

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”  
Lawrence C. Chin  
October 2011 – March 2013

**THE “CHENEY PLAN”, CIA'S WAR WITH THE NEOCONSERVATIVES,  
AND THE “CRIMES AGAINST RUSSIA”**

The following is part of the Preface to my “Secret History”, VOL IV. It was originally written to be an introduction providing the political background information for understanding the story. It shall be presented here as an independent essay by itself.

The themes of the essay are three: (1) the covert reasons for United States' destabilization of the USSR since the 1980 – that it's more about the struggle for natural resources than about ideological conflict with communism – (2) the political warfare between the CIA and the neoconservatives from 2001 to 2010; and (3) a hypothetical neoconservative plan for a “microchipped utopia”.

The first two themes (“crimes against Russia” and “CIA's war with the neoconservatives”) are covered in researches based entirely on information in the public domain. Its conclusions are therefore as trustworthy as any other think tank papers or conspiracy theory materials you can find online. The scenario of the “microchipped utopia” is however hypothetical and has no basis in publicly available information. It's presented as “food for thought” only.

Since the genre of this essay is “conspiracy theory”, the nature of “conspiracy theory” shall also be examined.

True and false about “conspiracy theories”:  
The “New World Order”, “Illuminati”, and “Freemasons”

*Alles ist Mist was der Staat macht*<sup>1</sup>

The “conspiracy theorists” constitute an uneven terrain. A few of them are of academic stature, such as Daniel Estulin, Michael Ruppert, Thierry Meyssan, and Michel Chussodovsky, whose works I trust more or less. Those in the “alternative news” (like the “Corbett Report”) are also okay. The rest are not well educated and have a world view that is less realistic and more mythical. Those with the greatest popularity tend to fall into this category, like Alex Jones, David Icke, or the Zeitgeist and Thrive movements. (Alex Jones' Prison Planet and Info War are not always too inferior a quality because he sometimes has competent writers on his staff.) Then there are many on the bottom that say laughable things and others that are too weird to be trustworthy (like John Coleman). Knowing this terrain is important, for two reasons. Firstly, while the United States government in particular, and Western governments in general, have become the most secretive in world history – far more secretive than the North Korean or Chinese government – by always covering up their operations and agendas with diversionary “cover stories” (“official stories”), academics and journalists do not question these “cover

<sup>1</sup> Attributed to Spiegel in an anonymous CIA officer's review of *The Service: The Memoirs of General Reinhard Gehlen*: [https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol16no3/html/v16i3a06p\\_0001.htm](https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol16no3/html/v16i3a06p_0001.htm).

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

stories” and are thus blind to the real operations and true agendas. Secondly, while secret gatherings like the Bilderberg Group have dominated the contemporary decision-making process in the West, academics do not discuss this phenomenon. It has thus been left to independent investigators and wild fancies alike on the fringes of normative culture – to the unregulated and disorganized discursive world of the counter-cultures – to distrust the “cover stories” and seek behind the veil the true operations of the government and the real decision-making process.<sup>2</sup> There is thus the difficult task, in the search for truth, of distinguishing the competent investigators from wild fantasists.

There are simple rules of thumb in this regard, like: those conspiracy theorists that are invited onto Russia Today are worth listening to. Then, given all the secrecy surrounding government operations in the West, the most trustworthy sources of information have to be the so-called “whistleblowers” – insiders who confess to you what has happened *inside*. In the following, for example, I cite Sibel Edmonds and Susan Lindauer as the two most important recent sources of information on the operations of the US government. Here, too, there is a problem. Not all whistleblowers are genuine – that is the most problematic feature of this category. The very popular Annie Machon for example has been co-opted.<sup>3</sup> Her book *Spies, Lies, and Whistleblowers* is an “active measure”<sup>4</sup> and she is probably on the payroll of MI6. And yet nobody notices this. Disinformation agents (pretenders) are frequent in this category.

We can summarize “conspiracy theorists” in one sentence by saying that they theorize how the banking, industrial, and political elites in the West, constituting a shadowy cabal, have been orchestrating world events from behind the scene in order to implement “New World Order”. *Something like this* is true, but the quality investigative works are lone voices in the vast sea of fairy tales about the NWO, most of which are unrealistic, mythical, and overly simplistic conceptions, while some, like Ken Adachi and David Icke, are so ridiculous as to even affirm the “elites” to be hybrids

---

2 “Counter culture” is here defined as a sub-culture whose essence consists in the denial of the dominant culture as oppressive, untrue, or alienating from true human nature. Counter-culture thus includes everything from cultural feminism through UFO enthusiasts to 911 truth movement. My personal experience with 911 truth groups has taught me that these counter-culture groups are essentially of the same structure as the “gnostic” cultural feminism. Although the majority of the 911 truth activists are uneducated and unintelligent, they are run through by an unshakable conviction of their special genius which sets them apart from the rest of profane society. This is their “gnosis”. They are further convinced that they are, because of their possession of this “gnosis”, in a special position to redeem the corrupt society in which they are trapped and threatened. The “truthers” are here to redeem America by restoring the corrupted version of America back to its pristine state (the “Constitution” of the founding fathers). I don't disagree with the outline of their version of reality – America has indeed been corrupted away from its Constitution – but, as you shall see below, I harbor serious doubt that uneducated people like them, trapped in a mythical vision of reality, could possess the qualification for the sacred task of the restoration of the republic.

3 Annie Machon's website is at: <http://www.anniemachon.ch>.

4 Strategic disinformation to confuse or discredit the enemy target. The term comes from Christopher Andrew's *The Sword and the Shield: the Mitrokhin Archive and the Secret History of the KGB*. Thus Annie Machon in her book maintains that Libya was responsible for the Lockerbie Bombing, when any insider would tell you that it was the CIA which had destroyed the plane in order to kill DIA officer Charles McKee.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

between humans and extraterrestrials.<sup>5</sup> I first came to conspiracy theories because I noticed an extraordinary similarity between the “Cheney Plan” and the “New World Order” which the conspiracy theorists have attributed either to the Bilderbergers or to the Rothschild and the Illuminati who were supposedly behind them. Were Dick Cheney's secret plans actually known by many? And who are these “Illuminati”? But I was soon disappointed. In most cases, while all that which the conspiracy theorists have said about the “New World Order” looks true from afar, they turn out to be wrong, uneducated guesses, frequently mythical formulations, upon closer examination. Furthermore, all the rumors about “Illuminati” have turned out to be a bunch of garbage. And yet you cannot find educated guesses about the “New World Order”, along with the secret cabal orchestrating it, in the mainstream, because academia in the West as a rule is hostile to any worldview which contradicts the official versions of major events given by the authority and which posits any malicious orchestration by shadowy cabal from behind the scene.<sup>6</sup> The problem is that politics has become as esoteric a domain to the ordinary people as is any branch of science, and yet the decline of intellect among university researchers has resulted in the growing number of unthinking “scholars” who can't do any better than accept the words of their government on face value, completely unable to notice the increasing use of deception by their increasingly corrupt governments in the Western world. The domain of international relations and national security is the worst. The “scholars” in this domain are active disinformation agents sponsored or paid by the authority through the intermediary of NGOs (like the National Endowment for Democracy or Carnegie Endowment for International Peace). If you want to understand what this “New World Order” is, or what your government has really been doing, you have but the conspiracy theorists to serve as your guide, which is most unfortunate, because you then have to

---

5 It is on Ken Adachi's website Educate-Yourself that I have found the most ridiculous story on intelligence agencies I have ever seen: James Casbolt's “Project Mannequin” (<http://educate-yourself.org/mc/casboltagent1chap.shtml>), which recycles all the stupid modern myths about alien contacts with humans and elites being alien-human hybrids.

6 See for example, *Conspiracy Theories in American History: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Peter Knight. The first essay in the Encyclopedia, “Conspiracy Theories in America: An Historical Overview”, by Robert Alan Goldberg, while providing an excellent overview of the major conspiracy theories operative in American history, including the origination of the term “New World Order” with Welch in the 1970s, is skeptical of the truth values of any conspiracy theories. As examples of the mainstream, academic opinion on conspiracy theories, you might also consult articles which Scientific America regularly features, e.g.: Michael Shermer, “Why people believe in conspiracies”, Sept. 10, 2009 (<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=why-people-believe-in-conspiracies>), and his August 18 2012 “Why people believe conspiracy theories” (<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=why-people-believe-conspiracy-theories>). A deeper sociologico-semiotic analysis of conspiracy theories in recent time is provided in Mark Fenster's *Conspiracy Theories: Secrecy and Power in American Culture*, whose 2008 second edition has significantly expanded on its first edition of 1999. Fenster here analyzes Richard Hofstadter's earlier (1960s) approach to the study of conspiracy theories, the “paranoid style”, then argues that this approach of treating conspiracy theory as pathological is flawed, and presents his own more sophisticated approach which deconstructs conspiracy theory in an interpretive framework which he has evidently adopted from Lacanian psychoanalysis and the semiotics of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. Within such novel application of the latest trend in literary interpretation Fenster dismisses possible truth values in conspiracy theories of every kind while admitting the important role played in history by secret treachery in political order, intelligence covert operations, government secrecy, and secretive alliance between private individuals and groups. Note that by “conspiracy theory” Fenster includes also many variants like American militia groups, white supremacist extremists, UFO enthusiasts – all of whom believe in “New World Order” – whom I don't consider here. He even analyzes fictional uses of conspiracy theory like Robert Anton Wilson's *Illuminatus!* trilogy.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

carefully distill reality from “myth” and fish out the few pieces of trustworthy information from among a massive amount of idle-talk and demonic tales concocted by uneducated, obtuse, and paranoid minds. This condition is natural: since the majority of human beings are not born very intelligent, they cannot be expected to understand the complex and specialized actions which the governments and the decision-making elites perform to manage societies and their mutual relations from the very top. Neither can they be expected to practice rigorous scientific methods and not believe in things which they themselves have made up to comfort their self-esteem. It's important for you to understand what I have persistently referred to as “mythical formulation” of reality. UFO enthusiasts often theorize that primitive cultures who had had contacts with extraterrestrials formed from these their conceptions of gods and ghosts because they did not have minds advanced enough to understand the alien beings in their own right. It is in the same way that the uneducated masses have formed an immature notion of NWO: their minds are not advanced enough to fully conceptualize the plans of the “elites”. They have something that looks like the truth, but not really the truth. To use another example, theoretical physicists have been led by their complex numerical measurements and mathematical description of the physical reality to the “Big Bang” scenario: quantum fluctuation, inflation, differentiation of forces, the standard model of elementary particles... In any primitive culture you might find a scenario on the origin of the cosmos that operates along the same line, differentiation from an original undifferentiated whole: a watery mud, chaos, in the beginning, from which split heaven and earth, and all beings popped out from earth... The myth sounds similar to the scientific scenario, *something like that is true*, but it is not true, because people of ancient civilizations were not sophisticated enough in their intellectual development. A third problem with conspiracy theories is the fossilization of discourse. The counter culture worldview suffers from the same problem which characterizes the world view of other liberation ideologies like cultural feminism. It is the manifestation of the same old phenomenon that a discourse whose elements were originally conceived to describe reality soon solidifies into a self-referential and self-consistent “idle talk” that no longer describes in any way the reality which it claims to describe. The NWO discourse has congealed into regular categories of Agenda 21, Chemtrail, One World Government, Illuminati, MK-ULTRA, Federal Reserve, Bilderberg... Once introduced into these fixed categories, one becomes unmotivated to learn about, for example, the changes in the agendas of the “elites” and the advances in their technology for domination. The discourse has become a form of prejudice, preventing new information from streaming in through “cognitive dissonance”.<sup>7</sup> No conspiracy theorists will take seriously, thus, this international court trial which has changed everything – the “New World Order” has secretly ended – nor bother with the supreme mind-control technologies which I have introduced here, still caught up in their demonic tales about the “elites” and mythologies surrounding the ancient MK-ULTRA.

The elites of the West have indeed been planning *something like* a “New World Order” for a very long

---

<sup>7</sup> The difficulty we all have in grasping new concepts which disturb our existing worldview. This common phenomenon which scholars for 911 truth themselves name as the greatest obstacle to mainstream public's seeing through the official 911 story (the 911 Commission Report: <http://youtu.be/mEGgAk1AbA4>), they also suffer from after their “awakening” has congealed into a new worldview.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

time. What I mean is that they have had a plan for the whole planet, which conspiracy theorists' NWO somewhat resembles, and that so, for convenience's sake, I shall stick to the term “New World Order” and then clarify it. The conspiracy theorists are usually only vaguely correct about what the “New World Order” really is, especially as it concerns our contemporary times. To speak plainly, the “New World Order” is nothing less, or more, than an universal empire united under the rule of Western elites, which has often been referred to as the “One World Government”. The “New World Order” evolves around three issues: the destruction of Russia and China, the unification of administration of earth's natural resources under Western corporations, and the rational control of all human beings for the sake of efficiency. All three issues are interconnected. Only the more sophisticated figures in the domain of conspiracy theories (like Daniel Estulin, Thierry Meyssan, or those researchers associated with the Canadian-based Global Research, etc.) have enough geopolitical knowledge to comprehend *something* in all three issues – and the academics speak nothing of these three central concerns of Western governments. The typical consumers of conspiracy theories have usually only some vague notion about the goal of the totalitarian control of human beings, but, because they lack the necessary education, usually cannot comprehend the relation of this to the issues of natural resources and the geopolitical situation with Russia and China. They speak endlessly about the evil desires of the “elites” to enslave the common people, and yet their picture of the “elites” is highly stunted, overly simplistic, and unrealistic portrayal of human beings. Any insider who comes upon the viewpoints of the general conspiracy folks would find their portrayal of the elites stupid and laughable, reinforcing the elites' prejudices against the common people as incapable of comprehending anything – even though the conspiracy folks do better than the mainstream folks in that they at least realize that the “official stories” which the mainstream media have been propagating are not “real”. And the first reason why the typical conspiracy folks' picture of the elites is inadequate is that they only focus their attention on a small portion of the elites' concern, missing the larger picture.

The second reason why the conspiracy folks' picture of the world of elites is inadequate is its oversimplicity, manifested in their portrayal of the “elites” as always acting in a single bloc and having control of all oppositions on the surface. They form their picture thusly because it is *easier* to think of the elites as an unified group without divisions, in-fighting, and internal intrigues. This also causes the conspiracy folks to infer an excessive degree of manipulation of world events from a hidden center. They have been passing around among themselves the stories of how the Rothschild and the Illuminati have been, from behind the scene, pitting nations against each other from the Napoleonic wars through the two World Wars to the Cold War, financing both sides of the conflicts; how the bankers have increasingly gained complete control of our life through the establishment of central banks in every country in Europe and in America; and how they have been, since the late eighteenth century, trying to replace individual nations with One World Government by recruiting political elites in each country to subvert its national sovereignty from within. The Rockefellers, the Rothschild, the Warburgs, the central banks, the Federal Reserve, the League of Nations, the Council of Foreign Relations, all in the early twentieth century; the United Nations, the Bilderberg, the European Union, the Trilateral Commission... these in the latter half of the twentieth century. There is some truth in all the paranoid

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

fear – the stories about bankers' control of our money through central banks and their orchestration of economic depressions through restricting the money supply do seem true – but the picture is hardly this simple. The less sophisticated conspiracy theorists tend to assign excessive behind-the-scene power to the nebulous entities “Illuminati” and “Rothschild”, determined to see them as running both sides of every historical conflict, even the Cold War.<sup>8</sup> This makes talking to them about geopolitics completely pointless, for, according to this kind of worldview, there are no *real* conflicts between nations. The Illuminati and the Freemasons (who are they?) are just putting up some shows for us. Having such penetrating insight into reality surely gives the conspiracy theorist a feeling of superiority, but – is it real? In reality, politics can best be characterized as an interweb of influences at various levels. While Blair and Schroeder attend Bilderberg conferences to appease the interests of industrial elites who want an unification of the world under their administration, when they return to their post, they are still obliged to attend to other kinds of interests, local and geopolitical. While the Bilderberg acts as an unifying force between United States and an united Western Europe, the geopolitical alliances at the levels below (the French-German-Polish Troika of the 1990s and the French-German-Russian Troika before the Iraq Invasion) which contradict the Bilderberg unification are just as real, and a single Schroeder plays with the anti-Russian Bilderberg Group while at the same time forming alliance with Putin in another domain of interests (to ensure energy security *for Germany*). When he plays with Putin too much, the Bilderbergers would cause him to be removed, but the “elected leaders” are not their puppets in any simple sense. In the same way, the product which the conspiracy theorists like to attribute to the Bilderbergers from behind the scene may be the convergent results of different interests that are completely at odds with one another. De Gaul has laid the foundation for European Union by forging France's unity with West Germany because he wanted to check the influence of Anglo-American world-domination, while the Bilderberg and its ideological predecessors (like Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman) have wanted the European Union because they dream of Europe's unification with North America. Both sets of interests are real. Meanwhile, the academics do just the opposite, talking about Schroeder's energy concern for Germany but completely ignoring his attendance at Bilderberg conferences. When the academics focus only on the geopolitical reasons for EU while the conspiracy theorists only focus on the “conspiratorial”, globalist, reasons, neither side sees the full picture and the audience is confused.

The truth is thus somewhere in between – between the worldview based on “official stories” (such as found in academia and journalism) and the conspiracy theories. I'm devoting the beginning of this exposition to an examination of the nature and inadequacy of “conspiracy theories” because the truth I'm revealing to you here is going to sound like another “conspiracy theory” (albeit a more sophisticated one), which is not what I hope for. The truth is the opposite of the dominant opinion on planet earth, which is ultimately based on the “official stories” propagated by Western governments, especially the United States. The truth, namely, is that United States has become one of the most evil countries in world history, and this, unfortunately, in the Western world at least, only the conspiracy

---

<sup>8</sup> They often rely, for example, on Commander William Guy Carr's bizarre *Pawns in the Game* and others who were his predecessors or followers. See below. .

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

theorists and the consumers of conspiracy theories can swallow, even though they couldn't quite really understand how. My ideal audience are the academics anywhere in the world, who are, unlike ordinary consumers of conspiracy theories, able to comprehend complexities and ambiguities. My ideal audience should understand “conspiracy theories” as a cultural phenomenon specific to the Western world. They arise because Western governments, especially the United States, have been for decades concealing what they do with deceptive “cover stories” so that anyone in the West who is interested in government's business can only guess and guess.<sup>9</sup> In “unfree” countries like China, Russia, and Iran, where the “state-controlled” mainstream media actually (at least until 2008 or so) impart political information that is true and important (like United States' and its allies' latest geopolitical moves to strangle them) on their population, there is no such need for “conspiracy theories”. Geopolitics which you only find on Global Research, etc., in the Western world are a regularity in the mainstream media of “unfree countries”. For this reason, and because I cite below some conspiracy theories along side regular academic works, even though I do not seek audience among the “conspiracy folks”, I have to present my exposition as if it were a correction to conspiracy theories.

Another mistake – related to the previous one – which the conspiracy theorists commit in their conception of the “elites” is the overlooking of the most important distinction between the “Radicals” and the “Moderates”. When Alex Jones pounds you with the insight that the opposition between the right (Republicans) and the left (Democrats) is just diversionary smoke screen – “You should focus on the puppet master hiding behind the scene rather than the left puppet and the right puppet on the scene!” – you should really take pains to not get carried away by the supposed intellectual superiority which this “see-through vision” seems to imply. The conflicts between the Democrats and the Republicans in American politics are quite real, one representing the Moderates and the other the Radicals, after the paleoconservatives have been flushed out of the Republican party. Throughout the 1990s, the Moderates were the norm in the Bilderberg club, while the Radicals were a small network of individuals who had formed within the Bilderberg crust, who were completely ignored by the Bilderberg majority, but who were slowly infiltrating positions of influence. The Radicals and the Moderates were looking at the same goals and the same problems, but their differing approaches in solution would result in confrontation for which “war” would be the proper descriptive. The “CIA's war with the neoconservatives” would be part of this larger confrontation between the Moderates and the Radicals.

For my story about the International Court trial, I do not have to be interested in the whole history of the “New World Order”; I need only to understand the project of the “New World Order” as it has been conceived in the past 30 years, which would be the background information for understanding the “Cheney Plan”, the “crimes against Russia”, and CIA's discontent in the process. As I have noted, I will

---

9 Thus Christopher Hitchen's characterization of “conspiracy theories” as “white noise which moves in to fill the vacuity of the official version”. I shall not seek a deeper analysis of the sociological and epistemological origins of conspiracy theories such as has been attempted by Mark Fenster with his semiotic deconstruction of conspiracy theories in the aforementioned work.



## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

present my understanding as a correction of the inadequate understanding, among the majority of “conspiracy theorists”, of the contemporary version of the New World Order. I have now established that the most important misconception which the conspiracy theorists have formed of “NWO” is that the “elites” function in a single bloc and that their aim consist solely in the domination of human beings. The “elites” are in fact an conglomerate of associations, and what binds them together, other than the search for power, is an utopian spirit which they have inherited from their Enlightenment predecessors and which has been encoded in the “New World Order” since the very beginning. This is the motivation for a New World Order on the ideological plane. Then I need to dive into the specific practical motivations for the contemporary version of the “New World Order” project which has rarely been discussed among the conspiracy theorists, namely, that, from the 1980s onward, the “elites” of the West have developed their plans for the whole world specifically in response to the coming planetary crisis with which humanity will be faced when the earth's resources, principally oil, will run out.

The Enlightenment ideological predecessors of the “elites” I'm referring to are the so-called “Illuminati” and “Freemasons”, but the “elites” themselves can longer be characterized as “Illuminati” and “Freemasons”. This is another error in the “mythology of the NWO” which we must do away with before embarking on a proper understanding of the contemporary project of “New World Order”. There is no such thing as “Illuminati working from behind the scene to install New World Order” and such thing as “Freemasons' secret domination of world politics” is a misnomer. I will spend the next few pages on explaining this because holding onto the myth about “Illuminati” and “Freemasons” constitutes the most serious impediment among the consumers of conspiracy theories to a realistic conception of the international politics which underlie Western elites' plan for the whole world (“New World Order”). To do this, I have to, firstly, return to the very origin of the myth, Father Augustin de Barruel's *Memoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme*.<sup>10</sup> Barruel wrote his volumes in the aftermath of the French Revolution, at a time when the “Illuminati” and the “Freemasons” as social phenomena have not yet been muddled and mythologized by the growing number of unsophisticated “conspiracy theorists” in contemporary time – at a time when “conspiracy theories” have not ventured too far away from reality.

Barruel's contention in this classic is that the French Revolution was brought about through the conscious effort of a “triple conspiracy” which constitutes the real meaning of the term “Jacobinism”. The Jacobins were an alliance of utopian radicals who consciously “conspired” to bring down religion (Christianity in the European context), the political authorities (kings in this context), and finally the current civil society itself.<sup>11</sup> The first “conspiracy” (to bring down Christianity) was at first conceived

---

10 Lindsay Porter, in *Conspiracy Theories in American History*, describes him as being “the father of modern conspiracy theorists” (p. 115).

11 “Le résultat de ces recherches & de toutes les preuves que j'ai puisée, sur-tout dans les archives des Jacobins & de leurs premiers maîtres, a été que leur secte & leurs conspirations ne sont en elles-mêmes que l'ensemble, la coalition d'une triple secte, d'une triple conspiration dans lesquelles, longtemps avant la révolution, se tramerent & se trament encore la ruine de l'autel, celle du trône, & enfin celle de toute la société civile” (xxj, vol. 1).



The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

by the *philosophes*; the *philosophes* then fancied that kings of Europe should be brought down as well, and in this second conspiracy they were joined by the (European, mostly French) “Freemasons” (les Francs-Maçons). Those who were properly known as the “Illuminati” were the ones who had conceived of the third conspiracy, to overthrow existing civil society altogether.

Freemasonry started off as a religious order of deism.<sup>12</sup> They believed in a natural religion of God – the Jehovah – which had continued from Adam the First Man but which was broken and covered up by Christ – and only rediscovered by the Crusaders when they were searching for the foundation of the Temple in Jerusalem. For this reason the Freemasons were staunchly anti-Christian. Their first objective was thus to destroy Christianity, which, they thought, had enslaved humanity in the darkness of ignorance, and restore the universal religion of deism: to return humanity to the light of truth – the original Jehovah.

The Freemasons were the ones who had developed the motto “liberté, égalité” which were to be adopted in the Revolution. It was their motto. Only those of the highest grades of Masonry knew its true meaning: that the kings and clergy were no higher than the commoners and had authority only to the extent that the commoners had given them authority. Within Freemasonry Barruel distinguishes further the hermetic, the Cabalist, and the Martinist branches. The Martinists were the most radical in political beliefs; just as the worship of Jehovah was the natural religion, there was in the beginning of time a political authority which was also natural, namely, the paternalism of the patriarchs, of which the father figure in the family was the contemporary image. A fatherly authority who ruled over a group of equals – this natural condition was signified by “liberté, égalité”. The problem with the current situation was that nature had been violated; the cover-up of nature by Christianity and kingship constituted humanity's current enslavement and entrapment in delusion. Liberation consisted in overthrowing established religions and political authorities and returning to the original condition of nature – the original utopian existence characterized by equality and liberty. Equality and liberty meant the extinction of all kings and all religions.<sup>13</sup>

Barruel carefully distinguishes the Freemasons of the European continent (especially in France and Germany) from the English Freemasons. The English Freemasons were moderates and never fancied the overthrow of current political authorities. The English Freemasons were no more than a fraternity organization whose purpose was mutual aid between its members. While they also believed in the natural religion of God – that Jehovah was the common God of mankind – for them this meant only that, as children of the same God, we should love and help each other – not that we needed to eliminate Christianity and the kings in order to restore our original unclouded view of our God Jehovah and our original freedom under “natural” political authority. It was the Freemasons on the continent who had

---

12 I'm here following Barruel and skipping over the usual history of how what was originally a guild of stone masons (operative freemasons) began accepting members who were not stone masons (speculative freemasons) who eventually overran the entire Freemasonry.

13 Vol. II, p. 211.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

devoted themselves to this utopian project.

The Illuminati started off under Adam Weishaupt in Bavaria in 1776 as just one among many secret utopian societies which, like the masonry, were mushrooming throughout Europe at the time. Weishaupt had adopted the same utopian spirit concealed behind the slogans “liberté, égalité” but had advanced one step further by conceiving the original utopian condition to be a sort of primitive communism: a distinctionless common existence of equals without laws and properties.<sup>14</sup> This was the natural state which human institutions had distorted and which was the object of the secret program of restauration. Weishaupt had decided however that his secret order could only implement its utopian ideals under the cover of other secret societies and thus that it should take root in societies only by infiltrating the Freemasons. After the Illuminati order was formally suppressed by the authority in Bavaria, it is said to have secretly continued and penetrated into France, where it worked its magic. According to Barruel, the French Revolution succeeded ultimately thanks to the conspiratorial efforts of Weishaupt's Illuminati.<sup>15</sup>

Barruel's classic describing the French Revolution as born from this malicious triple conspiracy was enormously popular in his day, and he was not alone, nor the first, in asserting the orchestration of French Revolution by the Illuminati. John Robison has argued for the same scenario in his *Proofs Of A Conspiracy*, on around the same time (1798).<sup>16</sup> After Barruel and Robison, many a conspiracy scholar has followed in with similar demonic depiction of the Illuminati the French Revolution. Was Barruel correct? Unlike the situation with the Bilderberg Group, the influence which Freemasonry and the Illuminati have exerted on world history has been extensively studied by academics. Let us deal with Freemasonry first. The *Dictionnaire de la Franc-maçonnerie*, edited by the most prominent “masonologist” in France, Daniel Ligou, includes 50 pages of bibliography listing approximately 1000 titles in English, French, Spanish, Italian, and German which cover the history of Freemasonry in all European countries, including Poland and Russia, plus European colonies. In regard to Barruel's thesis, you can get a notion by consulting, for example, the review which the imminent professor of Sorbonne, Albert Soboul, has published in this *Dictionnaire*. Under “Révolution française”, he reviews the diverse viewpoints and conclusions of the most important authors in the field (Gaston Martin, Albert Mathiez, Augustin Couchin, Albert Lantoiné, George Lefebvre, André Bouton, M. Lepage, etc.), after which we understand that the Freemason participation in the Revolution was hardly uniform and extremely divisive to the lodges: some were fervent radicals, others remained neutral, and many walked out, adhering to the Ancien Régime. For a detailed bibliographical study, you may also use Charles Porset's

---

14 “Cet objet [de Weishaupt] ne varie jamais dans son esprit. Plus de religion, plus de société et de lois civiles, plus de propriétés, fut toujours le terme fixe de ses complots.” (*Mémoire*, Vol. 3, p. 15.)

15 As Lindsay Porter summarizes: “The first two volumes of the *Memoirs* lay the blame for the French Revolution specifically at the feet of the French Enlightenment thinkers, whose alarming philosophy espoused, among other things, a breaking down of national boundaries, overthrowing the monarchy, and establishing a democracy based on merit. Volumes three and four trace the historical antecedents for these schools of thought, finding that the Illuminati ultimately pull the strings” (ibid.).

16 *Proofs Of A Conspiracy* can be accessed online at Sacred Text: <http://www.sacred-texts.com/sro/pc/index.htm>.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

*Hiram Sans-Culotte: Franc-maçonnerie, Lumières, et Révolution: trente ans d'étude et de recherches* (1998). The resume of the studies is that there has not been a Freemason conspiracy during the French Revolution. What is known is that the turmoils of the Revolution had caused most of the Masonic lodges to cease operating, and that Freemasonry only resumed during the Napoleonic time when Napoleon purposely cultivated Freemasons and recruited them into his army and civil services. Meanwhile, the Freemasons in England, never radical, had had to distance themselves from anti-Monarchist radical politics in view of the infamy which the radical Freemasons in France had accrued. After the French Revolution, however, the Freemasons had played a decisive role in founding the Third Republic as true republican democracy. For this, consult Avner Halpern's classic, *The Democratization of France 1840 – 1901: Sociabilité, Freemasonry, and Radicalism* (1999). Between 1840 and 1900, the Freemasons in France were the vehicle of all the progressivist ideas – all the socialist, but not communist, tendencies which today characterize most European nations. In a France which was still ruled by the conservatives associated with the Catholic Church, they advocated popular democracy, government intervention to protect small businesses from corporate monopolies and financial magnates, universal compulsory education in secular setting away from the Catholic Church, the elimination of all religious themes from public life, freedom of the press, the elimination of poverty, the promotion of social connectedness and the spirit of community in the populace... In short, the democratization and secularization of France, and they were able to push through their progressivist agendas through peaceful democratic procedures because the democratic structure of Masonic lodges – election of representatives and federation in which local autonomy was respected – had long accustomed the Masons to the working and the structure of democratic means. It was the Freemasons who had founded the first political party in France, the Radical Party (le Parti radical), in 1901. After the election of 1902, the Freemasons had succeeded in implementing virtually all of their agendas, wresting France away from the Church and making France the secular and modern nation-state which today is standard in Western Europe. Although the Masons had made every attempt to separate the Radical Party from the Masonic lodges, the dominance of the Radical Party in French politics of the early twentieth century has entailed that a major portion of political figures in France were Freemasons, who had found their way into office by joining the Radical Party.

Because of all this, there has always been in France, even to the present day, a pervasive fear that the Freemasons have excessively dominated the French power structure to the detriment of the French state. The documentary film made by Gabriel le Bomin and Stephane Khemis, “Les Francs Maçons et le pouvoir”, traces out the history of hysteria, throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century, over Freemason lodges in France.<sup>17</sup> In America, the Freemasons had been frequent enough in the American Revolution that the founding of the American Republic seemed to many to be a quintessential Freemason work. Even though historians have liked to play down the Freemason influence in American Revolution, Marie-Cécile Révauger has revealed the preponderance of Freemason influence in her *Le fait maçonnique au XVIII siècle: En Grand Bretagne et aux Etats-Unis* (1989). See especially

---

<sup>17</sup> It can be seen at: <http://youtu.be/qG9K5Te-9Rw>.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Chapter 3, “La franc-maçonnerie dans la révolution américaine”. Révauger is very explicit in the assertion that, while the American Revolution cannot be said to be a Freemason conspiracy, the influence of Freemasonry was determinant. While acknowledging that the ideological landscape of American Masons was not uniform, some lodges remaining loyalist while others went to the patriots' camp – loyalists and patriots may even co-exist in the same lodge – she nevertheless asserts that Masonic affiliation was almost necessary to occupying key posts in the revolutionary society.<sup>18</sup> In America as well the Masonic lodges were structurally conducive to the revolutionary movement in that the lodges became the most convenient venues through which revolutionaries networked with one another. Furthermore, just as in France, Masons were typically more progressive in ideological outlooks, more likely to advocate democracy (representative government). The Freemason participation in American Revolution however – even from Révauger's own favorable description – did not reach the degree to which the French Freemasons had shaped the French society in the nineteenth century. In America, fear of Freemasons' dark influences has been episodic, and so less effective in detrimental effects than in France. For the Anti-Masonic movement in the United States, consult William Preston Vaughn's *The Antimasonic Party in the United States 1826 – 1843* (1983). After 1843, anti-Masonic sentiments have largely been restricted to the conspiracy theorists. As for Freemasonry in Spain, the foremost authority is José A. Ferrer Benimeli, director of Centro de Estudios Historicos de la Masoneria Espanola until 2009. See his *La Masoneria espanola* (1996). The development of Freemasonry during the eighteenth century had been impeded by the Inquisition and Fernando VI's prohibition, then briefly facilitated under Napoleon's occupation, but suppressed again by the Spanish authority until the liberation of 1868. The influence of Freemasons on society in the case of Spain would be the most minimal in all the cases considered here. For Germany, consult Manfred Steffens' *Freimaurer in Deutschland: Bilanz eines Vierteljahrtausends* (1964). From the first Masonic lodge “Absalom zu den drei Nesseln” established in Hamburg in 1737 sprang a wide variety of Freemason lodges, the divisions among them ensuring that the lodges would have little effect on the political situations in Germany.

World War Two represented the watershed in Freemason history in all countries of Europe. The Nazis severely suppressed Freemasonry in Germany, and both the Nazis and its Vichy collaborators would have completely destroyed French masonry had it not been for the perception that Freemasonry had already been rendered impotent. For Freemasonry in France during the Second World War and afterward, I have consulted Daniel Ligou's *Histoire des Francs-Maçons en France*. From Ligou's study it is apparent that Freemasonry in France – the country in which Freemasons have had the greatest degree of influence on society and politics – have declined to the status of “talk shops” or discussion groups, despite the regeneration since World War Two of all the prominent masonic lodges (most of which had flourished since the time of the Ancien Régime): Grand Orient de France, Grand Loge de la France, Grand loge national française, Grand loge feminine française (a women's lodge), Droit

---

18 Révauger, p. 101: “Il est pour le moins suprenant que l'affiliation à l'ordre ait été si répandue parmi les officiers de haut rang. Tout porte à croire qu'il était difficile d'occuper un poste clef dans la société révolutionnaire sans recevoir le sceau de légitimité d'une loge.”

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Humain... The Masonic lodges held discussions on the socio-political issues which concerned the public just as during the nineteenth century, and Masons continued to be the vanguard of progressivism, favoring the unification of Europe in European Union, the unification of the world in the United Nations, a global currency, global disarmament, especially in regard to nuclear weapons, etc. But the Freemasons, it seems, are no longer vehicle for France's evolution to the next era of its destiny, such as its incorporation into the European Union. The Bilderberg Group would take over progressivist politics from now on. In a latest study on the matter, *Etat dans l'état*, *Le Point* journalist Sophie Coignard would like to differ, and affirms that Freemasons still held preponderant power over the French state.<sup>19</sup> Coignard has counted around 300,000 men and women in France who have been part of Freemasonry at one time or another, and, Masons have tended to occupy the upper echelons of society, a vast number of officials and executives in French government and French enterprises continuing to be Freemasons. However, I do not subscribe to the view that Freemasons continue to secretly dominate French politics and society because they no longer exert an *unified* influence on the French state such as they have done back in the nineteenth century: Masons who associate with Sarkozy would work for his neoconservative goals, while Masons who are in the socialist camp would work for the opposite goals. Meanwhile, the Freemasonry in North America, although joined by many important figures in politics, remains fraternity in functioning and does not exert a preponderant and *unified* influence on the politicians who are its parts. The functioning of Freemasonry is social, a system of networking through which those in the business world and in the lower echelons of the government structure may provide preferential treatment to fellow Masons. In Germany, the separate Masonic lodges have since late 1950s been unified into the Vereinigte Grosslogen von Deutschland, whose influence on German society and European politics is same as elsewhere, a system of networking to facilitate one's advancement in society. In Spain, Freemasonry was banished under Franco's regime and has only regained life in the past 30 years or so. The problem with Freemasonry today is its disunity. The lodges across the Western world do not always recognize each other and frequently debate each other over such issues as the proper forms of ritual. The disappointing conclusion of the 2007 Canadian documentary “Secret History of the Freemasons”, produced by John Wesley Chisholm,<sup>20</sup> is mostly accurate: no hidden control of world events can really be found in these social groups whose functions are increasingly restricted to fraternity and networking – a result almost ensured by its vast membership of five to seven millions around the world.<sup>21</sup> The authors whose works

---

19 Le Point immediately ran an article to advertise her book: “Les Francs-Maçons de Sarkozy”, March 12 2009, <http://www.lepoint.fr/actualites-politique/2009-03-12/les-francs-macons-de-sarkozy/917/0/324920>. On an episode of the French TV show *Revu et Corrigé*, Coignard has to defend herself against the same objection I raise here: <http://youtu.be/sLM8JsqbTzA>.

20 It can be seen at: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n9QH\\_nlTm2w&feature=share&list=FLlc-JNKaHINvw2exrF0opcA](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n9QH_nlTm2w&feature=share&list=FLlc-JNKaHINvw2exrF0opcA).

21 The “secret domination of world politics” requires the secret society to act in unison. As long as Masonic lodges have difficulty in recognizing each other, they cannot exert an *unified* influence on world events. News about the individual Masonic lodges' participation in government's clandestine operations, such as P2 lodge's involvement in NATO GLADIO terrorist attack in Italy (documented in, for example, Emanuel Amara's documentary film “1950 – 1990: Les scandales des armées secrets de l'OTAN”: <http://youtu.be/8yDMstF9pDI>) and in other criminal actions, give people a false sense of the extraordinary power of Freemasonry. One should keep in mind that a lodge like P2 operated without

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

I have consulted above are the most important scholars in the study of Freemasonry, and their works can be trusted because Freemasonry is in fact not so secret – unlike the CIA for example: the archives of the lodges have been open to the public for a long time. In America, these archives have enabled scholars to compile Masonic histories for each state. (I have consulted, for example, Dorothy Ann Lipson's *Freemasonry in Federalist Connecticut* (1977) and Richard Rutyna and Peter Stewart's *History of Freemasonry in Virginia* (1998).) In the Spanish-speaking world, the study of Freemasonry has advanced so systematically that specialized departments have been set up in universities (such as El Centro de Estudios Historicos de la Masoneria Espanola or El Centro de Estudios Historicos de la Masoneria Argentina), and specialized journals created (such as El Revista de Estudios Historicos de la Masoneria), to enable professional study of and publication on Freemasonry. To adjust themselves to the age of the Internet, Masonic lodges themselves have gone into the open, setting up official websites and agreeing to be interviewed for quality documentaries.

The most acclaimed recent study in academia of the Illuminati has to be Richard van Dülmen's *Der Geheimbund der Illuminaten* (1975). In regard to the intentional and clandestine orchestration of the French Revolution by the Illuminati, Dülmen's response is emphatically negative. The reality is that Weishaupt's secret order was soon torn apart by internal dissent before being put out of existence by external authority, unable to exert any influence on world events. The infamy which the Illuminati order has incurred ever since its public exposure resulted in the situation that, from 1789 to 1848, it became identified with Jacobinism in the conservative circle in Germany,<sup>22</sup> even given a certain fundamental incompatibility between Jacobinism and Illumism.<sup>23</sup> According to van Dülmen, the perception of the Illuminati in the conservatives' circle was distorted and could not offer us any insight into the real structure and function of Illuminati.<sup>24</sup> In America, the great scare of Illuminati exploded as soon as the American republic was founded. The Federalists, who were supported by the religious factions, quickly imported the Illuminati scare from John Robison's classic and used it to attack Thomas Jefferson's Democratic Republicans, labeling them Illuminati infiltrators here to destroy the Christian religion in America.<sup>25</sup> Since the beginning of the eighteenth century, the paranoia over Illuminati had died out in America, and the view that the Illuminati did not expire but had secretly continued after suppression in Bavaria to dominate world events was continued in the reactionary circle, such as among conservative clergy, just like in Germany.<sup>26</sup> For the early twentieth century, I have consulted Nesta Webster's *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements* (1924) and Edith Miller's

---

the authorization of the Grand Orient of Italy and that it functioned as an instrument of NATO and CIA, rather than the other way around.

22 Dülmen, p. 94 – 95.

23 Illuminati were elitists and did not want mass domination, *Volksherrschaft*; *ibid.*, p. 95 – 6.

24 “Der Antiilluminatismus und die antiaufklärerische Haltung sind genuine Merkmale der reaktionär-konservativen Politik des frühen 19 Jahrhunderts und lassen keine Schlüsse über die wirkliche Struktur und Funktion der Illuminaten wie der Aufklärungsbewegung zu” (p. 95).

25 Jeffrey Pasley, “Illuminati”, in *Conspiracy Theories in American History*, p. 338.

26 *Ibid.*, p. 339.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

*Occult Theocracy* (1933), Myron Fagan's speeches,<sup>27</sup> and read about such personage as Gerald Winrod, and, for the later part of the twentieth century, I have consulted Reverend Clarence Kelly's *Conspiracy Against God and Man* (1974) and Gary Allen's *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* (1972).<sup>28</sup> Mark Dice, in his *The Illuminati: Facts and Fiction* (2009), mentions that there was a hiatus in publication on Illuminati between 1930s and 1970s. Within this period, however, not only was Myron Fagan warning the public about Illuminati's plan for world domination through One World Government, but John Birch Society also began a campaign of Illuminati scare in the same vein.<sup>29</sup> Also, Commander William Guy Carr's *Pawns in the Game* was published in 1958. All these works and warnings are complete garbage, waste of your memory. Webster, Miller, Winrod, and Kelly were anti-Semites from conservative Christianity and fascist extremism, and they proceeded by recycling the older myths about Illuminati, identifying it with communism, world Jewry, and a hidden conspiracy to destroy Christianity, and postulating the final objective of Illuminati as world-domination and enslavement of humankind through One World Government. There was very little originality in all of them; Barruel and Robison were simply recycled into the next generation of Illuminati theorists in reactionary clergy. While in nineteenth century Germany the conservatives saw Jacobinism as *the* threat and so identified the Illuminati with Jacobinism, in early twentieth century America and Britain the conservatives saw communism and the League of Nation as *the* threat and so identified the Illuminati with the communists and the globalists. Then Myron Fagan and Robert Welch (of John Birch society) presented the same material once more but added in the revised version of Commander Carr's *The Pawns In The Game* (that the Illuminati created the communist bloc and were running both sides of the Cold War to install One World Government). Gary Allen's book, finally, was another recycling of the same stories and the Illuminati mythology which had been perpetuated in conservative clergy now became the seeds for all the worthless gossips in the counter-culture domain: the Illuminati have penetrated of all positions of power, in politics as well as in enterprises, and have been orchestrating both sides in every conflict in history. You can see the trend: with the advent of post-modern society (and eventually the Internet), the reactionary clergy has been recycled into counter-culture to perpetuate the same old myth about “Illuminati New World Order” which refreshes itself at each new recycling by absorbing the latest current affairs (the Illuminati were responsible for the Vietnam War, the Cold War, and then 911 attacks). I say that most of these conspiracy theories are worthless because each new generation simply plagiarizes the previous generation, making the whole enterprise redundant. One can listen to Myron Fagan's 1967 lectures and read Commander Carr's *The Pawns in the Game* and find everything one wants to know about conspiracy theorists' world view, from Illuminati's history through the Council of Foreign Relations to the conspiracy about Federal Reserve and the anti-Constitution income tax scheme, on the basis of which, respectively, Bill Still has made his fame with his “The Money Master” (1995) and “The Secrets of OZ” (2010) and Aaron Russo has produced his warning with his “America: From Freedom to Fascism”. Furthermore, most of the recycled gossips about Illuminati and Freemasons are simply not true. To hear a reasonable account about secret societies you may consult

---

27 Myron's famous 1967 lectures in LP is available online at: <http://100777.com/myron>.

28 *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* is online: [http://www.whale.to/b/allen\\_b1.html](http://www.whale.to/b/allen_b1.html).

29 Michael Carriere, “John Birch Society” in *Conspiracy Theories in American History*, p. 373.



The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Michael Streeter's *Behind Closed Doors: The Power and Influence of Secret Societies* (2008), in which Streeter covers everything from the Illuminati, Freemasons, and Rosicrucians to criminal organizations like the Chinese Triad and Italian Mafia – and in which he also points up the unrealism in attributing the French Revolution to the Illuminati. I have also studied conspiracy theories in the German Internet domain (Infokrieg and Alles Schall und Rauch), and found the same garbage. I have also listened to the testimonies of such ex-Freemason as Bill Schnoebelen – who, while lecturing many correct things about Freemasonry, has insisted on the continuation of the Illuminati and Rosicrucians within the Freemason framework on the basis of his personal experience<sup>30</sup> – consulted Mark Dice's aforementioned book – which asserts the supreme dominance of the Illuminati by attributing to it the Bilderberg Group, Skull and Bones, and the Bohemian Grove as its subsidiaries, but which at least does us favor by verifying many eyewitnesses' personal account of Illuminati – and checked into the investigation of former FBI agent Ted Gunderson – who has warned us about the infiltration of the FBI and CIA by Illuminati. After all this, I have to recommend you to read Richard Hofstadter's 1964 classic “The Paranoid Style in American Politics” – at least when it comes to Illuminati and Freemasons.<sup>31</sup> I have to here align myself with the academic view that the Illuminati have died out a long time ago within the framework of Freemasonry and that all these contemporary counter-culture figures and early twentieth century fantasists are perpetuating a myth that is harmful in that a fantasy (“mythical”) version of “New World Order”, which frequently reverses reality,<sup>32</sup> has replaced the *real* geopolitics which underlie a *real* version of “New World Order”. Never before in history has there been a scapegoat like the Illuminati which has absorbed so many evils and yet is non-existent. My conclusion is further that, while Illuminati have ceased to exist a long time ago and Freemasonry has lost its unitary political influence precisely due to its growth and popularization, it is really the Bilderberg Group which, in competition with many other strands of political influence in the Western world, has assumed the influential role which Freemasonry has once played in France in the nineteenth century – carrying the Western civilization to the next phase of its proper destiny – and which is the main vehicle for the “New World Order”.

The root of “New World Order”:  
utopianism and the crisis of human civilization

“Fürsten und Nationen werden ohne Gewalttätigkeit  
von der Erde verschwinden,  
das Menschen Geschlecht wird dereinst eine Familie,

---

30 See his lecture at Bible Prophecy Club, “The Light Behind Masonry”: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7nL7\\_B0CIFc&feature=share&list=FLLc-JNKaHINvw2exrF0opcA](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7nL7_B0CIFc&feature=share&list=FLLc-JNKaHINvw2exrF0opcA).

31 In Harper's Magazine, November 1964, available at:

[http://karws.gso.uri.edu/jfk/conspiracy\\_theory/the\\_paranoid\\_mentality/the\\_paranoid\\_style.html](http://karws.gso.uri.edu/jfk/conspiracy_theory/the_paranoid_mentality/the_paranoid_style.html).

32 For example, the unthinking consumers of conspiracy theories often buy into Fagan's false view that the Warburgs supported Hitler, when the Warburg enterprise was actually suppressed and banished by the Nazis. I trust Ron Chernow's *The Warburgs: The Twentieth-Century Odyssey Of A Remarkable Jewish Family* (1993) more than Fagan's worldview.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”  
Lawrence C. Chin  
October 2011 – March 2013

und die Welt der Aufenthalt vernünftiger Menschen werden.  
Die Moral allein wird dieses Veränderung  
unmerklich herbeyführen”<sup>33</sup>

Although the investigation of Illuminati and Freemasonry will not yield the identification of a secret cabal orchestrating world events from behind the scene, it is never wasted, for the ideological legacy from the Illuminati and Freemasonry has incarnated itself in contemporary Western elites. What I mean is that New World Order is essentially an Enlightenment project. Earlier I have mentioned both an ideological and a materialist reason why the Western elites have wanted to unify the world under a “New World Order”. The first, ideological, reason is the utopian tradition which the Western elites have inherited from the time of Enlightenment. Although there is no Freemasonry conspiracy to rule the planet even when so many political figures of the Western world belong to one lodge or another, Freemasonry as the vanguard of progressivism is an indication of the extent to which the upper echelons of Western society have been infected with a form of utopian progressivism. The recovery of an original lost paradise by a small cadre of intellectual elites in possession of esoteric knowledge – the true meaning of Freemasonry and Illuminism – has been a typical intellectual movement in the Western tradition. Eric Voegelin has termed it “gnostic” and has diagnosed its origination in the metastatic deformation of Christian eschatology (instead of waiting for God to transform our corrupted world into a paradise at the end of time, we should do it ourselves). The Freemasons and the Illuminati were thus no more than two among many utopian formations all subscribing to the same sort of earthly gnostic salvation. Although the Masons and the Illuminati regarded themselves as the intellectual elites who alone among humanity had awoken to the truth, their original religious and political views were laughable and stupid. This not only has Father Barruel laid bare in his seminal work, but you can also discern in the famous original works of the Illuminati, like *Einige Originalschriften des Illuminatenordens, welche bey dem gewesenen Regierungsrath Zwack durch vorgenommene Hausvisitation zu Landshut den 11. und 12. Oktob. 1786. vorgefunden worden*, which, as a manual of rituals, provides a window to the bizarre resuscitation of ancient Near Eastern gnosticism and mystery religions among mediocre thinkers who somehow thought themselves special. After two centuries, the Freemasons who populate the upper echelons of the Western society could not possibly hold onto the religion of the Jehovah and myth of the patriarchs. What I want to argue, however, is that the basic stance which has colored both Freemasonry and Illuminism, that society can be saved from its corruption through the rational and conscious intervention of a group of geniuses in a top-down approach – never leaving it to chance evolution – *this* has remained, and has during the past two centuries become rampant among the political, financial, and industrial elites of Western Europe and North America. Part and parcel of this stance is the spirit of universalism which has constituted the original essence of “natural religion” and “natural political authority”. Any particularism which separates one portion of humanity from another – be it nationalism or religious difference – is in the eyes of the intellectual elites of humanity a form of distortion of nature which keeps humanity in the

---

33 Adam Weishaupt.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

state of slavery and illusion. Originally humanity had but one God in common, Jehovah, and one political authority in common, the patriarchs. Inherent in the ideas of “utopia”, “equality”, and “liberty” is the idea of “All in One, without distinction”. When all these conspiracy theorists expose the common goal of Western elites as the unification of humankind under One Government, One Religion, and One Currency, you must seek its ideological origin in Freemasons' and Illuminati's utopian project to recover nature, and ultimately in the “gnosticism” from two thousand years ago.

Friedrich Hayek has once, in his *The Constitution of Liberty*, contrasted the French “revolution” with the English “evolution”, saying that these two describe two very different traditions in the theory of liberty: “one [the British] empirical and unsystematic, the other [French] speculative and rationalistic”. He furthermore makes remarks concerning the conditions that produce the two different lineages, largely as a matter of cultural differences or different “mentalities”: “the first [British] based on an interpretation of traditions and institutions which had spontaneously grown up and were but imperfectly understood, the second [French] aiming at the construction of a utopia, which has often been tried but never successfully”.<sup>34</sup> The British therefore favored social organizations that had accidentally evolved without human intention, and the French favored the rational planing of social organization. “[W]hat we have called the 'French tradition' of liberty arose largely from an attempt to interpret British institutions [that had evolved naturally into being]... [but eventually t]he two traditions became... confused when they merged in the liberal movement of the nineteenth century” (p. 55). The French version has spawned eastward those centralized and totalitarian governments we have so feared in history (communism and fascism), while the British version has expanded westward to result in American federalism.

From this you can see that the utopian tradition which has manifested itself in Freemasonry and Illuminism is a continental (French) tradition – that confident attitude that human genius is capable of discerning, and eradicating, unpleasant current social existence. It is the kind of attitude which has, ever since Edmund Burke, the most insightful observer of the French Revolution, so horrified the Anglo-Americans.<sup>35</sup> It is the kind of attitude which, unfortunately, you would find Dick Cheney

---

<sup>34</sup> Chapter 4: Freedom, Reason, and Tradition; p. 54.

<sup>35</sup> See Edmund Burke's “Reflections on the Revolution in France”, in H.B. McCullough ed. *Political Ideologies and Political Philosophies*, p. 70. Burke's view can be summarized: the conventions which we have inherited from our ancestors are imbued with wisdom and are presupposed in any abstract arrangements of society we may draw up as a constitution in our conferences, such as did the intellectuals during the French Revolution to construct an utopia. The way in which the French revolutionaries tore down all conventions and drew up a rational design of society from scratch therefore seemed deeply unwise to a conservative like Burke. Will Durant has summarized Burke's view in this way: “In his writings on the French Revolution Burke gave a classical expression of a conservative philosophy. Its first principle is to distrust the reasoning of an individual, however brilliant, if it conflicts with the traditions of the race. Just as a child cannot understand the reasons for parental cautions and prohibitions, so the individual, who is a child compared with the race, cannot always understand the reasons for customs, conventions, and laws that embody the experience of many generations... So the second element of conservatism is 'prescription': a tradition or an institution should be doubly revered and rarely changed if it is already written or embodied in the order of the society or the structure of government” (*The Story of Civilization: Part X, Rousseau and Revolution*, p. 724).

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

manifesting to the maximum degree possible.

It is mostly during the nineteenth century that the French confidence began infecting the American spirit. When the utopian spirit of the Illuminati and (continental) Freemasonry becomes the standard among the elites in the Anglo-American world, it means nothing less than the invasion of the Anglo-American mind by an ideology alien to it. It would seem that the infection of the American mind by the spirit of French Revolution has been pretty much a done deal by the beginning of the twentieth century. When the “conspiracy theorists” conjured Woodrow Wilson's aim for an One World Government which he disguised behind his idea of the League of Nations, they are really pointing to the utopian spirit which he had acquired. When Daniel Estulin points out how Rockefeller had financially supported the Bolshevik Revolution, or when Gary Allen reveals how the Warburgs had supported Lenin and Trotsky, it is not so much because Rockefeller and Warburg, these exemplary capitalists, had been converted to communism as because the claim to universalism, pretension to uniformity, and the ideal of top-down rational planning – which the communists had themselves inherited from the French Revolution – really appealed to them these converts to the utopian spirit of Illuminism and Freemasonry – the converts to “Reason over nature and accidents”. Now it seems that Vice President Cheney, through his years of mingling with the “elites” (through the Council of Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission, Haliburton, etc.), had become impressed by the “reasonableness” of Illuminism and Freemasonry and adopted the same confidence and utopian spirit. He and his neocon clique would however pursue the ideal of rationalism with a fervor that would shock even their contemporaries.

Today the most prominent secret society which truly exerts an *unified* influence on Western politics is the Bilderberg Group, whose ideology essentially remains this utopian spirit of Illuminism and Freemasonry which I have just summarized. You do not have to appeal to conspiracy theories to realize this; but you can get a notion to this effect by reading David Rockefeller's own confession in his autobiography.<sup>36</sup> The Bilderberg Group represents the highest level of decision-making in the Western sphere, and its influence, although not as absolute as the conspiracy theorists have supposed, is even greater than that which the Freemasons have exerted on French politics in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. The Bilderbergers' concern is however no longer a simple ideological one as it was the case with Freemasons and Illuminati; they have been convening especially to work out a plan to save human civilization from extinction. Even before the collapse of the Soviet Union the Bilderbergers have taken notice of the fact that the earth was rapidly running out of the natural resources (foremost oil) which we human beings have been using to build and sustain our artificial world made of machines – which we call “industrial” or “post-industrial civilization”. Now this world of machines in which we live is constructed of inorganic minerals and sustained, mainly, by combustion and mechanized farming, both hydrocarbon-based. The industrial and financial elites of the West, which comprised the Bilderberg Group, were faced with the prospect that the economic empires they had built up to supply and move the great civilization of humanity would shrink as the fossil fuel and minerals which this machinery called “civilization” had to devour to survive (to run itself and to replace its parts, respectively) were

36 David Rockefeller, *Memoirs*, 2002. Especially Chapter 27, “Proud internationalist”.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

dwindling away. In fact, as soon as oil has “peaked” – “Peak Oil”, meaning the point after which the production of oil must decline, until it reaches zero level – not only will the entire economic structure of human civilization collapse, but food production will diminish to such extent that mass starvation would wipe out the majority of human population. The results are a drastic decline in the complexity of the human division of labor, the sudden loss of our post-modern living standard and life-style (a “return to stone age”), and, consequently, revolutions and rebellions everywhere by which all existing human political institutions will crumble as well. Civilization is, well, finished. Not only have Peak Oil activists like Michael Ruppert raised this alarm within the camp of “conspiracy folks”,<sup>37</sup> but scholars occasionally warn of the impending collapse of our civilization within the respected domain of universities as well. In 2005, the famous Jared Diamond published his *Collapse*, in which he examines previous cases of civilizational collapse and compares these cases with our own, finding us treading on the same path. (Because Diamond does not have an exclusive focus on Peak Oil but has widened his perspective to include a host of other deteriorating factors which are about to bring down the human civilization,<sup>38</sup> I will not mention his work below.) My favorite source of information in the civilian world about Peak Oil – combining conspiracy theories and academic research – is the newly founded (2011) Swiss Institute for Peace and Energy Research (Schweizer Institut für Friedensforschung und Energie), led by Daniele Ganser.<sup>39</sup> Ganser's latest book, *Europa im Erdölrausch* (2012), traces the history of human oil consumption, especially in regard to Europe and Switzerland. What I do want to point out to you is the certain fact that the US military has already commissioned studies just like Diamond's and which predict the end of human civilization, once oil has run out, in just the way I have outlined. The Western “elites”, the Bilderbergers, and the corporate masters are all well aware of these studies.

To save “civilization” – that crown jewel of evolution in the vast expanse of this mostly empty universe – the Western elites began envisaging a two-stage solution. First, to grab hold of all the natural resources still not yet under their direct exploitation in order to prolong the current phase of industrial civilization just a bit longer – especially to prolong the life of the economic empires which have underpinned it; but this was only to buy the time needed for them to effect a fundamental transformation of the way we live our lives: the elites would not be willing to let us live without machines – insofar as they were the ones who have been supplying the machines – but the machines

---

37 Ruppert has already pointed out the problem of Peak Oil in his *Crossing the Rubicon*. After his failed escape to Venezuela and his return to the United States, he focused on alerting the public about Peak Oil. See the discussion of UN Study Group in the upcoming narrative.

38 The past cases of the collapse of human community with complex division of labor – sometimes to the point of extinction – which Diamond examines are the Easter Island, the Pitcairn and Henderson Islands, the Anasazi, the Maya, and the Greenland Viking. In all cases, civilization collapses due to human damage of its environment, which he groups into eight categories: deforestation and habitat destruction, soil destruction, water management problems, overhunting, overfishing, effects of introduced species on native species, over-population, and increased per capita impact of human beings (p. 6). “The environmental problems facing us today include the same eight that undermined past societies, plus four new ones: human-caused climate change, buildup of toxic chemicals in the environment, *energy shortage*, and full human utilization of the Earth's photosynthetic capacity” (p. 7; emphasis added).

39 Its website: <http://www.siper.ch/de/>.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

would have to be built and sustained differently. The transformation to a sustainable civilization was the objective of the second stage. Since the earth could not possibly sustain seven billion people when oil is run out, the Western control of the remaining natural resources would also allow the Bilderbergers to decide which groups of human beings are worthy enough to survive and which aren't. The point of the whole game is to take explicit control of the inevitable.

The Bilderbergers' concern with the inevitable human population bottleneck is reflected in conspiracy theorists' “Agenda 21”, the paranoia over powerful elites' desire to exterminate a large portion of the common people (population-reduction). Again, lacking an education in science, the ordinary consumers of conspiracy theories could not understand that over-population is a real problem but mistake the reduction of population for elites' need to better control them (as if those in power would have a problem in managing seven billion people in this age of computer automation). If you run over Alex Jones' Prison Planet discussion forum you will find everybody disbelieving that the earth would have a limit in supporting human beings. This is why the Bilderbergers have decided that the saving of our earth must proceed clandestinely.

Infected with Enlightenment utopian spirit, this perennial gnosticism, the Bilderbergers have not only seen themselves as the saviors of humanity, but have also decided to bundle the transformation of human civilization to attain sustainability with the construction of an Unified Utopia (“One World Government” in the parlance of conspiracy theorists).<sup>40</sup> This is the “utopian spirit” they have inherited from Freemasonry and Illuminism. For them, this is merely the “reason of history”, the “goal of history” anyway. Hasn't it always been the case that smaller states coalesced into larger states, that every great civilization was born from the unification of warring states in an “interaction sphere”?

The fact that the utmost concern of the Bilderberg Group was with the rational and centralized administration of earth's resources should direct your attention to those obscure measures like the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative as in fact the most important entity in any conception of the “New World Order”.<sup>41</sup> Both the control of common people and the construction of a World Government (*Weltstaat*) revolve around the problem of the natural resources of the earth. The common people must be controlled because they have no understanding of the consequences of their actions – because, unless forced to do otherwise, they will always end up destroying the planet with their wasteful life-style and ignorance of scientific facts. Furthermore, only a World Government can coordinate the economies of all the selfish nation-states to construct a sustainable global economy. When Aaron Russo mentions in an interview with Alex Jones – which will be mentioned below – that the Rockefellers and other “elites” believe they are doing good with their scary agendas, he is quite right: the “elites” are conscious of their attempt to save human civilization.

---

40 Daniel Estulin has repeatedly emphasized that “One World Inc”, like the EU extended to the whole planet, is a better characterization.

41 The Norway-based organization has a website: <http://eiti.org/>.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”  
Lawrence C. Chin  
October 2011 – March 2013

West's crimes against Russia (and China):  
The most sophisticated form of hypocrisy

The first phase in the saving of our “civilized way of life” thus entails that the Western elites, something like the chosen ones, should take complete control of the whole world and all the remaining natural resources. As the situation stood in the beginning of the 1990s, Russia and China were the two main obstacles to Western elites' project for global domination. Russia came most prominently into their view. The Soviet Union was in possession of the greatest amount of unexploited mineral resources and oil reserves among all nations on earth.<sup>42</sup> Again oil was the most important of all natural resources. Russia had the largest oil reserve in the world, followed by Saudi Arabia, United States, and Canada – and yet oil production has peaked by 2000 in all three latter followers.<sup>43</sup> As soon as Peak Oil has approached and the world's natural resources have dwindled away, “whoever gains Russia's resources holds the key to global supremacy. Thus destabilizing the Russian state has become the goal of the Shadow Masters [namely, Western elites] after the collapse of the Soviet Union in December 1991.”<sup>44</sup>

Since it was the Rockefeller's fellows who had gained sway in the Reagan administration, there is reason to suspect that Reagan's sudden staunch stance against the Soviet Union was really more motivated by a desire to get hold of the natural resources in the “Evil Empire” than by ideological distaste for communism. While the established view in academia is that the Soviet Union has collapsed due to its internal defects,<sup>45</sup> the Russian accusation that the West has orchestrated this collapse through a combination of foreign policies and clandestine operations should not be dismissed as “paranoia”.<sup>46</sup> My own opinion is that the truth is, again, somewhere in the middle: although the USSR has died from its internal socialist defects and, especially, Gorbachev's incompetence, Reagan's military build-up and

---

42 In the words of Daniel Estulin in *Shadow Masters*: the Soviet Union possessed “the world's largest mineral wealth, a vast reservoir of gold and gemstones, the world's largest oil reserves, untold quantities of nickel, platinum, and palladium, and more timber than the Amazon, not to mention an immense stockpile of Soviet-era weapons...” (p. 43 – 44).

43 See, for example, the speech given by Exxon-Mobil CEO Rex Tillerson at the Council of Foreign Relations in June 2012: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gj6cqbwfrYc&feature=share&list=UUL\\_A4jkwvKuMyToAPy3FQKQ](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gj6cqbwfrYc&feature=share&list=UUL_A4jkwvKuMyToAPy3FQKQ) (10:00).

44 Daniel Estulin, *Shadow Masters*, p. 43.

45 David Pryce-Jones, in *The Strange Death of the Soviet Empire*, has set forth the most extreme version of the established academic view. Perestroika and Glasnost have liberated the subjects' mouth and actions. Whenever Soviet subjects protest, mostly on nationalist grounds, and the local Soviet leaders requested military intervention from the center, Gorbachev would invariably decline. The Soviet Union has thus died because it has given its subjects the freedom to dismantle it. The Chinese scholar Chuexing (曲星), in his *50 Years of China's Foreign Policy* (中国外交 50 年), attributes the death of USSR to Gorbachev's incomprehension of the nature of his country and his people as compared with his idealism. Henry Hale from Yale University, in his 1999 “The Strange Death of the Soviet Union”, similarly assesses the demise of the USSR as resulting from Gorbachev's incorrect assessment of his country and his officials when he tried to transform the coercion-based union of the republics into one that was consent-based.

46 Cf. David Pryce-Jones, *ibid.* Also: “... some, perhaps many, SVR officers share the belief of the current leader of the Russian Communist Party, Gennadi Zyuganov, in a long-term Western plan first to destroy the Soviet State and then to prevent a revival of Russian power...” Christopher Andrew, *ibid.*, p. 564.



The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Western intelligence's clandestine operations to destabilize the Soviet republics and satellites (Poland, the Popular Front of the Baltic states) have greatly facilitated the death.

“Soros was angry, 'not at Bush's aims – of expanding the Pax Americana and making the world safe for global capitalists like himself – but with the crass and blundering way Bush is going about it. By making US ambitions so clear, the Bush gang has committed the cardinal sin of giving the game away. For years, Soros and his NGOs have gone about their work extending the boundaries of the 'free world' so skillfully that hardly anyone noticed. Now a Texan redneck and a gang of overzealous neocons have blown it.” (Neil Clark, in *New Statesman*)<sup>47</sup>

“Some have called it the CIA's greatest covert operation of all time.

“It involved deep penetration of a hostile regime by planting a network of agents at key crossroads of power, where they could steal secrets and steer policy by planting disinformation, cooking intelligence, provocation, and outright lies.

“It involved sophisticated political sabotage operations, aimed at making regime leaders doubt their own judgment and question the support of their subordinates. It involved the financing, training, and equipping of effective opposition forces, who could challenge the regime openly and through covert operations.

“The scope was breath-taking, say insiders who had personal knowledge of the CIA effort. All the skills learned by the U.S. intelligence community during fifty years of Cold War struggle with the Soviet Union were in play, from active measures aimed at planting disinformation through cut-outs and an eager media, to *maskirovka* – strategic deception.

“It was war – but an intelligence war, played behind the scenes, aimed at confusing, misleading, and ultimately defeating the enemy. Its goal was nothing less than to topple the regime in power, by discrediting its rulers.

“Many Americans believe this was the CIA's goal during the 1990s, when the Agency had “boots on the ground” in northern Iraq, working with Iraqi opponents to Saddam Hussein. Most patriotic Americans probably hope that the CIA today has such an operation to overthrow the mullahs in Tehran, or North Korean dictator Kim Jong Il.

“But the target of this vast, sophisticated CIA operation was none of them. It was America's 43rd president, George W. Bush.” (Kenneth Timmerman, *Shadow Warriors*, 2007)

---

47 Cited in Daniel Estulin, *Shadow Masters*, p. 101.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

The first excerpt summarizes the context for the following schism between the CIA and the neoconservatives, and the second points out poignantly the existence of CIA's clandestine war with them – describing the Agency's modus operandi without however naming the reason nor the real target, namely, Vice President Dick Cheney. For now, pay careful attention to CIA's modus operandi: a sophisticated network of saboteurs to clandestinely extend the boundaries of the “Free World”.

George Soros was a regular associate of the Bilderberg Group and “skillfully” means “through hypocrisy”. Now the Bilderbergers' scramble to take over the natural resources in Russia's former “zones of influence” and in Russia itself was no different from Hitler's conquest of the Soviet Union to obtain “living space”. Beating up the weak to rob him of his money – isn't that the most usual form of injustice in the world? But the Bilderbergers had to do it clandestinely, “without anyone noticing it”, as is said above, for two reasons. First of all, open warfare between large nation states in this age of nuclear bombs and advanced weapons was unimaginable, and would do no good to either side. Conquest was only imaginable when effected through subversion of the enemy state from within. The second reason was far more pernicious. The Bilderbergers, this new breed of Western imperialists, wanted to have their cake and eat it at the same time, and didn't want to “look bad” when they devised their evil plan to reduce the Russian world to their colonies. The moral authority and good reputation which the Western world had carefully built up in the eyes of the world – as the free and the prosperous – must not be damaged when it began re-envisaging the conquest of the world. In fact, it is the weak guy whom they were robbing who must look “bad”, as if it were due to his own moral fault that he was robbed, as if robbing him was justice. In different regions of the Russian sphere the Western elites would decide on different strategies, but the method underlying the diverse strategies was always the same old technique tried for thousands of years by nations against each other: go into the enemy territory, find out who was already fighting the enemy, and help him win. In other words, the most typical game of clandestine operation, *destabilization*. What is different this time is that the Bilderbergers wanted to disguise their help of the enemy of their enemy. Either the help had to look entirely altruistic, or it cannot be traced back to them, especially when the enemy of their enemy whom they were trying to help were employing violent means. Throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, the Bilderbergers's main instrument in the project of destabilizing the Russian sphere was the CIA and the State Department (who worked together with their European equivalents). The CIA was the most suitable instrument because they had perfected art of deception or “hypocrisy”. The CIA's most typical modus operandi was “divide and conquer”. Whenever the CIA goes into a nation – so goes its modus operandi – either the minorities in that nation or the opposition groups would begin rebelling against the central government or protesting against the ruling party. In Western media, the matter would then be framed as “the oppressed minorities resisting a totalitarian regime trying to secure their human rights or democratic self-government” or “people hungering for democracy overthrowing the undemocratic despots”. The United States State Department would then vouch support for the “freedom fighters”, “oppressed minorities”, or “democratic movements” in the United Nations because the United States is the champion of democracy and human rights around the world. Everything looks good – looks like a battle of good against evil. Nobody knows that the humanitarian NGOs which have

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

gone into these nations to help the “oppressed minorities” are filled with CIA operatives, and that, in reality, no significant human rights violations or restriction of democratic freedom have been perpetrated by the central regime against the minorities or the people, but that the “freedom fighters” or “democratic reformers” were merely stirred into action by CIA operatives who have appealed to their ethnic identity or nationalism rather than to their loss of “human rights” or “freedom of speech”. This modus operandi of the CIA was precisely the method upon which the Bilderbergers have decided as the manner in which to gradually alienate former Russian satellites from Russia and recruit them into the Western sphere of influence. The CIA, the State Department, and their European equivalents have thus become the Euro-American Bilderbergers' servants in a clandestine war to conquer Russia (and China as well) under the guise of spreading democracy, self-determination, and human rights around the world.

In the 1990s, when the split between the Radicals and the Moderates in solving the “Russian Question” had not yet surfaced, Brzezinski's 1996 classic *The Grand Chessboard* was the manual outlining Bilderbergers' strategy to occupy and partition Russia. Brzezinski was quite explicit, like Estulin, in the recognition that, as Peak Oil neared, the control of Eurasia was the key to world-domination – and Russia happened to be in the center of the Eurasian mass where most of the unexploited natural resources were concentrated. Brzezinski suggested strategies to make alliance with Russia's neighbors (either the former Soviet states or the newly risen powers like China and Iran) so as to drive Russia into the bosom of the (still consolidating) European Union (to force Russia to join the EU community). This was the blueprint strategy of the Moderates by which the West may colonize Russia, and explained West's continuous effort to alienate Russia from its former satellite states by recruiting these states into the Western structures (both EU and NATO). This objective lay behind all strategies to destabilize the Russian sphere of influence.

The “destabilization of Russia” and its sphere of influence would be carried out by sponsoring Islamic terrorists in the Central Asian regions (except Georgia) and manipulating political oppositions in Eastern Europe and other Central Asian states where developed political systems were well entrenched. In the 1990s, the Bilderbergers had developed a focus on Central Asia, which was important because the area was rich in unexploited oil and natural gas reserves. As Peak Oil neared, and when the Soviet Union had just collapsed leaving the Central Asia region “fair game”, the Western elites wanted not only to grab the region's natural resources away from Russia but also to isolate Russia from its southern neighbors. They identified the enemy of their enemy in this region to be the Islamic extremist groups whose activities and beliefs had been suppressed during the Soviet era, who had been hating Russia for this reason, and who dreamed of establishing their own Islamic state in contradistinction to the secular society which Russia had favored in the region. A history of the Soviet repression of the fundamentalist variants of Islam and the growth of anti-Russian feelings among the religious extremists can be found in Ahmed Rashid's *Jihad: The Rise of Militant Islam in Central Asia* (2002).<sup>48</sup> The Western elites

---

48 Especially Chapter 3, “Islam Underground in the Soviet Union”.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

therefore decided to foster the Islamic extremists in this region and help them break away completely from Russian influence. Because many Islamic groups engaged themselves in guerrilla warfare with the Russian forces and local authorities, the CIA and the State Department had to render the help through intermediaries and in complete secrecy. The most conspicuous instance was the Chechen rebels. Helping Chechnya break away from Russia was the first step toward pushing Russia out of Caucasus, and an independent Chechnya may even be the prelude to the long-term break up of Russia itself. While we can hear about United States' official support of anti-Russian feelings in Chechnya as a human rights issue after 1999 (e.g. Freedom House's 1999 project “American Committee for Peace in Chechnya”, later becoming “American Committee for Peace in Caucasus”), we will not hear about US and NATO governments' support of Chechen rebels' fight with Russian forces throughout the 1990s. The Russian government was not naïve, and, since the late 1990s, had been openly accusing the United States of helping the Chechen rebels via Pakistani and Turkish intermediaries. But United States and Europe invariably dismissed the Russian complaint as “paranoid”. There have however been confessions from insiders to this effect. I have earlier mentioned the most conspicuous example, namely, the former FBI translator Sibel Edmonds. For example, in three interviews which she has conducted with James Corbett in December 2011 and in January and February 2013,<sup>49</sup> she reveals that, from 1996 to 2001, it was the US and NATO which have set up all the “Islamic terrorists” (the Chechens in particular, but also others) in Central Asia and Caucasus as proxy forces to dismantle the Russian influence in this region. According to Edmonds, the US and NATO were doing this mostly through Turkish intermediaries (specifically, the Turkish special forces and proxies recruited into NATO's GLADIO network).<sup>50</sup> In the first half of the 1990s, the CIA, the State Department, and NATO forces were using Turkish commandos to train the Chechens and recruiting Turkish mobsters to send into Azerbaijan, etc. (This was Turkish “GLADIO Plan A”). In the middle of the 1990s, when a particular scandal broke open in Turkey which rendered the intermediary of Turkish commandos and criminals unfeasible (the “Susurluk Incident”), the US and NATO decided to foster the sentiment of Islamic extremism in Central Asia. They sent out Turkish extremist Imans to set up Madrasahs (Koran schools) throughout Central Asia as a way to spread Islamic fundamentalism and reinforce locals' antagonism toward the secular Russians. (This was “GLADIO Plan B”). What lay at the bottom of religious sentiments here was ethnic feeling and nationalism. The Islamic religiosity which the CIA, the State Department, and their European equivalents (chiefly, Germany and UK) tried to foster was intertwined with Pan-Turkic nationalism. Since most of the Central Asian republics were of Turkish origin, the believers were clandestinely encouraged by the United States and Europe to dream of establishing a Turkic Islamic state spanning from Western China through Central Asia to Turkey. Since

---

49 Corbett Report Interview 422: <http://www.corbettreport.com/interview-422-sibel-edmonds/>; Corbett Report Interview 598, <http://www.corbettreport.com/interview-598-sibel-edmonds-on-gladio-b-protected-terrorists-and-stifled-investigations/>, and Corbett Report Interview 604, <http://www.corbettreport.com/interview-604-sibel-edmonds-on-turkey-the-hood-event-israel-and-gladio-b/>.

50 GLADIO was a special division of the “Stay Behind” network which was a secret army inside NATO that was directly under American command. Daniele Ganser has made a name for himself by investigating this secret NATO army “Stay Behind” and the terrorist activities it has committed in NATO countries (Italy, Belgium, and Germany) during the Cold War to incite anti-communist feelings among the population. His website is at: <http://www.danieleganser.ch/>

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

nationalism was formed as a reaction against Russian (and Chinese) domination, the new Turkic state would be anti-Russian and pro-Western. This is how a large piece of the former Russian world may break away from Russia and enter the “free world” of North America and Western Europe, forcing Russia to look for its options westward when even China would be closed off as a partner.

Sibel Edmonds did not reveal much of what she knew about this in her book *The Classified Woman*. An instance which she did reveal in the book was however quite instructive. The theme of her book concerns the Turkish components of a shadowy government crew who were gradually taking control of the US government, whose members were international, including politicians, scholars, business tycoons, and whose enterprises were frequently criminal, such as supplying terrorists, selling US nuclear secrets on the black market, and drug trafficking. Douglas Dickerson, a small member of this shadowy crew, came to Edmonds' house one day in late 2001 to recruit her because she was a translator at the FBI's team charged with monitoring the Turkish components of this shadowy government operations. Introducing the American Turkish Council, an element of the shadow government, he said to her:

“ATC is one of the most powerful organizations in the States. They have several hotshot lobbying firms working for them: the Livingston Group... the Cohen Group... They deal with the highest-level people in the Pentagon, State Department and the White House. They're able to secure hundreds of millions of dollars of US government contracts for Turkish companies every year, many of them for stuff in Central Asia... Turkish companies, through ATC and ATAA, get most of the contract grants reserved for Central Asian countries and do tons of work for us; Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, and the rest of them, those countries are our future bases and energy sources. Where have you been?”<sup>51</sup>

While the American Committee for Peace in Caucasus would never utter anything other than a concern for human rights and stability in the region – when instability was actually fostered by US and NATO forces themselves – when the crew of the shadowy international groups spoke to each other, the true motivation surfaced. It's all about oil, natural resources, and the military bases to guard them and to threaten Russia and China. Indeed, as Edmonds reveals in the aforementioned interview, the Islamic insurgents had been manipulated to attack Russian and Chinese interests throughout Central Asia. Whenever the Russian and Chinese companies were about to conclude an oil and natural gas deal with the local authorities, the local authorities would suddenly be attacked by Muslim terrorists and guerrillas. The local authorities would get the message: they needed to ally themselves with Western interests and move away from the Chinese and the Russians.

I introduce the “shadow government inside talk” at this juncture in order to drive home the point that the sole concern of everyone in Western governments and businesses lay in the energy pools of the Caucasus. I however also want to prepare you for a divergent development, for the shadow government

---

51 *Classified Woman*, p. 65.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

crew who populate Edmonds' confessions were not your typical Bilderbergers – they were not the Moderates, but a network of Radicals who had been sharpening their swords throughout the 1990s and finally got hold of power in 2001.

In the second case, the destabilization of Russia's zone of influence in states where elaborate governmental structures existed, the encouragement of ethnic and nationalist feelings did not have to result in warfare. From 1996 to 2005 the Bilderbergers targeted Bulgaria, Slovakia, Croatia, Serbia, Ukraine, Georgia, and Kyrgyzstan by manipulating political oppositions in these former Soviet states. The method in all these cases was the same: creating proxies in the student movements for democracy or supporting political oppositions to topple the anti-American and pro-Russian incumbents under the disguise of democratic reform. The result was the election of a pro-American and pro-NATO leader. Because the incumbents were invariably painted as brutal autocrats ignoring people's desire for freedom, their overthrow looked more like a spontaneous triumph of good over evil than what it really was: one country's intervention in another country's internal politics in order to set up a puppet regime in the latter, the most usual occurrence in human history. The CIA and the State Department, doing the bidding for their industrialist backers like George Soros, worked behind the scene while sending out the typical democracy promotion NGOs (National Endowment for Democracy, International Republican Institute, US Agency for International Development, the Freedom House, the Open Society Institute, and their European equivalents) to mobilize, even create, political oppositions in the unfriendly or pro-Russian country and help them win over the office. The United States and NATO would in this fashion effect regime change in unfriendly nations while making it look as if the change were demanded by popular will and the result of people's self-determination. In reality, what the CIA, the State Department, and their NGO partners did in most of these cases was to mobilize the anti-Russian feelings among one segment of the population who were disenchanted with their Soviet past and manipulate them to overthrow the pro-Russian leader supported by another segment of the population who were favorably disposed toward their former Russian overlords. It was never really about democracy or civil liberties or political rights. By framing the situation of ethnic and nationalistic hatred into one of democratic reform for people's sake, the United States and NATO, and the Bilderbergers behind them, were able to go into their enemy's territory and dismantle him in an act of silent invasion while looking good at the same time: when, at times, their support of the oppositions through these private democracy-promoting foundations was exposed (such as in the case of Serbia), they looked more like liberators than stereotypical invaders.

The democracy promotion NGOs specifically liked to mobilize the youth and young students in these former Soviet states to work against the pro-Russian and anti-Western incumbents, because the brainless young people were more likely to be tired of, or bored with, the austerity of the old Soviet form and to mistake the facade of happiness seen in English pop-music and Hollywood movies for “freedom” and “human rights”. The youngsters were encouraged to form their own democracy promotion groups, and taught by the US and European NGOs as to how to analyze voter sentiments, devise campaign (or propaganda) strategies, and mobilize protests and outreaches, until the momentum

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

could be built up to push the “autocrats” out of office. Prompting them to engage themselves in oppositional political activities gave them a sense of power for which they hungered, this they confused with “democracy”, and the positive connotation of “democracy”, because the word was associated with Western cultures, made them feel closer to the happy world of American pop-culture which attracted them because it refreshed the boring life which they had inherited from Soviet domination. You must credit the planners in the CIA and the State Department for having understood so well the psychology of boredom engendered by the austere life under communism and the attraction offered by this new form of “opium for the masses” which was called “pop culture”.<sup>52</sup> Occasionally, if the locals could not do the job by themselves, the US and NATO countries would manipulate international organizations like the IMF to make conditions unfavorable to the anti-Western regime in the former Soviet state so as to make it easier for the locals to destroy it. Sometimes even clandestine dirty tactics, like assassinations, may be used to make the work of opposition groups easier. When the job is done in one former Soviet state, the CIA, the State Department, their European equivalents, and the NGOs run by George Soros and other government affiliates then moved onto the next one, stirring up “democratizing feelings” (in reality, anti-Russian hatred and hunger for American happiness) in one former Soviet state after another and using the same method to create, unify, and help opposition groups, until we seem to witness a wave of democratic movement sweeping across the peripheries of the former Soviet world. The NGOs defeated the socialist regime in Bulgaria in 1996; the student movement defeated the pro-Russian Meciar in Slovakia in 1998; the US NGO-funded student movement OPTOR pushed the anti-Western Milosevic out of power in Serbia in 2000; the youth movement KMARA took out Shevardnadze and brought in the pro-Western Saakashvili in Georgia in 2003, in the so-called Rose Revolution; PORA and other youth groups played crucial roles in 2004 in organizing the protests in Ukraine which forced another election to be held that brought the pro-American and pro-NATO Yushchenko to power, in the so-called Orange Revolution; KelKel and other youth movements participated in People's Movement of Kyrgyzstan which unified the opposition groups and brought down the pro-Russian Akaev in 2005, in the so-called Tulip Revolution. The youth movement organizers in one country often were trained by, and met with, the youth movement organizers in another country, resulting in cross-fertilization of revolutions across the former Soviet world. The suspicion of “conspiracy” and behind-the-scene orchestration was obvious, and yet most Western academics proceeded to be mystified by the coincidence and develop theories about “diffusion of democratic processes”.<sup>53</sup> Only the conspiracy theorists flocked to the conclusion that a silent, non-

52 Zbigniew Brzezinski writes in his 2004 *The Choice*: “... the cultural transformation unleashed by America is inimical to traditional stability. It contains a strong democratic and egalitarian content... In many parts of the world, the cumulative impact of American mass culture is politically destabilizing...” (p. 188). The KGB has always formally – and rightly – regarded Western pop-music as politically subversive to the Soviet system, which fact however Christopher Andrew, the most prominent scholar on Russian intelligence history, derides as the manifestation of unwarranted paranoia (*The Sword and the Shield*, p. 548).

53 For example, Simon Teune, ed., *The Transnational Condition: Protest Dynamics in an Entangled Europe* (2010), especially Tsveta Petrova's “Thinking about Transnational Diffusion and Cycles of Protest: The 1996-2005 Wave of Democratization in Eastern Europe”; or Valerie Bunce and Sharon Wolchik, *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Postcommunist Countries* (2011), especially “Diffusion of Democracy” in its first chapter, “Breakthrough Elections: Mixed Regimes, Democracy Assistance, and International Diffusion”, p. 17.



## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

violent implementation of American and NATO imperialism was at work.<sup>54</sup> The refrain of the academics from any assumption of behind-the-scene orchestration by Western interests, even their frequent denial of the effectiveness of Western democracy promotion NGOs in the fomenting of these revolutions,<sup>55</sup> and the instruction for student activists to complain about the lack of help from US authorities,<sup>56</sup> were all part of the deception aimed at legitimizing foreign destabilization of the Russian world as some sort of spontaneous and natural human awakening to the “correct” values of freedom and human rights which the West has merely had the good fortune to discover before anyone else. Together with the aforementioned dismissal by academics of any conspiracy cabal orchestrating world events from behind the scene, a collusion between academia and the power elites in perpetuating the Western hypocrisy cannot be more evident.

The United States and NATO – or the Bilderbergers behind the scene – have however failed to effect regime change in Belarus (2001, 2006), Azerbaijan (2003, 2005), Armenia (2003, 2008), and Kazakhstan (2005). Nor did they succeed in Moldova and Russia itself. The pro-Russian incumbents in these nations (Russia aside) skillfully repressed and divided the oppositions and set up pro-regime

---

54 Luc Michel provides a succinct example of this greater clarity at Palestine Solidarité: [http://www.palestine-solidarite.org/analyses/Luc\\_Michel.280912.htm](http://www.palestine-solidarite.org/analyses/Luc_Michel.280912.htm). The French journalist Manon Loizeau, who was not a conspiracy theorist but was a typical leftwing journalist and who was frequently critical of Russia and the “totalitarian regimes” in Chinese and Russian allies, has, contrary to her usual approach, produced in 2005 an excellent documentary which treads in the same direction of seeing the CIA and American imperialism at work in the democratisation of 2000 to 2005: “Les Etats-Unis à la conquête de l'Est” (<http://youtu.be/tt881dlthpM>).

55 Bunce and Wolchik, *ibid.*: “In fact, there is a consensus among many analysts that [international democracy promotion] assistance has had positive effects, but largely at the margins. This conclusion is based in part on the common assumptions shared by international democracy promoters and local democracy activists that domestic politics ‘trumps’ international influences and that external aid is effective only in receptive contexts – that is, in settings where citizens are demanding democracy and partnerships can be forged between external democracy promoters and local political activists.” Bunce and Wolchik list two dozens or so references for the consensus. It would be conspiracy theory to claim that, without international democracy promoters from the outside, not much opposition would even have existed to the incumbent autocrats.

56 To cite one example to illustrate a wide-spread phenomenon. Giorgi Kandelaki, a youth leader in Georgia's Rose Revolution and co-founder of KMARA, has written an account of the Revolution in the July 2006 United States Institute of Peace Special Report, “Georgia's Rose Revolution: A Participant's Perspective” (available at: <http://www.usip.org/publications/georgias-rose-revolution-participants-perspective>). After denying the effectiveness of Western NGOs, he recalls further: “Western governments, particularly the United States, have been vilified and lauded for supporting the Rose Revolution. Observers' reactions have ranged from enthusiasm about the future of democracy in this part of the world to far-reaching conspiracy theories crediting the U.S. ambassador in Tbilisi, Richard Miles, with being the *eminence grise* of the revolution. The fact that Miles was also U.S. ambassador in Belgrade during the revolution to overthrow Milosevic fits this line of thinking... During the revolution, not only were western actors unhelpful, but at times they were actually detrimental. For example, Georgian civil society members had to work hard to convince some Council of Europe officials that the Revival and Industrialist parties could not be considered opposition parties. Ambassador Miles not only did not ‘mastermind’ the revolution; on occasion his actions and statements were quite destructive. Favoring protracted negotiations, he strongly discouraged decisive action by the opposition and considered Mikheil Saakashvili dangerously radical. In short, even in the critical preliminary report by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), western leaders showed little desire to support decisive action.” Lies and deception.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

youth movements of their own, even when the oppositions were trained by veteran electoral revolutionaries from the successful cases.<sup>57</sup>

Just as the academics would never see the wave of democratisation as what it really was – the destabilization of the Russian world – they would never focus their attention on the true motive of the Western elites in promoting democracy in the former Soviet world: the hunger for natural resources and the cordoning off of Russia's options except the European Union. Typically, once the pro-Russian regimes were removed and pro-Western leaders installed in these former Soviet states, these “democratized” states would begin integration into the military, political, and economic structure of the West (NATO and European Union). The free-market reform concomitant with democratization would cause the transfer of former state-owned enterprises and industries in these new territories to the hands of the Bilderberg industrialists and bankers.<sup>58</sup> The Bilderbergers' desire to swallow up former Soviet industries was uncompromising, and, in cases where peaceful subversion from within through “democratic reform” could not achieve the objective, they would resort to the same tactic employed in Central Asia and the Middle East, supporting armed rebels. Daniel Estulin has made a case study of this process in the case of Kosovo War in *Shadow Masters*. The Serbian president Slobodan Milosevic had been refusing to allow free-market reform in his land, blocking Bilderbergers' access to the industrial complexes which the Soviet empire had left behind. There were significant mineral fields in Kosovo. The oil reserves in the Aegean sea and the strategic need to connect NATO East (Turkey) and NATO West (Europe) were also reasons for Bilderberg's desire to swallow up the entire Balkan as quickly as possible. In 1996 they convened a meeting in King City, Canada, where they decided on the plan to destabilize Yugoslavia – to cause it to break into pieces – to support the Kosovo Liberation Army in guerrilla warfare against the Serbs, and to remove Milosevic. They set up the Kosovo Diplomatic Observer Mission, filled with CIA and other Western intelligence operatives, to help stir up conflicts in Kosovo by provoking the Serbs, and helped the KLA, through Albanian proxies, wage war and smuggle drugs. Here you see again how the United States and NATO decided to dismantle their enemy (the Serbs) by stirring up the ethnic feeling and nationalistic sentiments of their rivals (the

---

57 See especially Simon Tuene, *ibid.*, and Bunce and Wolchik, *ibid.*, Chapter 7, “Failed Cases: Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Belarus”.

58 The US and NATO would encourage these former communist states to commit themselves to “privatization” of their state-owned enterprises. Not just that, they encouraged “privatization” in the form of market sales by tender, auction, or stock purchase, rather than sales to insiders or political management. This would make sure that the enterprises become foreign-owned rather than staying in the hands of natives: as they would be bought out by European and American enterprises. Not willing to see the meat fall entirely to Western hands, the Russian companies also cut in to buy up industries in the Balkans. See the case about Serbia and its surrounding in Lenard Cohen and John Lampe, *Embracing Democracy in the Western Balkans: From Postconflict Struggles Toward European Integration* (2011), esp. “Problems with privatization and prospects for Foreign Direct Investment”, p. 405. Heavy industries, utilities, and banking – it was in the banking sector that Euro-American colonialism has been the most pronounced. The current high level of foreign ownership in Central and Eastern European financial institutions is historically unprecedented. The Bilderberg Group has a passion for controlling the money supply everywhere in the world. See, for example, Rachel Epstein, “Transnational Actors and Bank Privatization”, in *Transnational Actors in Central And East European Transitions* (2008).

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Muslim Albanians in Kosovo) and encouraging killings between the two sides. The West-backed independence of Kosovo would take many years to come to fruition, and Milosevic would be removed only after almost four years. What is particularly sad about the case of Kosovo and Serbia is that, while United States and NATO intentionally stirred up and supported the Muslims in armed conflicts in the former Yugoslavia to harm the Serbs, they were able to utilize international organs (forcing the UN Security Council to set up the International Criminal Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia) and the media to make it look as if it were the Serbs who were the bad guys. Serbian generals were arrested and shipped to the Hague as “war criminals”, and eventually Milosevic himself, when it was the Muslims, like the KLA, who had killed more Serbs than vice versa, when, that is, it was the Serbs who were the victims of Western aggression and their only crime was remaining allies of Russia. The Western humanitarian organizations were able to make up stories of Serbian atrocities in Kosovo and Bosnia-Herzegovina to make the Serbs “look bad”: robbing the victim but making it look like it was the victim who was the bad guy.<sup>59</sup>

This modus operandi has also had great success in the case of China. China was the second ultimate target of the Western alliance, and the CIA, the State Department, and their European equivalents, doing the bidding for their industrial overlords, had also been clandestinely engaged in the game of the destabilization of China by helping the discontent minorities in the outlying regions of the Chinese sphere rebel against the Chinese central authority. In this case the dividing line between the sponsorship of terrorism and the manipulation of political oppositions was very thin and often indistinguishable. Recall<sup>60</sup> that, as part of the story of how the US and NATO (especially Germany), through Pakistan and Turkey, were using Islamic extremists to attack Chinese and Russian interests in Central Asia, Sibel Edmonds has also revealed how the CIA had brought a Turkish Islamic extremist to the US to set him up, and then sent him off to China to help the Uighur separatists wage guerrilla war against the Chinese authority. This was done clandestinely; but the US public support of Uighur has been seen in White House's reception of Uighur activists, National Endowment for Democracy's funding of Uighur NGOs in both Xinjiang and United States (like the Uighur American Association), and democracy-promoting organizations' (like the Jamestown Foundation's and Human Rights Watch's) criticism of China's anti-terrorist treatment of Uighur separatists as “hypocritical”, as an “excuse to cover up political oppressions of minorities”.<sup>61</sup> The goal was to incite Uighur's ethnic hatred of Chinese by cultivating in them the impression that they had been “oppressed” by the Chinese. While the threat of terrorism to America was entirely fabricated, the threat of terrorism faced by Russia, China, and

---

59 Other than Daniel Estulin's *Shadow Masters*, John Laughland's *Travesty: the trial of Slobodan Milošević and the corruption of international justice* (2007), prefaced by Milosevic's attorney Ramsey Clark, is another work which goes against the mainstream propaganda and asserts Milosevic's innocence of war crimes and crimes against humanity. In the first chapter, Laughland details how the US and NATO, especially UK and Germany, systematically made up stories about Serbian atrocities on the Albanian population in Kosovo.

60 From “Appendix” to “How I have been made into a different person, Part I: China and Europe”.

61 See for example, Human Rights Watch, April 2005 Vol. 17, “Devastating Blows: Religious Repression of Uighurs in Xinjiang” (<http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/china0405.pdf>). Keep in mind that the Human Rights Watch is one of George Soros' foundations.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

their Central Asian allies was very real. In 2007, when the states of Shanghai Cooperation Organization launched joint anti-terrorism military exercises, they meant business, and it has been United States and its NATO allies which have been the backers of Islamic terrorists in China, Russia, and Central Asia. Tibet has been another region which the United States has attempted to cause to secede from China proper. The technique was the same: the CIA and the State Department came in as human rights workers to stir up anti-Chinese sentiments on the basis of ethnic hatred and nationalism; the NGOs like National Endowment for Democracy funded Tibetan human rights organizations in China or in exile to propagate the sentiment that Tibetans had been “oppressed” by their Han overlords. Unrest then followed; until, perhaps, a “color revolution” can bring about Tibet's independence and make Tibet into an American ally.<sup>62</sup> I can personally vouch for CIA's hand in all the seemingly innocent, humanitarian, support of the oppressed minorities in China and everywhere else by American and European democracy promotion organizations, because, if you recall, in 2006 when the CIA came to recruit me, it was for the same “mission” of promoting ethnic consciousness among China's southern minorities under the guise of academic research. The research into the origins of Chinese civilization was innocent enough, there was only scientific objectivity and no political purpose. And yet political opposition would be clandestinely cultivated, as if it were the unintended consequence of scientific objectivity. Nothing would ever be traced back to the CIA, the State Department, and their German equivalents. If the ethnic minorities in southern China were not aware of their distinctiveness from the Han Chinese, the CIA would do something to make them become aware of it. In the end, “color revolutions” would overrun Xinjiang (northwest), Tibet (southwest), Yunnan (south), the Mongolian regions (north) – until China shrinks to the dozen provinces in central China, plus perhaps Manchuria: just like the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The Chinese Communist Party would crumble; the United States would help run elections in China, and the new China, significantly weaker, would become an US ally and its industrial bases merge into American and European corporations. That was CIA's and State Department's plan for China, very similar to their plan for the disintegration of the Soviet Union and Russia's sphere of influence. While United States and Europe have wanted Russia because of Russia's vast reservoir of natural resources, they have wanted China because of China's industrial base and enormous potential for consumption. (Raw materials are dug out of Russia's sphere of influence, and then transformed into products in China, the “factory of the world”.) In the end, are there really oppressed minorities in China? Xinjiang and Tibet are too strategic a region for China to lose; the Chinese government has thus tried its best to appease the Uighur and the Tibetans – along

62 Recall the references I have cited in Chapter 2 of “Karin's Meetups”, especially Ben Mah's “U.S. Funding for the Tibetan Exiles: Past and Present” (<http://www.chinyleftreview.org/?p=53>), which details how the CIA and its Indian partners have been helping Tibetans rebel against the Chinese central authority since the 1950s, how the operations have stopped during the Nixon years, and how they have started again under the Reagan administration. The Tibet-related NGOs which Ben Mah has named include: International Campaign for Tibet, the Tibet Fund (which pays Dalai Lama), the London-based Tibet Information Network, Gu-Chu-Sum movement of Tibet, Longsho Youth Movement of Tibet, and Voice of Tibet. These all receive funding from the National Endowment for Democracy and it would not be strange that the CIA has had a hand in all of them. As I have noted, Ben Mah's claim that the March 2008 Tibetan riot was another typical CIA-orchestrated destabilizing operation is inaccurate; when it was planned it was; but because of the lawsuit in the International Court, when it was carried out it had become a CIA-orchestrated MSS-orchestrated operation to fool the United Nations about CIA's innocence of its worldwide destabilization ops.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

with the rest of the fifty something minorities in its territory – with policies very similar to the Affirmative Actions practiced in the United States. The discontent of the Uighur, the Tibetans, and other minorities is not the result of deprivation of their civil liberties, political rights, and economic freedom, but solely the result of the repression of their nationalist ambitions – their desires to have states of their own and to see the Han Chinese expelled from their territories. I'm not suggesting that nationalist ambition is not legitimate, but only wish to point out that the situation of the Han Chinese is not significantly different than that of the English Canadians who do not wish to see the French Canadians gain independence: there is no significant political repression of the Quebeckers either in Canada, the independence of Quebec is itself only espoused by half the Quebeckers, and it would be very strange if the media in China and Russia report that the French Canadians have *all* wanted independence because they have suffered under “repressive regimes”.

Concomitant with the crimes against Russia and China were the crimes against Putin himself. Putin had come to power in 2000 to protect Russia against Western colonization of Russia. Yeltsin was clearly a stooge for United States and NATO, and under his reign, the Anglo-Americans had been able not only to rob Russia of its financial base through the “free-market reforms” which their “advisers” had instructed Yeltsin to put in place, but also to manipulate the oligarchs – all of whom were unsophisticated selfish people – to hand over much of the oil and natural resources industries to Anglo-American corporations. Putin understood well the overall strategy of the West: to cordon off Russia from its former satellites and potential new allies like China so as to force it to join the European Union. Then, the entire Russian industries would be bought out by the West just like what had happened in the Balkans and Eastern Europe. Putin refused to let Great Russia fall to such pathetic state. He believed in “Eurasianism”: that Russia has its own tradition and greatness distinct from European West.<sup>63</sup> West's rape of Russia during the 1990s in a bid to take over its resources and reduce this strategic competitor to a “sick man of Eurasia” is not just documented in Daniel Estulin's *Shadow Masters* and Michael Ruppert's *Crossing the Rubicon*, but also in leftist Naomi Klein's *The Shock Doctrine*. Coming to power, Putin immediately set out to break up the power of the oligarchs, expelling some and jailing others, while bringing many industries under *de facto* state control in order to prevent the Western corporations from swallowing them up. The most famous case of the oligarchs busted was of course Mikhail Khodorkovsky; Putin immediately had him jailed after he decided to merge his oil company with Exxon-Mobil. Because Putin had stopped the Bilderberg on its track of colonizing Russia, the latter had supported the efforts by exiled oligarchs to slander him in both Russia itself and in the West and organized massive media campaign to demonize him, hoping to generate enough opposition to bring him down. Again, the Bilderbergers' principal instrument in this campaign was the CIA, the State Department, and their European equivalents. The CIA had long ago infiltrated both the Russian press and the Western media, and its operatives and assets began bad-mouthing Putin in a project to discredit him both to his people and to the world. The media around the world has thus

---

63 See Andrei Piontkovsky, “Putin's Rapprochement with the West: Tactical Ploy or Strategic Choice”, in Werner Weidenfeld, et al ed. *From Alliance to Coalitions: The Future of Transatlantic Relations*, Bertelmann Foundation Publishers, 2004.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

typically portrayed him as dictatorial, domineering, power-hungry, womanizing, and secretive, faulting him for rolling back democratic development in Russia<sup>64</sup> and accusing him of orchestrating false flag attacks, like the 1999 Moscow apartment bombings, as a way to generate pretexts to invade Chechnya. Most of these traits actually described the opposite of Putin's personality.<sup>65</sup> Some were made-up stories, like Putin's extra-marital affairs, others were distortions, and still others came about by reframing a good quality as a bad quality. For example, Putin's arrest of Khodorkovsky to preserve native ownership of Russia's oil industry was portrayed as robbery of an honest businessman and the suppression of a democracy promoter (since Khodorkovsky had attempted to promote political opposition to Putin).<sup>66</sup> Since Putin loved Russia and wanted his country to have an important place in the world, the Western media and academia universally faulted him for harboring imperial design to glorify himself (the “reconstitution of the Soviet empire”). Then, because Putin loved his family very much, he had tried to keep his family affairs from public view. While this trait of his may indeed have

---

64 I have seen so many documentaries, in English, Dutch, and German, devised as propaganda tool to slander Putin. I need only recommend the most extreme example as illustration. For example, “Putin, onze vriend”, produced by Dutch investigative journalism program KRO Reporter: <http://youtu.be/iuw13n-JwAo>. Sometimes these slandering propaganda films are not entirely without educational value. See, for example, dissident Tania Rakhmanova's award-winning “La prise du pouvoir par Vladimir Poutine” (2005; <http://youtu.be/1FgHb17pf1s>) which was co-produced with ARTE France and which has also a German version: “Die Machtergreifung des Wladimir Putin ([http://youtu.be/AVU0E45EXBM; www.arte.tv/de/programm/992050.html](http://youtu.be/AVU0E45EXBM;www.arte.tv/de/programm/992050.html)). The documentary is an informative narrative describing how Putin came to power in the midst of the scandals surrounding Yeltsin's “Family” and the oligarchs; this is educational. The film is biased in that its interviewees are entirely composed of the anti-Putin minority that exists in the Russophobic world, like the journalist Elena Tregubova and the oligarch Boris Berezovsky, both of whom are in exile in UK. It is the most typical technique employed by the Western propagandists: to present the opinions of a discontent minority in or outside Russia as if it were a widely shared sentiment in Russia. The same can be said of another documentary film, CBC The Passionate Eye “The Putin System” (aired August 12 2012: <http://youtu.be/m5Rkom1RpKA>), which portrays events somewhat accurately (though in less details) and is not aggressively slandering and propagandist. It is biased through the same method: all interviewees are dissidents in exile (including former KGB official Oleg Kalugin and, again, Boris Berezovsky). This documentary also unambiguously attributes the 1999 Moscow apartment bombing to the FSB. None of the documentaries produced in the West on Putin thus ever deviates from the “common wisdom”. Robert W. Orttung, in Freedom House's *Nation in Transit 2011*, “Russia”, sums up this “common wisdom”: “Since coming to power as president at the beginning of 2000, Putin has established a personalized system of authority in Russia that has weakened institutions such as the parliament and stunted the evolution of political parties, nongovernmental organizations, and free public discussion in the popular media” (p. 454).

65 It's very hard for you to know this, because there are so few books in the Western languages which portray Putin accurately. In my opinion the best book – the most accurate – on Putin remains Richard Sakwa's *Putin: Russia's Choice*. Because Sakwa has portrayed Putin as an upright character, people have called him an apologist of Putin. And yet Sakwa is merely being accurate. The German American Michael Stuermer's *Putin and the Rise of Russia* (2008) is another fairly accurate, not overtly propagandist, account of Putin which you might consult. Putin has advertised himself for the 2000 election in *First Person* (2000), with Nataliya Gevorkyan, Natalya Timakova, and Andrei Kolesnikov, trans. Catherine Fitzpatrick.

66 A very well-made documentary which I have seen defending Khodorkovsky in this way is Cyril Tuschi's 2011 “Der Fall Chodorkowski”. The film is comprehensive in that it chronicles Khodorkovsky's whole life. Annie Williamson, who is famous for her September 1999 testimony in the House of Representative about the US destruction of Yeltsin's Russia, defends Putin, especially in regard to his arrest of Khodorkovsky, in her February 2005 lecture at Mises Institute's annual conference, noting that Putin had no choice if he wanted Russia to live: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PEuoKtooyyo&feature=share&list=FLLc-JNKaHINvw2exrF0opcA>.



## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

originated from his training as a KGB officer, it is portrayed in the Western media as the secretive behavior befitting a tyrant. The media in the West have also attributed numerous murders and assassination to Putin, like that of former FSB agent Litvinenko and journalist Anna Politkovskaya – both of whom were Western agents – when these people were most likely murdered by shadowy figures associated with Western interests themselves after they had served their function for them.<sup>67</sup> Like they had done everywhere else, the US and NATO governments and intelligence agencies had been using democracy promotion NGOs to fund similar human rights NGOs and news organizations in Russian interior (GOLOS, the Moscow Helsinki Group, *Novoya Gazetta*) and charge them with the task of inciting anti-Putin protests, promoting political oppositions, and propagating anti-Putin viewpoints. Putin of course saw them as what they were, West's proxies to destabilize Russia from within under the pretext of democracy-promotion – to remove patriots from leadership and bring in pro-West traitors and puppets who would agree to allowing the Bilderbergers to snatch up Russia's vast natural resources base and industrial complexes. He thus cracked down on them when he could. Here is where the perniciousness of the new game manifests itself most clearly. When he cracks down on, or restricts the freedom of, these Western destabilizing agents, he risks looking like an autocrat who cannot tolerate opposition or dissent. Somehow preventing your enemy from harming your country makes you look bad. Putin hated this game invented by the West because it had completely inverted reality. The terrorists from the Caucasus were ultimately helped by the West (the CIA and NATO) to bomb the Moscow apartments in 1999, and yet the West charged the destabilizing agents like the Moscow Helsinki Group and Levitnenko to spread the falsehood saying that Putin did it. When Putin removed or suppressed traitors who wanted to sell off Russia, the Western agents were able to make the rest of the world believe that he was doing harm to the Russian people. This pernicious game which you have witnessed Russia suffer in the preceding battle at the International Court of Justice – being victimized while being made to look like the victimizer – has in fact characterized Putin's whole experience with the West. The “autocrats” in other former Soviet states have all experienced the same problem. When Lukashenko (Belarus) and Nazarbayev (Kazakhstan) suppress the Western-funded democracy promoting and human rights NGOs in their country, they all acquire the reputation of dictatorship, and when they speak the truth by accusing these NGOs of being foreign agents, they look like they are just finding excuses. Lukashenko, Nazarbayev, and Ilham Aliyev may not be, like Putin, clear-cut cases of a leader who truly cares about his country and his people, but they are clearly trying to protect their countries from being colonized by imperial powers which aim to reduce their people to second-class citizens in the world after robbing them of all their wealth. I call these leaders “nativists”

---

67 It is now known that Alexander Litvinenko was on the payroll of MI6 until the day he was murdered, and even his father in Italy has now announced on a 2012 Russia Today interview that he now believed that his son was killed in a double-agent scheme rather than assassinated under Putin's order. Estulin has also questioned Putin's assassination of Litvinenko in *Shadow Masters*. In the case of Anna Politkovskaya, see, for example, John Laughland's “Who killed Anna Politkovskaya” (<http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig6/laughland2.html>). Laughland notes two particular facts about Anna Politkovskaya, that she was very little known in Russia and that her backers in Russia could be traced back to the American Committee for Peace in Caucasus – which made her an American agent. (Note that she had met with US State Department officials several times in regard to her campaign for Chechnya.) Nevertheless, Laughland notes that her assassination was clearly designed to embarrass Putin, and therefore cannot have been commissioned by him.



## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

because they seek to leave their nations' wealth in the hands of their own people. Why is this bad? The situation wasn't like this before. During the 80s, when the United States helped the Mujahideens in Afghanistan to fight the Soviets or the Contra in Nicaragua to fight the Sandinista regime, people were still capable of perceiving the situation for what it was: helping the enemy of your enemy to fight your enemy in your struggle with your enemy, the most usual occurrence in human history. In fact, the game of destabilizing your enemy from within by helping your enemy's enemy in his interior has been the standard operations of the CIA and all intelligence agencies around the world for the entire period of the Cold War, not to mention its standard use in past history for thousands of years. What has changed is that, since the end of the Cold War, this standard operation has suddenly become imperceptible. Somehow, in the 1990s, the Bilderberg and their instruments have decided that the struggle against an enemy had to be disguised by making selfish endeavors look altruistic – and, often, by making invasion look like spontaneous collapse from within. They have skillfully made their harming their enemies look good. They have skillfully solidified the pretext under which they harm you – democracy and human rights – into a form of political correctness and infused it into the very being of all international organizations – from the United Nations down to regional structures like the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Western powers, but principally United States, have been able to do this because they have been skillfully translating their military and economic prowess into diplomatic muscles to manipulate the lesser nations in the UN to let America take control of the whole organ, which it then uses to legitimize its selfish agendas as if these were altruistic and conceived for the good of the whole humanity. On the plebeian level, the American dominance in pop-culture and West' high living standard and advanced sciences have also fooled ordinary people into confusing these attractions with the conceptions of democracy and human rights which have really been developed to advance West's selfish agendas of imperialism.<sup>68</sup> Spreading democracy and human rights, or the very image of allowing oppositions, allowing people to disagree with you, has become something which nobody can admit to be “not good”. And yet United States and NATO have the resources – backed up by economic and diplomatic muscle – and the allure – backed up by the attraction of pop-culture and high living standard – to incite citizens in the Russian sphere to disagree with the pro-Russian “nativists”, but Russia and its allies have not the resources and allure to do the same in United States and NATO countries. This is how the West has been able to practice the most sophisticated form of hypocrisy – to invade Russia (and China) like Hitler (and the Japanese) have done and yet come out looking like the good guy while making their victims, Russia, China, and their allies, look like the victimizers.

Note that the case of my own recruitment illustrates how the CIA has even begun to utilize academic discourse to hide “destabilization” under the garb of legitimacy. While the real purpose of advancing the Western view of the origins of Chinese civilization – that the Han Chinese and the southern Chinese minorities came from very different origins, contrary to the official view of Chinese academia – was to promote ethnic hatred of the minorities toward Chinese central government, if the Chinese government cracked down on it, they would “look bad”, as if they were afraid of the truth. Not just

---

<sup>68</sup> The issue of how West's, especially America's, cultural and pop-cultural dominance translates into political power – soft power – requires an entire study of its own. Brzezinski has made much of this issue in *The Choice*.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

“democracy” and “human rights”, but even truth and “academic freedom” have become transposed to the nefarious purpose of destabilizing enemy states and promoting Pax Americana while looking good at the same time.

The political correctness of democracy and human rights with which the United States and its NATO allies have infected all international organizations and forums is thus a sort of ploy which these imperialist powers have developed to destabilize Russia, China, and their allies and then colonize them without giving away the truth that they are conquerors and their victims are victims. You cannot doubt the hypocrisy of such regional international organ as the Organization for Security and Cooperation of Europe which are set up in the Western alliance itself when the OSCE sent out missionaries to monitor election fairness in Kazakhstan or Belarus, and accused the incumbents there of frauds when people failed to elect “oppositional leaders” despite incumbents' overwhelming popularity. But even the political correctness in United Nations is merely a ploy to advance and cover up the Western powers' imperialist conquest of the world. The game cannot be given away because, in Nietzsche's words, human consciousness has evolved beyond the primitive morality of the blond beasts and has understood “slave morality”. Humanity has come to an agreement through experience that invasions and conquests are wrong, and that's why West's good reputation as the righters of wrongs cannot be damaged. Recall my earlier comment about the absurdity of justice as injustice.<sup>69</sup> Nations have developed a whole system of international laws to legitimize slave morality. And yet the “blond beasts” that the Bilderberg Group are remain “blond beasts”, and they can only continue their conquest within the mode of slave morality (the protection of the weak against the strong), just as “the Leader-state still trespasses interstate morality, but only clandestinely”, so that “the art of looking like a victim of another's injustice while perpetrating injustice on that other has replaced the art and ruse in the employment of force which Machiavelli has so carefully laid out in *The Prince*”.

Later I will also focus on the other victim of this most sophisticated form of hypocrisy, the human mind itself, when I shall discuss the other hidden purpose in the political correctness of democracy and human rights, the promotion of consumerism. Putin, Nazarbayev, Lukashenko, and Aliyev have all warded off Western-promoted oppositions in their country by raising the living standard of their population, because they know that “democracy” and “human rights” are merely transpositions of the real issues of the attraction of pop-culture and the ability to live comfortably.<sup>70</sup> The political correctness of human rights and democracy has not just muddled our perception of who is a conqueror and who is a victim, and what “freedom” really means, but has given us an erroneous perception that disagreement and opposition are good and that the good guys permit disagreement and opposition. First of all, I do not think that the political correctness of allowing people to disagree with you is always a healthy ingredient leading to human happiness, wisdom, and survival. Unless you see values in disagreement for the sake of disagreement – to preserve the right to disagree, for example, even when you know you

---

69 In the Preface to *Karin's Meetups*.

70 A fairer presentation of Azerbaijan's prosperity under Ilham Aliyev can be found in Svante E. Cornell's *Azerbaijan Since Independence* (2010).

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

are wrong in your opinion – why should you allow others to disagree with you when you know better? You should not allow people to disagree with you when you are in possession of the right knowledge about how reality works while others are not, when you know better than other people what is in their best interest, and when you genuinely want to work for their best interest. If Putin has been autocratic at all, it is because he is aware that he understands Russian people's interests better than those Russian people who disagree with him. Secondly, those that promote the idea that opposition and disagreement are good themselves don't permit opposition and disagreement, and yet, because they have been promoting opposition and disagreement in their enemy states, we don't usually notice it. The brutal manner in which Saakashvili, after coming to power as opposition in Georgia, cracked down on his political opponents is never discussed among the democracy-promoting NGOs; while Freedom House's *Nations in Transit* constantly accuses the nominally privately owned media in Russia or Kazakhstan of being, in reality, channels for the state's official stories, it misleads us into the impression that the situation is any different in United States or Europe. It might turn out that the United Nations, after Putin's reform of it, might just agree with me about the futility of opposition and disagreement in a plan to protect the human mind itself and ensure humanity's very survival.

Schism among the Western elites:  
The case of Iraq and Putin's election

This modus operandi in the conquest of Russia – subverting the enemy from within while discrediting him at the same time – has been so successful that, when it is violated by another radical approach to the matter, serious schism would result among the Bilderberg Group. The radical approach, and the schism, were engendered for the first time by an unlikely source, Saddam Hussein. While the United States and Europe were united in grabbing Central Asia, the Caucasus, and Eastern Europe away from Russia, they ran into major problems in their dealing with Iraq. Iraq, remember, was under sanction during the 1990s because of the First Gulf War. The sanction had completely devastated Iraq's economy, industry, and military capabilities. To get out of the sanction, the shrewd Saddam Hussein began carefully dividing the Western alliance. He of course understood what “Bilderberg” and “New World Order” were all about, and knew what the Western elites' real agendas were: to establish direct control of all the world's natural resources and, in the case of the Middle-East, to completely control the exploitation and distribution of oil. He knew well that these agendas had been the driving forces behind West's antagonism toward Russia. He saw that the sanction (and the no-flight zone) was mainly enforced by the Anglo-Americans, while European countries were far more dependent on Middle-Eastern oil than the United States. He had therefore discovered a fault line between the Anglo-Americans and the continental Europeans along which he could gradually divide, and dismantle, the Bilderberg's transatlantic alliance. He began promising lucrative oil contracts to France and Russia – while promising none to the Anglo-Americans – on the condition that they support the lifting of the sanctions in the UN Security Council. This had resulted in the extraordinary circumstance that the continental Europe began drifting toward Russia when it came to the issue of Iraqi oil. Western Europe – but especially France, which, an odd man in Europe because of its Gaullist tradition, had always had

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

the habit of pursuing energy security on its own, now agreed with Russia that the sanction against Iraq should be lifted. Sensing serious divisions appearing between themselves and their European allies, the Americans began dividing into two camps, the Radicals and the Moderates.

This was the time of the Clinton administration. The radical camp were composed of Anglo-American oil giants who, to protect their individual interests, were willing to break alliance with the Europeans, especially the French, on this issue. They were growing impatient, and, grouping themselves around Cheney, wanted direct military occupation of Iraq. This would enable the Anglo-Americans to grab all the oil contracts away from France and Russia. Cheney had also persuaded them to the more radical approach in regard to the entire “Russian Question” – the approach of direct military occupation of the Arab world and Central Asia, or Russia's and China's backdoor region: the indirect approach espoused by the Bilderbergers, the CIA, the State Department, and everyone else – supporting terrorists and inciting “color revolutions” – was too soft and slow for him. The case of Iraq was especially difficult. The CIA had continued its usual approach in Iraq, namely, clandestinely supporting oppositions in Iraq to topple Saddam Hussein's regime, but Saddam always proved himself extremely effective in unraveling these CIA-supported coup d'états. The failed 1996 CIA-supported coup by the Iraqi National Accord (*Wifaq*) was the most conspicuous example. Internal disputes as to the support of oppositions also hampered the clandestine approach. For example, the CIA and the State Department were skeptical of Ahmad Chalabi's Iraqi National Council – which the US government had equipped with guerrilla units – based in the northern Kurdish regions. On the other hand, Cheney and his Radical gang quite liked Chalabi. Saddam would eventually drive out the INC. Regime-change was nowhere in sight in Iraq, in contrast to the progress which the CIA, the State Department, and their European partners were making in Eastern Europe. Oil production was quickly peaking everywhere except in Russia and Central Asia. The American oil giants looked destined to be locked out of the energy reserves of the Middle-East.

Then came the neocons. The neocons had always been concerned with protecting and promoting Israel's dominance in the Middle-East, and saw that the Radicals' agenda for direct military occupation of Iraq and the rest of the Middle-East would greatly enhance Israel's dominance and security in the region. The neocons thus began aligning themselves with the Radicals, whose representative was, again, the future Vice President Dick Cheney. The new alliance between the Radicals and the neocons eventually came to dominate the Republican party – now the new Republican Party – while the Moderates began dominating the Democratic party. The stage was set for a show-down. The shadowy government which Sibel Edmonds has named in her *Classified Woman* (or the “private government” which Webster Tarpley has fingered as responsible for 911 attacks) was essentially this networks of the Radicals, which spanned from United States through Turkey to Israel. Although their members were also regular attendees of the Bilderberg meetings, the neocon Radical group, through their blatant promotion of military solutions to all problems in the world – including nuclear first-strikes against Russia and China – severely alienated, not just the moderate Bilderbergers in America (with whom the CIA and the State Department were allied), but also the European Bilderbergers, who were much more

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

comfortable with the low-profile approaches of clandestine support of oppositions. Since Clinton belonged to the moderate camp, he was not interested either in the radical approach to the problem of Middle-Eastern oil. The radical Republicans thus saw him and other Democrats as obstacles that should be removed through overwhelming force. The White Water Affair and the Monica Lewinsky Affair are two instances of this.<sup>71</sup> Clinton survived the onslaught, but the enormous hostility had thus been sown between the Radicals and the Moderates in America. When the neocons, the visible representatives of the Radicals, pleaded Clinton in 1998 to adopt their idea of a military invasion of Iraq in exchange for their endorsement of him, he promptly ignored them.

The proper way to understand the Radicals is to imagine elements in the Bilderberg Group (the “elites”) becoming radicalized by neocon philosophers, forming secret networks within the larger Bilderberg framework, and trying to take over the larger network in order to advance their radical agendas which this larger network had ignored. The networking of criminal activities – selling national security secrets and lobbying for the invasion of Iraq – which Sibel Edmonds has described in her November 2009 interview with *The American Conservatives*<sup>72</sup> – is the manner in which the Radicals functioned. Throughout the 1990s they had been infiltrating positions of power and recruiting converts from peoples in key positions. The Moderates under the Clinton administration were becoming alarmed by the growing networks of the Radicals, which was why the FBI was tracking their activities.

Understanding the distinction between the majority of the Moderates who held sway throughout the 1990s and a minority of Radicals who networked into being in secrecy during the same period is the most important step in understanding American politics in the past twenty years, and yet it is a concept which has proved most difficult to grasp, even by the best minds among the “conspiracy theorists”. Because of the prominence of the Radicals during the Bush administration those conspiracy theorists – virtually the only ones who are even looking into the issue – have tended to identify the Radicals as the norm, lump the CIA with them, and completely lose sight of the fact that the CIA has always been allied with the Moderates – who have now shrunk to the Democratic Party – who were on the scene first. Neither can they identify who has done what: the War on Terror was the work of the Radicals, while “color revolutions” were the work of the Moderates. Each group has its own think tanks: the Radicals have their American Enterprise Institute, while the Moderates have their Brookings Institute. Someone like Thierry Meyssan has noticed the distinction,<sup>73</sup> and yet even he flounders when he

71 The White Water Affairs happened like this. Some man was caught committing frauds with federal funds, and, when he was caught, agreed to framing President Clinton in the affair in exchange for a lighter sentence. The Clinton family had nothing whatever to do with the whole fraud scheme. When you hear something about how the Israelis had bugged Clinton's line to catch him flirting with Monica Lewinsky, you have to wonder if they were working with the neocons.

72 At: <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/whos-afraid-of-sibel-edmonds/>. The Radicals she has named are Mark Grossman, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, and Douglas Feith.

73 Meyssan thus writes on his Réseau Voltaire in regard to the Brookings Institute (<http://www.voltairenet.org/article14391.html>) : “La Brookings Institution est souvent présentée comme le principal think tank des démocrates. Il s'agit plutôt d'un organisme représentatif des *élites modérées*, favorables à une régulation économique limitée, *par opposition au patronat libertarien de l'American Enterprise Institute*. Désormais active en politique étrangère, elle préconise – comme les néo-conservateurs et dans les mêmes circonstances – l'usage de la force,

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

investigates 911 attacks by erroneously attributing them to the CIA.

Then, through election frauds and dirty campaign tricks the Radicals were finally, in 2001, able to seize power and take over the US governmental structure. This was the neoconservative revolution of 2001. They quickly began to prepare for the invasion of Iraq, Afghanistan, and the rest of the Middle-East. The Moderates, e.g. the CIA, continued to try to solve the problem which Saddam Hussein had created *in their way*. As France and Russia lobbied hard in the UN for the lifting of sanctions on Iraq, the Moderates ceased opposition to this outcome and sought to gain a share for the Anglo-Americans as well in the post-sanction market of Iraq. They thus commissioned the CIA for this task. In this connection a very important testimony has recently emerged, a self-published book by another whistleblower, *Extreme Prejudice* by a certain Susan Lindauer. In this book Lindauer recounts her experience of being recruited by the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency as an asset, specifically as an intermediary between the CIA and the Pentagon on the one hand and the Libyan and Iraqi government on the other in order to unofficially negotiate deals through back door channels at a time when these two nations were under sanction and had no official relations with the US. These back door negotiations were never reported in the press, and if it weren't for Lindauer's informing us, we would never know about their existence. While her work with the Libyan diplomats predated the current situation, her “unofficial” negotiations, on behalf of the CIA, with the Iraqi government was part of the Moderates' attempt to gain the Anglo-American share in a post-sanction Iraq.

According to Lindauer, the Moderates were in the end completely successful in their attempt. When the neocons and the Radicals joined together to campaign for the military occupation of Iraq, Saddam became worried. His attempt to alienate between the Anglo-Americans and the Europeans and use the Franco-Russian alliance to dissolve the sanctions against him had resulted in the formation of Radicals in the American camp who would not shy away from the use of military force. He thus decided to give in to the Moderates in the American camp. If the United States agreed to lift the sanctions, he would agree to renege on the oil development contracts which he had signed with Russia and France and hand over virtually all the oil rights to the United States<sup>74</sup>; to resume weapons inspections with no conditions; to allow the FBI or Interpol Task Force to operate inside Iraq with full rights to conduct investigations and make arrests, as part of the country's cooperation with the War on Terrorism; to allow the US corporations to “return to Iraq in all economic sectors, and function at the same market share as they enjoyed prior to the First Gulf War in 1990”, and to grant US corporations priority contracts for the reconstruction of Iraq's hospitals and health care system and telecommunication infrastructures; to “guarantee the purchase and import of one million American automobiles every year for 10 years”;<sup>75</sup> and even to institute democratic reforms, putting himself in the background.<sup>76</sup> “In short,

---

mais pour motifs humanitaires et non par évangélisme démocratique, par devoir et non par enthousiasme conquérant. La moitié de ses chercheurs a travaillé dans le passé pour le Conseil de sécurité national ou la Maison-Blanche” (emphasis added).

74 *Extreme Prejudice*, p. 116; p. 156.

75 *Ibid.*, p. 115 – 6.

76 *Ibid.*, p. 122 – 4.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

as of November 28 2001, at the close of the first year of the Bush Administration, and fully 16 months before the invasion of Baghdad, Iraq had agreed to the full framework of demands put forth by the CIA in November and December 2000. The CIA had succeeded in controlling the agenda on Iraq, and secured all major US interests in any post-sanctions period.”<sup>77</sup>

All governments around the world knew the United States and United Kingdoms wanted to invade Iraq because the sanctions were about to be lifted, but the whole reason was not only kept out of public consciousness but also couldn't even be discussed in the UN sessions. Instead, the neocons promoted the “cover story” about “Weapons of Mass Destruction”, and just because it was United States which was making a fuss about this “WMD” nonsense, every other nation had to address it as if it were real. (I'm pointing out another sad fact about the American use of “cover stories” in all major political events: endless amount of time and resources have been wasted on non-issues just to avoid discussing the real issues.) Only occasional whistleblowers like Susan Lindauer and Karen Kwiatkowski have noted the *real* issue in public statements. (Karen Kwiatkowski in, for example, the documentary film “Why We Fight”.) For a particular reason, the Moderates were trying their best to prevent the invasion of Iraq, and they (through the CIA) had basically solved the problems for Anglo-American oil giants who formed the backbone of the Radical camp. But the Radicals had already decided on their military solution. Everything has to do with the status of the Muslim peoples after the 911 attacks.

Now let's rewind to the event of 911 terrorist attacks. You might have heard of Cheney's Energy Task Force meetings in the White House during the first half of 2001, from February until April that year. The participants were Exxon Mobil, Conoco, BP America, Chevron, and Royal Dutch/Shell – all the Anglo-American oil giants.<sup>78</sup> These were the foundation of the radical camp – and the meeting constituted the essence of the new administration insofar as the Bush administration was essentially a group of oil men and women whom the oil industry had sent in to hijack the executive government: Cheney: Halliburton; Bush: Spectrum 7 Energy; Condoleezza Rice: Exxon-Mobil...<sup>79</sup> Cheney and his neocon intellectuals had already devised a plan for them: let 911 attacks happen – Cheney had been planning on this false flag operation since the end of the Clinton era – in order to obtain the pretext for military occupation of Central Asia; they would then use the attacks to formulate a new national defense doctrine, the “Preemptive Strike” doctrine, in the name of which they could invade Iraq, Syria, Iran, and Venezuela. (If a certain confession was trustworthy, David Rockefeller, the most frequent

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., p. 116.

<sup>78</sup> The leaks from the Moderates – the CIA, the State Department, and the Democrats – have allowed Washington Post to publish in 2005 the identities and meetings of Cheney's Energy Task Force. See Dana Milbank and Justin Blum, “Documents say oil chiefs met with Cheney's Task Force,” November 16, 2005 (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/15/AR2005111501842.html>). Michael Ruppert has emphasized the importance of this Energy Task Force in both his book *Facing Collapse* and his interviews in the associated documentary “Collapse”. Paul Thomson has pointed out in his *The Terror Timeline* (2004) that it was after these meetings, in April 2001, that Cheney began asking the military to reformulate its strategic pursuit as one of securing energy resources around the world.

<sup>79</sup> A short account of how the American oil industry sent in this emergency team called “Bush administration” to save itself from Peak Oil, see Daniele Ganser, *Europa im Erdölrausch*, p. 286 – 297.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

participant of the Bilderberg Group from the American side, *had been on board with the Radicals*.<sup>80</sup>) When 9/11 attacks happened, the United States thus got to occupy Afghanistan and establish military bases in Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, etc. At first the neocon intellectuals (like Paul Wolfowitz) were not happy because they were really concerned with Israel, not with oil per se, and Cheney skipped over Iraq in favor of Afghanistan. But not to worry, for Iraq was Cheney's next target. The deal which the Moderates had secured with Saddam Hussein to avoid a war with Iraq was promptly ignored by Cheney. Now why make deals with Saddam when you can swallow up the entire Middle-East with force? In accordance with business convention, the oil chiefs, when faced with the alternatives between massive profits in a few years *without* your friends and tiny profits over a long course *with* your friends, chose the former.

I have called this the “Cheney Plan”, or the beginnings thereof. It is the single most important element in the constitution of a fault line along which the Bilderberg would split and the war between the CIA and the neoconservatives would reignite. The foundation of the “Cheney Plan” was “Islamic terrorism”. Back in the 1990s, when Cheney began contemplating on a radical approach to bringing the most important Central Asia and Middle-East into America's grasp, dissatisfied as he was with the piece-meal approach of the Moderates, he needed a pretext under which he could send the military directly into the region. He had taken notice of Brzezinski's lamentation in *The Grand Chessboard* that a democracy is not motivated to create empires oversea (in this case, in Eurasia) unless the people perceive sharp threat to their life and lifestyle. His eyes quickly fell upon militant Islam – and adopted the radicalism which the neocon cabal had been preaching. Only if he could make the Muslims America's new enemy, after the Soviet! *While the Moderates were using the CIA, the State Department, and their European partners to breed militant Muslims as allies of America and Europe, the strategists for the Radicals – Cheney and the neocons – were inventing plans in the opposition direction*, for bringing the guerillas wars which militant Islam was occasionally waging against its nation-state oppressors to America itself, so that pretext could be generated under which America could send troops to the heartlands of Islam to clear out the region as if for the purpose of self-defense.

The neocons had been on a crusade to eliminate the perceived enemies of the Jewish people for decades; this is what they felt to be the reason for their existence, their historic mission. This is why they had all converted from Trotsky communism to patriotic fascism, and why they had acquired a messianic fervor during the Cold War for the destruction of the Soviet Union, for this “evil empire”

---

80 In a 2005 interview with Alex Jones which has been widely circulated on the Internet, Aaron Russo, the maker of the documentary film “America: From Freedom to Fascism”, has recounted the pre-9/11 confession of Nicholas Rockefeller that a bogus war on terrorism was about to begin whose purpose was to take away people's liberty to the point of planting RFID chips inside their body, by which the elites would turn off their life if they “get out of line”. The interview is available on Despertares: <http://teatrevesadespertar.wordpress.com/2011/09/03/aaron-russo-el-objetivo-final-es-ponernos-un-chip-de-control-a-toda-la-poblacion/> and its portions are also included in: “North American Union and RFID chips” (<http://youtu.be/vuBo4E7ZXo>). That the Rockefellers, unlike Soros the financier, would join the Radicals was natural enough since Exxon, Mobil, and Chevron have all descended from John Rockefeller's original Standard Oil Company (Ganser, *Europa im Erdölrausch*, p. 38 - 41).



## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

was the last superpower where Antisemitism still ran rampant.<sup>81</sup> Now that the Soviet Union was gone, the last remaining enemy of the Jews, in their eyes, were the Muslims. How lucky for them that the Muslim populations were sitting on top of one of the last remaining oil and natural gas reserves on earth, so that their wish for a military destruction of the Muslim world could find appeal in the community of the oil giants who were becoming increasingly desperate. You might have also heard of the seminal piece which the famous Harvard scholar Samuel Huntington had published in 1993 in Council of Foreign Relations' *Foreign Affairs*, “The Clash of Civilizations”. Huntington was a member of the American Enterprise Institute, Cheney's most important neoconservative think tank, and the ideas which constituted this seminal article he had first given as a lecture in 1992 at the AEI. The idea of “clash of civilization” he had taken from Bernard Lewis, a neocon scholar on Islamic civilization – all these should immediately warn you about the veracity of his “great insights”. His contention was that, after the Cold War had ended, the former ideological conflicts (communism versus free market) would be replaced by conflicts motivated by ethnic and religious differences within civilizational centers or, more likely, on the fault lines between major civilizations (between Orthodox Christianity and Islam, for example). He had a particular focus on the fault line between Islam and Western Christendom, which in his system of thinking would eventually overtake all other ethnic and religious conflicts as the most prominent and urgent. At times he really did sound like a truth-teller here to educate rather than a propagandist here to condition us to a false view of reality: he thus describes the Western projects to promote democracies in foreign lands as simply the advancement of parochial Western interests under some universalist pretension (promoting human rights as good for humanity in general). His perception of a new era of ethnic conflicts was however pure invention: the ethnic consciousness and nationalism which suddenly exploded in the former Soviet world had been systematically bred by the Americans and their European allies as a ploy to slowly destroy the Russian state from within. This, as you have seen, was the original strategy of the Bilderberg Group, who were now grouped as “Moderates”. Now the neocon ideologues had adopted this idea to invent the fiction of an upcoming conflict between Islam and the Christian West in order to prepare us for open warfare with the Muslims on their territory – once the neocons could successfully bring Islamic guerrillas wars (“terrorism”) onto the American shore. By 1996 Huntington had developed the idea of “clash of civilization” into a book, *The Clash of Civilizations: Remaking of World Order*.

As you have seen, these Muslim militant groups like Al-Quaeda were already Western proxies, although they were under the employment of the Moderates for use against Russia and China. Cheney's shadow government crew had merely to hijack a few elements in the Moderates' proxies and send them off to attack America instead of the Russians and the Chinese. Then the fiction which the neocons had invented (Islam vs. Christendom) could become reality. This was how 911 attacks had happened. When the “War on Terror” had started in consequence of the 911 false flag attacks, Huntington's “clash of

---

81 This characterizes the conversion of William Kristol's father, Irving Kristol, the quintessential of New York Intellectuals. Everyone is different. David Horowitz has described his conversion in *Radical Son* (1997). He turned from the New Left to neoconservatism when he became aware of the moral corruption of the leftists. Paul Wolfowitz formed his neoconservative bent under Alan Bloom and Albert Wohlstetter at the University of Chicago. And so on.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

civilizations” immediately became a category of ordinary Americans' consciousness.<sup>82</sup> While simple-minded patriotic Americans were furious toward the Muslims who “hated the American way of life”, the Muslims around the world were more and more angered as the “War on Terror” turned into the invasion of Iraq. Everyone had fallen into Cheney's, and neocons', trap. The fiction was now reality. The mutual hatred between the West and the Muslim world was precisely the vehicle the neocon-led Radicals had wanted, the vehicle by which one side of the radical alliance (oil giants) could get hold of world's most important remaining oil reserves and the other side (the neocon intellectuals) could destroy the antisemitic Islamic civilization. This is a classic example of the conspiracy scenario which the hard core conspiracy theorists see at work behind all major enmities in the world: Cheney's goal was to eventually engulf the entire planet into World War Three between the United States, China, and Russia while making it look like it was all China's and Russia's fault. Cheney's ultimate objective was the destruction of Russia – he was just like the Moderates in this respect – because, again, the largest remaining oil and natural gas reserves, along with everything else, were found in Russian Siberia. The neocons were still with him on this, because, even though the Soviet Union was gone, the Russian people remained in their eyes hard-core “anti-Semites”. Afraid that conventional terrorism might not be big enough a catalyst to drive the whole planet into World War Three – “terrorism” is really just a nuisance to our life – Cheney was thinking about developing the “terrorist threat” into “nuclear terrorist threat” since the very beginning. Examples of his effort included his campaign for the United Nations to frame Viktor Bout and for the media to fear-monger about “dirty bombs”. (Of course the news about Jose Padilla's “dirty bomb” attempt was all made up, without a shred of reality behind it.) Direct your attention also to Sibel Edmonds' confession – that the “shadow government crew” (the secret network of the Radicals) had been, since late 1990s, secretly leaking nuclear secrets of the United State to foreign buyers so that terrorist organizations could eventually get hold of them. This was actually just part of this plan. Since it was unlikely that some ragtag and low-tech “terrorists” could ever get hold of nuclear weapons, Cheney's shadow government crew had been trying to clandestinely supply them with these.

The 911 attacks, the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, and the War on Terrorism thus resulted in a direct confrontation between the Radicals (composed of the neoconservatives and the oil giants) and the Moderates (composed of the CIA, the other traditional government bureaucrats, and the Democrats, all of whom were allied with the European Bilderbergers). The Moderates, the CIA, and the State Department had been carefully cultivating, for a whole decade, the Muslims as America's allies; they wanted the Muslims to be on the side of America and Europe because their target was, remember, Russia, and Islamic fundamentalists hated Russia. But, overnight, Cheney had turned Muslims into America's deadliest enemy. Perhaps you can get a notion of the situation when you read such CIA operative's “confession” as Lindsay Moran's *Blowing My Covers*. Months before 911 attacks, Moran was serving under official cover in the US embassy in Macedonia (guess what her mission really was), and her book was full of descriptions of Serbs' hatred for America because, everyone knew, the

---

82 See, for example, Edward W. Said's critique in *The Nation*: October 4 2001, “The Clash of Ignorance”. Available at: <http://www.thenation.com/article/clash-ignorance>.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Americans favored the Muslims, such as the Albanians, and were biased against the Serbs because they were friends with the Russians. When the 911 attacks happened, the Albanians flocked to her, pleading “We Muslims love you Americans! Please don't hate us!” You can solidify your notion by considering another anecdote, the story of Ayman Al-Zawahiri, who our authority has taught us is Bin Laden's right-hand man. Again, it is Sibel Edmonds who has revealed the real story of Al-Zawahiri's life. In two interviews with James Corbett, Edmonds reveals that Al-Zawahiri was actually one of the operatives whom the United States and NATO had recruited in the 1990s for their GLADIO Plan B operations. Namely, he was a CIA-Pentagon operative, another Islamic extremist whom the Moderates had cultivated to fight Russian forces in the Caucasus and the Balkans.<sup>83</sup> The CIA and NATO had such high regard for his usefulness that, when he was arrested by the Russians in 1996, they bailed him out. The same with Bin Ladin. Then, in 2001, the political climate suddenly changed. Cheney and his neocons came into power, and demanded that Al-Zawahiri, along with Bin Ladin, be framed into America's enemy. The media now conditioned the American public to believe in a different reality, that Al-Zawahiri and Bin Ladin wanted to destroy America and that Americans needed to hate them. The Moderates' decade-long project (on both the American and European side) was instantly overturned – and for what? Because the neocon cabal wanted to “save Jews”, and they were able to find their patrons among the Anglo-American oil corporations who were impatient because of Saddam Hussein, etc. Nobody, except this tiny minority of rightwing extremists in the vast Jewish political spectrum, had any enthusiasm for the “crusade to save Jews” – for hating Muslims – when the Jewish people were doing just fine around the world.

It is because the Moderates knew that the clash of civilization would be intensified – part of neocons' objective – by the Iraq invasion that the CIA had done everything they could to save a deal for America in the event that the sanction should be lifted. But no use. When Cheney persisted in his plan, the CIA and the rest of the US government then tried obstruction. Finally, after the invasion had happened, the Moderates tried criticism. This – the CIA's and the Moderates' anger over Cheney's and the neocons' provocation of Muslims around the world – is the context in which so many of the criticisms of the Iraq War from Democrats, the CIA, and the State Department may become intelligible. For example, the Valerie Plame affair: how former ambassador Joseph Wilson poked holes in one of the “Weapons of Mass Destruction” nonsenses, that Iraq had once sought to procure uranium yellowcake from Niger, in his July 2003 op-ed in *New York Times*,<sup>84</sup> resulting in his wife becoming Cheney's target.<sup>85</sup> This was just one example among many. Ultimately, the neocons wanted invasion of Iraq partly because, in this way, the Muslims would be irreversibly converted to America's enemy. America and Europe had irrevocably lost their most effective proxy against Russia. Everyone hated Cheney, his 911 attacks, and now his invasion of Iraq.

83 Refer to Corbett Report, Interview 598 and Interview 604. See also Corbett Report, Episode 258, “Know your terrorists: Ayman Al-Zawahiri”: <http://www.corbettreport.com/episode-258-know-your-terrorists-ayman-al-zawahiri/>.

84 Wilson, “What I did not find in Africa”: <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/07/06/opinion/what-i-didn-t-find-in-africa.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm>.

85 Valerie Plame's *Fair Game*, p. 125 (Bush's 2003 State of the Union address) – p. 140 (Plame's exposure after the publication of the op-ed).

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Cheney's response was to practice his brand of feudalism on the CIA. He wanted the CIA to take the blame for the “failure to prevent 911 attacks”. The CIA was incensed. Although there were officials in CIA's headquarter who have been recruited into Cheney's “shadow government” and have thus participated in the orchestration of 911 attacks, the CIA on the whole was against it. What was this “intelligence failure” business about? (Of course, just like the FBI, the CIA was tracking all the moves which Cheney's shadow government was making before 911 attacks and was well aware of what he was planning to do. But, in accordance with “convention”, they made no sound, and kept the displeasure to themselves.) Moreover, Cheney ordered the CIA to pretend to regard the Islamic extremists in Central Asia as America's “enemies” and go after them likewise. The CIA did not like the business of destroying the assets and proxies whom they had carefully built up, but they had to bow to political pressure and begin killing and kidnapping these “terrorists” many of whom formerly worked for the Agency and NATO-GLADIO. Cheney wanted these CIA assets and proxies tortured so that their “will to resistance” may be broken completely: in Cheney's worldview, the ruler had the right to make the subordinates take the fall whenever he found it pleasing. The antagonism between the CIA and Cheney's neoconservative camp intensified as time passed. In the period since 911 attacks, it was common to read in books written by neocon authors scathing comments about the CIA as “stupid” and “incompetent”, while many CIA officers began appearing in the discursive world of the counter culture (like [www.counterpunch.com](http://www.counterpunch.com)) or political opposition (The American Conservative) to launch vicious verbal attacks on the neoconservative Bush administration.

The mutual dislike between the CIA and the neoconservatives dated back to the Reagan era. Remind yourself, for example, of the controversies surrounding “Team B”: how a group of future neocons took up the function of oversight over the intelligence which the CIA had produced of Soviet Union's military capabilities, and severely criticized the Agency for underestimating the Soviet capabilities, and how the CIA reacted with tremendous antagonism because these neocons had purposely made up intelligence exaggerating the Soviet technological edge over America in order to justify Reagan's military build-up.<sup>86</sup> The neocons were fond of making up stories to demonize whoever was the devil in their scheme of things, while criticizing the CIA because these professional intelligence officers produced accurate information in which the devil did not appear so threatening. You have to know what all this was about. The neocons were fanatic about destroying the Soviet Union, and about exterminating the Islamic civilization, all through actual use of military force, because they were on a crusade to exterminate the enemies of Jews. The CIA – like everybody else – simply had no interest in the crusade. Nobody else shared the fervor which had gripped the neocons when it came to the physical destruction of civilizations which the neocons deemed *judenfeindlich*.

Cheney next wanted the CIA to cooperate in manufacturing faulty intelligence about Iraq's “Weapons of Mass Destruction”. Of course, once the CIA had done so, they would then take the fall for

---

<sup>86</sup> See the concise short account of the origin and the works of Team B in Anne Hessing Cahn's and John Prados' “Team B: The Trillion Dollar Experiment” in *The Bulletins of Atomic Scientists*, April 1993.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

“intelligence failure” on Iraq's WMD programs. (Long before the invasion, everyone in the US government already knew that Saddam Hussein possessed no WMDs; but Cheney wanted to pretend to be mistaken about this in order to have a pretext to invade Iraq. Then, afterward, when the cake had already been baked, he would just have the government feign “incompetence”.) Because the CIA adamantly refused to make up false evidence about Saddam Hussein's WMD capabilities, Cheney decided to move this duty to Douglas Feith's Office of Special Plans in the Pentagon. Then, guess what, when nobody found any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq after the invasion, Cheney and his neocon gang made the CIA take the fall anyway by simply asserting that the faulty intelligence came from the Agency. Since the general population knew nothing about the Office of Special Plans anyway, CIA's “double intelligence failure” (911 attacks and Saddam Hussein's WMD) became a category of ordinary Americans' consciousness.

With Cheney's plan to invade Iraq, the severe confrontations between the Moderates and the Radicals in the United States had enlarged into a general confrontation between the European Bilderbergers – all of whom had been comfortable allies of the Moderates in America – and the American Radicals – who had now clustered around the neocon intellectuals led by Dick Cheney. Within the domestic US, a Moderate like George Soros was incensed by Cheney's neocon gang for three reasons. As the earlier excerpt has revealed, the first reason why the Moderates within the American Bilderberg Group – to which Soros belonged – were angry with the neocons was that Cheney's gang had violated the established modus operandi of world-conquest. Was world-conquest to be effected through hard power or soft power? The neocons had been obsessed with brute force for decades, and now they had decided to use hard power at the expense of soft-power. By this time, America and Europe had been slowly conquering half of the former Soviet zone through peaceful “color revolutions”: this is soft-power at its best. Conquest through soft-power pleased both the left and the right. As you have seen, conquest through soft-power makes the conqueror “look good” and makes the victim “look bad”. It disguises conquest as if it were the unintended consequences of the moral faults of the victim. George Soros was able to obtain the support and approval for “color revolutions” from all constituents, from the left through the libertarians to the radical right, whereas the neocons could seek support and approval for military invasion of the Middle-East only from the radical right. The United States had lost its soft-power allure among the left, the paleoconservatives, and the libertarians. The neocons' conquest through hard power had made the conqueror “look bad” to at least half of the political spectrum, and the reputation of the United States was declining world-wide. The second reason for the moderate American Bilderbergers' anger toward the neocons was the alienation this conquest had caused between Europe and America. It was the Anglo-American petroleum corporations which were going to benefit from the invasion of Iraq, not the European ones. As neocons beat their war-drum throughout 2002, a tremendous rivalry developed between the European Bilderbergers and the American neocons, which has been commented upon in numerous observations of the Bilderberg Group's dynamics during this time.<sup>87</sup> France was already the least enthusiastic member of the European Bilderberg Group and yet its

---

<sup>87</sup> See Estulin's *La Verdadera Historia Del Club Bilderberg*, Appendice 2, which covered the 2005 Bilderberg meeting in Rottach-Egern, Germany; then the report on the same meeting in the Nexus Magazine, “Bilderberger in Rottach-Egern”

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

interests was most hurt. Chirac thus gathered up Germany's Schroeder to form an alliance with Putin's Russia. This was the so-called second “Troika”. Putin himself was consciously exploiting the disagreement between the Americans and Europeans on the issue of Iraq in order to drive a wedge into the enemy camp – he was one with Saddam Hussein on this. In fact, the second reason why the American oil giants had decided to adopt Cheney's “radical approach” during early 2001 was precisely Putin. With Yeltsin gone and Putin on the scene, American oil corporations were definitively shut off from Central Asia and Siberia – for Putin had no interest in making Russia a Western colony by joining the EU and in fact wanted to remake Russia into a Eurasian power by dominating world's energy market through retaining control over the oil and natural gas reserves in his own country and in the former Soviet states. (Recall that he was an “Eurasian”.) While France wanted Germany's, and now Russia's, alliance because the Gaullists still wanted France to be a global player, Schroeder's Germany had its own reasons. Schroeder had maintained close relationship with Putin because, ever since Putin had come to power, he had been using energy issues as a way to divide the Euro-American alliance in the Bilderberg Group. Schroeder had to play both sides at the same time. When it came to the Kosovo War and the color revolutions in Eastern Europe, because these former Soviet regions were strategically crucial to Germany on geographical grounds, Schroeder was allied with America and the UK (with the Moderates in America, that is). But when it came to Germany's energy security, he inclined toward Putin. From 2002 onwards, Putin would join Schroeder and Chirac repeatedly in summits of the “Troika” (Russia-France-Germany), using their common opposition to the invasion of Iraq as a rallying point on which to forge an “Eurasian World Power” as a counter-point against American unilateral global dominance. Again, the typical academic point of view – that France and Russia saw a common interest in a multipolar world as the preventive against Pax Americana and an assurance for their ability to play a role in world affairs – is insufficient.<sup>88</sup> The academics' refusal to recognize any cabal of elites orchestrating world events from behind the scene have seriously hampered their understanding of the true meaning of geopolitics. What Putin was really doing was using France, the odd man in Europe, to divide the Bilderberg alliance and *thus to prevent the installation of the*

---

(<http://www.nexus-magazin.de/artikel/lesen/bilderberger-in-rottach-egern>) which Estulin's Appendix partially reproduces. See also James Tucker's “Bilderberg split on Iraq War”:

[http://www.prisonplanet.com/bilderberg\\_split\\_on\\_iraq\\_war.html](http://www.prisonplanet.com/bilderberg_split_on_iraq_war.html).

- 88 Heinz Brill, a German Bundeswehr scholar who has written extensively on European geopolitics, provides a typical example of the academic analysis of the “Troika” in “Strategische Allianzen in der Europapolitik” (*Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift*, Ausgabe 5/2003: [www.bmlv.gv.at/omz/ausgaben/artikel.php?id=139](http://www.bmlv.gv.at/omz/ausgaben/artikel.php?id=139)): “Für Putin bot sich die Chance, auf die Russland jahrzehntelang vergeblich gewartet hatte, nämlich den Bund mit Berlin und Paris gegen die amerikanische Hegemonialmacht zu schließen und damit endlich als Großmacht auf dem europäischen Kontinent wieder präsent zu sein. Dmitri Rogoschin, Vorsitzender des Auswärtigen Ausschusses der Duma, und andere Emissäre kamen nach Berlin, um auszuloten, ob die 'Achse' Berlin - Paris - Moskau gegen die Hegemonialbestrebungen Amerikas Bestand haben könnte... Auf dem Höhepunkt des Irak-Krieges sprach Rogoschin in einem Interview sogar von einer 'Eurasischen Union als neuer Supermacht'.” Another good example of insufficient academic analysis is Alexander Rahr, a member of the German Council on Foreign Relations (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik) and an expert in energy politics, who, in his *Russland gibt Gas: Die Rückkehr einer Weltmacht* (Hanser Verlag, 2008) attributes Putin's objection to Iraq invasion solely to Russia's desire to have a stake in Iraq's oil industry development and fear of lowering oil price when the United States should massively dump Iraqi oil on the market (p. 31). This is very shallow analysis.



## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

“*New World Order*”, which would mean the dismantling of Russia (and China as well). George Soros, a Hungarian Jew and a natural hater of Russia, could not have been more horrified by the development caused by Cheney's neocon gang; and General Wesley Clark, Bilderberg's pet-general during their takeover of former Yugoslavia, got on “Democracy Now” to openly ridicule the idea of the invasion of Iraq and gave away in later interviews the rest of the neocon plan (the invasion of Syria and Iran).<sup>89</sup> Cheney's approach had so seriously fragmented the “New World Order” crew – one member after another of the old Bilderberg club was walking out; even a most staunch ally of the Euro-American Bilderberg club like Turkey had become opposed to the Americans<sup>90</sup> – that the “New World Order” such as had been envisaged by the Western elites now risked being prevented by the new Euro-Russian alliance for a “multipolar world”.

The third reason was the same old “Muslim Question”. Just like the CIA and the rest of the US government, the Europeans had no interest in any crusade to rid the world of the enemies of Jews. During the 2003 annual Bilderberg conference (Versailles, May, 2003), Dominique de Villepain was reported to have charged in the face of the American delegate: “It's because France and the Pope have objected to the invasion of Iraq that we have been able to avert a Christian-Muslim 'clash of civilization!'”<sup>91</sup> Europe, just like the Moderates in America, saw in Muslims tremendous usefulness as instrument against Russia, and now the neocons wanted to break it. Of course, instigating a clash of civilization was precisely neocons' goal.

The severe split between Europe and America had caused so many elements in the Radical camp who had formerly made no sound about 911 attacks to walk out from the camp, most notably Brzezinski, the originator of the idea of using a false flag attack to start off the solution of the “Russian Question”. In 2004 he published *The Choice*, in which he soberly admonished the Cheney gang to return to the method of soft power which the Moderates had been practicing, noting the tremendous damage which his invasion of Iraq had done to America's alliance system. When even the leading voice from the Center for Strategic and International Studies – another neocon think tank funded principally by the oil

89 Peter Schwarz, “La guerre en Irak divise l'OTAN”, 13 February 2003, World Socialist Web Site.

90 See for example, Severin Weiland, “Weltweite Allianz für Verschiebung des Krieges”, *Spiegel*, 9 January 2003:

<http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/irak-krise-weltweite-allianz-fuerverschiebung-des-krieges-a-229981.html>. Sibel Edmonds has noted, in the aforementioned interview with The American Conservative, that Turkey walked out on Iraq invasion because it could not get the Kurdish share it had wanted.

91 David Ignatius, “The Franco-American divide: getting worse”, The Daily Star, 26 May 2003. It is archived at Tony Gosling's Bilderberg archive: <http://www.bilderberg.org/2003.htm>. In this Preface, I will not bother to analyze paleoconservatives' similar wish to avoid the “clash of civilization” between Christendom and Islam which the neocons sought. For example, Pat Buchanan wrote “Whose War” in American Conservative (March 24 2003) in a vain hope to persuade the American public to critically reject neocons' proposal to invade Iraq and reform the Middle East: “This is a time for truth. For America is about to make a momentous decision: whether to launch a series of wars in the Middle East that could ignite the Clash of Civilizations against which Harvard professor Samuel Huntington has warned, a war we believe would be a tragedy and a disaster for this Republic” (<http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/whose-war/>). The paleocons' motive was however different from the Moderates': they wished to avoid war with Islam *not* because they saw in Islam instrumentality for destabilizing Russian and Chinese influences.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

giants – began raising doubts, Cheney had now better rethink his “Cheney Plan”. (Then, there was also the case of Francis Fukuyama, among others.)

Putin would continue to hold “Troika summits” until mid-2005 – the last one was held in Kaliningrad in July 2005<sup>92</sup> – after which his project for an Eurasian alliance against Anglo-American unilateralism at last broke down. During these three years of division within the Bilderberg club, Great Britain was also increasingly becoming the odd man of Europe, just as France used to be. The European Bilderbergers had groomed Tony Blair to be the agent who would bring UK to their plate – to integrate UK into the “United States of Europe” – and yet he had gone his own way to ally with the American neocons on the issue of Iraq. Severely reprimanded by the European Bilderbergers for his betrayal of their trust,<sup>93</sup> he went to meet with Chirac and Schroeder in Berlin in September 2003, six months after the invasion, to please them with the idea of an European army;<sup>94</sup> and then in 2005 after the last Troika summit. Meanwhile, the moderate Bilderbergers in America began an aggressive campaign to dislodge the “neocon traitors” from power. Again, George Soros led the way. He went on TV interviews,<sup>95</sup> and, by early 2004, had published *The Bubble of American Supremacy: The Cost of Bush's War in Iraq*, and put its chapter on Iraq invasion on his website ([www.georgesoros.com](http://www.georgesoros.com)) for free access by the public. The view point which he explicitly articulated, in this book and in his other public statements, was that Bush's unilateralism, Doctrine of Preemptive Strike, and the invasion of Iraq born from these had harmed America's moral leadership in the world, physically weakened its material forces by overextending its military capacity, and alienated its traditional allies. Soros was trying his hardest to persuade the public to reject the neocon administration in the 2004 election. His lamentation was just a weaker statement of the actual accusation that Bush, or rather the neocons behind him, had abandoned the proven, and established, modus operandi for world-conquest, adopted the discarded, disavowed, and dangerous method – open warfare between nation-states – and endangered the “New World Order” project by alienating old partners in the game – all for the sake of a dubious crusade to save Jews. When the Moderates in the American Bilderberg Club denounced the Radicals, they would never spell out the true reasons. It was an established convention among the elites that the common people did not deserve to know what those above them were planning to do with them. The elites might fight among themselves, but the common people must not know why. George Soros announced that Bush's motivation to invade Iraq was “shrouded in mystery”<sup>96</sup> even though he knew exactly why; General Clark, during his appearance on Democracy Now, ridiculed the invasion of Iraq similarly – “Nobody knows why” – even though he knew exactly why, namely the need to establish military bases in the

---

92 Press statements by the Troika leaders at Kalinningrad are available at Russie.net:

<http://www.russie.net/article1894.html>. The August 2004 Troika summit is mentioned in: “Islamistische Bekenner schreiben: Geheimdienste zweifeln an Putins Qaida-These”, by Matthias Gebauer and Yassin Musharbash, Spiegel, Sept. 1 2004, available at: <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/ausland/islamistischebekenner-schreibengeheimdienste-zweifeln-an-putins-qaida-these-a-316062.html>.

93 See again Estulin's Appendix 2 and the same Nexus Magazine article.

94 *Der Spiegel*, 20 September 2003, “Berliner Dreier-Gipfel: Blair sagt Ja zur EU-Armee”.

95 Numerous times on the Charlie Rose Show.

96 *The Bubble of American Supremacy*, Chapter 4, “The Iraq Quagmire”.



## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Middle East and to forcibly occupy the oil fields in the region, this being American oil giants' selfish, and short-term, solutions to their urgent problems at hand – which, for the Moderates, threatened the entire “New World Order” project.

The fact that the Moderates had to persuade the voters reveals to you, however, this surprising fact – if you are conspiracy theorist who have been used to the idea that all elections have been orchestrated by Bilderbergers from behind the scene and all elected presidents were nothing more than their stooges – which can only shock you in the inner core of your being: the 2004 election was real! The traditional Bilderbergers, the “Moderates”, rallied around John Kerry's candidacy. This was why the 2004 election was so vicious, and why the Bush camp (the “Radicals”) had to play all sorts of ingenious tricks (such as diverting the issues to “gay marriage” as a way to win support from the Christian right) to win the election *fairly*. The Bush-Cheney gang simply cannot depend on the elites (the Bilderbergers) for their reelection. They could no longer count on being invited to a Bilderberg conference a year before the election and then getting assuredly elected a year later thanks to Bilderbergers' skillful manipulation of public opinions through the media giants which they controlled. In fact, it was John Kerry and John Edwards who were invited to the Bilderberg conference before the election. The Bilderberg Group wanted the Democrats back in office in order to steer America back on course: a peaceful colonization of Russia through its incorporation into the European Union. The CIA set to work and played countless clandestine tricks to discredit the Bush-Cheney gang and to help the Kerry camp.<sup>97</sup>

After Bush's triumph in 2004 election, CIA's secret war with the neoconservative regime – with Cheney chiefly – intensified. To beat down the insubordinate Agency, Cheney sent in Porter Goss to act as the new “director” of the CIA. Porter Goss seriously admonished the insubordinate elements in CIA's ranks and files – “We are here to support the administration's policies” – resulting in resignation en masse by experienced CIA officers from both the headquarter and the clandestine service.<sup>98</sup> In contradistinction to their usual habit of secrecy, the CIA officers began leaking to *Washington Post* and *New York Times* hints about the ongoing civil war between them and the neoconservative administration. It is reported that Porter Goss, when consulting with his closest cronies, had to whisper for fear that his ranks and files might have bugged his office. This was how bad the animosity between the Agency and its “whipper” had become. It was because Goss had been totally ineffective in bringing

97 Yu Shiyu, with his “CIA's fall from power” (于时语, 联合早报, 中央情报局的失势:

[http://www.stnn.cc/op\\_ed/pol\\_op/t20060522\\_217871.html](http://www.stnn.cc/op_ed/pol_op/t20060522_217871.html)), has produced one of the most accurate descriptions I have ever seen of the CIA and its situation in recent years. He correctly perceives a civil war exploding between the CIA and the Bush administration because of the War on Terrorism, and briefly mentions the CIA's manners of attack through publications and leaks devised to discredit the Bush administration – this will be narrated below – and Bush administration's habit of making the Agency take the fall for “intelligence failures”. It's important to note that he mentions another reason for the conflict between the CIA and the neocon administration which I will not discuss here: neocons' favoring of electronic surveillance (SIGINT) at the expense of human intelligence (HUMINT), in consequence of their obsession with technology.

98 This is widely reported in *New York Times* and *Washington Post*, the usual conduits for CIA “leaks”. E.g “A Year Later, Goss' CIA Is Still in Turmoil”: [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/18/AR2005101801549\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/10/18/AR2005101801549_pf.html).

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

the Agency's rank and files in line with his harsh methods that he was removed within a year – of course, according to official story, he had merely “quit” for personal reasons – and General Hayden brought in. General Hayden would employ the soft method of reconciliation instead as a way to bring the CIA in line.

### Truce and “leaks”

Although Cheney had won his second term as the emperor, he was forced to reconcile with the rest of the Bilderberg Group whom he had gravely offended. When Brzezinski hinted at the use of false flag attacks to allow United States to occupy Central Asia, he still had in mind the Moderates' solution to the “Russian Question” (to drive Russia into the European Union). Cheney's idea – nuclear warfare with Russia – had frightened him, and United States' alienation from Europe caused him to object. He was at heart a Moderate, in fact. Michael Ruppert has once interviewed a certain Johannes Koepl, who recalled Brzezinski subscribing to the Bilderberg plan for an unified global dictatorship.<sup>99</sup> This was the original plan of the Moderates: a peaceful unification of the world via economic integration such as had happened in Europe (the “EU idea” extending to the entire planet), so that a global bureaucracy directed by Western elites may eventually develop to run the entire world; the Bilderbergers may then implement the transition to the next phase of human civilization through the global bureaucracy. Brzezinski was recalling Cheney back to this original plan with his *The Choice*, and the rest of the Euro-American Moderates were similarly appealing to him – for the sake of the “Russian Question”, please! Cheney had to give in. As Werner Weidenfeld has noted in the aforementioned Bertelsmann study (“The Intertwining of Security and Economics”), Europe had only objected to Cheney's invasion of Iraq because he had hurt transatlantic alliance, not because Europe no longer wanted America's partnership. *Europe, and the Moderates in America, wanted to establish the next phase of global civilization through a multilateral peaceful approach, whereas Cheney had wanted to establish his own version of new civilization through World War Three, which he would effect unilaterally.* That was the ultimate cause of the conflict between the Moderates and the Radicals in America, and between Europe and Cheney's America, of which CIA's war with Cheney was a surface reflection. The elections of the pro-American Sarkozy and Merkel in France and Germany to replace Chirac and Schroeder who had dared ally with Putin represented how the Bilderberg Group reconciled the difference which the neocons, principally our Vice President Cheney, had caused. The United States had not just effected regime-change in Iraq, but had also brought it about in France and Germany as a result. Once the Bilderbergers had decided that Europe needed to come back to the side of the United States or vice versa,<sup>100</sup> the “shadow crew” quickly went to work to effect regime changes in France and Germany. Thierry Meyssan identified the “shadow crew” as the CIA, although his uncaring lumping of the CIA with the Radicals has caused me to be doubtful of the correctness of his identification. How the CIA had supposedly clandestinely helped manipulate the French electoral process so as to install Sarkozy –

---

99 See: <http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/zbig.html>.

100 Again, the minutes of the 2005 Bilderberg meeting included the grooming of Angela Merkel in the media as a way to manipulate the public to replace Schroeder with her in the coming election.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

a man closely associated with Frank Wisner Jr and bred to be America's puppet – as France's head of state is documented in his “Sarkozy, le tabou ultime”. According to him, this “Operation Sarkozy” predated the invasion of Iraq.<sup>101</sup> Perhaps it was actually a neocon op which was later permitted by the Bilderberg majority. In any case, with Sarkozy in power, France was pulled back from Russia. Meysan has similarly noted, in “Angela Merkel, une néo-conservatrice à la présidence de l'Union européenne”,<sup>102</sup> Merkel's connection, first with the CIA – immediately after the fall of the Berlin Wall – and then with neoconservatives – manifested by her dependence on Jeffrey Gedmin, a neocon from the American Enterprise Institute, and her husband's employment with Biosym Technology and Accelrys. Clearly, Merkel was a neocon girl whom “Bilderberg Europe” had permitted as a gesture to Cheney. It was only through the manipulation of public opinion by the medias under the control of Group Axel Springer and Bertelsmann that Merkel's party CDU was able to achieve parity with SPD in the 2005 election.

Cheney's truce with the Bilderberg majority has been clearly documented in the minutes of the 2005 Bilderberg meeting. Supposedly, in return, Cheney should give up his “Iran Plan”, which was the next step in his radical solution to the “Russian Question”. The Europeans expected him to give up his unilateralism and plan for World War Three, in other words. Cheney's envoy to this meeting included the neocon Richard Perle, who, with the other neocon intellectuals, was still dreaming of the extermination of Iran to “save Jews”. The European Bilderbergers interrogated the American delegate Richard Haass whether Cheney was still serious about striking Iran. Haass quickly assured his European counterparts that United States had neither the means nor intention to strike Iran, at which Perle groaned.<sup>103</sup> Nobody in the US government, outside the small neocon circle, was supporting Cheney and his neocon zealots in furthering the break from Europe. The pressure which the European Moderates had brought to bear was so great that the neocon intellectuals were increasingly cornered.

---

101At <http://medialma.blogspot.com/2008/08/pour-la-libert-d-expressionny-compris-la.html>. “Bien avant la crise irakienne, Frank Wisner Jr. et ses collègues de la CIA planifient la destruction du courant gaulliste et la montée en puissance de Nicolas Sarkozy. Ils agissent en trois temps : d'abord l'élimination de la direction du parti gaulliste et la prise de contrôle de cet appareil, puis l'élimination du principal rival de droite et l'investiture du parti gaulliste à l'élection présidentielle, enfin l'élimination de tout challenger sérieux à gauche de manière à être certain d'emporter l'élection présidentielle.”

102 [http://www.horizons-et-debats.ch/0703/20070122\\_01.htm](http://www.horizons-et-debats.ch/0703/20070122_01.htm).

103 In the Nexus Magazine report on the 2005 Bilderberg conference, it is related: “Angeblich fragte ein französischer Bilderberger Henry Kissinger in scharfem Ton, ob das Säbelrasseln der USA bedeute, dass neue Feindseligkeiten mit dem Iran zu erwarten sind. Richard Haass, CFR-Vorsitzender, bat darum, sprechen zu dürfen, und nannte dann die Möglichkeit einer Iran-Invasion unrealistisch, schon allein wegen der Größe des Landes und seiner Bevölkerung, ganz zu schweigen von den Milliarden Dollar, die eine solche Operation kosten würde. Die Armee der Vereinigten Staaten stecke noch im Irak bis zum Hals im Dreck und sei sehr zurückhaltend bezüglich neuer Abenteuer auf feindlichem Gebiet, vor allem gegen einen viel gesünderen, besser vorbereiteten und besser organisierten Gegner. Ein Bilderberger aus der Schweiz wollte wissen, ob ein möglicher Angriff gegen den Iran einen Präventivschlag gegen die Nuklearwaffenlager einschließen würde. Richard Haass antwortete, dass eine solche Offensive kontraproduktiv sei, denn Teherans Optionen für einen Gegenschlag reichten vom „Auslösen terroristischer Anschläge und Instabilität im Irak, in Afghanistan und in Saudi Arabien bis zum Erhöhen der Ölpreise, was eine globale Wirtschaftskrise bewirken könne“. Während des Abendessens, so hieß es aus verschiedenen Quellen, kritisierte Richard Perle Haass Position und betonte, dass er das anders sehe.”

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

When it came to Iran, all that Cheney could get was the usual clandestine operations to destabilize the country from within. The Moderates remained convinced that destabilization from within was enough to take Iran. From April 2005 onward, until March 2006, a series of unrest rocked the city of Ahvaz in Khuzestan in the southwest of Iran, culminating in a wave of bombings. This area was strategic in that it was a major oil-production center, but it was also home to two million Arabs who had been resisting Iranian rule. Apparently, the Americans and the British had been training the Arab separatists in Iraq and then sending them into Iran to wreck havoc.<sup>104</sup> From 2005 onward, American special forces had also been infiltrating Iran to (while scouting out targets for an air strike) link up with other minority groups bent on rebelling against the Iranian central authority.<sup>105</sup> The usual modus operandi of sponsoring terrorism or oppositions in the target nation – this was what the Moderates were comfortable with but what Cheney was impatient with. Cheney was also forced to give the go-ahead to the next step in Bilderberg's original plan (the peaceful unification of the world through economic integration): namely the creation of North American Union in anticipation of the economic integration between the European Union and North America. Meanwhile, the CIA and the State Department, in accordance with the Moderates' original plan, continued to carry out “color revolutions” in Ukraine, Belarus, and Kyrgyzstan. The success of these peaceful methods of regime-change, in contrast to Cheney's violent method in Iraq, was meant to demonstrate to him the superiority of the Moderates' method.

You should by now be able to acquire a notion of the fundamental difference between the moderate Bilderbergers – by whose side the CIA has stood – and the Radicals led by Cheney – in both the solution to the “Russian Question” and the eventual establishment of the “One World Government”. The Bilderbergers' vision was the consolidation of existing nation-states into supra-national entities under the pretext of economic integration and then the peaceful integration of the supra-national entities into a single *Weltstaat*. Russia and China were to be peacefully and quietly integrated into the Western order.<sup>106</sup> When this is done, transition to the next phase of human civilization can then be orchestrated, economic structure transformed and population reduced, etc., warding off the catastrophic collapse of the current economic infrastructure and political institutions when oil production declines and mass starvation follows in. Of all these speculators in “conspiracies”, Grazyna Fosar and Franz Bludorf have come up with the most accurate description. They write in “Die Bilderberger Hinter den

---

104 As usual, the Iranian regime's accusation that the United States and the UK were behind the terrorist attacks in Ahvaz, and then in Zahedan in 2007, was accurate, while the US and UK denial disingenuous. The British Ahwazi Friendship Society spokesman Nasser Bani-Assad's statement that the bombings in Ahvaz were false flag attacks carried out by the Iranian regime to benefit its hardliners was typical of the approach of the American and allied clandestine services, already seen in the case of Putin: once you have used terrorists to attack your enemy, blame the attack on him. Meanwhile, the false flag attacks within the US and UK were made out to be real: real terrorist attacks were made into unreal, and unreal made into real.

105 As reported by Seymour Hersh in *The New Yorker*.

106 The contrast of Euro-American Moderates' vision with Cheney's radicalism is the context within which you should understand expositions like Pierre Hillard's *La foundation Bertelsmann et la gouvernance mondiale*. C.f. Hillard, “La foundation Bertelsmann au service d'un marché transatlantique et d'une gouvernance mondiale”, at <http://www.voltairenet.org/article160130.html>.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Kulissen der Macht”:<sup>107</sup>

Der britische Journalist Will Hutton vom Londoner Observer bezeichnete sie einmal als „Hohepriester der Globalisierung“, was inzwischen in Journalistenkreisen so etwas wie ein zweiter Name der Bilderberger geworden ist. *Das bedeutet nicht, dass die Bilderberger amerikanische Hegemonialpläne fördern würden, wie sie etwa der Doktrin des Bush-Clans entsprechen. Sie propagieren zwar auch eine Weltregierung, aber eher als multilaterale Lösung, unter dem Dach einer gestärkten UNO.*

So müssen die USA auf den Bilderberger-Treffen für ihre Politik durchaus auch manchmal „Prügel“ einstecken. Prominentester Kritiker der Bush- Politik im Outer Circle ist der Belgier Etienne Davignon. Auch Tony Blair wurde schon des Öfteren im Kreis der Bilderberger gescholten, zum Beispiel, weil er seine Zusage, in Großbritannien den Euro einzuführen, nicht einhalten konnte.

*... Die Bilderberger favorisieren als langfristiges Ziel, in den beiden Americas sowie in Asien Freihandelszonen nach Art der Europäischen Union zu schaffen. Am Ende soll dann die Welt im Grunde nur noch in drei große Machtblöcke aufgeteilt sein. Entsprechend soll es dann auch nur noch drei wichtige Währungen geben – den Dollar, den Euro und eine noch zu schaffende asiatische Einheitswährung. Wenn Sie sich fragen, wo bei diesen ganzen Sandkastenspielen eigentlich die Afrikaner bleiben – danach fragt bei den Bilderbergern offenbar niemand. Ihnen scheint nur die Dauerrolle des Käufers, Almosenempfängers und billigen Rohstofflieferanten zgedacht zu sein.*

But Cheney had never given up the planning for his “radical solution.” Throughout 2005 and 2006, the CIA, still disgruntled over Cheney's destruction of their decade-long work (building up Muslim extremists), continued to disrupt Cheney's “War on Terror”. (Europe would have supported them in this effort in any case.) The Agency tried to put an end to Cheney's pressure for them to destroy and torture their own proxies by leaking the extraordinary rendition program to the public. They used journalists or human rights investigators, both American and European, as proxies in this campaign. The journalists or investigators would be given hints as to where to look, and when all the secrets of CIA's participation in the War on Terror were exposed, it is as if the journalists and investigators had done it themselves – as if the CIA couldn't keep its secrets. CIA officers, said to be “disturbed” by the extraordinary rendition programs, met with US reporters, who then passed on the secrets to a certain Claudio Fava from Italy's left-wing Socialist Alliance. It is in this way that Fava was able to publish his investigative report in June 2006 exposing all the extraordinary rendition secret flights and hinting at the existence of secret prisons in Poland, Romania, Afghanistan, etc.<sup>108</sup> When you hear news about how

---

107 At: <http://fosar-bludorf.com/bilderberger.html>. Emphasis added.

108 Statewatch has preserved a copy of the European Parliament Interim Report which Claudio Fava has prepared on the alleged use of European countries by the CIA for the transportation and detention of prisoners:



## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

the American Civil Liberty Union, the Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and Human Rights First were suing the Bush administration on behalf of former detainees in American secret prisons or involved in the exposure of the extraordinary rendition program, you should ask yourself: why would those civil liberty organizations, all of which had been infiltrated by the CIA, or those human rights entities which were funded by none other than CIA's most important boss George Soros, want to disrupt CIA's secret operations in the War on Terror? Obviously, these lawsuits and the extraordinary efforts to expose the secret renditions and secret prisons were orchestrated by the CIA itself from behind the scene in a clandestine war it was waging against Dick Cheney. When a Human Rights Watch researcher John Sifton helped a German court to track down the CIA team which had carried out the rendition of the Lebanese-born German citizen El-Masri (supposedly mistaken by the CIA's counter-terrorism unit for a wanted “Al-Qaeda”), it was the CIA itself which had orchestrated this indictment of its contractors: since when did George Soros' employees begin to go after the CIA? You might want to look into the Italian court's indictment of the CIA team in the famous case of the rendition of Imam Abu Omar with a similar insight into CIA's true agendas. Although the local Imam (Hassan Mustafa Osama Nasr) was not originally a CIA asset or anything like that, the bungling of “unlawful” CIA operations by America's allies is always a dubious occurrence. When the European Parliament issued, in 2006, its final investigative report on CIA's extraordinary renditions over Europe, it was doing none other than what the CIA and the Moderates had wanted done.<sup>109</sup>

The CIA also leaked other secret programs in Cheney's “War on Terror”. For example, on June 23, 2006, James Risen and Eric Lichtblau at *New York Times* exposed the US government's use of SWIFT to track the flow of terrorists' money. The same with the leaking of Bush's authorization for the NSA to spy on all Americans without warrants. Despite the truce between the Europeans and Cheney's Radicals, Cheney was experiencing serious obstacles to the pursuit of his plan.

Even though the neocons' modus operandi was to deliberately create chaos, the goal was not just to create the climate of fear necessary for the public acceptance of new measures which were really designed to dominate them rather than to help them. The conspiracy theorists have loved to cite the example of how the Rothschild bloc used this method to introduce a central bank (the Federal Reserve) into the United States back in the early twentieth century: creating economic depression by tightening the money supply in society and then offering their central bank as the solution. Cheney's conception, on the other hand, was that chaos would allow the current plate to be wiped clean so that a completely new system may be built up from scratch in its place. This is the “shock doctrine” described in Naomi Klein's *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. In my earlier chapters and in “The story behind my experience with implantable microchips” I have described how Cheney was planning to carry out the project of a complete reorganization of human civilization (along with population reduction) as a way to create an “utopia” to replace the existing human civilization. This is his own radical take on the “New World Order”. Again, the ultimate justification for a new order of civilization

---

<http://www.statewatch.org/cia/reports/ep-cia-interim-report-english-final.pdf>.

109 The report can be seen at: <http://www.expose-the-war-profiteers.org/archive/government/2007/20070130.pdf>.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

was that the existing human civilization was unsustainable because it was constructed on hydrocarbon energy and was growing too large population-wise. While the majority of Bilderbergers did prefer a more centralized administration of human societies, human habits, and human life-processes in the new civilization in view of the fact that it was precisely “laissez faire” or lack of central planning which had brought our civilization to the point of collapse and extinction, Cheney's version distinguished itself by the radical degree to which human life shall be centralized through advanced technology. This you would see presently. His utopia differed so much from existing human society that it was only possible to institute it through a complete destruction of the current “corrupt” and unsustainable civilization. This complete destruction could only be brought about by a World War Three or total nuclear holocaust. Cheney plan differed from the Bilderberg plan, thus, in this: that he wanted his “War on Terrorism” to end in a planetary nuclear holocaust by provoking Russia to fire nuclear missiles upon the United States. This was why he insisted upon using nuclear bombs to wipe out Iran in an massive air attack: it was certainly not because the Iranians had built their nuclear weapon facilities too deep underground for conventional bombs to hit them.

It was not only the radical degree of centralization in Cheney's utopia with which the moderate Bilderbergers were uncomfortable, but also this method in implementation. As the excerpt from Fosar and Bludorf above has shown you, although the Bilderbergers had been dreaming of a new civilization as well, they were thinking of introducing it into reality only by piecemeal. They wanted to transform our civilization little by little into the new, desired form, over several decades. The *Weltstaat* was to be forged through slow integration of the North American Union, the European Union, the Asiatic Union... But here Cheney wanted to wipe out our civilization in a single stroke and to erect a radical *Weltstaat* on its ashes *all at once*. The CIA, the Moderates, and anyone in the Pentagon who was not insane quickly set out to disrupt this crucial step in the “Cheney Plan” by leaking its portions to the public. The result was Seymour Hersh's July 2006 “Last Stand: The military's problem with the President's Iran policy” in *The New Yorker*<sup>110</sup> and Daniel Ellsberg's September 2006 Harper Magazine article, both detailing how “several senior Air Force officers involved in the planning were appalled at how Iran was being set up for an unprovoked nuclear attack.” Iran's enrichment program was just a pretext; the real goal was to provoke Russia. (Recall that this was the plan exposed by the MSS director when I was about to fly to China and which landed in the UN Security Council on January 22 2008 as the “bargaining chip” for the Chinese and the Russians.) The same was the rational behind the missile defense system, a completely worthless entity if you want to prevent nuclear strikes with it. Meanwhile Cheney continued his plan to develop the “terrorist threat” into “nuclear terrorist threat”. In 2007, he was even planning to detonate Air Force's own nuclear bombs in the United States and then blame it on “terrorists” hiding in Iran. He would then bomb Iran with nuclear bombs. Insofar as Iran formed part of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, he expected China and Russia to retaliate with nuclear weapons. This plan was also foiled by some disobedient Air Force generals, who, this time, leaked it to the channel of “conspiracy theories” rather than to a mainstream press – because only conspiracy

---

110 Available at: [http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2006/07/10/060710fa\\_fact](http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2006/07/10/060710fa_fact).



## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

theorists were capable of believing that their nation's leader could be this malicious. Given the continual resistance from the military, the CIA, and the Moderates in general (most of the Democrats), Cheney resorted to sending clandestine operatives to Pakistan to sell nuclear bombs to the Islamic extremists hiding in the Pakistani-Afghanistan region so that they might have something nuclear with which to attack the United States.

Cheney began envisaging shuffling the American people into concentration camps in the event of nuclear strikes, and thus concurrently ordered the construction of massive FEMA camps all over the United States. After the experience of nuclear destruction of their cities, the American people would certainly be more receptive to the greater degree of government centralized control over their life (“dictatorship”). It seems that it is in order to produce pretext for his concentration camp program that Cheney had ordered, back in 2005, the orchestration of hurricane Katrina through military's secret weather modification technology. When Cheney ordered the military to create hurricane Katrina to destroy New Orleans, he purposely instructed the government to pretend incompetence, so that, when a million homeless people complained about government's inaction afterward, he could order the construction of concentration camps and the devise of various FEMA procedures which could later be used in the event of nuclear holocaust and to prepare the way to dictatorship which would constitute the transition period to his utopia.

Naomi Klein has, in her aforementioned work, analyzed the neocon strategy of allowing the poorer districts of New Orleans to be wiped clean so that corporations may come in to construct, on the ruins, a rational, planned society from scratch. But she was not a conspiracy theorist, and so she was not capable of suspecting that hurricane Katrina might actually have been created by the US government. Only the weirdest among the conspiracy folks (Alex Jones included) have been shouting on the Internet that the US government was capable of creating hurricanes, tsunamis, and earthquakes, as part of its weather warfare arsenal which it has built up since the 1960s. Only the weirdest documentaries like “That's impossible” dare mention US military's weather modification programs. How can normal people believe this? I believe it only because I have witnessed, with my own eyes, how the US government caused rains to fall and wind to blow with centimeter precision. But, as soon as the conspiracy theorists have proved themselves to be more sensitive to reality than the mainstream people, they degenerate into simplistic conclusion and mythology. They typically associate the weather warfare technology with the Alaska-based HAARP,<sup>111</sup> but I have to caution you that, while there is some truth in their rumors about HAARP, the military's weather modification program is certainly far more complex and various than a single mechanism and a single facility located in Alaska. (Since I am no expert in this, I shall leave the matter at that.) The conspiracy theorists make utterance such as: “The Illuminati plan is to create maximum chaos to instill maximum fear to create a sense of maximum dependency on authority. They want multi-leveled chaos to justify the imposition of marshal law, concentration camps, centralized dictatorship and the Orwellian global state in all its forms.”<sup>112</sup> Well

---

111 The High Frequency Active Auroral Research Program, which has a website at: <http://www.haarp.alaska.edu/>.

112 From Doug Yurchey's 2005 write-up at: [http://www.world-mysteries.com/doug\\_katrina.htm](http://www.world-mysteries.com/doug_katrina.htm).

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

said, but who were these Illuminati? The “plan” was real enough, but it was Dick Cheney's plan, and its function was to enable the transition to his “utopia”. Once again, the fault of the conspiracy theorists: they discover something about our psychopathic Cheney, confuse his radicalism with the rest of the elites, and refer to these real human beings as some nebulous collective entity, as if they were mythological creatures.

From Cheney's side, the neocon intellectuals fought back amidst all the leaks. Examine, for example, the books by which the neocon gang launched their counter-attack on the representative of the Moderates, George Soros: David Horowitz and Richard Poe's 2006 *The Shadow Party: How George Soros, Hilary Clinton, and Sixties Radicals seized control of the Democratic Party*; and on the CIA and the State Department: Kenneth Timmerman's 2007 *Shadow Warriors: The Untold Story of Traitors, Saboteurs, and the Party of Surrender*. It is interesting that Horowitz and Poe described Soros' network of the Moderates as rising and taking hold of the US government in exactly the same way in which the Radicals had done. In reality, Soros' “network” was the majority and supported by America's European allies – it hardly needed to “rise” and “take over”. Horowitz and Poe were neocon ideologues who projected the neocons' own malicious ways onto their political enemy in an effort to hide themselves. Next, the example of Timmerman is highly instructive. His accusation, which I have cited in the beginning, that the CIA and the State Department had been sabotaging the President's “War on Terrorism”, was actually correct, but he twisted the reason around. By taking Cheney's official stories as real (that America was under tremendous threat from terrorists and evil rogue states) he was able to make those “liberals” from the camp of the Moderates look like a bunch of incompetent and self-serving career bureaucrats who were willing to sell off their own country to evil invaders as a way to advance their own career: stereotype. Meanwhile, the real reasons for CIA's sabotage of Bush administration's agendas remained buried in depth not even the conspiracy theorists could fathom. While incensing those in the CIA, he was doing none other than using on the CIA those techniques which the CIA had used on the Russians and the Chinese. Nevertheless, Timmerman's book should be singled out as extremely educational, for here he has meticulously catalogued every one of CIA's (and its allies') operations to disrupt Cheney's War on Terrorism, from the beginning until the heydays of 2006 – mostly through leaks. Certainly, consult his book for a history of “CIA's war with Vice President Cheney”.

### The new “Cheney Plan”

I hope I have provided the context in which the confusion which has existed in the “conspiracy rumors” may at last be cleared up. There have been two competing versions of “New World Order”: the Euro-American Moderates' “World Union” which would be established through peaceful means and Dick Cheney's radical “utopia” which would be established through the orchestration of World War Three. The conspiracy theorists as a rule confuse the two versions, saying stupid things like “Whether America will invade Iran is decided in the Bilderberg meeting” (Alex Jones) when the Bilderberg Group has been against Cheney's plan to invade Iran or “The New World Order is a renewed version of

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Anglo-American world-domination” (Webster Tarpley) when this Anglo-American unilateralism is Cheney's approach which the Bilderberg Group opposed. Now, just when the Moderates and the Radicals were implementing both versions at the same time and fighting with each other over the matter, my case at the International Court of Justice happened (November 2007) which, as you have seen, had completely changed the course of the “Cheney Plan”. He now had a new plan, the “new Cheney Plan”. You have also seen how the MSS director, by exposing at the same time the greater plans of the Radicals (Cheney's orchestration of 911 attacks and plan to exterminate Iran with nuclear bombs) and the lesser plans of the Moderates (CIA's support of Islamic terrorists in the 1990s to wreck havoc on Chinese and Russian interests in Central Asia), had caused the Moderates (like the CIA) to become ever more reconciled with the Radicals (principally Cheney). The war between the Radicals and the Moderates – or CIA's war with Dick Cheney – was effectively put to an end.

China and Iran were now convicted as “terrorism-sponsoring states”; the UN was now entirely restructured to combat the non-existent “nuclear terrorism”; microchips were implanted into the bodies of governmental and intelligence officials around the world to prevent anyone from violating international laws and International Court's judgment; the United Nations and all governments around the world now had to adopt United States' proposal to keep all their operations and sessions in secret, away from public knowledge, as a way to “not cause panic” among the common people, thus extending the American style of “shadow government” (super secretive government) to the entire world. As you have seen, once the ICJ Madam President ordered the Chinese government to help, under obligation from UN Resolution 1373, United States reorder international relations and achieve its nefarious agendas one more time since 911 attacks, these were Cheney's accomplishments achieved through the sacrifice of the MSS director. The world was almost perfect in his eyes: ordinary people were now required by UN Resolutions to live in the state of illusion, and anyone who by miracles awakened to the harsh truth that he was not living in reality but in an illusory world manufactured by the elites would have to be labeled “insane”. Furthermore, the specialized nanochip system had been installed in the International Court, and Cheney had ordered his protégé M. Chertoff to sue Russia in the wake of Russo-Georgian war... Meanwhile he had microchipped Obama and all his important cabinet members – in their brain – to render them his remotely controlled robots, while he himself retreated deep behind the scene. The groundwork was now set for him to orchestrate nuclear holocaust through the International Court system *with its very sanction*. Our former Vice President's plan was to get Putin and his top officials convicted in the International Court and microchipped in the brain, allowing him to remotely control them to overreact to a variety of causes such as the missile defense system and to attempt a “first strike” against the United States.

As I have noted, the nanochip system for remotely controlling people was interfaced with a super computer. This super computer, once it was interfaced with the mind-reading computer, had the power to collect all the thoughts of the implantees and, mapping out their desires and priorities, then coordinate their free wills in such a way that the final outcome of their actions together would be one which the Master in control of the super computer had desired. In other words, this computer had the

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

capacity to map out the respective goals, the respective usual ways to obtain these goals, and the respective responses to environmental stimuli among a group of people and then coordinate their responses and actions to obtain their goals in such a way that they would end up accomplishing what the Master had wanted them to accomplish. I'll have more to say about this super computer presently and in the upcoming narrative. This super computer program could for example be used to calculate the motions of more than three planets given their gravitational interactions together, and was now picked up by Cheney for his plan to start World War Three – once he would have established remote-control capacity over the disobedient elites of the world. That is, the super computer would be used to automatically direct the remotely controlled elites to play out the script of nuclear holocaust which Cheney's “small cadre of elites” would have written and fed into the computer.<sup>113</sup> The “script” for the end of the world which Cheney wanted to feed into the computer would also include a host of other natural disasters and destabilizing events. He would – with the help of the computer – orchestrate disasters at home to destabilize the United States (such as arming the Mexican drug cartels clandestinely and sweeping them into the United States to destabilize America's southwest<sup>114</sup>) and economic and financial crises to destabilize the world economy (such as secretly commanding the Chinese to collapse the US dollar). Hyperinflation, drug cartels' violence, terrorist attacks, all this in an election year, perhaps to result in the suspension of elections. Since nobody knew that the US military was already in possession of technology to manipulate the weather and to cause earthquakes, he would also secretly orchestrate hurricanes, earthquakes, and tsunamis to all occur at the same time. Wars, economic crises, organized crimes, natural disasters, and finally nuclear holocaust – everyone would think that the Biblical prophecy about the end of the world was being fulfilled and the evangelicals would perceive that Christ's second coming was about to happen. Cheney's goal was indeed to orchestrate an end of the world and the beginning of utopia in the same way in which it was predicted in the Bible. For example, Mark 13:6 - 27:

Watch out that no one deceives you.  
Many will come in my name, claiming,  
“I am he”, and will deceive many.  
When you hear of wars and rumors of wars,

---

113 Since the computer controls you, whoever is in control of the computer can control you to do anything you *can* do, like instructing you to bump your head against the wall, without your having any power to resist (since your free will is hijacked). Then imagine the chips are planted in the brain of all your friends and family members. Your “programmer” then feeds into the computer the script of “Romeo and Juliet” and instructs the computer that you shall be Romeo, she Juliet, and the computer will control you and your friends and family to play out the drama of “Romeo and Juliet”. You guys will play out the drama without any ability to do otherwise, *since the computer controls what thoughts you are allowed to think*. More on this below.

114 Given Cheney's personality, he must have had many hard core figures in the Mexican drug cartels microchipped so that they would become his personal remotely controlled robots. These robots could then be controlled to lure others in their cartels to the “traps” where the latter would also get microchipped. In this way the Mexican drug cartels would eventually all secretly fall under American control. When it came time for Cheney to orchestrate the End of the World, then, he would control the cartels to cause mayhem in the border regions between Mexico and the United States so as to destabilize the US southwest.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”  
Lawrence C. Chin  
October 2011 – March 2013

do not be alarmed. Such things must happen,  
but the end is still to come.

Βλέπετε μή τις υμας πλανήσῃ.  
Πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου  
λέγοντες ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι  
καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν.  
Ὅταν δε ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων,  
μὴ θροεῖσθε. Δεῖ γενέσθαι,  
ἀλλ' οὐπω τὸ τέλος.

Nation will rise against nation,  
and kingdom against kingdom.  
There will be earthquakes in various places,  
and famines.  
These are the beginning of birth pains.

Ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος  
καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν.  
Ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους,  
ἔσονται λιμοὶ.  
Ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα.

Pray that this will not take place in winter,  
because those will be days of distress  
unequaled from the beginning,  
when God created the world, until now  
And never to be equaled again.  
If the Lord had not cut short those days,  
no one would survive.  
But for the sake of the elect,  
whom he has chosen,  
he has shortened them...

προσεύχεσθε δε ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμῶνος.  
Ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλιψίς  
οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως  
ἣν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς ἕως τοῦ νῦν  
καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται.  
Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν κύριος τὰς ἡμέρας,

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”  
Lawrence C. Chin  
October 2011 – March 2013

ουκ αν εσώθη πασα σάρξ.  
Αλλα δια τους εκλεκτους  
ους εξελέξατο  
εκολόβωσεν τας ημέρας.

But in those days, following that distress,  
“the sun will be darkened,  
and the moon will not give its light;  
the stars will fall from the sky,  
and the heavenly bodies will be shaken.”

Αλλα εν εκείναις ταις ημέραις μετα την θλιψιν εκείνην  
ο ηλιος σκοτισθήσεται,  
και η σελήνη ου δώσει το φέγγος αυτης,  
και οι αστέρες έσονται εκ του ουρανου πίπτοντες,  
και αι δυνάμεις αι εν τοις ουρανοις σαλευθήσονται.

#### Cheney's “utopia”: a computer-run mechanized earth

Cheney's final goal was the establishment of a microchipped society. An utopia made of microchipped people was an extension of the idea of embedding RFID chips universally on all manufactured products for the purpose of centralized inventory.<sup>115</sup> The Department of Defense had been using active RFID chips to tag shipping containers moving throughout its supply chain since the 1990s. The private sector soon adopted the idea and funded MIT's Auto-ID Center in 1999. The new RFID technology developed there was widely adopted by private businesses (starting with Walmart) and the Defense Department starting from 2003. The key idea involved in the RFID project which Cheney wanted to extend into an “utopia” was “Internet of Objects”.

The vision underlying automatic identification (or Auto-ID) is the creation of an “Internet of Objects.” In such a highly connected network, devices dispersed through an enterprise can talk to each other – providing real-time information about the location, contents, destination, and ambient conditions of assets. This communication allows much-sought-after machine-to-machine communication and decision-making, rendering humans unnecessary and mistakes a thing of the past. Today, Auto-ID can track not only enterprise assets, but also the movement of products, containers, vehicles, and other assets across vast geographic areas.<sup>116</sup>

The advantage of RFID technology, and the essence of “Internet of Objects”, is that, when a RFID tag

---

115 You can glean a lot of information about the RFID chips in commercial use from Patrick J. Sweeney's simple book, *RFID for Dummies* (2005).

116 Ibid.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

is embedded in every object in the world – keep in mind the fact that the world we live in, urban civilization, is just an universe of objects, either consumer products or machines – this will allow for corporations to track every object's whereabouts and condition in real time and at all times, that the tracking is error-free since it is performed entirely by machines, that the action taken in respect to each object is also decided and performed entirely by machines (computers), eliminating the possibility of human errors, and that corporations, when they share with each other the information they have gathered about their objects, may then pool all the information into a centralized database. This would make possible the centralized administration of all the objects which make up the machine-world in which we have enveloped ourselves and which we call “civilization”.

It is this idea of super-efficient centralized administration of all objects in the world which had so impressed the moderate Bilderbergers as to motivate them to fancy the “Internet of People” – the microchipping of all human beings in our world with RFID “tags” in order to bring them under a most efficient sort of centralized administration. But Cheney would go further. The elites in the West (that is, the Moderates) were generally open to the plan to microchip all human beings so that they could manage human beings in the same way in which ranch owners and factory farms managed their cattle and pets. In Chapter 4 of his *La Verdadera Historia del Club Bilderberg*, “Hacia una sociedad sin dinero en efectivo”, Daniel Estulin has traced the idea of human microchipping to its other origin, the development of paperless financial transaction. The financial elites have been envisaging for a long time the replacement of anonymous paper money with digital money like credit cards which registers the identity of the buyer and the seller. This allows for the possibility of centralized administration of all human economic transactions. The Bilderbergers were generally receptive to the idea of the implantation in all human beings of RFID microchips in which is stored digitally all information regarding the person's identity, financial resources, medical condition and history – everything about him or her.<sup>117</sup> As a person walks through society, the machines embedded in his or her environment everywhere will pick up information regarding his or her condition, movement, transactions – everything about him or her. All anonymity could be eliminated. The “Internet of things” can now be enmeshed with “Internet of people”: all internal operations of the grand machine called “civilization” – the movement of, and transactions between, every thing and everyone, like the metabolism of an organism – will then become entirely transparent for the management on the top. Even before universal microchipping, the increasing use of credit cards and electronic communication is already enabling a

---

117 Daniel Estulin, *ibid.*, thus cites Texe Marrs: “En primer lugar – escribe Texe Marrs en *Millennium: Peace, Promises, and the Day They Take Our Money Away* – el mundo se verá obligado a utilizar un nuevo sistema de identificación internacional informatizado que permitirá un acceso inmediato a los datos personales digitalizados como detalles bancarios, clasificación crediticia o situación laboral. Todas las personas dispondrán de nuevas tarjetas de identificación personal para que el nuevo sistema funcione... Poco después de eso, todas las tarjetas de identificación personal, tarjetas de débito, permisos de conducir y tarjetas de crédito se aglutinarán en una sola Tarjeta Inteligente Multiuso de tecnología avanzada con un circuito integrado de sistemas empotrados capaces de almacenar tanto dinero electrónico como información referente a la identidad personal... Casi simultáneamente a este acontecimiento, el mundo se quedará sin dinero y la moneda se ilegalizará para que todo lo que debamos comprar y vender lo hagamos mediante operaciones informáticas, es decir, simplemente una serie de números flotando en el ciberespacio.”



The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

rudimentary form of centralized administration of human beings. The “Internet of people” through microchipping is the next step.<sup>118</sup> It is as part of the project for centralized administration of human beings that such programs as Total Information Awareness must be understood. (Of course it had nothing to do with terrorism.)

When the DARPA nano brain chip system came into service in the middle of 2008, our Vice President began envisaging an expansion of this original conception of centralized administration of human beings (or the “Internet of people”) to its utmost perfection. I have earlier written down a rudimentary description of this nano brain chip system, both in “The story behind my experience with implantable microchips” and Appendix 2 to “Karin's Meetups”. I have described how, in the most extreme case, a combination of these nano chips implanted into a person's brain can allow the controllers in the control center to remotely control the subject without his being able to resist in any way at all. The implanted person would be reduced to a robot remotely controlled by some powerful figures hidden behind the scene somewhere. I have described how, in this most extreme case, the remote control of the person is accomplished through artificially induced command hallucination. I have also noted that the remotely controlled person would look so natural that nobody would be able to tell he is no longer himself but is being remotely controlled to perform his actions, and that the remotely controlled person himself wouldn't know it unless he is told about it.

The nano brain chips which DARPA had invented to remotely control human beings was the culmination of mind-control researches which the US government had been conducting in various spheres since the 1950s. In the following narrative, “The conspiracy in the International Criminal Court”, I will also introduce you to a weaker form of this system, which consists simply in a single type of nano brain chip designed to pick up the global patterns of electrical activities in the brain of the implanted person and to transmit the information back to the computer inside the control center which would then decode the patterns. This nano brain chip was originally designed to read your thoughts, in other words – when the computer decodes the patterns of activities in your brain, it is translating them into the “thoughts” you are having, like decoding letters or sounds into their meanings in speech recognition programs, or the decoding of “signifiers” into “signifieds”, to use the language of (Ferdinand Saussure's) structural linguistics or Lacanian psychoanalysis. This is the type of nano brain chip with which I would be implanted in late 2009, and this type was sufficient to allow our Vice President to construct the centralized control of human beings in the absolute degree which he had desired for his utopia.

In the main narrative I will provide a description of the exact mechanism by which this nano brain chip allows your thoughts and desires to be read by a computer – and to be controlled by a computer: its basis in brain physiology, the use of a “mind-reading dictionary” to decode the human brain's activities,

---

118 “Y aquí lo tiene: un microordenador chip puede implantarse bajo su piel, y las estadísticas demográficas pueden leerse con un escáner electrónico. Se dispondrá todo para un Gobierno que desea controlar los movimientos de todos y cada uno de nosotros, hasta que lo sepan todo de usted.”

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

etc. In this preface I will simply assume that you believe this is possible – those of you who find the very idea of “computer reading your thoughts” to be fantasy should “google” “brain-machine interface” or “brain-computer interface” to see for yourself that this technology has already been in use in its rudimentary form in the civilian world, notably in medicine – and show you how Cheney was originally planning to use the thought-reading nano brain chips to construct an “absolute utopia”. His conception was that this nano chip shall be implanted into the brain of every single person on the planet – in fact, into the brain of every single animal, and even into every single insect. A super computer would then be set up to read, collect, and store the thoughts and desires of every single human being and every single animal on the planet. In other words, the government shall program a most sophisticated giant computer to access the thoughts of the hundreds of millions of people who will still remain in the utopia. Now, you are probably thinking of this system along the line of Total Information Awareness: that the giant computer will intercept every thought which every person has thought, store it, and “flag” a thought when a person is “thinking incorrectly” – like how NSA's Echelon will “flag” your communication when you make threats over the phone. Certainly it could do that, and it would certainly be integrated with the Total Information Awareness system so that the government official, when he singles you out, can not only see what you have bought, eat, said on the phone, and watched on the Internet, but also examine what you have thought. But no, the system is far more pernicious than that. It's about controlling your thoughts and desires so that you will only think and want what the government has programed you to think and want. The super computer can make you think and desire whatever it wants you to think and desire by simply reversing the process of mind-reading. While the nanochip in your brain allows the computer to decode, and read, your thoughts by picking up the pattern of electrical activities in your brain, it can also allow the computer to remotely control you by artificially inducing the pattern of electrical activities in your brain which would correspond to the actions, thoughts, or desires which the computer wants you to perform or think or want.

Once the super computer could collect all the thoughts read from the chips inside the head of everyone and also control his or her behavior, thoughts, and desires, it would, by mapping out the desires and priorities of all human beings, then coordinate their free wills in such a way that the final outcome of their actions combined would be a predetermined one, namely the “script” which the small cadre of elites will have written. That is to say, everyone will be remotely controlled to play out the daily life of the utopia which Cheney's small cadre of elites will have predetermined. The greatest advantage of the system is that everything is automated, just like the RFID system: the elites need not concern themselves with what this or that person has thought or should do; they need only feed the “total picture” or the “script” into the computer, and the computer will decide on its own who should do what at what time in order to result in the “total picture”.

This is the ultimate form of “Internet of people”, and you cannot appreciate its horrifying nature until you have grasped its power when, in the utopia, the “Internet of people” will be thoroughly integrated with the ultimate form of “Internet of objects” and the ultimate form of “Internet of nature”. The use of RFID technology to automatically track, and decide actions on, all the objects in the world was only the

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

rudimentary form of the “Internet of objects”. The fact is that the US government has already in the past decade accomplished the ultimate form of “Internet of objects” by building all over the nation Homeland Security “control centers” whose computer system is connected to every electronic machinery in the country so that, from there, Homeland Security personnel would have the ability to remotely control every single electronic device in the country – from your personal computer to your cellphone to the ticket machine in the metro station.<sup>119</sup> On the other hand, the US government has also developed technology for a complete “mechanization of nature”. What I’m referring to here is a technology by which those in the control center could actually remotely control every single movement in what you think is the natural environment. As I have hinted, the lawsuit between the United States and Russia has allowed me to witness for myself, from late 2009 onwards, how from those Homeland Security control centers government officials could remotely control the weather above me – causing rain to fall at their whim or wind to blow at any particular location of their choosing, and certainly hurricane to wipe out any town – and even such small things as the falling of leaves. That is, hiding in the control center, they could cause the wind to blow on me at the whim of their will, and direct an exact number of leaves (even just one leaf) to fall from the tree in front of me. This was done obviously using one of those weather modification technologies which the US government had been developing for decades. As I have noted, I’m not versed in the scientific basis of the weather modification programs and so shall leave the matter at that. When the government proceeded to microchip (or “nanochip”) even every animal and insect in the environment, the control center would have acquired the power to remotely cause the birds to fly or dogs to bark or run. Just as in the case of the “Internet of people”, a giant computer can be brought in to automatically control the weather, the animals, and the insects, and coordinate their movements according to, or in such a way as to accomplish, a pre-written “script”. This is the ultimate form of the “mechanization of nature” or the “Internet of nature”: the entire nature can be interconnected and controlled to conform to a predetermined total picture. Again, everything is automated; you need only to feed a “script” into the computer and the computer will decide on its own where to cause rain and where to blow hurricane so as to actualize your “script”. Imagine when the same thing is done for all the machines in the world and all three domains – the automated control of all people, the automated control of all nature, and the automated control of all objects – were integrated into a single system, to be run by a single computer program according to a single predetermined “script”: this was Cheney's conception of his “utopia”. The small cadre of elites – led by Cheney – who would write the “script” would thereby make themselves into God. As I have

---

<sup>119</sup> The original plan was the integration and centralization of the nation's infrastructure. This is possible because the computer – or digital or processor – revolution has changed the very nature of machines. Anything digital can be remotely controlled, unlike anything that runs on steam. The coming of the digital age thus means also the era of the “centralization of machines in government's control centers.” This phenomenon has passed unnoticed by most people because most ordinary people do not become targets for those who have got themselves into the control centers. Any of the big government hot shots that have insinuated themselves into the control centers can make the life of anyone under surveillance unlivable by constantly remotely turning off the machine he is using at the moment. The hot shot official is in effect the modern equivalent to the “god” in the mythology of tribal people, able to remotely turn off traffic lights, read anyone's emails, turn your computer on and off for entertainment, etc. And quite often even more capricious because some of the government officials who have got themselves inside the control centers do not have good characters at all. Below, you will see that Cheney's dream was precisely to perfect this “god” into “God”.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

noted in “The story behind my experience with implantable microchips”, Cheney was dreaming nothing other than his own “deification” through technology.

The “script” was thus some sort of “destiny for everyone and everything”, the “overall plan” for everyone, everything, and every part of nature, akin to the Christian conception of “God's plan” for the world or all His creation. Below, and in the following exposition of the scientific principles behind mind-reading, I will explain why it is that the person under mind-control through the nanochips implanted in his or her brain will not notice that he or she is being controlled – will not notice that the desires and thoughts he or she is having in his or her head are activated by a foreign computer rather than by his or her own “free will”. At this point you should only understand that no one in this utopia will ever notice that everything he or she does or encounters has been controlled, and preordained, by some unseen human beings hiding in a control center. When you have a nano brain chip inside your brain, you will only think and desire what the giant computer inside the control center is allowing you to think and desire – you will never be able to think and desire something which the giant computer does not want you to think and desire *because the computer controls what pattern of activities your brain will produce*. In this way whoever is programing the computer is also indirectly programing you, deciding what you will ever think, want, and do for your entire life. The Programmer is thus your God. Of course the Programmer does not have the time to decide what thoughts you are going to have for the rest of your life – that is why the system has to be entirely automated – he will not even have the time to decide on the overall shape of your life – even though he could – insofar as he, as the elite, has to manage, not just your life, but the lives of five hundred million to a billion other people who are living in this wonderful “utopia”. The Programmer simply writes the “script” – the overall outcome – for the whole society. For example, if the Programmer writes, and feeds into the super computer, the script “There shall be every year 10.065 million automobile accidents with 26,365 fatalities,<sup>120</sup> there shall be 3,567 murders, 1,118,954 thefts, and 513,235 assaults per year,<sup>121</sup> unemployment rate shall remain 5.2%, mean income per household shall be 33,000 Amero (the new global currency) per year, birthrate shall be 2.1 babies per woman”, the super computer will coordinate every person's movement and every movement in the weather, etc., to produce exactly this many accidents a year, and will coordinate every person's desires and movements to result in exactly this many murders and this much unemployment per year, this much money made per person, and 2.1 babies born from each woman – all with pinpoint accuracy. The pinpoint accuracy in the overall picture implies a pinpoint accuracy in the details of any single person's life. In order for you to forge, together with your fellow citizens, a society which conforms in the end to the overall statistics which the Programmer has laid down, the super computer will have calculated who you will marry and at what age, what job you will hold, how much money you will make for the rest of your life, whether you will get into an accident and die and at what time, *whether you are law-abiding or a criminal*, etc., all in coordination with the same “life plans” which it will have calculated for all your other fellow citizens, and it will control you to live out, with

---

120 Census Bureau's statistics for automobile accidents in the United States between 1990 to 2009 is available at:

<http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s1103.pdf>.

121 Based on statistics of crimes in the US: <http://www.disastercenter.com/crime/uscrime.htm>.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

pinpoint accuracy, this life it has calculated for you – *without your having any power to cause yourself to deviate from it however slightly* because this computer has control over your “free will” – the patterns of activities which your brain produces at each moment. It is not so cruel because everyone will live on *believing erroneously* that everything that has happened is “natural” – not just because the nanochips are so well designed that the implantees cannot tell the difference between their “natural” thoughts and thoughts which are remotely controlled, but also because people do not know that their government has the power to control their freewill, the weather above them, the movement of animals in their environment, and all the machines they will never use. People will have the illusion that they are acting on their free will, that they have control over their destiny, that the world is what they make of it, and that the shape of the world is the result of their own efforts in combination with the accidents of nature. They will not know that their destiny and the shape of the world are now entirely decided by the small cadre of elites whom they don't even know to exist. Those who believe in God may attribute everything to God's will; but nobody will ever attribute everything to government's, or Dick Cheney's, will – *the will of the Master Programmer*.

This is the “utopia” which your revered Vice President of the United States had begun conceiving starting from late 2008. It is a society which functions entirely orderly, efficiently, and rationally (according to a predetermined “rational plan”) – like a ticking clock, a big machine – despite ordinary people's natural inclination to resist any orderly formation of their life against their will. This is utopia in the absolute sense because people are controlled like robots down to the last details of their life and yet they are happy and feel themselves “free”. It is a society that is secretly run by a giant super computer from behind the scene – in fact the entire earth is secretly run by this giant super computer.

It is important that the entire earth is “programmed” along with human society. The “utopia” only works – the pinpoint accuracy in the fulfillment of the “script” for human society is only possible – when both nature and the animal world are integrated with the human world: when there is an Internet between people, objects, and nature – all together. Similarly, every little detail of your life can be determined by the super computer with pinpoint accuracy only when everyone you ever meet is also so determined like you – when there is an Internet of people. The reason for this lies in the inherent limitation in the ability of the super computer to remotely control human beings using the thought-reading nanochips alone. The super computer's control of your life through controlling the patterns of activities in your brain means that it can only remotely control you to do what you know how to do, to say what you know how to say, to feel what you know how to feel. Not just that: it can only remotely control you to do what you usually do, to say what you usually say, to feel what you usually feel. This is because the thought-reading nanochip system was originally designed to read people's thoughts by picking up and translating their brain activities, and its ability to remotely control people by reversing the process was a side product of DARPA's research. The DARPA scientists have discovered, while working on the technology, that the computer which received, and decoded, the information about experimentees' brain activities could transmit the information back to the brain, in which case the brain was reading information off the computer rather than the computer reading information off the brain.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

The nanochip can stimulate the brain as well as pick up information about the brain. In this way, the computer can remotely control your thoughts by selecting, among your own thoughts, what thoughts you should think. So basically the computer is telling you which thoughts among all of your thoughts you should think. Thus, you can say that the computer is thinking for you with your own thoughts. The advantage is that, since the thoughts which you are remotely controlled to think are just your own thoughts, you won't notice that you are being remotely controlled. You would think you still have your free will, whereas, in reality, the computer has hijacked your free will. The limitation is that those of you who have no desires for cruelty inside you will not be remotely controlled by the computer to suddenly act cruelly toward others, just as you cannot be remotely controlled to understand the details of quantum mechanics if you have never previously acquired the background knowledge in theoretical physics and mathematics that is necessary to understanding quantum theories. To put it in another way: the computer cannot control you to lift up 200 pounds of material if you have never grown the necessary muscles on your arm; in the same way, the computer cannot control you to have thoughts or emotions for which the physical basis – the neurological pathways – have not yet existed in your brain. When you learn high grade calculus, you are physically changing the neurological pathways in your brain, which then allow your brain to be capable of producing patterns of activities that correspond to the understanding of quantum mechanics. Only then can government's super computer control you to understand the details of quantum mechanics by activating the necessary activities in your brain. It is either through a feat of genetics or childhood abuse that a specific pattern of neuro-pathways has grown in the brain of a psychopath – pattern which constitutes the physical basis for his sadistic and antisocial desires. Only then will he feel pleasures from inflicting pain on others. A Gandhi whose brain is not wired up in the way of the antisocial's brain would not know how to derive pleasure from inflicting pain on others and therefore cannot be controlled by government's computer to kill people for pleasure. As I will emphasize throughout the following narrative “The conspiracy in the International Criminal Court”, the thought-reading nanochips which the Russian government has required the US government to implant widely in the American population around me can only allow the Russians to control everyone to do what it is in their nature to do. The same with Cheney's utopia. If the Programmer decides that you will have to live the life of a serial killer when you have never known the pleasure of cruelty, the super computer will have to gradually develop your thoughts and feelings to the point where you can begin to feel pleasure from causing others to suffer. It will have to control the movements of your environment in such a way that your brain will respond to them by forming neuro-pathways which will allow you to feel pleasures from the sufferings of others. It can be done, but it will take time. If you have the potential for sadism, but have never developed or explored it, and are living as a peaceful citizen because your life has been fine and you are happy, the super computer has only to control all the people around you to deny you what you want from them, to control all the machines around you to malfunction when you use them, and to control the social milieu in which you pursue your life goals to obstruct your pursuit. In time, as you have become increasingly unhappy, you will begin exploring sadism and causing harms to others as your compensation. It does not happen overnight, for it takes time for the neurons in your brain to form new pathways. At every stage of your increasing unhappiness, the super computer will acquire the ability to activate in your mind thoughts of

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

hurting others, until one day it can finally control you to engage yourself in serial-killing. A sort of conditioning. In other words, since what you are depends on how your fellow citizens and your environment, whether natural or machinery, respond to you (and it of course depends on how you respond to their responses), the super computer, or the Programmer, can program your life with pinpoint accuracy only when it, or he, can program at the same time the life of everyone else, the functioning of all the machines, and even the movements of the animal world and the weather above you. For what you are is the result of an interactive process: even the weather has to be controlled because your mood is partly conditioned by the weather above you and the climate in your region. On the other hand, if you don't have the potential for sadism – some human beings don't – your Programmer may never be able to command the super computer to condition, and control, you to live out the life of a serial killer. On the other hand, if you have been “chipped” with the set of nanochips which reduce you to the state of command hallucination, you *can* be remotely controlled to kill people even when you have no potential for cruelty at all inside you.

The horror of the utopia lies in the fact that it will have completely eliminated any control you may normally have over your destiny – over what you want to make of your life. Since Cheney's goal in the construction of this utopia was, as you shall see, to create an economic system with the greatest degree of efficiency and sustainability, and a theocracy of the greatest social order, which amounted to a social structure with the greatest degree of control over the individuals, if the super computer has calculated that 0.005 percent of the population will have to be serial killers for the sake of this greatest degree of economic sustainability and theocratic harmony (creating public confidence in the police, in the central authority, and in God, for example) and decided that you shall be one among the 0.005 percent since you have the potential, it will program you to become a serial killer, to get caught, and to spend the rest of your life in prison while carrying on an infamous reputation, all without your having the slightest power to resist falling into such fate. You may have graduated from university, you may have fallen in love with the greatest woman, you may have shown great talents for the arts with which you want to make a good name for yourself – none of that matters: at certain point you will discover yourself giving all these up, committing crimes, and getting arrested while everyone, including yourself, thinks it's your own fault. In other words, if it is determined that you must live an unhappy life in a prison house for the “good” of the whole society, you will be controlled to live an unhappy life and you will never be happy no matter how hard you try. You may consider the “script” for this most efficient and theocratic society to be a sort of “computer program”, since it is a program – the destinies of everyone and everything – that the super computer has calculated which will bring about the overall statistics of everything on which the Programmer has decided. When Vice President Cheney came across, during late 2008, this latest nanochip-based mind-control technology which DARPA had developed, he wanted to transpose its use and develop it into a general population measure which consisted in bringing all human thoughts themselves under a centralized administration, and ridding the common people of their free will once and for all. In other words, he began contemplating on a plan to turn all human beings – along with all animals and all of nature – into parts of a computer program without their even knowing it. The entire earth will be reduced to a “Program” secretly run by a super computer



## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

– a Program which he had instructed his technicians and the super computer to compose according to his vision of what a perfect society should look like. The unfortunate fact in the whole matter was that Cheney's interest lay in the theocratic order of his utopia, not in his subjects' happiness. I will explain later in the narrative what exactly this theocratic utopia was to consist in; Cheney was basically satisfied only with a society where everyone believed in our Judeo-Christian God, as either a fundamentalist evangelical Christian or as an Orthodox Jew. Now, because of this, although, insofar as everyone was controlled like a robot through the hijack of his or her freewill, the citizens of the new world will not suffer the kind of discomfort which the subjects in George Orwell's *1984* constantly experience, the “utopia” will not be geared toward maintaining its citizens in perpetual pleasures either, like it is the case in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. Although Cheney will have the power to completely eliminate crimes, disease, and suffering in general with this “technology of utopia”, he will not do so. All the accidental and human-caused misfortunes in our life he will make sure that we still have in our “perfect world” – by programing these into the “script” so that the super computer will make them happen according to the statistics which his small cadre of elites – the Master Programmers – will have laid down. Cheney's interest lay in replacing all natural misfortunes and disasters with artificial ones which his elite cadre will program into the our world. (This is why in my illustration of what the statistics in the “script” might look like I have used the US Census Bureau's actual statistics as my basis.) What is “perfect” about our utopia is therefore the fact that everything is artificial – decided by human genius – and not the fact that our happiness will shoot through the roof. Nothing will ever be left to chance anymore – that's why the world is “perfect”. Cheney has wanted this way not only in order to hide the operation of the super computer from ordinary people – everyone is supposed to mistake the computer's actions in controlling everything for God's actions – but also because misfortunes and unhappiness are religiously didactic (showing us God's punishment, etc.) and so reinforce people's belief in the all-powerful God.

Cheney's “script” for his utopia, as “God's Plan”, must also define a historical dimension for the new humanity, not just a static statistics of its daily functioning. For example, to solidify their faith in the Biblical God, Cheney may have wanted to include in his “script” the instruction to make humanity replay those mythical episodes of Israel which we read about in the Old Testament. The super computer will then remotely control the new human collective to play out Biblical history – and no one will have the slightest power to resist becoming part of this “sacred history”. I'm not saying that this is actually what Cheney has planned to do. I know only that Cheney's “script” for the new humanity does not consist only in a static society without change, but defines also a history, a history that is religiously didactic in the same way in which theologians have discovered history (as recorded in the Bible and after Christ) to be so. History teaches us about God's Plan and strengthens our faith. (Cheney would orchestrate history as, to use Lessing's conception, God's “education for humankind”: *die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*.) As for the specific details of this didactic “sacred history”, I don't really know, but am making a plausible guess. I would however like to impress upon you the fact that Cheney has been fond of orchestrating world-history as if he were God and would not be satisfied until all the stupid people in the world mistake his own orchestration for “God's plan.”

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

DARPA's ultimate form of mind-control technology is only possible because of certain facts concerning how the human brain works – that its functioning is universal across the human species despite gender, racial, and linguistic divides, allowing for the possibility of its complete decipherment, and that human thoughts and emotions operate according to strict rules so that, as long as the person is rational and unreflective, it is possible for a computer to predict the evolution of his or her thoughts and emotions far into the future based on their current state – which I have not explained here but which I will explain in the exposition below of the scientific and engineering bases of DARPA's mind-reading technology. In laying out the bare principles in Cheney's original conception, neither have I touched upon the technical difficulties in the implementation of the idea. Cheney thought of the possibility of a computer-run earth, his “utopia”, when he noticed the potential in integrating various military technologies and programs that were already existent by late 2008: the nanochip-based mind-reading and mind-control technology; the integrated monitoring and command of nation's infrastructure (the centralized command of all electronics from Homeland Security control centers); the militarization of animals and insects<sup>122</sup>; and weather modification programs. He had discovered that he could create “God” by expanding each program to universal application and then integrating all of them into a single “Program”. The expansion of each program itself required the integration of various sub-programs. For example, the programming of your entire life – reducing you to part of a computer program – which I have described requires the integration of nanochip-based mind-reading technology with a super computer capable of calculating simultaneously the evolution of your thoughts and the thoughts of, say, a hundred million other people. Then, the integrated mass-mind-control program had to be interfaced with all these other programs for controlling nature, animals, and electronics, while an “event coordinator” program had to be interfaced with them all. Cheney had ordered DARPA to work out the various integrations and interfaces needed for the construction of his “utopia”, but, before the scientists could complete the work, he was busted by the Russians in November 2009. “Cheney's utopia” which I have described for you was in the planning, but its technological basis was not yet created.

Cheney's plan for a “computerized microchipped utopia” is the most top-secret information I'm leaking to you here. I'm not sure if you could thoroughly appreciate the meaning of what Dick Cheney was originally thinking about doing to you – assuming you are one of those who are meant to survive the End of the World. The old human being which nature has evolved on planet earth is now obsolete, thanks to mighty American technology. A new human being has come onto the scene, who is no more than an extension of an United States super computer – the super computer stores all the thoughts and emotions you have ever had, derives the algorithms according to which your thoughts and emotions

---

<sup>122</sup> DARPA has also been implanting biochips into insects to convert them into remotely controlled “spy bugs”.

Interestingly, there are again conspiracy folks who have been talking about this “militarization of insects” on the Internet. For example: “VIGILANCIA SOBRE LA POBLACION CON TECNOLOGIA MILITAR: DRONES, PAJAROS E INSECTOS ESPIA”, at <http://teatrevesadespertar.wordpress.com/2012/01/23/vigilancia-sobre-la-poblacion-con-tecnologia-militar-drones-e-insectos-espia/>.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

operate and evolve, and calculates, and guides, the evolution of your thoughts and emotions for your entire life along with all your fellow human beings. The super computer thinks your thoughts for you as it does for all humanity, and lives your life for you as it does for all humanity, while you have been reduced to a mere spectator of your own thoughts and emotions. You have ceased being an individual. You live only to discover the “plan” which some computer has already decided for your life. Your very inner self has been subsumed into a greater whole, a Program – a computer program which the super computer has itself calculated to actualize Cheney's “script”. This new humanity is somewhat like the Borg in Star Trek: all individuals in the Borg community are fitted with biochips to enable them to function as parts of a whole rather than as individuals, the difference being that members of the Borg are aware of this whereas Cheney has no intention of letting the new chipped humanity know that *he* is the one who is controlling the fate of everyone and deciding the history of humanity, not God. Technology has truly changed the picture. Even a most talented writer like Aldous Huxley, who has tried to imagine an utopia where citizens are pre-destined by human genius in the top (*Brave New World*), could only imagine manipulation of ontogeny and psychological conditioning (like hypnopaedia). He has rightly feared that the universalization of American way of life (the vulgar mass society) might mean a dark future for humanity,<sup>123</sup> but he would never be able to imagine that, one day, the Americans would go directly into citizens' brain and, using super-advanced information technology, turn human predestination by the elites into mathematical precision. America is not just a revolting mass society, but also the most advanced technocratic state in history where bio-physical humans are fast being replaced by informationally governed, automated mechanical processes. The reduction of our life to a computer-calculated program for the sake of efficiency is the point of consummation of American technocracy. I hope you can get some notion of the fact that all the idle talk out there on the Internet about mind-control and microchipping only gives you a glimpse into the most rudimentary forms of the technology in question, not into this most advanced form which our former Vice President Cheney was on the path of conceiving. The so-called “targeted individuals” are the most usual idle-talkers about human-microchipping, and yet they can only conceive of a one-on-one relationship between the target and the controller – where the controller targets a particular person's mind, usually manually, in order to do no more than make him or her suffer pain. How about chips inserted into the brain of millions of people at once to allow for automated, and computerized, programming of everyone's, and therefore society's, destiny? There is a supposed “expert” who has been warning us about human-microchipping, Dr Katherine Albrecht, and yet her imagination does not reach beyond the insertion of RFID chips into citizens' body (not in their brain) to allow for tracking by authority.<sup>124</sup> (On other times she talks only about health concerns associated with RFID microchips implanted in pets to track them.) The campaign she has been conducting is in fact harmful in that she makes people erroneously believe that government's agenda of human-microchipping amounts to no more than tracking and invasion of privacy. Decoy, diversion. Would she be able to imagine that your very free

---

123 C.f. David Bradshaw's introduction to *Brave New World*.

124 Dr Albrecht runs a website “Spychips”: <http://www.spychips.com/>. Her August 2012 “RFID at school position paper” (<http://www.spychips.com/school/RFIDSchoolPositionPaper.pdf>), examining the use of RFID at schools to track and monitor students, teachers, and staff, is but a joke compared with what the government has *really* been doing.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

will is at stake? The same can be said of Henry Porter's 2006 documentary “Suspect Nation”, which “warns” us about implantation of RFID chips under our skin.<sup>125</sup> Nobody has so far comprehended this ultimate goal of US government's mind-control technology – the final goal in the evolution of the “Internet of objects, people, and nature”.<sup>126</sup> On the other hand, there are occasionally good documentaries, like BBC's 2006 “Human Version 2.0”, which actually do open your mind as to what is possible and thus enable you to *understand me* when I warn you, as I do here, about the “utopia” in which you are about to be trapped. “Human Version 2.0” documents the latest researches on the decoding of human brain functioning, even shows you how scientists, fitting electrodes to a mouse's brain, can remotely control its movement on a computer, and then reveals to you the source of funding for most of these researches: the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. DARPA has been funding every one of the brain-computer interface studies conducted in the civilian domain since the 1970s, and Cheney's utopia certainly concludes BCI as such.<sup>127</sup> After you have heard the scientists interviewed in this BBC documentary speaking optimistically about downloading our thoughts to computers for our immortalization, you may be able to *comprehend* my next warning, which concerns Cheney's ultimate step in his own “deification”: he will keep himself frozen in a tube, with his brain interfaced with the super computer which runs the entire planet, so that, as he never dies, his mind will forever control the super computer while not letting the computer control his mind (in the way in which, as I will soon explain, the “master chip” had allowed him to do). He will be able to see what anyone (or any animal) sees, what any camera records, access what any machine detects, and control earth's weather and tectonic movements, the behavior of any machine, and the life of any human being and any animal, merely with his thoughts. The whole earth will exist in his Mind, and he will be truly God over us all and the whole planet earth. He will have become the *Geist* in Hegel's philosophy: world-history will be none other than the self-development of his *Geist*.

It is my personal experience with a mini-version of Cheney's utopia during the years of 2011 and 2012 which has allowed me to understand not only its horrifying nature but also the extent of the “most sophisticated form of hypocrisy” practiced by the US government. When Cheney was caught by the

125 It can be seen at: <http://youtu.be/PYEJntbh9j0>.

126 One person who has come close to comprehending this plan is Rauni-Leena Luukanen-Kilde, a former medical officer in the Finnish government who has become thoroughly immersed in the discursive world of conspiracy theories. She has written about NATO's plan to microchip every single person so that a supercomputer can be set up to control the actions and emotions of every single human being on the planet. See her “Microchip Implant, Mind-Control, and Cybernetics” in SPEKULA, 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter, 1999. In “MICROWAVE MIND CONTROL: MODERN TORTURE AND CONTROL MECHANISMS ELIMINATING HUMAN RIGHTS AND PRIVACY” (1999), she writes: “Supercomputers in Maryland, Israel and elsewhere with a speed of over 20 BILLION bits/sec can monitor millions of people simultaneously. In fact, the whole world population can be totally controlled by these secret brain-computer interactions, however unbelievable it sounds for the uninformed.” The accuracy of her sources I don't have the time to verify, but the point is that she can *understand* the plan while others babbling in the issue of mind-control and human microchipping cannot. Rense has collected both of her articles: <http://rense.com/general17/imp.htm>.

127 The earliest BCI researches which DARPA has funded that I know of are those of Jacques Vidal of University of California at Los Angeles in the early 1970: “Real Time Detection of Brain Events in EEG” (1976) ([http://www.cs.ucla.edu/~vidal/Real\\_Time\\_Detection.pdf](http://www.cs.ucla.edu/~vidal/Real_Time_Detection.pdf)) and “Toward Direct Brain-Computer Communication” (1973) (<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.bb.02.060173.001105>).

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Russians in conspiracy with me, everyone in the conspiracy against Russia would have to “finish his or her mission”. The Russians thus commanded the DARPA scientists to continue integrating the various computer systems into the “utopia” so that they may “finish their mission” – and this they finally accomplished toward the latter half of 2010. At the end of 2010, in order to restart the evidence-replacement process which was interrupted, and further complicated, by the French April 2010 objection – this is basically the theme of the following narrative – the Russian government once more adapted “Cheney's utopia” to its own purpose, namely the production of replacement evidences to seal its victory in the International Court trial. (All this will be explained in detail in the following.) My entire environment had already been microchipped and wired up to preliminarily resemble Cheney's utopia; now that the technology was further developed, this utopia was extended in an approximate fashion to the entire planet. Instead of programming all of us to forge the most efficient theocracy, however, the Russian planners instructed the super computer to calculate a collective story for a million of us who were microchipped in the brain. The collective story was a collection of our lives which would contain all the evidences that the computer had also calculated were needed for the international court system to rule that Russia had irreversibly won the trial. In other words, our lives, our destinies, were programmed just as if we lived in Cheney's utopia, except that the lives that the super computer had decided for us would not result in a perfect theocracy but would simply end up producing all the evidences which Russia needed to win its trial. Just as I have noted above, the horror of the “utopia” only becomes apparent when what you are programmed to be is not what you feel is in your nature to be or involves a lot of suffering. As you will read in the following narrative, a profile was forged in the International Court as to who I was while I couldn't be more different from this forged profile; meanwhile Russia would not be able to seal its victory in this International Court trial unless this profile actually did describe me. The Russians thus programmed the super computer to make sure that I live out a life in conformity to this profile, and this was the life which the super computer had calculated for me, just as it would have calculated what my life would be were I really living in Cheney's utopia. When I didn't conform to the profile which the Russians had established for me – to the profile they needed in order to win or conclude the trial – the nano brain chip allowed the super computer to remotely control my thoughts and behavior so that I could be changed into a different person who would conform to the profile. The Russians now became my Programmers, in the sense that they were the ones who had programmed the super computer to which my thoughts were interfaced to remotely control me to think and behave in conformity to the profile they had decided that I must be. Since every single person I knew had also been microchipped, the super computer had acquired absolute control over my thoughts, feelings, and behavior by remotely controlling other people's reaction to me so that I would also be forced by my significant others' reactions toward me to conform to the profile my Programmers had decided that I must be. The profile of me which my Programmers had needed to win the trial was a person who was stupid, schizophrenic, violent, autistic, and perpetually suicidal and homicidal, and thus I would have to live out a life in conformity with this profile. Since I was born a genius and was not perpetually suicidal and homicidal (who is?) the super computer would suppress my cognitive functioning to turn me into a retard and control my environment to frustrate me as a way to condition me to develop extraordinary aggression toward

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

myself and others, etc. The super computer would control my friends to distance themselves from me, to not hear me when I talked to them, and to drop me from their life, so that I could gradually be isolated and provoked; my environment and my computer would be remotely controlled to perpetually malfunction as a way to build up my frustration, and I would be remotely controlled to overreact to these frustrations, remotely controlled to throw chairs in public places so as to get myself into trouble with the police and security guards. As the super computer remotely controlled me to run into frustrating circumstances almost daily, my will to live was gradually worn out. The computer then calculated under what frustrating circumstances I would develop the desire to hurt myself as a way to release the enormous frustration that was bottled up inside me. It trapped me in these circumstances easily since it controlled my thoughts and feelings, everyone I met, and everything I touched. I thus began cutting myself. This was how the super computer could maintain me in a perpetual suicidal mood and engage me in perpetual acts of self-injury, and it was able to do this all the more easily by keeping me aware that I was being remotely controlled every second of my life – that I was being enslaved to become a worthless person contrary to my great potential. Every day when I woke up, I would be remotely controlled to waste my time running here and there for nothing, to read this and that book, to surf onto this and that website, to formulate this and that plan for oversea traveling, to meet this and that person, to get rejected by this and that new friend, to be detained by police and security guards for this and that stupid reason, to get provoked by this and that vagrant, to feel tormented by simple noises and movement of people toward which the computer controlled my mind to develop strange phobia, to think thoughts and feel feelings which I didn't want to think and feel – all in order to produce the evidences needed to benefit some foreign countries I had never been to. I got no breaks, no rewards, and no pays; it was a full time job, or total slavery. The knowledge that I had to run around every day to do someone else's work and to feel pain in the process, and was only allowed to make friends and meet new people to the extent that this may produce the evidences needed to benefit those foreign nations, made me understand that my life was not worth living. I had the potential to be a genius, to do great things, and to cause my fellow human beings to greatly admire me, and yet I was controlled, or enslaved, to do stupid things and be angry and frustrated all the time in order to discredit myself in the eyes of others. Then there was the painful realization that this computer in the control center had already decided what my future life would be like, and that I was here only to discover what the computer had planned for me. This super computer – or rather those who had programed it, the Russians and their new friends from around the world – was my God. If the super computer had decided that I needed to cut up my arm tomorrow around 5 PM, I would suddenly be driven to cut up my arm tomorrow on 5 PM without the possibility to ever not do it. If it had decided that on 6 PM next Tuesday I would get in fight with someone and arrested by police, it would happen even though I had always been a peaceful person in the past and would never get in fight with others under normal circumstances. In other words, I was experiencing the same suffering as the person I have earlier described who has the potential for a much better and richer life and yet who has been “chosen” to be a serial killer, to waste away all his potential, and to spend the rest of his life miserably in prison. The knowledge that I lived in Cheney's “utopia” thus entailed an extraordinary sense of powerlessness, “learned helplessness”, and then the deepest depression, and perpetual suicidal mood.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

It is thus that, while espousing itself as the beacon of freedom and democracy around the world, the US government has in reality been secretly working on plans to eliminate freewill from planet earth. What is the point of “freedom” when you are not allowed to have “freewill” – when you are only thinking and feeling insofar as government's super computer is thinking and feeling for you in accordance with some “script” which some human genius in the government has laid down? A semblance of constitutional framework guaranteeing some basic rights and freedom could remain in the “utopia” *since human beings' very ability to want and desire things has become part of government's central planning*. Constitutional framework for robots! Assigning the freedom to switch channels to your television when you hold the remote control in your hand! While United States is going around the planet condemning oppressive regimes for depriving their peoples' freedom, it is secretly planning to offer these peoples the very elimination of their freewill. The United States has, in other words, been offering its far more potent poison as the antidote to others' less effective poison. Once again, when the United States commits human rights abuse, the techniques involved are so sophisticated that the victims cannot usually even develop an understanding of it, let alone articulate it. When some activist in Iran was arrested by the authority and “tortured” in prison, he arrives in the West, is received by human rights organizations, and shows wounds from beating and burnt marks from cigarette butts – the human rights activists thereby decry Iran as “human rights-abusing”.<sup>128</sup> Any idiot who has gone through this kind of unimaginative and low-tech torture could articulate it. United States has been smarter; it refrains from beating and burning victims in secret prisons – those CIA secret prisons for terrorist suspects aside – because victims would complain about it. Instead, it abuses its citizens with mind-control technology and kills its people with artificial natural disasters because when the victims complain to human rights organizations – assuming they have the intellectual capacity to correctly describe the mechanism of their torture, which is rarely the case – they cannot help but sound like mental patients and are laughed out of door instead of getting the sympathy normally afforded to victims of human rights abuse. (I'm talking about the same problem which is my topic at the end of my Second Supplemental Pleading.) Their political function aside, human rights organizations operate according to established paradigms as to what human rights abuse is. Beating and drowning have a place in, are “categories” of, these paradigms, but mind-control through biochips is not, so that human rights organizations find itself “lacking jurisdiction”, so to speak. The US government thus stands above accusations of human rights abuse and, while claiming moral superiority over China, Russia, and Iran, is secretly working on the gravest human rights violations which the ordinary mind is not even advanced enough to conceive. Here, another expression of the “most sophisticated form of hypocrisy”.

Now a final remark of caution about Cheney's “utopia”. I do not know what Cheney has planned to do with the recently developed technology to transform human nature itself through “transhumanism”. Aaron Franz has made an excellent documentary on this critical issue, “The Age of Transitions”.<sup>129</sup> In

---

128 I'm using the case of Ibrahim Mehtari, documented for example in Manon Loizeau's “Chronique d'Iran interdit”, as an example illustrating the typical.

129 Available at: <http://www.theageoftransitions.com/index.php/videosbutton>.



The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

the beginning of the film, it is related that, on December 3 2001, Newt Gingrich, one of Cheney's neocon circle, himself attended a NBICS workshop sponsored by the National Science Foundation.<sup>130</sup> He encouraged government funding to study “converging technologies for enhancing human performance” so as to lead to a “more efficient human societal structure”. This involved cybernetic enhancement of human performance, genetic modification, merging human beings with machines, brain-machine interface... The documentary specifically mentions the concept of “singularity”, the point in time when man-made computer will have at last surpassed the human brain in intelligence. For “singularity”, consult also the famous technology enthusiast Ray Kurzweil – who would be excited about every one of the components which make up the technology of utopia which I have just described. All Radicals in Cheney's circle would be excited by “singularity”, and in fact believed something similar, that evolution has arrived at such point that the original sort of human being can be phased out, and replaced by the far more efficient, centrally administered, new humans who are half organism and half machine. Cheney must have imagined a way in which “transhumanism” will be universally applied to all citizens in a significant way. I have however no insider information on this point, and so shall leave the issue at that.

#### Cheney's justification: laissez-faire is obsolete

In a sense, Alex Jones has been correct when he characterizes the “elites” as attempting “full spectrum dominance”. Whether you are talking about Cheney's vision of the future society or the Moderates' vision of it, it is taken for granted that the government and the corporations shall engineer the weather (“geo-engineering”), the produces of nature (“genetically modified food”), and all natural phenomena so that even the air we breathe and the food we eat will be controlled by the government and its corporate partners. We must remind ourselves of the “utopian spirit” which we have examined in the beginning to understand the elites' motivation: human genius can be trusted to refashion the world, in contradistinction to the attitude of traditional conservatism, that what we have inherited from our ancestors or from nature is imbued with wisdom and shall not be altered rashly. The problem with the conspiracy theorists is, as I have noted, that they have in general failed to distinguish the different versions of “New World Order” which have been imagined by diverse figures from a radical like Cheney to the more moderate Bilderbergers. In Cheney's version, the domination of human beings is so thorough that the very essence of a human organism – its freewill, its *own* desires to make something of its life against the resistance of the external world – has disappeared. The future society which most Bilderbergers have envisaged for us cannot be this extreme. In this essay I cannot reveal the versions which the Moderates (and this includes most of the Bilderbergers) have imagined of our future society because I have no experience and no insider knowledge in this regard – except for agreeing that it involves some sort of “global dictatorship” or “global incorporation” and conceding that, while the

---

130 “Nano-Bio-Info-Cogno-Socio”. The proceeding of this NBICS workshop can be gathered from the report “Converging Technologies for Improving Human Performance” ([http://www.wtec.org/ConvergingTechnologies/Report/NBIC\\_pre\\_publication.pdf](http://www.wtec.org/ConvergingTechnologies/Report/NBIC_pre_publication.pdf)) which, issued in June 2002, incorporates all the expert views expressed at the workshop.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

Moderates might not envisage the universal implantation of brain chips, they probably would favor the universal implantation of RFID micro-devices under our skin (the sort which stores our money, medical information, and personal identification information). Thus, even a general notion of the domination of human beings involved in all these utopian conceptions makes you wonder if the Western elites have all converted to communism after the world-wide collapse of communism. Just when Francis Fukuyama has declared that world-history has ended in the triumph of liberal democracy and free-market economy, the elites of liberal democracy and free-market economy want to return to the defeated communism. Again, you find Aaron Russo's famous recollection resonating in this respect: how his Rockefeller recruiter revealed to him that the “elites” have been wanting to replace free-market capitalism in the West with socialism. In reality, Fukuyama was lying, the elites have not believed that world history has ended at all when communism has collapsed, and Aaron Russo's understanding was not actually quite correct. The Western elites have all been converted to Hegelianism: *The “New World Order” is actually a synthesis between the thesis of communist totalitarianism and the antithesis of free-market democracy. The new synthesis looks like socialism because it contains moments of communism but is no longer the traditional socialism with which we are familiar.*

Our Vice President Cheney, like the rest of the neocons, and indeed like the rest of the moderate Bilderbergers, was a firm believer in, and enthusiast for, technology. Everyone here agrees, and Cheney especially believes, that the admonition from classical liberals like Friedrich Hayek was no longer valid, in two senses. *First of all, it is because classical liberalism is actually incorrect.* Recall the difficult contradiction in political philosophy between order and freedom. There is no such contradiction in classical liberalism because there it is held that order could arise from the combined interactions of free and spontaneous actors who have not intended this order at all but who were merely pursuing their own interests without regard to the “whole picture”. Adam Smith's explanation of how rational self-interest in a free-market economy (namely, without anyone planning it) leads to economic well-being is one of the earliest example. Classical liberals from the twentieth century have been at pains to point out that order cannot arise precisely where any central authority exists trying to plan it rationally. For convenience's sake, consider Ronald Hamowy's summation of the objections raised by Hayek and his mentor Ludwig von Mises to centralized economic planning in socialist states:

“Mises had argued in a seminal article published in 1920 that productive efficiency was contingent on knowing the real prices of the factors of production, since without such prices it would be impossible to know how to rationally allocate resources. With all productive resources owned by a central authority and in the absence of market-generated prices, the calculation of real costs would be impossible and thus render production essentially random. To these conclusion Hayek added the notion that the market was itself essentially a discovery process providing information that would otherwise not exist on the relative value of goods. This information, he contended, could only be supplied by free markets since it was impermanent and widely dispersed among a host of individuals, many of whom were not even aware that they possessed any relevant knowledge, knowledge that emerged only as a product of the market

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

process itself. As one economist has written of Hayek's conclusions: 'Persons embedded in a competitive process can, by virtue of their very rivalry with one another, impart information to the system of relative prices that in the absence of competition they would have no way of obtaining.' Without a price system socialist economies lacked the ability to coordinate the actions of consumers and producers and were thus doomed to substantial misallocations of resources.’<sup>131</sup>

Consider next the general formulation of Hayek's objection:

“In the same [Cairo] lecture, Hayek introduced the notion of spontaneously generated orders, arguing that not every social arrangement, despite the consistency of its elements, requires that it be the product of a designing intelligence. Indeed, the knowledge necessary to produce such arrangements 'can exist only dispersed among all the different members of society and can never be concentrated in a single head, or be deliberately manipulated by any man or group of men.’”<sup>132</sup>

Cheney and the new generation of Western elites have increasingly moved away from the position of classical liberalism because, firstly, they have noticed an error in the thinking of Hayek and his kind. While neoconservatism has tended to be associated with free-market extremists who buttress their view with the authority of Milton Friedman, you must understand that this association is merely superficial convergence. *Cheney's neoconservatives do not really believe in free-market in the traditional sense, just as the moderate Bilderbergers no longer believe in market capitalism.* The neocons like to bring out Milton Friedman to push for deregulation on large corporations because, in this way, the corporations, whose alliance the Radicals seek, could increase their profits in the short run. When it comes to consideration of the long run, the neocons believe in centralized planning. They have simply borrowed Friedman's free-market purism (no intervention of any kind in the market by a central authority) as a ploy to temporarily satisfy their hungry constituents who have suffered under the Clinton era. Now central planning has been cast in a new light because the planetary crisis with which we are now faced has demonstrated to the new generation of Western elites that *an orderly system that has evolved out of laissez-faire would in fact lead to its own collapse.* The classical liberalism of Hayek and others like him is inapplicable to reality in the long run since it has simply assumed that the matériel which circulate in an economic system and the energy supply which keeps the system in circulation are inexhaustible. When matériel and energy supply are in fact limited, only central planning could make sure that the market is sustainable in the long run. It is time to ignore the very reason why the free market system of the West has triumphed over the communist system of the East – that centralized command cannot achieve an efficient allocation of productive powers. Because Cheney has been constantly updated about the latest advances in high technology going on in the military, he has long ago perceived the potential in the super computer projects that were being developed in the US military (especially in DARPA). *That is, he has noticed that technology has changed things, that it has invalidated the traditional wisdom concerning the limitation of human genius* – the second reason

---

<sup>131</sup>Ronald Hamowy's Introductory Essay to Hayek's *The Constitution of Liberty: The Definitive Edition*, p. 2 -3.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

why he and the neocons have abandoned classical liberalism. While central planning by a *human* authority always fails because no group of human beings can have even a rudimentary grasp of the vast reservoir of information and knowledge that is dispersed throughout the hundred million actors who are exchanging goods and services in a market, the DARPA super computer, by recording and predicting the thoughts of all hundred million actors and combining this precise knowledge of the collective human psychology with its absolute grasp of the quantity of natural resources which remain and the productive powers of existing enterprises, *can* plan an economy whose eventual prosperity it foresees (“calculates”) with almost 100 percent accuracy. In fact, in Cheney's version of utopia, *there is no free will* to speak of in any case; *there are no free actors* whose unintentional actions will end up coordinating demand and productive forces. Everything and everyone is being remotely controlled like a robot. The super computer which will run the utopia is the most extreme form of centralized command imaginable and yet it is quite capable of handling the complexity involved in the distribution of productive resources which no human beings can possibly comprehend. Do you see the point here? The point is that the US military has invented a computer whose computing power has far surpassed the “point of singularity” and has now equaled God's.

#### ADDENDA

May 2013

In the above I have set up a model by which to comprehend the otherwise confusing events in American politics in the past 20 years or so. I have argued that the politics of the past 20 years can best be captured in the visualization of a triangular structure of enmity: the Moderates, the Radicals (the neocons and their allies in industries), and the Russians (together with their Chinese allies). Each side of this triangular structure was the enemy of the other two. This triangular structure of enmity was never resolved until the Moderates (or a small number of them) had allied themselves with the Russians to destroy the Radicals in 2010. The difficulty in comprehending this triangular situation is reinforced by the fact that very few observers in alternative media and in the domain of conspiracy theories pay attention to the enmity between its two American sides: the Radicals and the Moderates, which has manifested itself in the conflict between the CIA and the neoconservatives. To be sure, the mutual dislike between the CIA and the neoconservatives was widely reported (or hinted at) in mainstream news like the New York Times or Washington Post, and was occasionally pronounced vividly in media events (such as when former ambassador Wilson, the husband of Valerie Plame, cursed the neocons on TV interviews: “They are not Republicans! They are radicals...”). But this mutual dislike has pretty much escaped all notice within the circle of conspiracy theorists who otherwise cast critical looks at the US government. Even the great Sibel Edmonds, in my view the most insightful political analyst on the Internet and on whom my analysis here has heavily relied, is not very clear on the great divide between the CIA and the neocons. What's worse, the antagonism between the CIA and the neocons is obscured by their occasional collaboration in projects in which their interests overlapped, such as in the Chechnya project (for example, the American Committee for Peace in Chechnya). One exception in the camp of “critics” is the British documentary film maker Kevin Adam Kurtis, whose 2004 “The Power

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

of Nightmares” documents clearly (especially in the first two episodes) the war between the neoconservatives and the “Moderates” (the CIA, the Democrats, and the traditional bureaucrats of the US government).<sup>133</sup> In the film, however, Curtis attributes the conflict to neocons' perception that liberalism was destroying America by leading the masses to relativism and worthless consumption, which should be fixed by an absolutist ideology (“delusion”) of good vs evil. For this reason they set out to demonize America's enemy, first the Soviet Union, and then the Muslims – exaggerating their threat – in order to revitalize the masses with the noble idea that it was their, Americans', destiny to destroy the evil in the world and remake the world in their image. This project caused the neocons to collide with the CIA and the traditional wing of the US government who were more interested in realistic assessment of the enemies and a pragmatic approach in dealing with them (“Realpolitik”). Such is Curtis' analysis. There is certainly some truth in this. In the above I have however dug deeper into the phenomenon, diagnosed neocons' motives in reaction against Antisemitism, and attributed their conflict with the CIA and the traditional US elites to latter's lack of interest in “saving Jews”. It is my contention that I'm correct on this account.<sup>134</sup> While the Moderates have envisaged their objective as a global union controlled by the Atlantic alliance (United States and European Union), the neocons have set as their goal a global imperial axis formed by United States and Israel – Western Europe is excluded from the masters in this view.

The model I propose here also provides a context in which the conspiracy theorists' perspective on Osama bin Laden may become intelligible. While bin Laden was a CIA asset to fight the Soviets in Afghanistan in the 1980s, he continued to be a CIA proxy throughout the 1990s for destabilizing Russian influences in Russia's sphere of influence. It is just as Sibel Edmonds has revealed. Hence just like Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden was in Chechnya in 1992 – the strategic zone of struggle after Afghanistan.<sup>135</sup> Most likely, bin Laden was another GLADIO Plan B operative when GLADIO was shut down everywhere else in 1991 but retained its cell in Turkey. In other words, bin Laden was part of the Moderates' grand strategy in continual destabilization of Russia after the Cold War, which has been summarized by the former CIA officer Graham Fuller, in this way:

“The policy of guiding the evolution of Islam and of helping them against our adversaries worked marvelously well in Afghanistan against the Russians. The same doctrines can still be used to destabilize what remains of Russian power, and especially to counter the Chinese influence in Central Asia.”<sup>136</sup>

Now Graham Fuller's words could be taken as official statement – if you have been paying attention to Sibel Edmonds – for, although he had supposedly retired in late 1980s as CIA's top officer in charge of

133 The first episode also includes a useful presentation of the controversies surrounding “Team B”.

134 I want to recall in this connection Pat Buchanan's 2003 article “Whose War” cited earlier.

135 See former CIA agent Berkan Yashar's interview with Russia's Channel One: <http://intellihub.com/2013/05/06/osama-bin-laden-died-of-natural-causes-according-to-former-cia-agent/>.

136 Cited by James Corbett in his May 8 2013 Eye Opener episode: <http://www.boilingfrogspost.com/2013/05/08/the-eyeopener-who-is-graham-fuller/>.

## The Cheney Plan, CIA's war the neoconservatives, and the “crimes against Russia”

Lawrence C. Chin

October 2011 – March 2013

the Near East and South Asia region and gone to work for Rand Cooperation instead, he remained the “runner” of GLADIO Plan B in mid-1990s (thus the “runner” of all the Islamic militants whom the US and NATO were using against the Russians and the Chinese in Central Asia) and was the personal handler of Fethullah Gülen, who was CIA's number one Iman for radicalizing the whole Central Asian region against the Russians. (Gülen's NGOs, operating from the United States, have created more than 300 Madrasahs in Central Asia; listen to Edmonds and see Gülen's website: <http://fgulen.com/en/>.) The fact that bin Laden was most likely a GLADIO Plan B operative like Gülen certainly explains why the US government had tried hard to protect him in the 1990s.

“In March 1998, it was Libya's Gaddafi, not Clinton, who asked Interpol for the first international arrest warrant for bin Laden. Gaddafi suspected fundamentalist bin Laden of destabilizing Libya's moderate Muslim state – at the behest of the US Interpol ignored the warrant...”<sup>137</sup>

It is not clear to me why bin Laden made the anti-American *fatwa* in August 1996. Perhaps the CIA had instructed him to do so in order to cover up the fact that he, and many other Islamic militants, were US operatives. Bin Laden's fate changed – and so did the fate of countless other GLADIO Plan B operatives, including perhaps Khalid Sheikh Mohammed – *when the US policy suddenly changed*. The neocons came into office and reversed the Moderates' policy, deciding that the Muslims should now be America's enemy. These GLADIO Plan B operatives would now become “patsies”, taking the fall for false flag terrorist attacks against America. 911 critics, including Michael Ruppert, were fond of citing the French report that a CIA officer was standing by the bedside of Osama bin Laden in a hospital in Dubai in July 2001.<sup>138</sup> By that time the CIA was probably worried – they knew that the new masters in Washington had different ideas for their Muslim operatives and that this bin Laden was chosen to take the fall. Bin Laden's whole family was in Washington on September 11 2001; they evidently were aware that “the Americans now want our little Osama to take the fall after he has served the CIA for so long...” After they took the fall for 911, both bin Laden and Khalid Sheikh Mohammed were portrayed in mainstream media worldwide as independent killers who hated America. This is essentially the job of a “patsy”: to let the government he works for invent a narrative of his life – a fiction – that describes him as a different person (invariably a simpler and worse person) than what he really is and to let the whole world believe this fiction to be reality. This has been the “job” of Lee Harvey Oswald, Timothy McVeigh, and all the Al-Qaeda terrorists alike.

---

137 Craig Morris, “September 11”, in *Conspiracy Theories in American History: An Encyclopedia*, p. 650.

138 See, for example: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/nov/01/afghanistan.terrorism>.