



PHOENIX JOURNAL EXPRESS

A bulletin commenting on appropriate current news events, clarification of portions of the Journals and answers of a general nature to questions not found in the existing Journals.

PHOENIX JOURNAL EXPRESS is published by America West Publishers, Inc. P.O. BOX 986 Tehachapi, CA. 93581. Subscription rate is \$20 per 13 issues or \$75 per 52 issues, First Class mailing. COPYRIGHT 1991 by America West Publishers, Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction of this copyrighted material for private non-profit use is expressly encouraged, for commercial purposes it is strictly forbidden.

MARCH 1991 VOLUME IX NUMBER 11

3/7/91 HATONN

TODAY'S WATCH

Instead of bantering about with the non-news this day, we are going to get down to nitty-gritty discussion regarding the Middle East War/Kuwait/-Sabah-Family/Bush connection, etc. Chelas, this is hard medicine to swallow but you MUST come into acknowledgement that I am not simply feeding you "far-side" information. You can go check this out from documentation from many sources but I suggest you begin proving-up in easy-to-understand sequence.

I am going to ask Dharma to print herein, a brief summary of the secret underground regarding things like the Global Regime of Interdependence--the REAL name for Bush's New World Order. Then, I suggest you get the "White Papers" which will be given reference from KC&associates, 13510-A Aurora Ave. North, Seattle, WA 98133.

This will deal with "why Bush had to have a war" and I am most grateful to one who has put it succinctly into focus. You will find nothing new from that which I have given you but I find that if you glean information as backup from Earth source--you tend to come into believing. I honor Craig B. Hulet of KC&associates for this valuable research and presentation. What I will give you is not comprehensive for it is taken from a radio interview of limited time allowance--so please, follow up. America West is getting information so that if you call them, they can either supply you with the "papers" or tell you where to obtain them--should you prefer to contact A.W. Thank you.

Dharma, just roughly transcribe the

tape, please. I will monitor and make comments, if deemed necessary, but mostly I simply want you citizens to hear it from "ground 0". I also request that our "Editors" not try too hard to turn the conversational English into perfect prose.

TRANSCRIPTION

Craig B. Hulet:

This is a brief discussion of the orchestration of the entire event (Iraq/Kuwait/U.S. war) for political reasons that have been completely unknown to the American people. They were laid out long before August 2nd (1990) as a political objective.

The objectives we were given throughout the period between August 2nd and somewhere around the first of January (1991) where COMPLETE MYTHS WITH NO BASIS WHATSOEVER--things like Saddam Hussein's military strength being a "million-man" army was a complete fabrication for he only had 475 thousand well-trained troops, 7,500 Reservists and the remainder are a "People's Army"--some as young as 11-years and as old as 80-years--so can hardly be considered as part of his military.

In each stage of the war after August second, George Bush gave us a different political objective upon which to focus, like "*defending Saudi Arabia*", when the facts were that Hussein never had the industrial capacity nor the offensive capability of going any further than Kuwait, *and everybody in the Pentagon and the White House knew that*. However, they had to convince the American people of some reason to send the initial 200,000 troops over there and so they told us it was to defend Saudi Arabia.

We were also told that Hussein was about to take over and control 20-50% of all of the oil in the region, which was and is an utter myth. He couldn't have controlled the oil and he couldn't even have threatened control of the oil during the month of August because the nations that were aligned against him on August 2nd, the Arab states, were Saudi Arabia, Syria, Israel, and of course, Iran on the East and Turkey on the North, so it is totally absurd to believe that one little country such as Iraq could have dictated, through military power, to the combined forces in the Middle East, including Egypt, which outnumbered him at least 10 to 1 in every single category of military capability. (Hatonn: Now take this information as absolute minimum for Craig is giving you that which was "known" and documented where he and his researchers could ferret out the information. It is understated, brothers--for Soviets (and you) had supplied Saddam with heinous weapons--but YOU had the same weapons with the exception of Bull's cannons, etc. Please wait until you have read all of this before you stop and start comparisons to disprove one or the other of us. Please stop the nit-picking for you are in serious circumstances if you could remove even nine-tenths of the facts.)

Saddam simply would not determine that he could be successful in going further than Kuwait in offensive. He did not ever intend nor feel capable of controlling the oil supply of the Middle East--that would be a totally fabricated lie served to we-the-people.

This war was NEVER about oil--it was simply never about any of those things given to you. When George Bush told you that it was "NAKED AGGRESSION", he lied again because if it was

seriously about "naked aggression" and we weren't using some selective moral indignation over Saddam Hussein's actions, would we have hardly been aligned with Assad of Syria, who killed thirty thousand of his own people, annexed Northern Lebanon and installed a puppet regime which was responsible for killing a hundred and seventy thousand Lebanese? Yet, we are supposed to believe that, in this instance, naked aggression so offended the U.S. administration that we would send half a million, or more, troops to stop it. That is another of the "great" myths--being a total lie. (*Hatonn: You must understand the definition of "myth"--a myth is not necessarily "false" but Craig is using the word as representing "lie".*) This is really what I see as the kind of problems that are of such a magnitude that you can safely say that the American government is so out-of-hand that **THEY TELL THE TRUTH ALMOST NEVER!--TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.** In one instance, where George Bush did tell the truth--nobody even understood what he really MEANT. That is when he said, "The U.N. Security Council would be used to enhance the New World Order"--that IS THE ONLY STATEMENT OF TRUTH GEORGE BUSH HAS SAID SINCE AUGUST 2ND--**BUT NOBODY UNDERSTOOD HIM.**

Question from Interviewer: "One of the questions that I had is why Hussein allowed the U.S. military forces to build up to the capacity that it has--to a level where he could, apparently, no longer crush it through his military?"

Saddam Hussein had no choice, really, but to sit back and watch the build-up because Saddam's military does not have an offensive capability to make a move of that magnitude. He is a "counter-puncher" and he has powerful "defensive" capability. He defeated the country of Iran in the last four months of the war, where he could not defeat Iran offensively throughout the seven and a half years of that war. But when he suckered and brought Iran into Iraqi territory and brought their troops to him, he fought defensively, which is completely and entirely a different tactic. That is where he excels and that is where his greatest ability stands.

The real question, rather than, "Why did Hussein allow our troops to build-up, where I don't believe he had a

choice but to sit back, because at that point after August 2nd, he knew that he had been "suckered" into Kuwait. Let me explain what I mean by "suckered-in".

Prior to August 2nd--one week prior--the American Government, the Administration and National Security Council, the CIA--the entire intelligence apparatus, had been informing President Bush and Baker that an invasion was imminent, into Kuwait. Up to seven days prior to August 2nd, the invasion was so imminent that there were serious "red alert" type memos and memoranda. Yet during that exact period of time, April Glaspie, our Ambassador to Iraq, told Saddam Hussein that we did not get involved in "Arab to Arab issues over border disputes". Now, she was attacked for having said that because it gave the green light to Hussein, to his way of thinking, to go into Kuwait. Baker chastised her publicly and said it was a "blunder". But in fact, Baker lied. Undersecretary of State John Kelly told the Senate Subcommittee **EXACTLY THE SAME THING A WEEK BEFORE THE INVASION** and he went even further as he said, "...we would do NOTHING to defend Kuwait because we have no defense treaty with Kuwait and this is an Arab to Arab issue." Under questioning then, Margaret Tutwiler, a spokeswoman for James Baker's State Department, held a Press Conference and she said exactly the same thing as Undersecretary Kelly--"...we have no defense treaty and it is an Arab to Arab issue". So it was entirely corroborated that the Administration's position on Iraq taking Kuwait was a "green light" for Iraq to take Kuwait. Hussein believed he had the sanction and the approval of our Administration, or at least the auspices that gave what he believed was the right to go in and take Kuwait.

Now then, on August 2nd George Bush screamed that he was surprised and shocked by this activity and called Hussein a "Hitler" and accused him of "Naked Aggression". Of course, that was totally feigned surprise and "naked aggression" was a total myth. **BUSH KNEW HUSSEIN WAS "GOING IN"**. The question is--why would George Bush want Saddam Hussein to take Kuwait?

Question: Wasn't Iraq already in Kuwait, working in the area around

the sea?

Well, Saddam Hussein has a perfectly legitimate claim to the Ramalian Oil fields region where the Sabah family has been slant drilling and stealing oil from him. And the Bubyian and Warbyian Islands, which is the area you ask about, is where Saddam Hussein wants a deep-water port. The fact is, that for the past two years he has already been dredging that area and the Kuwaitis have even helped finance the dredging of the area so Iraq could develop that deep-water port. Therefore, it is implied, in Kuwaiti activity, that the area was already considered Iraqi territory. Those are the only two things that he asked to be remaining in his possession--and he agreed to totally pull out of Kuwait as long as those things were left to him--which were already his. Every nation in the world said they would go with that agreement and it was acceptable. The only people who found it unacceptable was President Bush and James Baker.

Question: And why would they find it unacceptable?

Because they have a "political agenda"--a political objective--that goes all the way back to April of 1990, and fully six months prior to that, during a study group session on the Middle East. The original political objective was much, much different than what we have been told. In April of 1990 there was a conference, an internationally led conference, at the White House--George Bush chaired it. Fitzgerald, the former Prime Minister of Ireland, authored the "white paper", the task force report, on the subject of the Middle East that came out of that April, 1990, conference. The political philosophy and the International Community's view of the Middle East was forever changed at that point in history. They thought that, because the Soviet Union was no longer a player in the Middle East, the Western Powers--Germany, England, France, Japan, Canada and the United States (the International Community of Western Powers), thought it was then time for them to move in and politically influence the Middle East in a greater degree than ever before. The first thing on the Agenda, they felt that they should control the region because of its natural resources and would stabilize the region by eliminating the military components of Iraq, Syria and, eventually, even Israel and Libya--eliminating them and totally dis-

arming them militarily--unilaterally, if necessary. That they would use the United Nations Security Council as the means, if necessary, was called for in April of 1990.

This political objective, that was stated in April of 1990, was corroborated again by a different source and that was Terik Aziz in his press conference after the Baker/Aziz meeting. Aziz stated that Bob Dole, and three or four other senators, paid Hussein a visit in April of 1990 and gave him an ultimatum of a disarmament scenario where Hussein would disarm chemical, biological, conventional weapons and ballistic missiles. To do so he would receive credits and be allowed to be a player in the New World Order.

NO TO NEW WORLD ORDER

(Hatonn: Now this is on record that Hussein refused to go along with this New World Order.)

Of course Hussein said emphatically, "No--at least NOT UNTIL ISRAEL REMOVES THEIR CHEMICAL-BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS AND THEIR 100 NUCLEAR WARHEADS FROM THE REGION." So the forced unilateral diplomatic approach failed and they had to resort to the United Nations Security Council as the means to disarm Iraq and the rest of the Middle East. That is, and always was, the political objective. That explains "why" it was needed for Saddam Hussein to go into Kuwait and take it forcefully, as the provocation necessary to draw the UN Security Council and the U.S. forces into attacking Saddam Hussein.

I have been saying, for over five months in interviews throughout the country, "This isn't about Kuwait--this is about taking out Baghdad and destroying the industrial-military complex of Baghdad." Nobody believed me for five months--everybody said, "No, this is about Kuwait because Hussein invaded Kuwait." Wrong! As soon as the bombing started, where did Bush send the fliers? Straight to Baghdad!

QUESTION: *What about the resources, the phosphates and sulfates, that Iraq has? How might that play into any of this scenario?*

Well, on August 20, 1988, the *London Economist* reported that James Baker,

in what is known as the "Baker Initiative for the Middle East", paid a visit to Hussein. This was prior to the above mentioned conference of April, 1990. He suggested to Hussein that he would receive "no further credits from the West, from Saudi Arabia or Kuwait"--they had already made that clear--"unless he was prepared" (and he needed these credits to service his debt from the Iran/Iraq War. He had borrowed a tremendous amount of money, including 26 billion dollars from Western banks--Chase, J.P. Morgan--all the six big ones) "he would receive no further credits to service that debt unless he gave up his sulfur, phosphates--his oil and other raw materials--in perpetuity--as collateral." Of course Saddam Hussein is extremely "nationalistic"--he is an Arab Socialist--and he strongly believes in Iraq as a nation-state. He said, "Absolutely no," he wouldn't even consider such a thing. He knew it was giving up his national sovereignty--his people's sovereignty and so he absolutely refused to do such a thing. *(Hatonn: Please refer back to the Cartel Plans and HOW they managed to suck all the third-world nations into the banking system through this perpetual resource for collateral sleight-of-hand.)* That was the first beginnings of the Middle East being drawn into this so-called New World Order concept, because *it is an economic regime and it is about "raw materials and monetary policy"*. It is being demanded of ALL THIRD-WORLD AND LESSER DEVELOPED COUNTRIES THAT THEY GIVE UP THEIR NATURAL RESOURCES IN MANY DIFFERING WAYS: DEBT TO EQUITY SWAP, ETC. BUT TO PUT IT BLUNTLY, THE WEST, THE INDUSTRIALIZED POWERS, OUR MULTI-NATIONAL CORPORATIONS WHICH ARE, AT LEAST A HUNDRED OR SO OF THEM, ARE DEFENSE CONTRACTORS, AND THE "CORPORATE STATE CORPORATIONS" OF THE SOVIET UNION (POLAND, WEST GERMANY--THEY ARE STATE CORPORATIONS BUT THEY ARE STILL MULTI-NATIONAL) INCLUDING THE KUWAITI REGIME. THE KUWAITI GOVERNMENT IS SIMPLY ONE BIG MULTI-NATIONAL CORPORATION(S) OWNED BY THE ROYAL FAMILY OF SABAH. Those countries and companies that "play ball" get to play in the "Global arena". If they don't, they are targeted for elimination.

THIS IS WHY SADDAM HUSSEIN IS BEING ELIMINATED!

QUESTION: *Now, the Sabah family has a great many holdings in the United States and so does Saudi Arabia, do they not?*

That was the key that guaranteed the International Community would line up behind George Bush, and it is a total lie that "he lined up the U.N. votes so quickly because of his tremendous 'ability' on the telephone". "Telephone Diplomacy" we were fed by the press. That is a complete myth (lie), they already knew what the political objective was for Iraq and Kuwait back in April of 1990 at the conference at the White House. They already knew that Iraq was being targeted to be disarmed and if Hussein didn't cooperate diplomatically, he would be dealt with forcibly through the UN Security Council. So when the orchestration took place all the world leaders of the Western countries at the UN Security Council level all already knew exactly what was going on--it was a simple task to line up the votes and get resolutions against Hussein. The "fix" was already in place, to put it bluntly.

The key, however, that made it all "work" and why, when Libya took Chad recently in a sponsored coup in Chad--when Syria took Lebanon and installed their regime--when the Soviets moved into the Baltics and used force, or into Afghanistan, etc., or the Vietnamese went into Cambodia--none of those countries mattered in the least. Nobody gave aid to these people and we certainly didn't send troops to stop the "Naked Aggression" against those legitimate regimes. *This was due to one thing and one thing only: the guarantee that the UN and the U.S. and everybody would get in line and we would actually "have this war" to put Sabah back in his "pink palace" in Kuwait--that is the simple fact; that the Sabah family took the petro-dollars profit and invested in U.S. multinational corporations--hundreds of billions of dollars off-shore and in our banking system with Chase, Morgan Guarantee, Morgan Brothers--\$52 BILLION in T-Bills and Bonds (U.S. Gov't) and the interlock is so intense and so incestuous that the Sabah family has actually had a wholly owned corporation in the U.S.--still own it--Kuwait Petroleum owns*

Sante Fe International out of Los Angeles. They have had on the BOARD of Santa Fe International--of this Kuwaiti owned corporation--FORMER PRESIDENT GERALD FORD, who put George Bush in power as CIA Director, BRENT SCOWCROFT, who was an aide to Gerald Ford and is now the National Security Advisor to President Bush, AND RODERICK HILL, CARLA HILL'S HUSBAND--she is now the Trade Representative of the Bush Administration and she was HUD Secretary under Gerald Ford. So you will note that the Sabah family has used their tremendous petro-dollars to PURCHASE POLITICAL INFLUENCE WITH THIS ADMINISTRATION AND GOING ALL THE WAY BACK TO THE NIXON AND FORD ADMINISTRATIONS. THAT IS THE KIND OF POLITICAL CLOUT THAT GUARANTEED THAT THE UN COALITION WOULD BACK THE USE OF ANY KIND OF FORCE AGAINST HUSSEIN AFTER HE WAS BROUGHT INTO KUWAIT TO BEGIN WITH.

QUESTION: *Would you talk briefly about how Kuwait is so closely tied to the American companies?*

The Kuwaiti regime is unique in that it is very much like the Saudi regime, and that's why the Saudis and the Sabah family are working so closely, and always have. Being a Royal Monarchy, they do not operate the way Hussein or Qudafi, Assad or Mubarak, operate in their countries. When they sell oil on the global market--they don't "consume" their own production--they allow the Eastern Europeans to consume and they buy into things, i.e., they own a whole chain of gas stations, they own five percent of Texaco, they own a chain of gas stations in Europe but, more than that, fifty percent of everything that is taken in on those sales goes directly to the Sabah Royal family. The only one that can sign the checks--is Sabah, himself. Fifty percent of the profits goes to the Kuwait government which is also Sabah but is used, in addition, to disburse funds elsewhere and help control the population of Kuwait. The population is only about 600,000 actual citizens and the rest of the population is not made up of "citizens" and they are not allowed to "vote". The first 50% of profits, however, goes directly to Sabah! Kuwait is a total feudalistic, non-militaristic despotic State--according to our

own State Department. They have simply been able to wisely invest their money in the West, particularly in the U.S.--because they do have a fear of Islamic Fundamentalism and the Soviet Union.

When you buy this much U.S. Corporate power, for instance, when you own 3, 4, and 5 percent of a Corporation such as General Electric and defense contractors and the people on the Boards of those defense contractors you have real clout. The Board members of those "defense contractors" are also Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense and boy, you have bought considerable political clout and THEY KNOW IT!. *It is purely and simply a protection racket, in a sense, but more than that, it makes them a key player in the new GLOBAL REGIME* that George Bush keeps talking about.

QUESTION: *Do they not also own some 5% in McDonalds, Penneys, etc.?*

Oh yes, there is a long list of holdings that all of the citizens would easily recognize. The ones I focus on, such as IBM, Dow Chemical, Westinghouse, G.E., Atlantic Richfield, General Motors--those are all listed on the one hundred top (dollar amount) defense contractors in the U.S. You could say that they have purchased some stock in almost ALL of our major U.S. corporations. They never buy more than 5% of the class-A voting stock *because if they did so it would force disclosure to the S.E.C. as to "who" is buying up America.*

DISCLOSURE ISSUE AND INVESTMENT HOLDINGS

They purchase government T-bills and bonds and what they have done is purchase a "deficit"--a "growing" deficit--of the United States. That gives them very close linkage to the banking industry and the Federal Reserve System which is basically a "private banker's" bank which loans us our medium of exchange called the "federal reserve notes". That is a very powerful thing to purchase if you are looking for strong political clout and influence within the U.S. Government.

Ben Rosenthal of New York found out all of this described and found it extremely disturbing--between 1979 and through 1983. He filed suit to stop the

ownership of Santa Fe International by the Kuwaiti Government. However, after his death it fell to the wayside and no one, to this day, has dared to bring it up again because people get dead over such issues. He had also filed a House Bill which would force the disclosure of foreign nationals' holdings in U.S. multi-national corporations and in the banking industry because he felt that they would be buying political influence and could, therefore, influence more affairs of the U.S. Government by having this kind of wealth. That act did pass (The Financial Disclosure Act) in 1982, but pressure was brought to bear through Charles Percy, a senator and whose daughter married into the Rockefeller family, on President Reagan and also Vice President Bush, at the time, to veto that financial disclosure act. The threat was, at that time in 1982, as documented by Ben Rosenthal (and now you might know why Rosenthal died) was that if they were to disclose financial holdings of the Saudi regime and the Sabah family along with Kuwaiti holdings in the U.S. banking industry--they would shift their assets to Euro-dollars, Yen, Marks, etc. This would cause an immediate banking crisis in New York which would include ALL of the Six Major Banks. *The threat held strong and the Financial Disclosure Act was vetoed by President Reagan and to this day it is illegal for the U.S. Government to tell the American people how much financial influence Sabah has in the U.S.*

There is a new kind of "disclosure act" in the Senate but it is pre-supposed that Bush will certainly veto it. The reason Bush is concerned is that Bush is a "global operator". Bush sits on the Boards of Texas Gulf, Eli Lilly, Purolator--and a whole host of other multi-national corporations; but most importantly, the Interstate Bank of London, Dallas and Houston--an international banking family. There is no question that Kuwait has major dollars in that bank. George Bush is a large-scale Global Player. Bush has actually taken a perceived "step down" in his political career by becoming President of the U.S. His real political career had been as a Global Globe-trotter, if you will. It has been entirely a net-work of multi-national corporations who have widespread Global interests. In fact, take Texas Gulf, it is not even a U.S. Corporation and it does not operate in Texas or in

the Gulf states--it is a French "holding company" and it mines phosphate and sulfur (coincidentally, Iraq's raw materials that were requested) and turns it into fertilizers. George Bush is definitely a big player in the Global Regime.

This is why he continues to bring up and push the subject of the New World Order, over and over again. That really is the political objective of George Bush by being President. He doesn't care whether or not he is re-elected if this war would go bad--he has stated as much openly and publicly--even in the *Los Angeles Times*.

You see, all these holdings of Bush can be covered by placing the holdings in a "Blind Trust" and when he became President he did this for the first time in his career. He never did that prior to this--not even when he was CIA Director. He refused to place any of his financial holdings in a "Blind Trust". He has, to some degree, done so now. His blind trust is somewhere around a million dollars which doesn't even represent a drop in the bucket to his assets as of the day he took office as President. All the other holdings are in multi-national, international, etc., corporations where he is covered in secrecy. He does continue to receive what is called deferred compensation from the Zapata Oil which is a completely Bush-owned oil operation for off-shore drilling, where coincidentally, the first oil rig set up offshore--WAS IN KUWAIT. He also sits on the board and still receives "deferred compensation" from this. Deferred compensation is where the check is written but it goes into the "Trust Fund" and he can't spend it until after he is no longer President.

There are a lot of ways to get around that "Conflict of Interest", especially when you are the President. You don't have to get rid of your stock--you just temporarily cease to sit on the active Board of those corporations.

One of the most interesting companies on which he sits, actually he is a Limited Partner, with JAMES A. BAKER, III, in a corporation called Hollywood LPG II. It is a Houston, Texas, based company. The reason that it is so interesting is that in George Bush's "State of the Union" address, he suggested that because of this problem with Kuwait and Iraq with crude oil, that we must start

looking, as a nation, to other means and other resources--specifically liquid petroleum gas. (That is what "LPG" stands for--i.e., Hollywood LPG II, is a Liquid Petroleum Gas tanker fleet.)

FERTILIZER?

Bush sits on the board, and owns stock in, Eli Lilly. Eli Lilly is a MAJOR world producer of fertilizers and herbicides. The New World Order, to which "they" refer, isn't something that will enhance the opulence of Third World nations, *in fact it will reduce countries like Iraq, Syria, Iran, Jordan, and Libya back to pre-1979 forms of feudalism and poverty.* At the same time, you don't want to reduce a population such as those to complete poverty for they need to be fed in some manner--and that means feeding the tremendous numbers of poor in the Third World countries. *Just to accomplish this gigantic task will REQUIRE A LOT OF FERTILIZER!* George Bush is heavily invested in Texas Gulf which mines sulfur and phosphates which, without them, you cannot make fertilizer. Eli Lilly, which makes fertilizer--and of course, when you are going to constantly fertilize the ground to grow crops like soy beans, you will have problems with the soil--and you have to seek other places and that is where herbicides--also produced by this company--come in.

The interesting thing about this connection of Bush to Eli Lilly is that there was planned--for the Latin America Drug War--a shooting war in Latin America. That is, in part, what took place when we invaded Panama--with setting up an anti-drug force for Latin America to invade Latin American companies. (Hatonn: Yes, indeed, *I have told you all this--but you need to hear it again so please, just keep reading.*) Bolivia and Peru were definitely targeted. Part of the scenario for invading those countries in this so-called Drug War, was to use massive amounts of herbicides on the Coca crops and it was experimented on and the major portion of the experiments just ended in March of 1989-1990. At that point the product was approved for use to destroy the hundreds of thousands of hectares of Coca crops in Latin America. That product is called "Spike" and it comes from a Division of Elanco--a corporation of Eli Lilly. (Hatonn: This herbicide is deadly--re-

member a while back when it was used on the "Hemp" (marijuana) crops in Mexico, etc., and just happened to kill a bunch of workers and users? Brothers, I remind you--the drug trade is controlled right out of the Bush Administration! We are not talking of New World Order--we are talking about World (Global) total domination!)

I remind you again, that Bush is on the Board of Eli Lilly and owns stock in that company.

NEW WORLD ORDER? NO--GLOBAL REGIME OF INTERDEPENDENCE

The New World Order is a term that is considered totally passe' by all the Elite and Elite Think-Tanks--and I haven't used the word myself in over a decade in any of my analytical work or research papers, even when I was with the Institute. **THE PROPER TERMINOLOGY IS: "THE GLOBAL REGIME OF INTERDEPENDENCE" but if George Bush had used THAT terminology, people would have begun to understand right off that it was "economic" New World Order. It was absolutely necessary that the American people believe that the New World Order, when mentioned, would somehow have only to do with "Peace and Security" throughout the world through the use of the United Nations--or some nebulous attachment to moral rightness. THIS IS A TOTAL LIE IN ITS MOST CONTEMPTIBLE PRESENTATION AND USURPATION OF YOUR TRUST AND FAITH. THE NEW WORLD ORDER HAS NEVER BEEN ANYTHING ABOUT PEACE AND SECURITY--IT HAS BEEN ABOUT ONE THING AND ONE THING ONLY--IT IS A GLOBAL REGIME, A REGIME WHICH ALREADY EXISTS AND WE ARE IN THE TRANSITION STAGES OF IT--OF INTERDEPENDENCE. INTERDEPENDENCE ISN'T SOMETHING THAT COMES ABOUT THROUGH EVOLUTION OF FREE-TRADE LIKE SO MANY LIGHT-WEIGHT UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS--WHO PROJECT IT AS SOMETHING OF A UTOPIAN VISION THAT ALL THE WORLD BEGINS TRADING WITH EACH OTHER AND SOMEHOW ALL WAR WILL CEASE AND PEACE WILL JUST WASH OVER THE GLOBE.** It simply is not even a PART OF THE

STRATEGY.

Inter-dependence IS A STRATEGY. It was outlined in 1961 by Vincent Rock, a defense analyst of over 20 years, for the beginnings of it. He published a book called THE STRATEGY OF INTERDEPENDENCE which was initially used by the Kennedy Administration, and McNamara in the Johnson Administration. The strategy has been adopted ever since.

The strategy works in every field of endeavor, for instance, South Africa. We are wholly dependent on South Africa for the "platinum group" metals, chromium and commercial grade gold. It is for "strategic" war materials. This is well published and well known--that we are dependent on South Africa; therefore, the Globalist thinkers of the world future society, who are utopian, would say, "See, there is the interdependence," so we can have a lot of influence with South Africa and South Africa will work with us and we can bring about changes. *The fact is that we have enough chromite, chromium and platinum-group metals, in the LARGEST DEPOSITS KNOWN ON EARTH, IN THE STILLWATER COMPLEX BETWEEN THE BORDER OF MONTANA AND THE BORDER OF WYOMING.* It is a tremendously large complex and there is an almost unlimited supply of these strategic raw materials. Based on the analysis of 1961, however, done by Vincent Rock, the strategy of interdependence is as follows: *We shut down the mills and operation of the Stillwaters facilities and since 1963 it hasn't been mined. THEY WANT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, AND THE AMERICAN CORPORATIONS WILL GO ALONG WITH THIS, BECAUSE THEY PASS THE COSTS ON TO US ANYWAY, IN THEIR PRODUCTION FACILITIES--BUT THEY WANT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO "BELIEVE" THAT WE ARE DEPENDENT UPON SOUTH AFRICA (interdependent or mutually-dependent).*

THE REAL REASON IS SO THEY CAN GET CHEAP LABOR FOR THERE ARE NO LABOR UNIONS AND THUS NO LABOR PROBLEMS AND IN FACT, EVEN IF IT COSTS MORE, THE PERCEPTION OF THE "INTERDEPENDENCE" IS A PERCEPTION AS OPPOSED TO A

REALITY. THE "PERCEPTION" IS USED TO MANIPULATE OUR POPULATION, THE SOUTH AFRICAN POPULATION AND THE GOVERNMENTS ARE WORKING TOGETHER "KNOWING" THAT THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO NEED FOR THE DEPENDENCE.

This is EXACTLY that which is going on in the Middle East right now. They are going to create the PERCEPTION that without Kuwait's oil production and a free Kuwait under the Sabah family, there will be an insurmountable oil crisis. That is WHY we have to go to war and get this awful regime back into Government. We have now been taught, erroneously, to believe that we are totally dependent on Kuwait for oil--a total lie.

3/7/91 HATONN

CONTINUING ON WITH TAPED TRANSCRIPTION:

PLAYERS (CHARACTERS)

QUESTION: Who were some of the players in this Global Regime of Interdependence?

What we are talking about comes in two layers and when you talk about the U.S. multi-national corporations you can refer to a study done through the 1976 Senate, under Lee Metcalf. He is now, too, strangely deceased and became deceased before the study was completed. They produced a study called Interlocking Directorate Among Major U.S. Multi-National Corporations. It is demonstrated that there were no more than 3,500, mostly white-male Americans--Anglo-Saxon--and they sat on the boards of ALL the multi-national corporations and the major banks and foundations and a separate study, which was produced on the Federal Reserve System, showed that the same thing existed within the Federal Reserve System and ALL interlocking with the corporations, whereby one man such as William Webster (now head of the CIA and was with the FBI) sat on the Boards of as many as TWENTY MAJOR U.S. MULTI-NATIONAL CORPORATIONS, DEFENSE CONTRACTORS, BANKS--AND WHEN YOU CROSS-DIRECTORSHIP, ONE MAN SITTING ON THE BOARD OF, FOR INSTANCE, CHASE, WILL THEN ALSO SIT ON THE BOARD OF EXXON AND WILL BE SITTING

NEXT TO A BOARD MEMBER OF CHASE, ALSO, WHO SITS ON THE BOARD, SAY, OF MOBIL OIL. THAT IS HOW THEY "BEAT" THE F.T.C. RULES DEALING WITH THE "CONFLICT OF INTEREST" AND "FREE-TRADE".

They ALL sit on each other's Boards and there are at most 3,500 or less people involved. One man, alone, may own as many as 50-80 hats and interests in corporations, foundations, the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, The Council on Foreign Relations--a complete network which is extremely small when you consider what they are doing. This was considered by the deceased Lee Metcalf as a threat to our very way of life if we believe in "free-trade". He felt it would cause the kind of political influence, and he was right, that it ultimately has caused--such as in the case of George Shultz who now sits on the Board of Boeing--after eight years in the State Department where he was the single most influential man in the State Department. He opened up trade with Red China and now the trade is wide-open to Red China, which is a major, major victory to Shultz who, as Secretary of State, moved to increase trade with Red China to the point where Boeing Corporation now has RECORD SALES HERE IN SEATTLE AND THROUGHOUT THE U.S. NORTH-WEST. OF COURSE GEORGE SHULTZ IS NOW REAPING THE REWARDS OF HIS ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE STATE DEPARTMENT--HE IS ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS WITH BOEING CORPORATION.

What about Great Britain? What about Germany? What about all those others who are now petitioned and have agreed to give the U.S. money?

Every single one of the countries, including Japan, are represented in exactly the same scenario as just described. They are all players and they have institutionalized their ideology into groups that the far right and the far left tried to consider them some sort of Global Conspiracy--such as is the Trilateral Commission. The make-up of the Trilateral Commission, which is no more than 300 individuals at any given time, is a make-up of Europeans, West Germans, British, Japanese, Canadians and Americans. The same thing holds true and that's why when they refer to the Global

Regime, they aren't thinking in terms of Imperialism the way the far-left used to think the U.S. was operating--that kind-of neocolonialism--it is far beyond that. That implies a nation-State trying to reach out and control the globe and still retain its nation-State status. These men don't even consider the United States as a nation-State, they consider the nation-State as Exxon, Chase, IBM, ITT, etc. That is who they believe are now the "nation-State" and that is where they put all the cards.

Being the President of the United States is a grand vehicle through which to accomplish the dynamics of the "New World Order", or, "Global Regime of Interdependence". That is why I have said it is a step down for George Bush but a most important step.

The ones who will be in charge of the New World Order or "Regime" are the same men who are in charge right now. They make up the cabinet, multi-national corporations, defense contractors, the leading bankers for they also sit on the boards of IBM, ATT, etc. They already are in charge and they have agreed to agree on that first premise. It isn't a regime such as the "Christian Fundamentalist" "thing" with a world dictator, etc., it is too well planned to ever have the appearance of such. It is a kind of feudalistic cooperation between the "princes" of the "district". Those "princes" being the C.E.O.'s and Directors--the "districts" being the interlocking or intertwined regions where the multi-national corporation crosses over all country borders.

They no longer see nation-States. They operate in every country and they truly believe, and here I have a book called **PEACE AND AFFLUENCE THROUGH MULTI-NATIONAL CORPORATIONS** by Herbert Mertz, which goes so far as to say that the Regime is already in place and it is just a matter of making average layman aware of it. They go so far as to think that we should vote for our political rights no longer through Congress and nation-State Governmental apparatuses but through the multi-national political apparatus. Mertz is a Director of The World's Ecocracy.

One thing I learned while I was with the multi-national corporations as a consultant, is that one thing totally de-

void in the thinking is the welfare of the people, themselves. I have had it stated to me very clearly that "as they create the Regime and move-in and eliminate regions and first employ people and then throw them out of work and move an operation to a foreign place--however they transmit it--wherever there is disruption and the people are hurt by it, their attitude is simplistically stated and the words are: "When the sheep are fleeced--they bleat".

FEUDALISM

The Regime is clearly a feudalistic operation. I know well, some of the gentlemen who run some of these major corporations and they are, indeed, feudalistic in their thinking. I would go so far as to say that they are behavioral-social-Darwinists with a nasty stripe of Nietzsche.

HOW DOES EXTREME RIGHT AND LEFT AGREE?

There are many similarities, in fact, years ago I spoke with a newspaper reporter on that very topic. There is a loose merger between the radical right and the lunatic left and that is because they have a lot of the same enemies--for instance, Henry Kissinger. The John Birch society did a lot of research into the multi-national corporations and they are interpreted to mean that David Rockefeller was therefore, a Communist, because he was also working with the Soviet Union. The far left always looks at it as a kind of monopoly capitol with a Marxist flavor in trying to install a kind of capitalist Regime throughout the world. Forget free--anything however, for that is the very LAST thing on the minds of these men in point.

G.E., for instance, is a feudalist-State that has more in common with a socialist dictator such as Noreiga or the Saudi regime than they will ever have with the "free-market".

You must think back a bit to what the Sabah's threat was and then the Saudis' threat if there was any disclosure of financial holdings in 1982. The threat was that they would go to yen or marks, or whatever it would take to cause a banking crisis. In 1982 we were under a recession and there were tremendous bank failures and the large banks were also in trouble due to the Latin American debt along with the

Third World debt. That threat was very REAL and so, think about the threat today if we didn't put Sabah back into his "Pink Palace" with his 70+ wives. What would Sabah do?

WHAT OF THE MIDDLE EAST WAR RIGHT NOW?

It is about making an example of Hussein and totally DESTROYING his military-industrial complex if possible by actually bombing him back into the stone age. Then they look to Assad of Syria and it is clear that the message is that "...now you will disarm--right?"

As we move along here we find that Iraq is only the first major piece to the overall puzzle. This is a new dynamic and the reason it came about so quickly is because Soviet influence left the Middle East as a major "front". Because the Soviet Union appeared to no longer be a major influential player in that area, the Western Powers of the Global Regime could rush in and fill the void and create the dynamic which in the first instance is Iraq falling as a military power. (Hatonn: Here is where the information is now comprehensive enough to validly understand that the Soviets ARE STILL THE MAJOR MILITARY AND TECHNOLOGY-CAPABLE FORERUNNER. This is something that simply no-one has been allowed to know outside of the tiny handful of key players such as Kissinger, etc. It IS through the Soviets that the war was brought to a handy and abrupt halt with Hussein's toys intact and both sides were required to make a cease and desist peace "deal"--"or else!")

Using Iraq as an example they could go on until Syria and Libya and the rest of the countries would disarm unilaterally or the same fate would befall them. For instance, Baker recently went to Jordan and put out the "Olive Branch of Peace" to King Hussein and said "...we want you to be a part of the New World Order". The press was told that that was what was offered, however, what was told to King Hussein was considerably different for there was a strong implied threat that "...when we are through with Saddam--you guys are next!" They are taking the entire Middle East back to pre-1979 when there was a Shah of Iran, no military conflict between Iran and Iraq, Libya and Syria were not a military power to be reckoned with--they want to go back to where there were

non-military despots running those Middle Eastern countries with a SECRET POLICE POWERFUL ENOUGH TO KEEP THE PEOPLE, THAT ARE IN POVERTY, AT BAY AND CONTROL THEM SO THEY DON'T GET OUT OF LINE NOR CAUSE ANY RIFFLES IN THE WATERS TO ANNOY ISRAEL. Then, too, all of the natural resources of the Middle East will simply be exported through the corporate network into those regions where they want to industrialize like Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. It is a constant pattern of controlling one's resources and who gets it and who sends it to which companies and who gets the proceeds from it. How it works best, according to their thinking, is with feudalistic regimes such as the Saudi and Kuwaiti Regimes.

Countries like Iraq and Syria that claim national identity and have a strong military defense to back it up have to be removed from power. That's because their concern with Peace in the Middle East or protecting Israel from the Arabs--it is only a front to major extent, especially the "Peace" reasoning. Israel is an entirely different matter and is totally absorbed into the Global Elite system. It is boiled down, unfortunately, because the Exxon/Chase--the cabinet that makes up those very same Boards--can't then go to Syria and dictate economic policy. If you try to do so, they get their back up, like Hussein, and basically tell the West to "go to hell".

There are some real flaws remaining with ones, for instance, like Libya. The problem is that the West will push the thing until they very well might pull off the Global plan but there is always the probability that these objectors will get together and get their backs up and have some kind of terrible confrontation. The Arabs know what is under planning and they are split as far as leaders--but the Arab people are united.

The facts are that no matter how the war turns out--Hussein has won a tremendous victory in a political reference for it only has presented the obvious--that a tremendously powerful nation like the U.S. can and will simply move over and pulverize any lesser power who crosses its path in disagreement. The Arabs are totally united in two things--their total hatred of Israel and their total hatred of the

United States of America.

END OF QUOTED TRANSCRIPTION

Thank you Dharma, we will just close this off at this point for we are out of space. However, I just want to request that you ones obtain the "White Papers" and get informed. We have spoken at length on this subject and fleshed out that which these authors have not seen and the "whole" is a massive picture, indeed. You readers get your bearings, confirm to selves the truth--and then ponder what might be done to reverse this plague upon the world.

Remember what I told you yesterday--there will be a coalition of all Arab nations joined by the Soviet Union and then, brothers, the fur will fly and a bunch of chickens are going to get thoroughly plucked. I believe you can see why it is not as simple, either, as simply bringing "the boys" home--the Middle East is a boiling cauldron right now and will remain so--you have just made enemies under the surface with almost every nation in the world. So be it.

Thank you for your service and thank you for your attention. the only portion we did not cover is nuclear capability and we have already covered that quite thoroughly so I choose not to run over on this document.

Gyeorgos Ceres Hatonn, Cmdr.
UFF-IGFC

CONSTITUTION KIT

For those who want to know how they can help save our Constitution--we now are offering a detailed kit of information about our government and the Constitution to help in preserving our freedoms. The kit is available to individuals or groups for \$8.00 per kit, or for \$20 POST PAID with RAPE OF THE CONSTITUTION book included.

PHOENIX EXPRESS PUBLISHER TO SPEAK

George Green lecture Saturday, March 23, 2-5 PM. Cost \$7.00 per person, Rickey's Hyatt House, 4219 El

Camino Real (NE corner of El Camino and Charleston), Palo Alto, CA (415) 493-8000, Camino D Room, Ballroom complex (Behind Hugo's Market)

ALSO: Sunday, March 24, 2-5 PM Berkeley Conference Center, 2105 Bancroft, 2nd Floor, Host Room, Berkeley, CA, (415) 491-1651 for additional info.

PHOENIX INSTITUTE

The window for investment through the Phoenix Institute is now open, but closing fast.

Please contact us for more details as soon as possible.

SOME OF THE PHOENIX JOURNALS:

Burnt Offerings and Bloodstained Sands
Shrouds of The Seventh Seal--
AT THE PRESS,
THE BITTER COMMUNION
The Phoenix Express Vol's V & VI (\$15)
The Phoenix Express Vol's VII & VIII (\$15)

The price is \$10 per JOURNAL, (EXCEPTING EX-PRESS) 10% discount on orders of 4 or more. California residents add 6.75% sales tax. Add shipping, UPS \$3.25 and \$1.00 each additional or U.S. Mail \$2.50 for first title and \$1.00 each additional.

Write for Quantity Discount.

Available from America West or your Local Distributor.

Express is \$20 per 13 ISSUES (including back issues for the period) or \$75 per 52 ISSUES.

Send orders and Payments to: America West Distributors, P.O. Box 986 Tehachapi, CA. 93581.
For credit card orders Telephone 1 800 729-4131 PLEASE USE ONLY FOR ORDERS (THE EXPENSE IS TOO MUCH FOR US) For other purposes 805 822-9655.

TIME FOR RENEWAL FOR THOSE WHO ORDER 13 ISSUES AT A TIME.