

THE KENNEBUNKPORT REALITY CHECK: THE DANGER OF WORLD WAR III IS THE MUCH-NEGLECTED HEART OF THE MATTER

Most of the comments concerning the Kennebunkport Warning have avoided the main issue. The central point has nothing to do with any signatures or absence thereof. The key issue is whether the world strategic picture given by the Kennebunkport Warning is accurate or not. If the statement is true, as we firmly assert that it is, then the other issues can be seen in proper perspective, meaning that they are dwarfed by the threat of a world catastrophe. If Cheney really is pressing for a new false flag terror provocation, to be followed by a nuclear attack on Iran and martial law in the US, then that fact certainly ought to command the attention of all thinking people. To duck such an issue would be despicable. Nobody with the vaguest notion of what is happening in the world can doubt that Cheney is doing this – it is written in the newspapers, it is written in the graffiti on the walls. At this point it becomes our duty to mobilize to the limit of our capacity to ward off such an immense evil. All the other questions are trivial by comparison. And you cannot be an antiwar leader and be an agnostic about this, claiming you simply do not know or that you do not understand the concept of false flag. If you choose that cop-out, what kind of a peace leader are you?

THE FEAR FACTOR

Naturally, the world described by the Kennebunkport Warning is a terrifying world. But our chances of survival will be better if we are able to face reality, rather than retreat into a dream-world of opinions, perceptions, and recriminations. This applies especially to those who claim to be antiwar leaders.

Reality is that the signers signed – the irrefutable, photographic, courtroom quality documentary proof is posted on the internet. In the light of this overwhelming evidence, it is understandable that most of the signers are reluctant to issue a flat denial that they ever signed. Rather, their denials are oblique and ambiguous doubletalk.

ADULTS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT THEY SIGN

On the question of signing: under US law, if you are 21 years old and can read and write, if you put your name to something you are bound by it. If you sign it, you must accept the consequences. Your signature is your bond –

ask anyone who has signed an adjustable rate mortgage lately. The only way you can get out of this is to prove that you are mentally defective, and nobody has tried that, so far.

Most of us were told by our parents that we should never sign anything unless we had read it carefully and considered it from every possible point of view. That is a very good maxim. We must assume that capable political leaders dealing with the life and death questions of war, peace, and martial law will pay close attention to anything that they are asked to sign. And the signers are serious political leaders who know what they are doing, are they not? Such people know very well that they must take responsibility for their own signatures, don't they? Surely they cannot be in the habit of signing things without reading them. Considerations of this type lead us to us to the most embarrassing doubts about their competence and seriousness.

It is also worth noting that verbal contracts are valid in almost all states, as long as they cover the main points at issue – such as a commitment to sign a statement in token of political support. Anyone who recalls the Texaco-Pennzoil case, when the fate of about ten billion dollars was sealed by a verbal contract knows this. It would be foolhardy for people in politics and government to ignore such matters.

Anyone who has ever organized support for a statement knows how such a process works. You get a bunch of copies of the statement. You go to a gathering and hand out the copies. You buttonhole influential people and urge them to read the statement, evaluate it, and then sign it. Anyone who signs something under such circumstances knows that as mature adults they must take responsibility for their own signature. The organizer cannot subject the signers to hours of psychiatric depth analysis to determine their mental state, or to establish whether they have fully grasped each detail of the statement. There is no way to bring a notary along. They are professional politicians, are they not? One or two are or have been candidates for important federal offices. Surely in their official capacities they plan to read things before they sign them, since they are sure to be held responsible. Otherwise, they will be a laughingstock. They knew exactly what they were signing and, if they deny it, they are unfortunately lying. Anyone who talks of forgery or trickery in gathering these signatures is compounding that lying with slander.

The Kennebunkport Warning is a statement of about a dozen lines. Any normal person can read it and grasp the main points in less than a minute. Nobody can be rushed or stampeded into signing something like this, because it is so brief. It is not an appropriations bill of 1,000 pages.

We cannot avoid the delicate question of cointelpro, the domestic sabotage and wrecking activities of the intelligence agencies. A current news item

relates that the FBI spied on Coretta Scott King after the assassination of Martin Luther King. The reason was that J. Edgar Hoover feared that Mrs. King might continue her late husband's efforts to unite the anti-Vietnam War movement with the civil rights movement. The Kennebunkport Warning attempts to do something similar: its entire logic is to unite the peace, impeachment, and anti-globalization and other movements on a platform which would be independent of the Democratic and Republican Parties, which would no longer be crippled by a single-issue focus, and which would acquire the decisive power of 9/11 truth. The intelligence community of our time is well aware of the vast potential that would be unleashed by such a convergence. This is the eventuality they are intent on preventing. So nobody should be surprised to see counter-organizing in general, or to see the individual signers of such a statement quickly leaned on, squeezed, intimidated, threatened, or otherwise counter-organized. How could it be otherwise? Under Reagan's Executive Order 12333, many of the functions of the Cold War intelligence community were privatized into fronts and especially into foundations. Many foundations must thus be considered as tentacles of the intelligence community. The role of foundations in funding the peace movement and some of its leading activists is an immense factor of impotence and corruption. One such leader has commented: "I can't say anything about 9/11 – I might lose my funding!" Well, the Kennebunkport Warning does talk about 9/11, and that may be the rub.

IS CHENEY PRESSING FOR A WIDER WAR VIA FALSE FLAG OPS, OR NOT

This brings us back to the issue of whether the Kennebunkport Warning gives an accurate picture of today's world. We maintain that it does, and that it is true independently of who signs it or does not sign it. Those who have never learned to take responsibility for their own signatures will now fall by the wayside. But those who remain committed to operating in the real world as it exists independent of signatures or non-signatures must now redouble their efforts of mobilization to stop the Cheney neocon faction. Nobody should be demoralized or disoriented by the void of leadership which this matter has revealed; it is rather time to fill that void. We call on all persons and organizations of good will everywhere in the world to support the Kennebunkport Warning. We appeal to them to endorse it, to post it, to sign it, to publish it, and to recruit new signers as fast as they possibly can.