

To: Distinguished Recipients From:
John Whitbeck

Transmitted below are words of wisdom from my very distinguished recipient Bill Polk.

It should be noted, however, that Bill's advice is optimistically and generously premised on the assumption that the primary motivation for America's wars of choice is a desire to improve the quality of life for the peoples of the countries being attacked, rather than, as is vastly more likely, to serve the selfish interests of the three pillars of the Permanent Government of the United States (the military-industrial-intelligence-surveillance-homeland-security complex, the uniformed military and the Israel-First Lobby), before all of which virtually all transitory American politicians, including presidents, who come and go, full of sound and fury but signifying nothing, bend the knee in abject submission and subservience.

From William R. Polk

With all eyes focus on other problems — Yemen, Syria, Iraq, Gaza, Israel and Iran — this is not the time to discuss the Palestine issue. So, I will await a more suitable, if worse, moment to circulate the attached piece or a revised version of it. But let me here and now do two things: one is to ask for your criticism and, second, to explain what i am trying to do:

So, please criticize fully and consider my purpose and my attempt to accomplish i:.

I find that the daily flow of events is so overpowering that we tend to lose sight of how they fit together or where trends started to develop. Sequence if often lost in the staccato. Here, I try to create or restore a matrix into which they can be fitted.

Doing so, of course, requires one to leave out much. I have, for example, left out discussion of the nuclear issue, brushed over lightly the issue of terrorism and even jumped over events of the early wars. I narrow my focus even on seminal events and leave aside those that are either sterile or adequately known. Perhaps

I have left out too much. You will judge, I hope.

Alternatively, it is possible that the whole story is so well known that this is redundant. If you think so, please say so!

The opinions I express are, of course, mine and you may not agree with some of them. In a few cases I have thought it necessary or at least polite to source things that are particularly controversial, but I wanted to keep notes to a minimum: it is not the detail but the overview I am trying to lay out.

The attached is Part 1. In it i deal with the deeper past; then in Part 2 I begin more or less where I got involved, in the 1960s. I expect to be able to send you Part 2 in a couple of weeks.

Please do not circulate the attached (Part 1) as it is rough and I would like to improve it as I fit it into Part 2.

Many thanks for your help.

As ever, Bill

February 22, 2018