist assets have turned on their sponsors, is embraced by many, but it is bogus: Western intelligence has not severed its ties to "terrorists", and, in fact, continues to selectively guide these groups. The true "root cause" of "Islamic terrorism" remains Anglo-American control and guidance of "terror".

As pointed out by Michel Chossudovsky, the "Al-Qaeda" deception is [central to Anglo-American foreign policy](#), which rests squarely on the perpetual threat of a fabricated outside enemy, and fear of a "[new 9/11](#)". This deception provides the ongoing pretext used to justify endless warfare and endless criminality.

"Al-Qaeda" is indeed a "global brand": the pre-eminent brand of Anglo-American covert operation and propaganda apparatus, created, funded, guided and manipulated by leading government powers and intelligence agencies.

Without an end to the "terrorism" lie, there can be no end to the "war on terrorism".

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Larry Chin](#)

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