

On 10 Sept. Daniel New submitted the following article for submission to various Internet news organizations, shortly after the publication Daniel started hearing from various sources that the article contained errors. Below is the original article and directly at the conclusion you will find the correction submitted on 14 Sept.

On 10 Sept. Daniel New submitted the following article for submission to various Internet news organizations, shortly after the publication Daniel started hearing from various sources that the article contained errors. Below is the original article and directly at the conclusion you will find the correction submitted on 14 Sept.

MNAF Update

10 September 2014

GERMAN GENERAL TO COMMAND U.S. TROOPS

By Daniel New

NATO recently placed a German officer in command of all European troops, including US troops, something that has never happened before. Here's the story:

> "Brig. Gen. Markus Laubenthal, most recently the commander of Germany's 12th Panzer Brigade in Amberg, and chief of staff of Regional Command North, International Security Assistance Force Afghanistan, will be stationed at USAREUR headquarters, Wiesbaden, Germany.

>

> "This is a bold and major step forward in USAREUR's commitment to operating in a multinational environment with our German allies," Lt. Gen. Donald Campbell Jr., USAREUR commander, said of Laubenthal's appointment. "U.S. and German senior military leaders have been serving together in NATO's International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan for years. Sustaining the shared capability from this experience will benefit both U.S. and German armies." [1](#)

Americans do not like the idea of foreign commanders over US troops. In fact, both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have passed resolutions condemning such an action. Rolling Thunder and the Gulf War Veterans have also expressed their specific displeasure. [2](#)

The reaction from veterans in 1995-96 were aimed specifically at the Clinton administration, when he (illegally) placed American soldiers under a general officer from Finland on Operation Able Sentry, which went in to Macedonia as peacekeepers. For a couple of years the country was in an uproar and the name of Army Specialist Michael New was a household name, because he was the lone soldier who said, "No, thank you, I am an American soldier, and you do not have the right to force me to serve a foreign power against my will." For his efforts, Spc. New became an American hero, and was awarded a Bad Conduct Discharge from the Army.

The problem today has nothing to do with General Laubenthal, who is probably an excellent officer, and in view of the fact that Germany is a member state of NATO, it makes perfect sense from the European point of view that they should be allowed to see their own qualified officers in charge of an organization of which they are presumed to be equal partners.

The problem is one of national sovereignty.

Most people do not realize that NATO is a "military arrangement" created for stabilizing European affairs, under the authority of the United Nations. It is a U.N. adjunct. If you don't believe me, go to their website and read the preamble to their charter.

NATO does not answer to any member nation. It answers only to the United Nations. Does anyone remember the Bosnian conflict, where NATO was bombing and the U.N. told them to cease and desist? They went too far, and for its own political purposes, the UN Security Council ordered them to stand down. They complied immediately.

When a nation has a treaty relationship with another power, usually another nation, no one can argue that they are the same nation. They simply have a treaty. They agree to cooperate. The rules are binding as long as the treaty is in effect.

Treaties can also be with organizations, particularly since World War II, because the United Nations has spawned a plethora of organizations, all of which are aimed at establishing a one world government, and they spread their tentacles into every nation by way of "treaty law". This has proven to be a very effective way around "national law".

Even though one can argue that we are members of NATO, surely no one will argue that NATO is in charge of the United States. And yet the legal case can easily be made that NATO, not the United States, is in charge of all those troops assigned to NATO. And therein lies the problem: two different heads. "Anything with more than one head is a monster," my dad used to say. He was right. Everyone knows that no one really tells the USA what to do "we're too big. But how about other member states? Are they "equal partners" or not? The only way we get away with this is because we foot the bill for far too much of NATO for it to function without us.

Americans may not like it, but NATO has every right to appoint a German officer over all NATO troops.

The solution is to bring all US troops home from Europe, save a TON of money in the process, and let Europe provide the troops to protect Europe. Europe has no shortage of people, Europe is not impoverished, and Europe should be responsible for its own defense. Should they get themselves into a war, no doubt we will be willing to help them out again "if Congress declares war. (Yes, I know, it's an old-fashioned concept, found in that out-of-date document known as The Constitution. But it also happens to be the law, contrary to what Democrats and Republicans think.)

Most Europeans agree that the USA needs to quit pushing them around, go home and let them take care of their own problems. In fact, most Americans feel the same way.

Another War is Brewing

We all know that the current administration is itching to get us into a war with Russia over the territorial squabble in Ukraine and Crimea. The only reason that makes any sense for us to get involved in that war is that we want to reduce the influence of Russia, and to advance the cause of an eventual one-world-government. Russia is not so keen on a one world government, particularly if they are not the ones running it. (Those days are behind us, at least for now.)

Russian national interests are paramount in Crimea "it has been their domain and property for hundreds of years, and is their only warm-weather port. They cannot reasonably be expected to give it up without a struggle.

Another factor is the strong stand that Russia has taken against the radical Muslim world. We don't yet know how much that plays into the thinking of the current Muslim-lover in the White House, but it must be huge. The Muslim world hates Russia, (and us, for that matter), but at least we are helping finance their lunacy, whereas Russia has a policy of "zero tolerance for Islamic intolerance".

If the USA would start immediately to phase out its presence in Europe, it may well be that the world would be safer, or in any case, that the USA would be safer. Maybe we would stop stirring up fights that are not ours, and financing the wrong side, or both sides, as we have done over the past several administrations.

If the USA would quit propping up petty dictators and butchers with American tax money in the form of military and foreign aid, perhaps then the citizens of those countries could manage to throw off the yoke of dictatorship and eventually find their way to joining the civilized world as civil governments.

Contrary to the propaganda coming out of Washington, not one American has died in the Middle East for Freedom, not one has died "to keep us safe". They have died, and needlessly, to further One World Government, just as they did in Vietnam, under the UN agency known as SEATO.

Americans are growing weary of raising their children to be sacrificed on the altar of the New World Order. We'll defend OUR country, and OUR faith, but we will continue to take a dim view of politicians who want war, to satisfy the needs of the military-industrial complex working hand-in-hand with the globalists who are determined to undermine our national sovereignty and our Constitution.

-30-

Daniel New is the Project Manager of the Michael New Action Fund, a legal and educational effort to help raise awareness of what is being done to our nation, our military, and our sovereignty. www.MikeNew.com/ddnew@mikenew.com

<http://www.military.com/daily-news/2014/08/01/german-general-appointed-usareur-chief-of-staff.html>

See those resolutions here: <http://www.mikenew.com/resolutions.html>

CORRECTION

German Officer in command US, not NATO troops

Daniel New

I recently wrote my normally brilliant column on the elevation of a German (Brigadier General Markus Laubenthal) as commanding officer over US troops in NATO.

I stand corrected. BG Laubenthal is not in command of NATO troops at all, he is command of USAREUR " the US Army troops in Europe. This is not NATO.

I argued that Germany, being an equal partner in NATO, had every right to have a commanding officer from that country over that alliance, and I stand by those remarks. This, however, is a horse of a completely different color.

Ever since FDR, politicians of the Democratic Party have been working day and night to bring the United States military under the auspices of a "higher authority" than the US Congress, as is mandatory under the US Constitution. Harry Truman took us into an illegal war in Korea, and our soldiers are still there. Kennedy stepped up the ante in Vietnam, (where Eisenhower had committed some advisors), Johnson increased the commitment,

all under SEATO, a United Nations adjunct.

John Kennedy set forth a policy pursued by EVERY president since then, in State Department Document 7277, which called for the disarming of the United States and the Soviet Union, substituting in the place of their standing armies a United Nations Army, one army for the entire world, in order to achieve peace and end wars. The US Disarmament Agency was created toward that end, and still exists, as dedicated as ever to reducing our national military strength and increasing international military strength.

Both Bushes took us into illegal wars, without the Constitutionally required declarations of war, on the presumed authority of the dictates of the United Nations Security Council. Such a presumption is very close to treason, or at the very least, malfeasance of duty.

Obama did not get us in to these wars, but has done all he could possibly do to radicalize, and train and supply, the radical Islamic world. We waste resources and lives to keep up this grand illusion of fighting an implacable enemy, while funding that same enemy with the other hand. Machiavelli would have been pleased.

While we have no reason to question the integrity, nor the military capabilities of Brig. Gen. Laubenthal, we cannot find it acceptable that an officer not approved by Congress has been placed over American troops. It is a huge step in the wrong direction.

Congress should find in this action the grounds for impeachment. They won't. Because the Democrats applaud it, and too many of the Republicans seem content that the military-industrial complex is well fed and happy. An unholy alliance, if ever there was one.

The [Citizen Soldier Protection Act](#) was first proposed in Congress in 1996, and to this day remains a piece of legislation that needs to be introduced and passed. It would forbid the forcing of American troops under foreign command or officers without the express consent of Congress. Very simple. Very short.

Ask your candidates if they support this concept, and if so, ask them to become a co-sponsor in the next assembled Congress in January. Send a message.

Daniel New, Project Manager

Michael New Action Forum

www.MikeNew.com/

Real Americans don't serve as cannon fodder for the New World Order.