



Unravelling the New World Order

*An Exposé of How Government, Religious, and Financial Insiders
Are Deciding Your Future*

October 2009

CHAOS IN OBAMA'S AMERICA *Incompetence--or Planned Destruction?*

By Marilyn M. Brannan, Associate Editor

Marilyn Brannan, Associate Editor of *Monetary & Economic Review*, and *Unravelling the New World Order*. Her commentaries appear on the IRN/USA News website, www.irnnews.com.

We wonder what an honest poll would reveal if the following choice were posed to a wide cross section of American voters and taxpayers:

PLEASE CHECK ONE:

The escalating economic and social chaos in America is the result of :

- poor planning and factors beyond our control
 deliberately destructive actions.

Charles Krauthammer ("Decline is a Choice," *Weekly Standard*, October 19, 2009) says the notion that current economic chaos in the U.S. is the result of uncontrollable external forces is wrong. He states, "*Nothing is inevitable. Nothing is written. For America today, decline is not a condition. Decline is a choice. . . .*"

It is interesting to note that a Pew poll conducted in March 2009 revealed 70% of the American people prefer free-market capitalism--the system that has allowed this nation to become the freest, most prosperous and productive nation in history.

Clearly, that is not the preference of President Obama and his closest advisors and supporters. After observing the escalating economic chaos of the first nine months of the Obama presidency, coupled with the President's continuing rants while abroad about the egregious sins and failures of the United States, it is hard to conclude that his policies are calculated to promote anything other than the decline of our nation.

Obama's "International Community" Fantasy

Imbedded in the foreign policy of this current administration is the belief that there exists an "international community" willing (and able) to maintain stability in the world through international consensus. Nice idea. But even a fleeting acquaintance with world history scuttles that notion. Unfortunately, we have a president who ignores grim realities of the past, believing that as long as he is President, they will not intrude upon the carefully ordered future he has planned for us. He will just hit the "Reset" button.

The Global War on Terror, instigated out of necessity during the Bush administration, has now been re-named. Janet Napolitano, Secretary of Homeland Security, prefers to call the death struggles of global *jihād* "man-caused disasters." The recognition that much of the world faces a bloody and protracted struggle against the forces of radical Islam has been relegated by the Obama Administration to the junk heap of outmoded axioms of foreign policy.

Accordingly, the paradigm for dealing with the unsavory instigators of "man-caused disasters" has undergone a philosophical transformation under the Obama administration: We must now fight the forces of terror with the tools of law enforcement, and high-level al Qaeda prisoners will henceforth be interrogated by the more "humane" agents of the FBI—not by the CIA.

How does this serve the security interests of the United States?

The World Community According to Obama

Obama has abrogated our missile defense arrangements with Poland and Czechoslovakia, conceding strategic space to Russia in its old sphere of Iron Curtain influence. This is a dangerous and cowardly retreat, being felt throughout Eastern Europe, Ukraine and Georgia.

The President is ambivalent, indecisive on Afghanistan, contemplating minimalist strategies that our commanders on the ground have clearly stated have no chance of success. This amounts to a strategic retreat in Afghanistan—a war that, only months ago, the President declared to be a “war of necessity.”

In Iraq, the Obama administration is determined to withdraw U.S. forces according to rigid timetables that ascribe little importance to the new Iraq as a strategic partner and anchor point for hard-won U.S. influence in the Middle East.

In Honduras, the Obama administration is backing a dictator who illegally sought extension of his presidency—a grave constitutional violation in Honduras—and was removed from power by legitimate processes of the Honduran Supreme Court and national congress. This is a clear signal to other dictators in the region that the Obama administration has no sympathy for rule of law in democratic nations that have in the past been valued allies of the U.S.

Is this just incompetence—or intentional strategy for U.S. decline?

The Costs of Downgrading

Although there is much to be said for the relative equity of social democracy (manifested for a short period of time during the days of the early Christian Church), the costs in today’s socialized nations include diminished social mobility and individual liberty; chronic unemployment; sharply reduced innovation and dynamism in business, technology, and industry; the stifling of economic growth; and the sacrifice of defense capabilities and national security—to name a few.

Defense. The Europeans, although rich and developed, cannot project power. They long ago made a choice to commit their resources to a vast welfare state, limiting their expenditures on defense to a bare minimum. And why not? They have relied on the U.S. Navy to protect the open seas, the U.S. Air force for airlift operations, and the U.S. Marines on the ground in time of war and for humanitarian services such as tsunami relief. The U.S. has been able to do all of this because we have spent more on defense than the next nine countries combined. As the “New Liberalism” of Obama moves forward, however, defense spending will significantly decline, diminishing our power to defend ourselves and other nations that have needed our help in the past and likely will need it again.

While hundreds of billions of dollars are being squandered on “stimulus” programs and an endless array of domestic programs designed to buy votes and maintain one-party political control, the U.S. Defense Department is being required to make hard, cost-cutting choices that will result in abandoning advanced weapons systems, choosing between readiness and research, and dangerously diminishing our readiness to deal with future threats.

The Washington Times reported recently that the Senate has diverted \$2.6 billion in a defense spending bill to pet projects largely at the expense of accounts that pay for fuel, ammunition and training for U.S. troops, including those fighting wars in Iraq and Afghanistan (“U.S. Troop Funds Diverted to Pet Projects,” October 15, 2009).

Winslow Wheeler, former Senate staffer and now a senior fellow at the Center for Defense Information, wrote, “in 30 years on Capitol Hill, I never saw Congress mangle the defense budget as badly as this year.”

Militarily, the 21st century will be dominated by the ballistic missile. Up until now, the U.S. has enjoyed a great technological edge that was specifically designed to maintain American preeminence in such a time. But now, missile defense is being cut. The number of interceptors in Alaska has been reduced, and the airborne laser program (the technology for a boost-phase antiballistic missile) has been cut back. At the same time, the federal education budget—billions to support our union-dominated, notoriously cost-ineffective government schools—has been increased 100 percent in one year!

Is this just bad planning—or is it intentional destruction of our national security?

Energy and Security. The liberal obsession with “social and environmental goods” over security needs is prohibiting the drilling of offshore and Arctic oil deposits, denying us access to vast amounts of oil that would relieve dependency on and help curb the wealth and power of petroleum suppliers from Iran to Venezuela to Russia—none of which is friendly to America. Fully two-thirds of our trade imbalance comes from imported oil; and yet, we have it in our power to release huge domestic petroleum reserves by dropping the ban on offshore and Arctic drilling. We also have it in our power to reverse the 30-year ban on building nuclear power plants.

You decide: *Is current energy policy just “misguided”—or is it intended to undermine our security for political motives?*

Destruction of the Dollar

The fulfillment of the “Obama vision” necessitates huge increases in domestic expenditures, the most immediate of which is expanded (read, *universal*) health care. ObamaCare, currently under consideration, will cost well over \$1trillion. And once the budget gimmicks (empty promises included to mollify an outraged taxpaying populace) have

vanished into thin air as they are certain to do, hundreds of billions of dollars will be added to the staggering budget deficits—which the CBO projects conservatively at \$7 trillion over the next decade.

The effects of runaway spending on the U.S. dollar are already being felt. Credible economists forecast the monstrous deficits will lead to a catastrophic collapse and/or hyperinflation. The head of the World Bank, along with adversaries such as Russia and China, Iran, and Venezuela are demanding that the dollar be replaced as the world's reserve currency.

The staggering price tag for the socialist state known as “ObamaLand”—which Obama and the hard Left plan to govern for decades, if not longer—will be exacted on the dollar, on our primacy in space, on missile defense, on energy security, on our military capacities and on our stature and security as a nation.

Who Will Stand Up for the U.S.?

Who will watch out for the U.S. if we re-allocate the capital and assets previously committed to national security to social programs designed primarily to buy votes to keep the party of Obama in power?

If we voluntarily renounce our own power, there is no reason to believe other nations will follow suit. Common sense (somewhat like the laws of physics) tells us the opposite: *As one nation abdicates its position of power and influence, others will move in to fill the vacuum.* Inevitably, an inversion of power will result; and the land of the free and the home of the brave could become *the land of the shackled and the home of the defeated.*

Don't think it can't happen here.