The Real Link Between Bush and Hitler

by Paul Wolf, 11 October 2002

Introduction

I keep finding more of these articles comparing Bush to Hitler.

Yesterday Congress gave the President war powers to attack Iraq. A number of congressmen compared Sadam Hussein to Hitler in their speeches before the vote. So I guess it cuts both ways.

Meanwhile, the chairs of the intelligence committees have become increasingly frustrated with their 9/11 investigation, making an investigation by an independent commision all the more likely.

It’s been 27 years since the last serious investigation of our intelligence agencies (see www.cointel.org), which is something I think we need to do on a periodic basis.

Paul
NEW YORK -- Herta Daebuler-Gmelin got it half-right when she compared George W. Bush's tactics to Adolf Hitler's. "Bush wants to divert attention from his domestic problems," she told Schwaebisches Tagblatt on Sept. 18. "It's a classic tactic. It's one that Hitler also used."

Shortly after Ms. Daeubler-Gmelin made her remarks, Bush flung his long knives across the Atlantic, and within days she was no longer Germany’s justice minister.

Such sovereignty-busting gangsterism has its pleasures, but Bush’s biggest cribbing from the Hitler playbook is "permanent revolution." Developed by socialist theorist Leon Trotsky in 1915 and applied by such totalitarian masters of control as Hitler, Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung, permanent revolution is the pinnacle of the art of mass distraction -- one continually changes the subject of debate by striving for new goals that are always just beyond reach. The idea is diabolically simple: by the time people start grumbling about the problems created by your Great Leap Forward, you’re causing new difficulties with your Cultural Revolution. Opposition takes time to materialize; taking the nation from one crisis to the next neutralizes your enemies by focusing them against initiatives you’ve already abandoned.

On the domestic front, Bush has launched so many political offensives that it’s impossible for what’s left of the left to launch a coordinated resistance. Fast-track signing authority for free trade, expanded tax cuts for the wealthy and corporations while running up the deficit, drilling for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, rounding up detainees and depriving them of due process, unraveling environmental regulations, union-busting, curtailing privacy rights -- any one of these full-scale assaults would require a full-court press by liberals to block or overturn.

In a blizzard of legislative and regulatory activity, virtually everything on the right-wing wish list is now being proposed. Previous presidents spaced out their initiatives in order to build popular support; Bush prefers to leave elected representatives out of the equation. The more legislation he throws at the wall, the more he’ll get passed -- and the more people will forget that his is an illegal regime.

Generalissimo El Busho’s policy of permanent revolution has reached its zenith with his post-Sept. 11 foreign policy. Before we allow Bush’s razzle-dazzle to leap us ahead to his next war, let’s consider the one we’ve already got. Our campaign in Afghanistan, lest we forget, continues even as thousands more troops pack for Iraq.

**Operation Enduring Failure**

"Dead or alive," said George W. Bush, squinting hard at Osama bin Laden and Mullah Omar. If we couldn’t get those two, we’d settle for any other high-ranking Al Qaeda or Taliban official we could find. A year later our highest-profile prisoner is alleged Al Qaeda senior field commander Abu Zubaydah. Zubaydah was not involved, says the U.S., in any of
the major attacks -- Sept. 11, our East African embassies, the U.S.S. Cole -- but rather in two Y2K plots that never came off (blowing up LAX and a tourist hotel in Jordan). Hardly a big fish, he’s just a little minnow -- and we wouldn’t even have him if the Pakistanis hadn’t tossed him into our boat.

We blew it. U.S. taxpayers are spending between $500 million and $1 billion a month to occupy Afghanistan and fight its Islamist guerrillas (in the ‘80s we called them "freedom fighters"), yet we haven’t caught any of the people we blame for Sept. 11. Al Qaeda remains operational. They’re moving money, weapons and men around the Middle East and Central Asia, preparing for their next attack. Not only are you no safer than you were on Sept. 10, but you’ve spent billions of bucks along the way.

But wait a minute, Bush said, beginning to distance himself from Operation Enduring Failure: the Afghan war was never about finding Osama and his coconspirators. No, we actually went to Afghanistan to liberate its people.

"We’ve seen the pictures of joy when we liberated city after city in Afghanistan," Bush crowed on Dec. 12. "And none of us will ever forget the laughter and the music and the clapping at a stadium that was once used for public execution. Children now fly kites and they play games. Women now come out of their homes from house arrest, able to walk the streets without chaperons."

Beautiful imagery, nicely written by a talented but sadly anonymous White House speechwriter and echoed by TV reports filed from the Kabul Intercontinental. Too bad that, except for the part about games and kites, it’s a lie.

Public executions continue. Sharia law -- stoning adulterers and chopping off the arms of thieves -- remains in effect, enforced by the same judges who ruled under the Taliban. Judge Ahamat Ullha Zarif told Agence France Press on Dec. 28: "Public executions and amputations would continue in accordance with Sharia law but justice would be applied fairly and with mercy. ‘There will be some changes from the time of the Taliban,’ he said. ‘For example, the Taliban used to hang the victim’s body in public for four days. We will only hang the body for a short time, say 15 minutes.’ Kabul’s sports stadium, where the Taliban used to carry out public executions and amputations every Friday, would no longer be used. ‘The stadium is for sports. We will find a new place for public executions.’" Now that’s civic improvement.

Aside from a tiny minority of the residents of Kabul, ruled by Hamid Karzai’s U.S.-protected city-state, the "liberated" women of Afghanistan still wear the burqa. A May report issued by Human Rights Watch says that women are subjected to "sexual violence by armed factions and public harassment" and that gang rapes are commonplace, particularly in the north. Not one inch of road has been paved. Writing for the Lexington Herald-Tribune, Sudarsan Raghavan notes: "The fall of the Taliban has left a power vacuum in mostly ethnic-Pashtun southern Afghanistan that has been filled by scores of shuras, from provincial ones to others in small villages. Elsewhere, warlords such as Abdul Rashid Dostum in the northern city of Mazar-e-Sharif and Ismael Khan in the western province of Herat are now firmly in control of their fiefdoms, just as they were before the Taliban emerged in 1994. Along one stretch, the road is dotted with armed men at checkpoints controlled by tribal
shuras. Often, they are nothing more than highway robbers preying on commercial trucks and taxis."

What about all the money that we promised to spend to rebuild the country we bombed into freedom? The West welched. The Karzai government is already so broke that it can’t pay its employees; it’s already running a budget deficit -- $165 million by early next year. $2 billion has already been spent -- much of it likely stolen by corrupt Afghan officials -- while the lives of ordinary Afghans continue to be plagued by poverty and starvation.

It doesn’t take an expert on Central Asian politics to discern the obvious: occupation by a rich country that makes poor people even poorer is a recipe for resentment. Afghans are among the world’s most fiercely independent people. A self-indulgent Western superpower propping up a band of third-rate puppets isn’t helping to reduce anti-Americanism there. Never doubt that similar sentiments are spreading through other Muslim countries.

**Onward to Iraq**

One might ask why our Generalissimo is going after Saddam Hussein’s Iraq when the war in Afghanistan has worked out so poorly, but one would be missing the point: Trotsky’s theory of permanent revolution is at work. It is precisely because we botched Afghanistan that we’re moving on to Iraq.

(Ted Rall’s latest book, a graphic travelogue about his recent coverage of the Afghan war titled *To Afghanistan and Back*, is now in its second edition. Ordering and review-copy information are available at nbmpub.com.)

---

**Iraqi press likens Bush to Hitler**

*Strait Times*, Singapore, 10 October 2002
http://straitstimes.asia1.com.sg/world/story/0,1870,148133,00.html

BAGHDAD -- Iraq reacted to US President George W. Bush’s speech yesterday saying he told Hitler-like "lies" to justify an attack.

The Ath-Thawra newspaper, mouthpiece of the ruling Baath party, said he kept saying Iraq had biological and chemical weapons although his security services offered no proof to back up the allegations.

"All of these are aimed at sabotaging the return of inspectors, to deliver a prepared verdict in advance for attack. It’s the same methods employed by Nazi propaganda to peddle the lies of Hitler and pave the way for his aggressions," Ath-Thawra said.

The official Al-Iraq newspaper joined in saying Mr Bush’s lies were unimaginable.
"It seems that the White House has become a lunatic asylum and its occupants would do better by getting away for treatment," the daily newspaper commented.

*AFP*

---

German Leader Moves to Mend Ties With U.S. (excerpt)
Controversial Minister Quits, But Schroeder Firm on Iraq

... The resignation of another top politician who had made disparaging remarks about Bush was also announced. Ludwig Stiegler, head of Schroeder’s Social Democrat party in the Parliament, stepped down from that post but will remain in the legislature. A German newspaper reported that he had said in an interview that "Bush is acting as if he’s Caesar Augustus and Germany is the province of Germania," referring to the powerful Roman emperor who ruled from 27 B.C. to 14 A.D. ...

---

Reflecting on the younger Hitler: Know thine enemy
By William Thorsell, *The Globe and Mail* (Canada), 16 September 2002

How much should we know about Adolf Hitler? The question is relevant as we reflect on current fanaticisms, and controversial as CBS prepares a television miniseries on the younger Hitler and the BBC considers a drama about Hitler as a struggling painter in Vienna. ...

---

German Minister did not have to resign over ‘Hitler’ remark
*East African Standard*, Oct 9, 2002
http://www.eastandard.net/eahome/story09102002006.htm

Recently a German Minister likened United States President George W Bush to former German strongman Adolf Hitler.

Word went round in America and, especially in the White House, criticising the utterance of the German lawmaker. This has led to what many people think was forced resignation of the minister. Pressure was coming specifically from Bush who wanted the German lawmaker to apologise. It was shameful when the German Chancellor, Gehhard Schroeder, insisted on the minister’s stepping down. Schroeder is not realistic in this issue. Unbiased scrutiny shows
that there is no difference between President Bush and Hitler. Bush is geared towards imposing the American hegemony in the world as Hitler did. Bush has for sure proved to be attacking only the minority nations in the world as Hitler did, but Hitler was realistic because he went ahead and attacked strong nations, say, Britain and France.

Hitler felt hurt when a German was killed wherever in the world. Look at Bush. He felt hurt only when Americans died in September 11 attack, but he was not feeling for the death of innocent Afghan women and children when he attacked their country without proper evidence that Afghanistan was connected with the September 11 terrorism. Hitler had erected various military pockets in Europe. Bush and the predecessors have erected unnumbered military pockets world-wide. Hitler was a ruthless killer. President Bush is also a ruthless killer.

He is now geared to attack Iraq for no reason and knowing well he cannot get Saddam -- his target. Instead thousands of innocent civilians will die.

Hitler was a dictator in Germany. Bush is a dictator in the world. He began his dictatorship by rigging in the USA elections.

Today he is dictating terms to the UN. He has already said "You are either with us or against us," as far as war against terrorism is concerned. When all the UN members are against the Israeli incursions against the Palestinians he is behind the curtain supporting the Israelis.

On the same note, he has dictated that he will topple Saddam from power if the UN Security Council does not do the task. This he says will happen with or without allies. What else do dictators talk of?

The German minister hit the nail on the head and all people know that, including Schroeder, but he fears going against Bush as people feared going against former German dictator Hitler. There is no difference between Bush and Hitler.

(I think this one is a joke)

Hitler planned ‘9/11’ attack on New York skyscrapers

_Ananova, 9 October 2002_


Adolf Hitler planned September 11-style suicide plane attacks on New York skyscrapers.

Hitler ordered Second World War engineers to design a transatlantic bomber with a kamikaze pilot and plane slung underneath.

The Sun (http://www.thesun.co.uk/) reports that documents say the mother plane would get as close as possible, then launch the flying bombs "into structures like the Empire State and
Chrysler buildings”.

Hitler saw the skyscrapers as symbols of US power.

He also told a top woman pilot to form suicide squadrons.

The plans, which never left the drawing board because pilots wouldn’t volunteer, were found in archives in Berlin.

Story filed: 08:48 Wednesday 9th October 2002

UK spies reject al-Qaida link
Intelligence MI5 and MI6 dismiss Iraq terror ‘evidence’
http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,3604,808843,00.html

British intelligence agencies are dismissing claims by the Bush administration that there are links between Iraq and the al-Qaida terrorist network. The claims are being used by President Bush to press his case against Saddam Hussein, amid growing unease among Americans of the prospect of a US military invasion of Iraq, especially without British participation.

The allegations have already sparked off a dispute in the US over the way information and speculation by the CIA is being used by the Bush administration for its own ends.

Both MI5 and MI6 have been deeply concerned about unsubstantiated claims made by senior members of the Bush administration, notably Donald Rumsfeld, the defence secretary, about the threat posed by al-Qaida. They say the claims could be counter-productive since they are plainly misleading.

Mr Rumsfeld claimed last month that American intelligence had "bulletproof" evidence of links between al-Qaida and the Iraqi regime. He later added: "But they’re not photographs. They’re not beyond a reasonable doubt." This week Mr Bush suggested that al-Qaida leaders were in close contact with Baghdad.

British intelligence sources firmly reject such claims. Asked whether President Saddam had links with al-Qaida, one well-placed source replied: "Quite the opposite."

The clear message from British intelligence is that far from allying himself with al-Qaida terrorists, the Iraqi leader is distancing himself from them.

British sources interpret the murder in Baghdad of the former Palestinian terrorist leader, Abu Nidal, in August as evidence of President Saddam’s concern about accusations he is harbouring terrorists, especially one whose loyalty he could not rely on.
British intelligence sources also dismiss claims by Washington hawks that Mohamed Atta, believed to be the ringleader of the September 11 terrorists, met an Iraqi intelligence official in Prague on several occasions.

They also dismiss claims that Ramzi Youssef, convicted of the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Centre, was in fact an Iraqi agent who studied in Swansea.

Last October Paul Wolfowitz, the hawkish US deputy defence secretary, sent James Woolsey, a former CIA director, to Swansea, in search of evidence to back up the theory. He returned empty-handed.

An alliance between al-Qaida and Saddam Hussein makes little sense, say British sources, since Iraq’s secular regime would not appeal to al-Qaida fundamentalists.

Al-Qaida, the sources add, have paid little or no attention to the Palestinian struggle despite attempts by Bush administration officials and Republican politicians to establish a link between Palestinian extremists, al-Qaida and Saddam Hussein.

The sources also dismiss attempts by the Israeli government -- seized on by CIA officials -- to link Iranian-backed Hizbullah extremists in the Lebanon with al-Qaida.

They also say there is no evidence that al-Qaida fighters who fled from Afghanistan and are now reported to be in north-eastern Iraq have links with Baghdad.

A German prosecutor said yesterday that Iraq had obtained equipment for the manufacture of a new supergun, capable of delivering atomic, biological or chemical munitions.

Hubert Jobski, senior prosecutor in the south-west city of Mannheim, said machinery used for drilling the barrels of large guns was shipped to the Middle East in 1999 and 2000. It was sent initially to Jordan, but then delivered to Iraq, said Mr Jobski.
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