

“We Are Now In The Longest Continuous Period of War In American History”

Endless War Is the Agenda

By [Washington's Blog](#)

Global Research, November 13, 2014

[Washington's Blog](#)

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [History](#), [Terrorism](#)

Pulitzer-prize winning reporter James Risen [reminds](#) us:

We are now in the longest continuous period of war in American history. And yet there is remarkably little debate about it.

Many Americans assume “because 9/11”.

But regime change in [Iraq](#), [Lybia](#), [Syria](#) and [Afganistan](#) (and see [this](#)) was planned *before* 9/11.

Let’s take [Iraq](#), for example. Former CIA director George Tenet said that the White House [wanted to invade Iraq long before 9/11, and inserted “crap” in its justifications for invading Iraq](#). Former Treasury Secretary Paul O’Neill – who sat on the National Security Council – also [says](#) that Bush planned the Iraq war before 9/11. Top British officials [say](#) that the U.S. discussed Iraq regime change even before Bush took office. And in 2000, Cheney [said](#) a Bush administration might “have to take military action to forcibly remove Saddam from power.”

Cheney apparently even made Iraqi’s oil fields a national security priority [before 9/11](#). And the Sunday Herald [reported](#): “Five months before September 11, the US advocated using force against Iraq ... to secure control of its oil.” (remember that [Alan Greenspan](#), [John McCain](#), [George W. Bush](#), [Sarah Palin](#), [a high-level National Security Council officer](#) and others all say that the Iraq war was really about oil.)

Indeed, we’ve [seen it all before](#).

We [explained](#) last year:

We are in the middle of a perpetual series of wars. See [this](#), [this](#), [this](#) and [this](#).

As just one example, in 2010 the war in Afghanistan became the [longest war in U.S. history](#).

Why is the war of terror being waged indefinitely?

Many have [said](#) that “war is the health of the state”, and Thomas Paine [wrote](#) in the Rights of Man:

In reviewing the history of the English Government, its wars and its taxes, a bystander, not blinded by prejudice, nor warped by interest, would declare, that taxes were not raised to carry on wars, but that wars were raised to carry on taxes.

George Washington – in his [farewell address of 1796](#) – said:

Overgrown military establishments are under any form of government inauspicious to liberty.

James Madison said:

In time of actual war, great discretionary powers are constantly given to the Executive Magistrate. Constant apprehension of War, has the same tendency to render the head too large for the body. A standing military force, with an overgrown Executive will not long be safe companions to liberty. The means of defence against foreign danger, have been always the instruments of tyranny at home. Among the Romans it was a standing maxim to excite a war, whenever a revolt was apprehended. Throughout all Europe, the armies kept up under the pretext of defending, have enslaved the people.

Madison also noted that never-ending war tends to destroy both liberty and prosperity:

Of all the enemies to public liberty war is, perhaps, the most to be dreaded, because it comprises and develops the germ of every other. War is the parent of armies; from these proceed [debts](#) and taxes; and armies, and debts, and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few. In war, too, the discretionary power of the Executive is extended; its influence in dealing out offices, honors, and emoluments is multiplied: and all the means of seducing the minds, are added to those of subduing the force, of the people. The same malignant aspect in republicanism may be traced in the inequality of fortunes, and the opportunities of fraud, growing out of a state of war, and in the degeneracy of manners and of morals, engendered by both. No nation could preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare.

Greenwald [noted](#) in October:

As the Founders all recognized, nothing vests elites with power – and profit – more than a state of war. That is why there were supposed to be substantial barriers to having them start and continue – the need for a Congressional declaration, the [constitutional bar](#) on funding the military for more than two years at a time, the prohibition on standing armies, etc. Here is how John Jay [put it in Federalist No 4](#):

“It is too true, however disgraceful it may be to human nature, that nations in general will make war whenever they have a prospect of getting anything by it; nay, absolute monarchs will often make war when their nations are to get nothing by it, but for the purposes and objects merely personal, such as thirst for military glory, revenge for personal affronts, ambition, or private compacts to aggrandize or support their particular families or partisans. These and a variety of other motives, which affect only the mind of the sovereign, often lead him to engage in wars not sanctified by justice or the voice and interests of his people.”

In sum, there are factions in many governments that crave a state of endless war because that is when power is least constrained and profit most abundant.

Indeed, top American military officials and national defense experts say that our specific actions in the “war on terror” are [creating more terrorists and more war](#).

As Greenwald points out today, the endless nature of the war on terror is [a feature, not a bug](#):

There’s a good reason US officials are assuming the “War on Terror” will persist indefinitely: namely, their actions ensure that this occurs.

There’s no question that this “war” will continue indefinitely. There is no question that US actions are the cause of that, the gasoline that fuels the fire. The only question – and it’s becoming less of a question for me all the time – is whether this endless war is the intended result of US actions or just an unwanted miscalculation.

It’s increasingly hard to make the case that it’s the latter. The US has long known, and its [own studies have emphatically concluded](#), that “terrorism” is motivated not by a “hatred of our freedoms” but by US policy and aggression in the Muslim world. This causal connection is not news to the US government. Despite this – or, more accurately, because of it – they continue with these policies.

There is zero reason for US officials to want an end to the war on terror, and numerous and significant reasons why they would want it to continue. It’s always been the case that the power of political officials is at its greatest, its most unrestrained, in a state of war. Cicero, two thousand years ago, warned that “In times of war, the law falls silent” (Inter arma enim silent leges).

If you were a US leader, or an official of the National Security

State, or a beneficiary of the private military and surveillance industries, why would you possibly want the war on terror to end? That would be the worst thing that could happen. It's that war that generates limitless power, impenetrable secrecy, an unquestioning citizenry, and massive profit.

Just this week, a [federal judge ruled](#) that the Obama administration need not respond to the New York Times and the ACLU's mere request to disclose the government's legal rationale for why the President believes he can target US citizens for assassination without due process. Even while recognizing how perverse her own ruling was - "The Alice-in-Wonderland nature of this pronouncement is not lost on me" and it imposes "a veritable Catch-22" - the federal judge nonetheless explained that federal courts have constructed such a protective shield around the US government in the name of terrorism that it amounts to an unfettered license to violate even the most basic rights: "I can find no way around the thicket of laws and precedents that effectively allow the executive branch of our government to proclaim as perfectly lawful certain actions that seem on their face incompatible with our Constitution and laws while keeping the reasons for their conclusion a secret" (emphasis added).

Why would anyone in the US government or its owners have any interest in putting an end to this sham bonanza of power and profit called "the war on terror"? Johnson is right that there must be an end to this war imminently, and Maddow is right that the failure to do so will render all the due-process-free and lawless killing and imprisoning and invading and bombing morally indefensible and historically unforgivable.

But the notion that the US government is even entertaining putting an end to any of this is a pipe dream, and the belief that they even want to is fantasy. They're preparing for more endless war; their actions are fueling that war; and they continue to reap untold benefits from its continuation. Only outside compulsion, from citizens, can make an end to all of this possible.

Indeed, the American government has directly been supporting Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups for the last decade. See [this](#), [this](#), [this](#), [this](#) and [this](#).

And the American government [lies](#) - and even [kills its own](#) - to justify new wars.

Top American economists say that endless war has [ruined our economy](#). It benefits a handful of elites, while [levying a tax](#) on the vast majority of Americans.

Congress members - part of the super-elite which has [made money hand over fist](#) during this economic downturn - are [heavily invested in the war industry, and routinely trade on inside information ... perhaps even including planned military actions](#).

No wonder the American government is making the state of war permanent, and planning to [unleash new, widespread wars](#) in the near future.

Postscript: Under Bush, it was the "war on terror". Obama has [re-branded the perpetual fighting](#) as "humanitarian war".

But – underneath the ever-changing [marketing and branding](#) campaign – it's really just the good 'ole [military-industrial-and-banking](#) complex consolidating their power and making money hand over fist.

The original source of this article is [Washington's Blog](#)

Copyright © [Washington's Blog](#), [Washington's Blog](#), 2014

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Washington's Blog](#)

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