

The Global Hidden Powers That Controls The Intel Apparatus That Controls The Country.

By Matthias Chang – Future Fast-Forward

Part 1

Caveat

Don't believe me! Do your own research, think and come to your own conclusions. See the simplified diagram in Appendix 2.

Quotations

Senate Democratic leader, Charles Schumer (he was a US Senator since 1980) was asked by Rachel Maddow about Trump's spurning of the Agencies' findings. He replied:

"Let me tell you, you take on the intelligence community, they have six ways from Sunday at getting back at you. So, even for a practical, supposedly hard-nosed businessman, he's being really dumb to do this."

The New York Times, in a story pre-empting the speech by President Obama, wrote the following:

"The emerging approach, described by current and former government officials who insisted on anonymity in advance of Mr. Obama's widely anticipated speech, suggested a president trying to straddle a difficult line in hopes of placating foreign leaders and advocates of civil liberties without a backlash from national security agencies."

The New York Times reported that Obama was concerned about a "backlash from national security agencies."

In another story a few months later, the New York Times reported that, as pressure mounted on the president for more thorough torture investigations,

"Mr. Obama worried about damaging morale at the C.I.A. and his own relationship with the agency."

ACLU Concluded:

"All of this raises the question: just who is in charge in this country? Whether or not the security establishment actively retaliates against perceived insults such as Trump's, the New York Times's reporting suggests we have reached the point where the military/security establishment has now become an independent political force. As a democracy, our elected civilian leaders are supposed to answer to

citizens, and all the political constituent groups they make up. They're not supposed to answer to agencies created to carry out the nation's policies."

There are so much more quotes that I could cite, but enough is enough when the above quotes refer to two US Presidents!

But, these treasonous acts have been going on from a very long time! Intel Apparatus has always been weaponised to implement the 'secret' agendas of the Hidden Powers.

Only arseholes and idiots insist that the above are BS!

That is not my problem! You are the problem!

Traitors & Fifth Columns

I am slowly peeling the layers of the Onion as to who are the Ultimate Hidden Powers. Hint - it is not a country. It is the "Hidden Powers" who Control THAT country.

But, you must first under the influence of a **specific** country **before** venturing into a discussion as to who are the Hidden Powers **behind that** country.

Henry Kissinger and the Brits

Read carefully. I disclosed this hidden treasonous act a long time ago in Volume 1 of the Future Fast-Forward Trilogy (out of print)

Speech to the Royal Institute of International Affairs on **May10, 1982** on the occasion of the Bicentenary of the Office of the Foreign Secretary, entitled ***"Reflections on a Partnership: British and American Attitudes to the Post War Foreign Policy"***.

The change from "Pharaoh to that of the High Priest" by Britain was explained by Kissinger,

*"To the outside world, it may have seemed that Britain clung far too long to the illusion of Empire; in her relations with Washington, **she proved that an old country is beyond self-deception on fundamentals**. Bevin, the unlikely originator of this revolution in British diplomacy, shrewdly calculated that Britain **was not powerful enough to influence American policy by conventional methods of pressure, or balancing risks**. But by discreet advice, the wisdom of experience, and pre-supposition of common aims, **she would make herself indispensable**, so that American leaders no longer thought of **consultations** with London as a special favour but **an inherent component of our own decision making**. The wartime habit of intimate, informal collaboration thus became a **permanent practice**, obviously because it was valuable to both sides.*

“Our post war diplomatic history is littered with Anglo-American ‘arrangements’ sometimes on crucial issues never put into formal documents. The British were so matter-of-factly helpful that they became a participant in internal American deliberations, to a degree probably never before practiced between sovereign nations. In my period of office, Britain played a seminal part in certain bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union... indeed they helped draft the Key document. In my White House incarnation then, I kept British Foreign Office better informed and more closely engaged than I did the American State Department ...”

When Kissinger never considered Britain a spent force, why would Malaysian idiots think otherwise?

Malaysians do so, because of arrogance and conceit – the **fallacy of racial supremacy**. Hard to swallow, but swallow we must or we will pay a heavy price!

The US Intel Apparatus – A Summary

I hate to do this, but to avoid the criticism that I am inventing the Intel history, I am hard pressed to quote from Wikipedia (an USA / American creation), though I had covered extensively in the Future Fast-Forward Trilogy. Below is the Wikipedia’s summary:

During World War II, President Roosevelt was concerned about American covert intelligence capabilities, particularly in the light of the success of Churchill's Commandos. On the suggestion of a senior British intelligence officer, he asked Colonel William "Wild Bill" Donovan to devise a combined intelligence service modelled on the British Secret Intelligence Service (MI6), and Special Operations Executive, centralizing, for instance, the separate crypto-analysis programs of the Army, and Navy. This resulted in the creation of the Office of Strategic Services. On September 20, 1945, shortly after the end of World War II, President Harry S. Truman signed Executive Order 9621, dissolving the OSS by October 1, 1945. The rapid reorganizations that followed reflected not only routine bureaucratic competition for resources but also exploration of the proper relationships between clandestine intelligence collection and covert action (i.e., paramilitary and psychological operations).

On September 20, 1945, as part of Truman's dismantling of the World War II war machine, the OSS, at one time numbering almost 13,000 staff, was eliminated over the span of ten days. A reprieve, though, was granted six days later by the Assistant Secretary of War, reducing it to a skeleton crew of roughly 15% of its peak force level, forcing it to close many of its foreign offices; at the same time the name of the service was changed from the OSS to the Strategic Services Unit. In October 1945, the functions of the OSS were split between the Departments of State and War

The United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) dates from September 18, 1947, when President Harry S. Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 into law.

Present Structures

The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 created the office of the Director of National Intelligence (DNI), who took over some of the government and intelligence community (IC) wide functions that had previously been the CIA's. The DNI manages the United States Intelligence Community and in so doing it manages the intelligence cycle. Among the functions that moved to the DNI were the preparation of estimates reflecting the consolidated opinion of the 16 IC agencies, and preparation of briefings for the president. On July 30, 2008, President Bush issued Executive Order 13470 amending Executive Order 12333 to strengthen the role of the DNI.

The Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) used to oversee the Intelligence Community, serving as the president's principal intelligence advisor, additionally serving as head of the CIA. The DCI's title now is "Director of the Central Intelligence Agency" (D/CIA), serving as head of the CIA.

The CIA now reports to the Director of National Intelligence. Prior to the establishment of the DNI, the CIA reported to the President, with informational briefings to congressional committees. The National Security Advisor is a permanent member of the National Security Council, responsible for briefing the President with pertinent information collected by all U.S. intelligence agencies, including the National Security Agency, the Drug Enforcement Administration, etc. All 16 Intelligence Community agencies are under the authority of the Director of National Intelligence.

Changes

On 6 March 2015, the office of the D/CIA issued an unclassified edition a statement by the Director, titled 'Our Agency's Blueprint for the Future', as a press release for public consumption. The press release announced sweeping plans for the reorganization and reform of the CIA, which the Director believes will bring the CIA more in line with the Agency doctrine called the 'Strategic Direction'. Among the principal changes disclosed include the establishment of a new directorate, the Directorate of Digital Innovation, which is responsible for designing and crafting the digital technology to be used by the Agency, to keep the CIA always ahead of its enemies. The Directorate of Digital Innovation will also train CIA staff in the use of this technology, to prepare the CIA for the future, and it will also use the technological revolution to deal with cyber-terrorism and other perceived threats. The new directorate will be the chief cyber-espionage arm of the Agency going forward.

Other changes which were announced include the formation of a Talent Development Center of Excellence, the enhancement and expansion of the CIA University and the creation of the office of the Chancellor to head the CIA University in order to consolidate and unify recruitment and training efforts. The office of the Executive Director will be empowered and expanded and the secretarial offices serving the Executive Director will be streamlined. The restructuring of the entire Agency is to be revamped according to a new model whereby governance is modelled after the structure and hierarchy of

corporations, said to increase the efficiency of workflow and to greatly enable the Executive Director to manage day-to-day activity. As well, another stated intention was to establish 'Mission Centers', each one to deal with a specific geographic region of the world, which will bring the full collaboration and joint efforts of the five Directorates together under one roof. While the Directorate heads will still retain ultimate authority over their respective Directorate, the Missions Centers will be led by an Assistant Director who will work with the capabilities and talents of all five Directorates on mission-specific goals for the parts of the world which they are given responsibility for.

The unclassified version of the document ends with the announcement that the National Clandestine Service (NCS) will be reverting to its original Directorate name, the Directorate of Operations. The Directorate of Intelligence is also being renamed, it will now be the Directorate of Analysis. **See Appendix 1**

UK Special Branch / Counter Terrorism Command

The first Special Branch in the world was that of the Metropolitan Police, formed in London in 1883, with each British police force going on to form its own Special Branch. In Northern Ireland, the Royal Ulster Constabulary (1922–2001) had the RUC Special Branch.



Special Branch detectives on an undercover operation at the London Docks, 1911.

The UK Special Branch was established in response to the threat posed by Irish Fenians in the 1880s. The Home Secretary Sir William Harcourt established the first counter-terrorism unit in 1883, named Special Irish Branch, to combat Irish Republican terrorism through infiltration and subversion. It was initially a section of the Criminal Investigation Department within the London Metropolitan Police

This tradition has since spread to the Commonwealth countries.

Important facts

Terrorism remains one of the highest priority risks to national security. The aim of the Government's counter-terrorism strategy is to reduce this risk so that

people can go about their lives freely and with confidence. The police service plays a vital role in making this happen.

Within each force, this role includes: working locally to prevent radicalisation; protecting public places, transport systems, key infrastructure and other sites from terrorist attack; and being prepared to coordinate the response of the emergency services during or after a terrorist attack.

An important part, primarily by acquiring and developing intelligence on individuals of national security interest, is also played by each force's Special Branch, the department within police forces that plays a leading role in countering threats to national security.

The Strategic Policing Requirement sets out an expectation that the police will also maintain a cross-boundary response that supports the counter- terrorism structures and mechanisms through which forces already work together. These include the nationally coordinated network of regional police counter-terrorism hubs that work closely with police-force special branches and the Security Service (MI5) to identify and disrupt terrorist activity. Most of the costs of counter-terrorism policing are met by ring- fenced central government grants. Details have since been archived:

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7f99c6e5274a2e8ab4d29a/ct-special-brancharchive.pdf>

The opinion on The Special Branch of the London Metropolitan Police has changed over the years. In the review of the book, **“the Origins of the Vigilant State” by Bernard Porter**, the views were mixed, that “it has been a hidden but important part of Britain's political life for a hundred years. Opinions on its role have varied between those who saw it as protecting Britain from terrorism, revolution or worse and those who regarded the Special Branch as a threat to Britain's civil liberties. The truth has never been easy to establish, mainly due to the obsessive secrecy of the Branch”.

False Flag Operations

Douglas C. Youvan, in his “False Flag Operations: Analysis, Implications, and Historical Context” succinctly explains:

In the intricate tapestry of international relations and geopolitics, few tactics are as deceptive, controversial, and potent as false flag operations. By definition, a false flag operation is an act or series of acts undertaken by one entity, covertly designed to appear as if they have been executed by another. These operations are not just mere acts of subterfuge; they serve specific objectives, often of strategic importance. Whether used as a pretext for war, a justification for curbing civil liberties, or a method to discredit opponents, they have played pivotal roles in shaping the course of nations and the destiny of their peoples.

The term "false flag" originates from maritime warfare, where ships would fly flags of countries other than their own to deceive and approach enemies surreptitiously. This naval tactic serves as a metaphor for more complex

operations on land, in the air, and, more recently, in the digital realm. Today's false flag operations might involve cyber-attacks appearing to emerge from a certain country or terror attacks supposedly conducted by specific groups, when, in reality, another party with entirely different objectives is responsible.

The historical footprint of false flag operations is significant. They have been the silent catalysts behind wars, revolutions, and pivotal policy changes. Recognizing their significance isn't just about understanding history; it's about anticipating future challenges in an interconnected world. In an era marked by rapid technological advancements, the ability to conduct false flag operations, particularly in cyberspace, has magnified. Their detection becomes an ever-evolving challenge, and their ramifications extend far beyond the immediate impact.

The deception inherent in false Flag operations is elaborated further:

A false flag operation, at its core, is an act of deception. It involves a party, often a nation or a well-organized group, carrying out covert activities designed to appear as though they were conducted by another entity. The objective is to deceive observers and decision-makers into misattributing responsibility, often leading to misdirected blame, confusion, and strategic missteps. The act is a chameleon-like endeavour, where the perpetrator dons the "flag" or identity of someone else, masking their true intentions and actions.

Why conduct false Flag Operations:

The objectives behind false flag operations are as varied as they are profound:

1. Pretext for Aggression: By staging an attack on oneself or a third party and blaming it on a perceived enemy, a nation can create a justification for retaliation or even full-scale war. Such operations can sway public opinion, mobilize international support, and provide a seemingly legitimate casus belli.

2. Diversion: False flag operations can divert attention away from other activities or operations, creating confusion and consuming the resources of adversaries who are busy responding to the deceptive act.

3. Discrediting Opponents: By making it seem as though a particular group or nation is responsible for reprehensible actions, one can tarnish their reputation, undermine their credibility, and delegitimize their cause.

4. Shaping Narratives: In the arena of global opinion, perception often molds reality. By controlling the narrative, through false flag operations, entities can shape how events are perceived and interpreted, often leading to outcomes that favour their strategic interests.

5. Internal Control: Sometimes, the target audience of a false flag operation is a nation's own populace. By staging threats or attacks, governments can justify crackdowns, consolidate power, or suppress dissent under the guise of national security.

In understanding false flag operations, it's crucial to recognize them as tools in the vast arsenal of geopolitical strategy. They are neither relics of a bygone era

nor the sole domain of any single type of actor. In a world replete with competing narratives and interests, the false flag remains a potent, albeit controversial, instrument, wielded in the shadows yet echoing loudly in the corridors of power.

A few examples illustrate the above narrative:

USS Maine (1898): *While the sinking of the USS Maine in Havana Harbour is still a matter of debate, its aftermath isn't. The explosion aboard the ship was immediately attributed to a Spanish mine by certain U.S. factions, serving as a catalyst for the Spanish-American War. Later investigations have left the cause of the explosion inconclusive.*

The Mukden Incident (1931): *Japanese military personnel detonated a small charge on a Japanese-owned railway line near Mukden, blaming it on Chinese saboteurs. This event served as Japan's pretext for its invasion and subsequent occupation of Manchuria.*

Lavon Affair (1954): *This covert Israeli operation aimed to discredit Egypt's then-President Gamal Abdel Nasser by planting bombs in American, British, and Egyptian buildings and making them appear to be the work of Egyptian nationalists. The operation was exposed, leading to political fallout in Israel.*

Operation Northwoods (1962 - Not Executed): *This proposed plan by the U.S. Department of Defense sought to justify military intervention in Cuba. It involved a series of proposed actions, including the idea of staging terrorist attacks on U.S. soil and blaming them on the Cuban government. The operation was never approved. President Kennedy disallowed it!*

Gulf of Tonkin (1964): *In the Gulf of Tonkin Incident (1964), a reported attack on U.S. naval vessels by North Vietnamese naval forces in the Gulf of Tonkin was used to justify increased U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Subsequent investigations and declassified materials suggest that the incident was misrepresented and exaggerated.*

The Cold War and Operation Gladio: *Operation Gladio is one of the most enigmatic and controversial covert operations of the Cold War. Rooted in the immediate aftermath of World War II, Gladio was part of a series of "stay-behind" operations in Western Europe aimed at countering a potential Soviet invasion or local communist insurgencies. The revelations surrounding Gladio have raised unsettling questions about the clandestine activities of NATO, the CIA, and various European intelligence services during the Cold War era.*

In my book, the Future Fast-Forward Trilogy, I had exposed that the former Director of CIA, William Colby confirmed the dastardly Operation Gladio and I wrote:

“Operation Gladio was a covert operation and deceit planned and controlled by Western Intelligence Services (essentially the CIA and MI6) against their own citizens which was exposed in 1991. Gladio is Latin for sword. And appropriately Gladio was the sword that slaughtered hundreds of innocent people on trains, supermarkets, restaurants and offices via so-called terrorist attacks which were later blamed on the Left-Wing groups ... the political intrigue was weaved by the Intel Services, so

that the people, in a state of terror, would turn to the State for security and protection, which would then introduce draconian laws with minimum or no resistance at all and introduce fascism via the back door.”

Likewise, the Patriot Act (I) and (II) were introduced after the September 11 False Flag terrorist attack.

The US may be contemplating the use of the “Salvador Option” – the use of Death Squads if and when civil war breaks out in the United States.

And as I had warned years ago, and I do so now again, the next time you read or watch a video of any terrorist attacks, don’t jump to any conclusions immediately. Analyse the facts and the surrounding circumstances, the timing of the incident, the victims, and the policies announced by the government within 24 hours of the incident. And finally ask, “Qui Bono” (who benefits)?

In Part II, I will dwell deeper and exposed further the sinister agendas of the Hidden Powers and the use of Intel Services as their instrument of choice to achieve their objectives.

Appendix 1

Unclassified Version of March 6, 2015 Message to the Workforce from CIA Director John Brennan: Our Agency’s Blueprint for the Future

March 6, 2015

Colleagues,

Last September I asked an outstanding group of officers from across the Agency to examine our organization—particularly its people, processes, and structure—and to provide a report on how to ensure that CIA is optimally prepared to carry out its mission into the future. In conducting their research, Study Group members received input from thousands of Agency employees, reviewed best practices across the public and private sectors, and interviewed dozens of customers and current and former senior officers. With these recommendations as our guide, the Agency’s leadership team has made a number of decisions building upon the Agency’s *Strategic Direction* that are designed to strengthen our Agency in the years ahead. The decisions are designed to help us fulfill our institutional responsibility and integrated strategic

vision, which is to consistently provide tactical and strategic advantage for the United States through our information, insights, and actions.

The initiatives described below are driven by two fundamental shifts in the national security landscape. The first is the marked increase in the range, diversity, complexity, and immediacy of issues confronting policymakers; and the second is the unprecedented pace and impact of technological advancements.

When previously faced with such shifts, this Agency proved it can adapt and transform in significant ways, such as our response to the emergence of global terrorism. The time has come for us to do so again, which will require bold action in four interrelated areas. First, we must ensure that we continue to attract the best from the broadest pool of American talent, and develop our officers with the skills, knowledge, and Agency-wide perspective they will need to lead us into the future. Second, we must be positioned to embrace and leverage the digital revolution to the benefit of all mission areas. Third, we need an organizational construct and business practices that support our decisionmaking process. And fourth, we must allow all of our Agency's capabilities to be brought to bear as quickly and coherently as possible to meet the Nation's challenges.

Overall Plan and Initial Steps

Theme One: Invest in our people by enhancing our talent and leadership development. We must make it easier for our officers to acquire new skills, to strengthen their leadership abilities, and to deepen their distinctive tradecrafts while also broadening their understanding of CIA, the intelligence profession, and the national security mission. This was the number one issue raised by the workforce to the Study Group and is foundational to all other initiatives. Building on the Agency's *Strategic Direction*, we are making the following changes to the ways in which we are organized for, practice, and think about talent development:

- **Establish a new Talent Development Center of Excellence** to bring under one roof our efforts to improve the recruitment, performance management, training, and leadership development of our diverse workforce.
- **Place all training under CIA University** and create more opportunities for learning across disciplines to help us grow well-rounded intelligence officers. CIA University will be headed by a chancellor with the mandate to educate and train officers able to function in integrated mission environments and to develop into the next generation of Agency leaders.
- **Create more systematic methods to better develop leaders and to integrate our activities across the Agency**, starting with a plan to make multi-disciplinary exposure and experience the "new normal" at CIA.

- **Reset our expectations for leaders at all levels**, stressing the importance of developing and empowering our people, ensuring accountability, being committed to continuous improvement, and building a culture in which we are all intelligence officers first, regardless of our Directorate, position, or area of expertise.

Theme Two: Embrace and leverage the digital revolution and innovate across our missions. Digital technology holds great promise for mission excellence, while posing serious threats to the security of our operations and information, as well as to U.S. interests more broadly. We must place our activities and operations in the digital domain at the very center of all our mission endeavors. To that end, we will establish a senior leadership position to oversee the acceleration of digital and cyber integration across all of our mission areas

- **We will create a new Directorate that will be responsible for accelerating the integration of our digital and cyber capabilities across all of our mission areas.** It will be called the Directorate of Digital Innovation. The new Directorate will be responsible for overseeing the career development of our digital experts as well as the standards of our digital tradecraft.

Theme Three: Modernize the way we do business. The pace of world events and technological change demands that Agency leaders be able to make decisions with agility, at the appropriate level, with the right information, and in the interests of the broader enterprise. We must have the capacity to make the sound strategic decisions needed to build a better Agency and run it efficiently, even as we respond to urgent external requirements. We must empower our officers to address the operational, analytical, technological, support, and other issues that are at the heart of what we do every day. Accordingly, we will:

- **Enhance and empower the Executive Director's role and responsibilities to manage day-to-day organizational functions, including overseeing a revamped corporate governance model.**
- **Create a restructured Executive Secretary office** to streamline core executive support functions, thereby increasing effectiveness and efficiency.
- Even as we improve our ability to govern and make decisions and streamline our processes at the enterprise level, there will be a corresponding effort to delegate decisionmaking and accountability for achieving mission to the lowest appropriate level and to streamline our processes and practices throughout the Agency.

Theme Four: Integrate our capabilities better to bring the best of the Agency to all mission areas. During my time as Director, I have repeatedly witnessed that this Agency's greatest mission successes result from collaboration among all of our mission elements. Never has the need for the full and unfettered integration of our capabilities been greater. If we are to meet the

challenges of the current national security environment, we must take some bold steps toward more integrated, coherent, and accountable mission execution. **We will stand up Mission Centers** that will bring the full range of operational, analytic, support, technical, and digital personnel and capabilities to bear on the nation's most pressing security issues and interests.

Each new Mission Center will be led by an Assistant Director. These new Centers will not be tethered to any single Directorate; rather, we will organize within them the full range of Agency officers and elements possessing the expertise and capabilities needed to execute mission. The Mission Centers will work closely with all Agency elements to further enhance our integration and interoperability. The Assistant Directors will be accountable for integrating and advancing the mission—in all of its various forms—and for overall mission accomplishment in their respective geographic or functional area. They will be responsible for consistently preempting threats and furthering U.S. national security objectives with the best possible information, technology, analysis, and operations.

The Assistant Directors will work closely with the Directorate heads, who will retain overall responsibility and accountability for the delivery of excellence in their respective occupations across all of the Centers. To best reflect the mission and responsibilities of the Directorates, we will rename the National Clandestine Service the Directorate of Operations, and the Directorate of Intelligence will be the Directorate of Analysis. The Directorate heads will be responsible for developing officers with the specialized skills unique to the Directorates, for developing tradecraft, and for maintaining a strategic perspective that cuts across all issues and regions.

Along with the rest of the CIA leadership team, you can expect my absolute commitment in devoting the necessary attention and making the tough decisions required to lead these changes. We will move as rapidly as possible, and we will keep you informed of our progress. We look to all of you and challenge each of you to unleash the incredible intellect and dedication you bring every day to the most demanding mission challenges. We ask for your support as well as your input and feedback as we move forward with these changes. Together, we will make sure this extraordinary organization continues to reflect the absolute best this Country has to offer and to be indispensable to our Nation's security for many, many years to come.

John

APPENDIX 2

HIDDEN GLOBAL POWER



GLOBAL INTEL APPARATUS



Religious Denominations



Domestic & Foreign Controlled Countries



**The Tentacles
[Governments & Non-Government Entities]**



You – Part Of The Sheeples