

Richardson Studies Government Anthologies

Joel Skousen on Government Cover-ups



Compiled by Nate Richardson



Accessed from JoelSkousen.com

This compilation published free at RichardsonStudies.com

Copyright 2024

Updated 3.23.24

Topics

Historical Deceptions

Government Coverups

The Still Small Voice of Conscience

And More

Contents

JOEL SKOUSEN: WORKS	6
9/11 Update 2006.....	6
How to Analyze the News.....	170
Strategic Threats In the Current Decade.....	185
The Good-ol-Boys Network: Introductory Comments on Conspiracy.....	207
The Still Small Voice of Conscience.....	209
JOEL SKOUSEN: GOVERNMENT COVER-UPS	247
THE PHONY FALL OF THE SOVIET UNION.....	247
9/11.....	255
Chemtrails.....	387
Columbine Shooting.....	394
JFK.....	396
Martin Luther King Jr.....	399
OKC Bombing.....	407
PanAm 103.....	416
RFK.....	422
TWA 800.....	426
Vince Foster.....	429
WACO.....	434
JOEL SKOUSEN: HISTORICAL DECEPTIONS	436
European Union.....	436
Fall of Communism.....	449
George W. Bush.....	459
Israel.....	468
Operation Keelhaul.....	489
Pearl Harbor.....	492

War in Afghanistan.....494
War in Iraq496

JOEL SKOUSEN: WORKS

9/11 Update 2006

9/11 UPDATE 2006:

DETAILED EVIDENCE AND COMMENTARY FROM VARIOUS SOURCES

GENERAL DETAILS OF OFFICIAL VERSION:

TIMELINE

Source: Excerpted from Cheryl Seal's Smoking Gun

7:59: American Airlines flight 11, a Boeing 767 takes off from Logan Airport in Boston with 92 people, headed for Los Angeles. (BOSTON.COM: American Airlines Flight 11 was a nonstop from Boston to Los Angeles that was flown using a Boeing 767, an aviation workhorse. The captain was John Ogonowski, a 52-year-old man from Dracut. His first officer was Thomas McGuinness, 42, of Portsmouth, N.H. Also aboard were nine flight attendants and 81 passengers, for a total of 92 people on the flight manifest when the plane pushed back from Gate 26 at Logan International Airport). [*Pilot's transmission to tower says Gate 32*]

The flight took off uneventfully at 8 a.m., and the last routine conversation occurred at 8:13 a.m.

8:01: United Airline Flight 93, a Boeing 757, bound for San Francisco, is delayed for 40 minutes on runway, with 45 people on Board.

8:13: Boston Ground control loses contact with Flight 11. First red flag for Flight 11.

8:14: United Airlines Flight 175, a Boeing 767, takes off from Logan for Los Angeles with 65 passengers.

8:17: American Airlines Flight 77, a Boeing 757, leaves Dulles in D.C. headed for Los Angeles with 64 passengers.

8:20: Flight 11 reaches the Hudson River in NY and stops transmitting its IFF signal. Second Red flag for Flight 11. Had Bush put the airlines on high alert after August 6 when he received the warning, there is no doubt at all that these warnings would have evoked a very different response ... if, indeed, the hijackers had even gotten that far (under a high alert, they very well may have been apprehended at the airports).

8:24: Hijackers on Flight 11 accidentally broadcasts warning to the passengers over its radio: "Everything will be OK. If you try to make any

moves, you'll endanger yourself and the airplane. Just stay quiet." Third Red Flag for Flight 11.

8:25: Boston air traffic controllers notify other air traffic control centers of hijacking. Why wasn't NORAD (North American Aerospace Defense Command) notified at this time?

8:27: Flight 11 heads south toward Manhattan; flight attendant Betty Ong calls American Airlines reservations and reports that two flight attendants had been stabbed and a passenger had had his throat slashed. She identifies the seat numbers of the hijackers. Fourth red flag for Flight 11 — this one a BLOODY RED and wildly waving, yet it will be about 10 minutes AFTER THIS before NORAD is notified.

8:33: Last transmission from Flight 11: Hijacker is heard telling passengers not to move.

8:38: Boston Air Traffic control notifies NORAD that Flight 11 has been hijacked.

8:42: Flight 175 is hijacked. It begins to make a U-turn over New Jersey, reading for its northward assault on Manhattan.

8:42: Flight 93 takes off from Newark International Airport, headed for San Francisco.

8:43: FAA notifies NORAD that Flight 175 has been hijacked.

8:44: Two F-15 eagles are ordered scrambled out of Otis Air National Guard Base in Cape Cod. If NORAD had been notified (or was it?) at 8:27, when the plane was obviously hijacked and heading to NYC, an F-16 from Otis or Griffis would have been about 10 minutes from Manhattan at this point. In addition, since the WTC was high on the list of known targets, and since some of the warnings to Bush indicated airplanes could be used as "bombs," the WTC should have been given an alert and the building evacuated. If evacuation had started at 8:30, there would have been no one in the upper floors when the first plane hit and the loss of life would have been minimized.

8:45: Flight 11 strikes WTC's north tower at the 80th floor.

8:46: Flight 175 stops transmitting beacon signal.

8:52: Two F-15 Eagles take off from Otis. If F-15s had been scrambled from Otis at 8:27 they would now be in a position to engage the hijacked Flight 175 headed for the WTC.

9:00: United Airlines learns that Flight 93 flying over western PA may be in process of being hijacked.

9:00: Flight 77 makes U-turn and heads back for Washington. This is when the FAA should have notified NORAD, and NORAD should have ordered F-16s into the air FROM ANDREWS. If they had, by 9:15 F-16s may have been in a position to deflect Flight 77 AWAY from DC altogether.

9:02: Flight 175 strikes the WTC at the 60th floor.

9:16: FAA informs NORAD that Flight 93 may have been hijacked.

9:17: Federal Aviation Administration closes all airports.

9:24: FAA notifies NORAD that Flight 77 is hijacked.

9:24: NORAD orders three F-16s scrambled from Langley. The timing here is absolutely diabolical. It is EXACTLY not enough time for either a jet from Langley, which will be 10 minutes too late, or one from Andrews, which would have had just about 3 minutes between reaching the airspace over D.C. and dealing with the incoming Boeing 757. That Langley was chosen indicates a FEAR that in that 3 minutes a good pilot from Andrews just might have succeeded in aborting the disaster, despite the split second time frame.

9:25: Air traffic controllers notify Secret Service as Flight 77 makes dramatic maneuver just south of the Pentagon.

9:29: Bush, at Booker Elementary school, says an "apparent terrorist attack" under way. No orders are given to evacuate any buildings in D.C., or even to urge residents and workers to seek shelter.

9:40: Three F-16 Fighting Falcons take off from Langley. They reach Washington by 9:55, moving at 550 mph — the trip takes 14 minutes. The time from Andrews to D.C.: under 2 minutes. The time from Bolling: almost instantaneous. Not only is this a tragedy for the victims of the Pentagon, it was unspeakably cruel to those pilots, who, thanks to their delayed orders, have to live with the crushing feeling of having been 15 minutes too late. Here is a description of Andrews from its website: "Training for air combat and operational airlift for national defense is the 113th's primary mission. However, as part of its dual mission, the 113th provides capable and ready response forces for the District of Columbia in the event of a natural disaster or civil emergency." Yet Bush chooses Langley.

9:43: Plane crashes into Pentagon — a full 40 minutes after being reported hijacked and the likelihood of its being used as a weapon of mass destruction obvious. You will notice that now, everything seems to start happening — it seems as if everything were put on hold until the Pentagon was struck.

9:45: White House evacuated.

9:57: Bush leaves Florida.

10:05: South Tower of World Trade Center collapses.

10:08: Armed agents deployed around White House.

10:10: Pennsylvania plane crashes; part of Pentagon collapses.

10:13-10:45: Federal buildings in D.C. evacuated.

10:28: North Tower collapses.

10:46: Colin Powell heads for D.C. from Latin America. Again, notice that Powell is in Latin America, Bush is in Florida, Ashcroft in Missouri, and Rumsfeld in the part of the Pentagon most remote from the impact point.

1:04: Bush speaks from Barksdale Air Force Base in Louisiana.

1:27: State of emergency declared in D.C.

1:44: Warships from VA are deployed to protect coastline.

2:00: Bush at Offutt AFB in Omaha NE; this is not revealed until almost 4:00 pm. Also at Offutt that day from 8:00 a.m. on are several CEOs — at a "charity event" that just happens to be held at a SECURE AIR FORCE BASE? And it just happens that several of the CEOs WOULD HAVE BEEN at the WTC had they not been at Offutt.

6:54: Bush back in White House.

8:30: Bush addresses nation.

RADIO TRANSCRIPT EXCERPTS AND COMMENTARY—VARIOUS HIJACKED FLIGHTS

by www.boston.com

FLIGHT 11: A flight attendant's body was found at one of the crash scenes with thin wire bound tightly near her manicured hand.

The transcript of the air-traffic-control conversations shows that at 8:24 a.m., a controller heard a suspicious broadcast from Flight 11. Apparently, one of the hijackers confused the aircraft's radio with its public-address system.

"We have some planes. Just stay quiet and you will be OK. We are returning to the airport. Nobody move," the speaker said.

"Who's trying to call me?" the controller responded.

There was no response. Then came another radio broadcast, the transcript shows.

"Everything will be OK. If you try to make any moves, you'll endanger yourself and the airplane. Just stay quiet," the speaker said.

Air traffic controllers and American Airlines officials sent radio and text messages to the cockpit, but got no response. Ogonowski's relatives say it is unclear whether he and McGuinness were alive when the plane hit the World Trade Center.

Investigators say they believe Atta was flying the plane when it crashed.

The Wall Street Journal, and the people who staff the airlines' system operations centers offered a chilling account of a call that Betty Ong, a flight attendant from Andover onboard Flight 11, made to airline officials.

As the hijacking unfolded, Ong punched the number 8 on a seatback GTE Airfone and got through to an American reservations agent. The agent called the system operations control center in Fort Worth at 8:27.

"She said two flight attendants had been stabbed, one was on oxygen," said Craig Marquis, the manager on duty. "A passenger had his throat slashed and looked dead and they had gotten into the cockpit."

Ong said the four hijackers had come from first-class seats: 2A, 2B, 9A, and 9B. She said the wounded passenger was in seat 10B.

The flight attendant also said the hijackers had hit passengers with some sort of spray that made her eyes burn. She said she was having trouble breathing.

"Is the plane descending?" Marquis asked.

"We're starting to descend. We're starting to descend," she said.

In her conversation with Woodward, Sweeney, the flight attendant, relayed much the same information, including crew numbers, slightly different seat numbers, and the fact that they were descending.

Sweeney's last statement was chilling: "I see water and buildings. Oh my God. Oh my God."

At 8:33, controllers heard another, almost polite transmission.

"Nobody move please. We are going back to the airport. Don't try to make any stupid moves," the speaker said.

There is widespread speculation in law enforcement about whether all 19 hijackers were planning to commit suicide.

Atta clearly was ready to die, as evidenced by the will he left in luggage that did not make the connection to Flight 11. But investigators have said that other hijackers had papers urging them to prepare themselves for prison.

United **Flight 175**

Probe sees similarities in tactics

United Air Lines Flight 175 had much in common with American Flight 11: Both were flown with Boeing 767s and were early-morning, nonstop flights from Boston to Los Angeles.

Investigators say the hijackers picked the flights deliberately.

As the first flights of the day, there was little chance they would be delayed. With a 3,000-mile transcontinental trip ahead of them, each of the planes could have been loaded with up to 24,000 gallons of jet fuel - a mighty explosive punch.

Because it was a Tuesday, their passenger loads would have been relatively light, something to consider when a handful of men is planning to seize control of the jetliner.

And the 767s shared a common cockpit design with the other two planes hijacked Sept. 11, a pair of Boeing 757s. That meant the hijackers had to study only one set of instruments to learn how to fly either plane.

The crew of Flight 175 was led by Captain Victor J. Saracini, 51, of Lower Makefield Township, Pa. His first officer was Michael R. Horrocks, 38, of Glen Mills, Pa. The flight carried seven flight attendants and 56 passengers, a total of 65 people when the plane pushed back from Gate 19 at Logan Airport.

The plane took off at 8:14 a.m., and according to the FBI, had five hijackers among the passengers. The crew was led by Marwan Al-Shehhi, a citizen of the United Arab Emirates who was so close to Atta they considered themselves cousins.

Two of the other hijackers had flight training, Fayez Rashid Ahmed Hassan Al Qadi Banihammad, a Saudi, and Mohand Alshehri, another Saudi. The other two hijackers, likewise Saudis, were Ahmed Alghamdi and Hamza Alghamdi.

The plane had a routine climb, but at 8:37 a.m. it received an unusual call. A controller asked whether the pilots could see the earlier American flight.

"Affirmative, we have him, uh, he looks, uh, about 20, yeah, about 29, 28,000 [feet]," a pilot responded, according to the transcript from air traffic control.

The controller told the crew to make a right turn to avoid the American plane.

At 8:41 a.m., just four minutes before Flight 11 slammed into the World Trade Center, one of the United pilots radioed back to the controller.

"We heard a suspicious transmission on our departure from B-O-S," the pilot said, using the three-letter airport code. "Sounds like someone keyed the mike and said, 'Everyone, stay in your seats.'"

While little is known about what happened aboard Flight 175, because there wasn't the array of radio transmissions or cellphone calls, one member of the crew managed to get a message to the ground.

Around 8:50, Rich "Doc" Miles, the manager of United's system operations center in Chicago, received a call from an airline maintenance center in San Francisco that takes in-flight calls from flight attendants about broken items.

The mechanic said a female flight attendant called and said: "Oh my God. The crew has been killed, a flight attendant has been stabbed. We've been hijacked." Then the line went dead.

Miles, who by that time was aware of the American hijacking, answered, "No, the information we're getting is that it was an American 757."

The mechanic insisted, "No, we got a call from a flight attendant on 175.

In August, actor James Woods had an unsettling experience on American Flight 11. Woods said he was alone in first class with four men who appeared to be of Middle Eastern descent. During the six-hour flight, he noticed the men spoke to one another only in whispers and never ate, drank, or slept.

When the flight landed, Woods told a flight attendant and the authorities about what he had seen. He was interviewed after the crashes by the FBI, his agent said.

On other occasions, some of the hijackers were seen videotaping crews on their flights. Other times, they asked for cockpit tours.

Two also rode in the cockpit of the planes of one national airline, said a pilot who requested anonymity. The practice, known as "jumpseating," allows certified airline pilots to use a spare seat in the cockpit when none is available in the passenger cabin. Airlines reciprocate to help pilots get home or to the city of their originating flight.

EVIDENCE CONTRADICTING THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF EVENTS

OFFICIAL VERSION: Government officials had **no prior warning** or knowledge of the events, and no way to predict them:

Contradictions:

1. Warning from Philippine officials about "**Project Bojinka**" that bin Laden associates were undergoing flight training in the U.S. and planning to crash hijacked airliners into the Pentagon and New York's World Trade Center. Similar warning from the 1988 embassy bombings in Kenya.

“Just prior to the attack of the Saudi military base, officials uncovered the plot to blow up 12 U.S. airliners on January 6, 1995 when a fire broke out in a Manila apartment. During the trial a Secret Service agent testified that Yousef boasted during his extradition flight to New York that he would have blown up several jumbo jets within a few weeks if his plan had not been discovered. The government said the defendants even devised a name for their airline terror plot named, "Project Bojinka."
[WASHINGTON - 23JUN2001 (AirlineBiz.Com)]

Source: R. Joseph, Phd: “For example, following the arrest of those involved in the 1998 bombings of U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, documents were discovered which contained numerous references to pilot training and flight schools and a plot to hijack U.S. jetliners.

2. **CIA front companies were involved** with facilitating aircraft flight training [actually, a cover by the government proxies, so as to divert attention from where the actually hijackers got real training. In my opinion, none of the listed hijackers were those actually doing the hijacking]

“**Britannia Aviation**, a CIA front company surfaced recently in a dispute in Lynchburg, VA when a multi-million dollar contract for aircraft maintenance at Lynchburg Virginia Regional Airport was awarded to Britannia instead of a much larger local aircraft maintenance company, fully certified with many employees and already located at Lynchburg. Investigative reporter Daniel Hopsicker discovered that Britannia has only one listed employee and assets totaling less than \$1000. Britannia’s only address points to a small office sub-leased from Rudi Huffman Aviation owned by CIA Dutch asset Rudi Dekker trained two of the supposed hijackers (Marwan Al-Shehai and Mohammad Atta). [Mad Cow Morning News. com]

3. Several of the listed hijackers received **training at US military facilities** prior to 9/11 [I doubt these were the real hijackers, whose identities have never been revealed].

Guy Gugliotta of Washington Post: September 16, 2001 “As the investigation gathered strength yesterday, unusual leads began to surface, among them the possibility that some of the hijackers may have received training at Pensacola Naval Air Station in Florida or other U.S. military facilities.”

WAB: "Two of 19 suspects named by the FBI, Saeed Alghamdi and Ahmed Alghamdi, have the same names as men listed at a housing facility for foreign military trainees at Pensacola. Two others, Hamza Alghamdi and Ahmed Alnami, have names similar to individuals listed in public records as using the same address inside the base. In addition, a man named Saeed Alghamdi graduated from the Defense Language Institute at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, while men with the same names as two other hijackers, Mohamed Atta and Abdulaziz Alomari, appear as graduates of the U.S. International Officers School at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., and the Aerospace Medical School at Brooks Air Force Base in San Antonio, respectively."

4. A secret military unit code named "**Able Danger**" using computer data mining techniques uncovered a terrorist cell in Brooklyn led by alleged terrorist leader Mohamed Atta. The Pentagon order the data destroyed, claiming later invasion of privacy [hasn't stopped them from continuing].

Source: <http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/1205/120705nj1.htm>

Army project illustrates promise, shortcomings of data mining, by Shane Harris, National Journal

In the spring of 2000, a year and a half before the 9/11 attacks, Erik Kleinsmith made a decision that history may judge as a colossal mistake. Then a 35-year-old Army major assigned to a little-known intelligence organization at Fort Belvoir in Virginia, Kleinsmith had compiled an enormous cache of information -- most of it electronically stored -- about the Al Qaeda terrorist network. It described the group's presence in countries around the world, including the United States.

It was of great interest to military planners eager to strike the terrorists' weak spots. And it may have contained the names of some of the 9/11 hijackers, including the ringleader, Mohamed Atta. The intelligence data totaled 2.5 terabytes, equal to about 12 percent of all printed pages held by the Library of Congress. Neither the FBI nor the CIA had ever seen the information. And that spring, Kleinsmith destroyed every bit of it.

Why did he do that? And how did a mid-level officer in a minor intelligence outfit obtain that information in the first place? Those questions lie behind the latest phase of a simmering controversy in Washington: whether something could have been done to prevent the terror attacks of September 11.

Kleinsmith worked for an Army project code-named "Able Danger." This past summer, a number of former project members -- none of whom had worked for Kleinsmith -- came forward to say that Able Danger had identified Atta and linked him to a convicted terrorist who is still serving time in federal

prison for his role in the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center.

The Able Danger members recalled charts showing names and pictures of suspects, and their links to each other. Rep. Curt Weldon, an outspoken Pennsylvania Republican and longtime supporter of intelligence reform, has demanded to know why the charts were never shared with an agency positioned to halt the attacks.

He also points out that the 9/11 commission failed to include any mention of Able Danger in its final report, which is regarded as an authoritative history of the attacks. The Pentagon searched more than 80,000 documents and found no chart with the name "Mohamed Atta." Weldon has accused the government of a cover-up and called for a criminal investigation.

5. President Bush and VP Cheney received a detailed briefing on the bin Laden threat in a **"Daily Briefing in August 2001.**[However, I

suspect this was a red herring to make the case for incompetence rather than for direct planning].

Bush personally ignored warnings from the CIA on August 6, 2001 that Al Qaeda planned to hijack US planes (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A35744-2002May17.html>)

Bernard Weiner, Co-Editor, The Crisis Papers: "Similarly, nothing was done as a result of the government's own intelligence warnings. The August 6, 2001 Presidential Daily Briefing, entitled "Bin Laden Determined to Strike in U.S.," talked about al-Qaida wanting to hit the nation's capital, preparations for airline hijackings, casing of buildings in New York, terrorists in the U.S. with explosives, etc. Bush went to ground in Texas, the FBI told Ashcroft to stop flying commercial jets, etc. The attacks finally came about a month later, and the Bush forces were ready to make their moves. <http://www.crisispapers.org/essays-w/twenty-things.htm>

Regis T. Sabol: "According to the Washington Post, Richard Clarke, the government's top counter terrorism official, told officials of a dozen federal agencies at a White House meeting July 5, "Something really spectacular is going to happen here, and it's going to happen soon." C.I.A. Director Tenet "had been 'nearly frantic' with concern since June 22," the Post said. And Ms. Rice, herself, no less, warned on June 28, "It is highly likely that a significant al Qaeda attack is in the near future, within several weeks."

6. Michael Meacher, a former British Minister of the Environment said, " At least **11 countries provided advance warning** to US intelligence agencies" [a reflection of the natural leakage that occurs in large black ops to allied intel services—who still think the US is against terror.]

WAB: They ignored warnings from Jordanian intelligence in the summer that a major attack was planned inside the US using airplanes

(<http://www.iht.com/cgi-bin/generic.cgi?template=articleprint.tmplh&ArticleId=58269>)

WAB: They ignored warnings from Israeli intelligence in August that large-scale terrorist attacks on highly visible targets on the American mainland were imminent, organized by a cell of as many as 200 terrorists said to be preparing a big operation

(<http://www.dailytelegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2001/09/16/wcia16.xml>)

7. **High schools** in some NY city districts told students not to go down to the WTC on 9/11. SF **Mayor Willy Brown** was told by “airport security” not to fly that day, as was **Salmon Rushdie** in the UK. [Actually, Brown’s claim of a non-specific airport security call was only a cover—his real source was NSA Condi Rice: <http://www.thetruthseeker.co.uk/article.asp?id=1000>]
8. FEMA Urban Rescue team leader **Tom Kenny** told a nation-wide CBS audience on Sept. 12: “We’re currently one of the first teams that was deployed to support the City of New York in this disaster. We arrived on late Monday night and went right into action on Tuesday morning.” [He later said he ‘misspoke’ and meant Wednesday—but then his “first into action” statement became a glaring contradiction. He has refused all subsequent attempts for clarification].
9. NY **Mayor Rudolph Giuliani** admitted on air to Peter Jennings that he had advanced warning the South Tower was going to collapse. He never relayed any such warning to firefighting units on the scene, even though he was in the WTC-7 command center only hundreds of yards away.

Rudolph Giuliani Got Warning WTC Towers Were Going To Collapse

<http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/april2005/090405gotwarning.htm>

Alex Jones' PrisonPlanet.com reported this 15 months ago, but now they've received the video where then Mayor of New York Rudolph Giuliani admits to Peter Jennings that he got a warning that the South Tower was about to collapse. Jones: "Giuliani was operating out of Building 7 which he evacuated before that too was 'pulled' by means of demolition as Larry Silverstein admitted in a September 2002 PBS documentary.

Click play to view the ABC News clip. There is a slight blip where the word 'collapse' cuts off, but the full quote is as follows..."We were operating out of there when we were told that the World Trade Center was gonna collapse."

10. Discrete warnings were given to some WTC **CEOs and staff to stay home**. Also, a major business retreat/conference was scheduled by Warren Buffet for major CEOs from NY and elsewhere at Offutt AFB where the president went to ride out the affair [coincidence?]

“ On the morning of Sept. 11, Tatlock herself had just arrived with a small group of business leaders at Offutt Air Force Base in Omaha for a charity event hosted by Warren Buffett. She then heard the news of the first plane hitting the World Trade Center's north tower. The clip comes from the following San Francisco business journal. Tatlock is a high CEO in the Franklin Funds group, a group that had offices in the World Trade Center. The cover story in this article for her presence at Offutt was a charity event. However, note the unusual time for this supposedly charity event. It would have had to been around 8 AM Central Time, too late for a charity breakfast and much too early for any charity lunch or dinner. Notice also in the article that she arrived with a small group of "business leaders" all obviously from the East Coast. Its in print folks the top financial CEOs that had offices in the World Trade Center were at Offutt

airbase on the morning of 9/11.

<http://sanfrancisco.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/stories/2002/02/04/story3.html>

<http://sanfrancisco.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/stories/2002/02/04/story3.html>The World Trade Center

Brian Downing Quig: "FEMA was invoked in a "ceremony" on 9-11 at Fort Offutt in NE with Buffett

and friends also there."

11. **American and United airline stocks** were shorted on the options market, so someone could benefit from the price drop after 9/11. The options were never cashed in, and the NYSE claimed they couldn't trace the trades to anyone. [all trades are traceable—how else do they get paid?]

Questions posed for **Deutschebank-Alex Brown**

1. Who was the investor who purchased 2,000 United Airlines (UAL) put option contracts between August 8th, 2001 and September 11th, 2001? Did you or do you own any stocks of UA, AA, Merrill Lynch, Morgan Stanley, AXA Re (insurance) which owns 25% of American Airlines, and Munich Re.?
2. What can you say about 2,500 UA-contracts which were "split into 500 chunks each, directing each order to different U.S. exchanges around the country simultaneously." on August 10th, 2001? Did you purchase UAL options in August 2001? Is it correct that you purchased 4,744 put options on United Air Lines stock as opposed to only 396 call between September 6th and September 7th, 2001? What was your intention of doing that?
3. What is your connection to Wally Kromgaard who purchased 4,516 put options on American Airlines as compared to 748 call options on September 10th, 2001?

12. The **World Trade Center was completely shut down** (off limits to all tenants) and dark on the week-end before 9/11. It had also changed ownership just prior to the attacks, with changes in insurance policies. [All of this was necessary for planting of controlled demolition charges on main interior pillars and subsequent recouping of losses for the new owner]

Caller from New Jersey to the Art Bell Show, interview with Joel Skousen about 9/11. He stated emphatically, that in all his night time commutes to Manhattan from Jersey, he had never seen the WTC without lights until that weekend.

[Source: Morgan Reynolds](#)

Controlled demolition would have required unimpeded access to the WTC, access to explosives, avoiding detection, and the expertise to orchestrate the deadly destruction from a nearby secure location. Such access before 9/11 likely depended on complicity by one or more WTC security companies. These companies focus on "access control" and as security specialist Wayne Black says, "When you have a security contract, you know the inner workings of everything." Stratesec, a now-defunct company that had security contracts at the World Trade Center and Dulles International Airport, should be investigated, among others, because of the strange coincidence that President Bush's brother, Marvin P. Bush, and his cousin, Wirt D. Walker III, were principals in the company, with Walker acting as CEO from 1999 until January 2002 and Marvin reportedly in New York on 9/11. At least one report claims that a "power down" condition prevailed on September 8, 2001 (pdf, p. 45) at WTC to complete a "cabling upgrade," presenting an opportunity to plant explosives with low risk of detection.

13. **Controlled Airport sceners** and/or in baggage handlers had to be pre-positioned at Boston Logan Airport to facilitate getting weapons on board for the terrorists. The terrorists had both real and fake bombs, a gun, large knives, box cutters, mace and gas masks aboard [to hide these facts the 9/11 Commission did selective editing of flight attendant **Amy Sweeney's** transcript,

who told her airline about these items]. None of these could have gotten past normal screening. Terrorist could not have controlled this kind of access—only insiders at some higher level.

Gail sheehy of the UK Observer:

“Philip Zelikow, chooses which evidence and witnesses to bring to their attention. Mr. Zelikow, as a former adviser to the pre-9/11 Bush administration, has a blatant conflict. Played only excerpts, didn’t discuss Mrs. Sweeney’s call, about the bomb. "My wife’s call was the first specific information the airline and the government got that day," said Mike Sweeney, the widowed husband of Amy Sweeney, who went face to face with the hijackers on Flight 11. She gave seat locations and physical descriptions of the hijackers, which allowed officials to identify them as Middle Eastern men—by name—even before the first crash. She gave officials key clues to the fact that this was not a traditional hijacking. And she gave the first and only eyewitness account of a bomb on board. "How do you know it’s a bomb?" asked her phone contact.

"Because the hijackers showed me a bomb," Sweeney said, describing its yellow and red wires. HOW DID A BOMB GET THROUGH SECURITY, PLUS REGULAR KNIVES?"

14. FBI and Border/Customs agents produced the list and **dossiers of the 19 hijackers** within hours of the attack—not possible without prior surveillance [What is even more telling is the amount of knowledge the dossiers had, including complete knowledge of their last hours, carousing at night clubs—certain not like fanatical Muslim fundamentalists]

“It is a celebrated fact that Mohammed Atta and some of his friends were seen in nightclubs in the hours before 9/11, certainly a fact that argues against them being able to carry out their supposed missions because they were motivated by Islamic religious zeal. So their appearance in strip clubs blows the whole story that they were devout Muslims giving their

lives to Allah. Devout Muslims don't drink, never mind cavort with strippers.”

15. Several of the listed hijackers were on government watch lists and given visas, nonetheless--more than once. Some **held current visas** [evidence of either incompetence, or prior knowledge and collusion by someone who over-road normal INS procedures].

Source: R. Joseph, Phd: “The FBI was not only aware that Mohamed Atta was in the U.S. and receiving flight training, but that he been implicated in previous terrorist attacks, and had met with a senior Iraqi intelligence officer. In fact, by law, Atta and his "cousin" Marwan, should have never been granted visas or allowed into the country; yet in the months prior to 9/11 they were allowed to continue their activities unhindered. They were not alone. Several of the other hijackers had also been granted visas and allowed into this country in the weeks and months before 9/11 although they were known to be veterans of previous terrorist attacks. Salem Alhamzi and Khalid Al-Midhar were on a special terrorist-watch list given to Border Patrol and I.N.S. agents on August 21, 2001.”

16. At least one of the aircraft had a large, **bulging modification** on one side [Fl. 175], purpose unknown, that could not have been done by the terrorists, nor could it have entered the flight line without being noticed by everyone in maintenance. [This could be related to the ongoing controversy of which gate flight 11 actually left from –if another modified plane was inserted on the flight line for that flight as well. Pilot recording says “Gate 32,” family witness and press said “Gate 26”]

WAB: “The bulging modification on the belly of the aircraft that hit WTC-2. Video of the Boeing 767 crashing into WTC-2 shows a large and disturbing modification on the bottom side of the United Airlines Flight 175 aircraft. The aircraft almost missed its target and the person directing the aircraft made a dramatic last minute steep turn to intercept the corner of

the building. In the process of the steep turn the bottom of the aircraft suddenly becomes visible in the low morning sun and reveals a very large and bulging modification on the right side of the fuselage behind the landing gear doors. The bulge is as wide as the wing root, so it is easy to detect. : <http://www.thoughtcrimenews.com/wtc.htm>. This site contains some very speculative conspiracy theories that should be viewed with extreme caution for now. Also, the computer enhanced photos do not come from the new Hlava video but from the original CNN video of the crash. You can see a video clip of the original CNN footage by using opening a video player like windows Media Player and on "open URL" under File and putting in the URL: <http://www.serendipity.li/wot/wmv/ghostplane2.wmv>. The bulge is visible on this earlier video as well, proving that the bulge is not simply a doctored image by one source.

“Compare these photos with pictures of a normal Boeing 767 here: <http://www.globalaircraft.org/planes/b767.pl> (go to bottom of the web page to view how smooth and uniform the underside is). There is no bulge.

“ I called the Boeing Company for their reaction and had an interesting chat with Liz Verdier, the media contact person, informally tasked to answer 9/11 issues. I asked her for Boeing’s reaction to the potential modification of one of its aircraft involved in the crash into WTC 2 and described the large bulge showing up on the two videos. She quickly skirted the issue by saying that Boeing was not a part of the 9/11 investigation and insisted that all queries be directed to the FBI or Dept. of Homeland Security. I replied that this wasn’t about the investigation, but rather a technical question for Boeing on what this large bulge could possibly represent.

“She said that Boeing would not admit there was a modification nor comment on it, and that Boeing does not make these kinds of modifications (if there were any) but that it would have been something United Airlines might have done. I told her that based upon my experience as a military pilot and maintenance officer in a squadron, no major modification like this that would affect high speed air worthiness could or would be approved by the FAA without intensive consultations

with the engineering staff at Boeing. She continued to deny that Boeing would have been involved, which I found completely incredible. I then told her that I thought it was strange that she expressed no interest in seeing evidence of this bulge that we had been discussing in some detail. She admitted then that Boeing knew all about the internet charges surrounding the modified aircraft, had seen the pictorial evidence and that Boeing was determined not to comment about it. I picked up on the feeling that this was a very touchy subject at Boeing and tried to get her to at least admit to that much. She cordially declined to confirm even that. Obviously, she had her marching orders, which tells me Boeing knows more than they are saying.

“Why is this such an important issue? First, this is a modification that has never been seen on any other commercial 767 aircraft in the United fleet, according to various United pilots I have talked to. It is totally unique. For it to show up on one of the aircraft used to take down one of the WTC towers indicates it may be specifically related to the purpose of carrying out the attacks: enabling the aircraft to be remote controlled, or enhancing its explosive effect, or any number of other possibilities. Leonard Spencer at <http://www.serendipity.li/wot/aa11.htm> charges that it has something to do with firing forward missiles prior to crashing into the WTC, which I find absolutely no evidence for. The CNN video clip detail, previously mentioned, shows a burst of flame from the nose of the aircraft only after it actually penetrates the facade of WTC 2, belying his own conclusion about a missile being fired. I observed no evidence of a missile here.

“Second, such a modification would have to have involved United Airlines, the Boeing Company, and the FAA—each with close government connections. No foreign terrorist group could have pulled this off, no matter how much time or money they had, unless they were simply fronting for US black operations. Furthermore, the United Airlines pilots and ground crew would never have signed off on such an aircraft unless assured by airline management that it had some legitimate purpose, albeit of some secret “national security” issue.

“Third, if the modification had a benign explanation, Boeing, the FAA and United Airlines would all be quick to answer. So far they have

not. If the modification was related to the 9/11 tragedy, and this airplane was specifically inserted in the fleet for this task, it would be hard evidence of US involvement in provoking this tragedy. It would also provide evidence that there was some larger directing force behind the Arab terrorists charged with the event. No airline or other large US corporation would have been involved in facilitating such an act without acting on behalf of dark side operations within the mantle of government secrecy.

“There is no proof of any of these charges at this point, but these are the plausible conclusions that can be derived from what appears to be a cover-up over this strange modification. I find it difficult to believe that no one in the establishment media has noticed this glaring protrusion, especially since the NY Times published blowups of the 767 in its moment of maximum turn. The establishment media won't touch this story. Like Boeing, someone higher up must not want this issue to surface on a larger scale.

17. The Pentagon crash evidence, I believe, indicates that the American Airliner that hit the Pentagon was **laden with explosives** throughout the aircraft structure, and was blown into small pieces mostly outside the building. This could not have been done by a suitcase bomb, which would have left major parts of the aircraft intact. The airplane had to be pre-prepped for the job.

[This is my conclusion: see Pentagon Crash section for witness testimony supporting this position]

18. **Military Exercises** using real aircraft to simulate attacks in the NE and in Wash DC were planned for this period and moved up to September 11 [probably to allow for confusion and delayed military response among non-conspirators, as to what was real and what was a simulation].

Source: GeorgeWashington.blogspot.com

“On the very morning of 9/11/01, five war games and terror drills were being conducted by several U.S. defense agencies, including one "live fly" exercise using REAL planes POSING AS HIJACKED AIRLINERS. Then-Acting Head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Air Force General Richard B. Myers, admitted to 4 of the war games in congressional testimony. On September 11th, the government also happened to be running a simulation of a plane crashing into a building.

In addition, a December 9, 2001 Toronto Star article reprinted here, stated that "Operation Northern Vigilance is called off. Any simulated information, what's known as an 'inject,' is purged from the screens". This indicates that there were false radar blips inserted onto air traffic controllers' screens as part of the war game exercises. Moreover, there are indications that some of the major war games previously scheduled for October 2001 were MOVED UP to September 11th by persons unknown ...

Remember that for the attacks to have succeeded, it was necessary that actions be taken in the middle of the war games and the actual attacks which would thwart the normal military response. For example, Cheney watched flight 77 approach the Pentagon from many miles out, but instructed the military to do nothing (as shown in the testimony of the Secretary of Transportation, linked above).

Fighter jets were also sent far off-course over the Atlantic Ocean in the middle of the attacks (testimony of Senator Mark Dayton), so as to neutralize their ability to intercept the hijacked airliners...And air traffic controllers claim they were still tracking what they thought were hijacked planes long after all 4 of the real planes had crashed. This implies that false radar blips remained on their screens after all 4 planes went down, long after the military claims they purged the phantom war-game-related radar signals.”

War Games:

From the Bio of John Fulton - Intelligence Networking & Analysis

“On the morning of September 11th 2001, Mr. Fulton and his team at the CIA were running a pre-planned simulation to explore the emergency response issues that would be created if a plane were to strike a building.”

911truth.org: “As the day dawns over the East Coast on September 11th, 2001, the US Strategic Command headquarters at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska is on full alert, busily dispatching warplanes around North America in a rehearsal for Armageddon., under the overall umbrella of Global Guardian--the annual combined exercises run by Stratcom in conjunction with the US Space Command and NORAD, the North American Aerospace Defense Command. The man officially in charge of Global Guardian is Admiral Richard Mies, Stratcom's commander-in-chief.

“Ample evidence gathered from mainstream news sources and compiled by Thompson in the new timeline entries indicates that the wargames served to confuse and stymie air defense response to the simultaneous crash-bombings. Thompson cites multiple reports (see 8:30 am) indicating that Global Guardian is normally held in October, and that the run-through in 2001 was in fact originally scheduled for late October and then re-scheduled for early September at some point after March 2001. Who made that scheduling decision? That may be the most crucial question of all in determining the criminal culpability for 9/11 among US officials.

“Only one was a “cold war” exercise up north: The known NORAD wargames of 9/11, which were apparently incorporated into the larger framework of Global Guardian, include Northern Guardian, Vigilant Guardian and Vigilant Warrior. The most innocent-seeming of these, Northern Guardian was announced in advance and dispatched air force assets to the Arctic Circle in response to the Russian maneuvers also scheduled for that day. (The NORAD press release of 9/9/01 is still online.)

“However, Vigilant Guardian appears to have scripted simulated attacks within the continental United States. NORAD personnel in Rome, New York who received first reports of hijackings within NORAD'S Northeastern sector, including Col. Robert K. Marr and Lt. Col. Dawne Deskins, are reported to have asked if this was "real world or exercise." This implies that the scenarios for the wargames on September 11 were strikingly similar to the actual attacks that unfolded that morning--as was the supposedly unrelated CIA/NRO exercise.

Here is proof of the diversionary ability of these exercises, as reported by the wire service Newhouse News (1/25/02): “At 8:40, Deskins noticed senior technician Jeremy Powell waving his hand. Boston Center was on the line, he said. It had a hijacked airplane. "It must be part of the exercise," Deskins thought.

“At first, everybody did. Then Deskins saw the glowing direct phone line to the Federal Aviation Administration. On the phone she heard the voice of a military liaison for the FAA's Boston Center. "I have a hijacked aircraft," he told her.

“Six minutes later, at 8:46, the wargames were still causing confusion, apparently in the form of a craft (or at least a radar-blip) thought to be heading for JFK Airport in Queens: "Deskins ran to a nearby office and phoned 1st Air Force Chief Public Affairs Officer Major Don Arias in Florida. She said NEADS had a hijacked plane no, not the simulation likely heading for JFK."

“So much for Eberhart's "30 seconds" to adjust to real-world events [General Eberhart's false claim in the investigation that the wargames didn't inhibit a response]. Again, the new supporting evidence provided by Thompson suggests that no move was made to suspend the wargames until well after the second crash at 9:03 am, by which time the worst of the attacks had occurred and the Pentagon flight was well under way.

in the timeline, Thompson covers Vigilant Warrior as follows:

9:28 a.m.: Myers Updates Clarke Videoconference on Fighter Response... Counterterrorism "tsar" Richard Clarke, directing a video conference with top officials, asks Joint Chiefs of Staff Vice Chairman Richard Myers, "I assume NORAD has scrambled fighters and AWACS. How many? Where?" Myers replies, "Not a pretty picture, Dick. We are in the middle of Vigilant Warrior, a NORAD exercise, but ... Otis has launched two birds toward New York. Langley is trying to get two up now [toward Washington]. The AWACS are at Tinker and not on alert."

OFFICIAL VERSION: FBI and other agencies **did their best to investigate terrorist cells** prior to 9/11

Contradictions:

1. Months, before 9/11, the FBI, CIA, and the Bush administration knew that over a dozen men with

links to Osama bin Laden or on terror watch lists were in the United States and **attending U.S. flight schools**. FBI agents were feeding superiors reports of their activities. They were called off. But the information remained in computers and was produced only after the attacks, as if it were recently acquired.

Source: R. Joseph, Phd: "In 1995 and 1996, the FBI also learned that al-Qaeda associate, Abdul Hakim Murad and two other men, had received flight training at four different flight schools in the U.S. during the early 1990s: Coastal Aviation, Richmor Aviation, Schenectady flight school and Alpha Tango Flying Services in San Antonio. Murad was in fact recruited by Ramzi Ahmed Yousef, the bin Laden operative who had plotted and carried out the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. Murad was subsequently convicted of plotting to crash a suicide plane into CIA headquarters and blow up a dozen U.S. commercial jetliners over the Pacific.

"Specifically, in addition to the World Trade Center bombing, it was determined in 1996, that Yousef and Murad had been plotting to train and deploy five-man terrorist teams who were to infiltrate and bomb 12 different commercial jetliners, including Northwest Airlines, Delta Air Lines, and United Airlines, some of which were to be crashed into U.S. cities, including New York and Washington.

"U.S. government prosecutors described the plot as "one of the most hideous crimes anyone ever conceived." In October of 1996, FBI agents in Phoenix were also informed by an undercover

agent, Harry Ellen, that a number of Arab extremists at a local mosque were receiving aviation training. Ellen was alarmed and informed the Phoenix office "that it would be terrible if the bad guys were able to gain this kind of access to airplanes, flight training and crop dusters. You really ought to look at this, it's an

interesting mix of people."

"Indeed, one of the bad guys was Hanji Hajour, one of the September 11 hijackers. Hanjour was living in Phoenix and taking flight lessons at two different local schools: Professional Pilot Training and Cockpit Resource Management. Yet another suspected terrorist, Lotfi Raissi, was also in Phoenix, and later was briefly jailed in Britain on suspicion of training some of the 9/11 terrorists.

"Over the ensuing months and years, the FBI and CIA continued to receive intelligence which detailed how terrorists had gained entry into the United States and were receiving pilot training for the purposes of crashing commercial jetliners into American cities, including New York and Washington.

"For example, following the arrest of those involved in the 1998 bombings of U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, documents were discovered which contained numerous references to pilot training and flight schools and a plot to hijack U.S. jetliners. Two participants in the 1998 bombings, who subsequently turned government informant, also revealed to the FBI that they and other men directly linked with bin Laden, had been ordered to take flight classes. Specifically, Essam al-Ridi, received flight training at the Ed Boardman Aviation School in Fort Worth whereas Ihab Ali Nawawi received flight training at Airman Flight School in Norman, Oklahoma. This same Ihab Ali Nawawi was linked to the 1998 embassy bombings. Another terrorist, L'Houssaine Kerchtou, received flight training in Nairobi.

"In yet another high profile case, an Algerian terrorist, Ahmed Ressay, with direct links to al-Qaeda and bin Laden, informed FBI officials that al-Qaeda was planning to carry out coordinated terrorist assaults on high profile American targets including New York City and the Pentagon. Ressay, who had been arrested in 1999 for plotting to carry out terrorist attacks on the Los Angeles airport, detailed the plot to FBI agents as part of a plea agreement. Bin Laden, he warned, would soon unleash an incomprehensible horror on the people of the United States, and American commercial jetliners would be used as weapons in the attack.

“In 1999, the CIA and FBI received additional intelligence reports which warned that terrorists might hijack commercial jetliners and slam them into the Pentagon or the White House. Over the ensuing months and throughout 2001, the FBI, CIA, and other U.S. intelligence agencies became increasingly aware that individuals known or suspected to be linked with bin Laden or other terrorists groups, had been slipping into the country. They also knew that suspected terrorists on the FBI's "watch list" were receiving flight training. And they knew that men on their "watch list" were holding late night meetings that were attended by other men who were being watched, and many of these men then attended yet other meetings at different locations with yet other men on the FBI's "watch list" as well as with men who would later carry out the 9/11 attacks.

“In fact, a dozen different individuals that the FBI maintains on a "watch list" and who were under some form of surveillance, shared the same U.S. addressees and were in fact living with several of the 9/11 hijackers. For example, eight of those on the FBI's watch list lived at the same address as two

of the 9/11 hijackers: Hamza Alghamdi and Ahmed Alghamdi. All ten men shared a dormitory at Flight Safety International--a flight school in Vero Beach--and were training to be pilots. Hamza and Ahmed were on the jet that hit the south Tower of the World Trade Center.

“Yet another certified pilot on the FBI's watch list shared an address in Daytona Beach with Waleed Alshehri, a hijacker on the flight that struck the north Tower of the World Trade Center. Also at that address: Saeed Alghamdi, a hijacker on the flight that crashed in Pennsylvania.

“Waleed Alshehri and his brother Wail Alshehri, also shared yet another address with a woman living in Hollywood, Florida, who was also on the "watch list." And, she shared their surname: Alshehri.

“A Coral Springs man who was also on the FBI's watch list shared the same address as Marwan Al-Shehhi and Mohamed Atta. Al-Shehhi and Atta piloted the commercial jets that struck the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center.

“The FBI was not only aware that Mohamed Atta was in the U.S. and receiving flight training, but that he been implicated in previous terrorist attacks, and had met with a senior Iraqi intelligence officer. In fact, by law, Atta and his "cousin" Marwan, should have never been granted visas or allowed into the country; yet in the months prior to 9/11 they were allowed to continue their activities unhindered.”

2. **Zacarias Moussaoui** was arrested by FBI agents in Minnesota, after being alerted by a flight school that he was only wanting to learn to steer an airliner in the air. The field office found out from the French that he had a terrorist background, but FBI headquarters refused to allow his apartment to be search for further evidence.

Source: R. Joseph, Phd: “Like their superiors in Washington, FBI field agents knew that the nation was in danger of a terrorist attack, and that this threat involved the hijacking of commercial airliners. What these field agents did not know, but which they began to suspect, was that their superiors in Washington were acting as "accomplices" to Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda.

“On August 15 of 2001, just weeks before the 9/11 attack, FBI agents in Minneapolis, Minnesota, arrested Zacarias Moussaoui who was in the U.S. illegally. They were alerted to Moussaoui's presence and the danger he represented, by the manager of the International Flight School in Eagan, Minnesota.

“Moussaoui, the FBI was told, had been requesting training in a Boeing 747 simulator. However, he had no interest in learning about landings or takeoffs. According to an instructor at the flight school: "He just wanted to learn to steer the plane, which was very odd."

“The FBI field office soon learned from French intelligence officials that Zacarias Moussaoui was a suspected terrorist affiliated with radical fundamentalist Islamic groups and Osama Bin Laden. Upon further investigation, Minneapolis FBI agents became convinced that Moussaoui

posed a direct threat to the security of the United States and that he was part of a widespread terrorist plot that involved the hijacking and destruction of commercial U.S. jet liners.

“However, in order to confirm their suspicions and prevent what they were convinced was a major threat to the United State agents requested permission from superiors to search Moussaoui’s apartment. The request was denied.”

3. Extensive **FBI collusion with Middle Eastern agents** have surfaced in the OKC and first WTC bombing investigations. Impeachment attorney David Schippers reveals that McVeighs Iraqi helper, Al Hussain Husaini, was protected from discovery and released without prosecution. Hussaini was later allowed to get a job as a baggage handler at Boston Logan airport where the hijackings occurred. Schippers reports that prior to and after 9/11 the Justice Department did not want to hear his case, or those of the FBI agent whistleblowers he was representing.

Source: J. Crogan, investigative reporter: “Crogan The Middle Eastern connection to Oklahoma City Mon Feb 18 03:16:43 2002 68.3.132.0 February 17, 2002 Ever since the country was savagely attacked on Sept. 11, the FBI has relentlessly investigated flight schools, airports, universities, mosques, Middle Eastern charities and Muslim communities, looking for connections to al-Qaida or other jihadist groups. The only stone, it seems, the bureau hasn't been willing to turn over is its own investigation into the Oklahoma City bombing. Presumably, that's because the 1995 terrorist attack was the exclusive work of homegrown extremists Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols. Or was it? Even though McVeigh went to his death denying any larger plot, serious questions remain unanswered. Did John Doe No. 2 ever exist? If so, who is he? If not, why did a second suspect initially emerge?

“And then there's that troublesome FBI-authorized all-points bulletin issued just minutes after the truck bomb exploded. The alert sent

members of Oklahoma City law enforcement searching for two Middle Eastern-looking men seen speeding away from the blast area in a brown Chevy pickup with tinted windows and a bug shield. The APB was abruptly cancelled several hours later without explanation. The evidence that the Oklahoma City bombing involved a larger conspiracy, one with Middle Eastern connections, is compelling. And the trail begins with that mysterious pickup.

“The week after the bombing, Jayna Davis, a veteran Oklahoma City reporter at KFOR-TV, got a tip, which began her investigation of a local property management company. Dr. Samir Khalil owns Samara Properties, and several former employees told Davis they had seen a pickup, matching the APB's description, at the office. Davis discovered that Khalil, a Palestinian expatriate, had pled guilty in 1991 to several counts of insurance fraud and served eight months in a federal prison. Khalil's court papers indicated that the FBI investigated him for alleged connections to the Palestine Liberation Organization. But Khalil vehemently denied any PLO links. And he's never responded to my calls for comment. Former Samara employees also told Davis that six months before the bombing, Khalil hired a group of Iraqi refugees to do painting and construction work. This group had allegedly fled Iraq to escape Saddam Hussein's regime. But a Samara employee told Davis he saw them cheering the terror attack and vowing to die in Saddam's service. Davis then used surveillance camera to take pictures of these Iraqis.

Eventually, she focused on one man, Hussain Alhussaini (also known as Al-Hussaini Hussain), who seemed to match the last FBI profile sketch and description of John Doe No. 2. Over the next several months, she interviewed witnesses who said they saw McVeigh in the company of a Middle Eastern-looking man in the days and hours before the bombing. Using KFOR's photo line-up, they identified that individual as Alhussaini. Perhaps the most intriguing statements she collected came from a host of staff members at a motel near downtown Oklahoma City. They reported seeing McVeigh with a number of Middle Eastern men at the site in the months preceding the bombing. Using KFOR's photos, those men were identified as Samara employees. Alhussaini was included in that group. The motel witnesses also said they saw several of the Iraqis moving large barrels around in the back of an old white truck. The barrels, they alleged,

emanated a strong smell of diesel fuel, one of the key ingredients used in the Oklahoma City bomb. Davis also discovered that the mysterious brown Chevy pickup was impounded by the FBI on April 27, 1995. The pickup had been abandoned in an apartment building lot. According to the police report, the truck had been stripped of its license plate, inspection tag and all its vehicle identification numbers. It also was spray-painted yellow, but the original color was listed as brown.

One resident at the complex told the FBI the driver was "clean-shaven, with an olive complexion, dark, wavy hair and broad shoulders," in his late 20s or early 30s and of Middle Eastern descent. Davis also used a hidden camera to interview Lana Padilla, Terry Nichols' ex-wife, about Nichols' repeated trips to the Philippines, a hotbed for terrorist activity. "Tim bought Terry the first ticket for the Philippines," Padilla said. That trip occurred in 1989. His last visit came in November 1994. Ramzi Yousef, the Iraqi convicted for masterminding the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and a plot to blow up U.S. airliners, operated out of Mindanao and Manila in the Philippines. Yousef received funding from Osama bin Laden. According to a motion filed by the McVeigh defense team, an American fitting Nichols' description met with Yousef in the Philippines in 1992 or 1993. Davis eventually aired a number of pieces, taking care to disguise the Iraqi's identity.

However, Alhussaini voluntarily stepped forward on June 15, 1995, to publicly claim that KFOR and Davis had labeled him as John Doe No. 2. Alhussaini told Channel 9 in Oklahoma City he was living in fear. He claimed to be working at one of Khalil's properties when the bombing occurred. And he produced a handwritten time sheet as proof. The former Iraqi soldier also denied knowing McVeigh, and demanded a public apology from KFOR. KFOR and Davis stood by their reports and countered with witnesses who contradicted Alhussaini's assertions, including the time sheet, which was labeled a fabrication. Alhussaini responded by filing a state civil libel suit. However, he withdrew the suit the day before a judge was scheduled to rule on KFOR's motion for summary judgment. Meanwhile, Alhussaini's suit froze KFOR's coverage of the story. And Davis eventually quit after The New York Times bought the station and the investigation was stopped. The former reporter, who had collected 22 signed affidavits from the witnesses she interviewed,

was called to testify before a state grand jury that examined the bombing in 1997. With the witnesses' permission, she gave the grand jury the affidavits. Alhussaini then refiled his libel suit in federal court. Once again attorneys for KFOR and Davis filed for a dismissal. On Nov. 17, 1999, U.S. District Judge Tim Leonard granted their motion. In his ruling, Leonard stated that all the facts in Davis' report were either true or statements of opinion, and did not libel the plaintiff. Alhussaini then appealed the ruling. A hearing was held on Sept. 10; a decision is pending.

“Alhussaini moved from Oklahoma City and was reportedly living in the Boston area. His lawyer declined to give me a phone number for his client. According to 1997 medical records produced during his federal suit, Alhussaini said he had worked for a while at Boston's Logan Airport (where two of the planes were hijacked on Sept. 11). Quoting from those records, Alhussaini first told his psychiatrist that he had quit his airport job because, "If anything happens there, I will be a suspect." However, he later told his doctor that he "wanted to look for another job because he feels unsafe in the environment he works in, the airport, given the recent events involving his being previously suspected of involvement in the Oklahoma bombing." Alhussaini's specific job at the airport was never identified. I contacted the Massachusetts Port Authority, which oversees Logan, to obtain dates of employment. A spokesperson said the agency would not release any information... Over the past seven months, I reviewed all of Davis' documents, including the material she got from Bodansky. I also conducted my own follow-up interviews and found no holes in her investigation.

As for Davis, she's tried twice to give her material to the FBI. According to her attorney Tim McCoy, Department of Justice attorneys prosecuting Nichols rejected Davis' documents in 1997 because they didn't want more material to turn over to the defense. McCoy testified to this at a recent hearing in Nichols' state murder case. In 1999, former FBI agent Dan Vogel accepted the material, but he said that higher-ups later rejected it because the agency questioned Davis' ownership rights. I called the bureau but it declined to explain this strange turn of events. Perhaps if Vogel had been allowed to testify at a recent hearing in

Nichols' Oklahoma murder trial, details would have been forthcoming. But the Justice Department refused to let him take the stand.”

4. FBI headquarters tried to silence and then fired Turkish translator **Sibel Edmonds** after she uncovered other translators falsifying and covering for incriminating conversations of terrorists. Federal court system refused to back up her whistleblower claims according to law.

Source: Sibel Edmonds: “Over four years ago, more than four months prior to the September 11 terrorist attacks, in April 2001, a long-term FBI informant/asset who had been providing the bureau with information since 1990, provided two FBI agents and a translator with specific information regarding a terrorist attack being planned by Osama Bin Laden.

“This asset/informant was previously a high- level intelligence officer in Iran in charge of intelligence from Afghanistan. Through his contacts in Afghanistan he received information that: 1) Osama Bin Laden was planning a major terrorist attack in the United States targeting 4-5 major cities, 2) the attack was going to involve airplanes, 3) some of the individuals in charge of carrying out this attack were already in place in the United States, 4) the attack was going to be carried out soon, in a few months.

“The agents who received this information reported it to their superior, Special Agent in Charge of Counterterrorism, Thomas Fields, at the FBI Washington Field Office, by filing “302” forms, and the translator, Mr. Behrooz Sarshar, translated and documented this information. No action was taken by the Special Agent in Charge, Thomas Fields, and after 9/11 the agents and the translators were told to ‘keep quiet’ regarding this issue.

“The translator who was present during the session with the FBI informant, Mr. Behrooz Sarshar, reported this incident to Director Mueller in writing, and later to the Department of Justice Inspector General. The press reported this incident, and in fact the report in the Chicago Tribune

on July 21, 2004 stated that FBI officials had confirmed that this information was received in April 2001, and further, the Chicago Tribune quoted an aide to Director Mueller that he (Mueller) was surprised that the Commission never raised this particular issue with him during the hearing (Please refer to Chicago Tribune article, dated July 21, 2004).

“Mr. Sarshar reported this issue to the 9/11 Commission on February 12, 2004, and provided them with specific dates, location, witness names, and the contact information for that particular Iranian asset and the two special agents who received the information. I provided the 9/11 Commission with a detailed and specific account of this issue, the names of other witnesses, and documents I had seen. Mr. Sarshar also provided the Department of Justice Inspector General with specific information regarding this case.

“For almost four years since September 11, officials refused to admit to having specific information regarding the terrorists’ plans to attack the United States. The Phoenix Memo, received months prior to the 9/11 attacks, specifically warned FBI HQ of pilot training and their possible link to terrorist activities against the United States. Four months prior to the terrorist attacks the Iranian asset provided the FBI with specific information regarding the ‘use of airplanes’, ‘major US cities as targets’, and ‘Osama Bin Laden issuing the order.’ Coleen Rowley likewise reported that specific information had been provided to FBI HQ. All this information went to the same place: FBI Headquarters in Washington, DC, and the FBI Washington Field Office, in Washington DC.

“In October 2001, approximately one month after the September 11 attack, an agent from (city name omitted) field office, re-sent a certain document to the FBI Washington Field Office, so that it could be re-translated. This Special Agent, in light of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, rightfully believed that, considering his target of investigation (the suspect under surveillance), and the issues involved, the original translation might have missed certain information that could prove to be valuable in the investigation of terrorist activities.

“After this document was received by the FBI Washington Field Office and retranslated verbatim, the field agent’s hunch appeared to be correct. The new translation revealed certain information regarding blueprints, pictures, and building material for skyscrapers being sent overseas (country name omitted). It also revealed certain illegal activities in obtaining visas from certain embassies in the Middle East, through network contacts and bribery. However, after the re-translation was completed and the new significant information was revealed, the unit supervisor in charge of certain Middle Eastern languages, Mike Feghali, decided NOT to send the re-translated information to the Special Agent who had requested it.

“Instead, this supervisor decided to send this agent a note stating that the translation was reviewed and that the original translation was accurate. This supervisor, Mike Feghali, stated that sending the accurate translation would hurt the original translator and would cause problems for the FBI language department.

Source: Tom Flocco: “FBI translator Sibel Edmonds was offered a substantial raise to encourage her not to go public that she had been asked by the Department of Justice (DOJ) to retranslate and adjust the translations of [terrorist] subject intercepts that had been received before September 11, 2001 by the FBI and CIA. In a 50 reporter frenzy in front of some 12 news cameras, Edmonds said "Attorney General John Ashcroft told me 'he was invoking State Secret Privilege and National Security' when I told the FBI that I wanted to go public with what I had translated from the pre 9-11 intercepts".

5. Former FBI Terrorism **Task Force chief John O'Neill** was ordered to back off his investigation of the Saudis in the bombing of the USS Cole, as well as pursuing his al Qaeda investigations. He resigned in protest and was offered a replacement job as Chief of Security at the WTC—where he died on Sept. 11. [How

convenient that he was no longer available to testify about government stonewalling of his investigations on al Qaeda]

Source: AFPN: "Until he resigned, in August of 2001, John O'Neill was the director of antiterrorism for the FBI's New York office. O'Neill had worked on the investigations of the first WTC bombing in 1993 and the attacks on the American embassies in Africa in 1998. He became one of the world's top experts on Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda. O'Neill believed that "All the answers, everything needed to dismantle Osama bin Laden's organization can be found in Saudi Arabia." Yet the Bush administration blocked O'Neill's efforts to investigate the Saudi ties to bin Laden. The main obstacles to investigating Islamic terrorism, asserted O'Neill, were US oil corporate interests and the role played by Saudi Arabia in it.

"For example, Bush blocked an FBI investigation of the bin Laden family and kept his family's business ties to the bin Ladens as secret as possible. Among these business dealings were bin Laden investments in the Carlyle Group and connections between bin Laden and George W. Bush's first oil companies.

"O'Neill was very well aware of the warnings that came out in the summer of 2001. But it was obvious that he was considered more of a liability than an asset to the oil-obsessed Bush administration. Back in 2000, O'Neill had been investigating the bombing of the SS Cole, for which he was sure bin Laden was responsible. However, the US ambassador to Yemen, one Barbara Bodine, hamstrung FBI efforts at every turn, publicly calling O'Neill a liar, refusing to allow his men to be armed with more than small handguns and, in general, crippling the investigation. Although Bodine claims she was trying to keep diplomatic relations running smoothly, her history shows otherwise:

"Barbara Bodine has served primarily under rightwing old boys and in areas where their oil interests are being served. Under Reagan she served as Deputy Principle Officer in Baghdad, Iraq. Under Bush, Sr., she served as Deputy Chief of Mission in Kuwait and was there during the Gulf War. She has also worked for Bob Dole, and far more ominously, for

Henry Kissinger. Now, under Bush, Jr., she is in Yemen impeding an FBI investigation that focused on the son of a Bush family business associate.

“What makes Bodine's actions toward O'Neill particularly despicable is that she was said to be in part to blame for the Cole disaster. Even though she had been warned that the risk of attacks on Americans in the Yemen area were extremely high at that time, the Cole entered port under the lowest grade of security permitted in the Middle East with no warning to the destroyer. A top military analyst for the Pentagon's Defense Intelligence Agency quit in protest the day after the bombing because of Bodine and General Anthony Zinn's decision to allow the Cole to come into the port.

“In July, Bodine had O'Neill and the FBI barred from Yemen. About that time, O'Neill's name had been proposed by Richard Clarke as Clarke's successor as terrorism czar at the National Security Council. But a very mysterious incident that had happened nearly a year before was dredged up and used to blow that possibility out of the water. In November of 2000, at a retirement seminar in Tampa, O'Neill left his briefcase for a few moments in the convention room to go around the corner to use the phone. When he returned in a few minutes, the brief case, containing some papers considered classified, was gone. It soon turned up, but the incident was seized upon as an excuse to guarantee O'Neill would not get promoted. Was it a real theft? Or a set up to squeeze out the man who asked too many questions about Saudis and oil? O'Neill had finally had enough and quit.

Four days later, Bush was given the warning that could have, if acted upon, saved 3,000 American lives and the thousands of civilian lives lost in Afghanistan since October. Instead, he chose to ignore it. In early September, O'Neill took a job at the WTC as head of security there. Right before the disaster, he told friends he felt sure an attack was imminent and that he feared that terrorists would try to finish the job they had begun in 1993 to destroy the WTC. John O'Neill was in the first tower when it was hit. He was on his way into the second tower to help evacuate people when he was killed.”

6. **WTC janitor Rodriguez** said, "The FBI never followed up on my claims or on the other part of my story when I told them before 9/11, I encountered one of the hijackers casing the north tower."

Source: Greg Szymanski, "What happened to William Rodriguez the morning of 9/11 is a miracle. What happened to his story after-the-fact is a tragedy. But with miracles and tragedies comes truth. And truth is exactly what Rodriguez brings to the whole mystery surrounding 9/11. Declared a hero for saving numerous lives at Ground Zero, he was the janitor on duty the morning of 9/11 who heard and felt explosions rock the basement sub-levels of the north tower just seconds before the jetliner struck the top floors.

"He not only claims he felt explosions coming from below the first sub-level while working in the basement, he says the walls were cracking around him and he pulled a man to safety by the name of Felipe David, who was severely burned from the basement explosions.

"All these events occurred only seconds before and during the jetliner strike above. And through it all, he now asks a simple question everybody should be asking? How could a jetliner hit 90 floors above and burn a man's arms and face to a crisp in the basement below within seconds of impact? Rodriguez claims this was impossible and clearly demonstrates a controlled demolition brought down the WTC, saying "Let's see them (the government) try to wiggle out of this one."

"Well, they haven't wiggled out of it because the government continues to act like Rodriguez doesn't exist, basically ignoring his statements and the fact he rescued a man burnt and bleeding from the basement explosions. His eye witness account, ignored by the media and the government, points the finger squarely on an official cover-up at the highest levels since the government contends the WTC fell only from burning jet fuel. And after listening to Rodriguez, it's easy to see why the Bush administration wants him kept quiet.

"Bush wants him quiet because Rodriguez's account is 'proof positive' the WTC was brought down by a controlled demolition, not burning jet fuel. And Bush knows if he's caught lying about this or caught

in a cover-up, it's just a matter of time before the whole house of cards comes tumbling down. In fact, Rodriguez's story is so damaging – so damning – it literally blows the lid off the government story, literally exposing the whole 9/11 investigation as a sham and a cover-up of the worst kind.

“And it appears the cover-up also extends to the media. NBC news knew about his story several years ago, even spending a full day at his house taping his comments. But when push came to shove, his story was never aired. Why? His eyewitness account, backed up by at least 14 people at the scene with him, isn't speculation or conjecture. It isn't a story that takes a network out on a journalistic limb. It's a story that can be backed up, a story that can be verified with hospital records and testimony from many others.

“It's a story about 14 people who felt and heard the same explosion and even saw Rodriguez, moments after the airplane hit, take David to safety, after he was burnt so bad from the basement explosion flesh was hanging from his face and both arms. “So why didn't NBC or any other major news outlets cover the story? They didn't run it because it shot the government story to hell and back. They didn't run it because "the powers at be" wouldn't allow it.

“Since 9/11, Rodriguez has stuck to his guns, never wavering from what he said from day one. Left homeless at times, warned to keep quiet and subtly harassed, he nevertheless has continued trying to tell get his message out in the face of a country not willing to listen.

Here is his story: The Miracle

“It's a miracle Rodriguez, 44, who worked at the WTC for 20 years, is even alive. Usually arriving to work at 8:30am, the morning of 9/11 he reported 30 minutes late. If he'd arrived on time, it would have put him at the top floors just about the same time the jetliner hit the north

tower."It was a miracle. If I arrived on time, like always, I'd probably be dead. I would have been up at the top floors like every morning," said Rodriguez about the quirk of fate that saved his life.

But since he was late, Rodriguez found himself checking into work in an office on sub-level 1 when the north tower was hit, seemingly out of harms way. However, the sound and concussion of a massive explosion in the sub-levels right below his feet changed that. "When I heard the sound of the explosion, the floor beneath my feet vibrated, the walls started cracking and it everything started shaking," said Rodriguez, who was huddled together with at least 14 other people in the office.

Rodriguez said Anthony Saltamachia, supervisor for the American Maintenance Co., was one of the people in the room who stands ready to verify his story. "Seconds after the first massive explosion below in the basement still rattled the floor, I hear another explosion from way above," said Rodriguez. "Although I was unaware at the time, this was the airplane hitting the tower, it occurred moments after the first explosion."

But before Rodriguez had time to think, co-worker Felipe David stormed into the basement office with severe burns on his face and arms, screaming for help and yelling "explosion! explosion! explosion!"

David had been in front of a nearby freight elevator on sub-level 1 about 400 feet from the office when fire burst out of the elevator shaft, causing his injuries. "He was burned terribly," said Rodriguez. "The skin was hanging off his hands and arms. His injuries couldn't have come from the airplane above, but only from a massive explosion below. I don't care what the government says, what scientists say. I saw a man burned terribly from a fire that was caused from an explosion below. "I know there were explosives placed below the trade center. I helped a man to safety who is living proof, living proof the government story is a lie and a cover-up.

"I have tried to tell my story to everybody, but nobody wants to listen. It is very strange what is going on here in supposedly the most democratic country in the world. In my home country of Puerto Rico and

all the other Latin American countries, I have been allowed to tell my story uncensored. But here, I can't even say a word."

After Rodriguez escorted David to safety outside the WTC, he returned to lead the others in the basement to safety as well. While there, he also helped two other men trapped and drowning in the basement elevator shaft, another result he says of the explosives placed below the tower.

In fact, after leading these men to safety, he even made another trip back into the north tower, against police orders, in order to rescue people from the top floors. "I never could make it to the top, but I got up to the 33rd floor after getting some of my equipment and a face mask out of the janitor's closet," said Rodriguez, adding he heard a series of small explosions going off between the 20th and 30th floors, unrelated to the airplane strike, while making his way through the stairwell to the top floors. "Also, when I was on the 33rd floor, I heard strange sounds coming from the 34th floor, loud noises like someone moving and thumping heavy equipment and furniture. I knew this floor was empty and stripped due to construction work so I avoided it and continued to make my way up the stairs."

Rodriguez said he finally reached the 39th floor before being turned back by fire fighters and then, reluctantly, started his dissent back down and his own flight to safety while, at the same time, hearing explosions coming from the South Tower.

The Tragedy

The concerted effort by the media and the government to silence Rodriguez is the tragedy behind this American hero's story. And there is no question, Rodriguez is a "silent hero" for saving so many lives and for having the courage to continue telling his story against tremendous odds.

In an effort to open a fair and honest investigation as to why the WTC collapsed, Rodriguez has been ignored by government officials, the

9/11 Commission and the National Institute of Safety and Technology (NIST).

NIST, an independent investigative group funded by the government, put the finishing touches this week on its 2 year \$35 million 9/11 investigation. This week Rodriguez made his final plea to have his story heard while testifying at the final public hearing held in New York. " I disagree 100% with the government story," said Rodriguez. "I met with the 9/11 Commission behind closed doors and they essentially discounted everything I said regarding the use of explosives to bring down the north tower. "And I contacted NIST previously four times without a response. Finally, this week I asked them before they came up with their conclusion that jet fuel brought down the towers, if they ever considered my statements or the statements of any of the other survivors who heard the explosions. They just stared at me with blank faces and didn't have any answers. "Also, The FBI never followed up on my claims or on the other part of my story when I told them before 9/11, I encountered one of the hijackers casing the north tower."

Besides the explosions, Rodriguez also has provided testimony to the 9/11 Commission that he stumbled across one of the supposed 19 Arab hijackers inside the WTC several months before 9/11. "I had just finished cleaning the bathroom and this guy asks me, 'Excuse me, how many public bathrooms are in this area?'" Rodriguez told the 9/11 Commission. "Coming from the school of the 1993 [Trade Center] bombing, I found it very strange. I didn't forget about it"

Rodriguez, claims he saw United Airlines Flight 175 hijacker Mohand Alshehri in June 2001, telling an FBI agent about the incident a month after the attacks. Never hearing back from the bureau, he later learned agents never followed up on the story. "I'm very certain, I'll give it 90%" that Alshehri was casing the towers before the attacks," said Rodriguez.

Regarding the media's apathetic approach to his story, Rodriguez said immediately after 9/11 some newspapers picked it up but his words

were never taken seriously and quickly forgotten. "During the 9/11 hearings, NBC brought a crew out to my house and spent a day taping my story but they never did air a word of it," said Rodriguez. "Since then, some reporters and commentators have subtly warned me to keep quiet, told me my life could be in jeopardy and warned me that I really didn't understand who I was dealing with. "I have been receiving this type of subtle harassment for years, but I keep telling everybody I can't be intimidated because I am on a mission. Whenever someone asks why I keep talking or warns me that I could be killed, I just tell them I have nothing to lose. "I tell them I lost 200 friends and I am their voice now. I tell them I will do everything in my power to find out the truth since I am living on borrowed time since I probably should be dead anyway."

OFFICIAL VERSION: Osama bin Laden and his **al Qaeda** terrorist network were responsible for the attack. The CIA sponsored the rise of al Qaeda with the help of Pakistan's ISI, in order to free Afghanistan from Soviet domination, but bin Laden turned against his Western benefactors. The US has been hunting bin Laden and his top leaders with all their might.

Contradictions:

1. The French daily Le Figaro got reports from French intelligence that bin Laden was receiving kidney dialysis treatment at the American hospital in Dubai, UAR in July, 2001. A top CIA official was seen making him a visit. If bin Laden was a wanted fugitive, why didn't the US arrest him?

Source: Webster Tarpley's book on page 149, tells us of an October 2001 article in Le Figaro by Alexandra Richard, who reported, "The CIA met bin Laden in Dubai in July" [of 2001], two months before

9/11." Imagine that. An American France Presse dispatch quoted in Tarpley's book says, Osama bin Laden underwent treatment in July at the American Hospital in Dubai where he met a US Central

Intelligence Agency (CIA) official . . . Quoting a "witness," a professional partner of the administrative management of the hospital, they said the man suspected by the United State of being behind the

September 11 terrorist attacks had arrived in Dubai on July 4 by air from Quetta, Pakistan. He was immediately taken to the hospital for kidney treatment. He left the establishment on July 14. The dispatch also reports that the CIA man was named Larry Mitchell, Osama's handler and case officer. He was seen going into bin Laden's room and later "boasting to his friends of the meeting." Le Figaro also reported that

bin Laden brought his own doctor, and a close collaborator who would be the Egyptian Ayman al-Zawahiri, along with bodyguards and a personal nurse. Dr. Terry Callaway was bin Laden's urologist and attended to his serious kidney condition. Bin Laden also had had a mobile dialysis machine sent to his Kandahar hideout in Afghanistan in the first half of 2000 . . ." Of course, the CIA denied this all, despite reconfirmation from the French investigative reporters."

2. Both the governments of Sudan (during the Clinton administration) and the Taliban (during Bush 43 administration) offered to turn bin Laden over to the US. They were refused. Why? If bin Laden really had turned against the CIA?

Source: NY Times: Eric Lichtblau " State Department analysts warned the Clinton administration in July 1996 that Osama bin Laden's move to Afghanistan would give him an even more dangerous haven as he sought to expand radical Islam "well beyond the Middle East," but the government chose not to deter

the move, newly declassified documents show.

In what would prove a prescient warning, the State Department intelligence analysts said in a top-secret assessment on Mr. bin Laden that summer that "his prolonged stay in Afghanistan - where hundreds of 'Arab mujahedeen' receive terrorist training and key extremist leaders often congregate - could prove more dangerous to U.S. interests in the long run than his three-year liaison with Khartoum," in Sudan.

The declassified documents, obtained by the conservative legal advocacy group Judicial Watch as part of a Freedom of Information Act request and provided to The New York Times, shed light on a murky and controversial chapter in Mr. bin Laden's history: his relocation from Sudan to Afghanistan as the Clinton administration was striving to understand the threat he posed and explore ways of confronting him.

Before 1996, Mr. bin Laden was regarded more as a financier of terrorism than a mastermind. But the State Department assessment, which came a year before he publicly urged Muslims to attack the United States, indicated that officials suspected he was taking a more active role, including in the bombings in June 1996 that killed 19 members American soldiers at the Khobar Towers in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia.

Two years after the State Department's warning, with Mr. bin Laden firmly entrenched in Afghanistan and overseeing terrorist training and financing operations, Al Qaeda struck two American embassies in East Africa, leading to failed military attempts by the Clinton administration to capture or kill him in Afghanistan. Three years later, on Sept. 11, 2001, Al Qaeda struck the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in an operation overseen from the base in Afghanistan.

Critics of the Clinton administration have accused it of ignoring the threat posed by Mr. bin Laden in the mid-1990's while he was still in Sudan, and they point to claims by some Sudanese officials that they

offered to turn him over to the Americans before ultimately expelling him in 1996 under international pressure. But Clinton administration diplomats have adamantly denied that they received such an offer, and the Sept. 11 commission concluded in one of its staff reports that it had "not found any reliable evidence to support the Sudanese claim."

The newly declassified documents do not directly address the question of whether Sudan ever offered to turn over Mr. bin Laden. But the documents go well beyond previous news and historical accounts in detailing the Clinton administration's active monitoring of Mr. bin Laden's movements and the realization that his move to Afghanistan could make him an even greater national security threat.

3. During the war in Afghanistan, various sources report bin Laden being allowed to escape from Tora Bora into Pakistan, and his family and Arab guards over land into Iran, boarding ships at the gulf. US had satellite surveillance of this shipping and did not intervene.

Source: Capitol Hill Blue: President George W. Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney lied during the 2004

Presidential campaign when they claimed U.S. forces did not miss a chance to

capture Osama bin Laden at Tora Bora in 2001. A U.S. government document

shows a terror suspect held at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, was a commander for bin

Laden during the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in the 1980s and helped the

al-Qaida leader escape his mountain hide-out at Tora Bora in 2001.”

Source: Debka.com

ESCAPE OF BIN LADEN AND FORCES—AFGHANISTAN

debka.com

It was just before midnight Nov. 21 when Russian-made Antonov aircraft without markings began landing at the bombed-out airport of Konduz in northern Afghanistan.

The Northern Alliance's conquest of the Afghan city was still five days away, and a small group of Pakistani military intelligence officers and soldiers – all of whom had been serving with the Taliban – waited anxiously on a runway, together with a large number of Pakistanis wounded in battle lying on blankets. The planes were coming to take them home.

Around 5 p.m. earlier that day, U.S. bombings of the airport had suddenly stopped. As they waited for the airlift, the Pakistanis understood the rescue of their men trapped in Konduz had been set up in a silent agreement between their government, or commanding officers, and the U.S. Two planes were to touch down every night to pick them up until the evacuation was finished.

But as the airlift began, Pakistani air crews and their passengers were astonished to see they had company on the runways of Konduz – a second fleet of Antonov transports was running a parallel airlift on some mysterious mission.

Military sources have solved the mystery: The planes belonged to Osama bin Laden's al-Qaida. Under cover of the Pakistani airlift, 3,000 of the group's fighters were secretly lifted to safety from the besieged towns of Konduz and Khandabad about 15 miles to the south. The double airlift lasted five nights. The planes arriving to ferry Pakistani fighters home were closely shadowed by a phantom airlift extracting al-Qaida personnel.

The rescued Pakistanis were flown to air bases in northwest and central Pakistan. The al-Qaida men were taken long distance to the Persian Gulf emirates, landing, according to Gulf sources, in Abu Dhabi and the Somali town of Baidoa.”

4. Various sources came to US authorities both in Afghanistan and the US with detailed evidence of bin Laden locations. They were shocked to be rebuffed by administration officials, showing no interest in their claims.
5. None of the supposed al Qaeda top leaders that have been captured, like “9/11 mastermind” **Khalid Sheik Mohammad**, have ever been seen in public, brought to trial or prosecuted—years later. For all we know these former CIA and Pakistani ISI friends could be living it up in a villa.
6. If al Qaeda really is this well financed, world-wide terror organization, why have there not been any single incidents of small, cheap, normal acts of sabotage and terrorism in the US, with it’s nearly open borders? Cheney claims “we’ve got them on the run.” But, if they can pull off sophisticated bombings in Bali, Israel, Turkey, and everywhere a nation want to claim “al Qaeda

did it” why can’t they walk across the US-Mex border and sabotage power lines? It doesn’t add up! If you think they are cowed by the “effectiveness” of our Homeland Security system (Cheney’s claim), look at Israel. With a tiny country to surveil and a 10-fold higher density of police and military checkpoints, including security guards at every business, Israeli forces still can’t stop all car bombings, suicide bombings and infrastructure attacks – though they do stop many. Our country, in comparison, is wide open. Yet we have experienced none of these typical terrorist attacks. Why? As I have said before, either there are no significant terrorist cells here (hard to believe), or terrorism in the US is a controlled entity that our government can restrain or allow to operate according to its own political purposes.

JOHN KAMINSKI: “Many researchers claim the name al-Qaeda was made up in middle '90s by a

variety of American functionaries (one of them being none other than Richard Clarke) as an all-purpose villain the U.S. could blame as a convenient reason for its military adventurism

“Al-Qaeda doesn't exist except for when they want it to, to blame for any sort of strategic terror they have created themselves for some political reason, like influencing the elections in Spain. Hah, that one really backfired.

“Why haven't American intelligence operatives gone to these foreign countries to interview these named hijackers who turned out to be alive? Simple. Because they knew the list was fiction in the first place, and the Arab-types who have been named as terror gurus are mostly their own employees, or people who have been set up by them.

“It is a celebrated fact that Mohammed Atta and some of his friends were seen in nightclubs in the hours before 9/11, certainly a fact that argues against them being able to carry out their supposed missions because they were motivated by Islamic religious zeal. So their appearance in strip clubs blows the whole story that they were devout

Muslims giving their lives to Allah. Devout Muslims don't drink, never mind cavort with strippers.”

OFFICIAL VERSION: Government officials **tried their best** to react to the attack as it occurred.

Contradictions:

1. President Bush was allowed to continue reading to a grade school class in Florida while the nations was under attack [There were also several indication he was improperly briefed on how to react (confused his statements about the first and second attack). Sec. of Defense Rumsfeld, who had made a recent change to “use of deadly force” intercept procedures, just prior to 9/11, requiring his personal OK, made himself unavailable for command decisions during and after the Pentagon attack—walking down to see the damage rather than going to command post. Incredible! His nonchalant attitude indicates he knew there was no real threat from terror.

“Rumsfeld's case is particularly flagrant, given that he had signed off on a June 1, 2001 Pentagon order that for the first time inserted the Secretary of Defense into the chain of response for issuing military intercept orders for errant planes. His story is that he reacted to news of the first and second WTC crashes by continuing his routine morning briefings, and that after the Pentagon was hit (at 9:37 or 9:41 am, depending on which official timeline one prefers), he decided to assist in rescue efforts instead of taking his place at the command center [as his own change in procedures demanded—this is not credible as an excuse].”

2. There is evidence of military officials being given orders to **Stand Down interceptor aircraft**: A Tower controller at McGuire AFB revealed to private source of mine that a General officer called him a the tower and order the runway and to not allow fighters

take off. This was well before the second aircraft crashed into the WTC.. Other Air Force officers have reported privately to friends that “stand-down orders were in fact given to the fighter pilots on 9/11, some of whom had already scrambled and were airborne.”

Source: Will Thomas’ “Stand Down”

It happens all the time. When a small private plane recently entered the 23-mile restricted ring around the U.S. Capitol, two F-16 interceptors were immediately launched from Andrews Air Force Base, just 10 miles away. In a similar episode, a pair of F-16 “Fighting Falcons” on 15-minute strip alert was airborne from Andrews just 11 minutes after being notified by the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) of a Cessna straying towards the White House. [AP Nov11/03; CNN June20/02]

These were well-practiced routines. Between September 2000 and June 2001 the Pentagon launched fighters on 67 occasions to escort wayward aircraft. [FAA news release Aug/9/02; AP Aug13/02]

But on Sept 11, 2001, NORAD and the FAA ignored routine procedures and strict regulations. In response to a national emergency involving hijacked airliners as dangerous as cruise missiles, interceptors launched late from distant bases flew to defend their nation at a fraction of their top speeds. [NORAD news release Sept. 18/01]

WHAT NORAD KNEW

A recently resurfaced NORAD news bulletin released seven days after Sept. 11 explains that America’s aerial defenders were slow to counter rapidly developing air attacks because they didn’t hear from the FAA that

American Airlines Flight 11 had been hijacked until 8:40 that fateful morning. [NORAD news release Sept. 18/01]

But at the National Military Command Center (NMCC) in the basement of the Pentagon, Air Force staff officers monitoring every inch of airspace over the northeastern seaboard would have caught that first hijacking when Flight 11's identification transponder stopped transmitting at 8:20 - automatically triggering a radar alarm.

With their capability to monitor developing "situations" by tapping into military and civilian radars, U.S. military commanders would have also seen Flight 175 turn abruptly south 25 minutes later – just as they had watched on radar in October 1999 when pro golfer Payne Stewart's Learjet abruptly departed its flight path while enroute o Dallas. [CNN Oct26/1999]

In that legendary intercept, a fighter jet out of Tyndall, Florida was diverted from a training flight to escort the Lear, whose pilot had become incapacitated, trapping Stewart in the stratosphere. An F-16 was reportedly sitting off the left wingtip of Payne's pilotless business jet within 19 minutes of the FAA alert. [ABC News Oct25/99]

If NORAD had been as quick to scramble or divert airborne fighters on Sept. 11, two "anti-terrorist" F-15's on armed alert could have been sent south from Otis Air Force Base on Cape Cod. Flying at full afterburners without edging over the Atlantic to disperse their sonic footprint, two of the fastest fighters on the planet might have intercepted Flight 11 over the Hudson Rive six minutes from the World Trade Center.. Even launching on the FAA's first alert, the Mach 2.5 fighters could have reached Flight 175 before it struck the South Tower.

NO HURRY SAYS NORAD

Instead, in a stunning admission that received little press scrutiny at the time, NORAD noted that for all interceptions flown against the hijackers on Sept. 11, "Flight times are calculated at 9 miles per minute or .9 Mach." In other words, every interception flown by the world's hottest air-combat aircraft was flown at less than a third of the planes' top speed.

A Defense Department manual insists, "In the event of a hijacking, the NMCC will be notified by the most expeditious means by the FAA." To make this happen, the Federal Aviation Administration permanently posts a liaison officer in the Pentagon air defense room. [CJCSI 3610.01A, June1/01]

Yet, according to NORAD, after air traffic controllers realized that Flight 11 had been hijacked, 38 vital minutes passed before a pair of F-15's were scrambled from Otis. As they lifted off, American Airlines Flight 11 struck the North Tower of the World Trade Center, 153 air miles away as a Falcon flies. [NORAD Sept. 18/01]

United Airlines Flight 175 was still 20 minutes out.

"The F-15 pilots flew "like a scalded ape, topping 500 mph but were unable to catch up to the airliner," Maj. Gen. Paul Weaver later told reporters. [St. Augustine Times Sept16/01]

Scalded apes? Airliners fly at 500 mph. An F-15 can fly almost four-times faster.

STEP ON IT

One of the Otis intercept pilots dubbed “Duff”, later lamented: “We’ve been over the flight a thousand times in our minds and I don’t know what we could have done to get there any quicker.”

For starters, he and his wingman could have tried pushing their twin throttles fully forward. Instead of flying two-and-a-half times faster than a bullet, “Nasty” and “Duff” drove their expensive air superiority fighters at a leisurely 447-mph – supposedly to intercept a Boeing 767 flying 43 mph faster! Utilizing only 27% power, the F-15’s were “eight minutes/71 miles” away, according to NORAD, when Flight 175 struck the South Tower with 56 souls and more than ten tons of fuel onboard. [Christian Science Monitor Mar8/02]

HONOR THE THREAT

With both Trade Towers burning, and hijacked United Flight 93 shadowed by a circling F-16 over Pennsylvania, American Airlines Flight 77 was the only threat left in the sky. When that Boeing 757 silenced its transponder signal, made a U-turn over Kentucky and headed directly for the White House and the Pentagon, one billion viewers riveted to the big networks knew this was a kamikaze run. [Telegraph Sept13/01]

With no other bogeys on eastern seaboard scopes, air combat doctrine dictates that the two unemployed Otis F-15s already in the area be redirected to “honor the threat” of an incoming flying bomb, 330 miles out.

Even loafing along, the fighters would have more than 20 minutes to confront Flight 77 before it neared the Pentagon.

Instead, Pentagon professionals defending their country's nerve centers waited more than an hour after watching Flight 11 go rogue - including 30 critical minutes after Flight 77 turned abruptly toward them and the nearby White House - before scrambling two F-16's out of Langley Air Force Base to protect the capitol.

Nearly half-an-hour after receiving the belated order to scramble, two Falcons coasted in over the burning Pentagon. Slowed down to just 410 mph, it had taken the 1,500 mph-capable fighters 19 minutes to cover the 130 miles from Virginia. It should have taken just over seven minutes to reach the Pentagon – at about the time Flight 77 was making a predatory circle overhead. [NORAD Sept18/01; USAF]

GROUNDING

The supersonic jets were flown no faster than WWII prop-driven fighters. But it hardly mattered. Sitting on the Andrews ramp just 10 miles away, were two fully armed and fueled supersonic interceptors tasked with protecting the capitol from airborne terrorist threats on 15 minutes' notice!

Isn't it about time someone asked why those routinely launched Andrews interceptors were "stood down" as Flight 77 bored in toward the headquarters they were supposed to protect? [San Diego Union-Tribune Sept12/01]

In the most heavily armed nation on Earth, at least two-dozen air force installations were within fast flying time of the World Trade Center and Pentagon. Does anyone else wonder why none of those aircraft were ordered launched - or why none of the armed fighters on training flights or patrolling Air Defense Intercept Zones just off the Atlantic Coast were diverted to intercept four commandeered airliners until after the Pentagon was struck – one-hour and 18 minutes after Flight 11 was hijacked? [www.af.mil/sites/alphabetical.shtml#a]

According to NORAD, the F-16s from Langley were still “12 minutes/105 miles” away when the big Boeing they were “chasing” soared past the White House and the Andrews runways. Allegedly flown by an incompetent Egyptian flight student who couldn’t solo a Cessna, the 757 peeled off and piled into the Pentagon after an abrupt dive and pull-up that left veteran pilots agape. [San Diego Union-Tribune Sept12/01; NBC Nightly News Sept11/01; All Fall Down]

Immediately after the Pentagon was hit, the Andrews alert jets were launched to guard empty skies. [Mirror Nov13/03]

ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH

Responding to questions from a Senate confirmation committee two days after this suspicious fiasco, the Joint Chief’s acting air defense chief on Sept. 11 said he was in a meeting while all hell was breaking loose in his sector.

Air Force Gen. Richard Myers had not let a TV report about a small plane hitting the World Trade Center interrupt his routine. As jumbo jetliners kept diving into buildings, apparently no one thought to inform the acting commander of U.S. air defenses that his country was under attack. Myers said he came out of his meeting just as the Pentagon was hit.

Asked repeatedly when the brass were first informed of the emergency, and when interceptors were scrambled, Myers repeated a muddled mantra six times, saying ““I’ll have to get back to you on that.”
[www.defenselink.mil/news/Oct2001/n10232001_200110236.html]

Instead of being court-martialed like the luckless commanders defending Pearl Harbor, or even reprimanded, General Myers was awarded command of the entire U.S. military as new chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Bush publicly commended the air force general for his “calm manner, sound judgment, and his clear strategic thinking.” [White House press release Oct15/01]

As this bizarre and possibly treasonous story goes to press, the FAA has refused to disclose documents relating to when that agency notified U.S. air defenses about the four hijacked airliners. A second subpoena served on the Pentagon by the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States has been similarly unsuccessful in attaining records concerning whether NORAD responded quickly enough in dispatching interceptors on Sept. 11. [Washington Post Nov8/03]

Instead of fingering air traffic controllers for not following procedures, these documents could show that the FAA did follow its own Standard Intercept Procedures and notify NORAD within a few minutes of each

hijacking – which would leave the Air Force with even more explaining to do. [AP Oct18/03]”

3. **NORAD falsified the time line** to deny that they were notified by the FAA in time to react

9/11 Citizens Watch co-founder, Kyle Hence noted that, "Despite a forced delay of over a year in starting the probe, military and government officials in positions of responsibility at the time of the attacks have failed in their testimony to put forward a cohesive timeline. Official timelines from NORAD, the FAA, and other published accounts conflict with each other on significant details about the events in question.

NORAD was already on alert conducting exercises as part of Operation Vigilant Guardian that day, raising questions about response times and capabilities. Former top FAA administrator Jane Garvey's testimony failed to provide an accurate accounting of exactly when NORAD was informed of the first hijacking leading an FAA Public Affairs officer to promise to deliver a normal statement before press deadlines.

According to the official FAA timeline, the initiation of an inter-agency phone bridge (including the entire FAA network, Department of Defense, the Secret Service, and "other government agencies") occurred "within minutes after the first aircraft hit the World Trade Center" shortly after 8:46 a.m. EST. These phone bridges allowed NORAD to have real-time information about loss of communication with aircraft, loss of transponder signals, unauthorized changes in course, and other actions being taken by all the

flights of interest, including Flight 77."

However, the official NORAD timeline released shortly after the attacks reveals that the FAA was in contact with NORAD reporting real-time events regarding the hijackings prior to the crash of the first plane. The Northeast Air Defense System (NEADS) put Otis Air National Guard Base on alert at 8:40 a.m. EST and were scrambling planes in response to the hijackings even before the American Airlines flight crashed into the World Trade Center.

Despite the fact that NORAD had their aircraft and command in battle-ready posture, General Arnold testified that when it came time to respond to the attacks of the four hijacked planes his command had to depend entirely upon FAA radar and communications systems to scramble, monitor, and direct any air defense jets at their disposal.

"On its face this juxtaposition of testimony stretches credulity" commented **John Judge** of CitizensWatch.

There was also some confusion in testimony about exactly what protocol was in place in the event of hijackings prior to, and on 9/11. This point emerged in Commissioner Jamie Gorelick's questioning of NORAD General McKinley and retired General Arnold, who maintained that response to hijackings

is technically a matter for "law enforcement". This jurisdictional issue seemed to cloud the issue unnecessarily, because standard operating procedures require that in all air emergencies, including hijackings, the FAA must immediately notify the Pentagon and NORAD to scramble interceptors.

The confusion over NORAD response, or lack of it, on 9/11 was further compounded by the details surrounding a 'shoot-down' order.

4. Between September 2000 and June 2001 the Pentagon launched fighters on 67 occasions to escort wayward aircraft. On 9/11 **none were specifically launched to intercept any flights** until too late—and from too far away. At the Pentagon, two aircraft from Langley AFB way to the south were launched to intercept and preceded north at subsonic speeds. The closer aircraft at Andrews AFB were only launched after the Pentagon was struck. NORAD took 38 minutes after air traffic controllers alerted them Flight 11 had been hijacked, before launching a pair of F-15's from Otis AFB. [Military Exercises and other concealed high level distractions kept everything unstable, as planned]

Source Will Thomas, “Stand Down” Summary: Why no scramble?

Thomas saw a NORAD news release issued 2 days after, which says all interceptors flew at .07 mach (500 mph) Why so slowly? He calls Norad, and asks: why did they fly at only 500 mph. They said, “we’ll get back to you.” “You have 5 days” he tells them or he will release the story in Europe and Canada. The following morning he got an email from Col. Springs asking if he had written a piece critical of NORAD’s response. He said yes—and they refused to cooperate.

He asks: Why were planes launched from Otis (Cape Cod) AFB 175 miles from NY and why at Andrews they stayed on the ground. The pilots “Nasty” and “Duff” said they went to “full blower” to intercept. They were not. Flight times indicate only 500mph. 3 F-16s were in the air prior to the attacks on the WTC.. 2 jets out of Atlantic City (practicing bombing runs). Could have intercepted. Weren’t even told for one hour. Only after they landed were they told and rearmed. 2 F-15 were told to orbit out in the ocean. They had 40 minutes to deal with the Pentagon. Therefore, he concludes, “we let it happen.”

5. One military witness said a C-130 and **fighter jet were in the air over the Pentagon** 5 minutes prior to the attack. Why was it there and why wasn’t it used? Why has the government never admitted its presence?

Source: Jeff (eye witness) to Dick Eastman. "I was on the 30th floor of a building in Crystal City with an unobstructed view of the Pentagon on 9/11. I watched a C130 cargo plane flying very low come right by the building I was in and over the Pentagon followed shortly by a fighter aircraft. It got everyone's attention and brought all of us to the window. Approximately 5 minutes later I watched the airliner come over the highway and hit the side of the Pentagon. I know the difference between a cruise missile and a Plane. (Jeff tells Eastman, "My father is a retired Brigadier General and my brother is a Lt. Colonel in the Air force and an executive officer to a Four Star General on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.")

6. Transportation Secretary **Norm Minetta** testified before the 9/11 commission that **VP Cheney**, in command at the White House situation room, repeatedly uttered words indicating he was confirming orders to staff NOT to interdict the plane approaching the Pentagon.

Mineta: There was a young man who had come in and said to the vice president, "The plane is 50 miles out...The plane is 30 miles out." And when it got down to, "The plane is 10 miles out," the young man said

to the vice president, "Do the orders still stand?" Cheney whipped his neck around and said, "Of course

the orders still stand. Have you heard anything to the contrary?" Well, at the time I didn't know what all that meant. And...The flight that came into the Pentagon.

9/11 Commissioner Hamilton: And so there was no specific order there to shoot that plane down.

Mineta: No, sir.

OFFICIAL VERSION: The **4 airliners** involved were hijacked by the **19 alleged hijackers** listed by the FBI, and they used box cutters smuggled on board through normal security procedures.

Contradictions: I do not support those who claim there were no hijackers on board. There were too many oral witnesses to the radio transmissions from the planes to dispute that. Although some of the alleged cell phone calls were probably faked, many others, including those from flight attendants on Flight 11 seem accurate. What is hotly in dispute is whether the listed hijackers were the real hijackers. In the “too good to be true” evidence section I list the absurdities of the planted evidence used by the FBI.

1. **Seven of the listed 19 hijackers are still alive.** FBI Director Robert Mueller admitted that some of the hijackers “may have stolen identities” of innocent citizens. In September 2002, Mueller told CNN twice that there is “**no legal proof** to prove the identities of the suicidal hijackers.” But, the FBI didn't bother to change the names, backgrounds or photographs of the alleged 19 hijackers. John Kominski asks, “Why haven't American intelligence operatives gone to these foreign countries to interview these named hijackers who turned out to be alive? Simple. Because they knew the list was fiction in the first place, and the Arab-types who have been named as terror gurus are mostly their own employees, or people who have been set up by them.”

Source: WND: “World Net Daily.com: FBI denies mix-up of 9-11 terrorists, Stands by original list even though some ID'd are still alive. Nearly 48 hours after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, the names of the hijackers flashed across TV screens for the world to see. Based on intelligence information gained from interviews, witnesses, flight-manifest logs and passports found at some of the crash debris sites, the FBI claimed it correctly had identified all 18 hijackers. A short time later the number was amended to 19. A few days later the names were followed with photos of the men blamed for the terrorism that claimed nearly 3,000 lives in New York City, Washington and Pennsylvania. Incredibly fast intelligence work

– some of the information coming from the National Ground Intelligence Center in Charlottesville, Va. – enabled investigators to tie the attack to Osama bin Laden's al-Qaida network.

While there is no doubt the hijackings were the work of al-Qaida, questions remain about whether some of the hijackers actually were the men the FBI identified. Last year that doubt crept into the highest levels of law enforcement after a series of sensational news reports aired by the BBC, ABC and CNN, along with several British newspapers, cast suspicion on whether the FBI got it right. The reports suggested at least six of the men the FBI claimed were hijackers on the planes were in fact alive. They didn't survive the crashes, of course, but never boarded the planes.

The six claimed they were victims of identity theft. They were "outraged" to be identified as terrorists, they told the Telegraph of London. In fact, one of the men claimed he never had been to the United States, while another is a Saudi Airlines pilot who said he was in a flight-training course in Tunisia at the time of the attacks.

The stunning news prompted FBI Director Robert Mueller to admit that some of the hijackers may have stolen identities of innocent citizens. In September 2002, Mueller told CNN twice that there is "no legal proof to prove the identities of the suicidal hijackers." After that admission a strange thing happened – nothing. No follow-up stories. No follow-up questions. There was dead silence and the story disappeared. It was almost as if no one wanted to know what had happened. In fact, the FBI didn't bother to change the names, backgrounds or photographs of the alleged 19 hijackers. It didn't even deny the news reports suggesting that the names and identities of at least six of the hijackers may be unknown. Mueller just left the door open.

Until now. Now the FBI is sticking with its original story – regardless of whether photographs displayed of the suspected Sept. 11 terrorists were of people who never boarded those planes and are very much alive. FBI spokesman Bill Carter simply brushes off as false the charges from news reports that the FBI misidentified some of the Sept. 11 terrorists. Carter says they got the names right and it doesn't matter whether the identities were stolen. This comes as a complete about-face from Mueller's comment that there might be some question about the names of the Sept. 11 terrorists because they might have been operating under stolen identities.

The six Saudis in question are:

Abdul Aziz al-Omari was identified as one of the hijackers and the pilot who crashed American Airlines Flight 11 into the North Tower of the World Trade Center. Another man with the same name is an electrical engineer in Saudi Arabia. He lived in Denver after earning a degree from the University of Colorado in 1993. Coincidence? Consider this oddity. ABC News has reported that his Denver apartment was broken into and his passport and other documents stolen in 1995. In September 2001 he told the Telegraph, "I couldn't believe it when the FBI put me on their list. They gave my name and my date of birth, but I am not a suicide bomber. I am here. I am alive. I have no idea how to fly a plane. I had nothing to do with this." More disturbing is that the FBI accidentally may have fused two names to create one identity, because another man, Abdul Rahman al-Omari, who has a different birth date, is the person pictured by the FBI, but he still is a pilot for Saudi Arabian Airlines. After his photograph was released, he walked into the U.S. Embassy in Jedda and demanded to know why he was being reported as a dead hijacker.

Salem al-Hamzi was identified as one of the suspected hijackers on American Flight 77, the plane that was crashed into the Pentagon. Another man who has the same name works for the Saudi Royal Commission in Yanbu.

Saeed al-Ghamdi reportedly was one of the alleged hijackers on United Airlines Flight 93, the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania. He and another hijacker were said to have been in control of the plane when it was destroyed. A Saudi Arabian pilot has the same name.

Ahmed al-Nami was identified as a hijacker on United Flight 93. He also may have been in control of the plane when it crashed. A Saudi Arabian pilot with the same name is alive in Riyadh.

Wail al-Shehri was identified as one of the suspected hijackers on American Flight 11. He reportedly was in control of the plane when it crashed. Another Saudi man who is a pilot has the same name, and his father is a Saudi diplomat in Bombay. His picture was displayed by the FBI as the "terrorist" al-Shehri who crashed the plane. The al-Shehri who is alive had resided in Daytona Beach, Fla., where he enrolled in flight training at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University. He currently works for a Moroccan airline. Last year the Associated Press reported that al-Shehri had spoken to the U.S. Embassy in Morocco. His photograph having been released and repeatedly shown around the world is evidence the man in the FBI photograph still is alive, the Saudi Embassy explains.

Waleed M. al-Shehri, a name used by another suspected hijacker on American Flight 11, reportedly is the brother of Wail al-Shehri. The odd coincidence is that the other son of the diplomat father is named Waleed M. This prompted the BBC to report in 2001 that "another of the men named by the FBI as a hijacker in the suicide attacks on Washington and New York has turned up alive and well."

2. This may be one of the reasons why the FBI won't release surveillance video tapes of the hijackers boarding, which would show their faces. It may also explain why the government only released written transcripts of portions of the FAA radio transmissions from the planes, and not the actual recordings—people who knew the real people might testify that the **voices don't match**.
3. It goes against all investigative techniques to assume that the name under which a criminal registers himself on check-in is his **real identity**. The rush to do so by the FBI is indicative they had a set list of people they were going to expose, and inserted it into the story—to shield the real identities, which would trace back to certain collaborating nations.
4. The **flight training stories** about learning to fly Cessna light aircraft (which they all failed to do) as preparation for flying these sophisticated airlines is ludicrous. These stooges were put up to this as a cover story. They could barely speak English. Why didn't they go to the Arab speaking flight school at Fort Worth to train? The real hijackers would have had real training time at the controls of real airliners, in Saudi Arabia or some other compliant host.

Source Wash. Post: Let's look at what we know about the alleged suicide pilot of American Airlines Flight 77, Hani Hanjour. According to press reports, Hanjour had used Bowie's Maryland Freeway Airport three times since

mid-August as he attempted to get permission to use one of the airport's planes. This from The Prince George's [Maryland] Journal September 18, 2001: "Marcel Bernard, the chief flight instructor at the airport, said the man named Hani Hanjour went into the air in a Cessna 172 with instructors from the airport three times beginning the second week of August and had hoped to rent a plane from the airport.

"According to published reports, law enforcement sources say Hanjour, in his mid-twenties, is suspected of crashing the American Airlines Flight 77 into the Pentagon. . . .

"Hanjour had his pilot's license, said Bernard, but needed what is called a 'check-out' done by the airport to gauge a pilot's skills before he or she is able to rent a plane at Freeway Airport which runs parallel to Route 50.

"Instructors at the school told Bernard that after three times in the air, they still felt he was unable to fly solo and that Hanjour seemed disappointed.

"Published reports said Hanjour obtained his pilot's license in April of 1999, but it expired six months later because he did not complete a required medical exam. He also was trained for a few months at a private school in Scottsdale, Ariz., in 1996, but did not finish the course because instructors felt he was not capable.

"Hanjour had 600 hours listed in his log book, Bernard said, and instructors were surprised he was not able to fly better with the amount of experience.

"Mohammed Atta, alleged hijacker of Flight 11, and Marwanal-AI-Shehhi, alleged hijacker of Flight 175, both of which crashed into the World Trade Center, attended hundreds of hours of lessons at Huffman Aviation, a flight school in Venice, Florida. They also took lessons at Jones Aviation Flying Service Inc., which operates from the Sarasota Bradenton International Airport. According to the Post, neither experience "worked out."

"A flight instructor at Jones who asked not be identified said Atta and Al Shehhi arrived in September or October" and asked to be given flight training. Atta, the instructor said, was particularly difficult. 'He would not look at your face,' the instructor said. 'When you talked to him, he could not look you in the eye. His attention span was very short.'

The instructor said neither man was able to pass a Stage I rating test to track and intercept. After offering some harsh words, the instructor said, the two moved on "We didn't kick them out, but they didn't live up to our standards." (page A 15.)

Or try the Washington Post: Alleged hijackers Nawaq Alhazmi (Flight 77), Khaid Al-Midhar (Flight 77) and Hani Hanjour (Flight 77) all spent time in San Diego. "Two of the men, Alhazmi and Al-Midhar, also briefly attended a local fight school, but they were dropped because of their limited English and incompetence at the controls

"Last spring, two of the men visited Montgomery Field, a community airport . . . and sought flying lessons. They spoke to instructors at Sorbi's Flying Club, which allowed them to take only two lessons before advising them to quit.

"Their English was horrible, and their mechanical skills were even worse,' said an instructor, who asked not to be named. 'It was like they had hardly even ever driven a car'

"They seemed like nice guys,' the instructor said, 'but in the plane, they were dumb and dumber.'" ("San Diegans See Area as Likely Target," Washington Post, September 24, 2001, pg. A7.)

5. The real hijackers had **guns, knives, bombs, mace and gas masks**, as well as a box cutter or two (which also was illegal). These facts were suppressed because the Airlines would have been open to law suits about how those things got past security. How did they get past security?

Mrs. Sweeney's call, about the bomb. "My wife's call was the first specific information the airline and the government got that day," said Mike Sweeney, the widowed husband of Amy Sweeney, who went face to face with the hijackers on Flight 11. She gave seat locations and physical descriptions of the hijackers, which allowed officials to identify them as Middle Eastern men—by name—even before the first crash. She gave officials key clues to the fact that this was not a traditional hijacking. And she gave the first and only eyewitness account of a bomb on board. "How do you know it's a bomb?" asked her phone contact.

"Because the hijackers showed me a bomb," Sweeney said, describing its yellow and red wires.

Gail sheehy of the UK Observer: "The Moms want to know if investigators have looked into how the pilots were actually disabled. To think that eight pilots—four of whom were formerly in the military, some with combat experience in Vietnam, and all of whom were in superb physical shape—could have been subdued without a fight or so much as a sound stretches the imagination [pilots disabled by mace]

"The independent commission is in a position to demand such answers, and many more. Have any weapons been recovered from any of the four

downed planes? If not, why should the panel assume they were "less-than-four-inch knives," the description repeatedly used in the commission's hearing on aviation security? Remember the airlines' first reports, that the whole job was pulled off with box cutters? In fact, investigators for the commission found that box cutters were reported on only one plane. In any case, box cutters were considered straight razors and were always illegal. Thus the airlines switched their story and produced a snap-open knife of less than four inches at the hearing. This weapon falls conveniently within the aviation-security guidelines pre-9/11.

But bombs? Mace or pepper spray? Gas masks? The F.B.I. dropped the clue that the hijackers had "masks" in a meeting with the Four Moms from New Jersey, the 9/11 widows who rallied for this independent commission.

OFFICIAL VERSION: Too good to be true evidence. These claims by government were also suspect.

Contradictions:

1. If this large, complex and sophisticated operation was so sophisticated as to evade total scrutiny by the CIA, FBI, INS and NSA, why would the perpetrators be stupid enough to **leave a car** at Logan airport with telltale flight manuals inside? Why not take a taxi? This operation apparently took place over a 5 year period. Considering the expense of training pilots they could certainly have afforded a taxi ride to the airport. The boys who did the Madrid attacks used this same trick to finger al Qaeda as the culprit—a van with blasting caps and Koran tapes!
2. Tickets were **purchased with a credit card**, pointing a direct finger at an accomplice. Someone was trying to create a false

trail. A plan of attack this sophisticated certainly would have used cash.

3. That Mohammad Atta left his bag at the airport with airport employees and that they failed to put it on the plane. That the bag contained a video on how to fly planes, a uniform and his last will and testament. That Mohammad Atta did leave his drivers license in a rental car. No trained terrorist with the qualifications to pull off the complexity of the WTC attacks would make these mistakes.
4. How did the FBI know to raid the Boston Westin Hotel where the hijackers were staying, the day after the attack and how did they find out the specific pizza order, and their napping habits? It's impossible to believe that the hijacker's accomplices were still waiting in that Hotel. If the FBI was so incompetent prior to 9/11 how did you do all this magic so quickly? *Answer:* they were already in the government's data base.

Robert Bonner, the head of Customs and Border Protection, finally shot back at the panel with a startling boast. "We ran passenger manifests through the system used by Customs—two were hits on our watch list of August 2001," Mr. Bonner testified. "And by looking at the Arab names and their seat locations, ticket purchases and other passenger information, it didn't take a lot to do a rudimentary link analysis. Customs officers were able to ID 19 probable hijackers within 45 minutes."

5. **Magic passports** (2, actually) "In New York, several blocks from the ruins of the World Trade Center, a passport authorities said belonged to one of the hijackers was discovered a few days ago, according to city Police Commissioner Bernard Kerik.[The crooked cop linked to Mayor Giuliani, who Bush stupidly nominated as chief of Homeland Security]."

CNN: "In New York, several blocks from the ruins of the World Trade Center, a passport authorities said belonged to one of the hijackers was discovered a few days ago, according to city Police Commissioner Bernard Kerik. That has prompted the FBI and police to widen the search area beyond the immediate crash site." ...Leaders urge 'normal' Monday

after week of terror . . . " September 16, 2001. Commentary: We are asked to believe that one of the hijackers brought his passport with him on a domestic flight, even though he knew he would not need it then, or ever again; that upon impact the passport flew from the hijacker's pocket (or was he holding it in his hands?), that the passport flew out of the aircraft, that it flew out of the burning tower, and that it was carried by the air currents and landed safely, where it could be discovered, several blocks away...Mohammed Atta's passport (stolen) and found two or three blocks away

OFFICIAL VERSION: WTC TOWERS COLLAPSE The government claims both towers collapsed solely due to fire damage resulting from aircraft collisions.

Contradictions:

1. The North Tower had an explosion in the basement at or slightly before the first strike, which blew out all lobby windows and killed and burned people in the lobby or elevators. There was NO SMOKE nor black smoke residue in the lobby [I've seen the fire fighter videos upon arrival—the air was perfectly clear], so it could not have been caused by fuel coming down the elevator shafts as officials claim. The janitor and 14 other witnesses confirm no huge clouds of black smoke.
2. The south tower collapsed first even though the damage was limited to one corner. Its main central supporting pillars, capable of holding the entire weight, were relatively undamaged, the fire was shorter and less intense than in the North Tower.
3. The 23 degree initial tilt of the south tower's collapse would have normally kept tilting due to the vertical resisting moment of the powerful central pillars. It stopped tilting and descended vertically, indicating the central pillars were suddenly collapsed into zero resistance [not possible by crushing forces—steel pillars continue to bend and resist].
4. Video clips from a helicopter clearly show the radio/television towers on top of the North Tower starting to descend just before

the outside perimeter. This strongly suggests the central core columns were blown or melted by thermite charges. The outer perimeter structure is not designed to hold the weight of the tower—hence the resulting progressive collapse.

5. There were large pools of molten metal discovered at the basement level where the central columns rested. These could only have been created by thermite charges. Burning debris or fuel do not reach these kinds of temperatures even in optimum conditions, let alone in an oxygen starved pile of rubble 70 feet underground.
6. The rate of descent of both towers almost exactly matched the rate of free fall—violating the laws of physics. The resistance of each floor structure, not to mention the powerful central core columns would have slowed the descent by at least twice the time—unless demolition charges removed those central columns. BYU physics professor Steven Jones makes this case, complete with video references at www.physics.byu.edu/research/energy/htm7.html.

Source: Stuart Johnson, Deseret Morning News

"It is quite plausible that explosives were pre-planted in all three (WTC) buildings," BYU physics professor Steven E. Jones says. Jones, who conducts research in fusion and solar energy at BYU, is calling for an independent, international scientific investigation "guided not by politicized notions and constraints but rather by observations and calculations.

"It is quite plausible that explosives were pre-planted in all three buildings and set off after the two plane crashes — which were actually a diversion tactic," he writes. "Muslims are (probably) not to blame for bringing down the WTC buildings after all," Jones writes.

As for speculation about who might have planted the explosives, Jones said, "I don't usually go there. There's no point in doing that until we do the scientific investigation." Previous investigations, including those of FEMA, the 9/11 Commission and NIST (the National Institutes of Standards and Technology), ignore the physics and chemistry of what

happened on Sept. 11, 2001, to the Twin Towers and the 47-story building known as WTC 7, he says. The official explanation — that fires caused structural damage that caused the buildings to collapse — can't be backed up by either testing or history, he says.

Jones acknowledges that there have been "junk science" conspiracy theories about what happened on 9/11, but "the explosive demolition hypothesis better satisfies tests of repeatability and parsimony and therefore is not 'junk science.' "

In a 9,000-word article that Jones says will be published in the book "The Hidden History of 9/11," by Elsevier, Jones offers these arguments:

- The three buildings collapsed nearly symmetrically, falling down into their footprints, a phenomenon associated with "controlled demolition" — and even then it's very difficult, he says. "Why would terrorists undertake straight-down collapses of WTC-7 and the Towers when 'toppling over' falls would require much less work and would do much more damage in downtown Manhattan?" Jones asks. "And where would they obtain the necessary skills and access to the buildings for a symmetrical implosion anyway? The 'symmetry data' emphasized here, along with other data, provide strong evidence for an 'inside' job."

- No steel-frame building, before or after the WTC buildings, has ever collapsed due to fire. But explosives can effectively sever steel columns, he says.

- WTC 7, which was not hit by hijacked planes, collapsed in 6.6 seconds, just .6 of a second longer than it would take an object dropped from the roof to hit the ground. "Where is the delay that must be expected due to conservation of momentum, one of the foundational laws of physics?" he asks. "That is, as upper-falling floors strike lower floors — and intact steel

support columns — the fall must be significantly impeded by the impacted mass. . . . How do the upper floors fall so quickly, then, and still conserve momentum in the collapsing buildings?" The paradox, he says, "is easily resolved by the explosive demolition hypothesis, whereby explosives quickly removed lower-floor material, including steel support columns, and allow near free-fall-speed collapses." These observations were not analyzed by FEMA, NIST nor the 9/11 Commission, he says.

- With non-explosive-caused collapse there would typically be a piling up of shattering concrete. But most of the material in the towers was converted to flour-like powder while the buildings were falling, he says. "How can we understand this strange behavior, without explosives? Remarkable, amazing — and demanding scrutiny since the U.S. government-funded reports failed to analyze this phenomenon."

- Horizontal puffs of smoke, known as squibs, were observed proceeding up the side the building, a phenomenon common when pre-positioned explosives are used to demolish buildings, he says.

- Steel supports were "partly evaporated," but it would require temperatures near 5,000 degrees Fahrenheit to evaporate steel — and neither office materials nor diesel fuel can generate temperatures that hot. Fires caused by jet fuel from the hijacked planes lasted at most a few minutes, and office material fires would burn out within about 20 minutes in any given location, he says.

- Molten metal found in the debris of the World Trade Center may have been the result of a high-temperature reaction of a commonly used explosive such as thermite, he says. Buildings not felled by explosives

"have insufficient directed energy to result in melting of large quantities of metal," Jones says.

- Multiple loud explosions in rapid sequence were reported by numerous observers in and near the towers, and these explosions occurred far below the region where the planes struck, he says.

Jones says he became interested in the physics of the WTC collapse after attending a talk last spring given by a woman who had had a near-death experience. The woman mentioned in passing that "if you think the World Trade Center buildings came down just due to fire, you have a lot of surprises ahead of you," Jones remembers, at which point "everyone around me started applauding."

Following several months of study, he presented his findings at a talk at BYU in September.

Jones says he would like the government to release 6,899 photographs and 6,977 segments of video footage for "independent scrutiny." He would also like to analyze a small sample of the molten metal found at Ground Zero."

7. Seismic data shows there was a large explosive type force before each tower's collapse. Note also that the first impact (North Tower) appears much stronger than the impact on the south tower. This may be due to the near simultaneous explosion in the basement as described by the janitor of the North Tower.
<http://www.indigostaralliance.com/articles/sonic-pulses-afp.html>

[www.ldeo.columbia.edu/LCSN/
Eq/20010911_WTC/WTC_LDEO_KIM.pdf](http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/LCSN/Eq/20010911_WTC/WTC_LDEO_KIM.pdf) (original)

8. An eyewitness 6 blocks from the WTC heard explosions prior to each collapse.
9. The NY Times tape transcription of fire fighters reveals an explosion prior to the collapse of WTC 2 (South Tower) Multiple loud explosions in rapid sequence were reported by numerous observers in and near the towers. Some said these explosions were happening far below where the strike damage happened.
10. A video shows an object falling from WTC 1 followed by a camera shake from a seismic type movement. 14 seconds later WTC 1 collapses. <http://www.indigostaralliance.com/articles/sonic-pulses-afp.html>

Recommended book source on collapse: Painful Questions, by Eric Huffschmid

Gregory Stephen, Assistant Commissioner (F.D.N.Y.) p 14 (NY Times Transcript Firefighter's Testimonies)

A. No. I know I was with an officer from Ladder 146, a Lieutenant Evangelista, who ultimately called me up a couple of days later just to find out how I was. We both for whatever reason -- again, I don't know how valid this is with everything that was going on at that particular point in time, but for some reason I thought that when I looked in the direction of the Trade Center before it came down, before No. 2 came down, that I saw low-level flashes. In my conversation with Lieutenant Evangelista, never mentioning this to him, he questioned me and asked me if I saw low-level flashes in front of the building, and I agreed with him because I thought -- at that time I didn't know what it was. I mean, it could have been as a result of the building collapsing, things exploding, but I saw a flash flash flash and then it looked like the building came down.

Q. Was that on the lower level of the building or up where the fire was?

A. No, the lower level of the building. You know like when they demolish a building, how when they blow up a building, when it falls down? That's what I thought I saw. And I didn't broach the topic to him, but he asked me. He said I don't know if I'm crazy..

I have tried to put together an analysis of the collapses at the WTC that accounts for all the evidence without making unreasonable assumptions. As for the complex logistics of placing and triggering all the explosives, remember that modern electronics makes remote detonation, including varying time delays for different charges, a simple matter. No messy wires, just lots of shaped charges with radio-controlled detonators. And they could be placed over a long period of time in the course of routine maintenance. --Jeffrey King [But that wasn't the way it happened. They were placed only on the main central pillars, in utility areas, so that no entrance was required into rented spaces]

WAB COMMENTARY::

Investigative journalist Christopher Bollyn has written one of the best expositions on the ample evidence that there were explosives wired into the building prior to the attack. He writes, "In the basements of the collapsed towers, where the 47 central support columns connected with the bedrock, hot spots of 'literally molten steel' were discovered more than a month after the collapse. Such persistent and intense residual heat, 70 feet below the surface, in an oxygen starved environment, could explain how these crucial structural supports failed. Peter Tully, president of Tully Construction of Flushing, N.Y., told AFP that he saw pools of 'literally molten steel' at the World Trade Center.

"Tully was contracted after the Sept. 11 tragedy to remove the debris from the site. Tully called Mark Loizeaux, president of Controlled Demolition, Inc. (CDI) of Phoenix, Md., for consultation about removing

the debris. CDI calls itself 'the innovator and global leader in the controlled demolition and implosion of structures.' Loizeaux, who cleaned up the bombed Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, arrived at the WTC site two days later and wrote the clean up plan for the entire operation. AFP asked Loizeaux about the report of molten steel on the site. 'Yes,' he said, 'hot spots of molten steel in the basements.' These incredibly hot areas were found 'at the bottoms of the elevator shafts of the main towers, down seven [basement] levels,' Loizeaux said. The molten steel was found 'three, four, and five weeks later, when the rubble was being removed,' Loizeaux said. He said molten steel was also found at 7 WTC, which collapsed mysteriously in the late afternoon.

“Construction steel has an extremely high melting point of about 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit. Asked what could have caused such extreme heat, Tully said, 'Think of the jet fuel.' Loizeaux told AFP that the steel-melting fires were fueled by 'paper, carpet and other combustibles packed down the elevator shafts by the tower floors as they pancaked into the basement.' However, some independent investigators dispute this claim, saying kerosene-based jet fuel, paper, or the other combustibles normally found in the towers, cannot generate the heat required to melt steel, especially in an oxygen-poor environment like a deep basement covered by debris.

“Eric Hufschmid, author of a book about the WTC collapse, Painful Questions, told AFP that due to the lack of oxygen, paper and other combustibles packed down at the bottom of elevator shafts would probably be 'a smoky smoldering pile.' Experts disagree that jet-fuel or paper could generate such heat. This is impossible, they say, because the maximum temperature that can be reached by hydrocarbons like jet fuel burning in air is 1,520 degrees F. Because the WTC fires were fuel rich, as evidenced by the thick black smoke, it is argued that they did not reach this upper limit. The hottest spots at the surface of the rubble, where abundant oxygen was available, were much cooler than the molten steel found in the basements.” [End of Bollyn quote.]

Canadian Investigator Will Thomas has written an excellent work entitled, All Fall Down. In it he documents, "An eyewitness 6 blocks from the WTC heard explosions prior to each collapse. A fireman's transcription of the New York Times 9/11 firefighters' audio tape reveals an explosion prior to the collapse of WTC 2 was reported. A video shows an object falling from WTC 1 followed by a camera shake. 14 seconds later WTC 1 collapses."

Others: "The following clips originate from CBS Channel 2 in New York. The reporter is in a helicopter as the WTC Towers collapse.

In the first clip, the CBS reporter refers to a secondary explosion in the South Tower before its collapse. The reporter's exact words were "some kind of secondary follow-up explosion."

Thomas, Bollyn and others believe that the only explanation that explains the collapse of the Twin Towers without the use of complicated timed explosives placed throughout the building (requiring extensive pre-wiring) is the use of thermite charges in the basement, filling the cavity of the core section of 4 inch thick pillars holding up the towers. Here's Bollyn again: "Thermite is very exothermic. Temperatures above 4,500°F (2,500°C) are often reached. A byproduct of a thermite detonation in the WTC basements would be molten steel. The service core [of central pillars] of WTC 2 initially survived the collapse, but after a few seconds it also came to ground. This is consistent with molten iron from a thermite reaction pooling around the core columns, thus causing the collapse. 'If I were to bring the towers down, I would put explosives in the basement to get the weight of the building to help collapse the structure,' [says] Mark Loizeaux, president of Controlled Demolition, Inc.

However, contrary to Bollyn, I disagree that the seismic evidence shows powerful explosives prior to the collapse. I have looked at the charts and fail to see what he claims. Yes, there were plenty of eye and ear witnesses to prior explosions, but they most likely were not large enough to register on the seismic charts as a significant quake. This also points to the use of thermite. Thermite doesn't explode rapidly like C-4 or other demolition explosives. The mixture of aluminum powder and iron oxide burns only moderately fast, giving off heat well in excess of that required to melt steel. What's more, it creates its own oxygen supply by consuming the iron oxide and thus is the only thing that can account for the huge heat being generated for days in the aftermath of the fall of both towers.

Terrorists of the incompetent Arab variety that showed up at US flight schools could not have pulled off high tech insider explosives job, nor the collapse of WTC Building 7, which video evidence does show had been pre-wired with normal demolition explosives — lots of small charges on critical steel columns and corners which were timed to collapse the building vertically. Building 7 was almost exclusively occupied by government, and could have been pre-wired by government agents without alerting any civilians.

Christopher Bollyn commented on the insider connections to the WTC complex: "For example, Peter G. Peterson, chairman of the CFR and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York announced that his Blackstone Group had purchased, in October 2000, the mortgage on 7 World Trade Center, the 47-story building built by Larry Silverstein in 1987. Silverstein is the person who obtained 99-year leases on the twin towers shortly before 9-11 and who insured the property and its future income against terrorism. He is seeking some \$7.2 billion claiming the attacks were two separate events." Silverstein also made the indiscreet comment to reporters that he had given orders to "pull the building" just prior to its collapse. This is demolition lingo for bringing down a building by controlled demolition.

According to Bollyn, others suspected controlled demolition too: “WTC 7 mysteriously collapsed at 5:25 p.m. on 9-11, in what appears to have been a controlled demolition. John Wholihan, a firefighter with Rescue 5 from Staten Island was near WTC 7 when it collapsed. Wholihan told American Free Press that he heard ‘many explosions’ just before the building collapsed neatly within the perimeter of its foundation. Silverstein received some \$441 million in insurance money for WTC 7 although the cause of the collapse remains officially unexplained.”

What is clear, in my analysis, is that the official explanation of it coming down vertically and instantly cannot meet the test of reality. If it suffered damage from the collapse of the nearby WTC tower, it would have only been damaged on one side. A collapse from damage to one side would only have occurred with a massive falling over movement. There was no central system of support to fail in this building that could explain a vertical implosion collapse even with fire (which was small and only happening in two areas of the building).

John Kaminsky—9/11 critic’s commentary:

But the Thorn/Giuliani book raises even more interesting points, and even more impossible contradictions.

For instance, just prior to the first collapse, the top of the South Tower tipped to 23 degrees, but then it suddenly stopped its angular momentum, changed direction, and fell straight down, just about the time many people reported explosions at the bottom of the tower. The only way the momentum of the falling top could have been changed in mid-collapse was to blast away a portion of EACH of the 47 core columns, causing the building to fall uniformly into its own footprint.

How the Towers fell is impossible according to the official story because the gravitational potential energy of a skyscraper is nowhere near sufficient to destroy its own frame.

"Given that the lower columns were radically thicker steel, and obviously stronger, some of the columns should have still been standing - in some significant number."

- Witness 8 (Omholt)

"For the WTC buildings to react the way they did, literally thousands of super heavy-duty joints and welds would have to 'snap' at precisely the same instant."

- Witness 8 (George Humphrey)

"In order for the floor to fall, hundreds of joints have to break almost simultaneously on 236 exterior columns and 47 core columns. FEMA does not bother to explain how this could occur."

- Witness 10 (Hufschmid)

If all the joints weren't heated at the same rate, the building would not fall uniformly.

Thorn's patient narrative unveils all manner of revealing information to use in further discussions. One is the maximum temperature unprotected steel supports in these fires if 680 degrees; the first critical threshold in structural steel is 1,022 degrees.

These tests ultimately tell us that ...

"Fire did not weaken the WTC structure sufficiently to cause the collapse of the towers."

- Witness 11 (J. McMichael)

I won't give away too much more of the narrative, but just let me say THIS BOOK is a wonderful syllabus for anyone trying to comprehend the complex ramifications of the 9/11 tower collapses, perhaps the most accessible roundup to date of the single piece of evidence that should leave the American people demanding trials for treason and mass murder for hundreds of its most powerful leaders.

Why were those odd and powerful seismographic spikes recorded moments BEFORE the towers fell? Why were pools of molten steel still bubbling at the bases of the three fallen towers ONE WEEK after 9/11? Is there any doubt that all three buildings were brought down by controlled demolitions? No.

Contradictions WTC-7: An even stronger case is made for controlled demolition of WTC building 7. It was built of conventional steel framed members.

1. No such structure has ever collapsed due to fires, including those that were much larger and lasted longer than the small fires at WTC-7.
2. WTC owner Larry Silverstein admitted in public that he and the fire department commander decided to “pull” Building 7 [meaning demolition of]—a building with only minor damage from the collapse of the twin towers. To do so meant that the building had to have been pre-wired with explosives. If WTC-7 was a controlled demolition, and all video evidence clearly shows that this is the case, this leads credence to the overall suspicion that this was an inside demolition job. All WTC collapses show the telltale sign of explosive puffs (squibs) of smoke. In WTC 1 and 2 they are just under the collapsing rubble, timed to allow for the free fall of material. These are always explained as dust from collapsing floors, but in WTC-7 the squibs are high on the building even though the building is collapsing from the bottom up. Explosive squibs visible:
http://www.plaguepuppy.net/public_html/Flashes/squibs_along_southwest_corner.htm

OFFICIAL VERSION: PENTAGON CRASH The government claims that only AA flight 77 crashed into the building despite a suspiciously small entrance hole that penetrated way too far (3 rings of the recently renovated and highly reinforced Pentagon walls) and left hardly any visible debris outside the building, and very little debris inside. Multiple witness statements saw the Boeing 757 aircraft and some saw it actually crash into the building. Rescuers also found some burned victims still strapped into their seats. Landing gear and engine parts inside the Pentagon do match the Boeing aircraft, and serial numbers have been confirmed. The government also claims to have made DNA identification of almost all passengers and hijackers.

According to the FBI, the five hijackers aboard Flight 77 were led by Hani Hanjour, a Saudi who had a commercial pilot license. Two of the other four were the only hijackers to have been on the bureau's terrorist-alert list: Khalid Almihdhar, and Nawaf Alhazmi, both Saudis. The other

two hijackers were identified as Majed Moqed and Salem Alhazmi, both Saudis.

Employees at Advance Travel Service in Totowa, N.J., told The Star-Ledger of Newark that Hanjour and Moqed bought single, first-class tickets for Flight 77 on Aug. 31. Hanjour spoke little English, the employees said, so Moqed did most of talking.

The two tried to pay with a credit card, but it did not get an authorization. They then tried to pay with a check, but were refused. A short time later, they returned with \$1,842.25 in cash. At the men's request, Hanjour was given a seat in the front row of first class.

Contradictions: I feel the evidence is sufficient that AA flight 77 did crash into the Pentagon, but this fact does not explain all the other anomalies:

1. Other credible witnesses saw **a smaller aircraft**, and a C 130 cargo aircraft following and some military people (who would know) heard a distinct sound of a **missile in flight**.
2. Military witnesses smelled the distinct smell of **cordite explosives**.
3. The Pentagon **parking lot video** (cut and edited by someone before it was leaked) shows no large airliner, but does show the smaller plane and a missile smoke trail. It also shows the highly distinctive white flash signature of high explosives, followed by the billowing black and red of burning jet fuel.
4. Officials have never explained how they did DNA matches/**identifications of the hijackers**, where they had no possibility of finding original hair or skin samples, or dental records.
5. No part of the Boeing is capable of penetrating all three rings of the Pentagon (6 reinforced walls) with sufficient force to punch out a 12 foot hole in the C ring. Something else did that damage.

HERE'S WHAT I BELIEVED HAPPENED: First a key witness statements: Vin Narayanan said: "The hijacked jet slammed into the Pentagon at a ferocious speed. But the Pentagon's wall held up like a champ. It barely budged as the nose of the plane curled upwards and crumpled before exploding into a massive fireball." Other evidence that the **plane didn't penetrate** is from Master Sgt. Noel Sepulveda: "The right engine hit high, the left engine hit low, ... "For a brief moment, you could see the body of the plane sticking out from the side of the building. Then a ball of fire came from behind it." Sepulveda also described a huge explosion that sent him flying against a light pole [Jet fuel fireballs are too slow to do this].

The key item in this witness testimonies is that the airplane hit but **did not penetrate fully upon impact**. For the one witness to register in his mind that "the wall held up" indicated that there was sufficient time for that action to settle BEFORE the actual or full explosion. That's a very specific observation that can't be erroneous. Then there was a massive explosion with a white signature—meaning it was done with high explosives—sufficiently placed throughout the plane so that it disintegrated into thousands of tiny pieces, littering the parking lots and lawns with small bits. A fuel explosion simply doesn't do this, nor does a terrorist bomb in a suitcase (which would leave large chunks of the aircraft intact—including major wing elements).

I believe this plane was loaded along its entire length and in the wings with high explosives—which produced the disintegration and the white flame signature, unlike fuel which is only red and black. That's also why there was a smell of cordite. That's why the upper walls around the penetration collapsed later—the whole wall structure was shattered by the explosive force. This explosion might also explain why only some parts (one engine and some landing gear parts are inside the wreckage. The explosion blew them forward into the building, while others were blow sideways and scattered. The government is covering up something. It claims, ridiculously, that the airplane got swallowed up inside the building and the aluminum was all burned up—just plain impossible given the size of the massive wing beams and the relative low temperatures of burning fuel and debris.

The other smaller airplane, following the airliner and shooting a missile into the wreckage is more problematic, especially as to why. Maybe they wanted to test penetration of a missile into this new reinforced structure. But the parking lot video does show a missile presence. The portion of the larger airliner was edited out—perhaps because the leaker (a government employee risking his job) wanted the public to specifically take note of the smaller jet, which most missed in the drama of the first crash and explosion. But the missile certainly would explain the deeper penetration into the 3 rings of the building. There is nothing, however, in the Pentagon wreckage that looks like smaller jet parts, all of which would have gone into the Pentagon, had this jet crashed also--so this smaller jet would have had to have pulled up and exited through the smoke. Hard to get an American crack pilot flying this kind of maneuver who wants to be a suicide bomber.

Now, if only the government would quit hiding the other videos they possess of this crash, then we could have the whole story—but after this much cover-up that is unlikely.

BARBARA OLSON CALL:

Official story: Among those on board **Flight 77** was a familiar face to CNN viewers: Barbara Olson, a conservative commentator and the wife of Theodore Olson, the lawyer who argued George W. Bush's election case before the Supreme Court and now serves as the administration's solicitor general before the high court. He was sitting in his office at the Justice Department, watching the trade center drama on television, when his secretary came in and said, "Your wife is on the phone."

Olson said his wife told him "they had box cutters and knives. They rounded up the passengers at the back of the plane." In one version of the conversation, she told him both pilots were there. Olson told his wife about the Trade Center crashes. "What should I tell the pilot?" she asked.

The Olsons were cut off, but Barbara Olson called back [collect]. In between, her husband called the Justice Department's command center to alert them of the hijacking. When Olson called her husband back, she said the plane was circling and moving in a northeasterly direction.

The Washington Post of September 12, 2001, says this: "Details about who was on Flight 77, when it took off and what happened on board were tightly held by airline, airport and security officials last night. All said that the FBI had asked them not to divulge details."

Commentary: I think the alleged story about Barbara Olson calling her husband collect on a plane phone is bogus. You cannot call collect—it takes a credit card to even start the process.

BACKUP MATERIAL ON PENTAGON CRASH:

But then I saw the landing gear. It was on the ground in the alley between the B and C rings. When I saw it there, not only did I realize an airplane had struck the Pentagon but it was clear that the plane had come through the E, D, and C buildings to get there." (Paul K. Carlton, Jr., U.S. Air Force surgeon general, quoted by Dean Murphy, "September 11: An Oral History," p. 216

Photos of landing gear and other aircraft parts:

<http://www.rense.com/general32/phot.htm> compare to original parts:

<http://members.tripod.com/~aravm98/reference/757LGindex.htm>

PENTAGON WITNESSES

I was on the 30th floor of a building in Crystal City with an unobstructed view of the Pentagon on 9/11. I watched a C130 cargo plane flying very low come right by the building I was in and over the Pentagon followed shortly by a fighter aircraft. It got everyone's attention and brought all of us to the window. Approximately 5 minutes later I watched the airliner come over the highway and hit the side of the Pentagon. I know the difference between a cruise missile and a Plane.—jEFF to Dick Eastman (Jeff says, "My father is a retired Brigadier General and my brother is a Lt. Colonel in the Airforce and an executive officer to a Four Star General on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.")

see also <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/metro/daily/sep01/attack.html> which contains this eyewitness statement:

" Steve Patterson, 43, said he was watching television reports of the World Trade Center being hit when he saw a silver commuter jet fly past the window of his 14th-floor apartment in Pentagon City. The plane was about 150 yards away, approaching from the west about 20 feet off the ground, Patterson said.

He said the plane, which sounded like the high-pitched squeal of a fighter jet, flew over Arlington cemetery so low that he thought it was going to land on I-395. He said it was flying so fast that he couldn't read any writing on the side.

The plane, which appeared to hold about eight to 12 people, headed straight for the Pentagon but was flying as if coming in for a landing on a nonexistent runway, Patterson said.

"At first I thought 'Oh my God, there's a plane truly misrouted from National,'" Patterson said. "Then this thing just became part of the Pentagon, I was watching the World Trade Center go and then this. It was like Oh my God, what's next?"

He said the plane, which approached the Pentagon below treetop level, seemed to be flying normally for a plane coming in for a landing other than going very fast for being so low. Then, he said, he saw the Pentagon "envelope" the plane and bright orange flames shoot out the back of the building.

"It looked like a normal landing, as if someone knew exactly what they were doing," said Patterson, a graphics artist who works at home. "This looked intentional."

From: **Dick Eastman** (A researcher who backs the multiple plane theory. He does not think the larger aircraft actually hit the Pentagon, which I disagree with. But he has presented the best evidence of the small plane and missile shot) Here are some of his arguments and comments on witness statements.

“Kris Milligan, moderator of the cia-drugs yahoogroup, rejects the small-plane finding, refusing to look at the physical evidence, but instead relying

exclusively on "the witnesses" -- but has he really paid attention to what the witnesses are saying?

The fact of the matter is that the witnesses do not support the official story -- they support the small-plane conclusion -- they agree with the photo and video evidence!

The following is the most important piece on the witnesses you will read -- it is a lesson in forensic, witness psychology and logic. See especially Jim Hoffman's analysis also included. -- Dick Eastman

=====

Kelly Knowles from an Arlington apartment two miles away saw two planes moving toward the Pentagon, one veering away as the other crashed.

Tom Seibert, in the Pentagon, listened to " what sounded like a missile" followed by a "loud boom."

Lon Rains Editor, Space News, was driving up Interstate 395 from Springfield to downtown Washington. I heard a very loud, quick whooshing sound that began behind me and stopped suddenly in front of me and to my left. In fractions of a second I heard the impact and an explosion. The next thing I saw was the fireball. I was convinced it was a missile. It came in so fast it sounded nothing like an airplane.

Keith Wheelhouse and his sister, Pam Young were preparing to leave a funeral at Arlington National Cemetery when they watched "the jet" approach and hit the Pentagon. Both saw another plane flying near the jet that crashed. When asked if the other plane could have been an airliner performing a normal landing at Reagan National Airport, Wheelhouse stated that he was not confused by normal airport traffic.

Alfred S. Regnery, on the freeway with the Pentagon not yet in view, heard a jetliner "not more than 200 yards above the ground" passed overhead, disappearing "behind black cloud of smoke" was pouring from a "gaping hole."

Comment: Another witness hearing the loud sound and seeing the jetliner and assuming that sound source and object sighted are one and the same. But note that he saw an airliner and that it was 200 yards above the ground, not 20 feet.

Terry Scanlon interviewed a Hampton Roads woman who saw a plane following the jet that hit the Pentagon.

Christine Peterson, in her car in front of the heliport (near Riskus) saw the airliner. As it flew over she could read numbers on its wing. "My mind could not comprehend what happened. Where did the plane go? ... But there was no plane visible, only huge billows of smoke and torrents of fire."

Comment: It would certainly be jumping to conclusions to say that this witness saw that plane crash. Watching the Boeing she missed entirely the killer jet that came from another direction.

James S. Robbins, from his west-facing office window, one and a half miles east of the Pentagon, saw "the 757" as it was "diving in at an unrecoverable angle." "I did not immediately comprehend what I was witnessing. There was a silvery flash, an explosion, and a dark, mushroom shaped cloud rose over the building."

Comment: The plane was diving. But it must have recovered from the dive at the last second, because the pentagon was not hit by a plane at a downward angle. The killer jet travelled from the entrance hole to the C-ring exit hole without breaking above the floor of the third floor!!! Robbins saw the Boeing that did not crash and the explosion and smoke made by the killer plane that did. [Note: since this was written in 2002 it has come to light (photo and video supporting) that the plane diving over D.C. was a four engine plane with wings more swept back and more forward on the fuselage than the 757 -- and this over forbidden air space! Obviously a distraction plane. See photos of this plane diving directly over the capitol buiding by clicking on the URL at the bottom of this message. -- DE 5/30/04]

Christopher Munsey headed South on the Interstate saw "a silver, twin-engine American Airlines jetliner gliding almost noiselessly over the Navy Annex, fast, low and straight toward the Pentagon, just hundreds of yards away." Munsey saw the red and blue markings "as it appeared to hit the side of the Pentagon."

Comment: A silver twin-engined plane had to have been Flight 77, seen "over the Annex", i.e., over Arlington Cemetery hill, it had American Airlines markings and it was "noiseless," but notice the indefiniteness: "it appeared to hit the side of the Pentagon" -- there are usually psychologically definite reasons why people qualify their speech, in this case, perhaps, psychological reservations about what he really did see.

Fred Gaskins was driving near the Pentagon as he saw the plane pass about 150 feet overhead. "It was flying very smoothly and calmly, without any hint that anything was wrong."

And there is this (with Jim Hoffman):

How could the Pentagon have been approached by a second jet and the witnesses not report seeing two planes at once? The answer rests in part in important new information from the Department of Transportation concerning research on modification of people's memories of accidents.

Sarah Roberts once asked me, "Why do you impose your "two plane" theory on every witness account you come across?"

I replied that I did so because we are talking about a frameup murder case, and in a frameup the murder weapon is very important and so are the witness accounts of that weapon. But of course it is the evidence and the witnesses that, when taken seriously, impose conclusions on the investigator.

We have security camera proof that the real murder weapon was the plane that came in low and fired the missile. But Flight 77 was the frameup plane -- the plane people were supposed to think was piloted by cunning Arab suicides with box cutters etc. Yes Flight 77 airliner was there, and it really was seen by Robbins, Regnery, Eglas and others -- but seen by Eglas only at first, I am convinced -- before she turned her attention to the hit pole and the freeway traffic around her as she, as she says, stopped on a busy freeway, so that when she was ready to start looking for the plane again her attention was then caught by the split second glimps of the small jet (that we see in the video) crashing into the white hot missile explosion at the west wall of the Pentagon.

When a jet attacks at high speed from near ground level no one sees it coming -- from the annex to the wall would take about three seconds, and no one was expecting it -- many had been looking at the airliner -- but doing so in a place where airliners coming in low are quite usual, only a mile from Reagan National Airport. However there was also the news that was then coming in from New York, news that conditioned the soon-to-be witnesses to think in terms of hijacked airliners -- and that conditioning was reinforced, for many witnesses, by the long and showy display put on by a mysterious four engine airliner-sized jet that tarried over Washington D.C., and actually did some attention getting dives over the capital. Here are some pictures of that plane in a dive timed perfectly to coincide with the real Pentagon attack by the small plane with a missile.

The case is solved. We know there were two planes, in fact four planes part of the operation. The killer jet, the Boeing, the four- engine plane doing dives over the Capitol, and the C-130 that followed the Boeing over the crash just 30 seconds after the killer jet hit the wall. That is why I talk about them.

OFFICIAL VERSION: FLIGHT 93: United Flight 93 out of New Jersey was hijacked and crashed into a quarry in Pennsylvania after the hijackers lost control of the plane struggling with valiant passenger-heroes.

United **Flight 93**—Official Time Line

United Flight 93 was a Boeing 757 slated to fly from Newark to San Francisco. It was the only plane that didn't crash into a national landmark on Sept. 11, and authorities suspect two related reasons: The flight was delayed in taking off and by the time it was taken over, the nation knew it was under attack. Relatives were able to relay the information back to the plane in the frantic cell phone calls from passengers.

The captain was Jason Dahl, a 43-year-old Littleton, Colo., resident. His first officer was LeRoy Homer, 36, of Marlton, N.J. Also aboard were five flight attendants and 37 passengers, for a total of 44 on the flight. The plane pushed back from Gate 17 at Newark International Airport at 8:01 a.m., one minute after its scheduled departure.

United will not explain why, but the plane was delayed on the ground and didn't take off until 8:42. As it flew west over Pennsylvania and into northern Ohio, United transmitted a systemwide message, warning its pilots of a potential "cockpit intrusion."

The crew on Flight 93 replied by pushing a button that read out, "Confirmed."

Authorities suspect the plane was hijacked about 40 minutes into its flight. Unlike the other flights, there were only four hijackers aboard. Working in their favor was the relatively light load, the least of any of the hijacked planes.

According to the FBI, the leader and likely pilot was Ziad Samir Jarrah, a Lebanese who had received a pilot's license in Germany. He is suspected of being one of the three key players in the Sept. 11 plot, along with Atta and Al-Shehhi.

In Jarrah's apartment, he set up a three-panel, full-size replica of a Boeing 757 cockpit.

The FBI said the other three hijackers were Saeed Alghamdi, a Saudi and pilot; Ahmed Ibrahim A. Al Haznawi, a Saudi; and Ahmed Alnami, the 15th Saudi Arabian citizen among the hijackers.

The hijackers appeared to take control of the plane with lightning speed - springing up, donning red bandanas around their heads, with two forcing their way into the cockpit. One claimed to have a bomb tied to his waist.

According to the transcript from air traffic control, there were two short radio bursts, probably around the time the plane was taken over. In one, a pilot was heard saying, "Get out of here."

One government official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, said there were at least four radio transmissions. In two, the words spoken included "bomb on board." Many of the words were not in English, the official said, but two phrases that were heard included "our demands" and "keep quiet."

As with Flight 77, the hijackers claimed they were taking the plane to another airport.

"Hi, this is the captain," said Jarrah, according to a tape of an apparent inadvertant radio transmission obtained by ABC News. "We'd like you all to remain seated. There is a bomb on board. And we are going to turn back to the airport. And they had our demands, so please remain quiet."

One of the now-famous passengers was Todd Beamer, a 32-year-old employee of Oracle, the corporate software company. He tried to use an Airfone to call his family in Cranbury, N.J., but he couldn't get authorization for his company account. Instead, he was patched through to Lisa Jefferson, a Verizon supervisor in Oak Brook, Ill., at 9:45, after speaking briefly with another operator.

The company faxed his wife, Lisa, a summary of the 15-minute call.

Beamer told Jefferson that the pilot and copilot apparently were dead and the hijackers were flying the plane. He said one hijacker was guarding 27 passengers in the back of the plane with what appeared to be a bomb tied around his waist.

He said two more hijackers were in the cockpit, while the fourth was guarding the first-class cabin.

Beamer asked Jefferson to convey his love to his wife, due to deliver a child in January, and his two sons, ages 3 and 1. They also recited the Lord's Prayer.

Jefferson then heard Beamer ask: "Are you guys ready? Let's roll."

Lisa Beamer recognized it as a phrase her husband used frequently with their sons.

Another passenger, Mark Bingham, was a 31-year-old, 6-foot-5 rugby player. He called his mother, Alice Hoglan, who was visiting a relative in Saratoga, Calif., at 9:42.

"Mom, this is Mark Bingham," he said, nervously. "I want to let you know that I love you. I'm calling from the plane. We've been taken over. There are three men that say they have a bomb."

A third passenger, Jeremy Glick, had been a national judo champion.

Using an Airfone, he called relatives in the Catskills, where his wife, Liz, and daughter, Emerson, were visiting.

He asked his wife whether it was true that planes had been crashed into the World Trade Center, indicating how the story had already spread through the plane.

She told him they had, and he said passengers were taking a vote: should they try to take back the plane."

"Honey, you need to do it," Liz Glick replied.

Thomas Burnett Jr., 38, a businessman and father of three girls from San Ramon, Calif., made four calls home over about a half-hour.

In his fourth call, he told of the group's plans to storm the hijackers. "I know we're all going to die," he said. "There's three of us who are going to do something about it. I love you, honey."

Sandy Bradshaw, a flight attendant, called her husband, Phil, a US Airways pilot, at their home in Greensboro, N.C. She had been working in coach class, having picked up the trip late.

"Have you heard what's going on? My flight has been hijacked. My flight has been hijacked with three guys with knives," she said.

She also confessed something to her husband: She had slipped into the galley and begun filling pitchers with boiling water.

"Everyone's running to first class. I've got to go. Bye," she said.

Authorities contend the passengers, possibly armed with a fire extinguisher, may have incapacitated a hijacker who was flying in the right-hand seat, normally used by the copilot. They believe the plane flipped over on its back and speared into the ground at about 575 miles per hour.

Flight 93 crashed at 10:10 into a field in Shanksville, Pa.

FLIGHT 93 –9/11 commission excerpts [*coincide with the previous transcript, but edited The gov. only released this after the private Cleveland transcript below was released*]

“The controller responded seconds later: "Somebody call Cleveland." This was followed by a second radio transmission with sounds of screaming and someone yelling--"Get out of here! Get out of here!" Again, from an unknown source.

The Cleveland Center controllers began to try to identify the possible sources of transmissions and noticed that United 93 had descended some 700 feet. The controller attempted again to raise United 93 several times with no response. At 9:30, the controller began to poll the other flights in his frequency to determine if they heard the screaming. Several said that they had.

At 9:32, a third radio transmission came over the frequency. "Keep remaining sitting. We have a bomb on board." The controller understood but chose to respond: "Calling Cleveland Center. You're unreadable. Say again slowly." He notified his supervisor, who passed the notice up the chain of command.

By 9:34, word of the hijacking had reached FAA headquarters in Washington. FAA headquarters had by this time established an open line of communication with the Command Center at Herndon and instructed it to poll all the centers about suspect aircraft. The Command Center executed the request, and a minute later Cleveland Center reported that "United 93 may have a bomb on board."

That was the information Command Center relayed to FAA Headquarters at 9:34. Between 9:34 and 9:38, the controller observed United 93 climbing to 40,700 feet and immediately moved several aircraft out of its way. The controller continued to try to contact United 93 and asked whether the pilot could confirm that he had been hijacked. There was no response. Then, at 9:39, a fifth radio transmission came over the radio frequency from United 93.

ZIAD JARRAH: (Communication from United Flight 93.): Uh, is the captain. Would like you all to remain seated. There is a bomb on board

and are going back to the airport, and to have our demands -- (inaudible). Please remain quiet.

MR. FARMER: The controller responded: "United 93, understand you have a bomb on board. Go ahead." The flight did not respond. At 9:41, Cleveland Center lost United 93's transponder signal. The controller located it on primary radar, matched its position with visual sightings from other aircraft, and tracked the flight as turned east, then south.

At about 9:36, Cleveland Center asked Command Center specifically whether someone had requested the military to launch fighter aircraft to intercept United 93. Cleveland Center offered to contact a nearby military base. Command Center replied that FAA personnel well above them in the chain of command had to make that decision and were working the issue.

egin audiotape.)

FAA HEADQUARTERS: They're pulling Jeff away to go talk about United 93.

COMMAND CENTER: Do we want to think about scrambling aircraft?

FAA HEADQUARTERS: Oh, God, I don't know.

COMMAND CENTER: That's a decision somebody's going to have to make probably in the next 10 minutes.

FAA HEADQUARTERS: You know, everybody just left the room.

(End of audiotape.)

MR. FARMER: At 9:53, FAA Headquarters informed Command Center that the deputy director for air traffic services was talking to Deputy Administrator Monte Belger about scrambling aircraft. Then Command Center informed Headquarters they lost track of United 93 over the Pittsburgh area.

Within seconds, Command Center received a visual report from another aircraft and informed headquarters that the aircraft was 20 miles northwest of Johnstown. United 93 was spotted by another aircraft, and at 10:01 Command Center advised FAA Headquarters that one of the aircraft had seen United 93 "waving his wings." The aircraft had witnessed the radical gyrations in what we believe was the hijackers' effort to defeat the passenger assault on the cockpit.

United 93 crashed in Pennsylvania at 10:03:11, 125 miles from Washington D.C. The precise crash time has been the subject of some dispute. The 10:03:11 time is supported by evidence from the staff's radar analysis, the flight data recorder, NTSB analysis and infrared satellite data. Five minutes later, Command Center forwarded this update to Headquarters.

(Begin audio tape.)

COMMAND CENTER: Okay, there is now -- on United 93 --

FAA HEADQUARTERS: Yes.

COMMAND CENTER: -- there is a report of black smoke in the last position I gave you, 15 miles south of Johnstown.

FAA HEADQUARTERS: From the airplane or from the ground?

COMMAND CENTER: They're speculating it's from the aircraft.

FAA HEADQUARTERS: Okay.

COMMAND CENTER: It hit the ground. That's what they're speculating. That's speculation only.

(End of audio tape.)

MR. FARMER: The aircraft that spotted the "black smoke" was the same unarmed Air National Guard cargo plane that had seen United 77 crash into the Pentagon 26 minutes earlier. It had resumed its flight to Minnesota and saw the smoke from the crash of United 93 less than two minutes after the plane went down.

At 10:17, Command Center advised Headquarters of its conclusion that United 93 had indeed crashed. Despite the discussions about military assistance, no one from FAA Headquarters requested military assistance regarding United 93, nor did any manager at FAA Headquarters pass any of the information it had about United 93 to the military.

Military notification and response. NEADS first received a call about United 93 from the military liaison at Cleveland Center at 10:07. Unaware that the aircraft had already crashed, Cleveland passed to NEADS the aircraft's last known latitude and longitude. NEADS was never able to locate United 93 on radar because it was already in the ground.

At the same time, the NEADS mission crew commander was dealing with the arrival of the Langley fighters over Washington, D.C. He was sorting out what their orders were with respect to potential targets. Shortly after 10:10, and having no knowledge either that United 93 had been heading toward Washington, or that it had crashed, the mission crew commander explicitly instructed that the Langley fighters did not have "clearance to shoot" aircraft over the nation's capital.

The news of a reported bomb on board United 93 spread quickly at NEADS. The air defenders searched for United 93's primary radar return

and tried to locate assets to scramble toward the plane. NEADS called Washington Center to report:

(Begin audiotape.)

NEADS: I also want to give you a heads-up, Washington.

FAA-D.C.: Go ahead.

NEADS: United 93 -- have you got information on that yet?

FAA: Yeah, he's down.

NEADS: He's down?

FAA: Yes.

NEADS: When did he land? 'Cause we have confirmation --

FAA: He did not land.

NEADS: Oh, he's down-down?

FAA: Yes. Somewhere up northeast of Camp David.

NEADS: Northeast of Camp David.

FAA: That's the last report. They don't know exactly where.

(End audiotape.)

MR. FARMER: The time of notification of the crash of United 93 was 10:15. The NEADS air defenders never located the flight or followed it on their radar scopes. The flight had already crashed by the time they learned it was hijacked.

The following is a time-lapsed depiction of United 93.

(Videotape.)

To provide an overview of the materials presented thus far, the following is a time lapsed depiction of all four hijacked flights and the military's response.

(Videotape.)

MR. ZELIKOW: Conflicting Accounts. In May 2003, public testimony before this commission, NORAD officials stated that, at 9:16 NEADS received hijack notification of United 93 from the FAA. This statement was incorrect. There was no hijack to report at 9:16. United 93 was proceeding normally at that time.

Note: Document 4: FAA report, Chronology of the September 11 Attacks and Subsequent Events Through October 24, 2001, undated [Referenced Chapter 1, The 9/11 Commission Report, "We Have Some Planes," footnote 62]

An FAA chronology of events pertaining to the terrorist attacks and subsequent events through October 24, 2001 that includes details about the first unplanned FAA shut-down of civil aviation, the later reopening of airspace, congressional efforts to compensate airlines, warnings to pilots that entering restricted airspace could lead to the use of deadly force against their aircraft, measures taken to secure cockpit doors, and air strikes in Afghanistan.

An interesting element of the chronology is the 8:43 am FAA notice to NORAD that UA175 had been hijacked. This directly contradicts The 9/11 Commission Report (Chapter 1, page 23) and the FAA's own Summary of

Air Traffic Hijack Events, which both state the FAA failed to alert NORAD to UA175 until about the same time the flight crashed into the World Trade Center between 9:03 and 9:05 am.

Contradictions: After all the stand-down orders to keep fighters from intercepting the 3 other targets, the government does shoot this one down and then denies it and issues a huge cover story. Strange!

1. Despite making secret the FAA flight transcripts between Flight 93 and Cleveland Center (ATC), a private copy emerges from another private jet being monitored and controlled on the same frequency by Cleveland Center. These transcripts reveal: 1) the FI 93 pilot mistakenly transmitted to Cleveland instead of on intercom, that they had a bomb threat on board. 2) there was yelling heard in two other transmissions. 3) A nearby airliner with visual contact of FI 93 said he witnessed an explosion in the air. This was before flight 93 crashed. What the other pilots saw was either the bomb going off or a missile striking one of the engines. In either case, something big happened in the air that the government is denying.

By Mark Elsis: "9:58 a.m.: A frantic male passenger onboard United Airlines Flight 93 called the 911 emergency number, he told the operator, named Glen Cramer, that he had locked himself inside one of the toilets. Cramer told the AP, in a report that was widely broadcast on September 11th, that the passenger had spoken for one minute. "We're being hijacked, we're being hijacked!" the man screamed into his mobile phone. "We confirmed that with him several times," Cramer said, "and we asked him to repeat what he said. He was very distraught. He said he believed the plane was going down. He did hear some sort of an explosion and saw white smoke coming from the plane, but he didn't know where. And then we lost contact with him." This was the last cell phone call made from any passenger on any of the hijacked planes."

CLEVELAND CENTER TRANSCRIPT

Here's an abbreviated excerpt from the leaked private ATC transcript: However, AirDisaster.com has posted a sound file of air traffic control during the morning of 9/11. Specifically, Cleveland air traffic control had two brief contacts with United Airlines Flight 93, when the hijackers mistakenly broadcast messages meant only for the plane's passengers.

Executive 956 [private jet]: Just answering your call. We could year that, er, yelling too.

Cleveland Center: OK, thank you, were just trying to figure out what's going on.

United 93: [unintelligible] this is captain, please sit down, remain sitting, we have a bomb on board. [Sometimes pilots key the wrong button. In this case the Captain thinks he is broadcasting to the passengers on intercom but he is pressing the radio transmit button—shows he is under severe stress.]

Cleveland Center: Uh, calling Cleveland Center, you're unreadable, say again slowly.

Executive 956: [unintelligible] was reasonable, sounded like someone said they had a bomb on board.

Cleveland: That's what we thought, we just, er, we didn't get it clear. ...United ninety-three calling. United ninety-three, understand you have a bomb on board, go ahead. Executive nine fifty-six, did you understand that transmission?

Executive 956: Affirmative. He said there was a bomb on board.

[Later]Cleveland Center (2): [Voice changed to female, apparently second Cleveland controller.] Do you see any, ah, activity on your right side, smoke or anything like that?

American 1060: Negative. We're searching. Yeah, we do have a smoke puff now at about, er, oh probably two o'clock. There appears to be just a spire up like a puff of black smoke. [Indicates evidence of explosion in the air.] [End of ATC excerpt.]

2. ATC controllers in New Hampshire have told others they vectored a pair of F-16s to Flight 93. The Nashua said that an F-16 fighter stayed in hot pursuit of the hijacked airliner until it crashed in Pennsylvania and made 360-degree turns to remain close. "He must've seen the whole thing," the employee said, not knowing about the shoot down.
3. Witnesses on the ground saw a least one of the fighters in the sky near FI 93 and one saw the missile attack.
4. Pieces of the wreckage including suitcases and an engine were found miles from the crash site—consistent with the at-altitude explosion witnessed above.
5. A different unmarked civilian type jet with engines near the tale was seen by several witnesses following FI 93 down and circling the crash site. Later research showed it was leased to a company that subleases to the government. This aircraft presence indicates foreknowledge, and the government continues to deny its existence.
6. The Todd Beamer hero's "let's roll" phone call is suspect for several reasons. Cell phones rarely work at altitude, let alone for such a long conversation (13 minutes). He could hardly be planning an operation with a group of guys while chatting on the phone, and then suddenly say, "Let's roll." The government claims he was talking to an operator, but no recording has surfaced.
7. Sec. of Defense Rumsfeld made a slip of the tongue in the direction of truth when speaking to troops in Iraq: "I think all of us have a sense if we imagine the kind of world we would face if the people who bombed the mess hall in Mosul, or the people who did

the bombing in Spain, or the people who attacked the United States in New York, **shot down the plane over Pennsylvania** and attacked the Pentagon...”

World Net Daily: “Ever since Sept. 11, 2001, there have been questions about Flight 93, the ill-fated plane that crashed in the rural fields of Pennsylvania. The official story has been that passengers on the United Airlines flight rushed the hijackers in an effort to prevent them from crashing the plane into a strategic target – possibly the U.S. Capitol. During his surprise Christmas Eve trip to Iraq, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld referred to the flight being shot down – long a suspicion because of the danger the flight posed to Washington landmarks and population centers. Was it a slip of the tongue? Was it an error? Or was it the truth, finally being dropped on the public more than three years after the tragedy of the terrorist attacks that killed nearly 3,000?”

Here's what Rumsfeld said Friday: "I think all of us have a sense if we imagine the kind of world we would face if the people who bombed the mess hall in Mosul, or the people who did the bombing in Spain, or the people who attacked the United States in New York, shot down the plane over Pennsylvania and attacked the Pentagon, the people who cut off peoples' heads on television to intimidate, to frighten – indeed the word 'terrorized' is just that. Its purpose is to terrorize, to alter behavior, to make people be something other than that which they want to be."

Several eyewitnesses to the crash claim they saw a "military-type" plane flying around United Airlines Flight 93 when the hijacked passenger jet crashed – prompting the once-unthinkable question of whether the U.S. military shot down the plane.

Although the onboard struggle between hijackers and passengers – immortalized by the courageous "Let's roll" call to action by Todd Beamer

– became one of the enduring memories of that disastrous day, the actual cause of Flight 93's crash, of the four hijacked airliners, remains the most unclear. Several residents in and around Shanksville, Pa., describing the crash as they saw it, claim to have seen a second plane – an unmarked military-style jet.

9/11 Investigator Gail Sheehy Commentary:

“The official impact time according to NORAD, the North American Air Defense Command, is 10:03 a.m. Later, U.S. Army seismograph data gave the impact time as 10:06:05. The F.A.A. gives a crash time of 10:07 a.m. And The New York Times, drawing on flight controllers in more than one F.A.A. facility, put the time at 10:10 a.m.

“Up to a seven-minute discrepancy? In terms of an air disaster, seven minutes is close to an eternity. The way our nation has historically treated any airline tragedy is to pair up recordings from the cockpit and air-traffic control and parse the timeline down to the hundredths of a second. But as Mary Schiavo points out, "We don't have an NTSB (National Transportation Safety Board) investigation here, and they ordinarily dissect the timeline to the thousandth of a second."

"Pieces of the wreckage have been found as far away as New Baltimore, about eight miles from the crash site. When the eastbound plane crashed, a 9-knot wind was blowing from the southeast, [FBI Agent] Crowley said. ("Bereaved may visit Flight 93 site," Pittsburgh Tribune-Review, Friday, September 14, 2001.)

“On September 11, “[r]esidents and workers at businesses outside Shanksville, Somerset County, reported discovering clothing, books, papers, and what appear to be human remains. Some residents said they collected bags-full of items to be turned over to investigators. Others reported what appeared to be crash debris floating in Indian Lake, nearly six miles from the crash site.” (“Investigators locate 'black box' from Flight 93; widen search area in Somerset crash,” [Pittsburgh] Post Gazette, September 13, 2001.)

<http://www.post-gazette.com/headlines/20010913somersetp3.asp>

EVIDENCE OF A GOVERNMENT OBSTRUCTION AND COVER-UP AFTER THE ATTACK

1. Black boxes, cockpit recordings: Government officials deny finding them in WTC, though rescue workers confirm seeing them being found by the FBI and removed. The black boxes in the Pentagon crash were claimed to have been destroyed—nearly impossible unless the explosive scenario is correct. Cockpit recordings of flight 93 kept secret and only an edited version is played for families, who are sworn to secrecy. Why?
2. Fire fighters and all other first responders are **threatened and told to keep quiet** about anything they saw or observed—especially about hearing explosions prior to the collapse of the twin towers. Edited versions of non-controversial accounts are released years later.
3. FAA supervisor destroys taped recording of the ATC controllers retelling what they saw and heard. FAA colludes with the FBI to produce selectively edited snips of FAA telephone conversations of FAA superiors talking about the attack to justify the official version, while withholding all original recordings from public airing.

FAA flight recordings with hijacked aircraft kept secret—only selected portions transcribed and published.

Online Journal: "FAA tapes--All of it was recorded by a Federal Aviation Administration traffic control center. Those tapes are now presumed to be in the hands of federal law-enforcement officials, who arrived at the flight-control facility minutes after Flight 11 crashed into the World Trade Center. The tapes presumably could provide clues about the hijackers — and may become even more important if they plane's 'black boxes' are damaged or never found." ("Controllers' tale of Flight 11," The Christian Science Monitor, September 13, 2001.)

Withholding evidence: ""We know what she said from notes, and the government has them," said Mary Schiavo, the formidable former Inspector General of the Department of Transportation, whose nickname among aviation officials was "Scary Mary." Ms. Schiavo sat in on the commission's hearing on aviation security on 9/11 and was disgusted by what it left out. "In any other situation, it would be unthinkable to withhold investigative material from an independent commission," she told this writer. "There are usually grave consequences. But the commission is clearly not talking to everybody or not telling us everything."

During these transmissions, the pilot's voice and the heavily accented voice of a hijacker were clearly audible, according to two controllers. All of it was recorded by a F.A.A. traffic-control center in Nashua, N.H. According to the reporter, Mark Clayton, the federal law-enforcement officers arrived at the F.A.A. facility shortly after the World Trade Center attack and took the tape.

To this writer's knowledge, there has been no public mention of the pilot's narrative since the news report on Sept. 12, 2001. Families of the flight crew have only heard about it, but when Peg Ogonowski asked American Airlines to let her hear it, she never heard back. Their F.A.A. superiors forbade the controllers to talk to anyone else.

4. Federal Government ordered police to restrict access to the WTC collapse sight—especially to investigators, and photographers. It also ordered the immediate destruction of the evidence and had all steel cut up and sold as scrap with the stipulation that it be shipped outside the country. None of the scrap steel was to be left in the US for analysis. [This was essential as the steel clearly would show the signs of cutting charges used for demolition. The molten steel at the bottom would have shown the chemical traces of thermite burning charges].
5. FBI agents arrived “within minutes” at the CITGO service station across from the Pentagon to confiscate their surveillance video of the crash. How did they know about this video if there was no government foreknowledge of the attack or planning for a cover-up? The Sheraton Hotel camera tape and Virginia DOT tapes were all confiscated by the FBI as well. If conspiracy charges are so outrageous and offensive, why not settle them in an instant by showing the videos? Or do they confirm the government is lying?

Source: Online Journal: Online Journal. “After the Pentagon attack, the video cameras and tapes at a nearby CITGO, the Sheraton Hotel along I-395 and Virginia DOT cameras were all confiscated by the FBI and they have yet to disclose any of the contents that were recorded by those cameras. Those cameras would have recorded what came in to hit the Pentagon...”Karl Schwarz has the full story on All of the missing Pentagon videos:

http://www.onlinejournal.com/Special_Reports/020205Schwarz/020205schwarz.html

6. A memo has surfaced from within the FAA indicating that hijacker Satam al-Suqami had a gun on the aircraft and shot and killed passenger Daniel Lewin [an Israeli agent] in the process of hijacking the aircraft. The FAA initially denied the memo’s

existence, and then admitted its existence, but altered its contents.

7. NTSB claims all fireproof proof black boxes and voice recorders except one (FL 93) were destroyed or unrecoverable—an unprecedented failure rate in all of aviation accident history.
8. President Bush and VP Cheney personally called Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle urging him not to conduct a investigation. Then when when pressured they started playing with the terror alert warnings, raising them for an false threat they could concoct. When the White house finally acceded to participate, Bush relied on "Executive Privilege" to deny commissioners access to crucial documents, and require that White House could control what was kept secret.
9. **The 9/11 Commission** was rigged: After the initial controversy of trying to appoint insider-in-chief Henry Kissinger as Chair of the panel, Bush opted for a reliable yesman, Gov. Kean and other former elected officials who wouldn't cause waves when the cover-up became evident. The commission was plagued by the apparent conflicts of interest and excessive former relationships with government who should have been probed more complicity. Bush chose another artful dodger/lawyer, Richard Ben Veniste as chief counsel for the Commission—who treated all government witnesses as celebrities. Philip Zelikow, chooses which evidence and witnesses to bring to their attention. Mr. Zelikow, as a former adviser to the pre-9/11 Bush administration, has a blatant conflict of interest here. The controversial testimony of former counter-terrorism expert Richard Clarke in juxtaposition with the constant drama surrounding whether or not President Bush and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice will testify before the commission (under oath and in public) was all just a scripted diversion to use up the Commission's limited time and ensure that the real issues are never investigated or aired publicly.

I listened to Chief Counsel Ben Veniste's examination of numerous government officials on NPR radio. By all the initial joking and comradery that was exchanged between him and CIA Director Tenet, and later with

Asst. Sec. of State Richard Armitage (former chief drug importer for the CIA), it was clear no tough questions were going to be forthcoming. He played softball with them both. Instead of setting up legal traps in advance by asking questions Ben Veniste could later trip them up on, he wasted hours asking them questions these officials could easily evade by claiming ignorance or “national security,” and then failed to present any contradictory testimony.

It will be the same with Rice. There are dozens of general explanations she can come up with to explain the contradictions between her former statements to the press and the testimony of Richard Clarke. But even if Ben Veniste were able to make something of the differences, what would they show? That the CIA was negligent, incompetent, and worked at cross purposes with other agencies? Or, heaven forbid, that they failed to share information with other agencies? If they are guilty, so what? These are not faults meriting more than a slap on the hands. No wonder no government official responsible for security and intelligence has been fired. By focusing on such innocuous drama, the public is denied the key issues that cry out for an explanation.

10. **Commission flaws:** Huge portions of their report were classified, including the whole chapter on Saudi Arabia involvement. It disavowed and misrepresented the entire Able Danger testimony about the secret government data mining operation that had identified and tracked several of the alleged hijackers prior to 9/11. It evaded any interviews, discussions or investigations of the issues like the molten steel in the basement, plane mods, or government refusal to turn over the Pentagon videos. Its like the charges of government conspiracy didn't exist. AG John Ashcroft refused to discuss the testimony of FBI and DIA whistleblowers with the 9/11 commission. These FBI agents are currently being represented by impeachment attorney David Schippers, who charged that they were told by FBI higher authorities to suppress crucial information that could have led to the early interdiction of the 9/11 hijackers.

The 9/11 Commission Report: A 571-Page Lie by Dr. David Ray Griffin

From: <http://www.septembereleventh.org/newsarchive/2005-05-22-571pglie.php>

In discussing my second 9/11 book, *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*, I have often said, only half in jest, that a better title might have been “a 571-page lie.” (Actually, I was saying “a 567-page lie,” because I was forgetting to count the four pages of the Preface.) In making this statement, one of my points has been that the entire Report is constructed in support of one big lie: that the official story about 9/11 is true.

Another point, however, is that in the process of telling this overall lie, *The 9/11 Commission Report* tells many lies about particular issues. This point is implied by my critique’s subtitle, “Omissions and Distortions.” It might be thought, to be sure, that of the two types of problems signaled by those two terms, only those designated “distortions” can be considered lies.

It is better, however, to understand the two terms as referring to two types of lies: implicit and explicit. We have an explicit lie when the Report claims that the core of each of the Twin Towers consisted of a hollow steel shaft or when it claims that Vice President Cheney did not give the shoot-down order until after 10:10 that morning. But we have an implicit lie when the Commission, in its discussion of the 19 alleged suicide hijackers, omits the fact that at least six of them have credibly been reported to be still alive, or when it fails to mention the fact that Building 7 of the World Trade Center collapsed. Such omissions are implicit lies partly because they show that the Commission did not honor its stated intention “to provide the fullest possible account of the events surrounding 9/11.” They are also lies insofar as the Commission could avoid telling an explicit lie about the issue in question only by not mentioning it, which, I believe, was the case in at least most instances.

Given these two types of lies, it might be wondered how many lies are contained in The 9/11 Commission Report. I do not know. But, deciding to see how many lies I had discussed in my book, I found that I had identified over 100 of them. Once I had made the list, it occurred to me that others might find this summary helpful. Hence this article.

One caveat: Although in some of the cases it is obvious that the Commission has lied, in other cases I would say, as I make clear in the book, that it appears that the Commission has lied. However, in the interests of simply giving a brief listing of claims that I consider to be lies, I will ignore this distinction between obvious and probable lies, leaving it to readers, if they wish, to look up the discussion in The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions. For ease in doing this, I have parenthetically indicated the pages of the book on which the various issues are discussed.

Given this clarification, I now list the omissions and claims of The 9/11 Commission Report that I, in my critique of that report, portrayed as lies:

1. The omission of evidence that at least six of the alleged hijackers---including Waleed al-Shehri, said by the Commission probably to have stabbed a flight attendant on Flight 11 before it crashed into the North Tower of the WTC---are still alive (19-20).
2. The omission of evidence about Mohamed Atta---such as his reported fondness for alcohol, pork, and lap dances---that is in tension with the Commission's claim that he had become fanatically religious (20-21).
3. The obfuscation of the evidence that Hani Hanjour was too poor a pilot to have flown an airliner into the Pentagon (21-22).

4. The omission of the fact that the publicly released flight manifests contain no Arab names (23).
5. The omission of the fact that fire has never, before or after 9/11, caused steel-frame buildings to collapse (25).
6. The omission of the fact that the fires in the Twin Towers were not very big, very hot, or very long-lasting compared with fires in several steel-frame buildings that did not collapse (25-26).
7. The omission of the fact that, given the hypothesis that the collapses were caused by fire, the South Tower, which was struck later than the North Tower and also had smaller fires, should not have collapsed first (26).
8. The omission of the fact that WTC 7 (which was not hit by an airplane and which had only small, localized fires) also collapsed---an occurrence that FEMA admitted it could not explain (26).
9. The omission of the fact that the collapse of the Twin Towers (like that of Building 7) exemplified at least 10 features suggestive of controlled demolition (26-27).
10. The claim that the core of each of the Twin Towers was “a hollow steel shaft”---a claim that denied the existence of the 47 massive steel columns that in reality constituted the core of each tower and that, given the “pancake theory” of the collapses, should have still been sticking up many hundreds of feet in the air (27-28).
11. The omission of Larry Silverstein’s statement that he and the fire department commander decided to “pull” Building 7 (28).
12. The omission of the fact that the steel from the WTC buildings was quickly removed from the crime scene and shipped overseas before it could be analyzed for evidence of explosives (30).
13. The omission of the fact that because Building 7 had been evacuated before it collapsed, the official reason for the rapid removal of the steel---

that some people might still be alive in the rubble under the steel---made no sense in this case (30).

14. The omission of Mayor Giuliani's statement that he had received word that the World Trade Center was going to collapse (30-31).

15. The omission of the fact that President Bush's brother Marvin and his cousin Wirt Walker III were both principals in the company in charge of security for the WTC (31-32).

16. The omission of the fact that the west wing of the Pentagon would have been the least likely spot to be targeted by al-Qaeda terrorists, for several reasons (33-34).

17. The omission of any discussion of whether the damage done to the Pentagon was consistent with the impact of a Boeing 757 going several hundred miles per hour (34).

18. The omission of the fact that there are photos showing that the west wing's façade did not collapse until 30 minutes after the strike and also that the entrance hole appears too small for a Boeing 757 to have entered (34).

19. The omission of all testimony that has been used to cast doubt on whether remains of a Boeing 757 were visible either inside or outside the Pentagon (34-36).

20. The omission of any discussion of whether the Pentagon has a anti-missile defense system that would have brought down a commercial airliner---even though the Commission suggested that the al-Qaeda terrorists did not attack a nuclear power plant because they assumed that it would be thus defended (36).

21. The omission of the fact that pictures from various security cameras---including the camera at the gas station across from the Pentagon, the film from which was reportedly confiscated by the FBI immediately after the strike---could presumably answer the question of what really hit the Pentagon (37-38).

22. The omission of Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld's reference to "the missile [used] to damage [the Pentagon]" (39).
23. The apparent endorsement of a wholly unsatisfactory answer to the question of why the Secret Service agents allowed President Bush to remain at the Sarasota school at a time when, given the official story, they should have assumed that a hijacked airliner might be about to crash into the school (41-44).
24. The failure to explore why the Secret Service did not summon fighter jets to provide air cover for Air Force One (43-46).
25. The claims that when the presidential party arrived at the school, no one in the party knew that several planes had been hijacked (47-48).
26. The omission of the report that Attorney General Ashcroft was warned to stop using commercial airlines prior to 9/11 (50).
27. The omission of David Schippers' claim that he had, on the basis of information provided by FBI agents about upcoming attacks in lower Manhattan, tried unsuccessfully to convey this information to Attorney General Ashcroft during the six weeks prior to 9/11 (51).
28. The omission of any mention of the FBI agents who reportedly claimed to have known the targets and dates of the attacks well in advance (51-52).
29. The claim, by means of a circular, question-begging rebuttal, that the unusual purchases of put options prior to 9/11 did not imply advance knowledge of the attacks on the part of the buyers (52-57).
30. The omission of reports that both Mayor Willie Brown and some Pentagon officials received warnings about flying on 9/11 (57).
31. The omission of the report that Osama bin Laden, who already was America's "most wanted" criminal, was treated in July 2001 by an American doctor in the American Hospital in Dubai and visited by the local CIA agent (59).

32. The omission of news stories suggesting that after 9/11 the US military in Afghanistan deliberately allowed Osama bin Laden to escape (60).
33. The omission of reports, including the report of a visit to Osama bin Laden at the hospital in Dubai by the head of Saudi intelligence, that were in tension with the official portrayal of Osama as disowned by his family and his country (60-61).
34. The omission of Gerald Posner's account of Abu Zubaydah's testimony, according to which three members of the Saudi royal family---all of whom later died mysteriously within an eight-day period---were funding al-Qaeda and had advance knowledge of the 9/11 attacks (61-65).
35. The Commission's denial that it found any evidence of Saudi funding of al-Qaeda (65-68).
36. The Commission's denial in particular that it found any evidence that money from Prince Bandar's wife, Princess Haifa, went to al-Qaeda operatives (69-70).
37. The denial, by means of simply ignoring the distinction between private and commercial flights, that the private flight carrying Saudis from Tampa to Lexington on September 13 violated the rules for US airspace in effect at the time (71-76).
38. The denial that any Saudis were allowed to leave the United States shortly after 9/11 without being adequately investigated (76-82).
39. The omission of evidence that Prince Bandar obtained special permission from the White House for the Saudi flights (82-86).
40. The omission of Coleen Rowley's claim that some officials at FBI headquarters did see the memo from Phoenix agent Kenneth Williams (89-90).

41. The omission of Chicago FBI agent Robert Wright's charge that FBI headquarters closed his case on a terrorist cell, then used intimidation to prevent him from publishing a book reporting his experiences (91).
42. The omission of evidence that FBI headquarters sabotaged the attempt by Coleen Rowley and other Minneapolis agents to obtain a warrant to search Zacarias Moussaoui's computer (91-94).
43. The omission of the 3.5 hours of testimony to the Commission by former FBI translator Sibel Edmonds—testimony that, according to her later public letter to Chairman Kean, revealed serious 9/11-related cover-ups by officials at FBI headquarters (94-101).
44. The omission of the fact that General Mahmoud Ahmad, the head of Pakistan's intelligence agency (the ISI), was in Washington the week prior to 9/11, meeting with CIA chief George Tenet and other US officials (103-04).
45. The omission of evidence that ISI chief Ahmad had ordered \$100,000 to be sent to Mohamed Atta prior to 9/11 (104-07).
46. The Commission's claim that it found no evidence that any foreign government, including Pakistan, had provided funding for the al-Qaeda operatives (106).
47. The omission of the report that the Bush administration pressured Pakistan to dismiss Ahmad as ISI chief after the appearance of the story that he had ordered ISI money sent to Atta (107-09).
48. The omission of evidence that the ISI (and not merely al-Qaeda) was behind the assassination of Ahmad Shah Masood (the leader of Afghanistan's Northern Alliance), which occurred just after the week-long meeting between the heads of the CIA and the ISI (110-112).
49. The omission of evidence of ISI involvement in the kidnapping and murder of Wall Street Reporter Daniel Pearl (113).

50. The omission of Gerald Posner's report that Abu Zubaydah claimed that a Pakistani military officer, Mushaf Ali Mir, was closely connected to both the ISI and al-Qaeda and had advance knowledge of the 9/11 attacks (114).
51. The omission of the 1999 prediction by ISI agent Rajaa Gulum Abbas that the Twin Towers would be "coming down" (114).
52. The omission of the fact that President Bush and other members of his administration repeatedly spoke of the 9/11 attacks as "opportunities" (116-17).
53. The omission of the fact that The Project for the New American Century, many members of which became key figures in the Bush administration, published a document in 2000 saying that "a new Pearl Harbor" would aid its goal of obtaining funding for a rapid technological transformation of the US military (117-18).
54. The omission of the fact that Donald Rumsfeld, who as head of the commission on the US Space Command had recommended increased funding for it, used the attacks of 9/11 on that very evening to secure such funding (119-22).
55. The failure to mention the fact that three of the men who presided over the failure to prevent the 9/11 attacks—Secretary Rumsfeld, General Richard Myers, and General Ralph Eberhart---were also three of the strongest advocates for the US Space Command (122).
56. The omission of the fact that Unocal had declared that the Taliban could not provide adequate security for it to go ahead with its oil-and-gas pipeline from the Caspian region through Afghanistan and Pakistan (122-25).
57. The omission of the report that at a meeting in July 2001, US representatives said that because the Taliban refused to agree to a US proposal that would allow the pipeline project to go forward, a war against them would begin by October (125-26).

58. The omission of the fact that Zbigniew Brzezinski in his 1997 book had said that for the United States to maintain global primacy, it needed to gain control of Central Asia, with its vast petroleum reserves, and that a new Pearl Harbor would be helpful in getting the US public to support this imperial effort (127-28).

59. The omission of evidence that some key members of the Bush administration, including Donald Rumsfeld and his deputy Paul Wolfowitz, had been agitating for a war with Iraq for many years (129-33).

60. The omission of notes of Rumsfeld's conversations on 9/11 showing that he was determined to use the attacks as a pretext for a war with Iraq (131-32).

61. The omission of the statement by the Project for the New American Century that "the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein" (133-34).

62. The claim that FAA protocol on 9/11 required the time-consuming process of going through several steps in the chain of command--even though the Report cites evidence to the contrary (158).

63. The claim that in those days there were only two air force bases in NORAD's Northeast sector that kept fighters on alert and that, in particular, there were no fighters on alert at either McGuire or Andrews (159-162).

64. The omission of evidence that Andrews Air Force Base did keep several fighters on alert at all times (162-64).

65. The acceptance of the twofold claim that Colonel Marr of NEADS had to telephone a superior to get permission to have fighters scrambled from Otis and that this call required eight minutes (165-66).

66. The endorsement of the claim that the loss of an airplane's transponder signal makes it virtually impossible for the US military's radar to track that plane (166-67).

67. The claim that the Payne Stewart interception did not show NORAD's response time to Flight 11 to be extraordinarily slow (167-69).
68. The claim that the Otis fighters were not airborne until seven minutes after they received the scramble order because they did not know where to go (174-75).
69. The claim that the US military did not know about the hijacking of Flight 175 until 9:03, when it was crashing into the South Tower (181-82).
70. The omission of any explanation of (a) why NORAD's earlier report, according to which the FAA had notified the military about the hijacking of Flight 175 at 8:43, was now to be considered false and (b) how this report, if it was false, could have been published and then left uncorrected for almost three years (182).
71. The claim that the FAA did not set up a teleconference until 9:20 that morning (183).
72. The omission of the fact that a memo by Laura Brown of the FAA says that its teleconference was established at about 8:50 and that it included discussion of Flight 175's hijacking (183-84, 186).
73. The claim that the NMCC teleconference did not begin until 9:29 (186-88).
74. The omission, in the Commission's claim that Flight 77 did not deviate from its course until 8:54, of the fact that earlier reports had said 8:46 (189-90).
75. The failure to mention that the report that a large jet had crashed in Kentucky, at about the time Flight 77 disappeared from FAA radar, was taken seriously enough by the heads of the FAA and the FBI's counterterrorism unit to be relayed to the White House (190).
76. The claim that Flight 77 flew almost 40 minutes through American airspace towards Washington without being detected by the military's radar (191-92).

77. The failure to explain, if NORAD's earlier report that it was notified about Flight 77 at 9:24 was "incorrect," how this erroneous report could have arisen, i.e., whether NORAD officials had been lying or simply confused for almost three years (192-93).
78. The claim that the Langley fighter jets, which NORAD had previously said were scrambled to intercept Flight 77, were actually scrambled in response to an erroneous report from an (unidentified) FAA controller at 9:21 that Flight 11 was still up and was headed towards Washington (193-99).
79. The claim that the military did not hear from the FAA about the probable hijacking of Flight 77 before the Pentagon was struck (204-12).
80. The claim that Jane Garvey did not join Richard Clarke's videoconference until 9:40, after the Pentagon was struck (210).
81. The claim that none of the teleconferences succeeded in coordinating the FAA and military responses to the hijackings because "none of [them] included the right officials from both the FAA and the Defense Department"---although Richard Clarke says that his videoconference included FAA head Jane Garvey as well as Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld and General Richard Myers, the acting chair of the joint chiefs of staff (211).
82. The Commission's claim that it did not know who from the Defense Department participated in Clarke's videoconference---although Clarke's book said that it was Donald Rumsfeld and General Myers (211-212).
83. The endorsement of General Myers' claim that he was on Capitol Hill during the attacks, without mentioning Richard Clarke's contradictory account, according to which Myers was in the Pentagon participating in Clarke's videoconference (213-17).
84. The failure to mention the contradiction between Clarke's account of Rumsfeld's whereabouts that morning and Rumsfeld's own accounts (217-19).

85. The omission of Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta's testimony, given to the Commission itself, that Vice-President Cheney and others in the underground shelter were aware by 9:26 that an aircraft was approaching the Pentagon (220).
86. The claim that Pentagon officials did not know about an aircraft approaching Pentagon until 9:32, 9:34, or 9:36---in any case, only a few minutes before the building was hit (223).
87. The endorsement of two contradictory stories about the aircraft that hit the Pentagon---one in which it executed a 330-degree downward spiral (a "high-speed dive") and another in which there is no mention of this maneuver (222-23).
88. The claim that the fighter jets from Langley, which were allegedly scrambled to protect Washington from "Phantom Flight 11," were nowhere near Washington because they were mistakenly sent out to sea (223-24).
89. The omission of all the evidence suggesting that the aircraft that hit the Pentagon was not Flight 77 (224-25).
90. The claim that the military was not notified by the FAA about Flight 93's hijacking until after it crashed (227-29, 232, 253).
91. The twofold claim that the NMCC did not monitor the FAA-initiated conference and then was unable to get the FAA connected to the NMCC-initiated teleconference (230-31).
92. The omission of the fact that the Secret Service is able to know everything that the FAA knows (233).
93. The omission of any inquiry into why the NMCC initiated its own teleconference if, as Laura Brown of the FAA has said, this is not standard protocol (234).
94. The omission of any exploration of why General Montague Winfield not only had a rookie (Captain Leidig) take over his role as the NMCC's

Director of Operations but also left him in charge after it was clear that the Pentagon was facing an unprecedented crisis (235-36).

95. The claim that the FAA (falsely) notified the Secret Service between 10:10 and 10:15 that Flight 93 was still up and headed towards Washington (237).

96. The claim that Vice President Cheney did not give the shoot-down authorization until after 10:10 (several minutes after Flight 93 had crashed) and that this authorization was not transmitted to the US military until 10:31 (237-41).

97. The omission of all the evidence indicating that Flight 93 was shot down by a military plane (238-39, 252-53).

98. The claim that Richard Clarke did not receive the requested shoot-down authorization until 10:25 (240).

99. The omission of Clarke's own testimony, which suggests that he received the shoot-down authorization by 9:50 (240).

100. The claim that Cheney did not reach the underground shelter (the PEOC [Presidential Emergency Operations Center]) until 9:58 (241-44).

101. The omission of multiple testimony, including that of Norman Mineta to the Commission itself, that Cheney was in the PEOC before 9:20 (241-44).

102. The claim that shoot-down authorization must be given by the president (245).

103. The omission of reports that Colonel Marr ordered a shoot-down of Flight 93 and that General Winfield indicated that he and others at the NMCC had expected a fighter jet to reach Flight 93 (252).

104. The omission of reports that there were two fighter jets in the air a few miles from NYC and three of them only 200 miles from Washington (251).

105. The omission of evidence that there were at least six bases with fighters on alert in the northeastern part of the United States (257-58).

106. The endorsement of General Myers' claim that NORAD had defined its mission in terms of defending only against threats from abroad (258-62).

107. The endorsement of General Myers' claim that NORAD had not recognized the possibility that terrorists might use hijacked airliners as missiles (262-63).

108. The failure to highlight the significance of evidence presented in the Report itself, and to mention other evidence, showing that NORAD had indeed recognized the threat that hijacked airliners might be used as missiles (264-67).

109. The failure to probe the issue of how the "war games" scheduled for that day were related to the military's failure to intercept the hijacked airliners (268-69).

110. The failure to discuss the possible relevance of Operation Northwoods to the attacks of 9/11 (269-71).

111. The claim---made in explaining why the military did not get information about the hijackings in time to intercept them---that FAA personnel inexplicably failed to follow standard procedures some 16 times (155-56, 157, 179, 180, 181, 190, 191, 193, 194, 200, 202-03, 227, 237, 272-75).

112. The failure to point out that the Commission's claimed "independence" was fatally compromised by the fact that its executive director, Philip Zelikow, was virtually a member of the Bush administration (7-9, 11-12, 282-84).

113. The failure to point out that the White House first sought to prevent the creation of a 9/11 Commission, then placed many obstacles in its path, including giving it extremely meager funding (283-85).

114. The failure to point out that the Commission's chairman, most of the other commissioners, and at least half of the staff had serious conflicts of interest (285-90, 292-95).

115. The failure of the Commission, while bragging that it presented its final report "without dissent," to point out that this was probably possible only because Max Cleland, the commissioner who was most critical of the White House and swore that he would not be part of "looking at information only partially," had to resign in order to accept a position with the Export-Import Bank, and that the White House forwarded his nomination for this position only after he was becoming quite outspoken in his criticisms (290-291).

I will close by pointing out that I concluded my study of what I came to call "the Kean-Zelikow Report" by writing that it, "far from lessening my suspicions about official complicity, has served to confirm them. Why would the minds in charge of this final report engage in such deception if they were not trying to cover up very high crimes?" (291)

David Ray Griffin is author of New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11 and The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions And Distortions.

11. The purpose of the Commission seemed to involve two major goals: 1) cover up any government involvement, highlighting only evidence of bureaucratic bungling and 2) serve as a platform for generating structural changes in centralization and empowerment of government intelligence and surveillance sources, in the name of solution and reform.

EVIDENCE POINTING TO GOVERNMENT ULTERIOR MOTIVES:

Preplanning for War:

CBS News reported that barely five hours after American Airlines Flight 77 plowed into the Pentagon, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld was telling his aides to come up with plans for striking Iraq even though there was no evidence linking Saddam Hussein to the attacks. Former Sec. of the Treasury, John O'Neil's told interviewers that Iraq was targeted for regime change prior to 9/11. Frontline Special told of a National Security Meeting where Sec. of Def Rumsfeld suggests we "use this attack as an excuse to go after Iraq." He is overruled by those who want to go after Afghanistan first.

The invasion of Afghanistan was being planned before 9-11. US diplomats announced at a meeting in Berlin in July 2001 that Bush would attack Afghanistan by October of that year.

<http://chicago.indymedia.org/newswire/display/4774> It must be noted that the governments web pages linked to in the Indymedia article have been removed. Many have charged that the real reasons for invading Afghanistan were to build the Unocal pipeline, which the Taliban were refusing, and to control APFN: "Meanwhile, from February through August, the entire time that the danger from bin Laden was the greatest, Bush was focusing most of his efforts on persuading the Taliban to allow him and his oil pals put a pipeline through Afghanistan. Bush wanted to swipe the oil-rich Caspian region from Russian control. Back when Bush thought he could cut a deal with the Taliban, he did not consider them "evil." In fact, back when he smelled an easy deal in the wind, Bush described the Taliban's repressive regime as "a source of stability in Central Asia" that would enable the construction of an oil pipeline. So, in Spring of 2001, in Texas oil wheeling-dealing style, Bush handed \$43 million in taxpayer dollars over to the Taliban to sweeten the pot. Still, however, there was no deal.

“Laila Helms, the niece of former CIA director Richard Helms, worked as a public relations coordinator for the Taliban at this time. According to Helms, the Taliban offered to turn over bin Laden or provide the coordinates of his whereabouts. However, apparently under Bush's orders, the State Department refused this deal —a deal that would have removed Bush's best trump terrorist card from his stacked deck. Instead, on August 2, State Department officials met with Taliban reps in Islamabad and there delivered this ultimatum: give us what we want for the oil companies and we will "carpet your with gold." If you don't, "we will bury you beneath a carpet of bombs." The Taliban still held out.”

Former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill recently caused a major flap stating early as January 2001, the Bush administration began looking for ways to justify an invasion of Iraq. O'Neill said, "From the very beginning, there was a conviction that Saddam Hussein is a bad person and that he needed to go," O'Neill told 60 Minutes. "From the very first instance, it was about Iraq. It was about what we can do to change this regime.

"In the 23 months I was there, I never saw anything that I would characterize as evidence of weapons of mass destruction. ... I never saw anything in the intelligence that I would characterize as real evidence."

The Bushies were quick to attack O'Neill, but ABC News has found another official that was also at the meetings that backs up O'Neill's claims.

The fact is, Cheney's Pentagon cabal cherry-picked intelligence, lied about it and stove-piped it to the Oval Office. They knew they had a president that hated to read and relied heavily on advisors...and totally gullible. That information was then refunneled to Congress and the world

as truth. Of course, all has proved false, just as I told Sierrareaders Afghanistan would be a quagmire and that we would be lied into a war with Iraq, just as Bush 41 did. I also said Iraq would be a Vietnam redux. Any honest vet that knows a damn about strategy and tactics has said the same. Just call us Cassandra.

Preplanning for enhanced government surveillance and incarceration powers

The all too sudden emergence of the USA PATRIOT ACT and its instant introduction in Congress paralleling the anthrax attacks (which had the markings of another black operation) indicates that this piece of legislation was prepared in advance. All the Bush administration needed was "another Pearl Harbor" –a reference that a couple of Neocon strategists have talked about. Both "Rebuilding America's Defenses," the Project for a New American Century's 2000 report, and "The Grand Chessboard," by insider Zbigniew Brzezinski, suggested that American public support for this worldwide intervention would depend on creating a new "Pearl Harbor." Indeed it did.

CONCLUSION: As the above listings show, taken in its totality, a group of Muslim terrorists would never be capable of pulling off this range of attacks, including the controlled demolition of major buildings. It had to have been planned and implemented from within government circles. ***The huge cover-up by a wide variety of US government agencies, working in direct collusion with the White House, is the strongest evidence for government complicity in these attacks.*** Why else would they be trying to keep all the details secret if it didn't point to American involvement at all levels. I don't believe however that Pres Bush directed this. He just reads the scripts given him. It is my conclusion that this was a black operation of the globalist controllers of the US government, in conjunction with the al Qaeda front, which the US still controls at the top. In turn, al Qaeda leaders develop their own anti-American forces who do NOT know they are actually working to further a secret agenda of the

Anglo-American establishment—that is kept from them. Terrorism and war have thus become instruments of conflict management, and political control.

More than oil, more than wealth, I believe the main long-term agenda of the globalists controlling the Bush administration is the destruction of American sovereignty and replacing it with a global government—through the instrumentality of war and conflict, as justification. 9/11 was a “**new Pearl Harbor**” and is being used for maximum effect, to both undermine US and British constitutional civil rights, but to actively antagonize the world by constant intervention. That "Rebuilding America's Defenses," the Project for a New American Century's 2000 report, and "The Grand Chessboard," a book published a few years earlier by Trilateral Commission co-founder Zbigniew Brzezinski, both recommended a more robust and imperial US military presence in the oil basin of the Middle East and the Caspian region; and that both also suggested that American public support for this energy crusade would depend on public response to a new "Pearl Harbor," is not "theory."

Sadly, many officials in the US and Britain, including legislators and judges, are knowingly or partially knowing accomplices (even if by backing a hidden political control system they may think is “benevolent”). In the end they are clearly working against their sworn oath to their respective constitutions, nations and constituencies. [END]

STRANGE ANOMALIES

1. 15 or the 19 alleged Arab hijackers of 9/11 came from Saudi Arabia and yet the administration insisted on invading Afghanistan and the Taliban, whom they had given \$43 million in aid in May 2001
2. There is evidence military aircraft were prohibited by higher authority from taking off and intercepting the hijacking aircraft aimed at the WTC

and the Pentagon. Only interceptors from further away were allowed to continue limited intercepts, at subsonic speeds (so they would not reach the planes that crashed, in time)

3. The President was alerted to the first WTC crash before he began his reading session at the elementary school, and did not stop his reading after he was informed of the second attack.

4. The bulging modification on the belly of the aircraft that hit WTC-2. Video of the Boeing 767 crashing into WTC-2 shows a large and disturbing modification on the bottom side of the United Airlines Flight 175 aircraft. The aircraft almost missed its target and the person directing the aircraft made a dramatic last minute steep turn to intercept the corner of the building. In the process of the steep turn the bottom of the aircraft suddenly becomes visible in the low morning sun and reveals a very large and bulging modification on the right side of the fuselage behind the landing gear doors. The bulge is as wide as the wing root, so it is easy to detect. : <http://www.thoughtcrimenews.com/wtc.htm>. This site contains some very speculative conspiracy theories that should be viewed with extreme caution for now. Also, the computer enhanced photos do not come from the new Hlava video but from the original CNN video of the crash. You can see a video clip of the original CNN footage by using opening a video player like windows Media Player and on "open URL" under File and putting in the URL: <http://www.serendipity.li/wot/wmv/ghostplane2.wmv>. The bulge is visible on this earlier video as well, proving that the bulge is not simply a doctored image by one source.

5. As in OKC, government ordered all WTC debris removed immediately before forensic testing could be accomplished.

6. A memo has surfaced from within the FAA indicating that hijacker Satam al-Suqami (hard to imagine how they could know his name) had a gun on the aircraft and shot and killed passenger Daniel Lewin in the process of hijacking the aircraft. The FAA initially denied the memo's existence, and then admitted its existence, but altered its contents, denying the presence of a gun on board. Anonymous investigators within the FAA have admitted that the original memo detailing the shooting is

factual. This information could only have come from detailed pilot to ATC controller radio transmissions as the hijacking was in process. This partially explains why the FAA and FBI refuse to relinquish these tape recordings.

7. If al Qaeda is the largest and most well-funded terrorist organization in the world with hundreds of terrorist cells in the US and Canada, why have there been NO normal terrorist attacks (car bombings, suicide bombings, electrical pylon bombings etc?) in the US since 9/11 - the kind that cannot be stopped? We have nearly open borders, and we have no detailed protection against any of these easy targets. Instead, all we get is one or two high profile attacks. The government dubiously claims "we have them on the run." However, even in Israel with 10 times the security forces per person that we have, and with security guards at every store and shopping mall, they have weekly terrorist attacks. Something is wrong with this picture.

8. Government claims that all the aluminum skin of the 757 hitting the Pentagon was consumed (their explanation of lack of aircraft debris), and yet photos of debris being removed show mounds of office furniture, only one set of wheels and one engine core turbine part. No wing beams or other huge structural members that would have remained from a large aircraft.

9. In addition, government claims to have identified all passengers and military dead in the Pentagon crash by DNA, without showing how they gained access to a provable original source of DNA for those already dead (very difficult to do). The FBI failed to explain why there were no matches to terrorist DNA even though they claimed to have matches for terrorist body parts at the WTC (equally suspicious).

COMPARISON WITH COVER-UPS DURING OTHER INVESTIGATIONS

OKC BOMBING: The FBI has already demonstrated a propensity to alter and hide evidence in politically charged cases. They did so in the OKC investigation, working overtime to make it appear as McVeigh and Nichols acted alone, even though there were numerous Middle Eastern accomplices seen by numerous witnesses, and known to the FBI who refused to allow them to appear before the grand jury.

Additional anomalies: forewarnings to federal judges and agents not to show up for work, TV clips of fed. Agents discussing multiple bombs in the buildings being disarmed, seismic readings showing two distinct explosions, damage evidence of point charges on pillars of the Murray Bldg, and confiscated surveillance videos showing the explosion, which the Fed government refuses to release.

TWA 800 crash: Over a hundred witnesses saw two or more missiles in flight. They were threatened, bribed and coerced into silence. Their testimony was disregarded. Cockpit data and flight recorders from

flight 800 were found the first day by special Navy divers. They were altered, and then put back into the sea for later retrieval. Clinton Executive order removed whistleblower protections from this group of Navy Divers to ensure they wouldn't talk. FBI and CIA took control of the investigation from the NTSB, corrupted the evidence (removed all recovered plane parts that showed evidence of a missile strike) and concocted a fuel tank explosion scenario so bizarre that it took a \$2 million computer generated reenactment to make this story half-way believable to a gullible public.

TOUGH INTERVIEW QUESTIONS beyond the forgoing issues:

For **FBI director Mueller** or other key White House counter terrorism officials:

1. Why did the FBI close their files in Mid 1996 (marked Secret and coded 199) to investigate two of Osama bin Laden's relatives in Washington and a Muslim organisation, the World Assembly of Muslim Youth? {Khalid Al-Midhar and Nawaq Alhazm}
2. What did you decide after the French Secret Service told you in August 2001, that Zacarias Massoui might be involved in a hijack of a commercial passenger jet?
3. Why did George W. Bush stop inquiries into the terrorist connections of the Bin Laden family in early 2001?
4. Did your agency receive any reports about the following contacts with Mohammad Atta, or someone arrested by that name? a) searched for using an expired visa, b) driving without a license in Broward County, c) searched after an incident at Miami Airport.
5. Who made the decision to encourage AGent John O'Neill to stop investigating Al- Qa'aida's accounts? How did he come to be the security director at the World Trade Center, just before 9/11 resulting in his death?
6. Can you explain, why some media reports said, that two of the hijackers had bought tickets for flights scheduled after the Sept. 11 attacks?
7. Can you explain, why Ahmed Alghamdi, who was supposedly on the United Airlines plane that hit the World Trade Center, had also purchased tickets for a flight the next day from Dulles Airport in Washington D.C. to Saudi Arabia?
8. Why none of the 19 hijackers appeared on the passenger lists? Why do you not revise your lists now that you have admitted there were errors in putting out the list.
9. How do you know these were no aliases being used by others?

10. Can you explain, why the so called professional hijackers used credit cards with their correct names, and allowed drivers licenses with photos to be photocopied?
11. Which passport of the hijackers did you find in the rubble of the WTC and who found it at what time?
12. Did you just go through the passenger lists culling out the Muslim-sounding names and labeling the people bearing those names as hijackers? How do you explain the fact that there were no other Muslim passengers on the planes that were not hijackers?
13. Can you explain, why Mohammad Atta left his bag at the airport with the employees, or why they didn't put it on the plane? Who found the bag and how were you sure it was his?
14. Can you explain, why Mohammad Atta did put a video "how to fly planes", an uniform and his last will into his bag, knowing that he will commit suicide anyway? Can you explain, why Mohammad Atta did leave his drivers license in a rental car?
15. How did you know to storm the Westin Hotel in Boston on September 12th and that the hijackers were staying there? Can you explain, why the hijacker's accomplices were still waiting in that Hotel and how you determined who they were and details such as their specific pizza order, and their napping habits?
16. If the FBI was so incompetent prior to 9/11 how did you do all this magic investigations in 29 hours after the initial attack?
17. Why did the FBI ignore other ties of Bin Ladens family, who later were allowed to leave the United States without further investigations when normal American's were banned from flying? (including Sheik Bakr Mohammed bin Laden, Mohammed M. bin Laden)
18. What do you know about these other hijackers identities who are still alive and can you explain why most of them are actual commercial pilots, who wouldn't have need training in Cessnas?

19. What do you know about the current whereabouts of Said Bahaji, who was claimed to buy the tickets for some of the hijackers?

20. Can you explain why eye-witness Madeline Amy Sweeney described how hijackers stabbed passengers and then diverted the plane and why The FBI has named five hijackers on board Flight 11, whereas Ms Sweeney spotted only four. Also, the seat numbers she gave were different from those registered in the hijackers' names?

21. Whatever happened with Lotfi Raissi who was arrested in UK for teaching the terrorist pilots?

JOHN KAMINSKI questions:

Why did FBI director Robert Mueller say very publicly to the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco that nothing on paper connected Arab terrorists to 9/11? I mean, two and half years have passed. And the feds produced 19 names within 72 hours of the disaster. Notice a mathematical inconsistency here?

Seven or eight of the names on that original list have been found living comfortably in other countries. Why hasn't the FBI made any attempt to correct the errors made on that original list? See for yourself.

<http://members.fortunecity.com/911/september-eleven/hijackers-alive.htm>

and <http://www.welfarestate.com/911/>

We have Marvin Bush sitting suspiciously on the board of directors of the security company that had the contract for the Twin Towers.

We have Larry Silverstein, who conveniently leased and insured the towers shortly before the big hits, telling officials to "pull" a relatively intact tower, which then fell identically to the two structures that were

struck by airplanes, creating the impression that that's the way all three came down.

We have billions of dollars of windfall profits made by savvy investors in the days before 9/11, and an FBI investigation that insists nothing was amiss with these spectacular deals. Of course, we don't get the

details. Only "assurances" that the trades were not suspicious, despite patterns and results that were unprecedented in the entire history of financial trading.

We have reports from firemen of explosions at the base of the Twin Towers BEFORE they fell, and the seismographic evidence to back up these assertions.

We have leader after leader saying they didn't know such a thing could happen when the government had been studying the problem for ten years. It had held at least two major drills simulating such a possibility.

And we have a president sitting in a ghetto classroom in Florida, at possibly the most pivotal moment in American history, pretending to read a book that he was holding upside down.

Perhaps most tellingly of all, we have the tragic tale of John O'Neill, rabidly honest FBI investigator, prevented from following his leads about Osama bin Laden because of the danger he would have discovered the links from Afghanistan back to CIA headquarters. Just review the way he was

prevented from conducting his probe of the Cole bombing, and prevented by digging into other leads by the same guys - namely insiders Louis Freeh and Thomas Picard - who prevented significant reports from other FBI agents from seeing the light of day.

For **George Tenet**, CIA:

1. Can you confirm as dailynews yahoo reported, that you already started to monitor Osama bin Laden in 1998 with the help of 15 afghan agents, who got paid \$1,000 a month? Can you tell us something about the whereabouts of this agents?

2. Are any of these afghan agent also members of the ISI?

3. When was the first time you mentioned an Al-Qa'aida group to any member of the Senate? In other words, why did not Al Qa'aida figure prominently in any briefings before 9/11?

4. Why is it that of all the leaks you have reported from supposed 9/11 mastermind Khalid Sheik Mohammed, none have confirmed or addressed the issue of where they really received the sophisticated flight training necessary to pilot these aircraft to their targets?

5. Why, after almost a year in your custody, as you claim, have no charges be brought against Muhammed in any court of justice?

For Deutschebank-Alex Brown

1. Who was the investor who purchased 2,000 United Airlines (UAL) put option contracts between August 8th, 2001 and September 11th, 2001? Did you or do you own any stocks of UA, AA, Merrill Lynch, Morgan Stanley, AXA Re (insurance) which owns 25% of American Airlines, and Munich Re.?

2. What can you say about 2,500 UA-contracts which were "split into 500 chunks each, directing each order to different U.S. exchanges around the country simultaneously." on August 10th, 2001? Did you purchase UAL options in August 2001? Is it correct that you purchased 4,744 put options on United Air Lines stock as opposed to only 396 call between September 6th and September 7th, 2001? What was your intention of doing that?

3. What is your connection to Wally Kromgaard who purchased 4,516 put options on American Airlines as compared to 748 call options on September 10th, 2001?

MORE QUESTIONS BY PROTESTORS OF 9/11 COMMISSION

1. Who is Osama Bin Laden?

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO109C.html>

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO110A.html>

2. Who created and funded the Al Qaeda Network?

<http://www.communitycurrency.org/vital.html>

3. What is the relationship between Bin Laden, his family, the Carlyle Group and the Bush family?

http://www.copvicia.com/stories/sept_2001/bushbin.html

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/LAZ112A.html>

http://www.guerrillanews.com/counter_intelligence/doc233.html

http://www.guerrillanews.com/counter_intelligence/235.html

<http://www.truthout.com/0662.Bush.Saudi.htm>

<http://www.bushnews.com/bushmoney.htm>

http://www.americanfreedomnews.com/afn_articles/bushsecrets.htm

<http://www.truthout.com/01.11F.Arms.Carlyle.htm>

4. Why were no fighter planes dispatched to intercept the four hijacked planes on September 11th?

<http://www.nypress.com/14/50/taki/bunker.cfm>

<http://emperors-clothes.com/indict/indict-1.htm>

<http://emperors-clothes.com/indict/indict-2.htm>

<http://emperor.vwh.net/indict/urgent.htm>

<http://emperors-clothes.com/indict/indict-3.htm>

5. Who actually was in control of the "hijacked planes"?

<http://www.cyberspaceorbit.com/engt.htm>

<http://geocities.com/mknemesis/homerun.html>

6. What role did Pakistani Intelligence play on September 11th?

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO111A.html>

7. Did the CIA have foreknowledge of the attack, who tried to profit with put options on American, United, Merrill Lynch... stock just before the attack?

http://www.copvcia.com/stories/oct_2001/krongard.html

<http://www.independent.co.uk/story.jsp?story=99402>

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/FLO112B.html>

-[Someone with considerable financial resources, and foreknowledge of the terrorist event, put stock options "against" the airlines that were to explode that week of 9-11. - INSIDER TRADING PROFITS from 9-11 were reported by the US media when they thought it was Arab terrorists . . . but then the story mysteriously died. Then the UK Independent revealed that it leads to a firm chaired by the 3rd highest man in the CIA (and stranger still is that \$2.5 million of the "winnings" are still unclaimed (see below for URL to entire story).

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/RUP110A.html> .

Info confirmed by Independent Newspaper in UK:

[http://www.independent.co.uk/story.jsp?story=99402\]](http://www.independent.co.uk/story.jsp?story=99402)

8. Why were the FBI told to not investigate the Bin Laden family links in the US?

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/BBC111A.html>

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/HIN111A.html>

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/MAR111A.html>

-Ministers of Commerce and Energy, Donald Evans and Stanley Abraham worked for Tom Brown, another oil giant.

[BBC interview on the above issue: - The Bush Administration forced the FBI to back off of the Bin Laden investigation months before 9-11.

Source: BBC transcript BUSH ? BIN LADEN HIDDEN AGENDA!

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/events/newnight/newsid_1645000/1645527.stm\]](http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/events/newnight/newsid_1645000/1645527.stm)

9. If the CIA met with Bin Laden last July, why didn't they try to arrest him?

- CIA Station Chief in Dubai met with Bin Laden only 7 weeks before 9-11 took place, yet they did not try to apprehend him, only met with him. - The CIA station chief in Dubai met with Bin Laden 7 weeks before 9-11, and at a time when Bin Laden was supposedly "wanted" by the CIA.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/waronterror/story/0,1361,584444,00.html>•(English) <http://www.orf.at/orfon/011031-44569/index.html><http://globalresearch.ca/articles/RIC111B.html>

10. If the US is serious about ridding the world of terrorism, why do we continue to fund and train terrorists?

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/PAS111A.html>

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/MAR111A.html>

ONE DEFECTOR WITNESS OF GOVERNMENT CONSPIRACY IN 9/11

— Unverifiable source by John Quinn of TopView software—who appears to be very credible.

"The Enemy Is Very Much Within"

AF Intel Source: pro-Bush Government Factions 'Absolutely' Behind Tuesday's Mass Devastation!

By TOP_VIEW (John Quinn)

TOP_VIEW has just conducted a brief yet immeasurably important phone interview -- set up by a trusted and totally reliable intermediary already known to us -- with an Air Force intelligence specialist. The interview was carried out this evening, over two days after the incredible death and devastation that took place in New York City and Washington D.C. Our Air Force source told us his superiors had activated him at about 10 AM Tuesday morning.

He absolutely refused to permit us to record the conversation, even though he was speaking into some kind of electronic gizmo that substantially altered the sound of his voice; making him sound like Darth Vader with a serious chest cold. If his identity where ever to become known he would be instantly executed by any number of Government Intelligent Agencies. Some portions of his statements were unintelligible, and he refused to repeat several of these.

Although this source was somewhat taciturn and close-lipped, for the most part he was cooperative in terms of giving us enough time to transcribe what he was saying. Overall what is stated plainly and unequivocally is of absolutely paramount importance for every single person in this nation and the world: certainly among those of us who value our inalienable human rights and liberties and want them to remain un-imperiled, un-abrogated and unabridged.

TOP_VIEW: We'd like to hear what you have to say about the events on Tuesday. First of all, I assume you have knowledge of the events that

goes above and beyond what the public is being told by the media and the government?

Intel source: That's quite correct.

TOP_VIEW: Can you -- are you able and willing to relay this information to us?

Intel source: Well, that depends. Some of it. You're going to publish this?

TOP_VIEW: On the Internet.

Intel source: It's essential that nothing which could possibly be used to identify myself or "***" (our intermediary) is made public.

TOP_VIEW: We totally understand. Completely. That's exactly how it will be, and --Intel source: You've known "***" a long time?

TOP_VIEW: For about 6 years, sir.

Intel source: So... he'll vouch for you? (Chuckles) Fire away.

TOP_VIEW: Well... it's becoming increasingly clear that certain federal government sectors had prior knowledge of the destruction carried out on Tuesday. Would you concur with this?

Intel source: (mumbles.....Yes)

TOP_VIEW: Excuse me? I didn't understand you.

Intel source: Never mind.

TOP_VIEW: Is it true that our Government knew what was going to happen?

Intel source: You could say that. Actually there are certain (pause) groups in our government who pretty much ran the whole show.

TOP_VIEW: Are you saying that there was cooperation and collaboration between elements of our government and the perpetrators?

Intel source: No. What I'm saying is that these groups (within the Federal Government - TV) were the perpetrators of the action, right down the line from top to bottom.

TOP_VIEW: This is really incredibly shocking, what you're saying here. Did I understand correctly, that you say elements of the federal government were the prime force behind these so-called terrorist attacks Tuesday?

Intel source: That's correct. Absolutely. As before.....

TOP_VIEW: God, what a horrifying thing to come to grips with! What is your feeling about this sir, and exactly why are you even talking to us about this? Are you positive about what you're saying? What...? As before.....? What do you mean?

Intel source: (laughs) What should I answer first? I would never make this kind of statement without being fully certain it was factual. My own feeling is that it's completely sickening. It's repugnant and unacceptable and I'm completely opposed to what was done. But it's true and we all have to deal with it. There are forces within our Government who are completely determined to change the structure of our society at the

most basic level, and these are the kind of things they're going to be doing to make sure that (fundamental changes in our society) happens. They have an office in the basement of the White House....but that's just one of many. Before....? Oh yea.....remember that young man that was executed a few months ago????

TOP_VIEW: Tim...Oklahoma, then?

Intel source: Yes.....OKC. Same scenario, several other agencies involved, as well.

TOP VIEW: That is almost beyond comprehension.....but you know that I think about it, it all makes sense. Pause....What's going on in the military right now with regard to what's occurred? Do many military higher-ups know this, and if so what's their position?

Intel source: (mutters....of course they do, most at least)

TOP_VIEW: Excuse me?

Intel source: I said some do know and some don't. Some wouldn't believe it, just like many citizens wouldn't believe it. There are certainly lots of conflict going on at the upper levels of the military right now between people aware of the true facts.

[How to Analyze the News](#)

World Affairs Brief, February, 2010 Copyright Joel Skousen. Partial quotations with attribution permitted. Cite source as Joel Skousen's World Affairs Brief (<http://www.worldaffairsbrief.com>).

HOW TO ANALYZE THE NEWS AND WHAT GOES ON AROUND YOU

Critical analysis of current events is a complex process that is not systematized or rigid. All the information you see or gather is, generally, a combination of truth, half-truths, and error. Filtering out the truth begins with finding reliable sources, as well as critically scrutinizing sources that are known to have a specific bias.

Reliable Sources: No journalist or historian bases his writings on original material, except when relating what he or she personally experiences. This world is much too big with much too much going on for anyone to directly witness anything but a small fraction of life's happenings. Thus, we all have to rely on sources of information. As all of my readers know, most of the world has become heavily reliant upon the **establishment media**. People are busy, with little time to study and analyze current events. So they scan the front page each day, or watch the TV evening news, relying on these easy, quick sound bites to "inform" them about the world.

Almost everyone who gets this minimum dose of daily news thinks that they know what is going on in the world. **This is not so**, even though the media rarely tells an outright lie. What writers and editors do is purposefully omit key pieces of information that would significantly change people's opinion about what is being presented. This brings up the first rule in finding reliable sources. Search for someone who is **skeptical of the official version**, and who searches out key information that has been withheld by establishment sources.

It is fascinating to see how uniform the evening news is. No matter which channel you turn to, the same stories appear with the same general emphasis, even with regard to local stories. A common illusion today is that **Fox News** is significantly more conservative than the other big three networks. Not so. Fox is merely playing the role of the pro-government cheerleader, just like CNN did during the Gulf War, when it came out of obscurity to become an instant major player. That never happens without government ties. Meanwhile, the other three majors are doing their part. They criticize the current administration mildly, sufficient to appear as the opposition. In reality, however, they are part of the same machine designed to protect any insider administration, whether Democratic or Republican, from its strongest critics on the constitutional right. They

make sure they keep the most damaging evidences of conspiracy out of the public eye.

Virtually every major metropolitan area in the US has a major liberal, establishment newspaper which promotes this hidden agenda. In turn, every state of the Union is more or less controlled by the concentration of voters in liberal metro areas. Even though most states have a sizeable body of rural conservatives, their voice is rarely heard at the polls.

The one thing you can **learn from the controlled media**, including arch liberal newspapers like the Washington Post, NY Times, and LA Times, is the direction in which the conspiracy against liberty is going. I spend about a third of my time watching what the opposition does. When they start uniformly promoting certain issues in all the establishment journals (global warming, smart growth, gun control, etc.), it is obvious that there is some coordination going on. But remember, you can only learn to see through the selectively filtered news dispensed by the establishment media if you have other sources that feed you the missing pieces.

So where do you look for good alternative news sources? First off, **don't believe everything on the Internet**. Just because an alternative news source appears anti-establishment does not mean it is honest or a true advocate for liberty. Some of the most pernicious perveyors of disinformation are new outfits like the EU Times, that has no physical presence anywhere, or the mysterious untraceable Sorcha Faal, a pseudonym for a disinformation outfit that claims to have Russian sources. Conservatives tend to fall for all things Russian, as if they know everything. That perhaps explains the sudden inroads Russia Today television has made into the conservative community. They love to give voice to every conspiracy that comes around and conservatives fall for it. However, all the media coming out of Russia is still controlled by the KGB, and Russia Today is no exception.

Then there are the shysters, too many to list, who make up bizzare claims out of thin air that talk with supposed first hand knowledge about secret tunnels criss-crossing the continent connecting secret bases with aliens leaders. There are those who make up stories about defeating the globalist conspiracy by claims that opposing military forces are blowing up

the elites bunkers with nuclear weapons or using special financial structures to take back control from the elite. Benjamin Fulford and Lee Emil Wanta are two of the most notorious pushing these phoney claims about beating back the elite.

Many of the most well known and well funded alternative news media outlets come from a Leftist slant, such as Anti-war.com or Counterpunch.com. Oddly enough, this does not mean that these sites are the most dangerous opponents to liberty. Even though I reject the Left's brand of socialism, many have recently become allies in the fight to ferret out useful information on the betrayal of US interests by the Bush and Obama administrations (which the left correctly believes is engaging in illegal and unconstitutional intrusions into fundamental rights. Sadly, neither of these sites will countenance any talk of conspiracy. They censored the column of Paul Craig Roberts when he tried to bring up some of the evidence in 9/11 pointing to government involvement.

Also on the Left but appearing to cater to the right is the Lyndon LaRouche crowd which publishes the Executive Intelligence Review. LaRouche wormed his way into conservative circles by attacking Jane Fonda and the environmentalists. But LaRouche's background is socialist. He has long had ties with the Socialist International, which fronts for Moscow. I believe much of his sources for his EIR magazine come from the KGB. His wife has been a member of the Communist Party according to European sources. LaRouche worships FDR, so you know he's no conservative. He mostly attack the US government as a representative of greedy capitalism--a typical socialist position. While there is much truth to corporate America being in bed with government, he fails to attack or see the globalist agenda that is behind this crony capitalism. Webster Tarpley is a devotee of LaRouche and is often featured on the Alex Jones show, to the dismay of his more savvy listeners. All of Tarpley's solutions are socialist as well.

There are many that claim to be on the conservative side that are actually shilling for government. Some of them are sincere but blind, while others are manipulated by their hidden funding sources. **Newsmax.com**, for example, is funded in part by establishment insiders like Richard Mellon Scaife, and is predictably and unabashedly uncritical of nearly

everything that President Bush did. Chris Ruddy, who runs Newsmax, should know better after publishing a book on the evidence surrounding the Vince Foster murder. But he was strangely silent about the evils and deceptions of the Bush administration. **WorldNetDaily.com** is much better, but it still puts out occasion garbage. **NewsWithViews.com** is the site I think shows the best judgment about a broad range of issues and isn't afraid to touch upon responsible views about conspiracy.

The **Washington Times**, owned by the Mooneys, is pro-Bush and pro-war to a fault, and never even allows a hint of conspiracy issues or evidence to surface in its articles. Its sister publication, **Insight Magazine**, seems to be a bit more independent and rigorous. Insight does some first class investigative reporting, but still holds back on criticizing the neocon agenda. I've always suspected that the Mooneys, with their seemingly bottomless pit of money, are fronting for a government organization, perhaps the CIA. The dark side of the US government is expert in funding both sides of the political spectrum, thus controlling both sides.

The establishment has also secretly funded or taken over most conservative **talk radio stations**. Rush Limbaugh was "turned" early on. He was rewarded with millions in salary increases. I knew when it happened. He suddenly switched from open discussion of conspiracy issues to deriding and denigrating anyone who called in expressing thoughts on conspiracy. Now, there are very few truly independent, conservative voices on talk radio left. Almost all radio stations in the country are owned by one of the four or five major broadcast companies like Clear Channel, Citadel, Cumulous, and Intercom. Slowly, the most hard-hitting and independent conservative talk show hosts are being pushed out or fired. Even Christian radio stations are letting go of hosts who dare challenge President a neocon Republican like George Bush or Rick Perry---the newest Bush clone sent in to fool conservatives.

The meteoric rise of Glenn Beck provided conservatives an new champion to replace the compromised Rush Limbaugh. But Beck too has been a disappointment. I don't believe he is a government shill like Limbaugh, Hannity and O'Reilly, who show their true colors by visiously attacking anyone getting close to the issue of conspiracy. Beck is a true conservative who loves the constitution and champions the views of my

uncle W. Cleon Skousen. But Beck also has a major weaknesses. He's got a bruising ego, he's heresistant to correction, and has a brain that won't slow down enough to be careful. He often goes beyond the mark which makes him an easy target of criticism. But my biggest concern about Beck is that he early on got on the wrong side of conspiracy and won't consider all of the credible evidence that 9/11 was an inside job. That's a bit ironic since Beck clearly believes there is a globalist conspiracy to take down American sovereignty--he just won't consider the wider ramification of the powerful forces controlling both political parties and the media. Beck is just too bull headed to take an honest look at the best 9/11 evidence and change his mind. Neither does his cocky, shoot-from-the-hip manner lend itself to thoughtful introspection. I'm not impressed with his new internet TV channel, and especially unimpressed by his militaristic side-kicks that keep goading him in the wrong direction.

To me, the betrayal of liberty and constitutional principles by both Republican and Democratic leaders has become so open and blatant, that anyone claiming to be a champion of liberty can no longer stand with the mainstream Republicans, at least unconditionally. This is a key litmus test of whether or not you can trust sources who claim to be conservative. All of the major Christian leaders who support the mainstream Republicans unconditionally are either willfully blind or sold out to the lure of popular appeal. They know that to criticize a Republican president is to court financial disaster with their untutored congregations. Still, there are a few on the Christian right who have the courage to criticize a Republican administration that betrays principle. The most consistently insightful Christian critic of the Bush administration was Pastor Chuck Baldwin. He is still telling it like it is and worth listening to on www.chuckbaldwinlive.com.

On the Left, the **CIA directly cultivates journalists** who can be relied on to publish key leaks and slanted information—a practice that is illegal but done anyway. Some journalists, I am told, are even on secret monthly retainers. One thing you can count on. There isn't a single investigative journalist who regularly comes out with blockbuster revelations from inside government, who isn't on the receiving end of regular, purposeful, government leaks. There are even a few legitimate conservatives on the right like Bill Gertz of the Washington Times that receive leaks from

sources in government. However, these sources only leak information confirming and supporting the neocon justifications for war and intervention. It is strange that we rarely see any whistleblowers emerge from the CIA anymore. The dark side has apparently eliminated all opposition within that agency. The FBI still has a few that break ranks, but since the Justice Department refuses to give them a hearing, I think any others contemplating blowing the whistle will decide instead to remain silent or resign.

This much is for sure. No truly patriotic CIA agent or FBI agent is allowed to **leak critical information about illegal government activities or conspiracy for long**. Every telephone of every journalist in the world is tapped. Government always knows who is leaking to journalists. Only the unauthorized ones are hunted down and roused out of the government, and are often prosecuted like criminals by federal agencies eager to discredit and silence them. Dozens of whistleblowing agents from all federal agencies are languishing in US federal prisons on trumped up charges.

In a similar vein, watch out for the many up-and-coming "private" **intelligence sources**, like **Stratfor.com**, **Debka.com** or **Geostrategy-Direct**. When organizations with a world-wide intelligence reach suddenly appear out of nowhere, with no substantial traceable sources of funding, you can be assured they are almost always tapping into government sources. Stratfor was started by a college professor, and almost at its inception had an instant worldwide presence of top notch economic and geo-political intelligence. The analyses on that site are suspiciously skewed along lines that would mask the real motives behind world events. Debka.com is run by an Israeli business journalist who openly admitted to me that his sources are all government insiders. The trouble with that kind of arrangement is that a one or two man shop, even if sincere, can't possibly check up on whether they are being fed disinformation or not. Sometimes they can tell, but usually they cannot.

Another example is the **Northeast Intelligence Network (NEIN)**, which also claims to know too much for a group that is truly private—especially one that claims to be on the right side of the political spectrum (which is

specifically excluded from true insider information). In making warnings about terrorism, this outfit claims to have analyzed thousands of telephone intercepts. No private source has access to this kind of information. Either they are making it up or they are tapping into government intelligence directly, which makes them no more private than government covert mercenary corporations like DynCorp, MPRI, and Vinelli. Yes, NEIN may have a few military types who feed them information. I too have a few who occasionally let me in on what they observe, none of which is specifically classified or illegal to disclose. However, no one in the military leaking the kind of info NEIN publishes can do so regularly without being caught—especially when NEIN has an internet presence that openly publishes these claims. In like manner, I have long warned about former "insiders" **Al Martin** and **Sherman Skolnick**. They both claimed more than they could have known without having government sources feeding them.

Insider connected corporations and wealthy individuals also control **think tanks** on both the right and the left. The **Hoover Institution**, **American Enterprise Institute**, and **National Review**, even though they have done good research in the past, have become shells for neo-conservative globalist intervention. The **Heritage Foundation** used to be really conservative and hard hitting until it started to receive funding from establishment sources. Now it is relatively benign. Rarely does it criticize a Republican administration. The only exception to the corruption by funding trend has been the libertarian **Cato Institute**. Despite receiving major funding from establishment sources, it still resists control, and has not strayed far from its libertarian roots - except that it will never accuse the government of conspiracy. That seems to be the universal requirement for keeping an organization on the hook for establishment funding and free from establishment attacks. No one is allowed to play with the majors if they present evidence of conspiracy.

On the left, we still have with us organizations that grew out of Communist or Marxist influence within tax exempt foundations. Early on, the left targeted and gained control of the Carnegie, Brookings, and Ford Foundations. Even younger foundations like the Wallace, MacArthur, and Pew Charitable Trust are run with a liberal agenda. Some, like the Rand

Corporation, Wackenhut Corrections and BCCI, are suspected of being outright government operations, dressed in civilian garb.

Then there are the traditional globalist organizations like the **CFR**, **Trilateral Commission** and **Aspen Institute**. Although each of these organizations takes great pains to include in their membership up and coming middle-of-the-roaders, along with a few unthinking conservatives, to mask their hidden agenda, it is my opinion that these organizations are where the really dangerous people, who actively work toward the subversion of American constitutional sovereignty, congregate. Keep an eye on the top leaders of these organizations. I have noted that since the Iraq war, the media regularly calls upon spokesmen from the CFR much more frequently than in prior years. It seems the media is no longer afraid of conservatives who view the CFR as a subversive organization. It's now very much in the mainstream consciousness of Americans and given a positive, authoritative reputation.

Education and Experience: I don't accept anything in the news at face value without comparing it to what I already know is true. The greater the body of true knowledge that you possess, the easier it is to see fallacies and falsehoods. The more shallow your store of "facts" and true experiences, the harder it is to scrutinize new information, especially when it falls outside your limited area of expertise or experience. Those who come from a home where learning is a continuing affair enriched by good books and alternative news, and not confined to television and establishment schools exclusively, have a head start in this process. In public schools students develop a body of "knowledge" in the social sciences and historical areas that is politically skewed and largely distorted. Because these "truths" are repeated by everyone and assumed true, even good people can sometimes become resistant to changing their minds. All of you who have tried to introduce others to evidence of conspiracy and corruption in government know what I mean.

Regardless of your background, the best way to become a critical thinker is to start reading **argument-oriented commentaries** on various subjects. The best source of such commentaries is transcripts of debates where contrasting presentations are given on two opposing issues,

followed by a counter to each view and lastly a counter to the counter. That's what it takes to really see error. States that publish voter pamphlets often use this format for initiatives. Also, the Foundation for Economic Education (FEE) each month publishes "**Ideas on Liberty**," a collection of confrontational essays directly countering bad ideas in economics, law and politics. It makes for stimulating reading, and is not difficult to understand. See www.fee.org on the web.

Personal experience in various aspects of life can also be an analytical tool. Often, my ability to see something false in a statement by government is due to my understanding of how government works, not only because of my political science training, but also due to my experience working in Washington, DC and in the military. The most valuable type of experience is not obvious, however. Sometimes it's more important to be able to figure out what CAN'T be known so that you can detect sources that are lying. Having had a "top secret" clearance myself, and having also done FOIA searches to try to penetrate the wall of government secrecy (often used improperly to cover for illegal acts), I have a pretty good idea of what secrets one can and cannot get access to, without being a "deep cover" disinformation agent. This kind of experiential knowledge is especially useful in identifying gaps and falsehoods in alternative news and private intelligence analysis.

Common knowledge about how life works is also essential to see through pie-in-the-sky and too-good-to-be-true claims and schemes. One of the best ways to gain this kind of experience is to be determined to become **well rounded** in life, both in skills and in knowledge. You have to go out of your way to do so, as the world demands ever more *specialization*. Yes, everyone has to specialize in something to set themselves somewhat apart from others in the job market, but that shouldn't stop you from using your spare time to learn a little about a lot of other things. Self learning through books is the most economical way to do this. Even if your children don't go to college, make sure they learn enough about practical physics, electricity, chemistry, and other fields so they can make intelligent choices in life.

For example, I took several shop classes in high school as electives, and found that I thoroughly enjoyed building things and working with my

hands. I knew I should pursue a different field in order to make a living, but I intuitively knew these skills were also essential in life, especially for a family man. Later, in college, I continued to expand my skills in the manual trades with classes on welding, construction, and machining. I also tried to become well-rounded in technical and professional knowledge. I studied economics, law, political science, social science, psychology and philosophy—the good and the bad in each field. The bad was what college provided; the good had to be ferreted out on my own. Most everything I learned in the social sciences in college was junk. However, being confronted with falsehoods and having to search for truth (on my own time) was invaluable.

If you have gained a broad generalist background in the sciences, and know how the natural world works, you can often spot flaws in the growing number of phony scientific claims that abound on the internet, like man-made global warming. Even if you can't see through a particular suspicious claim, at least you can seek help from others more knowledgeable and usually understand their response. We are constantly bombarded by people pushing get-rich-quick schemes, free energy schemes, and bizarre scientific claims about doomsday scenarios. Recent threats about giant asteroids (**Planet X**) colliding with earth, or claims about the earth's poles shifting on a certain date due to astronomical alignment of planets (causing the flooding of half the US continent) have all turned out to be bogus. What was paraded on the internet as "scientific" opinion backing up these claims turned out to be merely New Age visionaries and a few pseudo scientists who were tapping into spiritualist sources. Thousands of people get caught up in these frenzies of fear. We have enough real threats from globalist domination without getting stressed out over bogus claims. Educating yourself in all aspects of life is the best way to prepare yourself to distinguish the fraudulent from the real.

Using logic: It is not enough, however, to merely accumulate knowledge and facts like so many books on a shelf. You must also learn how to filter that information and assemble it into a realistic view of the world. Most people know how to draw a simple conclusion from a logical proposal: $A = B$ and $B = C$. Therefore A must equal C . This is deductive reasoning. However, in a complex world filled with multiple layers of deception and

sophisticated lies, it is **inductive reasoning** that you must master in order to analyze the news and put together a coherent view of modern history.

Inductive reasoning is much more difficult to master. It involves taking a wide sampling of seemingly random information or observations and picking out patterns of truth, sufficient to derive broader conclusions. There are several reasons why most people do so poorly at inductive reasoning. For one thing, few have access to a wide range of details to analyze in the first place. Much of the blame for this lies with the media and the school system, on which the vast majority of people are reliant for their information, and which systematically omits critical details. Even when more information and evidence is available, however, few people have the patience to remember the details, much less to sort through the conflicts and contradictions found in the details long enough to derive conclusions or see the patterns. Inductive reasoning takes a good memory and a lot of mental processing.

This is the essential art of thinking that allows a few to **discover hidden conspiracies**, especially when there is a lack of defectors from the higher echelons that could reveal the degree of collusion that may exist. People have little trouble seeing small conspiracies, which abound in criminal events, mafia activities, and drug dealings. But they have trouble seeing the larger hidden hand of control that links many of these groups together, if only peripherally. It is this larger element of control that is the key indicator of an over-arching conspiracy working against the interests of sovereignty and the Constitution to destroy liberty.

Here is some of the basic inductive evidence or patterns of details that should lead someone to suspect that a larger conspiracy exists:

- 1) With few exceptions, almost never do the "big boys" get caught or prosecuted for major crimes (Allied war crimes of WWII, Enron, WorldCom scandals, etc.). This trend indicates that higher authority protects these powerful people. When judges consistently deny the introduction of evidence that points to government collusion, we can also rightly suspect that judges are involved in this collusion.

2) Powerful interests in the West have consistently funded Communism, protected it from public exposure, defended Stalin by denying his atrocities, and given Pulitzer and Nobel Prizes to the worst perpetrators of violence and deception. One could hypothesize that this was due to the stupidity and ignorance of our leaders, if this pattern only rarely occurred. But after 50 years of aiding Communist revolutions, shipping atomic bomb plans and materials to Russia and allowing spies to roam the halls of government at will, one can rightly suspect these Harvard and Yale grads can't be doing this out of mere ignorance.

Those who back the stupidity theory or the theory that the perpetrators are merely naïve liberals are of course partially correct. Many are. But stupidity theorists fail to acknowledge the experience of multiple anti-communist voices of reason, who confronted these leaders with their "naiveté and stupidity," protesting each and every one of these sellouts of liberty as they were occurring. They bear testimony to the hostile reaction they received after confronting our leaders with this evidence of betrayal. We can track the efforts of leaders to fire the critics, bury the evidence, and in other ways protect the guilty.

When this pattern is repeated decade after decade, despite mounting evidence of the disastrous policies that were being promulgated, it becomes increasingly more difficult for the rational mind to believe that all this is merely because of stupidity and sociological predilections (at least at the highest levels).

3) Historically, there emerges over time increasing evidence of **past conspiracies** for control and power. As time has passed since the killing of JFK, for example, more government whistleblowers have surfaced to tell of more official government involvement, including threats if they ever reveal what they know. This is true regarding other far-reaching conspiracies as well. Whether the subject is government collusion with the Mafia, covering for Russian and Chinese rearmament, running drugs to fund black ops in the CIA, or the purposeful allowing of illegal immigration, we see a widening picture of collusion and conspiracy at the highest levels. In reaction to the charges that do surface, government leaders uniformly blame every evil on individual rogue elements in police, or law enforcement. Yet the evidence from whistleblowers is consistent:

that cover-ups and suppression of dissent increases the higher they go in the appeals process. Again, this is evidence of over-arching, top-down control in conspiracy—not simply covering up to protect the boss.

The evidence for these kinds of patterns can only be found in watching and analyzing details of events stretching over years and decades of history, then forming them into a cohesive, consistent whole. The resulting picture of the world can be described, but only superficially. Those who master the skill of inductive reasoning have the ability to form their own world view, and constantly check it against the assertions of others to filter truth from deception. Those who don't are relegated to a dependency on others for in-depth analysis, a position fraught with risk as lies become ever more sophisticated and complex.

A Correct World View: We cannot understand how this world operates if we hold to a purely secular, evolutionary, or humanistic view. Even though the spiritual spectrum is mostly hidden to man on earth, its workings can be detected if one is sensitive to truth, and if one avoids offending the source of all truth by chronic violations of conscience. You cannot, for example, really understand the following conundrums about conspiracy without contemplating the possibility of Satanic control:

- The fact that people involved in the conspiracy for global control already have more money and power than any man can use. Why should these continue to push for global control?
- The generational affect. The conspiracy doesn't fade or alter course after the death of key people. If the driving force were only an individual or a small group of megalomaniacs, they would be incapable of controlling the direction others would take after they are gone.
- The fact that the globalists, in prepping the world for WWIII and encouraging a Russian/Chinese nuclear preemptive strike on the West, would also destroy the wealth

and power of these same powerful conspirators. Why would anyone do this?

These aspects of the conspiracy cannot be explained by conventional leftist anti-capitalist jargon about greed, power and class struggle—even though these do play a significant role. The thirst for control of oil is also part of the picture, but it doesn't explain the globalists' plan to risk partial destruction of the West in an effort to create a Hegelian conflict out of which people can be induced to give up national sovereignty and join in a NWO.

My only theory of explanation rests upon my belief that systematic evil really does exist in the universe and is in opposition to what God is trying to do. The head of evil spiritual forces (called Satan) is actively working to destroy God's purposes here on earth. Only Satan has the will and the motive to do as much destruction on a global scale as we have seen in the past and are destined to experience in the future. His ability to pull other men into this greater evil agenda is based, I believe, on the fact that all evil men, even when they possess wealth and power, need protection from the looming threat of God's judgment as well as immunity from earthly prosecution.

Satan has a pretty good track record of protecting his own on earth. Even in WWII, when major conspirators allowed some of their wealth in Europe to be destroyed, it was restored to them during the Lend Lease rebuilding process. In Iraq, corporations in collusion with the globalist government agenda are also being enriched in the corrupt process of reconstruction.

None of this is meant to say that a large number of people have direct knowledge of or knowingly participate in the Satanic aspects of this conspiracy. Only the few at the top need to know, although anyone who operates within the inner levels surely knows that there is some form of hidden power structure that controls all major government moves. The lower echelon participants are manipulated through a variety of garden variety inducements like promises of future position, power and fame. Threats are used only when necessary. Liberal intellectuals are easily induced to work for the New World Order because their academic training

induces them to believe they are part of an elite corps capable of bringing order and "fairness" to a greed filled competitive world. They are blind to the hidden victims of "compassionate liberalism." Likewise, there is a growing body of conservative socialists who fail to comprehend the inherent evil behind their new-found ideas about "compassionate conservatism," which is nothing more than socialism in another clever disguise. Perhaps the most disingenuous crowd of all are the journalists, who live in the fairy tale world of assertions that: 1) they are unbiased and neutral in their work; 2) they are free from the concerns of "greedy capitalism;" and 3) they have journalistic freedom within their news rooms. The latter is only true if they are predictable liberals. All true conservatives find themselves eventually driven out or forced to toe the official line.

The biggest fools in this world are those who view themselves as the brightest—those highly educated and smart people who proudly assert that there could never be an over-arching conspiracy because there would be too many people in the know, and that the secret would slip out. Aside from those who are actually and knowingly fronting for the conspiracy, most of these naive pundits are simply showing their lack of experience in dealing with this level of sophistication and deception. Sometimes insiders do see too much and talk, but these are quickly silenced in any number of ways ranging from subtle threats to outright elimination. The higher up in the conspiracy you go, the tighter the control system is. With a lack of direct evidence and first-hand accounts of the ongoing conspiracy, we must rely on our own abilities to gather and analyze information to formulate a reliable picture of what's going on in the world. The more accurate that picture is, the better prepared we will be to protect ourselves from the real threats that all of us will have to face.

Strategic Threats In the Current Decade

Analysis of Strategic Threats In the Current Decade (2010-2020)

By [Joel M. Skousen](#), Editor, World Affairs Brief

INTRODUCTION

Strategic threats are carefully planned threats by predator nations or groups that transcend their own normal sphere of influence and threaten the entire world with conquest and/or control. In this analysis I will discuss three current strategic world powers, which constitute a premeditated threat to world liberty, and the complex tactical maneuvers between them as they position themselves for the coming, inevitable conflict. Two of these world powers are nations--Russia and China--and the third is a transnational conspiracy of power by a combination of individuals in the West attempting to maneuver the world into a New World Order (NWO) of global control, euphemistically masquerading as a "global democracy." I will refer to the latter as Western globalists. All less powerful nations in the world fall under the influence of one of these three powers, either as direct allies, client states for the purchase of arms, and/or diplomatic allies working in collusion to further strategic goals of global hegemony. There is one further complicating factor, however. The Western globalists are divided into two main factions: a US/British faction firmly in control of the financial means of the NWO and the European Union, versus a large faction of hard-core leftists, secretly aligned with Russia and China, which controls the majority of votes in the General Assembly of the UN. I will attempt to describe each of the three power centers, their allies, and what I believe their individual strategy involves.

THREE COMPETING PREDATOR CENTERS OF POWER

RUSSIA

Ever since the rise of the Bolsheviks in 1917 all of Russia's resources have been focused on building a world empire under Communism. Despite taking no pains to conceal its ultimate goal of destruction of capitalism, Russia has been curiously assisted by certain Western political and financial powers in its spreading Communism to other nations. Numerous books document damning evidence of US State Department collusion with the US Deep State and key Western journalists to facilitate Communist takeovers of Eastern Europe, China, North Korea, Cuba, Cambodia, Vietnam, Nicaragua, Iran, Angola, Mozambique

and numerous other small nations. But the mother of all deceptions was reserved for the carefully planned "fall of the Soviet Union" in 1989 and 1990.

THE PHONY DEMISE OF THE SOVIET UNION

This last great ruse by Russia was a carefully planned gesture, not unlike previous attempts by Lenin and Stalin to put on a more human face in order to secure needed technology transfers and monetary assistance from the West. The latest and most sophisticated version of the masquerade will culminate in Russia's long anticipated attack on the West. Soviet defector Anatoly Golitsyn, in 1984, warned the CIA and the world about this ruse in his book, "New Lies For Old," but it was given little publicity, and the author was roundly discredited by our own government. Golitsyn, not yet savvy about the high level treason that had a grip upon the US government and the establishment media, could not figure out why no one was interested in his warning. Not only were Western intelligence agencies and the press not interested in Golitsyn's warning, they were about to join in the propaganda promoting this deception in order to make sure Western observers would believe it.

The Berlin Wall did, in fact, come down in 1989 and the Soviet armies did leave Europe in 1990, but the freedom movement and the overthrow of Communist regimes by "reformers" were not as spontaneous as they were made to appear. Anyone close to the action could see huge holes in the story--holes that a scrutinizing press corps should easily have perceived, but chose not to.

Uncharacteristically, the freedom movement among university students in Leipzig had suddenly begun to flourish, uninhibited by the Stazi, which had informers among every student group. No Western journalist dared utter the obvious question: why were students who had not dared to demonstrate the week before, suddenly free to do so without reprisal? Orders had obviously been given to the secret police to give the students a free hand. No arrests of dissidents were made. The same anomaly was observed by Russian students as they protested against Communism in favor of Yeltsin (who turned out to be a communist stooge). Where were the KGB who would normally be there taking names and arresting them in the night?

In Germany, assurances were planted among student leaders that demonstrations would be tolerated. At least two heads of Eastern European states (Erik Honeker of the DDR and Nicolai Ceausescu of Romania) said prior to their deaths that the Russians had ordered them to step down (as if in response to public fervor), and to turn over power to specific groups that had quickly put on the mask of

"reformers," but that were still Soviet controlled. Honeker obeyed and was allowed to live, while Ceausescu refused and was killed by his own secret police. Romanians weren't fooled by the sudden change in leadership in Romania; most knew the new "anti-Communist" leaders were still part of the old guard.

Subsequent stories have emerged in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland about current leaders who act the part of reformers but hide their past (and presumed current) allegiance with the Communist Secret Police. It is widely known in Poland that Lech Walesa was a secret Communist agent used to control the opposition Solidarity movement. The revelations of the following Eastern European experts are particularly revealing.

Petr Chibulka in the Czech Republic,

http://www.jrnyquist.com/cibulka_2003_0905.htm)

Judit Szakacs in

Hungary <http://www.time.com/time/europe/eu/daily/0,13716,339026,00.html>

Miroslav Dolejsi on all the former Soviet states

http://www.jrnyquist.com/dolejsi_analysis-1.htm)

A CRITICAL LOOK AT THE ATTEMPTED GORBACHEV "COUP"

A close look at the failed "coup" against Russian Premier Mikhail Gorbachev will easily demonstrate that this was an obvious fraud set up for Western consumption. Anyone who believes the KGB was so bungling that it couldn't capture Gorbachev at his unprotected dacha, or so tolerant that it would allow any real democratic opposition to maintain uninhibited access to radio and television during the "fall", hasn't studied modern Russian police state tactics. In fact, Yeltsin was never anything but a puppet figurehead present to give the illusion of an emerging democracy.

Furthermore, when the supposed heads of the KGB, and GRU, as well as the Defense Minister and other top leaders "fled for their lives" after the "failed coup attempt," the press should have been asking: who were they fleeing from? These men were supposedly in control of all the organs of power in Russia. Either they really were the heads and were faking their own self-imposed exile, or they were not the real leaders and were toppled to further the ruse. Notably, all of these top "leaders," including Gorbachev, had been only mid-level bureaucrats two years before. How do we explain their sudden rise to power, except that others selected them? And if other hidden leaders selected them, those secret leaders held the real power even then. Everything else that gives the appearance of Russian

democracy is just window dressing for Western consumption. That isn't to say that the Russians haven't allowed some legitimate opposition to arise, but it is always kept in a minority status and without access to the real reins of power.

It is my contention that the Communist leaders are still in charge behind the scenes today. In fact they never were out of power. I'm not referring to the stodgy old hard liners that are playing the role of open Communist deputies in the Duma (Russian Parliament). The real Russian leaders at the time of the coup, like Boris Berezovsky, Vladimir Guzinski, and Mikhail Khodorkovsky bequeathed to themselves all the former state enterprises (under the guise of "privatization") and became oligarchs. Even a cursory look at their backgrounds, shows that virtually every one of these "Mafia" chiefs was a top Communist leader in some part of the former Soviet leadership. The Communist bosses have also maintained tight control over the Russian banking system so as to shuffle Western aid money back and forth between their secret slush funds in Europe and the Middle East. As evidence of the power plays behind the scenes, one astute observer noticed that President Boris Yeltsin, at a high level meeting in the Kremlin, stepped aside and let Boris Berezovsky (newly named head of the Commonwealth of Independent States) enter the room first. This would never be done in Russian protocol unless Berezovsky were Yeltsin's superior. Naturally, these real powers behind the Russian "democracy" generally stay behind the scenes and rarely take key government positions--just as in the West where powerful men direct affairs from behind the scenes.

WHO ARE THE REAL LEADERS IN RUSSIA?

To further the deception, current Russian president Vladimir Putin railed against Russian Mafia leaders like Berezovsky and Gusinsky, issuing a steady stream of indictments, as if the Russian government is actively pursuing these international criminals. Of course, it's all a ruse. As I have reported in my World Affairs Briefs, Spanish intelligence documented five visits last year that Putin made to Berezovsky's villa in Spain just prior to Yeltsin's downfall and Putin's rise to power. The transcripts of their overheard discussions were apparently centered around the need to dump Yeltsin, install Putin, and begin the process of slowly shedding Russia's feigned image of weakness in order to get the West accustomed to a new, assertive Russia. As if following a script, Putin has suddenly become the new champion of Russian nationalism. He's "tough on crime" and supposedly opposed by liberals and old-line Communists alike. At first it was all a ruse. Even Gusinsky, head of the MOST media group--Putin's

supposed arch enemy and media opposition--is playing the role of a persecuted capitalist Jew. In fact, he was a good friend of Berezovsky and has a villa in the same compound in Spain.

But then something changed. Putin began a purge of the old oligarchs like Berezovsky and Gusinsky. The former was killed in London and Gusinsky was exiled. Other younger oligarchs were brought up on corruption charges and had their assets stripped. Some were let off under a secret deal in which Putin would get a cut of all their illicit operations in exchange for immunity
Russian/American financier Bill Browder [has widely testified](#).

While Putin began his reign as a puppet of the oligarchs, he appears now to have captured total control of the old communist apparatus, in the style of Joseph Stalin.

A TOUCH OF TRUTH IN EVERY DECEPTION

Am I saying that everything was faked in the so-called fall of Communism? Not at all. The yearning of Eastern Europeans and Russians to be free was real. That part didn't have to be faked. But virtually all of the former Soviet Eastern European states are still under some Russian influence through controlled politicians.

Even the Russian pull-back of weapons was a partial lie. After negotiating the removal of US missiles and nuclear weapons from Europe (INF treaty) the Soviets allowed US inspectors to witness the destruction of the longer-range SS-20 missiles, which constituted the bulk of their European force. But in 1986 the Russians secretly moved in more modern, shorter-range SS-23s to deep underground bunkers in East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria just prior to signing the treaty, and never declared them or destroyed them. They didn't remove them even after the so-called "fall of the Soviet Union," demonstrating Russia's follow-on role in this fraud, even during Yeltsin's supposed democratic regime. The missiles in Slovakia were discovered and removed during the mid-90s, but neither the US government nor the press has asked about the contents of other secret bunkers--which still exist today.

A portion of the image of economic weakness in Russia is real, however. Even after billions in capitalist aid to the Russian oil sector, the civilian economy is still weak--thanks to Western sabotage of the "free-market" reforms and continued hidden economic control by the Communist-Mafia hierarchy. What else would you expect when the US government pays millions of dollars to a

leftist university like Harvard to direct the reforms? Essential elements such as private property rights and transportation were never freed from Soviet-style control. Regulations and bureaucratic red tape still abound, as does official corruption requiring huge pay-offs and bribes. When Russia complained about its dire straits and perennial threat of famine, President Clinton and European leaders shipped them millions of dollars in monetary and food aid. In fact, there was no famine. Russian farmers had plenty of crops to sell, but they were displaced in the markets by the US food aid, which was sold to the people by Russian leaders for a tidy profit.

FEIGNING WEAKNESS TO HIDE STRENGTH

As for Russian military weakness after the “collapse”, only the manpower side of Russian military was allowed to collapse. The Russians purposely failed to pay troops or to maintain normal living standards within the ranks, leading to bad feelings and discontent. However, Russian production and development of high tech conventional military equipment has been ongoing. Huge stockpiles of tanks and mobile artillery were simply taken out of current inventory and stockpiled. They remain dispersed in depots beyond the Ural Mountains as part of the Conventional Forces Treaty signed with the US and NATO. This neat little treaty allowed the Russians to match US reduction in forces without actually destroying equipment--the Russians only had to put their tanks "out of reach." In fact, the Russians brought back some of that inventory during the Chechen conflict, and the US let them get away with it without so much as an official protest. Additionally, although many of the rank-and-file soldiers have left the military, the Russians did not decommission their huge corps of officers and NCOs. Thus, Russia maintains a suspiciously top-heavy military officer and NCO corps allowing it to refill the ranks of enlisted soldiers in a matter of months should war break out.

FALSE DISARMAMENT?

What about Russia's highly touted disarmament of nuclear forces? This, too, is a grand deception, aided and abetted by US arms controllers. The older, out-dated aspects of the Russian military complex are on display to give the appearance of disarmament. Much of that has been dismantled at US taxpayer expense. US public television and the Clinton Pentagon joined forces to promote the image of Russian nuclear weakness with a highly doctored presentation entitled *Missiliers*, about the crumbling Soviet arsenal. A naive US General Habiger of US Strategic Command lent his credentials to the widely publicized TV documentary, which

supposedly showed an inside view of the old and decrepit Soviet-era nuclear bunkers. In fact, they were too old and too decrepit to be credible. US missileers who saw the documentary refused to believe those facilities were operational. With the exception of one limited view of the new SS-27 missile launcher, the US has never been allowed to see Russia's modern arsenal of weapons. Many of the older SS-18 ICBMs were dismantled in the 1990s with US taxpayer funds. The warheads, however, were not dismantled, but were given back to the Russians for recycling into their new missiles. Even the recently signed Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions is a fraud. Less than a year after it was signed, with great fanfare, Russia announced it would not dismantle hundreds of its remaining SS-18s and other missiles until mid next decade. Not only did the US not protest, but our own nation continued its part of the agreement, unilaterally--our most powerful missiles, the MX Peacekeeper, will be completely dismantled by the end of 2004. The Russians are clearly implementing Sun Tzu's classic war doctrine of "feigning weakness" prior to a strike.

ONGOING WEAPONS DEPLOYMENT

The top secret Russian military-industrial complex is in full production, but it is now quite separated from the normal, visible economy. Many suspect that early Western aid and loans were almost exclusively funneled into these hidden portions of the Russian economy, or into the oil sector which funds much of military production. However, despite economic weakness, the Russians are continuing for a decade to build tremendous new nuclear/biological and chemical weapons systems--all with the assistance of US technology transfers---until the rift over Syria stopped all cooperation.

In the late 1980s, the Soviet Union was seen deploying biological warheads for their multiple-warhead SS-18 ICBMs. As late as the early 1990s, after the signing of agreements pledging to destroy all biological and chemical warfare stocks, bona fide defectors from Russia gave testimony of massive cheating on biological and chemical weapons programs. Again, no protest was forthcoming from the US and no sanctions were imposed.

Russia is now manufacturing, on average, one new SS-27 missile (also called the Topol-M--a 6th generation ballistic missile with active maneuvering capability to evade interception) per month, and hiding them in underground facilities--replacing older SS-19 missiles located at the Sarakov missile base some 450 miles southeast of Moscow. The SS-27 can carry at least 3 medium weight warheads and up to 10 smaller nuclear warheads. They are developing a

new even larger version that can carry up to 15 warheads. It can also be armed with a single massive H-bomb developed by the Arzamas-16 site of the Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy (MINATOM). According to Russian weapons engineers, the new Arzamas warhead has an explosive force equal to over half a million tons of TNT.

The Washington Times has reported that, in 1995 and 1996, this weapons developer illegally obtained US-made IBM supercomputers exported with Clinton administration approval. The supercomputers were exported directly to the Russian weapons lab, using false commercial and non-military contracts. This was in direct violation of US law. IBM pled guilty to the illegal export and paid a \$8.5 million fine for their illegal sale, but the damage was already done. Later evidence proved that the Clinton administration actually facilitated the sale and gave IBM assurances of protection.

The Russians intend to build a total of 500 of these mobile missiles, each one capable of mounting the full range of nuclear, biological or chemical warheads. This is truly an ominous weapons system, and should be our main concern in terms of designing an Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense. We built our last modern ICBM (the MX "Peacekeeper" missile) over 20 years ago, and we unilaterally dismantled them in 2003, in spite of the fact that the Russians reneged on their part of the Strategic Forces Reduction agreement.

The Russian ABM system is composed of hundreds of SA-5 and SA-10 anti-aircraft/anti-missile missiles.

Moscow not only has its nominal 100 ABM missiles, as permitted by the treaty, but also several thousand other SAM interceptors, many of which have been upgraded with ABM capabilities. In total, Russia has 12,000 SAM/ABM interceptors at 280 sites. The SA-10 is a totally new missile now from what it used to be and continues to be fitted with nuclear warheads (unlike our dumbed-down proposed ABM system that has no warhead at all). Russia has 18 huge battle-management radar installations located around the periphery of the country, as well as in space, to direct their ABM system. Upgrades of these radar sites as new construction of several more were carried out during the ABM treaty negotiations. US and NATO spy satellites detected these violations, but only one radar unit was halted. It was finished two years ago and the US failed to protest this violation of the ABM treaty. Yet Russia still demands that we abide by the treaty.

Further, the Russians are building huge underground nuclear bunkers and weapons production facilities in the Ural Mountains, clearly intended to function during a nuclear war. "Yamantau Mountain is the largest nuclear-secure project in the world," said US Congressman Roscoe Bartlett (R-Md). "They have very large train tracks running in and out of it [actually 5 tracks wide], with enormous rooms carved inside the mountain. It has been built to resist a half dozen direct nuclear hits, one after the other in a direct hole. It's very disquieting that the Russians are doing this when they [supposedly] don't have \$200 million to build the service module on the international space station and can't pay housing for their own military people." Ken Timmerman, one of the best sources of information on the subject says, "The Russians have constructed two entire cities over the site, known as Beloretsk 15 & 16, which are closed to the public, each with 30,000 workers. No foreigner has ever set foot near the site. A US military attaché stationed in Moscow was turned back when he attempted to visit the region a few years ago..."

In public testimony before a House Armed Services Subcommittee last October, KGB defector Col. Oleg Gordievsky said the KGB had maintained a separate, top-secret organization, known as Directorate 15, to build and maintain a network of underground command bunkers for the Soviet leadership -- including the vast site beneath Yamantau Mountain. When pictures of this complex were published on the front page of the New York Times in 1996, the CIA was asked to respond. Keeping pace with the long standing secret government policy to protect Americans from any information that would point to a Russian threat, the CIA spokesman said the agency wasn't worried--the huge Russian facility was purely "defensive." How do they know that when they admit that no US official has ever visited the site?

In 1998, US Strategic Commander (STRATCOM) General Eugene Habiger, the same naive commander who took part in the NPR propaganda documentary *Missiliers*, called Yamantau "a very large complex -- we estimate that it has millions of square feet available for underground facilities. We don't have a clue as to what they're doing there." No clue, general? Not even one clue? People this stupid obviously get to be generals because they are predictable yes-men in a military determined to purge out any future George Pattons or Douglas MacArthurs. I noticed in *Missiliers* that Habiger never mentioned the Russian military's refusal to answer questions about Yamantau Mountain as he waxed eloquent about the deep camaraderie and trust he felt with his Russian military

counterparts. If this is the best general we can find to head STRATCOM, the US is in mortal danger.

The Yamantau Mountain complex is not far from Russia's main nuclear weapons lab facility, Chelyabinsk-70. Honest military analysts suspect that Yamantau's huge 400-square-mile underground complex houses nuclear warhead and missile storage sites, launch control, and several full-blown nuclear weapons factories--all designed to continue production after a nuclear war begins. The US has no equivalent to such extensive protected production facilities. According to Ken Timmerman, the Russian government has provided no fewer than 12 separate and contradictory explanations for the site, none of which are believed to be credible.

Russia also has a massive national command and control system dispersed among three different hardened underground locations. Besides Yamantau Mountain, there is the Yavinsky Mountain underground complex and the Sherapovo bunker site, south of Moscow. Sherapovo is the primary command center for Russia's "civilian" leaders. The Kremlin is connected to Sherapovo and other bunkers by a secret subway line. Once at Sherapovo, they can conduct the war effort using a highly redundant communications system "allowing the leadership to send orders and receive reports through the wartime management structure," according to a 1988 Pentagon report.

RUSSIA'S STRATEGIC PLAN OF ATTACK

It is my considered opinion that the Russians do not want to begin their massive attack on the West with a conventional flow of armaments and troop build-up in Europe. These types of precursor movements would be easily detected by US and European reconnaissance satellites. Neither do the Russians want to destroy Europe if they don't have to. I believe that Russia is planning a massive preemptive nuclear strike on US and British military facilities sometime toward the end of this current decade--precisely because such a strike would decapitate Western military power within two days, with little loss to Russia, and instill fear in the rest of the world. By concentrating the initial attack on the US and Britain, the Russians believe they can turn to European leaders and intimidate them into submission without a fight. The Russians are optimistic they can count on Europe's leaders since many European heads of state are now aligned with the Socialist Internationale, a front for international Communism created during WWII by Moscow as a means of controlling Europe. Russian GRU defector Col. Stanislav Lunev's revelations about Russian military strategy and planning, including his claim that every Russian military exercise is based on the premise

of a pre-emptive nuclear attack on the US military, tend to corroborate my suspicions.

US UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT

During the Obama administration, the US removed all triple warheads from the Minuteman III missiles and replaced them with a single warhead. The current stock of Minuteman missiles is now diminishing as several are launched as tests each year and never replace. The US is planning on a new missile to replace the MMIII but it won't be ready until 2030. A Russian/Chinese attack on the West will surely take place before these are in production.

WHAT ABOUT TIMING?

I do not believe the intended strike is imminent. It is my estimate that the Russians won't be ready to strike until sometime after 2020. Here's why: Their latest and most modern weapon systems are not going into serial production until 2020, 21, 22 and 23. Despite the continual stockpiling of core supplies and other evidence of war preparations referenced in the excellent and ongoing work of J R Nyquist, the Russians lack several elements that would ensure success, and they won't strike until everything is in place.

First, they desire to make sure that the US disarms as many of our nuclear missiles as possible. They have already succeeded in getting US leaders to complete the unilateral disarmament of the feared MX intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). These 50 blockbuster ICBMs were located in hardened silos surrounding the Four Corners area of Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska and South Dakota have now all been dismantled. No comparable disarmament of the Russian Topol-M missiles is being required, despite Russian promises to dismantle all SS-18s.

President Clinton's 1998 orders to the military (PDD-60) ---revamping our nuclear strategy---dictated that we prepare to “absorb a first strike and not launch on warning still stands today, but “prepare to retaliate afterward.” Dumbfounded (but compliant as always) the top military brass wanted to know, "retaliate with WHAT?" Good point! However, the Russians most likely are not counting on PDD-60. They suspect we won't abide by this suicidal order now that Clinton is out of office.

Sadly, I don't believe President Trump has even been told about PDD-60 and that it is still in force. Even our missile forces still practice launch on warning, but PDD-60 removed the alternate launch codes to do that should communications

with the White House be cut off. I think the nuclear launch codes simply won't ever arrive, forcing our forces to absorb the first strike.

Another timing factor is that Russia will not strike until her people are sufficiently antagonistic to the West to form a wall of public opinion supportive of a nuclear first strike. The constant US media attacks and the fake intelligence blaming Russia for interfering in the US election by hacking the DNC computer (it was an internal leak, not a hack) have all help create a negative feeling in Russia toward the US.

Over the past decades, US and NATO globalist leaders have antagonized Russia and other Slavic peoples by establishing NATO as a force for aggression and intervention rather than defense. That was the real underlying reason why our globalist leaders fomented the war in Kosovo, Iraq, Afghanistan, and eventually IRAN. The humanitarian excuse of opening Iraq to democracy was just a cover for other strategic intentions about conflict creation. It is also why the Clinton administration paid Harvard's leftist academics to sabotage "free-market" reforms in Russia. If the US government had been serious about facilitating Russian reforms, they would have hired the libertarian CATO Institute instead. Ten years ago, the Russian people admired America and longed to be like the West. There is now a deep sense of resentment among Russians for repeated humiliation in Europe, coupled with widespread bitterness and cynicism about economic freedom. The reforms are going nowhere and many Russians long for the return of the meager but stable flow of supplies they got under the stifling, but predictable, Soviet system. Russians are tired of seeing fellow Slavs and other allies (such as Iraq) pushed around by NATO in Kosovo, Serbia and Bosnia. America is hated by many and commonly distrusted--for good reason. They long to see Russia return to her pre-Cold War glory as a world power. Putin, instead of being viewed as the ruthless second level Communist hatchet man that he is, is ascending to the status of national hero.

The war in Afghanistan and Iraq has done even more to antagonize the Muslim world, especially in Pakistan. The torture, abuse and humiliation of Iraqi prisoners, which came to light in 2004, has done more to dispel American pretenses of morality and democracy than anything to date. All of this is continuing to build antagonism toward America that will eventually erupt into a violent international backlash--and not by terrorism only.

Another factor in timing is that Russia needs to further secure its back door with China. Russia would not dare attack the West without assurances of Chinese

assistance on the Eastern front. A new "non-aggression" pact (reminiscent of the Hitler-Stalin non-aggression pact that helped facilitate WWII) is in force between China and Russia. However, China is not sufficiently strong militarily to handle its side of the bargain. Thus, Russia is busy helping the Chinese to build up sufficient military forces, especially naval and missile forces, to conquer and control all of the Pacific Rim during the opening months of WWIII. But there is a downside to this strategy which Russia cannot dismiss lightly. Russia knows that China is a predator nation like itself, and will ultimately challenge Russian hegemony when strong enough to do so. That is why Russia has stopped selling its most modern weapons to China, knowing that China is cloning everything they can get or steal from the West.

The Russians and the Chinese are very concerned about the potential threat a US anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system presents. This is not simply a cover, in my opinion. It is the foremost topic of heated discussions in every political forum the Russians or Chinese engage in, whether in public or in secret, with the US or with its allies. Clearly a viable ABM system threatens Russia's potential to pull off a successful nuclear first strike. Russia suspects that the US ABM system will consist of not a mere 100 interceptors, as claimed, but thousands instead. This ABM issue is a major key to understanding the Russian perception of timing. The US fixed base ABM system is not very effective in tests, mainly because it doesn't have an explosive warhead. Rather it uses a kinetic "hit vehicle" that must actually contact the incoming warhead to destroy it. Now that Russia and China are developing maneuvering warheads, our ABM systems are obsolete.

US COVERING FOR THE RUSSIANS

The US intelligence community (under both Republican and Democratic administrations) has known all these facts for years and yet continues to actively cover for the Russians, on orders from the White House. At least, it appears that way to me. The US continues to play on the illusion that Russia and China are loyal partners in the "war on terror" despite evidence that Russia and China are still engaged in widespread proliferation of nuclear and other weapons technology via their client states like Pakistan and North Korea. The US uses Israel as a conduit for technology transfers to China as well. Israel is allowed to sell any of its military technology to China, and much of that comes from the US.

THE GROWING THREAT OF CHINA

China clearly has its sights set on world hegemony. The attitude of oriental superiority over the occidental bourgeoisie has long pervaded China and even

predates Russian predatory tendencies. Realistic analysts who have long experience with both Russia and China know that neither will long be subservient to the other. Russia and China may attempt to use each other for short-term gain, but will eventually tangle for ultimate supremacy.

For the present, Russia and China are teaming up against the West in a new unilateral quest for arms. This is no surprise. The Russians have been arming China, off and on, since the Chinese Communists came to power under Chairman Mao. But now, the Chinese are playing both sides of the fence, East and West. Knowing that Russia is willing to supply it with plentiful quantities of second-rate equipment, China is looking toward the West for advanced American technology and funding in order to upgrade its Soviet and home-grown equipment.

No nation on earth is building military power faster than China, but it has further to go, so it is not yet a threat but it will be our biggest threat in the next decade. In the end, the complacency of other nations regarding China will change into outright terror as the world one day wakes up and finds itself facing a military monster of incredible size and ferocity.

The Chinese already have a formidable land based army of men, tanks and artillery. What it lacks is a world class navy, air transport and missile force, coupled with a sophisticated communications and control system sufficient to extend Chinese power worldwide. That's no small task to accomplish, but they are rapidly developing all that capacity. They are even ahead of the US in over-the-horizon anti-ship missiles---a real threat to our carriers.

Naturally, China is harnessing its billions in trade dollars supplied by naive American champions of free trade to build their forces. The Chinese leaders are openly derisive of American Republicans who are convinced that peaceful trade will moderate Communism. For the Chinese, war with the West is inevitable. It's no longer a matter of if, but when!

WESTERN GLOBALISTS: THE NEW WORLD ORDER

The movement to establish a global system of control began somewhere back in the murky past of the Illuminati (1776) and has since morphed, grown and expanded till now there are numerous shadowy variants and groups that make it almost impossible to pin down exactly who is running things and where the real motive and power is coming from. Fortunately, it is not necessary to know all of the secrets underlying this movement. It is sufficient to establish that all of the

existing globalist organizations--the Council on Foreign Relations, Trilateral Commission, Aspen Institute, Bilderburgers, Royal Institute for International Affairs, Committee of 300, Club of Rome, etc., aspire to global control and elimination of national sovereignty. Numerous quotations of their own leaders and members state just that. That they have more sinister long-term motives and intentions concerning the eventual use of global control is not so clear or easy to prove. However, the track record of global intervention does not portend an optimistic outcome.

Those who watch the way global insiders operate and cover up illegal operations of influence and control almost always come away convinced that there is some form of conspiracy involved. This conclusion is really not too difficult to establish if one has access to the details of each case. Look at the specific evidence pointing to government misdeeds and the subsequent cover-ups of economic manipulation, assassinations, terrorist attacks on airlines, illegal weapons trade, government coups, and high level corruption. In each of these cases, there is a common thread: the active involvement of a vast array of high officials, government agencies, the media, law officers, lawyers, judges, and sometimes international corporations and organized crime--coordinated and inter-connected enough to hide the truth, obstruct justice and cover for high level leaders.

That's **what a conspiracy is**: a coordination between normally separable government officials who have no legal right or lawful need to collude in their official capacities. Sadly, it happens all the time. The excuse given, when discovered, that these unfortunate incidents are merely the workings of the proverbial "rogue agent" is rarely true. Upon close examination, the trail leads always to higher levels where the cover-up and obstruction gets serious. For further evidence, read the accounts of the many government whistle blowers out of the military, CIA, DEA, or FBI, found in Rodney Stich's now dated evidence in *Defrauding America* www.defraudingamerica.com

THE NEW WORLD ORDER (NWO) AS A PREDATOR MOVEMENT

NWO globalists take great care to mask their intentions by appealing to "democracy" and making constant references to free trade and "human rights" and the support of international law. But a close look at their justification for intervention in Afghanistan, Iraq, the Balkans and Syria clearly indicates that tyranny and ethnic cleansing was fostered, then overlooked, or even partially falsified until it festered enough to justify intervention and subsequent control.

While most people in the Western world do not view the NWO as a predator movement, the Eastern world certainly is beginning to see it in that light. I will make the case that the changing role of NATO and the UN from a defensive organization to an aggressor in Iraq, Kosovo, Bosnia, East Timor, and Africa was and still is intentional, meant to help stir up hatred and discontent sufficient to justify an eventual Russian and Chinese strike on the West as previously discussed.

WHY?

The big question is always, why would those who strive for global power and financial control want to engender a nuclear war that would destroy the whole world? In the first place, it is not true that the whole world would be destroyed. Millions would die, and over half the people in any country under attack would get very ill, but probably no more than 20% of the populace of any nation subjected to a military facilities first strike would die. Most countries will not be targeted. Russia, who is planning this war, is sensible enough to be prepared to shelter many of its citizens from nuclear effects. Among Western nations, however, only Switzerland has a comprehensive fallout shelter program for its citizens.

However, US leaders have extensive shelters in place plus multiple contingencies to survive the attack they all know is coming. A few thousand savvy conservatives in America also have provided shelter systems for their families. Nuclear war is quite survivable, outside of the actual blast zones, with adequate preparations in place (see my book, *The Secure Home* for specific plans for installing a shelter in your home)

The core of the question about the prime motive remains: why destroy the tremendous prosperity that even these conspirators for global power enjoy? Most people do not sufficiently understand real evil. To them, this scenario is simply unimaginable. But the fact remains, powerful men in government and business have knowingly colluded to finance war and destruction. It has happened before and it will happen again. For example, globalists bankers, corporation heads and government officials colluded prior to WWII to finance Hitler and Stalin, and undermine capitalist nations in order to pave the way for Socialism and war. A close look at the conduct of the war relative to aid and concessions to Russia paint a picture of Western complicity to play the Hegelian game-- building up an enemy in order to produce a controlled crisis and a later response in the direction of more globalist and socialist control. The West actively colluded in the betrayal

of captive nations and paved the way for Soviet military dominance and conquest around the world in order to set the stage for future conflict.

None of the World Wars in this century were accidents, in my opinion. Conflict was created with the long-term goal to facilitate a consolidation of world power in the hands of the NWO elite. It is true that many of the Wall Street bankers who financed Hitler and the Alfried Krupp-owned German war industries saw those investments destroyed, but they were always taken care of after the war and allowed to make even greater millions in the reconstruction process. That was much of the motive behind the Marshal Plan. German armorer Alfried Krupp, who was convicted at the Nuremberg trials for using slave labor, was pardoned by John J. McCloy, US Military Governor and High Commissioner in Germany. McCloy was also the globalist insider who eventually became head of the CFR. Clearly there was a system of immunity and protection established for insider participants so that war could be used as an instrument of change, without destroying its own leaders and the power behind them. In each case, there was a common motive--to use the horrors of war to accelerate the demand for international institutions of control that would not otherwise be acceptable to free men and women.

To fully understand the globalist mode of operation, we must address one of the great inconsistencies in US foreign policy: Why have US leaders (especially from Truman onward) actively undermined other pro-Western governments and secretly armed and supported Communist guerrilla operations in such countries as China, Korea, Cuba, Nicaragua, Laos, and Cambodia? Why do globalists attack some Communist regimes and support others? The main reason is that globalists are dedicated socialists, in terms of commitment to control, but want the benefits of a partially free market to finance that control system. They have a code name for this dualism--the Third Way--which is a euphemism for the old Fabian socialism (private ownership but government regulation and control). Naturally, globalists like the trappings of wealth that the capitalist component of a controlled economy provides.

Communism has been a useful tool for the globalists to subvert liberty in the world. Communism takes the rap, while the globalists steadily undermine world independence and national sovereignty by eventually replacing communist nations with their own brand of corporate capitalism---not true free markets. The NWO boys are experts in the use of Hegelian tactics of creating enemies that produce a desired response. For example, Communism is often characterized by

certain excesses in tyranny that engender a call for global intervention--very convenient. The Communists come in with their tyranny and the globalists step in to defeat them and yet don't deliver true liberty, but a controlled variety of debt bondage to international financial organs.

THE USE OF WAR TO INSTIGATE RADICAL CHANGE

PDD-60 is an important clue to how the globalists intend to force reluctant Americans into a militarized global government. Right now there is a massive movement in opposition to globalism by about half of the people in the West, as evidenced by the Brexit vote and the rise of many anti-EU parties in Europe. But if the US military is decapitated in a first strike, which the US allows by making use the nuclear codes don't get to our missile forces in the US and UK, the Western world will be suddenly in a position of helplessness.

After the strike our leaders will emerge from their bunkers and claim total innocence--that the Russians and Chinese deceived them--that they didn't know this was coming. They will be lying, but the surviving public will forget all about national sovereignty and constitutional rights and beg government to save them. To do so, our leaders will say, now that our military is mostly destroyed, that we must join with other nations in a MILITARIZED global government in order to prosecute this new war.

The people will go along and conjure up images of a new patriotic war like WWII. But, this time, after the war, our leaders will cement us into a permanent New World Order and national sovereignty will never be returned. This prediction alone explains the suicidal and unilateral disarmament the US has engaged in for the past 30 years. It explains the rationale for covering up for Russia's constant cheating on arms control agreements and treaties. It explains why Bill Clinton would direct the US military to absorb a nuclear first strike (PDD-60) and NOT launch on warning. It explains why the US would keep stalling year after year to make sure America is undefended against a nuclear strike and that there are no provisions for civil defense shelters. It isn't that US leaders are stupid. They aren't suicidal. They simply can't get the world to take the final plunge into global control without a war.

While the US is slowly being sucked into the NWO through gradualism, I still think war is necessary to get Americans to give up their core liberties. It's one thing to fool the people into thinking we are still sovereign as we slowly entangle ourselves in the United Nations, transnational trade agreements and the EU, but it is another thing entirely to start hauling Americans to courts in The Hague over a

wetlands violation in Virginia. When that starts happening, the Powers That Be know that Americans will rebel and start demanding that we extricate ourselves from globalism. War is designed to be so devastating to Americans (a massive nuclear strike is the "mother of all terrorism") that they will easily give up any liberties in order to have someone "save them." The Patriot Act's passage by a compliant Congress showed just how dumbed-down and stupid leaders and people can become after an appropriately motivated terror event such as the 9/11 attacks on the WTC.

HOW DO YOU WIN A WAR AFTER ABSORBING A NUCLEAR FIRST STRIKE?

Clearly the NWO globalists do not intend to lose a war to the Russians or Chinese, which brings up the next question: **how** do the globalist plan to win a war with Russia and China when they absorb a first strike that destroys most of the US and British military machine at the very onset of hostilities?

First, I think the use is using a lot of off-budget money to finance secret weapons systems which will not be used to defend us from this first strike, but will be used thereafter to stop any further attacks while the US and UK regroup under a global military banner. Europe, in fact, may not be included in the first strike as Russia wants to preserve the economy of Europe by blackmailing it into submission. Certainly Europe's meager NATO forces would be incapable of taking on the Russians alone. I think perhaps, that ongoing secret plans within the EU to create an EU army separate from NATO is the intended beginning of a globalist military force that will be built up quickly after this war starts.

In the coming war, I also suspect China will play the same role as Russia did in WWII. I think the globalists plan is to induce China to switch sides and attack Russia's rear, in exchange for more military technology. China knows that it has to eventually go up against Russia, so why not then when Russia would be faced with a two front war. Why would the globalist's make such a deal with China? - Because it not only facilitates the defeat of Russia, but because China then would become the new cold war enemy after WWII and justify keeping the new globalist military intact and not returning national sovereignty to each member nation after the war.

A FEW COMMENTS FOR THOSE WHO UNDERSTAND THE THREAT BUT DOUBT CONSPIRACY

There is one major mistake in the assumption that almost all people make who object to conspiracy--they assume that everyone or nearly everyone contributing to the conspirator's agenda must know there is a conspiracy and be privy to the entire plan and all its details. This is not true, but conjuring up this assumption allows people to easily dismiss conspiracy with the understanding that too many knowing people would make it impossible to keep the secret.

I certainly have never made a case for all or even many of the participants knowing the whole plan or even substantial parts of it. Quite the contrary. All my writings have concentrated on explaining how and why top level conspirators use masses of predictable leftists, yes-men, ambitious lackeys and partially knowing ladder-climbers to do their bidding--specifically so as to limit the number who have "need to know" access. They cement together the whole conglomerate with subtle and not so subtle threats--and occasionally carry them out. Many are bought off with regular payments--like journalists and judges. Most know only parts of the puzzle.

However, almost everyone in high places does know there is "power structure" above them they dare not challenge, they also know it isn't good for their job, advancement or health to "ask too many questions." Read any number of the tales by federal whistleblowers to confirm this general fear. Thus, most participants rationalize it all away as some benevolent control system, or believing that "whoever they are" must control the world in order to have stability. Others, especially in the enforcement ranks, are just too corrupt to care. But the bottom line is: very few know that the Powers That Be (PTB) intend to pull the nuclear trigger via Russia and China. All the little steps leading up to weakening the US and building up Russia and China are covered by liberal notions of "détente," "easing tensions," and "peace." The lesser officials who are tasked to defend these lies tend to believe their own propaganda.

However, the ones at the very top, who do know how to use war to create Hegelian responses, are very very evil--something most of the world doesn't really believe in anymore, and that is why many people can't conceive of or believe in this horrible brand of conspiracy. But keep in mind what they did before in building up Hitler, only to set him loose on Europe during WWII. The war created a justification for the UN and facilitated the rise of a new enemy (Russia) in its aftermath. Remember Pearl Harbor--not because of the infamy of Japan, but the infamy of Roosevelt and his leftist crew who induced Japan to attack and hid the information from our own military in Hawaii. We now have

proof that Roosevelt knew of the impending attack and refused to warn Pearl. It happened before, so why should it be so hard to believe now? We are reaching the culmination of what George Marshall and his cohorts planned by creating a cold war enemy. Russia was allowed to rise and have hegemony over Europe in order to create the next war. The phony demise of "Communism" is merely the final effort to lull the West into complacency before the strike. We are about to see it descend upon the world.

In all of this, I'm certainly not discounting the military-industrial complex argument, but it doesn't explain why people who are already fabulously wealthy and who control the reins of power are still pushing the world toward greater and greater global control. None of this will give them any more personal power or wealth. How much money and power can any single person use? The military industrial complex argument doesn't explain the rush to suicide and disarmament at an alarming rate. Some participants are blind, but surely some must suspect this is a very dangerous game and are going along in order to please some other very powerful people above them.

But let there be no doubt, the top echelon expects to survive this--why else have they built significant bunkers at US taxpayer expense, and private bunkers in resort homes in Colorado at their own expense. Somebody knows something is coming. Also, war is not as futile a tactic as most conspiracy debunkers assume. At least 2/3 of the world will survive this even without preparations, and virtually all the high level people who know that war is coming have made preparations to survive it.

IS THERE ANY HOPE OF COUNTERING THIS EVIL STRATEGY?

This strategy is wholly dependent upon shielding Americans and Europeans from Russian and Chinese intentions. Keeping people ignorant and naive also allows these same globalist leaders to claim that they didn't know of Russian and Chinese intentions. We must not let them get away with this, lest they claim the right to lead America into the war for global control. If you trust our government, remember Pearl Harbor. The evidence is now fully proven that Roosevelt induced Japan to attack in much the same way our own government now is helping to induce a Russian attack in the future (see Bob Stinnett's book "Pearl Harbor--Day of Deceit" for evidence of the Pearl Harbor conspiracy). There is also a growing body of evidence that the US government (dark side) was directly involved in the 9/11 attacks and subsequent cover up.

See <http://www.worldaffairsbrief.com> "9/11 Update". There has been a huge

cover-up about this false flag terror attack, but the next provoked war (allowing a nuclear attack on America) will be much more deadly to millions of Americans. Every one of you reading this is at risk, so do not take lightly what I say. In any case, the least you can do is prepare to survive the next war. If I'm right on timing we still have a few years to prepare.

Joel Skousen, Editor World Affairs Brief

<http://www.worldaffairsbrief.com>

The Good-ol-Boys Network: Introductory Comments on Conspiracy

Introductory Comments on Conspiracy From STRATEGIC RELOCATION (Government Threat Section)

THE GOOD OLD BOYS NETWORK

This is an amplification of the workings of Group Four--the corrupt law enforcement boys that do the dirty work for the controllers. They constitute what are referred to as the black sectors of our own government, and are linked to a larger sector of the organized criminal world. This is one reason why the FBI maintains so many underworld contacts. It's not just for utilitarian purposes of tracking the underworld. They assist each other in numerous covert activities.

Each of the Federal Services (FBI, CIA, ATF, INS, Secret Service, etc.) have many good and patriotic people working for them. The good guys are the regular, naive, want to serve my country types who are assigned the legitimate tasks of government enforcement. Virtually every agency head knows about the black side of his organization. No one is allowed to run these agencies

unless he can be trusted to execute the special orders that come down via discrete private channels. Upper level managers who are part of the conspiracy are always watching and judging both the above ground side and the covert side to see who can be trusted to do corrupt work or who has to be removed.

They look for signs of unprincipled behavior in those they invite to do the dirty tricks stuff. These guys carouse, they cheat regularly on their wives, and in short, don't have any scruples about doing any job for money or future advancement. These are carefully cultivated and tested with a variety of semi-legal activities to make sure they don't have much of a conscience. Once they enter the black underground, they enter the world of covert operations--but not just ordinary covert operations (because there are both legitimate and criminal types of operations performed by the same agency). I do not have the space in this book to detail all the evidence for this, but I will tell you this:

1. The CIA runs a worldwide drug distribution net, to finance this black underground series of operations. Kun San, the infamous drug warlord of the Iron triangle testified of this openly--that his major client was the CIA and he could name names. Barry Seal was killed after revealing his involvement in flying cargo planes loaded with drugs for the CIA into the famous Mena Arkansas 10,000 foot rural runway (during Governor Clinton's term).
2. The FBI regularly assists and covers up for numerous illicit government operations. Occasionally, critical evidence is falsified in their now discredited forensics labs in order to alter the outcomes of certain investigations. The FBI played a major role in the cover-up of the JFK assassination, the Waco attack, the Oklahoma City Bombing, and the Vince Foster murder.
3. CIA and Secret Service agents who were part of the black underground side, pulled off the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Bobby Kennedy and Martin Luther King, to make them martyrs for a much larger political purpose. The killers may not have known the purpose, but those who gave the orders did.

John F. Kennedy was, in my opinion, the first president to be elected who actually knew that he was put into power by this powerful underground group. He was only a second level person himself however, and quite

disposable, as we later found out. JFK was taken out by the very same leaders who put him in. The job was carried out by a select group of dirty tricks boys from the CIA, Secret Service, and FBI. This was the world's first good look at the workings of the conspiracy. They made a lot of sloppy mistakes, and got away with it for only one reason--they had enough control over the media, members of the Supreme Court, Congress, and a host of others that they could cover up almost anything. Their errors were huge and needed multiple cover-ups. Watching how they did it told me a lot about how extensive their powers are. Before I go into some details, let me backtrack and show how this gang of government hit-men operates in various parts of the federal security forces.

The Still Small Voice of Conscience

by

Joel M. Skousen

When you finish reading this, you may not view life in quite the same way again—even if you are indifferent about, or passionately dislike what I have to say. I do not claim or presume that the reader will actually change what they are—that's a more difficult and individualized process—but what I do claim is that once a person understands the workings of conscience, in detail, they will never be able to escape its constant commentary on one's thoughts, desires and actions. That is what will be different.

Those that already listen well to conscience, perhaps even without realizing it, will understand better how they get reminders, helps, and warning signals; and will better be able to teach others around them about this great secret to life. If you learn to recognize the inspiration and heed its advice, it will become your **constant guide to a better life.**

In contrast, those that have become experts in evading the warnings of conscience will not be able to rationalize, make excuses and justify their own problems and mistakes with the same ease as before. Promptings to change will never be as easy to disregard. Nervous feelings warning about bad habits, thoughts or actions will never be as easy to hide from again.

This might sound negative, but it is really a very big positive. When we develop the self-control to follow conscience accurately and with consistency, we find ourselves living better, happier lives. Eventually you will even long for more of its promptings and warnings—simply because, by following that little voice in our mind, everything in life goes better. It warns us not to say things we shouldn't, not to buy things we can't really afford, and not to do things that will get us into trouble. It helps us avoid accidents, illness, investment mistakes, and bad judgment.

With those kinds of benefits, why wouldn't everyone want to listen? Simply because we can't take the beneficial promptings without taking the criticism it offers about our improper thoughts and behavior as well.

The criticism or guilt feelings that come via our conscience are sometimes so uncomfortable that people become expert at evading it or shutting it down. In fact, most people learn early in their youth to hide from the voice of conscience. They develop a myriad of ways to cover it up, deny it, rationalize it away, and in other ways deaden its tiny whisperings so they can feel good about doing what they want to do. But in deadening the voice that criticizes and brings legitimate guilt, they also kill the whole “goose that lays the golden eggs” —that source of divine truth that leads to a better life. Of course, the fruit of conscience is not necessarily wealth, but truth—which is ultimately more valuable than gold.

My purpose in this writing is to help re-sensitize your mind to the voice of conscience, and in the process, encourage you to learn to love its promptings and

heed its counsel. Almost everyone needs to be reminded from time to time how to recognize the signals of conscience. It's like getting a reality check that rebalances and corrects our self-image so that we no longer live under the illusions of false pride. I realize that this can be emotionally painful, but the ultimate spiritual consequences of hiding from reality are not very pretty. In its worst form, it leads to haughtiness, verbal abuse of others, and bad judgment—or, in its most chronic forms, mental illness or suicide.

But those who take the tough road of listening to conscience, and develop the self-control to follow its counsel will come to possess an inner peace that will give constancy to their lives amid a world that is headed for increased turmoil. I can't promise you happiness, per se, in a world that is capable of tremendous cruelty to others, but I can promise you the internal peace that comes from knowing you have done your best in any given circumstance.

Many people have periods of happiness here and there in life, but never really get a solid handle on the workings of conscience, because they only selectively listen to the things they want to hear from conscience, picking and choosing what is comfortable or what leads to success in a job or business.

But without listening to the personal signals that criticize our bad personal habits, we make lots of little errors in daily living that eventually add up to bigger problems, including irritations to a spouse and conflict with others.

Probably, the most crucial signals from conscience are those little **warning feelings** that precede every instance of bad judgment that is going to cause you trouble or put your life in danger. Often these warning feelings are **so subtle they are all too easy to dismiss**, even when the consequences are grave. Let me give you a few real-life examples of people who failed to heed the warning voice of conscience, and the sad consequences that followed.

You will probably see similar habit patterns and mistakes of disregarding conscience in your own background. Hopefully, by seeing how easily these people could have avoided nearly fatal accidents and serious injury by listening, you will be sufficiently motivated to correct any similar bad thinking patterns in your own lives.

The Reader's Digest used to have an interesting section each month called "*Drama in Real Life*" with stories of people caught in life-threatening situations that normally lead to heroic acts of rescue or escape. Most all result in tremendous suffering. I have often wondered how differently these situations would have turned out if people had listened to the warning voice of conscience. Rarely do any of them admit to these warnings even though some make an urgent appeal to God once in trouble. Only a few recall any premonitions or warnings beforehand, though none relate it to conscience—just strong nervous feelings. In each sample, you will notice there were a series of little mistakes and missed opportunities to see what was coming, that they missed.

First, there is the bad habit of taking undo risks, especially unnecessary ones that athletic, youthful individuals do for thrills, pride, bravado, daring or peer pressure. What they all have in common is that the more they engage in danger, the more they desensitize the warning voices in the mind—especially when they have survived similar dangers before. Putting oneself constantly in danger exposes a person to nervous feelings so often it is possible to become insensitive to crucial warnings when you need them most.

In the process one also loses the ability to distinguish between two different types of nervousness: one form addresses the "correctness" of what you are about to do, and the other reacts to the danger or unfamiliarity itself. Sometimes the act may be dangerous, but still correct to proceed. Other times the act may be safe (physically) but you are warned not to proceed for other timing or moral reasons. That is why all of us have to learn to distinguish between these two types.

People who make it a habit of not heeding nervous feelings always make big mistakes eventually.

The first story is about excess bravado under peer pressure where a fellow allows himself to go beyond a barrage of nervous feelings in his quest to “meet the challenge”. He was an experienced “free solo” rock climber and is invited by his climbing partner (who has superior in skills) to compete with him (first mistake), climbing dangerous cliffs. He then discovered as his friend starts out on the first pitch that he intends to do it without the aid of safety ropes (second mistake).

The more cocky and talented partner taunted him into more and more difficult reaches (this “friend” also shows severe insensitivity to conscience in what he pushes others to do). Our “hero” fails to decline each increasing challenge despite growing fatigue. The tired climber feels extremely nervous about the last, death defying section, but can’t resist the taunting of his friend (the third and near fatal mistake). He described this last desperate ordeal in gripping detail. He barely survived in the end, and his partner made some light comments, further indicating no remorse for his part in the near disaster. (*Reader’s Digest*, Feb. 95, “Death Grip” pg. 128).

At least at the end of his story the author admits his mistake and seems determined not to repeat it. I wonder though. People who persist in being friends with those who are chronic violators of conscience are asking for trouble.

Next, let’s look at the bad habit of letting the fact that “everybody else does it” cloud obvious dangers, and undermine the warnings of conscience. There was a young woman who took a job tending the children of a couple working in the bush in Africa. Everyone regularly swims and bathes in the Epulu River, even though there are crocodiles lurking. While this is rationalized because the river is the only source of bathing water, and “everyone does it,” one would think that prudence would dictate making a shallow “safe pool” next to the river, or at least

having an armed person present and watching for danger. They did neither, and she was caught in waist deep water by a huge crocodile, while washing her hair.

She doesn't mention any nervous premonitions directly related to the attack. But she does mention having felt that it was "time to go"—she mentions the lateness of the hour. While I cannot be sure without talking to her, often people get nervous signals about something coming but don't know why or to what it is directed. In mentioning the "lateness of the hour," was she simply attaching a reason to her nervousness? I don't know, but in any case, despite whatever warning she may have had, she took the time to wash her hair in deep water. A large crocodile grabbed her arm and wouldn't let go, spinning and thrashing her around under the water. A nearby male friend came to help her, and after a horrible death struggle between her, the friend, and the crocodile, the crocodile finally tore her arm off, but she lived. —Great heroism on the part of the friend, but definitely avoidable. (*Readers Digest*, July 94, "In the Jaws of a Crocodile" pg. 70).

In the next example, a couple from Europe goes canoeing and camping in Canada. They saw at least two messages from other campers on the lake warning of the presence of an aggressive black bear. They agreed to be cautious and sought out another campsite farther down the lake. They found another site with a cabin on it, but it was already partially occupied by some hunters (strangers, but not unfriendly).

Because of the known danger, the hunters invited them to share the cabin with them. They declined, rationalizing that they came to be in the outdoors, and would rather stay in their small tent. They probably wanted their privacy too, which their little tent would provide. But that tent didn't even come close to providing any protection from the bear attack that came in the morning. The girl escaped, but her companion took the brunt of the attack, only barely surviving—with serious injuries. (*Reader's Digest*, Jan 95, "Caught in the Jaws of Death").

It is amazing how huge consequences come from disregarding **very small warnings**. In hindsight one may question why they didn't get a stronger warning

when it was a matter of life or death. But, sometimes that's all we get. The crucial point is that the warning was there, however small. They got it but disregarded it. That's why it's important to develop a habit of always watching out for nervous feelings and not disregarding them so easily.

Here are some examples of failures to heed strong and clear warnings. In the first, a couple picked some mushrooms in the wild, without any particular training (informal or otherwise) in mushroom identification. But they did call a Korean friend when they got home, who knew about mushrooms (indicating they must have felt some anxiety about the dangers involved). The friend could not say for sure over the phone but cautioned them not to eat them until she could come over and check them out. They declined, rationalizing that it would only make them sick, or that jokingly, "they would die together." And they almost did. (*Reader's Digest*, July 89, "Transplant Emergency" pg. 43.)

Next, a surfer in Oregon, who was a victim of a shark attack, doesn't specifically mention his own feelings, but he does mention failing to heed several other more open warnings of shark danger: First, he noticed schools of fish leaping out of the water, which he knew was a sign of escape from a predator. Second, he heard fishermen mention having seen a huge shark, 30 miles to the south, attack and kill a large sea lion. And third, even as he was paddling out, two other surfers, who were leaving, said that they saw something, and felt nervous (somebody listens).

He failed to heed all of these warnings, and got struck by the shark, and barely survived—mostly because of his buoyant surf board which kept the shark from dragging him under (*Reader's Digest*, July 95, "Encounter with a Great White" Pg. 74).

Let us suppose he didn't feel any particular nervousness inside, despite the outward warnings. **Why do some people get warnings and others not?** First, some forms of immoral behavior lead to loss of warnings. If the beneficial warnings or signals from conscience are from a divine source as I

believe, then there may be penalties involved in becoming insensitive—— because they get in the way of wrong things a person persists in doing.

In another case, a handicapped mother (in a wheelchair), leaves her young daughter by the swimming pool while she goes to answer the phone. While on the phone, she hears a splash and fails to heed any warning feelings to go back and check, rationalizing instead that it is the dog. By the time she returns the daughter has drowned and is only barely revived by her heroic efforts (*Reader's Digest*, April 89, "I have to save my baby" pg. 65).

I do not wish to appear harsh about someone else's misfortune, but it often amazes me how tiny the warnings signals may be. Most of the time it is nothing more than a fleeting thought which crosses your mind. It is up to us to grab each interrupting thought and hold on to it until it is analyzed for possible accuracy—— and then act upon it, even if there is only a chance it is right. This takes consistent practice until one begins to gain a conviction of its efficacy. So many little thoughts pass through our minds during the day, it becomes easy to treat them all lightly——that's the big danger.

In another story a woman was canoeing in waters known to harbor crocodiles and actually admits to feeling extreme nervousness prior to crossing a stretch of water where the attack occurred. She ignored this clear warning and was severely mauled by the crocodile——barely escaping alive (*Reader's Digest*, Oct 89, "Crocodile Attack" pg. 71).

In another case, a man demonstrated multiple bad judgments in going along with a friend on a Mexican jet ski outing. The friend, an experienced handler of "Jet Skis" talks our future victim into going out into the ocean despite his nervous feelings. He was even more nervous when he sees the patched up condition of the Jet Ski he is about to rent. He notes that the operator has to use starting fluid to get it started——a bad omen if you are going far out away from land and have to restart it.

Sure enough, his machine stops out in the ocean and cannot be restarted. Then there is another error—his buddy offered to take him back in with his jet ski, but he was afraid to leave the jet ski because of the high deposit required on the rental. So his friend went off to get help, leaving him alone to drift. The jet ski sank, and he was left to drift in the ocean in his life jacket—a mere speck, and is only miraculously found (*Reader's Digest*, Nov. 95 “A speck in the Endless Sea,” pg. 141.)

Finally, there was the sad case of a man with clear, distinct warnings that went unheeded. He was driving on a bumpy orchard road with cans of volatile fluid in the back of his vehicle. He got a distinct nervous feeling prompting him to secure those cans. He disregarded the warning, and shortly afterwards, they exploded, engulfing the vehicle in flames. He suffered severe burns and barely survived, attributing much of his recovery to the miraculous hand of God. Sadly, he never mentioned the sad lesson he should have learned: that had he heeded the warning of God through his conscience, he wouldn't have needed the “miracle” and would not now be permanently disabled. (*Ensign*, March 1994)

Let's now take some time to discuss in detail the full range of ideas and signs that come from conscience, including warning signals, how they appear and why they are sometimes difficult to distinguish from our own thoughts.

HOW CONSCIENCE WORKS

What precisely is conscience and how does it work? Although it is not possible to precisely define conscience in purely scientific terms, or determine how it functions, physically, I will try to describe the process according to my experience—which is almost identical to hundreds of other people I have talked to.

There are several mental experiences that everyone seems to sense regularly in life—some more than others, of course, but these are the universal ones:

1. From time to time, *thoughts or ideas* seem to appear in the mind out of nowhere, which are not linked to what we were thinking about—that feeling that you just got “interrupted” or got an idea from “out of nowhere.” Most inventors get key concepts and ideas like this at the moment of a break-through, often in a direction different from anything they had been thinking about previously.
2. There are little *reminders* that come to mind, seemingly out of nowhere, prompting us to remember something, or go back and get something when leaving the home. It could be a reminder to call someone, to think about someone or to do something. I have found that when I act on those reminders when they come, it often turns out to be very timely: the person is home when I called, or the person needed help at the time I was reminded to call or visit.
3. There are *Promptings* that push us to do something we know we should do, but don’t feel like doing. For kids, it is often a prompting to do homework instead of playing with friends. For moms, it may be a prompting to turn off the television and clean up the house or do the dishes. For dads, it can often be a prompting to fix something the wife has been nagging about for months, when he feels “too tired” or wants to watch television.
4. And last but certainly not least, there are those very helpful *Nervous feelings* that warn people about doing something that isn’t quite right or a danger to us. It could even be over an offensive word in anger, about eating too much, about buying junk food, splurging on something one can’t afford, or making a bad investment. The contrasting feeling we are looking for are *Calm Feelings* or assurances that you’re on the right path.

Social scientists have spent considerable time and effort trying to explain of these phenomena in terms of environmental preconditioning, or subconscious workings of the mind. The mental pressure of conscience is generally referred to as guilt, and many psychologists are quick to ridicule the validity of guilt, especially in matters which do not appear to have any immediate negative consequences.

It is true, that learned guidelines and environmental experiences can partially precondition the mind. But I do not believe in environmental determinism per se. I believe that environmental influences are compared to our own set of desires and ultimately against our innate personality set points—those innate proclivities to do and believe only what they are comfortable with.

Our own innateness plays a far greater role in explaining why people placed in similar environments aren't affected in the same ways. Some, in fact, are completely immune and unaffected by certain environmental conditions, while others are easily susceptible.

Others attribute the foregoing phenomenon to some “sixth sense”—a mystical kind of “gut feeling” that persons without a religious explanation use to define spiritual experience. Naturally, religious people attribute these things to divine intervention in the lives of mankind. Because the mind interacts with both its own internal, preconditioned feelings and external spiritual input, all of these explanations can be correct, but at different times. Let me explain in more detail how I view each of the four listed ways in which we receive influence by our conscience.

1. **IDEAS THAT INTERRUPT YOUR TRAIN OF THOUGHT**

Everyone experiences ideas occasionally that seem to "come from nowhere"—an interruption of our present train of thought. These ideas always form expressions in the mind that **sound like our own voice—same grammar, same syntax,**

same vocabulary—like talking to yourself. The only thing distinguishable is that the idea didn't seem to come from us—it felt like it was external and original.

Science alone simply has no credible explanation, in my opinion, for these phenomena, especially when you get a warning about someone else when you had no possibility of knowing there was a problem—other than to attribute them to coincidence. But, alas, these kinds of connections between people and unknowable events are simply too powerful to be mere coincidence.

You may disagree or have other ideas, but whatever your final conclusion, don't let it stop you from becoming more aware of the phenomenal accuracy of conscience in interacting with and prompting us about our thoughts and actions.

I believe that wherever thoughts are processed in the conceptual middle of the brain, there is a **receptor that is capable of receiving spiritual input**. What is spiritual input? I think it is simply a refined medium of communication different from anything we can measure in physical spectrum. But there exists an ability of the mind to detect these spiritual signals.

Although the mind is an idea processor, it doesn't appear to be able to distinguish easily the original source of any idea unless they come through one of the 5 senses (to see, feel, hear, touch or smell). Neither can it tell when an idea is received from outside the mind except when our own thoughts are interrupted by something that is a clear departure from our present train of thought.

In addition, there are **two different spiritual sources of ideas** that can come into our minds: One type is the inspiration and promptings we may receive from divine sources and the other type are temptations and enticements from opposing satanic forces. Neither divine nor satanic influences in the mind are accepted by the academic world, because they cannot be proven or measured scientifically. But, they are nevertheless quite real.

I believe everyone receives external spiritual influence whether they consciously acknowledge them or not. In fact, it really isn't necessary to know their nature to make use of them—and that may be even preferable from God's testing purposes, so that man doesn't know the "source from whence they come."

What makes the two forms of spiritual communication difficult to prove or even detect is that they both come into the mind as ideas that sound like our own words and thoughts. It is therefore both easy and natural to confuse them with our own human input and analysis. This adds to the interesting nature of life's test we are going through.

Thinking is a fairly conscious process. Sometimes it is not deliberate, as when your thoughts are just drifting from one thing to another. But the better thinkers in life are consciously aware of the thinking process and heading in a distinct mental direction most of the time.

In contrast to this conscious thinking process, external spiritual input always comes as a very subtle "interrupt" in your thought patterns. This happens most often when the mind is not engaged in heavy rational thought, or external sensory overload—that is, when it's open to being interrupted. They may or may not have to do with the subject in your mind, but generally one can recognize them as external since they come as a surprise.

Try to distinguish these interrupts from random thoughts. Some people's minds are much less ordered than others and have lots of idle, random thoughts. These people have the most difficult time perceiving external spiritual impressions—often because they have learned to tune out almost all random thoughts rather than go through the more difficult exercise of controlling and analyzing what they are thinking about.

This is an excellent way learn to discipline the mind. Force yourself to concentrate on every thought that floats into the mind, and analyze it for credibility. When you do that, not only do you find that some ideas are valuable,

but there are many worthless ramblings as well. And as you start to analyze and classify these random thoughts, you will naturally start to have less of the truly wandering variety—simply because the process of analyzing and classifying ideas naturally brings order and discipline to the mind.

2. REMINDERS

These are some of the most pleasant helps that come from an active conscience. The prompting to go back in the house for something you forgot, or the reception of a hint to look in a certain place when searching for something lost. You might be reminded to pay a bill before it's overdue or to call someone you've had trouble reaching. When you respond right away, things go better. I have found that if I disregard a reminder, I usually don't get reminded again and only remember on my own that I was reminded, once it is too late.

In business, you may be reminded to do something now, even though there seems to be no immediate pressing need—and later you learn that something unexpected came up confirmed why it had to be done then. In finance, you may be prompted to take some financial action before anyone realizes the market is going to change.

I have also found it very valuable to assume reminders are from the divine source, and **give thanks and credit accordingly**. After doing this for many years, I now have the conviction that, because of this attitude of gratitude, I get a lot more beneficial reminders than I did as a youth. Perhaps someone up there is pleased when someone recognizes this divine source of reminders, blessings and warnings.

3. PROMPTINGS

The kind of promptings I will address here have to do with nagging feelings from conscience that we should overcome some bad habit, or do some specific thing

we know we should do, but don't feel like doing. They can often feel like a reminder, but the difference here is that reminders are usually about something you aren't resistant to. Promptings almost always are pushing you to act because the source of the prompting knows you are going to be resistant.

Most people get these all the time, and these are the promptings or pushing feelings of conscience that nobody wants to hear. When we tell these to "go away" we are unwittingly telling the Lord to "get lost" and He does distance himself—an unintended consequence that will eventually prove costly toward our long-term progress.

When one makes a habit of disregarding promptings to change and improve, one no longer merits certain common blessings—like protection, good judgment, and freedom from illness—at least not in the same degree as before. When we regularly deny inspired suggestions, we are often left to fend for ourselves, and sometimes denied help when we most want it.

Some talented people do quite well on their own, by the world's standards, without paying attention to conscience, but they **never know what they are missing** had they learn to seek both professional competency and divine guidance. How does one calculate the value or merit of information one never receives? We can't—but are simply left on our own—and we wonder why things just don't seem to go well anymore, or why life doesn't seem to have any spark anymore. Eventually major errors begin to creep in; some moral, some not.

The cutoff of inspiration is gradual, just like the acquisition of a refined conscience. The Lord almost always avoids immediate consequences, to enhance this earthly test—so it's not obvious that there are eventual consequences for mistakes of bad judgment.

All of us remember the promptings we got as teenagers to do our homework when we least felt like it. Rationalizations would flood in: "You can do it later,"

“You can do it after you play with friends,” etc. Both teens and adults deal with the daily promptings to get up on time, or to help your Mom or wife with household chores, when you would rather watch TV. Some of the hardest promptings to handle are the ones that prompt you to do something better with your time than what you are doing—when it’s not actually wrong, but not the best use of your time.

In short, promptings almost always come when you are resistant—proving that you really need that nudge. It takes a lot of internal self-control to overcome your natural weaknesses, and to get good at always doing what you know you should do “especially when you don’t feel like it.” Following that little rule, as I will discuss later, is the best defense against depression.

Lastly, you need to distinguish between nagging feelings that come from recurring expectations from job, church, spouse, or family that are really NOT what you should be doing at this specific time. In other words, sometimes you feel nervous about acceding to a recurring demand when there is something better or more important that you should be doing. That’s what conscience is for—to help you order your priorities when there are multiple conflicting demands.

Don’t let other people or expectations make you feel guilty about things when you know there is something more important that you should be doing at that specific time. It may even be for the sake of your own health or stress level that conscience will tell you to decline an obligation rather than spread yourself too thin. Learn to say no when you feel right about your decisions without regret. Always let conscience be your guide, above rigid or set expectations.

4. **NERVOUS FEELINGS**

Whenever we receive any temptation, or create a thought of our own volition that is incorrect or less than correct, we will always receive a negative feeling either

from our own mind (when it has been trained to analyze correctly) or lacking that, from the divine source through conscience, or both. Most often, this signal from conscience appears as an instantaneous **nervous feeling, anxiety or fear as to the correctness of the thought or intention.**

It usually is very subtle, unless life threatening (when it may be quite strong). When people make a habit of ignoring nervous feelings, they become calloused to them, and they run the risk that these critical signals will become almost imperceptible to them.

There are significant differences in people's abilities to sense these little nervous warning feelings—especially in the small things. Some people are simply more sensitive to divine truths than other people—and it isn't necessarily related to the presence of organized religious training. Many people seem to feel divine promptings or warnings even in the absence of religious training. And others who receive a lot of formal religious training don't necessarily feel comfortable with it and do not internalize the still small voice of conscience. There is also the factor that all religious teachings may not be equally correct or divine—which may act as stumbling blocks for some very good people who don't feel comfortable in organized religion.

You might expect, or hope that the warning signals of conscience would be stronger and clearer the greater the danger or the mistake, but that isn't necessarily true. Sometimes we get penalized for years of disregarding conscience. And sometimes, for people who are brought up correctly by their parents, and who know better, the Lord turns down the volume (to a mere whisper, sometimes) to help us further refine our sensitivity to truth and to test our allegiance to even the smallest hint of error.

These nervous feelings can even disappear altogether if people becomes so hardened in evil desires (and thus become insensitive to them) that they no longer hear them. God is very reluctant to break the hidden veil around the earth, that obscures the spiritual world around us and which keeps His presence hidden. That's part of this earthly test, to see who can sense small spiritual signals, rather than wait for some dramatic intervention by God.

It is important to differentiate between the nervous feelings that come from conscience and other normal nervousness that comes as a result of having to do something unfamiliar, new or outside our comfort zone. For example, a young person might be asked to give a short talk in front of an audience. It may be a proper and good experience, yet he feels very tense about it, as in stage fright.

Thus, it's important to realize (and to teach your children) the difference between nervousness related to correctness and that which comes from doing something new or unfamiliar.

One way to resolve the question is to ask yourself a question that addresses the rightness of the action. "Should I be doing this? Is it the right thing to do?" Assuming it is right; one will feel calm about answering, "yes" to the question, even if you're still nervous about the performance. Sometimes if still in doubt, it helps to reverse the question and ask if it is "wrong" to do this. By now, the correct answer should be more clear.

Sometimes there are legitimate gray areas of doubt, especially when dealing with situations where there is nothing wrong with the action (that is wholly legal and good by everyone's standards), but where doubts still exist. Worse yet, one might feel good about it, but a parent or spouse may not. What do you do, then? In these cases, we have a conflict between someone's mind and another's conscience. Which one is getting the proper signal? I recommend one or two approaches.

Sometimes it is helpful to seek out the advice of another person whose judgments you know to be wise and trustworthy, and who is good at listening to conscience. Ask for their opinion before you give them any rationalizations or justifications about the issue. Trustworthy, wise people may not always be those we consider our closest friends. Learn to distinguish between people you like and people in

whom you have higher trust in their wisdom or good judgment. Hopefully, every parent should strive to be such a person of trust for their own children.

In like manner, every person should make it his highest priority to find a mate with a solid feeling for conscience. One of the most interesting things I learned from my mother's refined intuition is that wives can often spot or sense a bad business deal even when they know nothing about the technical matters involved. Sometimes it is easier for them to feel the nervous feelings of conscience since they are not wrapped up in the business process or in the desire to make it go through.

Every one of the bad business deals made by my late father was presaged by my mother, who could always sense when my Father was going to have problems with an unreliable business partner. My mother's judgment never failed, and my father didn't always learn from his business mistakes. Other than this flaw in his investment decision making, he was otherwise a wise and loving father with deep spiritual insights into life.

If you have no source of trust to check your doubts with, start mentally going forward with the plan in your mind. If it is the wrong choice, the nervous feelings should increase the closer you get to action. That is a definite warning sign you don't want to miss. In fact, the presence of rationalizations is always an indication that you don't feel calm about it.

With high risk financial decisions, there can be an additional risk of "digging yourself in a hole," where one bad investment leads to more pressure to salvage it with yet another risky deal. It takes courage sometimes to walk away with a modest loss, rather than get deeper into a bad situation.

Unfortunately, like in a commitment to marry the wrong person, too many people get so far down the road that pulling out can get very embarrassing, and expensive. Nevertheless, I have found that it is always better to listen to the warnings of conscience, no matter what the consequences—even if one has to

notify all the guests that the wedding is called off. I've stopped counting the number of divorced people I've known who had such warnings in their mind after they committed to marriage, but were too embarrassed to back out.

CALM FEELINGS (as the contrast to nervous feelings)

The positive side of conscience works like this: when we think of appropriate thoughts and actions, we will feel calm about them (as to the correctness). It is still natural to be anxious about new or difficult things ahead, even when correct. In reality these calm assurances are what produce that internal peace that comes from doing what is right. Most of the time, calm feelings are simply the complete absence of doubt and nervous feelings (about the correctness).

One of the most important things naturally fearful people can learn when confronted with constant worry about a child or spouse who is away, is to simply ask, "Is he OK?" or "Will he be alright?" If true, you'll feel a calm confirmation and then you can stop worrying about it and trust in your feelings. Sometimes that takes some self-control to force yourself to stop worrying and trust your feelings in conscience.

Watch Out for Rationalizations

In contrast to the above, evil spiritual forces attempt to imitate calm feelings whenever possible. This is most often done by getting people to rationalize away nervous feelings, or in other ways, talk themselves into something that isn't right. Everyone knows what that process feels like. Rationalizations are especially powerful when they match your own desires to do something. When you want something badly enough, watch out for powerful rationalizations which may drown out nervous feelings.

It is important to establish a habit pattern of learning to recognize rationalizations just as they begin, and to cut them off. The deeper one gets into these excuses the

more the false hope increases that it will turn out well, when it won't. Rationalizations are a trap. Be careful also not to be guilty of trying to feed rationalization to someone else you may want to have join you in an activity. His or her nervousness may be your last chance to escape future consequences—since you may already be “past feeling” the proper nervous feelings.

So, why do so many people persist in pushing past those warnings, even when they know better? As mentioned before, it is often because they established a habit pattern of disregarding conscience very early in life, or heeding peer pressure too often. Sometimes it is also the failure of parents to reinforce and correct conscience when their children are young.

All too often one parent will intervene with the one who is upset and offer permissive counsel like, “let them go, dear—they're just having fun.” Bad judgment like this isn't easily corrected, even in the face of continual problems with your kids. Permissive parents tend to excuse continued problems as if they weren't permissive or “loving” enough! That's where innate resistant to tough discipline in a parent causes a real blind spot—where they only feel nervous about being too strict, and not about being too permissive.

All too often, the parent's own conscience has become so clouded that they don't even feel intolerance for most bad behavior. It has long been a source of consternation to me when observing families with out of control children, where the children's behavior doesn't seem to bother the parents at all—or at least not enough to stop it.

Differentiating Good and Evil Signals in Conscience

Promptings from the Lord always point you in directions that you will ultimately feel right about doing. Satanic temptations and enticements, on the other hand, are not so predictable. While they more often than not appeal to the carnal or egotistical side of your desires, they may involve complete falsehoods,

or even partial truths, depending on how the dark side thinks they can best get you to make an error.

Thus, you cannot judge the source of external spiritual input by the substance of the thought alone. Satan will often use full truth, partial truth, or even excess truth (meaning, more than what is appropriate for the circumstances) to get you to make a mistake. Ultimately, the loss of internal peace and confidence will, if humbly recognized, indicate the nature of this source of ideas.

In general, Satan will attempt to counter what the Lord desires for us, though he may and does use rationalizations that you might think are OK. When Satan supplies the original bad idea in your mind, the Lord responds with nervous feelings to warn us of something is wrong with that idea. You may not know what the right answer is, but at least you know this isn't it. Satan begins to counter with rationalizations to make you feel good about it—that's the process of implanting a false sense of calmness. It takes significant time and experience to detect the difference and become good at it, so don't be discouraged if you get fooled once in a while.

The reason that rationalizations are so convincing, if you insist on listening to them, is that the Lord does not always persist in providing warnings to those determined to go their own way. Sometimes He does, when the issue is extremely serious, but often, the Lord allows us to be led away by our own desires, especially when we refuse to learn by any way other than bad consequences.

The greater, long-term danger of rationalization is that conscience itself becomes dull and insensitive. The mind is very quick and can learn to easily evade the subtle warnings of conscience or bring out well-used rationalizations to help out. The Lord believes in letting people follow their innate desires if they are determined to do so—that's part of the test of life. Things don't go better in life when you stifle the voice of conscience, no matter what the movies and commercials infer about immorality, worldly attitudes and "life in the fast lane."

Let's now look at how Satan works on people who are resistant to normal sins and temptations. Once a person becomes fairly good at recognizing temptation and is resolved to stay true to their principles, they become fair game for "**overshooting the mark**," (being tempted to go beyond that which is appropriate).

In this deception, Satan takes advantage of a person's desire to do something good or significant, and feeds them ideas that will get them to go to an extreme that will result in the person rejected or discredited. This is a real danger mostly for good people with lots of drive or ambition.

I've seen a lot of examples of this with good people involved in the struggle for political truth and freedom. The Lord has his own timetable for reversing tyranny and his sword of justice doesn't usually fall upon evil until the majority of people have become corrupt enough to deserve what comes. It's easy to get discouraged as years go by and we continue to lose liberty. Some may even be tempted to take revolutionary action before the Lord is ready to approve, or before a large enough minority is inconvenienced enough to join in.

Among the best people—those most sensitive to issues of truth, the temptation to overshoot the mark is the hardest deception to see, and difficult to undo once you go down that path.

Selective Spirituality

Of all the deceptions, the most subtle, is spiritual blindness. It begins by disregarding promptings, no matter how small or insignificant. But the more common malady among otherwise good people is being a good listener to things we want to hear and becoming deaf to promptings we don't want to hear—that's what leads to partial spiritual blindness.

If one seeks only for worldly success, especially prestige and self-advancement, it is easy to become receptive only to promptings or temptations which lead to getting ahead quickly—toward wealth and personal advancement, or recognition. It's not that those things are bad in and of themselves, but when we only desire divine help for reasons of self-aggrandizement, and not self-correction, the Spirit of Truth is offended and one gets cut off from higher truth and help in the future. People who play this selective game with truth may be allowed to advance for many more years, but eventually they stumble or fall when a major warning or prompting is missed.

A highly successful lawyer, for example, will often use his success in the legal field to think he is so great, he doesn't have to lose weight, exercise, or treat people more courteously. In other words, his pride in one justifiable area allows him to cover his other weaknesses and dismiss them. Even religious leaders can get carried away with excessive pride and use flamboyant language and gestures in sermons, or brag about their presumed relationship with God.

Someday, they'll find out that the Lord is offended when people only want to hear things that lead to greater wealth and recognition but reject the warnings and criticism that lead to greater humility and goodness.

This process of "selecting only the truth you want to hear" will create "limits" on your personal progress. Anyone who places limits on the types of truth they will accept is courting eventual disaster, and will suffer from spiritual blindness generally, and will lack vision about essential advanced truths that lead one out of the dangers that will befall society.

GETTING RESTARTED WITH CONSCIENCE

I cannot overemphasize the importance of allegiance to truth as it comes via conscience. Even if you are not a religious person, or if you dispute my belief

that God is the source of the positive promptings to conscience, try the following test:

For the next month, try to assiduously follow every prompting of conscience you feel is right, and see if two things don't happen. First, if you are diligent in listening and responding to the promptings, they should increase in quantity, and get even more specific about mistakes you have been making. You will get more promptings than you want or are comfortable with, if your initial experience is like mine.

In the process, you will notice how conscience will tend to focus more and more on your personal bad habits, rather than on simple reminders to do important things during the day. All told, you should be able to look back on your experience and say that things went a lot better when the promptings were followed carefully and not resisted.

It is easy to become discouraged during this test. Your comfort levels will be challenged constantly, and there are dark spiritual forces out there that don't want you to start listening closely to this guiding voice and will do anything to keep you from improving your sensitivity and commitment to self-control. Remember that the positive promptings of conscience almost always involve things that we normally do not want to do—because “it's too hard,” you think, or inconvenient.

Get in a habit of forcing yourself to comply with every little prompting that you feel is right, no matter how trivial it seems—like picking up a piece of trash you see on the floor, or putting things back in their proper place. Often those come just to test how committed you are to listening and doing.

Some will overdo it thinking that they have to comply with every single thought that comes to mind. That's not what I'm saying. You always need to be listening for that brief but subtle confirmation that it is the right thing to do at that specific time. Sometimes you shouldn't stop and do some small thing when there are

other more pressing priorities. If you leave off this last step, Satan can easily flood your mind with useless distractions that divert you from more important things. That's all part of the **trial and error part of developing better judgment with conscience.**

Secondly, when you are reminded or prompted to do beneficial things, like remembering something you forgot, give credit to the Lord, even if you aren't sure it came from Him. If these things are from Him, He will be appreciative of your remembering and will bless you with more promptings. Try this and see.

With the exception of those dedicated to being indecisive or rebellious, I have never, had any person come back to me after trying this test and say that they didn't begin to have an increase in promptings, and more positive outcomes when promptings were followed.

Finally, here are **two simple rules** to help everyone tie into the workings of conscience with more sensitivity and success. These aren't mechanistic rules because they simply get people to focus on the two prime signals of conscience that involve a change in behavior. These signals are not the same for everyone, but individualized to your personal needs. Memorize them and teach them to your children:

- 1. Never do anything you feel nervous about, as to the correctness.**
- 2. Always force yourself to do what you know you should do, especially when you don't feel like it.**

The **first rule** ensures against major errors. Yes, occasionally, if you and your wife are too cautious, you may lose an opportunity or two. But the important thing in life is to avoid major mistakes, from which you may not be able to recover. Life and the heavens can always guide you to other opportunities if you miss one through excessive caution, but when we disregard conscience, and make a major error, sometimes it takes years to recover.

When nervous feelings come, remember, that they don't tell you what you should do, only that what you have concluded is, at the least, not quite right. You have to apply yourself and think it through again, until you find a solution you feel is right. The reason **God works this way is so that we grow**. If He simply provided all the answers directly in prayer, we would become dependent and weak and wouldn't grow. By teaching us to hear a caution and then work hard to find out why, we grow and become better people.

Often we can't find an answer when we want it, so we have to wait until something does come to mind. Even if the answer is right, you may feel nervous because the timing of your action may not be right. In any case, waiting will usually make the problem clearer at a later time. This is especially important as to lifelong decisions like marriage. If in doubt, wait. It will become clear with time.

The **second rule** ensures that you will put pressure on yourself to do the positive things you are prompted to do in life, that you know are right.

This second rule is the most important way to overcome depression, bar none. No one gets severely depressed without disregarding the first rule. And no one gets out of depression without living the second.

Whenever depressed, just ask yourself, "What should I be doing right now?" Several things will come to mind—you probably won't feel like doing any of them (especially if an evil, brooding spirit is bearing down on you). But choose one you feel best about, and then muster all your willpower and force yourself to get up and do it. Depression has a hard time plaguing a person that is actively doing something productive. This process gets easier every time you try it.

Remember also that the more you progress, the more subtle will become the temptations and trials. Rely on that still small voice of conscience and you will always have just the amount of inspiration and help you need to make it through—not without trial and effort, mind you, but there will always be a way out.

Even if you never come to a complete surety of the truth of what I have said here, following conscience to the best of your ability at any given level of progress will ensure that eventually, you will come to a deeper understanding of these promptings over the course of this life. And when you finally meet your maker, you will recognize him as that friendly voice in your mind that always kept pushing you on towards perfection of the heart.

I honestly think that the Lord wants us to learn from conscience—not simply become mechanically obedient to it. That is why I think the signals are so subtle—so that you really have to feel and think about them, and figure out what is right when you get conflicting signals. It may be frustrating at first, but keep learning from the mistakes you make in listening and eventually you will get better at it.

This much I have learned; that no matter how intelligent and well trained we may become in life, we never know enough about the future to become independent from divine wisdom and foreknowledge. That is why conscience will always be around—because we need it.

SUICIDE AND CONSCIENCE

Lastly, I have to mention suicide because it has become epidemic in our society and is a classic case of Satanic voices overwhelming the divine voice inside one's mind. The major flaw in professional counseling is that establishment training in psychology denies the most important factor involved in suicidal

thoughts —the overwhelming role of Satanic depression in a person’s spirit. They either don’t believe in Satan or have been conditioned by their secular training to never touch religious principles and to excuse all depression as a chemical imbalance, treatable with **mood altering drugs** —that I have found actually suppress the workings of conscience.

When SSRI drugs are used to treat depression, I believe that they end up suppressing the mind’s reception of the signals of conscience, including the bad signals from Satanic influences that often cause mental problems and erratic behavior. That’s why they appear to work, while the patient is on them. These drugs are used a lot to help children suppress chronic ADD and other mental control problems and there are some pretty bad side effects.

During withdrawal from these drugs, there appears to be a high correlation between withdrawal and suicidal thoughts which many have complained about. My personal opinion is that this is caused by the sudden reintroduction of satanic influence of the mind that was suppressed before.

I found out about this suppression of conscience while trying to help a good friend’s teenage daughter who was abusing drugs and having moral problems. I taught her about the workings of conscience in order to re-sensitize her mind to those divine corrective signals. But, she clearly didn’t like hearing them, not wanting to change her behavior.

Her parents finally took her to a psychiatrist who put her on mood altering drugs, and she seemed to improve for a while, at least in attitude. I saw her about a month later with her new “carefree” mental attitude and asked her what made the difference. She said, “Once on this drug, I couldn’t hear that nagging voice of conscience anymore!”

That was a wake up call for me. Yes, the high level of satanic influence might be suppressed when on a drug, yielding temporary stability, but she was no longer

getting the corrective voice of conscience either. And, with the crutch of mood altering drugs, people rarely learn to overcome their own problems, until they get off of them, and tie into the beneficial signals of conscience. So, parents beware of the lure of psychotropic drugs, the dumbing down of conscience, and their potential link to suicide.

I've had a brother commit suicide, and have known several others who have succumbed to it. I have never met anyone with suicidal thoughts that wasn't under the constant barrage of Satanic depression, and feeding them thoughts about how there's "no way out" except by killing themselves.

More than just trying to talk someone out of their negative thoughts, it's important to teach them how Satan can also speak to their mind without them recognizing it—because everything coming through conscience comes in their own voice and grammar. People with suicidal thoughts always think they are talking to themselves, but it isn't necessarily true. Teach them that any idea about killing themselves is coming from Satan. It's not really them, and how to resist it.

The two rules of conscience really help here. When anyone is depressed remind them of rule #2, to stop sulking and get up and do something they know they should be doing, especially now that they don't feel like it.

If you've raised your children with this habit since they were young, they should have already developed the self-control to know how to force themselves to act when depressed. It's the most important training you can give them so that they develop a natural resistance to suicidal thoughts.

Sadly, few parents watch out for the signs of depressive inaction and have not learned how to discipline bad attitudes and get their children into action when depressed. If you don't teach this when they are young, and expect them to do it, it will be much, much tougher when under the severe Satanic depression which often comes in their teens or young adulthood.

Don't forget to pray your heart out as well for Satanic spiritual influences to be lifted from your home, and teach your kids to pray deeply as well when they recognize Satan's influence on them. That said, remember that you can't pray away Satanic influence if you are permissive and allow bad influences to enter your home constantly through television, cellphones, books or the influence of problem friends in public schools. A lot of societal shielding is necessary in today's world until children get old enough and strong enough spiritually to see and resist. That's why homeschooling has now become so important with discerning parents.

TEACHING CHILDREN ABOUT CONSCIENCE

When teaching your children about the workings of conscience, be careful not to convert the signals of conscience into specific rules alone. Rules are important in a home, but they aren't as effective long term as teaching a child how to be self-governing through listening to conscience. I realize that it is sometimes easier for parents to create a rule rather than explain how they had a feeling before something went wrong, but of the two, the latter will yield better results.

My own mother made this mistake. She had an excellent conscience, but whenever she observed her children doing something wrong, she would correct us and sometimes make up a new rule. There were never enough rules to cover everything, and we could usually find exceptions to the rules. If she had instead corrected us and then asked, "Didn't you feel nervous about that before you did that?" we would have begun to listen for those warning signals.

It's not enough to just tell kids "let conscience be your guide" because there is more than one voice in each person's mind, and they need to learn to differentiate between good promptings and rationalizations and temptations, as I explained earlier. Parents have to learn to correct the errors of conscience children make, but many are reluctant because they themselves haven't been listening to all the

signals. Believe me, once you start teaching children about conscience and correcting them, they'll let you know when they see you not doing what's right. That's OK, as long as they do it respectfully.

When you apply the things I've mentioned here, you should be able to feel a distinct improvement in your ability to listen, and you'll also experience an improved ability to detect the things your children are doing wrong—and that includes their attitudes as well. **When you correct bad attitudes** before they become bad actions, they will make fewer mistakes.

At what age can you begin to teach conscience? In my experience, a child doesn't begin to really understand or hear his conscience until somewhere between 3 and 5 years of age.

You can tell when a child is starting to perceive conscience when they start looking around to see if someone is watching when they are about to do something they shouldn't, or when they become evasive or tell lies. Once they get to this age, instead of only telling a child what they did wrong, you need to start probing about how they felt before they did something wrong.

Get used to asking first if they had any nervous feelings before they did what they did. This will be most effective if the thing they did caused harm to themselves or broke something. If they don't remember feeling anything, don't be afraid to explain to them that they should feel a tiny nervous feeling whenever they are about to do something wrong.

The first step is to teach children to pay attention to the thoughts in their minds. Most children have a hard time picking up on the warning signals because they are running around doing things so fast, and their mind is running at such a pace, that they do not slow down their thinking enough to hear anything. Don't be afraid to demand a child slow down and stop acting in erratic ways—at all times.

Uncontrolled behavior is the biggest enemy a child has to picking up on the signals of conscience.

The Importance of Developing Self Control

In preparation for teaching a child to abide by the tiny signals of conscience, you have to teach and expect a child to learn self-control when they are young. If you have to count to 3 or 5 before they obey your call to “come!” you’re allowing your child to develop a very bad habit of procrastination and perhaps even rebellion. If they can ignore and defy your verbal demands think how easily they will evade the tiny voice of conscience.

The foregoing has been about errors and mistakes a child makes and teaching them how to listen to nervous feelings that warn against mistakes. But the other half of a child’s problems involve failure to do anything good or right when they aren’t being directed by the parent. That’s where teaching children how to hear promptings from conscience comes in.

When children get to that age when they are starting to hear their conscience, they have to face the transition from a world of constant playing or being entertained to one of self-direction and begin to make productive decisions.

In this stage of life, they often complain to parents about being “bored” with “nothing to do.” That’s a sign that they aren’t used to checking their conscience for what they should be doing. I don’t expect kids to pick up on being productive all on their own. This takes some direction from parents—teaching them how to use a book, how to clean up their room, make something, or draw a picture or other productive activities.

Once given some training and expectations, conscience can now begin to prompt them in little ways. Once you develop a good routine at home with chores for the

kids, and lists of things they can do or learn in their spare time, you'll start to see they still come up with the "I'm bored" routine. That's a good time to suggest they **check their mind for what they should be doing**.

If they immediately come up with a string of rationalizations and excuses of why they don't want to do those things, then you know they are starting to be fed excuses from the dark side of conscience. It's natural. It happens to all of us, but it's a good opportunity to sit down with them and explain how to tell the difference between the good promptings we get and the negative excuses that come into the mind to stop us from doing what's right.

It takes a few years of interacting with your children about what you are feeling and what they are feeling for these concepts to sink in and become natural for them. Don't think that you can sit them down and explain conscience from A to Z to them and be done with it. It is in the little reminders and corrections you give a child about his or her conscience that is most effective.

But hardly anyone even thinks consciously about conscience anymore, let alone how to correct it in others. That's why we've become a rule-making people, and a legalistic society. It's a poor system except in helping citizens avoid major crimes.

At the micro level of life, rules are never specific enough to cover every situation and every contingency, so it is natural for people to think they have a lot of leeway in their behavior, beyond the rules. But they don't, really. Conscience has an opinion about almost everything—though it won't allow you to use it like a Ouija board—asking yes or no questions on who to marry or what stocks to put your money into.

MENTAL HABITS THAT DETER THE OPERATIONS OF CONSCIENCE

There are two tendencies in behavior that lend themselves to problems with conscience. The first are people that don't control their thoughts or expressions well. Those types of people tend to get the most false signals and often develop chronic bad judgment.

The second are people who think too fast or flit from one thing to another without thinking. They need to consciously slow down in order to hear the small voice of conscience, as I suggested with training children.

A third group are intellectual and scientific oriented people who lack any feelings for seeking out or dealing with spiritual promptings. Intellectual and scientific pursuits require very heavy emphasis on the deductive and inductive thought processes from sensory inputs alone.

They also take great care to exclude random and non-traceable inputs. This can easily lead to bias against feelings or the acceptance of spiritual input that can't be proven. Not all intellectuals have this problem.

Increasing Your Self Control

It does little good to hear the promptings of conscience unless one develops sufficient self-control to force yourself to follow those promptings. Conscience is an internal process. Once you've left home, there's no one to prod you do what you know you should be doing by your conscience. So, if you haven't developed ample self-control skills, you'll fail at what I'm trying to teach here—perhaps not in the listening part, but certainly in the follow-through part.

For example, people often get reminders from conscience to do something, and put it off until it is convenient. That may involve listening to a rationalization or it may be a lack of self-control. It takes a lot more self-control to abide by a

prompting in conscience because the voice or idea is so tiny and because there is no one hovering over you to enforce it. And though there usually are consequences for evasion and procrastination eventually, they may not show up for years. By that time, you probably won't even relate the failure to your chronic failure to listen and act.

So, how do we improve self-control? The answer lies in the interesting link between the physical and the mind. When the mind is required to put pressure on the physical side of self, either to suppress improper or untimely urges, or to make it perform something difficult, the mind gains strength and gets better at controlling urges that come from a complaining body. The mind does not develop the same degree of self-control when it is only required to operate on mental aspects alone. The mental effort required to suppress an idea is often easier than suppressing strong physical drives.

Thus, it is no surprise that forcing yourself to do strenuous and invigorating physical exercise is one of the best ways to develop mental self-control. Hard breathing, calorie burning exercises are perfect for improving both mental and physical strength. There is also something about the slow fatigue that builds up over long distances and time with aerobic exercise that builds endurance and mental toughness. If you are not used to heavy exercise, get a good checkup and work up gradually in your toughening process.

Once a person has developed good mental powers over physical control, they need to start applying this control to other weaknesses—being overweight is a common but tough one. Bad speech or conversation habits are another (these are especially difficult to break). Ultimately, one needs to apply themselves to eliminate bad mental habits of daydreaming, drifting, or erratic thinking.

CORRECTING CONSCIENCE

The most common problem with conscience is people's tendency to make permanent rationalizations that seal off reception of certain signals. They no longer hear the warnings. In other words, people talk themselves into accepting that a problem is no longer a problem—or that it is beyond their capacity to change. They become immune to any future nervous feelings on that subject and their judgment begins to deteriorate in other areas. Here is a list of some of the most common areas where people cut off the signals of conscience, and no longer hear them:

- Eating junk food, overeating in general and accepting the weight problem
- Ignoring bad behavior in their children
- Watching too much TV and unhealthy movies, music, books and other “entertainment”
- Indulging in addictions: alcohol, pornography, smoking, etc.

There are many more but those are some of the most common in our society.

It's hard for any person to see what they are missing in conscience, but others close to them can see faults more easily. Your parents, spouse, or close friends can sometimes be your biggest help in correcting conscience. They will often be reluctant to intervene and help you see unless you invite them in to give you helpful observations.

There are risks in that of potential offenses, but not so much if you are dealing with someone who is also good at listening to conscience. They'll hear the signal and know how to tread properly on your feelings.

There are many professionals who people are often encouraged to pay to help, but most of these don't understand any of the principles I've espoused here. Most of the rehab or self-help systems professionals develop for dealing with these

problems involve gimmicks to reduce the pain of change. In fact many will tell you that “self-control doesn’t work.”

In reality, **self-control always works**, it is people that fail to develop enough of it or the mental strength to endure the pain that all change requires. The great thing about getting good about listening to conscience and finding the control to abide by it is that these larger addictions never happen. If they ever do, applying yourself to the little self-control restrictions of conscience will help build the mental strength to tackle the larger addictions, with the help of God, family and friends.

CONCLUSION

Within the workings of conscience are found the essence of our *final examination* on earth. No matter what you do publicly on earth—no matter how much fame, fortune or power you accumulate, the core judgment concerning your conduct on earth will center around how you have reacted to the thousands of promptings you received in conscience over a lifetime.

We’ve all made mistakes, but no matter what has gone on before, we can always repent, change, and repudiate our past and begin the healing process by linking yourself to the still small voice of conscience—which will lead you back to that God who sent us here.

But the longer one waits, the more difficult the process of change, and the more distant the voice of conscience becomes. It takes many years to become accurate and sensitive to the whisperings of conscience, even when we try our very best to listen and obey; so be patient. But don’t ever allow yourself to become lax. Learn to love the still small voice of conscience, and always be on guard for correction. Commit yourself to act when you know what is right—especially when you don’t feel like it. That’s the key to a better life.

Thanks for listening

Joel Skousen

JOEL SKOUSEN: GOVERNMENT COVER-UPS

THE PHONY FALL OF THE SOVIET UNION

In late February 2023 the Alex Jones show called me and requested an interview on the issues surrounding the Ukraine war. I assumed it would be with Alex as usual, but it turned out to be with Owen Shroyer instead. The result was a disturbing interview as Shroyer has a completely pro-Russia point of view on the war, and went far beyond the normal conservative thinking error that “anyone the globalists are against must be good.”

He actually said that if it weren’t for the globalists attacking him, Russia would rather be an ally of the West rather than China. No thinking person has ever gone that far before. Even though the Alex Jones staff gets my World Affairs Brief, they apparently don’t read it—especially the previous Friday’s brief where I specifically went over the history of the Russia-Chinese alliance going back decades, and how Communism was still alive and well in Russia.

I had to re-explain all this to Shroyer, who had no evidence to rebut me, but doggedly held on to his belief that Putin was a good guy and a Christian who was

fighting our globalists in pursuit of liberty. I then launched into a review of the phony fall of the Soviet Union, which he was completely ignorant about, even though I have discussed this at least twice in the past year with Alex Jones on his show. I even mentioned that the Russian defector [Anatoliy Golitsyn had written two books](#) on how the Soviets were planning on faking their own demise, which he had not read. The CIA did nothing with Golitsyn's revelations because at that time they were still in the hidden mode of building Russia and China as future enemies---or at least not exposing their real intentions.

I even offered to review the evidence of the phony fall, but he wasn't interested. I got a wave of email response from listeners complaining about how ignorant Shroyer was of basic conspiratorial history, and how he continually interrupted me with his protestations about how he didn't believe me, but had no evidence to back up his "Pollyanna" view of Putin.

He ended by claiming that his argumentative style was reminiscent of "great classic talk radio." Surprisingly, Newswars.com posted the entire interview despite it being a big negative for Shroyer's style and lack of openness to evidence, with this intro:

Geopolitical analyst Joel Skousen joins host Owen Shroyer on The Alex Jones Show to break down the true dangers of the rising tensions with China and Russia leading up to WW3.

"Russia and China are against our globalists, but not because they intend to give any semblance of freedom to the world, but because they want to establish their own system of New World Order," Skousen said. "-Very tyrannical in the aftermath of what is going to become an inevitable World War III and nuclear war. But it won't start with Ukraine...there will be

another trigger even that has to involve China. And that's most likely either Taiwan or North Korea."

Perhaps the most irritating aspect to listeners was when he declined to hear the evidence about the phony fall of the Soviet Union. So even though I have covered this several times in past years in the World Affairs Brief, I'll give new subscribers the following summary:

1. Erik Honeker, dictator of E. Germany admitted on his deathbed in Chile that Moscow gave him orders to let the student protests in Leipzig go forward—proving that the fall was not spontaneous but directed by Moscow. Those protests started the movement by letting people think they were free to rebel, without being arrested. There was always a deep underlying dissatisfaction with Soviet occupation of Europe, but students always knew they would be arrested by the Stazi if they really got organized. All student organizations were infiltrated by the secret police, just as they were in Russia. So, I presume those spies suddenly began to encourage students to organize and protest. They knew the Stazi were told to stand down and would not arrest students. That's the only way the "spontaneous" uprising could have begun in a repressive state.

2. The Russian press said the KGB failed to capture Gorbachev in his undefended villa. Is that believable? The KGB had overthrown whole governments before and specialized in being able to assassinate at will, and yet all the most powerful and sinister organs of oppression in Soviet Russia suddenly failed to capture Gorby with only a few security guards in place?

3. While the alcoholic Boris Yeltsin was addressing student protestors in Red Square atop that tank, the television stations airing his speech and giving it prime coverage were still under the control of the Communist Party. Why didn't they cut off the television feed to keep the "revolution" from growing? I watched a documentary featuring Russian students who were part of that protest gathering, and one student is seen asking, "The only thing we couldn't understand was, 'where were the KGB?' They were always following us everywhere and tracking everything we did." It was because the KGB was also told to stand down.

4. It was announced that the counter coup against Gorbachev had failed and that the Defense Minister, the head of the KGB, and the GRU supposedly fled for their lives. No one asked the obvious question: "**Who were they fleeing from?**" When you are the heads of the military, the KGB, and the GRU—who do you flee from, unless you are simply puppets and told to flee as part of the ruse. In fact, each of these heads were mid-level bureaucrats a year before they were elevated to these high positions. Whoever put them there held real power, not them.

5. The same goes for Gorbachev and the entire Politburo. Gorby was a mid level arms negotiator 2 years before being named head of the Politburo, and so were most of the others. Whoever chose them were the real hidden leaders.

6. Those hidden Communist leaders turned out to be the "new Oligarchs" that emerged after the "fall"—Boris Berezovsky and friends, who had the power to tell the Russia state bank to loan them the money to buy up the oil industry, Gazprom, and media companies. Only the real hidden Communist leaders could have had that kind of power over the Soviet State bank.

7. Berezovsky became the head of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), promoting the image of the "peaceful" version of the Soviet Union. But Berezovsky was still the real leader of the "continuing Soviets" as Christopher Storey of the UK would write. A Russian blogger wrote that inside the Kremlin, he saw Yeltsin, Berezovsky and several other high Russian leaders go into a room for a meeting, and Yeltsin stepped aside to let Berezovsky go in first—protocol left over from Soviet days indicating Yeltsin still recognized Berezovsky as the top leader in Russia.

8. Historically, we have zero examples of any tyrannical government that voluntarily stepped down and repented of their evil. They have all been

overthrown by force, except this one, which I don't believe for a minute was real. Erik Honeker also revealed that Moscow ordered he and all other Eastern European dictators to step down from power. All complied except for Nicolae Ceausescu of Romania. The Soviet created the "National Salvation Front" which arrested him, and held a tribunal where he and his wife Elena were sentenced to death by firing squad in Dec. 1989. He maintained at the show trial that this was all a Soviet plot to kill him—which it was.

9. As further proof, the Soviets never disarmed, though they allowed the US to pay for the massive cleanup of the Soviet bioweapons labs (while the Russians built new ones) and the dismantling of all their older liquid fueled missiles that were outdated. But the US allowed the Russians to keep all the warheads and even built them a new warhead refurbishment factory under the Nunn-Lugar legislation, which the Russians promptly locked US inspectors out of, once complete. The US never complained publicly, indicating they were helping Russia cover for this ruse—part of the long-standing secret policy of building future enemies.

10. The Soviets never told the West even after the fall that they had deceived the West in the Intermediate Nuclear Forces treaty and had never dismantled their SS-23 missiles, which were later still found in caves in Eastern Europe after the phony fall.

11. The Soviets created leaders who would appear friendly to the West in the Eastern European states in preparation for the fall—two that we know about were Lech Walesa who founded the Solidarity Labor Movement in Poland and who was given a Nobel Peace Prize and Vaclav Havel the famed leader of the Czech Republic. Both turned out to be Soviet agents.

12. In preparation for the fall the Soviets put the Russian speaking regions of Donbass and Crimea within the boundaries of Ukraine, so they could have an excuse to re-invade when these Russia people felt threatened. The Soviets also forced hundreds of thousands of Russians to immigrate to the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania for the same reason. They are still there and we will see them used as an excuse to invade someday too.

13. Yeltsin the puppet was eventually replace by V. Putin, who met with Berezovsky five times in Berezovsky's villa in Spain the year he ascended to the presidency—showing that Berezovsky was the real behind-the-scenes leader. If Spanish intelligence knew this, certainly they would have told the CIA too, who continued to cover for the phony fall.

Putin eventually had Berezovsky murdered in London and the rest of the original oligarchs jailed or exiled, picking instead new younger oligarchs who promised to give him a cut of their earnings in exchange for protection—making Putin the wealthiest man in the world. Several dissidents have been poisoned during Putin's reign---hardly the act of a Christian leader.

As for Putin's support for the Russian Orthodox Church, the Orthodox Church never ever criticized the Soviets during their rule because the Soviets had installed Communist church leaders in all the high positions of the Orthodox Church—in a deal that allowed the Church to continue despite the Soviet's hostility to all religions---except that one.

So, Putin's support for the communist-infiltrated Orthodox Church after the phony fall is not evidence of his being a true Christian. And, as I told Owen, they don't appoint Christians to be a colonel in the KGB. And real Christians don't ban or heavily restrict other smaller Christian sects like the Jehovah witnesses, the Seventh-Day Adventists and the Mormons as Putin has done in Russia. And Christians don't bomb civilians as Putin has done in Ukraine, nor take Ukrainian Children and send them to Russia to be "re-educated."

I cannot overstate the importance of these little-remembered facts that are crucial to understanding the true history and motives behind Russian leader's past actions because of the important perspective that it gives us on current events.

THE 2014 UKRAINE COUP WAS ALSO FAKED

Conservatives have also been fooled by the appearance of a Western coup in Ukraine in 2014 that overthrew a “duly elected” president, Viktor Yanukovich, an open Communist. This notion disturbed conservatives and contributed to the propaganda that Russia was provoked into attacking Ukraine, and has led to conservatives ignorantly supporting Russia in the Ukraine war. But it wasn't really a western coup even though the US Endowment for Democracy did give many millions to fund the protest in the Maidan square in Kiev.

Just as the “fall of Communism” was a grand deception, so was the Orange Revolution in Ukraine. The proof is found in the fact that the protest went on for months, bottled up in the Maidan square, and surrounded by the Berkut (Ukrainian riot police). But on the Friday morning when the protestors supposedly won, the Berkut had secretly been given a stand down order, and didn't show up, allowing the protestors to finally leave the square. Even the presidential palace was left without police guards.

The next day, Saturday, the ruling Left-wing-and Communist coalition in the Rada (Ukrainian Parliament) voted Yanukovitch out of office and the media said he fled Ukraine for fear of his life. How come? The protestors had no arms. And why would the Communist coalition vote out their own president?

The only thing conservatives hear about is that Victoria Nuland, a globalist in the State Department, was involved in the Orange Revolution, so it must have been a globalist trap. Just as they never heard the contradictory details of the Phony Fall, they never heard about the stand down orders to the Berkut, which could only have come from the Communist president.

Russia is not the good guy in this war, even though corruption is a sad fact of life in both Russia and Ukraine since the Communist bureaucrats were never removed from their positions of power after the false breakup of the Soviet Union. But the Ukrainian people don't deserve to live under the continuing but hidden tyranny of the Russians—who are still an existential nuclear threat to the West, along with China. Details matter.

The following is a compilation of the WAB commentary and analysis on the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 (through 2005)

World Affairs Brief, September 14, 2001 Copyright Joel Skousen. Partial quotations with attribution permitted. Cite source as Joel Skousen's World Affairs Brief (<http://www.worldaffairsbrief.com>)

BUSH WAR THREATS BASED ON ANOTHER MORE DANGEROUS AGENDA

There is something very dangerous and wrong about this new war fever being pushed upon the American people. Taking advantage of a nation shocked and shaken after being "under attack," the Bush administration is showing every sign of marshaling a much larger military force than necessary to tackle the stated enemy--international terrorism. Terrorism is a distributed and dispersed threat. It is not concentrated in any single country. There are perhaps two dozen significant terrorist training camps in the world, and any one of them can be neutralized by the judicious use of point air strikes and special forces. There are hundreds of smaller terrorist cells in all western countries. Some are too well hidden to be found, but many can be tackled by existing intelligence and police agencies. The point I am making, as forcefully as possible, is that this problem does not have to be attacked with a Gulf War style mobilization--which is precisely what President Bush and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld are building. Something is very wrong with the growing beat of Republican war drums. The 50,000 reservists being mobilized alone exceed by almost 10 times the number of known terrorists in the world. There appears to be a hidden agenda behind these major war preparations--and fighting terrorism may well be only the excuse.

First, I want to establish that the official US response to this terrorist attack showing surprise, shock and indignation is, in part, a sham. For years the US government has known and tracked every significant terrorist organization to raise its head, and yet has done little to impede their growth or target their weapons procurement lines (with the exception of one attack on a Libyan terrorist training camp in the 80's, and those camps were back in operation within months). There is even evidence of US intelligence agencies turning a blind eye on terrorist preparations for just such an attack as happened this week. As Reed Irvine, writing for NewsMax.com, reported,

"In 1995, when one of his (Osama bin Laden's) followers, Abdul Hakim Murad, was arrested in Manila, the Philippine authorities discovered a plot on his laptop computer that called for hijacking US airliners and bombing them or crashing them into targets, including the CIA. It was called Project Bojinka, and US officials were made aware of it at that time. Murad admitted that he was being trained for a suicide mission. He was extradited to the US and convicted, together with Ramzi Yousef, of participating in the World Trade Center bombing in 1993. That should have focused the attention of the CIA, FBI and NSA on any indications that bin Laden had not abandoned Project Bojinka. Reports that bin Laden was training pilots should have set alarm bells ringing. Only a few months ago an American Airlines crew had their uniforms and ID badges stolen from their hotel room in Rome. At the end of August, the airline alerted its employees to be on the lookout for impostors, but apparently no one saw this as a possible link to Project Bojinka. Airport security remained as lax as ever. Next came bin Laden's warning in mid-August that there would be 'an unprecedented attack on US interests.' With Bojinka in mind, the government should have taken the strongest possible measures to prevent hijackings."

So, why should this nation be surprised when it finally falls victim to an enemy the US has allowed to prosper? It's partially because Americans always believe the half-truths about our government's efforts to stamp out

terrorism, or even drugs, for that matter. Simply put, the people don't realize that the government both harbors terrorism and fights terrorism with two different sides of its police power. It both facilitates drug importation (to fund black budget activities) and fights against drugs using competing portions of separate federal agencies. Naturally, the public only sees the "good guy" operations. But the dark side exists, and now predominates--under the surface.

Terrorists have had the motive, the hatred, the weapons and the will to attack the US for many years. Indeed, we in this nation are very vulnerable. So, why has America been spared for so many years? As I have pointed out before in these briefs, the only reason that Islamic terrorism has not struck before (with the exception of the failed bombing of the WTC in 1993) is that someone within the US who controls these terror networks has had a "hold" on any attacks on the US, accomplished by buying off terrorist groups with money, drugs and weapons. Part of the reason for that hold was to reserve the US for "domestic terrorism" that could be fomented by the dark side of government to blacken the reputation of the American right wing. That hold is now obviously gone as the government's ploy to make an enemy out of the right wing has run its course. Accordingly, we can expect Tuesday's attack to be just the beginning. Next, I expect to see terrorists use biological and chemical weapons, or even Stinger missiles left over from the Afghanistan war, to shoot down more airliners. Again, we'll hear the same "wake-up call" that is being trumpeted by government this week. Naturally, we will be unprepared for each new form of attack and as each new threat looms greater, some new and powerful legislative or military solutions will be promulgated--complete with more and more restrictions of liberty.

Sadly, the most ominous effect of this latest attack has been the negation of all the distrust of government that had been properly building during 8 years of the Clinton corruption. I am saddened by the abject submission of the American people to any edict the government attempted to justify in the wake of these attacks. It amounted to a partial use of martial law and the government didn't even have to use the term to enforce its edicts. Now President Bush has declared a National Emergency--without telling the people that former executive orders give the President unlimited powers in such situations. He won't use them just yet--but people will get

used to living under an "emergency" form of law, without realizing the full implications. In future attacks people will already have become accustomed to seeing the government shut down any sector of the nation that is affected, just as we saw the virtual shutdown of the air traffic system--including private aircraft flying to private fields. However, the price in billions of dollars lost to the economy will not go unnoticed as the recession deepens.

In the final analysis, I hold the US government in large part responsible for the events of September 11, because they have paid off, trained, swapped favors with, and even saved from destruction terrorist leaders like Osama bin Laden and Yassir Arafat for decades. If they didn't have intelligence specifically pointing to the use of hijacked airliners as weapons of destruction, they are at least guilty of having abetted this form of terror.

Conjecture abounds as to how, when and where the US intends to retaliate, but it's clear now that the US intends to make a BIG military statement to the world, and Osama bin Laden is to be the whipping boy. Frankly, I'm not sure what the Bush CFR team is up to, but whatever it is, it is looking ominous. My best guess is that they are going to take on Afghanistan with both air and ground troops. This is a foolish quagmire that the Russians stepped into and you'd think the US would be smart enough not to go down that road. But I suspect Bush may be promoting another agenda, which dovetails with the US/NATO intervention in the Balkans during the last decade--fomenting hatred of the US among the Eastern Bloc of Slavic peoples. If NWO powers intend to use a world War to accelerate the transition to world government, they need to help the attackers (Russia and China) to justify the attack on the West. US meddling and bullying around the world creates that hatred. Obviously, the Islamic world is aligned with the Russians, and thus I suspect that in this upcoming "war" the Powers That Be may have decided to spread even more hatred of America among the Muslims by taking on Afghanistan, in what will appear to the Arab world as a giant unjustly terrorizing a helpless and poor land.

If the insiders at the National Security Council (who really call the shots for Bush) want an even larger war than Afghanistan would provide, they could go after the dozen or so terrorist camps in Syria, Iraq, Iran, Yemen, the Sudan, and Libya. But this would surely usher in a major Middle East war, involving Israel. It would also pit the US directly against Yassir Arafat and his Palestinians--which the US is continually trying to protect from ultimate annihilation. I don't think the insiders want a full scale war in that region just yet.

Lastly, Bush could go after Iraq, like his father. However, there doesn't seem to be any new evidence of direct Iraqi involvement in this terror attack. Besides, attacking Iraq is old news and will hardly give a sense of "justice done" that Americans are so wistfully yearning for.

I originally suspected that all this "war preparation" was mere propaganda to justify the \$40 billion Congress has agreed to fund this bottomless cause. I have since concluded that these leaders are investing much more money and effort into this military buildup for simple sabre-rattling. They really do intend to go to war with someone larger than Osama bin Laden. A declaration of war, frankly, is meaningless unless you have an identifiable enemy to name as the object of the war. A one-sided declaration of war in this case would probably serve to justify more US interventionist warmongering at home and abroad, rather than fight terrorism. The secondary agenda is surely the consolidation of executive authority in the US. The predictable reactionary legislation to beef up US war-making powers in the name of fighting terrorism is already at Congress' door. The "Elimination of Terrorism Act" is being readied for a fast track treatment in both houses. Lost in the rhetoric, of course, is the fact that no additional powers are necessary to fight terrorism. Nevertheless, this bill gives the Executive Branch permanent powers to engage in warfare at any time without Congressional approval--an approach to which the founders of this nation would have vigorously rejected.

I am saddened to see how unscrutinizing people have become about the motives of government in a crisis. The reason so many people in the US are vulnerable to manipulation by the media in this regard is that they don't compare what the government does in any battle with what they could be doing--what the alternatives are. They only look at the government's story in isolation, as if its reasons stand alone and should be taken at face value. To a certain extent the public can't judge what's real because most people don't have much experience working inside government. Those of us who have been inside know how things work. When things don't follow according to how they are supposed to, experienced people see red flags indicating something unusual is occurring. There are red flags cropping up all over this excessive reaction to the events of September 11th. Let's look at the inconsistencies in the government investigation and its various pronouncements.

MY ANALYSIS OF THE "ATTACK ON AMERICA" --SEPT 11, 2001

America is full of a strange mixture of shock, sadness, indignation and bravado in the wake of the aerial suicide attacks on the World Trade Center (WTC) twin towers and the Pentagon. We have heard countless leaders vowing that "terrorism will not stand," and that Americans will bounce back and rebuild these symbols of American economic and military power--if nothing else, to deny the terrorists the joy of seeing America down and discouraged. All this is typically American in its arrogance and is very naive. Terrorism has only begun to strike America and we are terribly exposed--not only because of the free and open access which we rightfully cherish, but also because the political establishment has for years refused to interdict the training and arming of the known terrorist groups they now claim have committed an "act of war on America."

Government commentators echo the hollow words that “a sleeping giant has been awakened” and is filled with resolve. Hogwash! They said those same words in 1993 after the WTC bombing, and America quickly went back to sleep and all our anti-terrorist vows led to no significant diminution of the tens of terrorist networks and training camps around the world. Indeed, terrorist groups multiplied and became far better armed during the Clinton era. Worse, I don’t believe for a minute that the current administration’s retaliatory attacks being planned are truly meant to eradicate terrorism, let alone be effective at such an objective. They are targeting Osama bin Laden, a convenient scapegoat, while leaving the Palestinians untouched, who are the main source of support for Islamic terrorist activity. I will explain the motives behind government subterfuge, and help sort out the fact from the fiction in our government’s response to this incident. But first, let’s review how this act was accomplished, technically.

ANATOMY OF MASS MURDER USING CIVILIAN AIRLINERS

This terrorist act was a master stroke of planning and execution. It was a complex attack which could not have been done without the participation of larger groups already tracked by US intelligence. Yet there were at least three advantages to this strategy the perpetrators could count on. For one thing, the tactic itself came as a complete surprise. Attacking buildings via commandeered airliners is a tactic that had never been used before, and was nearly impossible to foresee. Counter-terrorist experts were all caught flat-footed. The perpetrators correctly realized that this kind of aerial attack is possible because of vulnerabilities in the airline security system. Once would-be perpetrators get past the airport security checkpoints the crews have no means of defense against them. Such an attack is also difficult to stop due to the presence of large numbers of hostages on board a hijacked airliner, coupled with the uncertainty about whether the hijackers intend on crashing it into a target or simply flying to an asylum destination (as in prior hijackings). How and when do you decide to shoot down a loaded airliner before the hijackers’ intentions are known? And how do you confirm their intentions to crash into a target as it is descending incommunicado? Tough call!

Commandeering a huge aircraft full of fuel creates damage effects far exceeding the powers of a lone suicide bomber with explosives strapped to his body--or even a vehicular bomb as used in the failed attempt to bring down the WTC in the parking garage in February 1993. In this case, at least four commercial airline flights were targeted for hijacking--all within a 20 minute time frame for departure, in order to ensure the maximum impact of a coordinated attack. This all-at-one-time attack would preclude US forces from reacting and mounting an armed airborne patrol around targeted cities as a deterrent. I suspect there was a 5th or 6th flight destined to attack the White House and the US Capitol as well, but these were fortuitously delayed at the gate for some reason and missed their time slot. They were later canceled in the FAA grounding of all aircraft so that some of the potential hijacking never reached its grisly fulfillment. One such flight that was canceled had several Arab passengers aboard who vigorously protested the cancellation. An airline official said, according to the NY Times, "These guys got belligerent, and said something like, 'We've got to be on this plane'...They expressed a desire to remain on the plane and resisted getting off." The men left the area quickly after leaving the plane before police or the FBI could interrogate them.

All flights had things in common. First, they were all transcontinental flights. The two aircraft that hit the WTC were the larger Boeing 767 and the other two were Boeing 757 aircraft. Second, they were all taking off with a full load of fuel necessary to get to the West Coast. A full fuel load on the 767s ensured the maximum fireball in the subsequent explosions within the WTC. Let me explain why this was important. The perimeter steel pillars and cross bracing in the twin towers provided almost all the structural strength. The initial crashes partially severed one side of the perimeter support structure in each case, but the crashes alone would have been insufficient to destroy the towers. The subsequent fuel-fed fires heated the remaining pillars to the point of structural failure so that the entire buildings eventually came down. Steel beams and columns sag when exposed to fire--especially when an explosive impact strips away the protective fireproof coverings surrounding the steel. When the pillars on the damaged floors buckled from the heat, the falling weight of the imploding top portions of each building was enough to overstress all the steel in each succeeding floor

beneath--that's why we observed the vertical domino effect. There was even sufficient collateral force from the falling debris as it spread outward at ground zero to heavily damage all surrounding buildings. The dramatic collapsing forces of the two towers caused the additional collapse of a neighboring 26-story building in the World Trade Center complex.

The time delay between the initial collisions and the final collapse allowed hundreds to escape the two buildings. Sadly, many were slowed or trapped on the upper floors and the roof of the WTC by either the existing damage or, as in one case, the well-meaning intentions of people enforcing an orderly exit. A few waited too long for an orderly exit didn't make it, including some valiant fire and rescue people who failed to anticipate the imminent collapse of the building.

In terms of getting weapons past security, the hijackers primarily brought makeshift and non-metallic knives in order to successfully evade discovery by airport metal detectors. Another potential tactic is to pose as a pilot or air crewman with false ID, but it does not appear at this time that any of the successful hijackings were done with weapons smuggled aboard by this method.. The Arab man arrested in NY two days later, as the airports reopened, was wearing a pilot's uniform and in possession of some identification not his own. He was also one of those who had a reservation on a transcontinental flight that didn't make it into the air on Tuesday. The FBI claimed on Friday that this man had no links to the terrorist act.

To achieve control over the aircraft, the hijackers, in at least one case, began stabbing stewardesses in order to lure one of the pilots out of the cockpit. Others may have made a direct attack on the cockpit door (which is fairly lightweight in composition). Pilots could then be overwhelmed, killed by stabbing, and the plane piloted by the hijackers to the targeted building.

The hijack planners most likely specified that the attack would take place on a cloudless day so as to make sure they could visually navigate to their destinations. While it is now known that the suicide-hijackers received some training in US simulators, run by private contractors, the variety of possible aircraft to train for and the complexity

of the systems meant that such training would only lead to partial qualification at best. But full qualification or certification was not necessary. The hijackers did not have to deal with take-offs and landings, the most critical tasks. Taking over a flying aircraft and handling only the yoke and throttles to control altitude and airspeed is a relatively simple process.

WHO AND WHY?

While government and media sources continue to point the finger at US-trained terrorist Osama bin Laden, when pressed, all have to admit that there is only circumstantial evidence linking him to this act. That isn't stopping the Bush administration from acting as if bin Laden is guilty and leaning heavily on Pakistan to induce the Taliban rulers of Afghanistan to extradite him to the US.

In response to US demands, Pakistan and the Taliban have told the US they will be only too happy to comply with US demands for bin Laden's extradition if the US presents credible evidence of his involvement--which may be tough to come by. One former US CIA official was even more candid. He said, "no specific evidence is necessary since we've proven the case against bin Laden's cohorts in court recently and no one will question us if we go after him again." Sad, but true--Americans are all too willing to give unquestioned support to government in these times. I was also distressed to see a CNN internet poll showing that almost 80% of Americans condoned the bombing of the Afghanistan capitol of Kabul should the Taliban refuse to hand over Osama bin Laden. Where is America's compassion for innocent citizens? Would they become terrorists themselves in bombing innocent civilians simply to assuage their ruffled national sensibilities?

Focusing on Osama bin Laden may be a red herring meant to divert attention from the Palestinians, support for whom provides the fire and drive behind almost all other Islamic terrorist groups. I have no doubt that these terrorist acts were committed by Arab Islamic extremists with a mix of Palestinians who may or may not feel the need to hide behind

religious motives. This radical branch of Arabs is the only culture on the planet intentionally producing committed suicide bombers and kamikaze pilots to slaughter innocent civilians. We also have specific evidence on the ethnicity of the attackers from cell phone callers on the doomed airlines who uniformly described the hijackers as Middle Eastern males, some wearing the tell-tale red bandannas identifying a unique terrorist group.

The FBI also claims to now know the identifies of 19 hijackers--all with Middle Eastern origins. Strangely they refuse to release the entire list publicly. Some of the 19 are Palestinians with links to Hamas and Islamic Jihad and US officials appear to be steering the blame away from them. I believe there exists a hidden protective inclination towards the Palestinians in our government operations--despite public support for the state of Israel. At least one Palestinian journalist filmed jubilant Palestinians rejoicing at the news of the attacks on the WTC and the Pentagon (this is not the same film from 1993 erroneously broadcast as if it were taking place now). Israeli correspondent Oded Granot reported that Yasser Arafat's Tanzim have kidnapped the Palestinian cameraman who filmed a report for a major news agency showing Palestinians in Ramallah celebrating the attacks against the United States as hundreds cheered. He said that the news agency was warned that the cameraman would be killed if they dared to air the item. Other films have been released and photos from these films can be viewed at <http://www.gamla.org.il/english/feature/cel.htm> These threats are very real and are carried out ruthlessly from time to time. To demonstrate how far the Palestinians will go to perpetuate the appearance of innocence in this affair, PLO leader Yasser Arafat arranged to have film crews roll the cameras while he gave blood for the victims of NY. Even if his blood was destined for NY (which I doubt), I certainly wouldn't want to be the recipient of this hypocrisy.

So, who is responsible? It's going to be very difficult to find that out in a timely manner. Even a US defense source admitted to the International Herald Tribune, "We're talking about an operation that was extremely well-planned and compartmentalized...Such a case could take years to complete and we simply don't have that amount of time." That is why the US has decided to go after Osama bin Laden. Israeli intelligence,

on the other hand, says (correctly) that all terrorist cells are supported and sponsored by one or more governments. Terrorist organizations need a steady flow of money, arms and explosives to do their work. Terrorist groups also need a broad base of intelligence operatives throughout the world to keep tabs on their targets. Governments provide this kind of support, but never allow those links to surface so as to avoid blame. Since the Bush administration keeps trying to build an Arab coalition against Iraq, it can't afford to go after any of the legitimate governments harboring terrorists--Egypt, Libya, Sudan, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Iraq, Jordan and Iran. So that leaves Afghanistan to attack. But, just remember, unless the US goes after all the terrorist camps (including most refugee camps) in Arab countries, it isn't really serious about carrying on a war against terrorism.

It really isn't all that important to know who, at the lower and middle levels, planned and carried out this attack. Fact is, the US is hated by all the major Arab nations (except Kuwait) for its superficial support of Israel. Even Saudi Arabia is only feigning friendship with the US. The motive for Arab antagonism against the US does not really rest of the issue of Iraq, for Saddam Hussein has made his share of enemies in the Middle East. The real unifying motive of all the Arab terrorist organs is the Arab hatred toward the state of Israel, camped right in their midst. There are many factions of terrorists, and some are bitter enemies, but they can all unite on the desire to see the Israel and the US brought down. That is why the pictures of US destruction were so heartily applauded by young and old alike in the Middle East. In the final analysis, any war on terrorism is ultimately futile unless it punishes all terrorists uniformly, and the Palestinians specifically.

GOVERNMENT WITHHOLDING OF CRITICAL INFORMATION

As the story of the tragedy unfolded, media talking heads were seemingly in the dark about what was happening and who was responsible for these crashes. The first collision with the WTC was viewed as a possible accident. By the time the second happened, some 16 minutes later, everyone began to suspect terrorism. Yet from the very beginning, many

moments before any building was hit, there was one very public government body that had crucial information that a hijacking had taken place, or at the very least that an aircraft was veering away from its destination and heading for NY--the FAA. Airline crashes and hijackings ring big alarm bells at the FAA which monitors and controls all commercial traffic. By law, all commercial aircraft flying in controlled airspace are in constant communication with Air Traffic Control (ATC). Thus, the FAA is going to know when something goes wrong.

A hijacking takes time to complete. Pilots are behind a locked cockpit door, so hijackers cannot burst in without flight attendants having a least a few seconds to alert the flight deck. There are intercom stations at both ends of each aircraft accessible to the flight attendants. Even if the hijackers aimed their first actions at the flight deck, it takes time to break down the door. In any case, with the onset of any hijacking emergency it is standard operating procedure for one of the flight crew to key the mike and make a call to ATC. Pilots are also trained to switch the aircraft radar transponder to code 7500 or 7700 indicating (silently) a hijacking or an emergency in progress. In addition, any time the aircraft deviates from its designated route of flight it must contact ATC or ATC will give them a call--all of which is tape recorded.

I find it impossible to believe that ATC did not have tape recordings of these emergency calls alerting them to a hijacking. Even during something catastrophic such as an explosion in the air, most pilots still have time to make an emergency call. A hijacking allows more time to react, especially when the only weapons in use are knives. The FAA would have turned these recordings over to the NTSB or FBI, but no federal agency has made mention of their contents even days after the events, and the FBI spokesman in NY specifically told at least one reporter that he had no knowledge of FAA reports. But even that same FBI official made statements at another session about pilot communication and routes changes that could only have been known through FAA provided tape recordings--so we can assume they exist. Strangely, none of the news media asked the FAA if such recordings exist, even though it is common knowledge that ATC communicates with aircraft. Why? The media continues to talk about waiting till the onboard voice and data recorders are found to find out what happened--as if that

is the only available source of information. Even after the first voice recorder was located (at the Pentagon crash site), it was announced by one television station that it was blank. This is also strange since these recorders have a 30 minute continuous loop tape that should have some older recorded information on it, even if it failed to record the current flight. Even if the hijackers learned which circuit breakers to pull to disconnect power to the recorder, it would still contain old recorded data.

The FBI has already demonstrated a propensity to alter and hide evidence in politically charged cases. They did so in the OKC investigation, working overtime to make it appear as McVeigh and Nichols acted alone, even though there were numerous Middle Eastern accomplices seen by numerous witnesses. In the TWA 800 crash, the cockpit data recorder was found the first day by special Navy divers, altered, and then put back into the sea for later retrieval. Sounds bizarre, but the FBI and CIA took control of the investigation from the NTSB, corrupted the evidence pointing to a missile attack and concocted a fuel tank explosion scenario so bizarre that it took a \$2 million computer generated phony reenactment to make this story half-way believable to a gullible public. While I don't believe the federal government was involved directly in any form of instigation of this particular attack, there are some indications they might want to skew the direction of blame away from the Palestinians.

TOO-GOOD-TO-BE-TRUE EVIDENCE

The FBI claimed on the day of the terrorist attacks that they found a car at Boston's Logan Airport containing written materials in Arabic as well as flight training manuals, which led them to a small pilot training facility in Florida. Jared Israel tracked down the owner of manuals, Huffman Aviation, and quickly determined that his company provided only small aircraft flight training. Rudi Dekker, the owner, did have information, however, about a company in Popana Beach, Florida that could have provided follow-on commercial pilot training with flight simulators. The FBI also claimed that surveillance cameras of the parking structure in the previous weeks showed the same car making multiple trips to the airport,

perhaps to scope out the terrain. According to Stratfor.com, they also found a van with pictures of Osama bin Laden and copies of the Koran--an all too convenient link to a sought-after conclusion.

Within 2 days of the tragic events of Tuesday (that supposedly caught every intelligence agency completely by surprise), the FBI claimed they had identified 50 participants, including all 18 hijackers, and have accounted for the whereabouts of 40 out of the 50--leaving only ten unaccounted for. In the 1993 WTC bombing investigation, it took years to find less than half a dozen leads. Something doesn't compute. In order to judge how much of this recent magic is probable or possible one has to know something about the Bureau's investigative capacity. No agency starting from nothing finds this much evidence so fast. It's simply too good to be true. Here is what was legitimate. They did do a cross check of the passenger manifest lists with CIA, FBI, and INS "watch lists" of terrorists. Bingo, lots of matches. They also checked on how payment was made for the tickets of these passengers. Apparently, they were able to trace the purchase of all 5 hijackers on the Boston plane to a single credit card--which yields an obvious accomplice.

But, here's the rub. If federal agencies had most of the hijackers and accomplices already in their database of dangerous suspects, why is it that they were not under surveillance and wiretapping? The FBI tapes thousands of innocent American phone conversations without a warrant according to telephone sources, searches through millions of emails via its Carnivore software, and echelon taps virtually everything going overseas.

Furthermore, if this large, complex and sophisticated operation was so sophisticated as to evade total scrutiny by the CIA, FBI, INS and NSA, why would the perpetrators be stupid enough to leave a car at Logan airport with telltale flight manuals inside? Why not take a taxi? This operation apparently took place over a 5 year period. Considering the expense of training pilots they could certainly have afforded a taxi ride to the airport. Tickets could have been purchased with cash at separate travel agencies. Either someone is planting evidence to send the FBI off after low-level accomplices (to shield others), or the feds are bringing up predictable suspects that will point to Osama bin Laden--the scapegoat. I

have no doubt that Osama bin Laden, after dealing with the double-crossing CIA in his early years, is very anti-American, but I'm suspicious about the US rush to judgment on this issue.

US CAUGHT UNPREPARED

One of the main reasons why I do not believe the US government was in any way involved in this terrorist act directly--despite strong past evidence of agent provocateur activities in Waco and Oklahoma City--is that the government at all levels was obviously totally unprepared for what happened. Every agency seemed to over-react and go into panic mode. The Secret Service went berserk in their reaction to the possibility of Pres. and Mrs. Bush being specifically targeted. One agent guarding Mrs. Bush recounted to a relative that while moving Mrs. Bush from the halls of Congress to a secret underground bunker in the sub-basement of a Washington building, loaded guns were pointed at Congressional staff members, warning them to clear the way for the First Lady's entourage--hardly a civil way to treat people on our own side who were trying to leave the Capitol quickly, as they had been instructed. Amid heavy traffic, the caravan reached speeds of nearly 60 mph, and at a grid locked intersection, police cars leading the First Lady's limo bashed other cars out of the way in order to make way--all this without any specific evidence of an enemy lurking nearby to justify such rash actions on innocent citizens. The President was flown from Miami to Barksdale AFB in Louisiana and then to the deep nuclear bunkers in Omaha, Nebraska before coming back to Washington. Vice President Cheney was shipped off to bunkers in Camp David to keep him separate from the President (admittedly, a good precaution).

MARTIAL LAW WITHOUT SAYING SO

The most draconian measure taken was when the FAA grounded all aircraft in the country and forced the closure of all airports, public and private. I think there was good cause to halt all air commercial air traffic

since it was obvious that the entire air security system had broken down, but they went way too far in keeping that lock-down on too long and applying it to small private aircraft operating under Visual Flight Rules (VFR) which don't even require a flight plan. It is patently unfair to penalize private commerce for the failure of the government to provide proper security in the commercial sector.

Look at the reality of US security. The White House and Congress sit under restricted airspace that no one is supposed to fly over, but there exists virtually no military or police means to stop anyone who does. There are usually only a few token National Guard aircraft on alert to patrol our borders--and only to play cat and mouse with Russian bombers who used to routinely violate US airspace. The nation's capitol used to be guarded by Nike missiles long ago, but they were removed in the 50's, leaving the center of government virtually unprotected. Until this week, there were no regular air patrols of armed aircraft ready to be called into action to protect critical infrastructure from attack. Why all the talk about Americans having to give up their liberty to have security when our own military policies, which require no sacrifice of personal liberty, are not allowed to do their job?

A CRITIQUE OF THE PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

Suddenly America has a crisis. It gets caught flat-footed and it over-reacts. Jets are now roaming the skies on 24 hour patrols at great expense and with inadequate numbers of pilots and planes to continue this practice indefinitely. The FAA continues to ban VFR flying by civilian aircraft. Currently, everything that flies has to be under a flight plan, and the ATC system isn't equipped to handle the added load of all the nation's small planes. I fear that this ban on free private flying may become permanent.

Here's the official list of new security restrictions mandated by the FAA:

- Discontinued curbside check-in and off-airport checked baggage acceptance (a real inconvenience).
- Access beyond security checkpoints limited to passengers with electronic or paper tickets, or with ticket confirmations (no more meeting passengers at the gate).
- Increased aircraft and airport security inspections (personal inspection of all bags).
- Vehicles near airport terminals monitored closely.
- No knives of any size on flights, or anything remotely resembling a sharp pointed object.

Security at the airports is being beefed up to the point that passengers must arrive 2 hours in advance of each flight just to make it through the detailed bag searches being mandated by the FAA. One cannot carry scissors, small pocket knives, needle nose pliers, multi-tools, or perhaps even large fingernail clippers. Billions of man hours are being lost simply because the federal government refuses to consider a simple, rational solution--that is politically incorrect.

THE SOLUTION: ARM THE FLIGHT CREWS

In the 50's and 60's airline pilots would sometimes carry a revolver in their flight bag, albeit unknown to the company--kind of a don't ask, don't tell policy. When the first hijackings occurred, all on flights going to Havana, pilots became more open about carrying weapons for protection. The airlines, with government prodding, disarmed the pilots as a matter of formal policy. Airlines wouldn't even allow pilots to carry a non-lethal stun gun to subdue a hijacker. The results were predictable when the word got out that airlines are a guaranteed "gun-free" zone. Hijackings skyrocketed. The FAA responded with metal detectors, which are OK, but

they're not foolproof, as we now know. They never have been foolproof. People can still hijack planes with even the threat of a bomb in their carry-on bag, because of airline policies directing flight crews to simply submit to hijackers. Now, its a different ball game. To submit to a hijacker is to die. The only solution is to give crews the means to fight back.

I'm a pilot and I know the risks of firing a weapon in a pressurized airplane. While not as catastrophic as depicted in the movies, it does put a small hole in a pressurized skin. Too many holes and the aircraft would have to descend. There are special weapons and rounds that have been developed, however, that won't penetrate an aircraft, but that will disable a human with blunt force. Yes, there is some risk to passengers in any fight, but now the stakes are high. With hijackers resorting to weak weapons like non-metallic knives, even a canister of pepper spray would be effective. Most pilots would be very competent with pepper spray or a gun, especially with some additional training. Many have former military experience. I'm not suggesting arming flight attendants, however, since they mingle closely with passengers; there is too much danger of having their concealed weapon taken from them forcefully. But with armed pilots and flight engineers behind a solid flight deck door, no plane could be commandeered as happened this week.

Hiring armed Air Marshals is also a possibility but not as good an alternative as an armed flight crew. There are thousands of flights per day that have to be protected and the cost to the airlines would be high. Most likely the airlines would economize by using Air Marshalls only on occasional flights as a partial deterrence. On the other hand, pilots could fill the role with no additional expense and are, I believe, capable of receiving training and acting as the ultimate guardians of the aircraft. Indeed, after this week's experience, they are probably anxious to do so for their own safety. Above all, the deterrent affect of knowing that every aircraft has an armed crew would be dramatic. Best of all, most of these new and costly air travel restrictions could be removed once again. If you agree, let the FAA hear from you.

THE BUSH SPEECH TO AMERICA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Tom Brokaw, Peter Jennings and Dan Rather lavished rare praise President Bush following his Churchill-imitating address to the nation. Everyone, it seems, is caught up in the lemming-like fervor to go to war against terrorism. Even Bush critic Pat Buchanan said after the speech that Bush has finally risen to the full stature of a President. I respectfully disagree. Everything about this speech was a fraud. Even at the expense of appearing unpatriotic, someone has to declare the truth: that the “emperor has no clothes.”

Bush is no Churchill. Churchill was a master of oratory. He wrote his own speeches. Churchill’s resolve was real. The Bush “resolute look” was tutored and practiced for hours in front of speech specialists, helping him overcome many of the normal facial quirks that betray this President’s amateurish personality and phraseology. Bush’s speech was written for him by the slickest team of wordsmiths money can buy--none of whom have any principles. They write speeches based only on what will sell. Even if the words are true, the motives are not. They use a stock format developed to a fine art by the Clinton team during prior State of the Union speeches, including:

- Carefully crafted generalities that promise something for everyone, and offend no one--all the while consciously omitting the specifics that would allow the listener to discern the contradictions with reality or principles that underlie each statement. My intent will be to clarify those contradictions.
- Liberal use of emotional and patriotic catchwords and phrases, like God, prayer, liberty, and freedom, without any real correlation to a true devotion to these concepts that would make such references honest and without hypocrisy.

- Praise for two or three token heroes brought into the galleries for special recognition. These people are being used for propaganda purposes and to provide images of support that leave no room for dissent or criticism. The Bush team predictably brought in the wife of a courageous passenger, the PM of Britain, a fireman, plus the Mayor and Governor of NY.

- Special emotional phrases meant to engender the spectacle of robot-like standing ovations at two minute intervals. So overdone is this mechanistic ploy that faces were dour at having to play along, and most hands were clapping in only token enthusiasm. And yet not a soul could afford, politically, to be seen NOT standing and not clapping. Even Hillary would reluctantly clap, while carrying on a diversionary conversation with Chuck Shumer (D-NY).

THE SUBTLE ERRORS, CONTRADICTIONS AND HYPOCRISY

1) In response to his query, "Who attacked our country?" Bush said, "The evidence we have gathered all points to a collection of loosely affiliated terrorist organizations known as Al Qaeda. They are the same murderers indicted for bombing American embassies in Tanzania and Kenya, and responsible for the bombing of the USS Cole." This is possibly true, but the US really doesn't know this for sure. What this response does is purposely lead the listener to a specific blamable subject and allow the US to avoid hitting other terrorists that they have ongoing "arrangements" with. Indeed, it is impossible at this point to pin the blame on any single organization because of the cross-connections between all Middle Eastern terrorist organizations. Most of the known hijackers can be linked with any one of half a dozen different organizations--so take your pick. Bush is selectively picking only one because it matches the need to go after Afghanistan and the Taliban, which have the fewest friends, internationally, and which provide the best opportunity for a big first military thrust that will make all this war hysteria justifiable.

2) To pacify the public about the long-term dangers of radical Islam, Bush said, “The terrorists practice a fringe form of Islamic extremism that has been rejected by Muslim scholars and the vast majority of Muslim clerics, a fringe movement that perverts the peaceful teachings of Islam. The terrorists’ directive commands them to kill Christians and Jews, to kill all Americans, and make no distinctions among military and civilians, including women and children.” It is correct not to paint all Muslims as evil, but radical Islamic fundamentalism is far from a fringe movement. Indeed, it is very inaccurate to depict this radical movement as small and without support. It has broad based historical and doctrinal support going back centuries to when Arabs set out to conquer and forcefully convert whole continents. It has a huge following in all Islamic nations and threatens the balance of power within every country in the Middle East. I believe that the fervor and ideological hatred being generated by fundamentalist Islam is capable of crushing the moderates among them. One of the things that makes this possible is the irrational mob mentality that so easily captivates young Muslims. Whether this dangerous personality weakness is cultural or innate, it is real and millions of young Muslims are being radicalized in their hatred against the US as you read this. In downplaying this danger of Islamic Jihad (holy war), Pres. Bush is denying Americans a realistic understanding of the threat to world stability that Islamic Jihad represents.

3) “The United States respects the people of Afghanistan — after all, we are currently its largest source of humanitarian aid — but we condemn the Taliban regime. It is not only repressing its own people, it is threatening people everywhere by sponsoring and sheltering and supplying terrorists. By aiding and abetting murder, the Taliban regime is committing murder.” Clearly the Bush administration is going after the Taliban--not just Osama bin Laden. The capture of bin Laden would be too easy and let the air out of this campaign before it has achieved its hidden agenda. Going after the Taliban allows the US to intervene in affairs of an entire nation and replace this hostile regime with one more compliant to the NWO. Bush claims to support the people of Afghanistan,

but he leaves out many details that belie that support. Bush had to admit that the US is currently the “largest source of humanitarian aid” to Afghanistan since this fact has been widely reported on the internet in the past week. But it wasn’t humanitarian aid. What Bush neglected to tell his audience is that the \$43 million Bush authorized for Afghanistan in May of this year went directly to the Taliban supposedly for cocaine trade counter-measures--even though the Bush administration knows that the Taliban manages all cocaine trade in the country. So, how can Bush claim to “condemn the Taliban regime” when it just gave the regime \$43 million? Fact is, the money never went to the Afghan people and Bush knows it. Bush said that “by aiding and abetting murder, the Taliban is committing murder,” but in reality the Bush administration is aiding and abetting the very enemy they claim to condemn. The only true statement Bush makes here is that the Taliban is repressing its own people. But they knew that before. Why give them aid then and pretend it went to the people?

4) “The United States of America makes the following demands on the Taliban:

- Deliver to United States authorities all the leaders of Al Qaeda who hide in your land.
- Release all foreign nationals, including American citizens, you have unjustly imprisoned, and protect foreign journalists, diplomats, and aid workers in your country.
- Close immediately and permanently every terrorist training camp in Afghanistan and hand over every terrorist, and every person in their support structure, to appropriate authorities.
- Give the United States full access to terrorist training camps, so we can make sure they are no longer operating.

These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion. The Taliban must act and act immediately. They will hand over the terrorists, or they will share in their fate.”

There are two levels of hypocrisy in this set of demands. First, the US never allows any of its allies (e.g., Israel, Ireland) to engage in these kinds of “take it or leave it” demands without condemning them for refusing to “engage” the terrorists in the “peace process.” Second, Bush isn’t telling his audience that these demands are specifically designed to be impossible to comply with--thus guaranteeing that the US will be justified in attacking Afghanistan. No country can know when they have delivered “all the leaders of Al Qaeda” because no such list exists. First, there’s the question of what constitutes a “leader,” and second, most leaders of Al Qaeda are from other Arab nations and are not physically present in Afghanistan. The same goes for the demand to “hand over every terrorist, and every person in their support structure, to appropriate authorities.” How does anyone define support people? How do you know if you’ve complied without a US presented list? Of course, we know what the US means by “appropriate authorities” --a rigged UN tribunal lacking many essential rights to due process.

For its part, the US has virtually no intelligence assets on the ground in Afghanistan. US military forces don’t even have translators who speak the southern Afghan dialect. How would they know any of the specifics necessary to judge compliance with their demands? To say that these demands are “not open to negotiation or discussion” means that no clarification can be had on these ambiguous issues--a catch-22 situation that clearly indicates the Bush administration doesn’t want a peaceful resolution. Shame on the Congress for applauding this radical agenda. China just signed a pact of mutual support with the Taliban a few days before this speech. Perhaps that is one reason the Taliban’s reaction today to Bush was defiant. Overall, I am skeptical of the Bush assertion that the US “respects the people of Afghanistan.” I worry about the

innocent people who are shortly to become collateral damage in the wake of the US juggernaut.

5) “Our war on terror begins with Al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated.” This is pure bravado. It can’t be done. The Palestinians rabble-rouse and radicalize more terrorists in a month than the US will eliminate in a year--and the US protects them from Israeli retaliation through various forms of pressure. Remember, this proclamation of intent to prosecute terrorism comes from a nation that has funded and made secret deals with terrorist organizations for at least 30 years. Why should we believe Bush now when the US has never even owned up to its illegal and secret support of terrorists in past years? Some US double dealing has even been done in the light of day. Remember when the US rescued Yassir Arafat from defeat in Lebanon and used taxpayer moneys to send in the Marines and fly hundreds of PLO terrorists to safety? Did that reform Arafat? Hardly. He’s still at it, with the help of millions in US aid each year.

6) “Why do they hate us?” Bush asks rhetorically. “They hate what we see right here in this chamber, a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms — our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote.” This is NOT why the radical Muslims hate us. If this were the real reason, terrorists would be attacking other democratic nations like Switzerland or Japan. The real reason they hate the US because it has become the bully of the world, intervening under globalist pretenses into every nation on earth. The proclaimed motive is always to “protect human rights,” but the real purpose is to establish global hegemony over every nation on earth and reduce national sovereignty to a euphemistic label. Muslims and Arabs hate the West because the West has betrayed them for centuries and betrayed every agreements they have made. Finally, they hate the West because they are allied with Russia, who has faithfully supplied them with weapons and explosives (for its own hegemonic ambitions), and who is

inexorably leading Islam into a future war with the West of horrific proportions. The globalist insiders who call the shots for Bush also want war to bring about their vaunted NWO purposes, and I believe that the true hidden agenda behind this proclaimed war on terrorism is to further antagonize and polarize the world prior to the coming war on the West. However it is probable that the young Bush doesn't know the ulterior motives behind his bold war of agitation. His father probably knows, but I think Dubya is just reading a script.

7) "They want to overthrow existing governments in many Muslim countries, such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Jordan. They want to drive Israel out of the Middle East. They want to drive Christians and Jews out of vast regions of Asia and Africa." What Bush says here is true, and with this statement the speech writers have given us a hint of what this new war is all about. I believe that in the name of SAVING other countries from terrorism, the US will now have a new and unique excuse to intervene with and bully the world. This is borne out by the Bush statements of how broad ranging and varied the attacks will be, as well as the indefinite timeline he lays out:

"Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign, unlike any other we have seen. It may include dramatic strikes, visible on television, and covert operations, secret even in success. We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them one against another, drive them from place to place, until there is no refuge or rest. And we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation in every region now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime." These are very threatening statements and are hypocritical as well. The US through FINCEN has long tracked the trail of money feeding terrorism. The US has even provided much of this money through the cover of aid to the very countries which harbor terrorism--who are all known to US intelligence. The primary nations supporting terrorism are RUSSIA, followed by CHINA. Any bets about whether Bush is going to

attack these two monsters? The new Bush war will be highly selective. That is why this statement is both true and a lie.

8) “Today, dozens of federal departments and agencies, as well as state and local governments, have responsibilities affecting homeland security. These efforts must be coordinated at the highest level. So tonight I announce the creation of a Cabinet-level position reporting directly to me — the Office of Homeland Security. These measures are essential. But the only way to defeat terrorism as a threat to our way of life is to stop it, eliminate it and destroy it where it grows... We will come together to give law enforcement the additional tools it needs to track down terror here at home. We will come together to strengthen our intelligence capabilities to know the plans of terrorists before they act, and find them before they strike.” These words reflect hints that the government spokesmen have been dropping for the past week--the need for more power and further reduction of private liberties. I’ve seen an advance copy of Attorney General Ashcroft’s new legislative proposal for increased law enforcement powers. They are ominous, but really only seek to legitimize what government already does illegally. Even though this legislation is being justified as a means to fighting terrorism, it’s amazing how much of Ashcroft’s proposals have nothing to do with terrorism. How does expanding the types of private property that can be confiscated by the feds for drug busts affect the war on terrorism? But sadly, Congressional opposition has dried up. Out of fear of appearing an obstructionist to this holy war, there is a de facto silencing of voices of reason. Whether America will seriously beef up its homeland defense remains to be seen. We have far more facilities to protect than we have police and military combined, so I think we will still remain relatively vulnerable to most small scale terrorist strikes.

9) There is a globalist sweep to this agenda. Bush calls for world unity behind the war: “We ask every nation to join us. We will ask, and we will need, the help of police forces, intelligence services, and banking systems around the world. The United States is grateful that many

nations and many international organizations have already responded with sympathy and with support. Nations from Latin America, to Asia, to Africa, to Europe, to the Islamic world. Perhaps the NATO Charter reflects best the attitude of the world: an attack on one is an attack on all." Nice words, but the truth is the US has had deep connections with all the world's police and intel forces for years--and such connections have never helped eradicate terrorism before. Most of these forces are too busy reaping the profits from government sponsored drug pipelines. Most terrorist groups form portions of these drug networks, sharing in the profits to finance their works of death. If things change now, it is only because the Powers That Be are switching agendas from supporting or tolerating terrorism to selective eradication.

10) Lastly, there is the promise of a bailout for everyone: "We will come together to improve air safety, to dramatically expand the number of air marshals on domestic flights, and take new measures to prevent hijacking. We will come together to promote stability and keep our airlines flying with direct assistance during this emergency...We will come together to take active steps that strengthen America's economy and put our people back to work." Bush and the FAA are refusing to allow the most simple and cost effective of the air safety alternatives (arming the aircrews). Instead he asks for us to be patient with the millions of dollars and man hours lost due to the new spat of restrictions. Instead of allowing the airlines to get back to normal fast, we will keep them hog-tied with inefficiency, spend billions in direct assistance, and force up ticket prices as well. And what about all the other people harmed by this event? What will the socialist Republicans say to the victims' families, the insurance companies, the travel agents, and every other sector of society who wants a bailout too? Going down this path is a recipe for financial disaster and a guaranteed tax bite that no one will relish. The most dangerous words I'm hearing lately from Capitol Hill are "money is no object." When money is no object, then someone is about to play loose with financial responsibility, and our liberties.

Here's the bottom line--two tests for determining Bush's true resolve on this matter:

1) If this is a real war on terrorism, Bush will actually do what he claims: He will hit all terrorists everywhere, including host nations like Russia, Iran, Syria, Libya, North Korea, Cuba, and China. This will never happen.

2) If this war is real, terrorism will fight back with increased fanaticism and will strike the US constantly and steadily, with everything from petty bombings to biological and chemical attacks. If we DON'T SEE a massive increase in terrorism, I will be very suspicious that someone is still controlling terrorism and making it appear as if this phony war is successful. If you want to see what a legitimate fight against terrorism looks like, watch Israel. Its government plays the game with one hand tied behind its back, and the results are daily attacks against Israeli civilians. If we don't see the same thing here, with our much weaker military and police presence on the streets, something will be very wrong with this picture.

World Affairs Brief, September 28, 2001

MORE BACKGROUND ON CIA CREATION OF ISLAMIC TERRORISM AND RECENT CONTACTS

The following comes from an article in The Hindu by Shamsul Islam, of the Department of Political Science, Satyawati College, University of Delhi, published on September 26, 2001. [courtesy of a posting by www.emperors-clothes.com.]

“The unprecedented deaths and destruction in two cities of the US on September 11 has stirred the conscience of the world. It was the most lethal, ruthless and daring terrorist strike on the nerve center of the world's most powerful nation today. The US, which promises to guarantee security to the world, was found wanting in checking the terrorist strikes at home for more than 40 minutes when the terrorists had the free run of its major airports, highjacking not one or two but four domestic planes to be used as flying bombs. It did not take long for the US establishment to identify the culprits who masterminded these terrorist acts. These were the `evil' forces of `Islamic terrorism' led by Osama bin Laden. The mainstream US media went on to explain these terrorist attacks in the context of the `clash of civilizations' thesis of Samuel Huntington. There were urgent calls for "forming a global alliance that will use all tools - diplomatic, political, economic, educational, investigative, and where appropriate, force - to pursue and root out the terrorist criminals and their supporters..."

“But it is really surprising that the US, mecca of information technology with its super computers and all kinds of data bases, should be so greatly short of memory about Osama bin Laden. The media in the US these days is full of biographical sketches of Osama bin Laden in which he appears on the world scene in 1990 opposing the Gulf War and then is shown growing into an anti-West monster, finally, targeting the US on `Black Tuesday'. However, it may be news to many ears that Osama's journey as a terrorist did not start in 1990-1991. Any honest biographical description of Osama should not overlook his activities in the 1980s when he was deputed by the CIA to Afghanistan to finance and oversee the resistance to the Soviets. He was groomed as a theocratic-terrorist by the US openly.

“In fact, there is lot of weight in the thesis that the modern Jehadi-Islam is a byproduct of intrigues by the West to keep the Islamic world under its suzerainty, devoid of any kind of democratic processes. And also to use it as a whipping boy occasionally whenever attention needs to be diverted

from issues raised by anti-globalization campaigners. The Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan (RAWA), which has a long tradition of opposing the Taliban regime and paying for it with blood, raised this issue in its September 14 press statement. While condemning the terrorist attack, the statement went on to underline the fact that "the people of Afghanistan have nothing to do with Osama and his accomplices.

“But unfortunately we must say that it was the Government of the United States who supported Pakistani dictator Gen. Zia-ul-Haq in creating thousands of religious schools from which the germs of Taliban emerged. In the similar way, as is clear to all, Osama has been the blue-eyed boy of the CIA". How the US and the CIA created Osama and his network has been well-documented in the book "Taliban: Militant Islam, Oil and Fundamentalism in Central Asia" by Ahmed Rashid who is the Pakistan, Afghanistan and Central Asia correspondent for the Far Eastern Economic Review and The Daily Telegraph of London. This book which has been published by the Yale University Press clearly shows who in reality created Osama. Ahmed Rashid in his superb expose is able to present the factual linkages between the US and the `monster' which it created.

Some of the excerpts are too revealing too be missed. In 1986, CIA chief William Casey had stepped up the war against the Soviet Union by taking three significant, but at that time highly secret, measures. He had persuaded the US Congress to provide the Mujaheddin with American-made Stinger anti-aircraft missiles to shoot down Soviet planes and provide US advisers to train the guerrillas. The CIA, Britain's MI6 and the ISI (Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence) also agreed on a provocative plan to launch guerrilla attacks into the Soviet Socialist Republics of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, the soft Muslim underbelly of the Soviet state from where Soviet troops in Afghanistan received their supplies. Casey was delighted with the news, and on his next secret trip to Pakistan he crossed the border into Afghanistan with President Zia to review the

Mujaheddin groups. "Thirdly, Casey committed CIA support to a long-standing ISI initiative to recruit radical Muslims from around the world to come to Pakistan and fight with the Afghan Mujaheddin. Washington wanted to demonstrate that the entire Muslim world was fighting the Soviet Union alongside the Afghans and their American benefactors."

“The book also goes on to show in graphic detail how harmless madrassas [Islamic religious schools associated with a Mosque. For a more in-depth reading on the radicalization of these schools, see: <http://www.ipcs.org/issues/articles/314-pak-suba.html>] were turned into factories for breeding religious guerrillas. "... between 1982 and 1992, some 35,000 Muslim radicals from 43 Islamic countries in the Middle East, North and East Africa, Central Asia and the Far East would pass their baptism under fire with the Afghan Mujaheddin. Tens of thousands more foreign Muslim radicals came to study in the hundreds of new madrassas that Zia's military government began to fund in Pakistan and along the Afghan border. Eventually more than 100,000 Muslim radicals were to have direct contact with Pakistan and Afghanistan and be influenced by the jihad... "In camps near Peshawar and in Afghanistan, these radicals met each other for the first time and studied, trained and fought together. It was the first opportunity for most of them to learn about Islamic movements in other countries, and they forged tactical and ideological links that would serve them well in the future.

“The camps became virtual universities for future Islamic radicalism". Interesting details of Osama's recruitment by the CIA for jihad [jihad] in Afghanistan are also available in this book. "Among these thousands of foreign recruits was a young Saudi student, Osama Bin Laden, the son of a Yemeni construction magnate, Mohammed Bin Laden, who was a close friend of the late King Faisal and whose company had become fabulously wealthy on the contracts to renovate and expand the Holy Mosques of Mecca and Medina. The ISI had long wanted Prince Turki Bin Faisal, the head of Istakhbarat, the Saudi Intelligence Service, to provide a Royal Prince to lead the Saudi contingent in order to show Muslims the

commitment of the Royal Family to the jihad. Only poorer Saudis, students, taxi drivers and Bedouin tribesmen had so far arrived to fight. But no pampered Saudi prince was ready to rough it out in the Afghan mountains. Bin Laden, although not a royal, was close enough to the royals and certainly wealthy enough to lead the Saudi contingent so when Bin Laden decided to join up, his family responded enthusiastically.

“He first traveled to Peshawar in 1980 and met the Mujaheddin leaders, returning frequently with Saudi donations for the cause until 1982, when he decided to settle in Peshawar. In 1986, he helped build the Khost tunnel complex, which the CIA was funding as a major arms storage depot, training facility and medical center for the Mujaheddin, deep under the mountains close to the Pakistan border.” The book also demolishes the CIA claim that after 1990 there were no contacts with Osama. Surprisingly, just a few weeks before the US Embassy bombings in Africa, the book tells us, “the Saudi conundrum was even worse. In July 1998 Prince Turki had visited Kandahar and a few weeks later 400 new pick-up trucks arrived in Kandahar for the Taliban, still bearing their Dubai license plates”. This all shows that any meaningful fight back against world terrorism today will have to begin from the backyard of the US” [end of Islam quote]

World Affairs Brief, October 12, 2001

EVIDENCES OF PRIOR KNOWLEDGE

(I am indebted to the research of Dr. Stan Montieth for many of these findings. Hear his radio broadcasts at www.radioliberty.com or order his September Radio Liberty Report and other fine materials at 1-800-544-8927.)

1. Israeli Mossad warned the US a week in advance

Numerous sources in Jerusalem and the UK published reports from Israel that the Mossad had sent a major warning to the CIA a week prior to the 9/11 terror attack that “large-scale terrorist attacks on highly visible targets on the American mainland were imminent.” The CIA claims they get these all the time and didn’t take it seriously. Now the CIA is issuing daily warnings and they expect us to take them seriously!

2. The FBI was tracking at least two of the terrorists

According to the LA Times, the FBI was tracking at least two of the hijackers prior to the event and failed to notify airlines. If the names of Khalid Al-Midhar and Nawaq Alhamzi had been passed to the airlines, they would not have been able to buy tickets on that fateful day.

3. Financial speculators shorted airline stocks before the crash

The New York Times reported the findings of Ernest Welteke (German Bundesbank) that “There have been fundamental movements in these markets (airline stocks) and the oil price rise just ahead of the attacks is otherwise inexplicable.” The US government claims to be investigating who placed these massive short positions, but have not reported any findings. Experts say it would take less than 1 hour to track these transactions down. Why the silence?

4. Certain VIPs were warned against travel

The San Francisco Chronicle reported that Mayor Brown was called eight hours before the attack and warned that “Americans should be cautious in

their travel.” (I consider this a general warning only since none of the planes involved were on the West Coast). Author Salman Rushdie (who has written anti-Islamic works) was warned by the FAA on Sept. 3 not to fly to Canada and the US, according to the London Times.

5. Certain military bases and overseas embassies were put on high alert

The Defense Language Institute in Monterey was put on alert prior to the attacks, as well as some overseas embassies and military bases. This is not definitive evidence, as there are other reasons for going on alert, but one has to question why the public was not warned.

6. CIA had advance warning of a plot to destroy buildings with hijacked airliners

I reported previously on Project Bojinka--the code name of a terrorist plot uncovered in the Philippines (where there are numerous Islamic terrorist activities). The CIA failed to surveil any flight schools in anticipation of this threat.

7. Suppression of Flight School warnings by higher authority in the FBI

According to wire services, FBI agents in Minneapolis, MN arrested Zacarias Moussaoui, an Algerian with French citizenship, on immigration charges. He was arrested after a tip from a local flight school that reported that the suspect wanted to be trained in flying a large jet aircraft, but said that he did not want to take the time to learn how to take off or land. The FBI knew he was a terrorist on French watch lists, but refused to pursue the case or issue search warrants on orders from higher authority, according to Phil Brennan of NewsMax.com (Oct 8, 2001) and David Schippers (see below).

CONTRADICTIONS IN THE WAR ON TERRORISM

For weeks, I have been making a case for the fact that the Bush administration is only prosecuting the war on terrorism in a very selective manner. However, this past week, the Bush team has begun to show signs of not being so selective. They have alerted the Israelis that they are going to go after Hamas and the Lebanese-based Hezbollah, two of the most virulent groups of terrorists in the Middle East. It still remains to be seen how or if these terrorists threats will be prosecuted. While this policy seems to add credence to their offensive against terrorism, note that Arafat himself is still favored by the US, and has even been welcomed into the anti-terror coalition by both Bush and Tony Blair. In fact, Blair held a major press conference side by side with Arafat, praising his commitment to peace, just hours before Palestinian assassins gunned down Israeli Minister Rehavam Ze'evi, Israel's highest ranking outspoken critic of the Oslo accords. The only beneficial result of Ze'evi's martyrdom was that it temporarily stymied US intents to elevate Arafat to sainthood and force Israel to deliver to Arafat his desired Palestinian state. Bush himself is careful not to cozy up to Arafat publicly. This tells me that Bush still wants to publicly distance himself from this wily snake--not because Bush doesn't intend to keep forcing Israel toward a disastrous negotiated settlement with the PLO, but because Bush doesn't want to be held liable for Arafat's unpredictable antics, should he suddenly bite the hands that feeds.

This contradiction in US policy, claiming to lead a worldwide war on terrorism while openly supporting a long-time international terrorist leader, is only one example of the hypocrisy of our leaders in dealing with terrorism. Indeed, the globalist leaders in the US, Britain, and other nations are adept at playing both sides of the fence in these conflicts: pretending to champion the cause of liberty, while lending aid and support

to terrorist organizations behind the scenes. Here are just a few examples:

- Tony Blair, Britain's Leftist PM and supposed biggest supporter of the war on terrorism, has a long history of appeasement of terrorism. In 1998 he released the Balcombe Street IRA gang from prison, in return for promises of IRA weapons decommissioning which were never fulfilled. This year he released hundreds of IRA prisoners on the basis of the same worn-out promise. London is also the fundraising headquarters for Europe of almost every international terrorist organization. They operate openly there.

- The Dublin government of Northern Ireland has joined in the anti-terror coalition (as has almost every other nation harboring terrorism), notwithstanding a long history of shielding IRA weapons, including helicopters which are almost impossible to hide for long without government complicity.

- Speaking of complicity, in 1988, during the Republican Bush Sr. administration, the US shipped arms, ammunition and Stinger missiles to the IRA in a CIA C-130 aircraft, via Dublin. Whistleblowers to this operation included Stephen Crittenden, owner of a CIA airline operation, and former IRA member Michael Martin, who helped unload the aircraft. The subsequent US administration under Bill Clinton openly gave honor and recognition to Sinn Fein's Gerry Adams, political leader of the terrorist IRA, and also facilitated other arms shipments. The IRA operates a huge fundraising organization in the US, and this pipeline of cash has still not been shut down or frozen despite assurances by the current Bush administration that they would shut down the money supply to all terrorist groups everywhere. Thus, all three recent US administrations are guilty of continuing covert support of the terrorist IRA.

As we watch this selective war on terrorism unfold, keep in mind what the globalist leaders did during WWII. It is true that globalist insiders funded and facilitated the rise of Hitler. They appeased him and gave him the silent wink, unleashing Hitler on Poland and Czechoslovakia. When war fully emerged, the West, by all appearances, began to prosecute the war vigorously. But it was not to last. As the tide began to turn to victory, the seeds of betrayal of Western interests began to emerge, affecting how the war would end. Secret concessions at Yalta and Tehran were made to the next future enemy (Russia) in order to facilitate its growth and power in the aftermath of war. Similarly, in the Gulf War, we saw the ending turn sour as Saddam Hussein was allowed to remain in power. I suspect no matter how far it appears that Bush will push this war on terrorism, he will never completely eliminate the core threats in the Middle East, in Ireland, in South Asia, or even in Latin America--areas where terrorism is allowed and fomented as an agent for change. In general, if there does emerge a pattern indicating which groups Bush protects and which he takes down, it will develop along the lines of who has been controllable in the past versus which groups have now grown beyond control, and therefore must be pared down to size.

World Affairs Brief November 9, 2001

MORE EVIDENCE OF US FOREKNOWLEDGE:

Tom Kenny of the National Urban Search and Rescue (Part of FEMA) told Dan Rather in an interview this week: "we were currently one of the first teams that was deployed to the city of NY for this disaster. We arrived late Monday Night and went into action on Tuesday morning." Who gave them the orders to deploy to New York the night before? Dan Rather never asked. You can hear the interview for yourself at : <http://www.haltturnershow.com/fema.ram>

NEW ANALYSIS ON THE HIJACKERS

There is growing evidence that all or some of the 19 hijackers listed by the FBI were not actually on board the doomed aircraft. This much we know: All hijackers came through airline security with a government issued photo-ID which matched their facial identity. But we have no assurance that the name listed on the ID matched the face. It is highly improbable, in fact, that hijackers with access to this level of sophistication and planning would use their own identities. Why not use the identities of known hijackers that your organization wants to make disappear? What better way to disappear than to have the FBI assume you died on Flight 77 or Flight 11? The FBI knows this is a common ruse, so it is strange that they would publish the names of all the hijackers so quickly and confidently without ensuring that these men are in fact dead--which is no easy task without identifiable body parts. The FBI claims that they took the names right off of the passenger manifests and matched them with their computer "watch lists." Strangely, as pointed out by Gary North, the passenger manifest lists published by CNN are missing all the names of the Arab hijackers. After over a week of my appeals to CNN to remedy this oversight, they are stonewalling, telling me they are "looking into it." What's to look into? Just give us the list. With this kind of obfuscation going on, I'm not sure we could trust the list even if they provided it.

I'm also not buying the all-too-suspicious story about the abysmal flying records of the supposed hijacker-pilots as they attempted to learn to fly at various private flight schools in Florida, Minnesota and elsewhere. First, even though it doesn't take a lot of talent to fly an airliner once in cruise mode, it does take talent and training (hands on in a real aircraft) to navigate over a long distance and then execute a fairly rapid descent and do a tightly controlled descending turn as was required in the attack on the Pentagon. It is highly unlikely that those Arab students who were washed out of flight school did these maneuvers. Secondly, there actually is an Arab run flight school in the US, with lessons taught in Arabic. Delta-Qualiflight Aeronautics, run by Khaled Miloud, operates at the Fort Worth Meacham field. Just this week, despite assurances by the newly

implemented Office of Homeland Security that “the American people can have confidence that their government is working around the clock to protect them,” 14 Syrian students were allowed to enter the US in order to enroll at this flight school. Given the availability of such a program for the hijackers in training, why would the terrorists go searching for English speaking flight schools in other states? Doesn't make sense.

Let's look at another possibility. Realistically, if a large Arab terrorist organization were going to implement training for this type of attack, they would have relied upon one of the nations that sponsor terrorism (Iraq, Syria, Libya, Iran or Egypt)--all of which have fleets of airliners and trained pilots--to host the training. Then, to divert attention away from these nations, the cell's leaders would send low level future suicide participants (expendable if they get caught) to enroll in relatively cheap US small aircraft schools. That's what I think happened. This does not release the FBI from their responsibility to track these flight school students, nor does it excuse their ineptitude in the task. In fact, there is evidence, as I presented last week, that the FBI purposely shut down any investigations that tried to highlight Arab attempts to get partial flight training, thwarting even speculation to the end that such an attack as happened last month was being planned.

World Affairs Brief, December 28, 2001

FBI CONTINUES TO COVER UP PILOT COMMUNICATIONS RELATED TO SEPT 11

In all major conspiratorial events, evidence related to the event continues to surface over time, and if the government is involved, it demonstrates its collusion by the degree to which it attempts to suppress and cover up the emerging evidence. As in the JFK assassination and the downing of TWA 800 by a missile, we are beginning to see the same pattern of obfuscation, denial, and cover-up by federal agencies in the September 11th tragedy--especially by the FBI, the military, and the FAA.

Some of the biggest questions about the events of 9/11 center around the hijacking of the various airliners: how the pilots reacted, and what actions the government took via the military to impede the results. Pilots have instant access to Air Traffic Control (ATC) with a push of a button on the control yoke. In contrast, it takes time for a hijacker to take over the cabin and then deal with the pilots who are in a separate compartment behind a locked aluminum sliding door. We know, by FAA admission, that in each and every case the pilots had time to communicate their emergency to ATC. In at least two cases the pilots were able to change the transponder code to 7700 for "emergency in progress" before the hijackers took control and switched off the transponder. The FAA and US military have standing orders and written procedures on how to intercept and deal with aircraft hijackings.

The FAA has said that it alerted military authorities in Colorado at the first signs of a hijacking. Yet we know that a few aircraft were scrambled and that all others were grounded and prohibited from reacting according to standing procedures. One of my subscribers is friends with an air traffic controller at McGuire AFB in New Jersey. His friend confided to him that "he was on duty at the time of the crashes into the towers. They got a phone call in between the first and second 'hit'. His superior told him that 'NO take-off's were permitted ... NONE at all.'" This was too early to be a direct result of shutting down all flights nationwide--which only affected private and commercial flights--not military. Here we have evidence of the US military acting in direct opposition to national defense--acting on orders from above. These orders couldn't have come from Bush, who was engaged at an elementary school, so higher military officials were either taking orders from someone else at the White House or acting on predetermined orders.

I find it also very strange that flight data and voice recorders from all the 9/11 crashes except Flight 93 (which crashed or was shot down over

Pennsylvania) have been declared not found, destroyed, or unreadable. These declarations are without precedent in aviation accident history, and especially preposterous when we consider that the FBI claims to have found letters, passports and other fragile documents belonging to the supposed Arab hijackers amidst the tons of rubble of the WTC--and yet they couldn't find crash hardened data recorders. The data and voice recorders are designed to survive both the crash and resulting fire and almost always do. Why not this time?

Now the FBI tells us they will not be releasing the lone cockpit voice recorder that survived Flight 93 because "it would be too traumatic for the surviving families." What could be more traumatic than what they already know? This is just another blatant excuse to withhold even more information about the tragedies. There has to be a good reason why the FBI refuses to release this voice recorder, and I think it has to do with the fact that it may not have been a hijacking at all that took down this aircraft.

It is becoming evident that Flight 93 was shot down by an unmarked white jet that was seen intercepting Flight 93 and following it down as it crashed. The jet was witnessed in detail by several people on the ground. One military witness claims he heard a missile being fired. In addition, the main body of the engine of Flight 93 was found miles from the main wreckage site, with damage comparable to that which a heat seeking missile would do to an airliner. There were also personal papers, and articles of clothing from the plane found miles from the crash. The government is now saying these were carried up into the air by the crash fireball--but no such occurrence has happened in other crashes. The existing body of evidence is found at on a website at www.flight93crash.com. The author of the website doesn't draw any conclusions except that Flight 93 didn't go down as the public has been told and that the government knows why and isn't telling.

MORE ATTEMPTS TO HIDE TRUTH BY BUSH ADMINISTRATION

Two stories have emerged this week further indicating that the Bush administration is aware of wrongdoing within the government and attempting to cover up.

First, in a private meeting with Sen. Majority Leader Tom Daschle and other leaders of Congress, President Bush pushed to limit the scope of any Congressional investigation of the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center. The meeting was called by Bush, indicating that he was sufficiently worried about the results of such an investigation, and was attempting to forestall it through a little arm twisting. I think he and others up the chain are worried that Congress may discover or reveal to the public one or more of the numerous pieces of evidence that point to government prior knowledge of the events, and its recent relations with Osama bin Laden. Bush knows that there are various witnesses who can give damaging testimony about government involvement--such as FEMA's Tom Kenny, who has been kept completely out of sight and beyond the reach of any media interviews since he told Dan Rather that he and his team were sent to NYC on Monday prior to the 9/11 disaster; or the CIA station chief in Dubai, Saudi Arabia, who knows of US officials' contacts with Osama bin Laden in the American hospital where bin Laden was being treated for kidney disease. Even if the Bush administration is able to skirt the prior knowledge charges, they would certainly have trouble avoiding blame for egregious intelligence failures relative to the attacks--attacks committed by persons well known to the CIA and FBI and who were already in their computer files.

Second, Bush made an impassioned attack against Congressional efforts to force the administration to reveal what was discussed with Enron during the secret meetings on energy policy with VP Cheney. The President said he must have the right to preserve a visitor's private conversations if he is to be successful in getting people to talk with government. Hogwash! Bush might have had a point if the subject of the

meeting were a matter of true national security or a criminal investigation, but this was supposedly a matter of government energy policy--something easily within the scope of government open meeting guidelines. The only possible reason for wanting to maintain secrecy was to conceal government collusion with certain favored companies--designing policies and energy rates that would give those companies a favorable advantage in the market place. We have the testimony of former Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Chairman Curtis Herbert, Jr., who claimed that he was forced to submit to an interview with Enron Chairman Kenneth Lay prior to being considered for the post, and that Lay made improper demands to him about energy policy after he was installed. Herbert also claims to have been removed by President Bush after he refused to comply with Lay's demands. If this is true, Bush has some explaining to do about why Enron seems to have veto authority over who serves in government energy oversight committees.

World Affairs Brief, March 8, 2002

INTERNET RUMBLINGS: NO AIRLINER CRASH AT PENTAGON?

A huge potential conspiracy scandal is emerging on the internet as photographs of the Pentagon crash site are being aired showing no evidence of any aircraft parts or wreckage. Rumors are flying that the government falsified this attack with a planted explosive charge at the Pentagon or that a truck bomb did the actual damage. I have viewed the sketchy evidence so far, and concur that no visible aircraft wreckage is shown. But, that doesn't mean it isn't there. The total package of evidence is far from conclusive at this point. In fact, there does exist other evidence, including witnesses who saw a plane, that directly contradicts the assertion of no aircraft. If you want to examine the photo evidence yourself go to

http://www.asile.org/citoyens/numero13/pentagone/erreurs_en.htm. Here are some points to consider:

1. The photographs were taken from too far away to make a definitive determination.
2. The explosion occurred at the base of the building and the roof structure caved in afterward on top of whatever wreckage may have survived the fire--making it difficult to see the wreckage.
3. The damaged portion of the building is more narrow than the wingspan of the airliner, lending credence to the charge that the aircraft could not have created this hole. However, the building exterior does show damage where the outer wings would have impacted. When an airliner crashes into a building with a hard exterior and a soft interior, the entire aircraft tends to break up in small pieces and be absorbed inside the building. That's what happened in both WTC towers. The façade of the Pentagon may not have given way. The outer portions of a wing are far less dense than the rest of the structure and could have disintegrated upon impact. All flammable materials would have been consumed in the ensuing fire.
4. At a press conference held at the Pentagon by Assistant Defense Secretary Victoria Clarke, on 12 September 2001, Arlington County Fire Chief Ed Plaughter had this to say: "First of all, the question about the aircraft, there are some small pieces of aircraft visible from the interior during this fire-fighting operation I'm talking about, but not large sections. In other words, there's no fuselage sections and that sort of thing." This quote does admit to the lack of large pieces of airplane wreckage, but he does say there were small pieces. Any pieces of aircraft wreckage would tend to discredit the no-airplane theory.
5. There is the issue of the security camera from a gas station across the street which reportedly captured the crash. As with all other such evidence, the FBI confiscated the video and has refused to reveal its contents. This happened in the OKC bombing as well. These actions are naturally suspicious, but typical of a government that regularly engages in

cover-ups. All the government has to do to defuse these charges is to release the tape. As of this writing, the FBI has not done so. However, the government did release on March 7 a clip from a surveillance camera outside the Pentagon--advertised as showing the plane hitting the Pentagon. See it at <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,47420,00.html> Finally, I thought we were going to settle this issue. No such luck. The first picture frame claiming to show an aircraft as a minor "white blur" is simply not there at the computer resolution Fox News was sending out. A Boeing 757 would certainly have had a much larger visual signature, even if blurred. Is this the best the government can come up with?

6. The biggest unexplained aspect of these charges is, what happened to the actual Flight 77 and all its passengers--none of whom have ever appeared alive. The plane can't simply have disappeared into nowhere, and no other airliner crash site exists that has not been accounted for. There is ample evidence that some of the supposed Saudi hijacker pilots (of other flights) have turned up alive, but this could easily be explained by the ad hoc way in which the FBI came up with the list of hijackers in the first place, without a shred of forensic evidence. The FBI also suppressed all aircraft passenger manifest lists that had Arab names, thus leaving the public with no means of confirming the government's assertions.

7. There are eye-witnesses, however. On Sept 11, the Washington Post compiled the testimony of several who saw the aircraft or debris on the ground. I will quote from the article by Barbara Vobejda, found at <http://a188.g.akamaitech.net/f/188/920/5m/www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/metro/daily/sep01/attack.html>

"I was right underneath the plane," said Kirk Milburn, a construction supervisor for Atlantis Co., who was on the Arlington National Cemetery exit of Interstate 395 when he said he saw the plane heading for the Pentagon. "I heard a plane. I saw it. I saw debris flying. I guess it was hitting light poles,...It was like a WHOOSH whoosh, then there was fire and smoke, then I heard a second explosion."

“Asework Hagos, 26, of Arlington, was driving on Columbia Pike on his way to work as a consultant for Nextel. He saw a plane flying very low and close to nearby buildings. ‘I thought something was coming down on me. I know this plane is going to crash. I’ve never seen a plane like this so low.’ He said he looked at it and saw American Airline insignia and when it made impact with the Pentagon initially he saw smoke, then flames.

At the Pentagon, employees had heard about or seen footage of the World Trade Centre attack when they felt their own building shake.”

“Ervin Brown, who works at the Pentagon, said he saw pieces of what appeared to be small aircraft on the ground, and the part of the building by the heliport had collapsed.”

“Damoose said the worst part was leaving the Pentagon and walking along Fort Meyer Drive, a bike trail, ‘you could see pieces of the plane.’”

“Steve Patterson, 43, said he was watching television reports of the World Trade Center being hit when he saw a silver commuter jet fly past the window of his 14th-floor apartment in Pentagon City. The plane was

about 150 yards away, approaching from the west about 20 feet off the ground, Patterson said. He said the plane, which sounded like the high-pitched squeal of a fighter jet, flew over Arlington cemetery so low that he thought it was going to land on I-395. He said it was flying so fast that he couldn’t read any writing on the side. The plane, which appeared to hold about eight to 12 people, headed straight for the Pentagon but was flying as if coming in for a landing on a nonexistent runway, Patterson said... He said the plane, which approached the Pentagon below treetop level, seemed to be flying normally for a plane coming in for a landing other than going very fast for being so low. Then, he said, he saw the Pentagon ‘envelope’ the plane and bright orange flames shoot out the back of the building.”

This last quote, as well as the others, clearly confirms that a plane did hit the Pentagon. But it is disturbing for another reason. Patterson is a graphic artist who works at home, so his ability to perceive detail and make accurate descriptions is founded in a lot of eye training. There is little chance a trained graphic artist is going to mistake a huge Boeing 757 flying only 150 yards from his window for a small commuter airplane holding only 8-12 passengers. The 757 would have been gigantic and its huge fuselage and long rows of windows could never be mistaken for a plane holding less than 12 people. This, combined with the nearly non-existent "white blur" purported to be the aircraft on the Pentagon security camera clip, may indicate that the plane which hit the Pentagon may not have been an airliner. This still leaves wide open the question of what happened to Flight 77. I have, so far, been unable to locate a Steven Patterson in the Pentagon City area of Arlington, Va. None of the graphic design firms in the area that I called have heard of him. Barbara Vobejda told me she didn't have a contact number for him either since his testimony was picked up by one of the dozens of "stringers" they had out in the field that day interviewing people on the ground.

So, for now we must conclude that some type of aircraft flew into the Pentagon, but the jury is still out on other murky details. It looks doubtful to me that the government would be so stupid as to try to falsify the entire aircraft event. On the other hand, they spent millions trying to explain away the missile shutdown (by the US Navy) of TWA 800, including the creation of a completely bogus video presentation falsifying what really happened. So they certainly are capable of grand conspiracy and deception.

MORE SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE--A LITERAL SMOKING GUN ON FLIGHT 11

We now have additional proof that the FAA suppressed news of occurrences surrounding the 9/11 crash of American Airlines Flight 11. A memo has surfaced from within the FAA indicating that hijacker Satam al-Suqami (hard to imagine how they could know his name) had a gun on the aircraft and shot and killed passenger Daniel Lewin in the process of

hijacking the aircraft. The FAA initially denied the memo's existence, and then admitted its existence, but altered its contents, denying the presence of a gun on board. Anonymous investigators within the FAA have admitted that the original memo detailing the shooting is factual. This information could only have come from detailed pilot to ATC controller radio transmissions as the hijacking was in process. This partially explains why the FAA and FBI refuse to relinquish these tape recordings. The government continues to claim that no usable black boxes have been recoverable from any of the crash sites, though they have the audacity to claim they have recovered letters and passports (highly flammable items) from the wreckage of the WTC. All of these things indicate the government has much to hide.

NEW EVIDENCE LINKING VENICE, FLORIDA FLIGHT SCHOOL TO CIA

According to Daniel Hopsicker (www.madcowprod.com), a former investigative reporter for NBC, the Venice, Florida-based flight school at Huffman Aviation which trained two of the suspected 9/11 hijacker pilots, has links to a company called Britannia Aviation, suspected of being a CIA operation. The CIA operates many shell corporations fronting for various aviation purposes that assist in its dark side operations. Britannia Aviation surfaced recently in a dispute in Lynchburg, VA when a multi-million dollar contract for aircraft maintenance at Lynchburg Virginia Regional Airport was awarded to Britannia instead of a much larger local aircraft maintenance company, fully certified with many employees and already located at Lynchburg. Hopsicker discovered that Britannia has only one listed employee and assets totaling less than \$1000. Britannia's only address points to a small office sub-leased from Rudi Dekker's Huffman Aviation in Venice, Florida. Another pertinent question might be, who made the call to the Lynchburg authorities (home of Jerry Falwell's Liberty University) to influence them to award this suspicious bid to Britannia? They aren't talking.

This connection may help answer the question why Arab hijackers, who could barely speak English, went to various English-

speaking flight schools for marginal training when a fully operating Arab-speaking flight school was in operation at Dallas Fort Worth airport. I believe the hijacker pilots were trained by large Middle Eastern airlines and attended the US schools only to establish a cover. They didn't want to implicate the Arab operation at Dallas Fort Worth. This story adds to the growing body of evidence that the CIA had foreknowledge and allowed the attack to go forward in order to justify the ongoing war on terrorism.

World Affairs Brief May 17, 2002

BUSH ADMINISTRATION ADMITS TO PRIOR WARNING ABOUT 9/11 HIJACKINGS

White House press secretary Ari Fleischer made a dramatic admission this past Wednesday--that US intelligence agencies had delivered to President Bush in early August definitive warnings that Osama bin Laden would be attempting to hijack commercial airliners. Fleischer was quick to provide a ready excuse for government inaction on the warnings by stating that the warnings did not indicate the possibility that the hijackers would use the aircrafts as guided missiles targeting high profile buildings.

This announcement is suspicious on its face. First, it has all the markings of a total fabrication designed to head off or soften the mounting real evidence of government foreknowledge and complicity with the 9/11 terrorist attack. The CIA was collaborating with Osama bin Laden in Saudi Arabia as late as July of 2001, so it is highly suspicious that the supposed intelligence warnings would have mentioned bin Laden by name as an enemy--unless bin Laden's primary purpose is to serve as a fall guy. Second, if, as Fleischer says, the warnings gave no indications that the hijackings would be "for the use of suicide bombing, nor for the use of an airplane as a missile," what did they think they were for, and why should

this warning have been given such special priority? Generic potential hijackings are not considered worthy news items to put before the President in his daily briefings. last, why no prior admission of this prior warning (if it existed at all)? Why wait for six months to reveal it?

I strongly suspect that this is a ploy to defuse the growing evidence of government prior knowledge. By airing a harmless version of prior warning, the public will be induced to view all other subsequent and more damaging evidence as 'old stuff.' Even Congress may be diverted from highlighting evidence of other more telling collusion between government and the hijackers as they go through the pretenses of an investigation. Here are some major questions that will probably go unanswered by Congress as a result:

- What is the relationship between the CIA and Rudy Dekker's Huffman Aviation which trained two of the alleged hijackers? Dekker leases space in his hanger to Britannia Aviation, a CIA front company.
- Why did the INS give numerous visas to these hijackers (in previous years, before 9/11) when they were conspicuously prominent on the CIA and FBI computer terrorist "watch lists?" I think the INS "mistake" of issuing renewed student visas to them after the attacks was only to provide a phony image of government incompetence--which doesn't match the exacting ruthlessness of the INS in holding Caucasian immigrants to the letter of the law.
- In light of the recent admissions about prior warning, why didn't the same agencies who briefed the President put two and two together and link flight school training taken by Arabs (with supposed ties to Al Qaeda) to the known threat of hijacking (even assuming the CIA didn't know the ultimate purpose of the hijacking)?
- Why did Arabs who could barely speak English go to America flight schools (which offered no instruction in large airliners) when there was an

Arab-speaking airline flight school in operation at Fort Worth International?

- Why is the FAA refusing to make public any of the tape recorded conversations with pilots of the hijacked airliners as the hijacking was taking place?
- Why the suppression of ATC controller testimony that two F-16 fighters were vectored to and intercepted Flight 93 over Pennsylvania, or about witness statements of explosions aboard the aircraft and the unmarked white jet aircraft that followed Flight 93 down to the ground as it crashed and then flew off at tree top altitude?
- Why did the government shut down all military flight lines in the East half way through the 9/11 attacks so they could not respond to other hijackings still in progress?
- Why is the FBI refusing to release the service station surveillance camera video they confiscated minutes after an aircraft flew into the Pentagon? How did they know to show up at the service station within such a short time period? Why did the government leak (unofficially) to NBC strange excerpts from a Pentagon parking video that, in fact, does not show a large airliner crashing into the Pentagon? The anomalies in the official story about the alleged crash of Flight 77 have given rise to a whole rash of internet suspicions pointing to another type of aircraft, possibly combined with a missile, that more fully explains the damage to the Pentagon. All this could easily be clarified by evidence the government has in its possession. Why the gag order?

People are so easily duped into accepting facile explanations for government incompetency and inaction. I participated on a panel discussion on terrorism at the FEE National Convention, and presented some of the anomalies in the official version of events surround 9/11, including the highly suspicious refusal of FBI headquarters to allow a local FBI office in Minnesota to search the apartment of an Arab flight school student who was reported to be only interested in learning to maneuver a

large aircraft--not takeoff and land. Michael Ladeen, a fellow panelist who works for the establishment American Enterprise Institute, was quick to react to my charges by saying the FBI was under pressure by the federal courts to be cautious about violating anyone's rights. Hogwash. My learned colleague was apparently oblivious to the voluminous testimony of FBI whistleblowers stating that the FBI violates the law anytime it wants. The surveillance of conservative Congressmen (Filegate) is only one example of such egregious violations of the law on a routine basis at the Bureau. If the FBI chose to be cautious in this case, it was only because the FBI was looking for an excuse to avoid exposing evidence pointing to an incident that powerful dark side forces in government wanted to happen--perhaps to justify further restrictions of constitutional liberties in America (see below) and to further globalist intervention.

World Affairs Brief, June 7, 2002

21st CENTURY WARREN COMMISSION

This is the title (by analyst John Horne) given to the bipartisan Congressional committee to investigate the government's role in the 9/11 attack on America. The committee is composed of members of the House and Senate Intelligence committees--all but a few of which are eminently controllable by establishment powers to ensure an outcome favorable to the government's official version of events (which denies all direct or indirect involvement and which claims it was too incompetent and underfunded to properly deal with the vague warnings it has admitted to having been aware of). Despite all the 'mea culpas' uttered by agency heads at the CIA, FBI and INS, no one has been asked to resign and no one has been fired or disciplined--except the few brave whistleblowers who say the agencies knew more than they are admitting.

The title is an appropriate one for the joint Congressional committee, given that the former Warren Commission's sole purpose was to cover up for the government's role in the JFK assassination and pin the blame on a CIA stooge. The thirty representatives comprising the current commission meet in soundproof security rooms, to make sure there are no leaks to the public. The majority of these men and women are recipients of large campaign contributions from government connected corporations, Wall Street firms, and labor unions. A large percentage are members of or have ties to the CFR, Trilateral Commission, and the Bilderbergers. Some have prior involvement with the CIA. The few who are conservative and independent will be overruled by virtue of their small numbers and muted by the rules of secrecy. You can read John Horne's analysis of each member and their financial background, sources of contribution, and involvement with ideological organizations at the following URL: <http://burningbush.net/firms.com/9-11committee.htm> .

World Affairs Brief, November 29, 2002

BUSH PICKS KISSINGER TO HEAD UP 9/11 INVESTIGATION

In a move that has shocked both the American left and savvy people on the right, President Bush named Henry Kissinger, the consummate insider and dark-side high-level manager, as head of the upcoming 9/11 investigation. Survivor groups have been demanding to know how much the government knew beforehand which might have allowed them to prevent the attacks. Most survivor groups demanded the creation of an independent commission to investigate the attacks, to be provided for as part of the domestic security bill. But the independent commission clause was removed from the bill after the White House balked at the commission's broad subpoena powers (which were aimed at White House insiders who have thus far refused to cooperate with Congress). Provisions for the 9/11 commission were reinstated at the last minute in a separate intelligence-spending bill after heavy lobbying by family leaders of the victims of 9/11.

The Bush administration has been maintaining for several months that it does not desire an independent inquiry. Now that Congress has mandated it, in spite of White House lobbying, the Bush administration has decided to sabotage the process by putting Kissinger in charge. Both Bush and Kissinger were guilty of egregious misstatements of fact and intent in their recent joint appearance at a press conference. In a classic example of doublespeak, President Bush remarked, "This investigation should carefully examine all the evidence and follow all the facts wherever they lead. We must uncover every detail and learn every lesson of September the 11th." If Bush is sincere, then why has he been so adamant about killing this investigation or limiting its scope, as I have reported in earlier briefs?

At the signing ceremony, Bush enthused, "Dr. Kissinger will bring broad experience, clear thinking and careful judgment to this important task." Indeed, Kissinger will use all his power and experience in secret dealing to make sure this investigation points no fingers at the Bush administration for this tragedy. For his part, Kissinger claimed he would "go where the facts lead us....We are under no restrictions, and we will accept no restrictions." More lies. The first thing the White House announced at Ari Fleischer's daily press conference was that the President would not be testifying at any point in the investigation. No restrictions?

SOME BACKGROUND ON KISSINGER

Publicly, Kissinger is most well known for serving as National Security Advisor and later as Secretary of State under Presidents Nixon and Ford. During his tenure in these positions, Kissinger sold out Vietnam to the Communists, despite the US's demonstrated military advantages and bombing victories at the end. During secret negotiations with China for pulling out of the costly war, Kissinger made one-sided promises to Red China on behalf of the US to: 1) refuse to support Taiwanese independence; 2) allow Red China to replace Taiwan in the UN; and 3) remain silent about US prisoners of war not released by Vietnam and Russia at the official end of hostilities. Kissinger was also responsible for

convincing Nixon to order the ban on the exportation of miniature ball bearing technology to the Soviet Union lifted -- a ban which had up to that time kept the Russians from developing accurate independently targeted warheads (MIRVs) on their nuclear missiles. This piece of treason increased the US's risk of nuclear annihilation tenfold. Kissinger also insisted on the ratification of the disastrous 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which effectively kept the US from developing any counter deterrent to the growing Russian missile threat.

There have been instances in which Kissinger has appeared to have anti-Communist sympathies. In 1973, Kissinger was involved directly in giving the green light and CIA covert support to Gen. Augusto Pinoche in his efforts to overthrow the Communist government of Salvador Allende in Chile -- just in time to thwart a systematic assassination of hundreds of anti-Communist officers and even American missionaries by Allende's most radical political wing. In 1975, Kissinger secretly gave a green light to Indonesian dictator Suharto to invade East Timor to suppress a Communist insurgency there. In 1976, Kissinger backed the coup leaders in Argentina who overthrew the leftist government that was allowing the Communist Tupamaro guerrillas to terrorize urban areas of Argentina and Uruguay. The left views each of these examples as evil. The conservative right views them as legitimate interventions to fight against the Communist domino effect. My view is more complex. Kissinger, like almost all State Department officials, is involved in efforts both to facilitate Communist revolutions and to curtail them. Under most circumstances, Communism is to be assisted so that it can serve as a vehicle for future conflict -- conflict which will help globalists usher in the era of world government. However, when a Communist revolution gets out of hand in the minds of these globalist leaders, it becomes necessary to curtail its progress until conditions can be established which are more easily controlled. Thus even in these examples, Kissinger was championing not the cause of liberty, but the complex agenda of globalism.

If we go even further back in Kissinger's career, we find he got his start with the OSS during World War II. The John Birch Society did a good deal of investigative research about this shadowy period and came to the conclusion that Kissinger became a Communist agent during this

period. Frank Capel's book, *Henry Kissinger, Soviet Agent* elucidates Kissinger's hidden background. Capel writes, "An anti-Communist who infiltrated Polish Communist Intelligence and rose to the equivalent rank of general has now named Henry Kissinger as a Soviet agent, recruited into a special group known as ODRA while he was a sergeant in the U.S. Armed Forces in Germany during World War II." More modern revelations indicate that Kissinger was actually assigned by the OSS to infiltrate Communist ranks and serve the US as a double agent. He served in this role during the FDR administration under the auspices of double agents such as Alger Hiss. In my view, the purpose of Kissinger's assignment was not, as most anti-Communist conservatives like to believe, merely to find out what the Reds were up to. More likely, his purpose was to actually facilitate Russian and East German espionage into US circles. In other words, I believe that globalists were running the US government even then, and that agents such as Kissinger and Hiss were really sophisticated global agents, allowing the Russians to think they were better at penetrating US intelligence than they really were. Again, the globalists are always playing a two-sided game, building future enemies up and then eventually going to war to eliminate them -- all with the purpose of advancing their goal of globalist control over sovereign nations.

World Affairs Brief, December 20, 2002

THE KISSINGER AND MITCHELL RESIGNATIONS

In response to a requirement that both Henry Kissinger and George Mitchell make public a complete list of their clients and lobbying activities or resign as heads of a Congressional panel investigating September 11, both chose resignation rather than comply with disclosure. Kissinger's maneuvers were particularly telling. At first he tried to negotiate a deal whereby he could make the appearance of disclosure while still keeping it

all secret from the public. He asked the 9/11 survivors group to designate a single person to receive knowledge of his client list, and stipulated that that person be sworn to absolute secrecy, prohibited from telling anyone what the list contained, even if he or she viewed a potential conflict of interest. When this was turned down for obvious reasons, not the least of which being that it wouldn't pass legal muster, Kissinger backed out rather than reveal who he does business with.

What's Kissinger got to hide? Kissinger and Associates includes other ex-government insiders such as National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft, Under Sec. of State Lawrence Eagleburger, international economist Alan Stoga, and investment banker Jefferson Cunningham III. Kissinger and Associates has lobbied for various Middle Eastern countries, most nations in the Far East (especially those with whom Kissinger has had major business relationships with, such as Indonesia with its gold mines), and Russia and China.

Kissinger also serves the globalist leaders by meeting with new leaders of other countries and explaining to them what is expected of them vis a vis the global agenda, and what they must comply with if they expect to be favorably treated. For example, Kissinger was the newly elected Spanish president's first visitor. President Jose Maria Aznar explained that Kissinger was merely explaining to him "how the world worked." I'll bet he was! Israeli government officials have often been observed meeting with Kissinger before engaging in official talks at the White House. Kissinger also jets around the world and meets with up-and-coming government leaders in secret confabs like the Bilderburger Conference, the Club of Rome and the Committee of 300. Thus, Kissinger certainly has much to hide in his client list – facts and relationships that would clearly indicate too much about Kissinger's real power in the world.

Here are a few interesting facts that shed light on Kissinger's commercial lobbying on behalf of corporations desiring an insider relationship with government. There are undoubtedly hundreds more that are not in the public arena.

Henry Kissinger was an international director of the Banca Nazionale del Lavoro (BNL), the Italian bank whose branch in Atlanta, Georgia made a \$4 billion unauthorized loan to Iraq during the Gulf War, according to the chairman of the US House banking committee. Kissinger also had links to BCCI, a front for CIA money laundering. In 1991, the Banking Subcommittee received documents from BCCI's liquidators that linked Kissinger to BCCI's use of a retired Brazilian Ambassador, Sergio da Costa, who was trying to front the purchase of a bank in Brazil. This was during the time the CIA relationship with BCCI was being leaked by various whistleblowers and they were getting ready to pull out, leaving the private shareholders and US taxpayers holding the bag. Da Costa was a partner in Kissinger Associates.

Brent Scowcroft and Lawrence Eagleburger played a major role in formulating the Bush administration's proposal to use \$1 billion in Export-Import Bank credits to sell defense technology and equipment to foreign companies that had lobbying contracts with Kissinger and Associates. Brent Scowcroft was particularly attempting to promote military sales to companies that he owned stock in – a clear conflict of interest. Another of Kissinger's clients was Unical, which was a partner with Enron during the energy trading scandal. These connections and meetings are part of the records VP Cheney is attempting to keep out of public hands.

Bush has nominated Thomas Kean as Kissinger's replacement. Here's some background on Kean. He was the liberal governor of New Jersey from 1982 to 1990, and is currently president of Drew University. He also serves as a corporate director for the Pepsi Group and petroleum giant

Amerada Hess, which has extensive relations with Saudi Arabia. Kean has a long history in managing left/liberal endowments: the National Environmental Education and Training Foundation; the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the World Wildlife Fund, the National Center for Learning Disabilities, and the National Endowment for Democracy. He served on the advisory board to the President's Initiative on Race during the Clinton administration, and has been involved in various UN gatherings, including the World Conference on Education for All and the Fourth U.N. World Conference on Women in 1995. Kean is obviously a reliable team player who will ensure that the 9/11 investigation never touches establishment powers.

Bush has also named Richard Ben Veniste to the panel, the same insider attorney that sabotaged Barry Seal's counter-suit against the US government. Seal correctly alleged that the CIA had hired him to fly in drugs to Mena, Arkansas, and he had the witnesses and evidence to prove it. Seal was assassinated after he talked too much about Clinton's connection with these secret shipments.

World Affairs Brief, May 9, 2003

ANALYSIS OF WHITE HOUSE OBSTRUCTION OF 9/11 INVESTIGATIONS

The Bush administration, the CIA, and the FBI are all refusing to cooperate with Congress as the latter tries to release for publication its 900-page report on the 9/11 terror attack on the WTC. The report contains numerous critical comments about administration and intelligence agency mishandling of forewarnings received by agents in the field—including a warning from an FBI agent that al-Qaeda supporters

might be training in US flight schools. This story, and many others that are even more damaging, has already been leaked to the public either by establishment sources or by internet news sources—and yet the administration is adamant that these same stories must remain classified and not be released as part of the report. Obviously, the administration doesn't want these reports to benefit from the increased credibility that a mention in a Congressional report would endow.

This particular Congressional report is unrelated to the independent 9/11 Commission [<http://www.9-11commission.gov/>] that was so slow in getting underway, and will be even slower at answering the questions presented by representatives of the victims' families [<http://www.911commission.org/>]. Given the less than comprehensive scope of the questions posed to the commission, as well as the establishment make-up of the commission's panel members, I don't expect anything revealing regarding government foreknowledge, failure to respond, and cover-up of suspicious activities to come out of its investigation. Even this commission is being stonewalled by the Bush administration. Newsweek magazine has reported that, "President Bush's chief lawyer has privately signaled that the White House may seek to invoke executive privilege over key documents relating to the attacks in order to keep them out of the hands of investigators for the National Commission on Terror Attacks Upon the United States—the independent panel created by Congress to probe all aspects of 9-11."

The members of the commission have all had to get security clearances to be on the panel. After the government delayed issuing the clearances for months, members are still not being given full access. As Newsweek reported, "Just two weeks ago, one commission member, Tim Roemer, a former Democratic congressman from Indiana, had sought to read transcripts of three days of closed hearings that had been held last fall by the House and Senate Intelligence Committees—hearings that Roemer, as a member of the House panel, had actually participated in. But when Roemer went down to a carefully guarded room on Capitol Hill to read the classified transcripts—he says to refresh his memory—he was stunned to learn that he couldn't have access to them. The reason, relayed by a congressional staffer, was that...administration lawyers [must] first review

them to determine if the transcripts contained testimony about ‘privileged’ material.” Obviously, the White House is trying to suppress something.

A couple of the victims’ representatives did ask some crucial questions, such as why official Defense protocols were not followed, and why the NY Port Authority delayed evacuation of the second tower, but they failed to ask any of the really tough questions that point to government collusion and provocation:

- Why has the government refused to make public the recorded pilots’ conversations with Air Traffic Control, notifying them of a hijacking in progress? We know these conversations took place because the FAA has confirmed having reported the hijackings to NORAD within minutes of their commencement.
- Why has the government denied having intercepted Flight 93 over Pennsylvania with 2 F-16s, despite the voluminous evidence that the airliner was shot down and shadowed to its crash by an unmarked jet leased to the government?
- Why were most military tower operators in the area told to ground all flights from taking off, including fighter interceptors?
- How and why were the reported cell phone calls from passengers on the hijacked airliners faked? Recent tests have shown that cell phones at high altitudes do not communicate with antenna towers on the ground. Almost all cellular and PCS systems utilize antennas which are only oriented for horizontal reception—not vertical.
- How did the US so quickly develop complete profiles and dossiers on all the supposed hijackers, including their night club activities, if these individuals were not previously being tracked by government agents? There is also the question of the long trail of incriminating letters, passports and flight manuals supposedly left behind by the hijackers at the airport or, in the case of the intact passport, miraculously recovered in the WTC debris.

- Why has the government never amended the list of alleged hijackers given that eight of these names belong to people still living? The government has never given a rational explanation for why hijackers would use their real names in any case.
- Why were the alleged hijackers whose names were on terror watch lists given visas, without the proper documentation normally required?
- What is the relationship between Huffman Aviation (the Venice, FL company that trained two of the hijackers) and the CIA, which leases space in Huffman's hangar through a front company?
- Why did the hijackers who could barely speak English attempt (unsuccessfully) to take flying lessons for small planes when there was an Arab-speaking flight school for major aircraft in Fort Worth, Texas? [They were covering for training on major aircraft received elsewhere.]
- Why did certain investors know to short the stocks of American airline companies prior to 9/11? Along the same lines, why has the government never attempted to subpoena Wall Street computer records to find out who these "lucky" investors were?
- Why have the testimonies of New York firefighters who heard bomb-like explosions in the towers during the evacuation process been suppressed?

The evidence of internal explosives being associated with the bringing down of the two buildings has been compelling, yet frustrating given its often amateurish assumptions. (One of these is that burning jet fuel would have had to melt the steel structures in order to precipitate the collapse—which is false. The heat need only have been sufficient to soften the metal beams and trusses, causing them to sag and fail). Claims concerning evidence of planted charges on all floors, leading to a controlled collapse of the WTC buildings, have never been credible to me (such a scheme is too complex, involving hundreds of small charges). However, there is new evidence that charges at the bases of the towers'

47 central steel columns could have precipitated the controlled vertical collapse of the buildings, and still have been consistent with the legitimate failure of the upper floor trusses reacting to the sudden collapse of central support. One crew of first responders into the first tower were shocked to see that the lobby on the main floor appeared to have been the object of an explosive blast—yet no signs of fire. On 9/11, two ABC reporters were filmed running away from the towers after seeing and hearing a ground floor explosion just prior to the collapse of the towers. There have also been reports of pools of molten metal at the base of these columns observed during debris removal. It is suspicious that the government threatened fire fighters who had heard other explosions to keep silent, and also that they ordered the tower debris removed so quickly, precluding complete forensic testing of the failed structure. The same thing happened after the Oklahoma bombing, where there was also irrefutable evidence of multiple charges and explosions.

World Affairs Brief, August 1, 2003

CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY ON 9/11 RELEASED—DISMAL FINDINGS

The best summary of the administration's attempt to cover-up federal involvement in the events of 9/11 is by former Watergate whistleblower John W. Dean, entitled, *The 9/11 Report Raises More Serious Questions About The White House Statements On Intelligence*

“The recently released Report of the Joint Congressional Inquiry Into The Terrorist Attacks of September 11, and its dismal findings, have been well reported by the news media. What has not been widely reported, however, are the inescapable conclusions that must be drawn from a close reading of this bipartisan study.

“Obviously, Republicans were not going to let Democrats say what needed to be said, or maybe Democrats did not want to politicize the matter. But since the facts could not be ignored or suppressed, they reported them without drawing certain obvious, not to mention devastating, conclusions.

“Bluntly stated, either the Bush White House knew about the potential of terrorists flying airplanes into skyscrapers (notwithstanding their claims to the contrary), or the CIA failed to give the White House this essential information, which it possessed and provided to others.

“Bush is withholding the document that answers this question. Accordingly, it seems more likely that the former possibility is the truth. That is, it seems very probable that those in the White House knew much more than they have admitted, and they are covering up their failure to take action.

“The facts, however, speak for themselves. Bush's Claim Of Executive Privilege For His Daily Intelligence Briefing

One of the most important sets of documents that the Congressional Inquiry sought was a set of copies of the President's Daily Brief (PDB), which is prepared each night by the CIA. In the Appendix of the 9/11 Report we learn that on August 12, 2002, after getting nowhere with informal discussions, Congress formally requested that the Bush White House provide this information.

“More specifically, the Joint Inquiry asked about the process by which the Daily Brief is prepared, and sought several specific Daily Brief items. In particular, it asked for information about the August 6, 2001 Daily Brief

relating to Osama Bin Laden's terrorist threats against the United States, and other Daily Brief items regarding Bin Laden, Al Qaeda, and pre-September 11 terrorism threats.

“The Joint Inquiry explained the basis for its request: ‘the public has a compelling interest ... in understanding how well the Intelligence Community was performing its principal function of advising the President and NSC of threats to U.S. national security.’ In short, the Joint Inquiry wanted to see the records. Bush's public assertion that his intelligence was "darn good" was not sufficient.

“The Inquiry had substantial background material, for the Clinton Administration's national security team had been very forthcoming. As a result, it warned President Bush of the inevitable consequences of refusal to provide access to the requested Daily Briefs. The Inquiry told Bush: ‘In the absence of such access, we will have no choice but to

extrapolate the number and content of [Daily Brief] items on these subjects from the items that appeared on these subjects in the Senior Executive Intelligence Brief and other lower level intelligence products during the same period.’

“Bush nevertheless denied access, claiming Executive Privilege. While the Inquiry did not chose to draw obvious conclusions, they are right there in the report for everyone else to draw. So I have drawn them, to see what they look like. Revealing Information In the 9/11 Report

“After pulling together the information in the 9/11 Report, it is understandable why Bush is stonewalling. It is not very difficult to deduce

what the president knew, and when he knew it. And the portrait that results is devastating.

The president's briefing of August 6, 2001 was the subject of public discussion even before the Inquiry started its work. As the 9/11 Report notes in a footnote (at page 206), 'National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice stated in a May 16, 2002 press briefing that, on August 6, 2001, the President Daily Brief (PDB) included information about Bin Laden's methods of operation from a historical perspective dating back to 1997.'

“At that May 16, 2002 briefing, Rice went on to say that the Brief made clear that one method Bin Laden might choose was to hijack an airline, taking hostages to gain release of one of their operatives. She said it was ‘a generalized warring’ with nothing about time, place or method. And she added, ‘I don’t think anybody could have predicted that these people would take an airplane and slam it into the World Trade Center, take another one and slam it into the Pentagon.’

“Unfortunately, Rice's statements don't fit comfortably with the Inquiry's information. It appears from the 9/11 Report that either Rice was dissembling, or the CIA was withholding information from the President (and hence also from Rice). But as we have been learning with the missing Weapon of Mass Destruction, the CIA has consistently been forthcoming. So it seems that it is Rice who should explain herself.

“A Closer Look At Rice's Statement Note again that Rice stated, in explaining the August 6, 2001 Daily Brief, that it

addressed Bin Laden's ‘methods of operation from a historical perspective dating back to 1997.’

What exactly did it say? We cannot know. But the Inquiry's 9/11 Report lays out all such threats, over that time period, in thirty-six bullet point summaries. It is only necessary to cite a few of these to see the problem:

‘In September 1998, the [Intelligence Community] obtained information that Bin Laden's next operation might involve flying an explosive-laden aircraft into a U.S. airport and detonating it.’

‘In the fall of 1998, the [Intelligence Community] obtained information concerning a Bin Laden plot involving aircraft in the New York and Washington, D.C. areas.

‘In March 2000, the [Intelligence Community] obtained information regarding the types of targets that operatives of Bin Laden's network might strike. The Statue of Liberty was specifically mentioned , as were skyscrapers, ports, airports, and nuclear power plants.

In sum, the 9/11 Report of the Congressional Inquiry indicates that the intelligence community was very aware that Bin Laden might fly an airplane into an American skyscraper. Given the fact that there had already been an attempt to bring down the twin towers of the World Trade Center with a bomb, how could Rice say what she did? Certainly, someone could have predicted, contrary to Rice's claim that, among other possibilities, ‘these people would take an airplane and slam it into the World Trade Center, take another one and slam it into the Pentagon.’

“The Unanswered Questions Is Rice claiming this information in the 9/11 Report was not given to the White House? Or could it be that the White House was given this information, and failed to recognize the

problem and take action? Is the White House covering up what the President knew, and when he knew it?

“The Joint Inquiry could not answer these questions because they were denied access to Bush's Daily Brief for August 6, 2001, and all other dates. Yet these are not questions that should be stonewalled.

Troublingly, it seems that President Bush trusts foreign heads of state with the information in this daily CIA briefing, but not the United States Congress. It has become part of his routine, when hosting foreign dignitaries at his Crawford, Texas ranch, to invite them to attend his CIA briefing.

“Yet he refuses to give Congress any information whatsoever about these briefings, and he has apparently invoked Executive Privilege to suppress the August 6, 2001 Daily Brief. It can only be hoped that the 9/11 Commission, which has picked up where the Congressional Inquiry ended, will get the answers to these questions. Rest assured that they will be aware of the questions, for I will pass them along. “ [End of Dean quote]

World Affairs Brief, August 8, 2003

WHY BUSH IS COVERING FOR THE SAUDIS—OR IS HE?

The Bush administration is building an ominous and blatant reputation for hiding its true dealings and motives behind a wall of “national security.” Here are some examples:

- VP Cheney defied the courts and refused to turn over to Congress records of White House meetings with Enron and other insider connected energy companies colluding to raise prices.

- The White House claimed “executive privilege” in response to numerous requests from Congress for information, including FBI dealings with the Mafia.
- The Bush administration continues to hold secret numerous pieces of information relative to the terrorist attacks on 9/11, including FAA tape recordings of conversations with pilots and NORAD; crucial video tapes of the Pentagon attack; and testimonies of firefighters at the WTC suggesting the occurrence of multiple explosions before the collapse.
- Attorney General John Ashcroft has refused repeatedly to reveal the names and conditions of hundreds of prisoners being held without charge relative to the war on terror, citing “ongoing investigations.”
- President Bush declared material presented in open public hearings at the 9/11 Commission as classified, and even prohibited the members of the Commission from reviewing the material afterwards.
- President Bush is claiming executive privilege in refusing to turn over copies of the CIA Daily Briefing reports he received prior to the 9/11 attacks. Sources claim these reports would demonstrate that the White House was warned specifically about the likelihood of attacks on government buildings using hijacked airliners.

Of course, the latest flap about excessive use of secrecy concerns the currently classified 900-page United States congressional report regarding the 9/11 terrorist attacks. As Sen. Richard Shelby (R-Al) told the audience of NBC’s Meet The Press, “I went back and read every one of those pages, thoroughly. ... My judgment is 95 percent of that information could be declassified, become uncensored, so the American people would know.” Shelby ought to know—he worked for the CIA before coming to public office. At the moment, the White House is refusing to declassify 28 pages of the report which, according to Congressmen familiar with the report, contain information giving evidence of Saudi financing of the terrorists.

Bush is refusing on a well-worn excuse: “It makes no sense to declassify when we've got an ongoing investigation,” he said. Bush also implied that he could refuse declassification indefinitely as long as the open-ended war on terror continued, claiming that “it would help the enemy if they knew our sources and methods.”

Let's examine these facile claims. Intelligence revelations included in the report would jeopardize an ongoing investigation only if the report mentions specific intelligence methods and sources, which it does not. The report makes only general statements about telephone intercepts and unnamed witnesses—which tells the Saudis nothing. The whole world knows about the US's eavesdropping capabilities. That a Congressional report would reveal that US intelligence is capable of gathering evidence on Saudi funding of terrorists is hardly an excuse for classifying the entire portion on the Saudi connection. Perhaps there is justification for redacting a sentence or two, but not 28 pages.

Much has been made in the news about the implications of the information contained in the 28 pages. In a purposefully ambiguous statement during a recent interview, Sen. Bob Graham (D-Fl.) remarked, “High officials in this [the Saudi] government, who I assume were not just rogue officials acting on their own, made substantial contributions to the support and well-being of two of these terrorists and facilitated their ability to plan, practice and then execute the tragedy of Sept. 11.”

The claim repeated by Graham is suspect for a couple of reasons. First, the US knew about the Saudi connection before 9/11. Why reveal it now and not before? Second, the US really doesn't have any reliable evidence that the much-publicized passenger manifest names [never seen by the public] really belonged to the hijackers. Six of the persons listed on the

government list of dead hijackers are still alive. How can you make a case for Saudi funding of the hijackers when you can't even prove that the two the Saudis were funding were the real terrorist hijackers? Let's revisit the issue of the hijacker names before we proceed.

BOGUS NAMES OF SAUDI HIJACKERS CONTINUE TO CIRCULATE

Much has been made of the fact that the majority of the presumed 19 hijackers were of Saudi origin. I don't know how the media and Congress can continue to play on these numbers. In reality, we know nothing about the real hijackers. The US claims the names are on the passenger manifests, but is keeping the passenger lists secret—at least in terms of the names of the Arabs on board. The fact that six of the named hijackers are still alive has not dissuaded the FBI from its certainty about the lists. Insight Magazine did an extensive article on the identities of these six. Here's an excerpt:

“The six claimed they were victims of identify theft. They were ‘outraged’ to be identified as terrorists, they told the Telegraph of London. In fact, one of the men claimed he never had been to the United States, while another is a Saudi Airlines pilot who said he was in a flight-training course in Tunisia at the time of the attacks.

“The stunning news prompted FBI Director Robert Mueller to admit that some of the hijackers may have stolen identities of innocent citizens. In September 2002, Mueller told CNN twice that there is ‘no legal proof to prove the identities of the suicidal hijackers.’ After that admission a strange thing happened – nothing. No follow-up stories. No follow-up questions. There was dead silence and the story disappeared. It was almost as if no one wanted to know what had happened. In fact, the FBI didn't bother to change the names, backgrounds or photographs of the alleged 19 hijackers. It didn't even deny the news reports suggesting that

the names and identities of at least six of the hijackers may be unknown. Mueller just left the door open.

“Until now. Now the FBI is sticking with its original story – regardless of whether photographs displayed of the suspected Sept. 11 terrorists were of people who never boarded those planes and are very much alive. FBI spokesman Bill Carter simply brushes off as false the charges from news reports that the FBI misidentified some of the Sept. 11 terrorists. Carter says they got the names right and it doesn't matter whether the identities were stolen. This comes as a complete about-face from Mueller's comment that there might be some question about the names of the Sept. 11 terrorists because they might have been operating under stolen identities.

“How can the FBI be sure that the 19 men it ‘identified’ are indeed the hijackers? ‘Through extensive investigation,’ Carter insists. ‘We checked the flight manifests, their whereabouts in this country, and we interviewed witnesses who identified the hijackers.’” But this is obviously untrue, at least in the case of the six living “hijackers.” Insight continues with one of the more egregious examples of misidentification on the list—the case of Wail al-Shehri.

“Wail al-Shehri was identified as one of the suspected hijackers on American Flight 11. He reportedly was in control of the plane when it crashed. Another Saudi man who is a pilot has the same name, and his father is a Saudi diplomat in Bombay. His picture was displayed by the FBI as the ‘terrorist’ al-Shehri who crashed the plane. The al-Shehri who is alive had resided in Daytona Beach, Fla., where he enrolled in flight training at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University. He currently works for a Moroccan airline. Last year the Associated Press reported that al-Shehri had spoken to the U.S. Embassy in Morocco. His photograph having been released and repeatedly shown around the world is evidence the

man in the FBI photograph still is alive, the Saudi Embassy explains.” [End of Insight quote.] Since the US has published this person’s photograph, and refuses to retract it, clearly this isn’t a case of merely relying on a stolen name. The fact that the person in the photograph is still alive proves his name shouldn’t be on the list, but the FBI continues to assert total infallibility. This indicates that the US is intent upon maintaining a “we make no errors” front.

Back to the Congressional report, it has been damaging enough to US-Saudi relations that the Saudis were mentioned at all, let alone by innuendo and without specific charges. The Saudis have sent a special ambassador to Washington to demand the 28 pages be released so they can respond to the charges. Still Bush refuses. What is there to hide? Bush appears to be protecting the Saudis from scrutiny. I think it’s a ploy.

The crucial dichotomy here is that the Saudis are not pleading for the US to cover for them. In fact, it’s just the opposite. They are demanding openness in order to defend themselves. Yes, I think the Saudis are funding fundamentalist movements throughout the Middle East, but they did not fund the US-controlled terrorists who were responsible for 9/11. The US’s insistence on painting the hijackers as Saudis is telling and may explain why the US insists on maintaining the existing list of hijackers despite evidence it is a fraud. If the US were really interested in covering for the Saudis, they wouldn’t have provided Congress with the intelligence on the Saudi connection in the first place. By making a big flap about the classification of the 28 pages, the administration actually accentuates the Saudis’ guilt by innuendo—all the while claiming to be protecting an “ally.” With friends like this, who needs enemies?

It appears to me that the Bush administration is using the bogus list of Saudi hijackers to blacken the Saudi image—another form of the ongoing blackmail the US uses to keep the Saudis in line for some other purpose,

perhaps oil. It is no secret that Crown Prince Abdullah, the de facto ruler of Saudi Arabia, is hostile to the US, and yet the Saudis continue to keep OPEC in line and oil flowing to the US.

THE US-TERROR CONNECTION

Accusing the Saudis of complicity in the 9/11 attacks is like the pot calling the kettle black. Collusion by our government with terror is a matter that needs open and careful scrutiny, despite Americans' almost outright refusal to consider the possibility. Given the Bush administration's blatant attempt to permanently weaken the Constitutional protections against warrantless searches and due process, coupled with its ongoing mania for armed intervention around the world in conducting the presumed "war on terror," I think there is more than sufficient reason to suspect that this government may have resorted to agent provocateur tactics to set the stage for such changes. A high profile terrorist attack such as what happened on 9/11 is a perfect opportunity for a hegemonic government to assert greater control over its citizens. The advent of the suspicious anthrax attacks (using spores traceable to US stocks) just prior to the passage of the USA PATRIOT Act gives additional credence to the charge of government provocation.

In order for provocations-through-terror such as the 9/11 attacks to work, the US has to make use of numerous third parties to give support to terror so that none of the terrorists' actions can be traced directly back to the US government. We already know that the CIA used Pakistani ISI intelligence operatives to funnel arms and other explosives technology to Al Qaeda. Pakistan continues to provide safe havens for the Taliban despite being partners in the war on terror. In fact, I do not believe there is any significant evidence, outside the government's own word for it, that either Osama bin Laden or the hierarchy of al Qaeda has broken away from CIA direction and support. This is not to say that the majority of mid- or low-level operatives in al Qaeda have any knowledge of continued CIA control. The connection needs only to be maintained at the highest levels.

This would account for the French intelligence leak about Osama bin Laden's meeting with the CIA station chief in Dubai, Saudi Arabia 7 weeks prior to the 9/11 attacks. It would also account for the fact that Osama bin Laden and his hundreds of Arab guards were allowed to escape the fighting in Afghanistan. The US had knowledge through satellite surveillance of their embarkation aboard ships, but failed to intercept them.

The US is also covering for the aircraft flight training the would-be hijackers received prior to 9/11. For instance, FBI headquarters suppressed local agent requests for search authority of one potential hijacker (Zacarias Moussaoui) who was taking flight simulator lessons in Minnesota, but was not interested in learning how to take off or land an airplane. There is also ongoing evidence of CIA involvement with Huffman Aviation in Florida, which provided superficial light aircraft flight training to two Arabs as cover for their having received training on major airliners elsewhere—perhaps in Libya or even Iraq. Flying Cessnas does not train anyone for handling the complex systems on Boeing aircraft—but it does provide a nice cover for training that may have taken place in other nations. Why cover for these other nation's training of the hijackers? Because it was done with US foreknowledge and there are those involved that could blow the whistle on US involvement. The US obviously has some nations to cover for, and others to expose. In all these reports and investigations, the real culprits funding terrorism (Russian and China) are not exposed while peripheral players like Saudi Arabia are. This is not mere stupidity, but purposeful confusion of events and target players in order to divert the American public from the truth.

Now, despite the utter lack of any significant low profile terrorism since 9/11, the Bush administration continues to push for more power to restrict civil liberties. Just this week, Attorney General Ashcroft announced another round of Patriot Act provisions, euphemistically entitled the VICTORY Act [Vital Interdiction of Criminal Terrorist Organizations Act], which would further expand government powers. All last month the

Department of Justice was assuring the public that it had no plans for a Patriot II version of legislation. Now, Ashcroft has announced he will make a 10-day, 20-state "Victory tour" that includes a stop in New York to push the new Act. There must be a nasty agenda behind all of this for the administration to keep pushing the limits of truth and honesty to this extent.

World Affairs Brief, September 12, 2003

SEPTEMBER 11 ANNIVERSARY – YET ANOTHER UNANSWERED QUESTION

A heretofore unreleased amateur video of the Boeing 767 crashing into WTC #2 shows a disturbing modification on the bottom side of the United Airlines Flight 175 aircraft. The aircraft almost missed its target and the person directing the aircraft made a dramatic last minute steep turn to intercept the corner of the building. In the process of the turn the bottom of the aircraft suddenly becomes visible in the low morning sun and reveals a very large and bulging modification on the right side of the fuselage behind the landing gear doors. The bulge is as wide as the wing root, so it is easy to detect.

You can view key images of this anomaly from the new Pavel Hlava video on the NY Times website:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/07/nyregion/07TAPE.html>. The last image in the sequence on the slide show clearly shows the bulge. A computer enhanced version of the image shows more detail on the size and shape of the bulge; see URL:

<http://www.thoughtcrimenews.com/wtc.htm>. This site contains some very speculative conspiracy theories that should be viewed with extreme caution for now. Also, the computer enhanced photos do not come from

the new Hlava video but from the original CNN video of the crash. You can see a video clip of the original CNN footage by using opening a video player like windows Media Player and on "open URL" under File and putting in the URL: <http://www.serendipity.li/wot/wmv/ghostplane2.wmv>. The bulge is visible on this earlier video as well, proving that the bulge is not simply a doctored image by one source.

Compare these photos with pictures of a normal Boeing 767 here: <http://www.globalaircraft.org/planes/b767.pl> (go to bottom of the web page to view how smooth and uniform the underside is). There is no bulge.

I called the Boeing Company for their reaction and had an interesting chat with Liz Verdier, the media contact person, informally tasked to answer 9/11 issues. I asked her for Boeing's reaction to the potential modification of one of its aircraft involved in the crash into WTC 2 and described the large bulge showing up on the two videos. She quickly skirted the issue by saying that Boeing was not a part of the 9/11 investigation and insisted that all queries be directed to the FBI or Dept. of Homeland Security. I replied that this wasn't about the investigation, but rather a technical question for Boeing on what this large bulge could possibly represent.

She said that Boeing would not admit there was a modification nor comment on it, and that Boeing does not make these kinds of modifications (if there were any) but that it would have been something United Airlines might have done. I told her that based upon my experience as a military pilot and maintenance officer in a squadron, no major modification like this that would affect high speed air worthiness could or would be approved by the FAA without intensive consultations with the engineering staff at Boeing. She continued to deny that Boeing would have been involved, which I found completely incredible. I then told her that I thought it was strange that she expressed no interest in seeing

evidence of this bulge that we had been discussing in some detail. She admitted then that Boeing knew all about the internet charges surrounding the modified aircraft, had seen the pictorial evidence and that Boeing was determined not to comment about it. I picked up on the feeling that this was a very touchy subject at Boeing and tried to get her to at least admit to that much. She cordially declined to confirm even that. Obviously, she had her marching orders, which tells me Boeing knows more than they are saying.

Why is this such an important issue? First, this is a modification that has never been seen on any other commercial 767 aircraft in the United fleet, according to various United pilots I have talked to. It is totally unique. For it to show up on one of the aircraft used to take down one of the WTC towers indicates it may be specifically related to the purpose of carrying out the attacks: enabling the aircraft to be remote controlled, or enhancing its explosive effect, or any number of other possibilities. Leonard Spencer at <http://www.serendipity.li/wot/aa11.htm> charges that it has something to do with firing forward missiles prior to crashing into the WTC, which I find absolutely no evidence for. The CNN video clip detail, previously mentioned, shows a burst of flame from the nose of the aircraft only after it actually penetrates the facade of WTC 2, belying his own conclusion about a missile being fired. I observed no evidence of a missile here.

Second, such a modification would have to have involved United Airlines, the Boeing Company, and the FAA—each with close government connections. No foreign terrorist group could have pulled this off, no matter how much time or money they had, unless they were simply fronting for US black operations. Furthermore, the United Airlines pilots and ground crew would never have signed off on such an aircraft unless assured by airline management that it had some legitimate purpose, albeit of some secret “national security” issue.

Third, if the modification had a benign explanation, Boeing, the FAA and United Airlines would all be quick to answer. So far they have not. If the modification was related to the 9/11 tragedy, and this airplane was specifically inserted in the fleet for this task, it would be hard evidence of US involvement in provoking this tragedy. It would also provide evidence that there was some larger directing force behind the Arab terrorists charged with the event. No airline or other large US corporation would have been involved in facilitating such an act without acting on behalf of dark side operations within the mantle of government secrecy.

There is no proof of any of these charges at this point, but these are the plausible conclusions that can be derived from what appears to be a cover-up over this strange modification. I find it difficult to believe that no one in the establishment media has noticed this glaring protrusion, especially since the NY Times published blowups of the 767 in its moment of maximum turn. The establishment media won't touch this story. Like Boeing, someone higher up must not want this issue to surface on a larger scale.

World Affairs Brief, September 19, 2003

“WINNING THE WAR ON TERROR”?

The Bush administration wants it both ways. First, it is bragging about winning the war on terror and is taking credit for dozens of unsubstantiated “successes” in foiling terrorist attempts. At the same time, Bush and Ashcroft are continually demanding additional surveillance powers, claiming they cannot effectively fight terrorism without them. Which is it? They can't have it both ways. Or can they? Obviously, if the public and the media can't or won't think through the contradictions, the federal government can keep claiming whatever they want.

Here are the contradictions:

A. There have been no normal, small scale acts of terrorism in the US, even after 9/11; even after attacking the presumed host countries of Al Qaeda; even after attacking Iraq, a nation supposedly harboring terrorists. It is easy for the administration to claim they are winning the war on terror – terrorism might not even exist in the US in the way the public thinks. If there are “hundreds of Al Qaeda cells” in the US, why have they never carried out an attack? If you think they are cowed by the “effectiveness” of our Homeland Security system (Cheney’s claim), look at Israel. With a tiny country to surveil and a 10-fold higher density of police and military checkpoints, including security guards at every business, Israeli forces still can’t stop all car bombings, suicide bombings and infrastructure attacks – though they do stop many. Our country, in comparison, is wide open. Yet we have experienced none of these typical terrorist attacks. Why? As I have said before, either there are no significant terrorist cells here (hard to believe), or terrorism in the US is a controlled entity that our government can restrain or allow to operate according to its own political purposes.

B. There is no rational linkage between suspending civil liberties and the current “state of emergency.” The only justification for denying habeas corpus, due process, right to a speedy trial, access to counsel, and proving probable cause in the issuance of search warrants is when the courts are flooded with defendants and the system is overwhelmed. At no time during or since 9/11 has that ever been the case. There is no reason why citizens or others cannot have access to normal judicial procedures and safeguards. Designating persons as “enemy combatants” with no civil rights is simply a cover for not having a good case against them. When judges buy into this scheme, they are acting in collusion with government rather than as a proper check and balance.

C. The DOJ claims it cannot allow terrorist suspects to take testimony from other terror suspects or prisoners for fear they might coordinate or pass along terrorist information. Baloney. None of these depositions take place in secret. The government is present and an official recording is always taken. What good would it do to pass information when the government is listening? Ashcroft continues to defy a court order to allow these depositions to precede.

D. In his latest tack, President Bush claims the DOJ needs broad new authority for all federal agents enabling them to demand access to private records and to compel testimony without the approval of a judge. This is in addition to continued requests for more warrantless surveillance power. While no one can deny it would ease any government's surveillance job to be able to surveil anyone and anything at all times, there are reasons why we do not allow this in a society that safeguards (or pretends to safeguard) fundamental rights, like privacy on private property. The key safeguard to this effect written into the Constitution is that no warrant shall be authorized against private property except when the government presents credible evidence of probable cause to a judge. Is that so much to ask, that there be some evidence or demonstrable reason why someone should be surveilled or his papers scrutinized?

Of course, if the government could demonstrate that there was a backlog of 100,000 suspected terrorists warranting secret surveillance, they might convince the court of the need to wave or expedite the process of issuing warrants. And in fact, that is the government's current claim: their "new" consolidated Terror Watch List contains approximately 100,000 names. But given the grave implications of such a breach of Constitutional rights, the substance behind the government's numbers must be carefully scrutinized. What I find absurd about their claim is that it accentuates the dichotomy I mentioned above: the utter lack of normal terrorism in this country. You can't have it both ways. There cannot be 100,000 terrorists and their supporters needing surveillance and have no acts of terrorism. The list is simply too big and too inaccurate.

There's another problem with secret government watch lists. There is no way available for anyone to purge his name from the list once on it. All those on the list are barred from travel on any airline forever—with no means of correcting potential injustice. That is not how the “rule of law” should work. Where is equal protection and due process here?

World Affairs Brief, September 26, 2003

9/11 MASTERMIND'S CONFESSIONS FULL OF DISINFORMATION

Associated Press writer John Solomon published excerpts from government “reports” which he was invited to review by “sources” that he declined to identify - even as to the federal agency involved. These reports purportedly contain confessions of the supposed mastermind of the Sept. 11 attacks, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, who was captured by CIA and Pakistani operators in the city of Rawalpindi, Pakistan on March 1 of this year. Naturally, he is being held “by the CIA at an undisclosed location.” Also, naturally, we can assume that Solomon’s reluctant source is from the Thus, none of what Solomon reveals can be checked or verified independently. I will quote the relevant excerpts and tell you why I think there are multiple contradictions and huge gaps in the story as Solomon portrays it. [My comments in brackets.]

“Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, mastermind of the Sept. 11 attacks [a total presumption by Solomon based only upon these reports and what the CIA has told him, improperly stated as a fact], has told American interrogators that he first discussed the plot with Osama bin Laden in 1996 and that the original plan called for hijacking five commercial jets on each U.S. coast before it was modified several times, according to interrogation reports reviewed by The Associated Press. [Notice Solomon doesn't say why he was invited to review these secret reports. If I were to request to see these same documents, either directly or via a legal FOIA

request, I would be told they are “classified” and unavailable for “national security” reasons. And yet, here we see them freely offered to a select member of the press. This is typical of how the CIA disseminates disinformation: “leaks” are often purposefully channeled through favored reporters who will not ask any tough questions or reveal contradictions.]

“Mohammed told his interrogators he had worked in 1994 and 1995 in the Philippines with Ramzi Yousef, Abdul Hakim Murad and Wali Khan Amin Shah on the foiled Bojinka plot to blow up 12 Western airliners simultaneously in Asia. After Yousef and Murad were captured, foiling the plot in its final stages, Mohammed began to devise a new plot that focused on hijackings on U.S. soil. [The US had captured laptop computers with all the details about the Bojinka hijackings – and yet claim not to have any idea the US was at risk of such hijackings.]

“...in its final stages, the hijacking plan called for as many as 22 terrorists and four planes in a first wave, followed by a second wave of suicide hijackings that were to be aided possibly by al-Qaida allies in southeast Asia [very ambitious plans]... Mohammed's interrogations have revealed the planning and training of operatives was extraordinarily meticulous, including how to blend into American society, read telephone yellow pages, and research airline schedules. [Yet the admissions that follow reveal huge contradictions to these claims – that there were no support cells inside the US for such an ambitious plan, and that communications between operatives were amateurish, lacking attention to planning.]

“In fact, Mohammed claims he did not arrange for anyone on U.S. soil to assist hijackers Khalid al-Mihdhar and Nawaf al-Hazmi when they arrived in California. Mohammed said there ‘were no al-Qaida operatives or facilitators in the United States to help al-Mihdhar or al-Hazmi settle in the United States.’ Mohammed portrays those two hijackers as central to the plot, and even more important than Mohammed Atta, initially identified by

Americans as the likely hijacking ringleader. [Central to the plot and yet given no means of support? Unthinkable, especially considering the level of sophistication necessary to pull off the 9/11 hijackings. According to other claims, al-Qaida had huge amounts of money supposedly made available to them by the Saudis, leaving them well positioned to finance such support.]

Mohammed said he communicated with al-Hazmi and al-Mihdhar while they were in the United States via Internet chat software. [No trained terrorist is this dumb. Even random use of pay phones is more secure than the Internet, and the CIA has long claimed that al-Qaida has sophisticated scrambling-enabled satellite cell phones. The vaunted NSA, which eavesdrops on all the world, claims al-Qaida is not leaving them any trace to follow. Such sophistication in eavesdropping avoidance could not have been achieved by a group as incompetent as Mohammed's testimony describes.] Mohammed said al-Hazmi and al-Mihdhar were among the four original operatives bin Laden assigned to him for the plot, a significant revelation because those were the only two hijackers whom U.S. authorities were frantically seeking for terrorist ties in the final days before Sept. 11. [Frantically seeking? Says who? This is more disinformation. The majority of US agencies didn't have a clue about the imminent terrorist threat, let alone were they frantically seeking anyone!]

By 1999, the four original operatives picked for the plot traveled to Afghanistan to train at one of bin Laden's camps. [Another all-too-convenient statement lending justification to the US decision to invade Afghanistan, even though the camps, by the time of the invasion, were guaranteed to be empty of terrorists.] The focus, Mohammed said, was on specialized commando training, not piloting jets. [This brings up another huge gap in the story. Why are there no details anywhere in this interrogation about where the presumed hijackers got real training in flying big jets? The story about learning to fly Boeing 767s in Cessna trainers is too bogus to even contemplate. It is merely a cover the US government has conspicuously failed to debunk, because to bring up the

real source of large jet training would necessarily focus attention toward possible US collusion with a major Middle Eastern country, other than Iraq.]

“Mohammed told his interrogators the hijacking teams were originally made up of members from different countries where al-Qaida had recruited, but that in the final stages bin Laden chose instead to use a large group of young Saudi men to populate the hijacking teams. [Contradiction: No plot this sophisticated can substitute a large percentage of its attack team at the last minute.]

“U.S. intelligence has suggested that Saudis were chosen, instead, because there were large numbers willing to follow bin Laden and they could more easily get into the United States because of the countries' friendly relations. Mohammed's interrogation report states he told Americans some of the original operatives assigned to the plot did not make it because they had trouble getting into the United States. Mohammed said the first major change to the plans occurred in 1999 when the two Yemeni operatives could not get U.S. visas. [Very true. In fact, none of the Saudis qualified to get into the US under existing visa guidelines. Visa holders have to show a visible means of support (regular job), have lots of money in a bank account, and meet a profile that indicates they have many obligations to family members left behind which would induce them to not stay in the US. The indigent hijackers had none of these, and yet they all got visas without question. The INS has no explanation for its supposed incompetence. The INS even sent Mohammed Atta and a fellow terrorist their visas at Venice Aviation in Florida (a CIA front) after the 9/11 hijacking, just as a demonstration of how “incompetent” they were.]

“Addressing one of the questions raised by congressional investigators in their Sept. 11 review, Mohammed said he never heard of a Saudi man

named Omar al-Bayoumi who provided some rent money and assistance to two hijackers when they arrived in California. [Contradiction: How can Mohammed claim to have developed a huge master plan and yet not know about a key support person? Are we to believe two of his key terrorists are the lucky recipients of anonymous largess?] Congressional investigators have suggested Bayoumi could have aided the hijackers [easy call - providing rent money is significant support] or been a Saudi intelligence agent, charges the Saudi government vehemently deny. The FBI has also cast doubt on the congressional theory [a convenient peace of coordination between two agencies tasked with covering up the real events of 9/11] after extensive investigation and several interviews with al-Bayoumi.

“But they have been able to corroborate with other captives and evidence much of his account of the Sept. 11 planning. [Easy to say when the CIA provides no details, holds all the captives themselves, and controls all dissemination of their supposed admissions].

“The interrogation reports make dramatically clear that Mohammed and al-Qaida were still actively looking to strike U.S., Western and Israeli targets across the world as of this year. [Why would he admit any of this? No terrorist of the dedicated Middle Eastern variety is going to spill anything that would jeopardize future operations – especially when not under any kind of torture. The US certainly isn’t going to allow him to go free for cooperating. Muslims aren’t afraid to die for the cause, so where’s the inducement to tell all?]

“Mohammed said through the various iterations of the plot, he considered using a scaled-down version of the Bojinka plan that would have bombed commercial airliners, and that he even ‘contemplated attempting to down the planes using shoes bombs,’ one report said. [Another all-too-convenient statement giving credence to theory of the shoe bomber

having a “link to al-Qaida.” In fact, the shoe bomber caught by the US government had no effective means of setting off the explosive (he was using a match), indicating he wasn’t a trained terrorist.] [End of Solomon quote.]

All the details provided in this story give the appearance that this captive is “telling all,” but when the story is scrutinized more carefully, the gaps I mentioned become even more conspicuous by their absence. Either the CIA is too dumb to ask obvious questions in this investigation, or they are purposely withholding critical information, or they are making it all up. The question of where they learned to fly jumbo jets is a huge issue in the investigation, and yet these suspicious and juicy leaks from the CIA give no indication they even asked Mohammed about this issue.

THE MEACHER REVELATIONS

Michael Meacher, a former British Minister of the Environment, made dramatic claims two weeks ago that, “Wars against both Iraq and Afghanistan were planned in advance of Sept. 11.” This is a fairly brave statement for a former member of the British governing establishment, one which may cost him his political career in the UK. In an article published in the Guardian, Meacher claimed that the US had foreknowledge of the plot but deliberately allowed it to go forward to advance a strategic agenda related to the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), involving promoting future US dominance in world affairs. [As my readers know, it is my opinion that PNAC was a carefully crafted front for the larger, more secret global agenda to take down US sovereignty and replace it with world government.] Meacher said that incompetence is only a cover, that it is “clear the US authorities did little or nothing to pre-empt the events of 9/11...[A]t least 11 countries provided advance warning to US intelligence agencies.”

9/11 PANEL FINALLY HOMING IN ON FAA TAPE RECORDINGS

According to the Wall Street Journal, after years of stonewalling Congress over the issue of when did NORAD know about the hijackings, “[t]he independent commission investigating the Sept. 11, 2001, terror attacks said it will issue its first subpoena, demanding documents it says the Federal Aviation Administration has withheld for months... FAA representatives testified they notified Norad almost immediately, but Norad officials testified that there had been a delay of about 30 minutes.” Fortunately, the targets of the subpoenas are the FAA tape recordings of voice communications with the pilots on the hijacked aircraft and the recordings of the call to NORAD.

“In an unusually sharply worded statement, the panel said ‘the FAA’s delay has significantly impeded the progress of our investigation’ and said the subpoena also is meant to warn other agencies that the commission now is ready to use its subpoena power to obtain the information it needs...The decision to issue the subpoena came late Tuesday, after staff members informed the commissioners that they had discovered records had been withheld...The commission said it was told by the FAA in early September that all records had been turned over, but investigators recently discovered that ‘highly material’ documents hadn’t been included. The FAA has since turned over dozens of additional boxes, but the subpoena would still be issued to ensure no omissions, the commission said.”

There is no reason why the FAA should be stonewalling on these requests unless there is something significant to hide. Shoving “filler material” at the commission is a common tactic: flood them with minuscule and hope they don’t realize there is more. I doubt the material they are covering up will be delivered. The government will destroy the tapes before acquiescing to a subpoena.

WHITE HOUSE REACHES SECRECY AGREEMENT WITH 9/11 COMMISSION

The independent commission on 9/11 announced this week that the White House would allow a small number of commissioners to review the classified intelligence briefings previously withheld. These could then share their findings with the other 9/11 panel members, but only after the White censors their notes. Finally, all such information will be kept secret from the public, thus denying the public the key purposes of the 9/11 commission - to inform the public as to how much responsibility the government shares in the intelligence and military failures to protect American lives in the WTC. This agreement is a sellout. Victims groups feel betrayed. They are, as with every other Congressional investigations (whitewashed) in recent history.

World Affairs Brief, February 6, 2004

WMD: ANOTHER SHAM INVESTIGATION

A day after trying to defend his justification for going to war in Iraq (saying, "Saddam was still a danger, even if no WMDs are found"), and denying the need for an investigation, President Bush reversed himself this week and called for an official inquiry. His advisors must have assured him that there is no way he can win the public relations battle on this issue without being exonerated officially by a commission. The recent official inquiry into the role of the Blair government in Britain on the David Kelly death, must have been encouraging to the Bush staff. PM Tony Blair, following the lead of Bush and other American presidents, called for

his own inquiry into claims of WMDs in Iraq – and so far seems to have succeeded in whitewashing the issue for the general public. No savvy persons in Britain expect this issue to get a fair hearing after the precedent-setting Hutton report.

In commenting on the upcoming investigation in the US, the White House made self-important comparisons between this new investigation and the Warren Commission, which investigated the JFK assassination. They intended the comparison to refer to the size and importance of the investigation. In reality, it is an apt comparison in a totally different sense. The Warren Commission was a whitewash and a cover-up from start to finish, including the choices of which predictable persons to serve on the Commission, which colluding Chief Justice to lead it, and which key lawyer (Arlen Specter, now a powerful US Senator) to run the day to day staff work.

Watch carefully who they choose to serve on this new commission. Just as with the 9/11 Commission, the members will all be establishment politicians who have been controlled in the past. Notice also that the breadth of the investigation is being widened to include dozens of superfluous issues—to make sure that commission members have no time to tackle the real issues, and also that the results won't be ready until 2005, conveniently after the November elections. And they called Nixon "Tricky Dick"!

In point of fact, the entire premise of the investigation – that this was a case of intelligence "failure" – is a red herring: a false lead to divert the public's attention from the truth. There was no intelligence failure. It was all a fabrication! There is a big difference. Everyone in the Bush administration, including CIA director Tenet, keeps trying to downplay what they said, claiming they really didn't say the threat was imminent or that there were definitive quantities of WMD. Really?

On March 11, 2003, Sec. of Defense Rumsfeld said, "[W]e know he continues to hide biological and chemical weapons, moving them to different locations every 12 to 24 hours and placing them in residential neighborhoods." Think about this for a minute. This has to be a fabrication. If the US had this kind of detailed intelligence (which

Rumsfeld claims they did), the US military would have been able to go right to those locations at the beginning of the invasion and capture these weapons. The fact that none were found anywhere, even after house to house searches means what Rumsfeld claimed was a lie.

Again, these are not intelligence failures, but fabrications. These fabrications would never have been made at the analyst level of the CIA, but rather at the political level in the White House and Pentagon. That is why Director Tenet can say with a straight face, “We never said the threat was imminent.” Of course not. But Bush did! Not only should people be fired over this, but they should do jail time for abuse of the public trust.

World Affairs Brief, April 2, 2004

WHAT THE 9/11 COMMISSION SHOULD BE INVESTIGATING, BUT ISNT

The controversial testimony of former counter-terrorism expert Richard Clarke in juxtaposition with the constant drama surrounding whether or not President Bush and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice will testify before the commission (under oath and in public) is all just a scripted diversion to use up the Commission’s limited time and ensure that the real issues are never investigated or aired publicly.

First, Clarke’s testimony is only partially genuine. He is playing a partisan role to help the Democrats undermine Bush by confirming that Bush and other Cabinet members had intentions to attack Afghanistan and Iraq prior to 9/11 (which is true), but he continues to foster the false idea that he and others during the Clinton administration were highly focused on al Qaeda—a threat the Bush administration, he says, failed to take seriously. In reality, the Clinton administration during Clarke’s tenure never tried to capture Osama bin Laden any more than the Bush administration, even when the Sudanese government had him in their

custody and offered to turn him over to the US. Clarke had to have known this.

CBS News and a Frontline Special reported that within hours of the 9/11 attack, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was instructing his aides to come up with plans for striking Iraq. The invasion of Afghanistan was planned before 9/11, as evidenced by US diplomatic pronouncements to a closed meeting in Berlin in July 2001 where it was leaked that Bush would attack Afghanistan no later than October 2001. The Indymedia documentation of that meeting has since been purged from all government internet sites. The India Times also reported a secret military agreement between the US and Russia in the spring of 2001 to jointly invade Afghanistan. Many suspect that the main reason VP Cheney is so adamant about refusing to disclose minutes of what went on during the secret meetings on energy is because oil giants openly discussed with Cheney the need to overthrow the Taliban in order to be able to build a major pipeline through Afghanistan.

Currently, the Bush administration has said they will allow Condoleezza Rice to testify in public and under oath. Despite the months of wrangling over executive privilege and separation of powers, it's a safe bet that Rice won't be embarrassed by the pseudo-inquisitor, Chief Counsel Richard Ben Veniste. I listened to Ben Veniste's examination of numerous government officials on NPR radio. By all the initial joking and comradery that was exchanged between him and CIA Director Tenet, and later with Asst. Sec. of State Richard Armitage (former chief drug importer for the CIA), it was clear no tough questions were going to be forthcoming. He played softball with them both. Instead of setting up legal traps in advance by asking questions Ben Veniste could later trip them up on, he wasted hours asking them questions these officials could easily evade by claiming ignorance or "national security," and then failed to present any contradictory testimony.

It will be the same with Rice. There are dozens of general explanations she can come up with to explain the contradictions between her former statements to the press and the testimony of Richard Clarke. But even if Ben Veniste were able to make something of the differences, what would they show? That the CIA was negligent, incompetent, and worked at

cross purposes with other agencies? Or, heaven forbid, that they failed to share information with other agencies? If they are guilty, so what? These are not faults meriting more than a slap on the hands. No wonder no government official responsible for security and intelligence has been fired. By focusing on such innocuous drama, the public is denied the key issues that cry out for an explanation.

HERE ARE THE KEY ISSUES THAT ARE BEING EVADED:

Planted, too-good-to-be-true evidence:

Hijackers are apparently too stupid to follow one of the cardinal rules of covering your trail: Don't drive to the airport – have an accomplice or Arab taxi driver drop you off. Instead, they drove themselves to Boston Logan Airport, and proceeded to leave flight manuals and Arabic messages in their van. Mohammed Atta's magic indestructible passport survived the inferno of Twin Towers and was found two or three blocks away. (Two passports were found in all, plus a pristine suicide letter in Arabic.) Within two hours, FBI agents were at restaurants where the hijackers had been eating, and at nightclubs where they went carousing — so much for their religiosity. How did they find this information so fast if they were too incompetent to track them beforehand?

Refusal of the government to produce tape and video evidence that would corroborate the official version of events and the list of hijackers:

The surveillance video recorded at the gas station across from the Pentagon crash site was confiscated by the FBI and never released. The parking lot video excerpt that was leaked doesn't show any jet the size of a Boeing 757. Crash proof black boxes from all aircraft except one were claimed to be destroyed or unreadable. The one played for surviving family members from Flight 93 was edited.

The Commission claimed it would subpoena FAA recordings of conversations with pilots prior to the hijacking, but never has followed through or released them. One tape recording from Cleveland Air Traffic Control that monitored the fate of Flight 93 over Pennsylvania was leaked, so we know these tapes exist. Interestingly, this tape shows that three or four other commercial aircraft talking on the same ATC frequency heard the pilot of Flight 93 tell the passengers that the hijackers told them there was a bomb on board, and yet the government has never mentioned this.

Here's an abbreviated excerpt from the leaked private ATC transcript:

Executive 956 [private jet]: Just answering your call. We could hear that, er, yelling too.

Cleveland Center: OK, thank you, were just trying to figure out what's going on.

United 93: [unintelligible] this is captain, please sit down, remain sitting, we have a bomb on board. [Sometimes pilots key the wrong button. In this case the Captain thinks he is broadcasting to the passengers on intercom but he is pressing the radio transmit button—shows he is under severe stress.]

Cleveland Center: Uh, calling Cleveland Center, you're unreadable, say again slowly.

Executive 956: [unintelligible] was reasonable, sounded like someone said they had a bomb on board.

Cleveland: That's what we thought, we just, er, we didn't get it clear. ...United ninety-three calling. United ninety-three, understand you have a bomb on board, go ahead. Executive nine fifty-six, did you understand that transmission?

Executive 956: Affirmative. He said there was a bomb on board.

[Later]Cleveland Center (2): [Voice changed to female, apparently second Cleveland controller.] Do you see any, ah, activity on your right side, smoke or anything like that?

American 1060: Negative. We're searching. Yeah, we do have a smoke puff now at about, er, oh probably two o'clock. There appears to be just a spire up like a puff of black smoke. [Indicates evidence of explosion in the air.] [End of ATC excerpt.]

Lack of verifiable evidence of hijackers' identities:

Security cameras at airport boarding gates would have clearly shown the Arab hijackers. The government won't release them or the actual passenger manifests, including Arabic named passengers. The claimed DNA samples are a fraud unless the government can prove it has custody of original DNA from the hijackers, seven of whom (according to other evidence) are still alive and nine of whom were dead or missing before 9/11.

Lack of evidence that al Qaeda is a world wide terrorist organization:

Al Qaeda had roots with the CIA, so it may still be controlled at the higher levels, for purposes of creating conflict and engendering in Americans a blind patriotism to support a phony war on terror. The CIA and its cohorts in the Pakistani ISI and the Israeli Mossad are the only sources of information on al Qaeda, which is suspicious. The organization was rarely considered a credible threat before 9/11. Even now, the CIA consistently refuses to display captured al Qaeda leaders in public or put them on trial. All leaks about supposed confessions mirror the government's story and have no other corroborating evidence. Of greatest significance is the fact that there have been virtually no normal terrorist attacks in the US since 9/11, even though the US has almost open borders and no protection against car bombings, electrical tower sabotage, or suicide bombings: weekly occurrences wherever terrorism is a legitimate threat.

Evidence of CIA involvement with the terrorists:

Ruddy Dekker, the owner of Huffman Aviation, and a fellow Dutchman who bought another aviation school next door, both had prior CIA dealings. Dekker had no previous aviation experience prior to acquiring Huffman Aviation in Venice, Florida, and showed a broad ignorance of technical aviation regulations and affairs when dealing with other professionals in the field. He sublet space in his hangar to Britannia Aviation, another government front company.

Prior knowledge warnings:

High schools in some NY city districts told students not to go down to the WTC on 9/11. SF Mayor Brown was told not to fly that day, as was Salmon Rusdy in the UK. Putin warned Bush about 25 suicide pilots. Germany and the Israeli Mossad said the US was warned not to fly that day.

Evidence of explosives in the World Trade Centers:

Investigative journalist Christopher Bollyn has written one of the best expositions on the ample evidence that there were explosives wired into the building prior to the attack. He writes, "In the basements of the collapsed towers, where the 47 central support columns connected with the bedrock, hot spots of 'literally molten steel' were discovered more than a month after the collapse. Such persistent and intense residual heat, 70 feet below the surface, in an oxygen starved environment, could explain how these crucial structural supports failed. Peter Tully, president of Tully Construction of Flushing, N.Y., told AFP that he saw pools of 'literally molten steel' at the World Trade Center.

“Tully was contracted after the Sept. 11 tragedy to remove the debris from the site. Tully called Mark Loizeaux, president of Controlled Demolition, Inc. (CDI) of Phoenix, Md., for consultation about removing the debris. CDI calls itself ‘the innovator and global leader in the controlled demolition and implosion of structures.’ Loizeaux, who cleaned up the bombed Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, arrived at the WTC site two days later and wrote the clean up plan for the entire operation. AFP asked Loizeaux about the report of molten steel on the site. ‘Yes,’ he said, ‘hot spots of molten steel in the basements.’ These incredibly hot areas were found ‘at the bottoms of the elevator shafts of the main towers, down seven [basement] levels,’ Loizeaux said. The molten steel was found ‘three, four, and five weeks later, when the rubble was being removed,’ Loizeaux said. He said molten steel was also found at 7 WTC, which collapsed mysteriously in the late afternoon.

“Construction steel has an extremely high melting point of about 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit. Asked what could have caused such extreme heat, Tully said, ‘Think of the jet fuel.’ Loizeaux told AFP that the steel-melting fires were fueled by ‘paper, carpet and other combustibles packed down the elevator shafts by the tower floors as they pancaked into the basement.’ However, some independent investigators dispute this claim, saying kerosene-based jet fuel, paper, or the other combustibles normally found in the towers, cannot generate the heat required to melt steel, especially in an oxygen-poor environment like a deep basement.

“Eric Hufschmid, author of a book about the WTC collapse, *Painful Questions*, told AFP that due to the lack of oxygen, paper and other combustibles packed down at the bottom of elevator shafts would probably be ‘a smoky smoldering pile.’ Experts disagree that jet-fuel or paper could generate such heat. This is impossible, they say, because the maximum temperature that can be reached by hydrocarbons like jet fuel burning in air is 1,520 degrees F. Because the WTC fires were fuel rich, as evidenced by the thick black smoke, it is argued that they did not reach this upper limit. The hottest spots at the surface of the rubble, where abundant oxygen was available, were much cooler than the molten steel found in the basements.” [End of Bollyn quote.]

Canadian Investigator Will Thomas has written an excellent work entitled, *All Fall Down*. In it he documents, “An eyewitness 6 blocks from the WTC heard explosions prior to each collapse. A fireman’s transcription of the New York Times 9/11 firefighters’ audio tape reveals an explosion prior to the collapse of WTC 2 was reported. A video shows an object falling from WTC 1 followed by a camera shake. 14 seconds later WTC 1 collapses.”

Thomas, Bollyn and others believe that the only explanation that explains the collapse of the Twin Towers without the use of complicated timed explosives placed throughout the building (requiring extensive pre-wiring) is the use of thermite charges in the basement, filling the cavity of the core section of 4 inch thick pillars holding up the towers. Here’s Bollyn again: “Thermite is very exothermic. Temperatures above 4,500°F (2,500°C) are often reached. A byproduct of a thermite detonation in the WTC basements would be molten steel. The service core [of central pillars] of WTC 2 initially survived the collapse, but after a few seconds it also came to ground. This is consistent with molten iron from a thermite reaction pooling around the core columns, thus causing the collapse. ‘If I were to bring the towers down, I would put explosives in the basement to get the weight of the building to help collapse the structure,’ [says] Mark Loizeaux, president of Controlled Demolition, Inc.”

Terrorists of the incompetent Arab variety that showed up at US flight schools could not have pulled off high tech insider explosives job, nor the collapse of WTC Building 7, which video evidence does show had been pre-wired with normal demolition explosives — lots of small charges on critical steel columns and corners which were timed to collapse the building vertically. Building 7 was almost exclusively occupied by government, and could have been pre-wired by government agents without alerting any civilians.

Christopher Bollyn commented on the insider connections to the WTC complex: “For example, Peter G. Peterson, chairman of the CFR and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York announced that his Blackstone Group had purchased, in October 2000, the mortgage on 7 World Trade Center, the 47-story building built by Larry Silverstein in 1987. Silverstein is the

person who obtained 99-year leases on the twin towers shortly before 9-11 and who insured the property and its future income against terrorism. He is seeking some \$7.2 billion claiming the attacks were two separate events.” Silverstein also made the indiscreet comment to reporters that he had given orders to “pull the building” just prior to its collapse. This is demolition lingo for bringing down a building by controlled demolition.

According to Bollyn, others suspected controlled demolition too: “WTC 7 mysteriously collapsed at 5:25 p.m. on 9-11, in what appears to have been a controlled demolition. John Wholihan, a firefighter with Rescue 5 from Staten Island was near WTC 7 when it collapsed. Wholihan told American Free Press that he heard ‘many explosions’ just before the building collapsed neatly within the perimeter of its foundation. Silverstein received some \$441 million in insurance money for WTC 7 although the cause of the collapse remains officially unexplained.”

What is clear, in my analysis, is that the official explanation of it coming down vertically and instantly cannot meet the test of reality. If it suffered damage from the collapse of the nearby WTC tower, it would have only been damaged on one side. A collapse from damage to one side would only have occurred with a massive falling over movement. There was no central system of support to fail in this building that could explain a vertical collapse even with fire (which was not uniform throughout the building).

Selective stand-down of military interceptors:

One of the most powerful evidences of government participation in the outcome of this attack by what I think were government controlled operatives, is the shooting down of Flight 93 over Pennsylvania by an F-16 aircraft, and the simultaneous but inexplicable holding of other fighters on the ground (orders to “stand down”). One of my subscribers is friends with a tower operator at McGuire AFB in NJ. He reports that his friend told him to not permit any fighters to take off. They could have easily stopped Flight 175 heading for the second WTC strike. (Flight 175 was the Boeing 757 airliner that several video tapes showed had a large bulging

modification on its belly, as documented in a prior World Affairs Brief.) Other fighters which were launched did so painfully late and were not told to “go buster” (supersonic speeds), to make sure they wouldn’t catch the Pentagon targeting aircraft on time. All of this analysis is contained in Will Thomas’ publication, entitled Stand Down.

The strange case of the Pentagon attack:

The attack on the Pentagon was much more complex than the government’s version of events, and also filled with contradictory evidence: lack of external debris coupled with a damage area too small to match a 757 airliner. The Pentagon parking lot video shows a huge, white explosion on the Pentagon wall, followed by a fuel-fed fire. Ordinary people wouldn’t know that only high explosives can generate this white image—and that it never occurs with the crash of a fuel-laden aircraft. The strangely edited video clip evens fails to show a large airliner crashing into the Pentagon, but rather the hazy image of a much smaller fighter-sized jet with a mysterious smoke or missile trail. Witnesses did see a large airliner, but others also saw a smaller jet. It is possible both were present, and that the smaller jet fired a missile into the Pentagon wall prior to the crash, which would explain how one object punched a 12-foot-diameter hole through three rings of the Pentagon. This could not have been done by any part of the relatively soft airliner nor its turbo fan engines. The video clip showing the smoke trail looks strangely unlike a real smoke trail from a missile (too white and too much soft curling smoke). It is almost as if whoever leaked the edited clip doctored it to give a hint that there was another aircraft and a missile involved.

Conclusions: As you can see from my abbreviated listing, there is no shortage of legitimate and substantive matters to investigate. No government commission with the kind of money and staff this commission has could possibly be unaware of these issues I have mentioned. They are documented and discussed by tens of credible internet sites, complete with photos, videos, theories, and laborious investigations.

WhatReallyHappened.com is one of the most comprehensive, though I don't buy into the total package of conclusions proffered by any one site. One must look at a variety of theories and issues to come to a final conclusion.

All these private investigations need some form of legal power of discovery in order to penetrate various veils of government secrecy surrounding key issues. The 9/11 Commission has failed the public by refusing to provide that penetration into government secrets. All of the roadblocks met by investigators have been put up by our own government—almost as if they really don't want the public to find out exactly how these sophisticated attacks took place.

I, for one, am convinced that Muslim terrorists were involved, but that they were directed and assisted by a huge network of secret operatives that only the US government could have produced. No portion of the 9/11 Commission investigation was allowed to follow through with any evidence pointing to government collusion in this great tragedy. That is why this investigation is an exercise in futility, if not a direct cover-up

World Affairs Brief, April 23, 2004

WITNESS TO THE SHOOTDOWN OF FLIGHT 93

This is my edited transcript from the comments of a caller named "Al" to the Howard Stern Radio Show on April 21, 2004. Howard asks him to tell the audience what really happened to Flight 93 in Pennsylvania.

"I live in Sommerset, Pa, just out of Shanksville. We were coming down the road from a friend's house. We heard a plane, a low level plane. We stopped the car to look, because that was unusual for this area. We heard an explosion ...saw smoke coming from the plane in the air, and there were two other airplanes that passed right over in the air..." Hear it via the

Internet on the Alex Jones website:

<http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/april2004/042104flight93.htm>.

World Affairs Brief, July 30, 2004

BLACK BOX SURVIVABILITY

One of the biggest contradictions in the accounts of the 9/11 series of crashes is the claim by government that nearly all of the 8 black boxes involved in the crashes were destroyed. Statistically, the survival rate of black boxes is above 95%. Why should this rate fall so dramatically during this one devastating terrorist event? Perhaps it didn't. Up until now, the public has been kept in the dark about the construction of these destruction proof recorders. We keep thinking there is a tape recorder inside that could easily be destroyed. Apparently it's an entirely different technology. Here's a report by David Luke following his dissection of one of these boxes at an alloy recycling center.

“Black boxes are made of extremely strong and resilient materials and designed to withstand every conceivable possibility for destruction. More importantly, the material that holds the information is not what the FBI would like you to know about. This material will survive even if the black box is **TOTALLY DESTROYED** (which in itself is highly unlikely by design). These materials, high temperature nickel alloys, are some of the most indestructible materials known to man...they are marked with a stylus not so much different than that of our old 33 1/3 vinyl albums, but in reverse. The information is scribed onto this alloy along with timing "nicks" for time/date reference...the marked strip is 'rolled' up into a continuous roll of high temperature alloy. The tight circular roll now resembles a solid. [It becomes] a solid piece of material that by design protects itself by only allowing the **EDGES** of the roll to be exposed to damage -- **THE DATA ITSELF IS SAFE IN THE CENTER OF THE STRIP**. So designed, the mass of the continuous rolled strip shields the 'whole' from damage.”

In the face of this analysis, Luke derives a disturbing conclusion: “So, when the FBI tells us that the boxes were nearly destroyed -- you can think, ‘This is possible’... BUT, during the highly unlikely event of the box's near destruction, it is doing what it is designed to do -- the casing absorbs energy to protect the metal roll that by design is nearly indestructible by itself. So when flight recorders come up blank, I ask the question, ‘NO DATA... For Whom?’” [End of Luke quote.]

World Affairs Brief, September 17, 2004

STANLEY HILTON LAWSUIT TOO GOOD TO BE TRUE?

For the second time in as many years, Alex Jones has interviewed Stanley Hilton, who has filed a \$7 billion dollar lawsuit against key members of the Bush administration, charging them with executing the 9/11 terrorist attack. Hilton, a lawyer and former Chief of Staff for Senator Bob Dole, has assembled a prodigious list of smoking gun witnesses that, if real, could expose the government's direct involvement in 9/11. Here are excerpts from both the 2003 and 2004 interviews with Alex Jones [www.prisonplanet.com]:

“AJ: What is your case alleging?

“SH: We are suing Bush, Condoleezza Rice, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Mueller, etc. for complicity in personally not only allowing 9/11 to happen but in ordering it. The hijackers we retained and we had a witness who is married to one of them. The hijackers were U.S. undercover agents. They were double agents, paid by the FBI and the CIA to spy on Arab groups in this country. They were controlled. Their landlord was an FBI informant in San Diego and other places. And this was a direct, covert operation

ordered, personally ordered by George W. Bush. Personally ordered. We have incriminating evidence, documents as well as witnesses, to this effect. It's not just incompetence – in spite of the fact that he is incompetent. The fact is he personally ordered this, knew about it. He, at one point, there were rehearsals of this. The reason why he appeared to be uninterested and nonchalant on September 11th – when those videos showed that Andrew Card whispered in his ear the [garbled] words about this he listened to kids reading the pet goat story, is that he thought this was another rehearsal. These people had dress rehearsed this many times. He had seen simulated videos of this. In fact, he even made a Freudian slip a few months later at a California press conference when he said he had, quote, “seen on television the first plane attack the first tower.” And that could not be possible because there was no video. What it was the simulated video that he had gone over. So this was a personally government ordered thing.

“AJ: Absolutely and now it has come out – five separate drills of flying hijacked jets into buildings that morning – which you told us about before it even broke in the Associated Press. They were trying to get out ahead of you. You talked about how you interviewed military people who were told it was a drill that morning. Then to get out ahead of that, the news finally reported on it. Now, we've learned that all these operations – I want to get into that, I want to talk about the new incriminating evidence of ordering it and how they had drilled on this, how Cheney was in the bunker controlling this. That has even come out in the mainstream news but they won't release the details of that, Stanley

“SH: And I've been harassed personally by the chief judge of the federal court who is instructing me personally to drop this suit, threatened to kick me off the court, after 30-years on the court... I did an interview with you, Alex, back in March of 2003, about a year and a half ago, and literally two weeks after that, I was contacted by the emissary of the chief judge of the federal court where I have the lawsuit. And I was warned not to publicize it but to keep it quiet and threatened with discipline. And it remained quiet

until a couple of months ago and then I got on the air on some programs and some publicity and... July 1st, I was threatened directly by the chief judge here, threatened with court discipline. This particular judge has been circulating communiqués to the other federal judges seeking anything negative she can get against me to try and discipline me after I've been on the court here for 30-years with no disciplinary problems at all. This is suddenly happening. And her assistants who are on the committee of the court met with me on July 1st in Palo Alto, California, and threatened me directly. They handed me a copy of the lawsuit and said that the judge wants me to dismiss this. What's this? She doesn't like the content of it. This is politically incorrect. This is outside the norm. I said I represented more than 400 plaintiffs, how am I going to dismiss this case? And they threatened me directly and they said, "the next time you'll be disciplined." And also they've threatened me not to go public, etc. And this is just outrageous....They sent a letter out, and of course they deny it's because of the political content of the suit but they told me directly on the phone that it is because of this suit and this judge is very, very angry, apparently has been in contact with Ashcroft's Justice Department. I got a call from Ashcroft's Justice Department a few months ago about this, demanding that I drop the suit, threatening sanctions and all kinds of things. I refused to drop it.

"I've been harassed by the FBI. My staff has been harassed and threatened. My office has been broken into and this is the kind of government we are dealing with...First of all, my office was burglarized in San Francisco several months ago. Files were gone through and some files were seized – particularly the ones dealing with the lady that was married to one of the hijackers...at least some of them were on the payroll of the U.S. government as undercover FBI, CIA, double agents. They are spying on Arab groups in the U.S. And, in effect, all this lead up to the effect that al Qaeda is a creation of the George Bush administration, basically. That's the entity that he called al Qaeda.is directly linked to George Bush. And all this stuff was stolen Fortunately, I had spare copies in a hidden place so nothing disappeared permanently. But more significantly, FBI agents have been harassing one of my staff members and threatening them with vague but frightening threats of indicting them. And it's just total harassment. They have planted a spy, an undercover agent, in my organization, as we just recently discovered. In

other words, these are Nazi Germany tactics. This is the kind of government you have in this country. This is what Bush is all about.

“AJ (2003): And this you told me last week before this was on ABC News that you have gotten some of this information through depositions and some other little tidbits that haven’t been disclosed. But also, you talked about how you deposed, you got the marriage certificates, the evidence, the photographs - a woman who was married to one of the hijackers. You talked to what you said were six or eight people who were connected to them. And then we have the news articles where the FBI gave them homes, paid their rent, followed them around. We know Israel was involved in similar things. Can you speak to that please?

“SH (2003): Yes, I do have a witness who was married, she’s an American woman, but she was married to one of the hijackers and she knew about seven of them. She met seven of them. Essentially these Arab hijackers were double agents. That is, they were operating inside the U.S. for ten to fifteen years in “cells”. Some of them used the term al Qaeda, they’ve used other terms. Al Qaeda is just a word. That means nothing. You could call them the Muslim Brotherhood, the Army of God, they go by all sorts of names. But what they are is a series of cells that have been aided and abetted by the U.S. Government. This woman was involved also, married to him at the time of the 1993 World Trade Center first bombing and the Oklahoma City bombing when her “ex-husband” actually traveled to Oklahoma City several weeks before the bombings. And they were involved, apparently, in that.

“But what we have here is double agents. In that they nominally appear to be Arab fanatics. But one of the points that she stressed is they are really not Muslims. They are more interested in Playboy than in the Koran. I mean these people drink. They are very secular. They are not the fanatical Muslim zealots that the Bush criminals would lead us to believe is what’s operating here. What they are is they receive regular payments from the U.S. Government. They have been recruited by the CIA, FBI,

counter-intelligence, and so-forth and paid money and allowed to exchange information with U.S. government agents about various activities going on....

“AJ: Now, let’s talk about what they want you to drop. Let’s talk about, without giving names, the people you deposed, what really happened, the picture you’ve got. You said earlier that Bush ordered this, they were simulating this which they now admit there were simulations on that morning. Let’s go over what they don’t want you to talk about, Stanley.

“SH: We have evidence both documentary as well as witness sworn statements from undercover former FBI agents, FBI informants, etc., that other officials in the Pentagon and the military and the Air Force that deal with the fact that there were many drills, many rehearsals for 9/11 before it happened. Bush had seen this simulated on TV many times. He blurted this out at a press conference in California a few months after 9/11 where he said he had, quote, seen the first plane hit the first building on the video. And that’s not possible because there was no official video of that. There was one of the second plane not the first one. He had seen the first one. We do have some incriminating documents that Bush personally ordered 9/11 events. It was well planned. A FEMA official has admitted on tape that he was there the night before – September 10th, that is ...[The official later recanted, and stated he arrived the next day. However, his denial doesn’t match his other statement that he and his crew “were the first ones on the scene.” The two claims are completely contradictory.]

“AJ: And now Mayor Giuliani, a few months ago in the 911 Commission, admitted that – Tripod II. They had their whole command post already moved out of Building 7 [destroyed later in the day of the attack]. Now, this is very, very important. This is a key area of this whole event.

“SH: I have interviewed individuals in NORAD and the Air Force. Individuals that work in NORAD as well as the Air Force have stated this, off the record, but the point is, yes, this was not just five drills but at least 35 drills over at least two months before September 11th. Everything was planned, the exact location.....

“AJ: But five drills that day.

“SH: That day, that day, and Bush thought it was a drill. That’s the only explanation for why he appeared nonchalant.....

“AJ: We also had NORAD officers and civilian air traffic controllers going, “Is this part of the exercise? Is this a drill?”

SH: Well, I’m trying to take their depositions – I’ve been trying to take their depositions for months. They’ve been trying to object to it. They will have to admit they were either lying then or now. It’s clearly perjury either way. They are liars and perjurers; that’s what they are. These are the people that we have running this government and, of course, they knew about it. How are they going to claim now that they didn’t know about these drills? Their idea is that nobody knew anything. It’s the old know nothing mentality. And how anybody considers this believable is beyond me.

“National Security Council classified documents which [garbled] and it was part of a series of documents that were involved with the drill documents. This was all planned – they had it on videotape. These planes were controlled by remote control, as I stated previously a year and a half ago, there’s a system called Cyclops.

“AJ (2003): Let me stop you right there Mr. Hilton. Everything you said was already backed up by mainstream reports. You’ve gotten it now, in sworn testimony in depositions under oath. But something that everybody wants to ignore is that three of the hijackers, at least, were trained at Pensacola Naval Air Station not at a local airfield - on the base, by the government, at least. Now we find out that eight of the hijackers under names we heard are still alive in the Middle East, on television doing interviews. You know, their faces, their names, same people. We have then Mohamed Atta being sent over to the Defense Language School at Monterrey. You talked to Steven Butler (the Dean).

“SH: Yeah. The witness I was talking about, personally met Atta - two Attas - Mohamed and the younger brother. And they are alleged to be two of the ones on the airliners. You know, the thing is, these individuals are, in my view, “patsies”. That is, they were paid by the government. I don’t believe that they themselves flew the planes into, as I said previously, allegations are that the government has this device that we codename Cyclops that allows, from an airbase nearby, to disable the pilot’s control of an airliner and to fly them by remote control.

“AJ: Let me stop you. Let me stop you. This is really key, Sir. We are so honored to have you. I’ve really studied this and I want to give you.. You probably already have and I want to reiterate it for the listeners. Bush, two days after the attack at a speech in New York said that in the future we can remote control these planes and land them so this doesn’t happen. And someone reached up and physically grabbed him by the arm and made him shut-up. And, if you’ve seen “The Masters of Terror,” we have the two Associated Press articles, after you were on our show and brought this up that you have this from inside military officers.....

“SH: See the thing is that you look back in ’93 and ’95, Oklahoma City, World Trade Center, and you say well Clinton was in power; whereas now

it's Bush. So you say well how could it be the same players here? The answer is that the shadow government transcends individual political puppets that occupy 1600 Pennsylvania. I mean it doesn't really make much difference whether it's Clinton or Bush. The shadow government, as I call it, essentially is continuous. These bureaucrats that you've got there at the Pentagon, State Dept., White House, etc., they stay on. They stay on from administration to administration pursuing a certain agenda. And I think this is all part of a pattern. And the latest example, manifestation was 9/11. You've got that and the anthrax attack which happened immediately right after 9/11.

“AJ: Mr. Hilton, from your experience, what types of groups of people, the shadow government, which they just announced, remember last year, that we've known about for years. And what does the shadow government want this world to be like?

“SH: Basically a one-world globalist tyranny controlled by them, of course, the neocons, neo-conservatives. But they are not really conservatives; they are radicals because they are seeking a radical destruction of our way of life for the last two-hundred years. They're are basically introducing an alien anti-American form of tyranny which has more to do with old Europe and Asia than it has to do with this country.

“SH: Well, the term that has been used is Zionazis, I think it's an apt term - Zionazis. And I think it's ironic because the Nazis based their theory on the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion,” which are alleged to have been shaped by Czar claiming the Jews wanted world conflict. Now we've got the complete reverse, where the current Zionazis of Israel and their friends here in the Bush administration and elsewhere are emulating Hitler. It's come full circle. Essentially it is the same thing, whether you call them Jews or non-Jews. The point is it's the same ideology - tyranny....

“I also wanted to point out that, just quickly, I went to school with some of these neocons. At the University of Chicago, in the late 60s with Wolfowitz and Feith and several of the others and so I know these people personally. And we used to talk about this stuff all of the time. And I did my senior thesis on this very subject – how to turn the U.S. into a presidential dictatorship by manufacturing a bogus Pearl Harbor event. So, technically this has been in the planning at least 35 years.” [End of interview excerpts.]

Analysis: Hilton has many things right, though he provides no backup evidence at this point. There is much circumstantial evidence to support the notion that the hijackers were linked to the government. If Hilton does have a credible ex-wife of one of the hijackers, who can give details supporting the suggestion that these Arabs worked for the federal government, this is indeed a smoking gun. But those suppositions won't do anyone any good if Hilton never divulges his facts. His claim that he is under a “gag order” by the judge does not surprise me, but I am skeptical about his double standard. He seems free enough to talk about the case, but refuses to give us the hard facts, names and details that would prove his charges. The courts won't ever let this information be made public, so if he is already breaking half his gag order, why not divulge the rest – the important part?

I'm also skeptical of his claim that George W. Bush personally gave the orders to put this heinous plan into action. He most probably was aware of it, and may have signed some orders initiating the trial runs, but this man is not capable of conceiving, let alone putting such a plan into action—except as he may have been following the directions of his handlers.

Hilton does seem to have a pretty good handle on the globalist controllers and their motives in using terror to take away our liberties. However, his admission that he was once one of them (in training), went to school with various globalist/neo-con conspirators, and even wrote a major paper promoting the concept of the US provoking another “Pearl Harbor” to achieve global hegemony is troubling. We are given no logical

explanation of where or why Hilton supposedly made the change from globalist provocateur and theoretician to patriot. His background is pure establishment, he has written nothing during the intervening years that would indicate a gradual change, and suddenly he emerges pushing a lawsuit that presses all the right buttons for 9/11 conspiracists. This has all the markings of an insider planted within the movement to discredit it.

Hilton's foray into this field is reminiscent of Daniel Sheehan's botched lawsuits aimed at the Iran-Contra scandal. Sheehan, a leftist lawyer from Harvard, and head of the left-liberal Christic Institute, filed suit against the Nicaraguan Contras and various government officials alleging many true things (gun running, drug smuggling, etc). However, he presented a poor case and allowed the largely true body of evidence to be discredited. Sheehan was also general counsel for the Jesuit National Headquarters, a radical Catholic order which has promoted Marxist "liberation theology" throughout Latin America.

Hilton's reference to Zionazis is also not very instructive. The relationship between Jews and the conspiracy is very complex, as is the dual nature of Zionism (some evil, some legitimate), and does not lend itself to these kinds of broad sweeping pejoratives.

I have read Hilton's legal brief. It is very sloppy, poorly written with rambling generalizations that can easily be disregarded as frivolous by the courts. This is a case that is going nowhere, and may thus allow Hilton to continue giving interviews without ever having to produce real evidence. I'm still waiting.

World Affairs Brief, October 29, 2004

9/11 COVER-UP CONTINUES

Few of the family members of 9/11 victims are satisfied with the whitewash done by the official 9/11 Commission. A large group has

banded together to demand another investigation. When will they ever learn that if the government can rig one investigating commission, they can rig each succeeding one?

The 9/11 Commission made mountains out of molehills on insignificant issues, while assiduously avoiding any in-depth analysis of critical evidence, such as the bulging modification on the bottom side of the second Boeing aircraft to hit the Towers, and the telltale molten pools of metal around the bases of the main supporting pillars of both buildings. The latter item especially is proof that the WTC was not brought down by burning fuel and debris in a low oxygen environment (which would never get hot enough to melt metal), but by special thermite explosives. Both of these pieces of evidence indicate aspects of the attack which could not have been accomplished by the bumbling terrorists seen taking flying lessons.

Another crucial piece of evidence of the government's collusion in the cover-up is the testimony of several rescue workers who assert, contrary to official reports, that US authorities found the black boxes that belonged to the hijacked planes. The following excerpt is from a story appearing in the October 28 Philadelphia Daily News.

“Two men who worked extensively in the wreckage of the World Trade Center claim they helped federal agents find three of the four “black boxes” from the jetliners that struck the towers on 9/11 - contradicting the official account. Both the independent 9/11 Commission and federal authorities continue to insist that none of the four devices - a cockpit voice recorder (CVR) and flight data recorder (FDR) from the two planes - were ever found in the wreckage. But New York City firefighter Nicholas DeMasi has written in a recent book -- self-published by several Ground Zero workers -- that he escorted federal agents on an all-terrain vehicle in October of 2001 and helped them locate three of the four. His account is supported by a volunteer, Mike Bellone, whose efforts at Ground Zero have been chronicled in the New York Times, [who said] he saw a device that resembling a “black box” in the back of the firefighter’s ATV.”

As time goes on, more and more people who have evidence countering the official version are having the courage to come forth and state their

case. Yet they are finding it increasingly difficult to do so. The reason this latest expose had to be self-published is that the established media and publishing sources won't touch any evidence that counters the official story. This conspiracy is broader than many Americans are willing to admit.

World Affairs Brief November 26, 2004

KEY 9/11 ISSUE OF PROOF

Many controversies continue to rage around the official version of the 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington DC. One of the most glaring anomalies in the 9/11 Commission's report was the virtual absence of proof on key issues such as whether or not there were more than one aircraft, or even a possible missile that collided with the Pentagon. There is ample evidence and witness testimony that Flight 77 did crash into the Pentagon, including airplane parts (engines and landing gear) whose serial numbers match maintenance records. But there are also witnesses to a smaller aircraft, and video evidence of high explosives and a missile. The government could easily put these arguments to rest by releasing all of the various video tapes they rounded up after the incident. So far, none have been released. Only a partial, and potentially doctored video from the Pentagon parking lot camera has been released—and that was a leak, totally unauthorized.

As NewsWithViews.com columnist Devvy Kidd pointed out, "The Department of Justice must release all the video from the Pentagon - the video tape immediately taken from the gas station camera pointed right at the point of impact, the videos from the nearby Sheraton, grabbed immediately and in a strong armed fashion by the FBI according to employees. That film will show what plane went by. The Virginia Department of Transportation cameras mounted on the freeway overpass would have recorded whatever plane went right by into the Pentagon. The FBI immediately grabbed all those videos and won't release them. The

same should be done regarding all video taken from surveillance cameras mounted on all buildings surrounding the WTC towers and WTC 7. The FBI has them and won't release them to anyone. The Department of Justice could give the families and survivors private screenings of all this film and then release them to the public. If there is nothing to cover up, then stop hiding the eye witnesses (all those surveillance cameras) that captured these events as they happened. What is there to hide?" [Source: <http://www.newswithviews.com/Devvy/kidd79.htm>] That is no idle question. The government should be eager to put these conspiracy theories to rest. Their refusal to release any of them can only be because the video evidence does not match the official version.

World Affairs Brief February 18, 2005

BIG QUESTION ABOUT MADRID SKYSCRAPER FIRE

Some of you may have read about the huge fire that engulfed the thirty-two story Windsor building in Madrid, Spain. It caught fire and burned all night, and into the next day. It was left a mere lattice work of steel beams and girders. The big question is why did the structure not fail? If temperatures exceeded those of the World Trade Center, why did this older steel structure, with almost no fire protection, survive and yet the Twin Towers collapsed in ominous heap? Lest you think that differences in construction accounted for this, World Trade Center building #7 was of similar beam and girder construction, yet it came down as if done by controlled demolition—with only moderate damage to one side. Something doesn't compute here.

John Kaminski has just published a piece on this key issue, asserting that the best evidence of black operations assisting the 9/11 terror attacks is found in the way in which the towers came down. Read it on the Jeff

Rense site: <http://www.rense.com/general63/9911skep.htm>. The evidence is powerful.

World Affairs Brief May 19, 2005

IMPORTANT UPDATES ON OKC BOMBING AND PENTAGON CRASH

Private internet_based investigators continue to use the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) to probe into government black operations that plan and assist supposed terrorist operations. Government illegal attempts to thwart these probes (including outright defiance of court orders, or blotting out 90% of the text of documents released) tend to provide further evidence of that government has something very big to hide.

When powerful information pointing to government wrongdoing emerges, conspirators within all branches of government use a variety of blocking and stalling tactics to make sure researchers are stymied in their naive attempts to get "honest" government officials to act on the information. One of the most insidious ways is to route these damaging revelations to Senators and Representatives that have a "conservative" reputation and yet are either compromised or knowingly involved in the cover_up. They promise to champion the cause and then bury it in a pile of delays and bureaucratic wrangling.

One such story is now emerging. Patrick Briley, one of most tenacious researchers into government involvement in the OKC bombing, has detailed the extensive evidence that Timothy McVeigh was being guided and directed by several FBI or CIA undercover operatives. What's more, he also shows how attempts to bring these revelations to the public have been thwarted by nearly the entire Oklahoma Congressional delegation—all conservative Republicans. When the information was brought to conservative California Congressman Dana Rohrabacker's attention, he promised a vigorous challenge to the official story, but he too has failed to

deliver. I don't have the space to cover the whole story but you can read an excellent summary at the following link:

<http://www.newswithviews.com/Briley/Patrick11.htm> Briley's extensive writings have the specific back_up details.

On the 9/11 Pentagon crash front, one researcher sent me a summary of eye_witnesses that is very

comprehensive. Although witnesses can be unreliable about fast moving events, when we read multiple accounts, certain patterns emerge. One thing is very clear: An 757 aircraft painted in AA colors did hit the building, despite the lack of much visible debris. There are simply too many witnesses who saw it. But that isn't the whole story. Several others saw another smaller aircraft, and several testified that the 757 aircraft, in fact, did not penetrate the Pentagon wall. This is because This particular section of the Pentagon had just been renovated with special steel, kevlar reinforced masonry walls and blast proof windows. What happened a second later tells what really happened.

Here's the testimony of an airline pilot, Tim Timmerman: I saw it hit right in front of ___ it didn't appear to crash [directly] into the building; most of the energy was dissipated in hitting the ground, but I saw the nose break up, I saw the wings fly forward, and then the conflagration engulfed everything in flames. ... and I saw the airplane just disintegrate and blow up into a huge ball of flames. And the building shook, and it was quite a tremendous explosion. I saw the area; the building didn't look very damaged initially,"

Eyewitness Vin Narayanan said: "The hijacked jet slammed into the Pentagon at a ferocious speed. But the Pentagon's wall held up like a champ. It barely budged as the nose of the plane curled upwards and crumpled before exploding into a massive fireball."

Other evidence that the plane didn't penetrate is from Master Sgt. Noel Sepulveda: "The right engine hit high, the left engine hit low, ... "For a brief moment, you could see the body of the plane sticking out from the side of the building. Then a ball of fire came from behind it." Sepulveda also described a huge explosion that sent him flying against a light pole.

The key item in this witness testimonies is that the airplane just disintegrated about a second after impact. That simply doesn't happen in fuel explosions. They all could see the nose breaking up and the wings flying forward—indicating the airplane was not penetrating the building. Then there was a massive explosion. If you have ever seen films of airplane crashes, and as a pilot I have seen many. They don't just disintegrate into tiny pieces, even when crashing into the ground at a steep angle, or even when erupting into a huge ball of burning fuel, as in the Pentagon crash. But this plane disintegrated into thousands of tiny pieces. One witness talks about seeing the ground littered with thousands of small bits and pieces of aluminum. This doesn't happen in a crash when the only explosive element is fuel.

When you couple this information with the Pentagon parking lot video which shows a huge white flash just prior to the ignition of the fuel, we have our answer. This plane was loaded along its entire length with high explosives—which always give off a white signature, unlike fuel which is only red and black. No single suitcase bomb in the baggage compartment could have caused this kind of disintegration of the 757 into tiny pieces. A suitcase bomb would have blown the plane into several big sections only. The presence of high explosives on the plane might also explain the narrow channel of damage that penetrated 3 rings of

the Pentagon. As we know now, It wasn't the airplane__ which stopped at the outer wall__ but perhaps the force of high explosives might well have sent the heavy nose gear parts forward at tremendous velocity. What does all this mean? It amounts to additional evidence that this crash, like the WTC Twin Towers ,which had explosives planted in the basements, could not have been done except without sophisticated insider help. Sadly, It's too bad that these revelations won't be read by more than a few thousand Americans. The public's tolerance for new evidence diminishes over time as the official line becomes more and more part of

official history. The conspirators know this, and count on it. Of course, it helps to control all the establishment news outlets just to make sure the damaging analysis is very limited in distribution.

World Affairs Brief August 1, 2005

SIBEL EDMUNDS CASE REVEALS LARGER COVER-UP

Vanity Fair magazine just came out with a blockbuster revelation demonstrating that translator Sibel

Edmund's story of corruption in the FBI is not going to die quietly as the Bush administration had hoped.

Not only has it been revealed that some of the Turkish intercepts Edmunds was translating contains

information pointing to cash payoffs to Republican Speaker of the House, Dennis Hastert, but that Air

Force Office of Special Investigations (SOI) helped in the cover-up of an Air Force officer's participation in

the Turkish bribery scheme.

For a summary of the Hastert bribery story, here's the Corporate Crime Reporter: "Turkish officials

boasted of giving 'tens of thousands of dollars in surreptitious payments' to House Speaker Dennis Hastert

(R-Illinois) in exchange for political favors [votes in favor of Turkish interests]. That allegation is contained

a profile of Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) whistleblower Sibel Edmonds in the current issue of

Vanity Fair magazine.

The article, 'An Inconvenient Patriot,' by British writer David Rose, reports that Edmonds was asked to

listen to wiretaps as part of what appeared to be an FBI public corruption probe into bribes paid to

members of Congress — both Democrat and Republican. Rose, citing 'some of the wiretaps,' reports that

'the FBI's targets had arranged for tens of thousands of dollars to be paid to Hastert's campaign

funds in small checks."

BalkanAnalysis.com provided information from Edmund's lawyers that they were challenging the Air

Force's attempt to whitewash the participation of an Air Force couple in the FBI corruption affair. On 7

August 2002, Sibel Edmonds launched a complaint with the US Air Force over the suspected illegal

activities of USAF Major Douglas Dickerson and his wife, Turkish-born FBI translator Melek Can

Dickerson. The Dickersons had tried to lure Edmunds into a scheme to join the shadowy Turkish-

American Council (Chaired by Brent Scowcroft of Kissinger and Assoc—and other establishment business

luminaries) which promised her a “lucrative arrangement” if she would help them keep secret certain

transcripts that indicated Turkish bribes were going to key US government players like Hastert. Instead of

cooperating Edmunds blew the whistle at FBI headquarters. Instead of being rewarded, she was silenced

by threats and then fired. Edmunds even gave closed door testimony at the 9/11 Commission, and it too

was buried, demonstrating how far the effort to cover for government collusion with terror goes.

As to charges of Air Force whitewashing the Dickerson matter BalkanAnalysis.com reports, “On 10

September, Colonel James N. Worth, the director of the Inquiries Directorate in the USAF Office of the

Inspector General, sent an official reply [to Edmund’s charges of wrongful conduct of Major Dickerson—ed].

This letter assured Edmonds that the Air Force’s Office of Special Investigations (AFSOI)

had.....conducted a complete and thorough review of her concerns [without answering any of them], and

therefore the case was closed. Of course, this did not deter the indefatigable Edmonds, whose lawyers

whipped off a letter challenging the validity and depth of the Air Force's investigation — had one even taken place — on 19 September.”

Rawstory.com correctly notes that, “On top of the usual prohibition against disclosing classified

information,

the Bush administration has smothered her case beneath the all-encompassing blanket of the ‘state-

secrets privilege’—a Draconian and rarely used [actually not rare anymore-ed] legal weapon that allows

the government, merely by asserting a risk to national security, to prevent the lawsuits Edmonds has field

contesting her treatment from being heard in court at all.”

Conspiracy note: Evidence of conspiracy is powerful when persons higher up in the FBI chain of

command (the Edmonds stonewalling went all the way to Director Mueller's office) and other government

officials in totally different and independent government investigative agencies (US Air Force) engage in

coordinated cover-ups or whitewashes. Such coordination to obstruct justice is illegal among persons with

investigative and judicial powers. Illegal use of the State secrets Acts is also takes a conspiracy among

those with fiduciary responsibilities to implement.

World Affairs Brief August 19, 2005

TURKISH INTEL: NO SUCH THING AS AL QAEDA

I have long maintained that there is something very suspicious about the way in which al Qaeda is brought

up as the blame of choice for all sophisticated and high-profile terrorist events, and yet there is a

disturbing lack of normal small terrorist activity that would normally present easy opportunities of choice to

do damage to the US—with little or no border protection. Now comes a blockbuster revelation out of

Turkey which gives specific connections between a variety of supposedly al Qaeda operatives and the

CIA. Turkey, like Pakistan, has long played along with the CIA and knows a lot about US double agents

and black operations. Kurt Nimmo, reports from Turkey:

“Consider the following, published in Zaman, the fifth largest newspaper in Turkey: ““Amid the smoke from

the fortuitous fire [i.e., the capture of Louai Sakra, said to be the al Qaeda regional boss in Turkey]

emerged the possibility that al-Qaeda may not be, strictly speaking, an organization but an element of an

intelligence agency operation. Turkish intelligence specialists agree that there is no such organization as

al-Qaeda. Rather, Al-Qaeda is the name of a secret service operation. The concept “fighting terror” is the

background of the “low-intensity-warfare” conducted in the mono-polar [US] world order... It is interesting

that Turkish intelligence would admit that the neocon “war against terrorism” is an entirely artificial construct.

Moreover, according to Turkish intelligence, “Sakra has been sought by the secret services since 2000.

The US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) interrogated him twice before. Following the interrogation CIA

offered him employment. He also received a large sum of money by CIA. However the CIA eventually lost

contact with him.” It is curious how alleged key people in the al Qaeda network end up working for the

CIA and other intelligence agencies [like ISI in Pakistan—ed].

“For instance, Abdurahman Khadr, who (according to ABC News Online) ‘lived side-by-side with Osama

bin Laden,’ was a ‘double agent, sent to spy on Al Qaeda fighters at Guantanamo Bay and in Bosnia.’ Ali

Mohamed, a former U.S. Army sergeant who trained Osama bin Laden's bodyguards and helped

plan the 1998 bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Kenya, worked for the FBI (Mohamed, obviously with the

grace of the feds, brought Ayman al-Zawahiri to San Francisco on a covert fund-raising mission),

according to the San Francisco Chronicle. Hamid Reza Zakeri claimed (during the trial of Abdelghani

Mzoudi, a Moroccan accused of helping the nine eleven hijackers) that 'Iran's secret service had contacts

with Osama bin Laden's al Qaeda network ahead of the September 11 attacks," according to Reuters. It

just so happens Zakeri claims the CIA owes him \$1.2 for services rendered as a double agent. [This will

be used in the future to help set up Iran for aiding al Qaeda—ed]

"Mullah Krekar, the leader of Ansar al-Islam, told al-Hayat newspaper in 2003 he had 'a meeting with a

CIA representative and someone from the American army in the town of Sulaymaniya (Iraqi Kurdistan) at

the end of 2000. They asked us to collaborate with them,' an offer Krekar said he refused. Osama

Moustafa Hassan Nasr, aka Abu Omar, 'a dangerous terrorist who once plotted to kill the Egyptian foreign

minister,' according to the Chicago Tribune, was such a valued CIA asset it was deemed necessary to

kidnap him off the streets of Milan after he had second thoughts about his work. And then there was

Muhammad Naeem Noor Khanm, the al-Qaeda 'computer engineer' who 'became part of a sting

operation organized by the CIA,' according to the Washington Post.”

All of this puts the following story into sharp perspective as to why the US had significant knowledge of

Mohammad Atta prior to 9/11 and never sought to arrest or extradite him. The US claims “they couldn't

touch him” because he had a green card. Really? Since when has that been a guarantee against arrest

for terrorism?

US COVERS UP RELATIONSHIP WITH ATTA PRIOR TO 9/11

More and more whistleblowers are coming out complaining that the US agencies knew of a terrorist cell in

Brooklyn containing 9/11 terrorist leader Mohammed Atta and that the US government repeatedly refused

to intervene. The AP ran this story this week, and it implicates the 9/11 Commission for playing a role in

the cover-up of damaging information:

“An Army intelligence officer yesterday said he told staff members from the September 11 commission

that a secret military unit had identified two of the three cells involved in the 2001 terrorist strikes more

than a year before the attacks. Lt. Col. Anthony Shaffer, who said he was associated with the Able

Danger unit, recalled that during a 2003 meeting with commission staffers in Afghanistan, he mentioned

that the unit had identified September 11 ringleader Mohamed Atta along with three other hijackers as

terrorist suspects. Three months later, in January 2004, Col. Shaffer said he was back in the United

States and offered to follow up with the commission, but his offer was declined.

A number of people are asking why this information is only now coming to light in the press and why the

9/11 commission hadn't investigated it last year. Rep. Curt Weldon reported on the Able Danger

operation clear back in 2002 when he talked about it at the Heritage Foundation. Weldon's source for this

revelation is a "former defense intelligence officer" (Col. Shaffer) who told the GSN news service where he

thought the fault lied: 'I personally talked with [Philip] Zelikow [executive director of the 9/11 Commission]

about this,' recalled the intelligence officer. 'For whatever bizarre reasons, he didn't pass on the

information.'" Zelikow says he wasn't told there was any specific cell in Brooklyn, implying that the

information was general. Shaffer disputes Zelikow's claim of ignorance.

World Affairs Brief Sept 4, 2005

ABLE DANGER COVER-UP

Thanks to the tenacious efforts of Rep Curt Weldon (R-PA), The Senate Judiciary Committee chairman

said Wednesday he would look into whether the Pentagon obstructed his committee by refusing to allow

testimony from five people who had knowledge of a secret military unit named "Able Danger." This is a

big issue the government wants cover-up badly. If the allegations are true, the government had

foreknowledge of Mohamed Atta's terrorist cell long before 9/11 and destroyed the information when one

of the intelligence analysts attempted to get the FBI to investigate. Rep. Weldon even took the information

to the 9/11 commission and it was buried. Now, the Pentagon is refusing to allow some of the key

whistleblowers to testify. Neo-conservatives at National Review magazine were parroting the

government position, which drew a stinging response from reader Andy McCarthy:

“I watched the hearing this morning, and that (NR’s excuse for government dismissal of the charges) is

not gonna wash. Both DOD and the 9/11 Commission put out numerous statements casting aspersions

on the Able Danger people who came forward on the ground that no documentary information

corroborated the claim — a claim no one seems too willing to go out on a limb to dispute any longer —

that the program identified Mohamed Atta as a potential terrorist (and perhaps other hijackers, too) well in

advance of 9/11. Now it turns out that volumes upon volumes of documentation from the program were

ordered destroyed in 2000. That also appears to have been a rather widely known fact (the guy who did

the deleting voluntarily testified at the hearing). If that was the case, why were these witnesses assailed

the way they were? And why did we continue hearing about how the Pentagon was looking under every

rock but not finding anything when, in fact, it had to have known that the entire quarry had intentionally been destroyed five years ago?

The Project On Government Oversight (Pogo.org) revealed that this treatment of whistleblowers is

becoming systematic, and is being ignored by the Congressional committee responsible to shield

whistleblowers: "Sibel Edmonds, president of the newly formed National Security Whistleblowers Coalition

made this statement: 'Chairman Davis and his staff have continued to disregard our requests for a

Government Reform Committee hearing to discuss badly needed provisions that would apply to

whistleblowers from the intelligence and law enforcement communities. Considering the unprecedented

number of national security whistleblower cases since the 9/11 terrorist attacks, it is appalling to see that

the Chairman of the House Government Reform Committee refuses to extend protections to those

courageous individuals coming forward.'"

Keep in mind, that coordinated collusion and cover-ups within different branches of government that are

specifically required to act independently in enforcing the law is a Proof of conspiracy—not theory.

CHEMTRAILS: FINALLY, SOME ANSWERS

Canadian investigative reporter **William Thomas** has uncovered, through tenacious and prodigious research, some answers to the mysterious chemtrail issue. Chemtrails are chemical laden vapor trails dispersed at high altitudes by US military tanker aircraft and by some private aircraft under top-secret contracts with the US government. A draft version of Thomas' report can be read online at <http://www.nexusmagazine.com/chemtrails.html>. I don't agree with everything Thomas writes or speculates about, but I will summarize his conclusions and share my analysis of what I think is well founded.

The chemtrail phenomenon has been observed for many years in different parts of the US as well as in other allied nations. These chemtrails are primarily characterized by thick trails of white vapor, which persist for long periods of time, gradually dispersing to cover wide areas of the sky. Let's review some of the major differences between these chemical vapor trails and the normal, harmless condensation trails (contrails) often emitted by aircraft. There are several critical distinguishing characteristics between these two types of emissions:

1) Chemtrails often occur at altitudes and in environmental conditions where normal contrails cannot and do not occur. According to NOAA meteorologist Thomas Schlatter, quoted in the article, At temperatures lower than approximately -40 deg F contrails almost always form, regardless of relative humidity. The higher the ambient temperature, the less likely that contrails will form. At temperatures above -40 degrees F, contrails are not expected. The persistence of contrails depends upon temperature, relative humidity, and the vigor of mixing between the exhaust plume and the ambient air. At low temperatures, with high humidity, and with stable temperature stratification (which inhibits vertical mixing of the air), contrails persist for many

hours."½ Chemtrails also occur at altitudes where contrails occur and thus the two are mixed.½

2)½ Chemtrails persist for many hours and spread out continuously until wide areas of the sky are covered.½ Contrails spread out only slightly and evaporate within 10 seconds to several hours, depending on the upper air humidity and temperature.½ Contrails can persist under exceptional circumstances, so this is not a definitive criteria.

3) Contrails are always pure white and don½t exhibit much halo effect.½ Chemtrails have an oily glint to them, with pronounced rainbow-like color effects (reddish or pinkish tint) as the sun shines through.½ Some of the best photographic evidence of chemtrails is found at <http://www.carnicom.com/contrails.htm>.

4) Contrails are composed of water vapor combined with a small amount of residue from burned jet fuel.½½ Analysis of chemtrail residues, in contrast, claims to have uncovered a variety of chemicals and other substances, including barium, aluminum oxide, microscopic fibers and oil-based products, none of which are intrinsic to normal jet fuel.

5)½ Contrails exit directly behind the engines of the aircraft, which produce the moisture.½ Thus, aircraft will exhibit only 1, 2, 3, or 4 distinct condensation trails, each trailing an engine.½ Chemtrails, in contrast, are expelled from multiple ports along the entire wing surface, not directly in line with the engines.½½ Once again, see the pictures on www.carnicom.com.½ These photos are perhaps the most definitive of all chemtrail evidence. Some debunkers use cropped photos of high-G maneuvers which gives off aerodynamic condensation from the wing--as a supposed explanation to wing emitted chemtrails.½ But this is bogus.½ Aerodynamic condensation doesn½t occur

in straight and level flight and never leaves a long contrail. It also shows up within inches of the wing trailing edge, unlike chemtrail spraying.

6) Contrails cannot be shut on and off at will, nor abruptly, as witnesses have seen in numerous sightings of chemical spraying by aircraft. I personally have seen this type of on/off spraying in Utah by two military tankers flying in loose formation. When numerous witnesses called **KSL--TV** in Salt Lake City to investigate, KSL dutifully parroted the government's official response: that the aircraft was a **government contractor flying a Lear jet and doing experiments on ice crystal formation**. Baloney! As one of those witnesses, and an experienced pilot, I can tell you those two huge military tanker aircraft were not tiny Lear jets. The government is lying--but at least, in this case, they didn't try to outright deny what hundreds of people were watching, as they usually do. They simply tried to take advantage of public ignorance of aircraft recognition, feeding them a phony but marginally plausible excuse.

7) Aircraft dispersing chemtrails always fly back and forth over a set area, creating circular or zig-zag patterns of vapor in the sky. Often many chemtrail aircraft can be seen in one area, flying in crisscross patterns laying down vapor trails before flying off over the horizon. Large airliners operating under Air Traffic Control fly on set airways and do not make such patterns in the sky. Government representatives have tried to pass off reports of crisscross chemtrail patterns as merely the convergence of airliner contrails at normal air traffic intersections, but this is false. For one thing, almost all airways in the US run in straight lines. Neither do airliners fly in close formation with other aircraft. In addition, chemtrail sightings almost never come close to normal airway intersections, lest they interfere with normal traffic or be observed by other airline passengers.

8) All legitimate aircraft at high altitudes emitting contrails will be acknowledged by the FAA. Conversely, the existence of aircraft spraying chemicals

is always denied by the FAA, under orders from the government. You can be on a cell phone, in real time, reporting the presence of an aircraft overhead to the FAA and they will tell you that no such aircraft exists on their radar screens. They are flat-out lying. It's amazing to me how many military pilots and government ATC controllers can so easily justify these lies. Surely some are aware of the damaging health effects reported on the internet. Occasionally, an honest controller will admit there is a military exercise blocked out for that area.

Many have long suspected that the government has been using these airborne chemical sprayings to **test dispersal methods for mild forms of biological or chemical warfare**. Indeed, chemtrail sightings have long been associated with community-wide illnesses reported in the areas of the sprayings. Thomas himself was involved in a case in **Espanola, Ontario**, in the spring of 1998. Residents there had been complaining of severe headaches, chronic joint pain, dizziness, sudden extreme fatigue, acute asthma attacks and feverless flu-like symptoms over a 50-square-mile area [which] coincided with what they termed months of spraying by photo-identified **US Air Force tanker planes**. An expert witness in the case, former Ontario Provincial Police Officer Ted Simola, described the lingering Xs and numerous white trails, some of which just ended as if they had been shut off but remained in the sky, observations consistent with other chemtrail sightings.

On November 18, 1998, the people of Espanola petitioned Parliament, suspecting possible government involvement in these airborne chemical emissions. They called upon Parliament to repeal any law that would permit the dispersal of military chaff or of any cloud-seeding substance whatsoever by domestic or foreign military aircraft without the informed consent of the citizens of Canada thus affected. In response to their petition, the Ministry of Defense eventually replied: It's not us. The government assertion was mostly true: it was not Canadian aircraft, but US Air Force tankers which were conducting the sprayings. Yet the Canadian government was complicit in allowing the US to experiment over Canada.

Thomas did finally get an American ATC controller to talk to him, under conditions of anonymity. The controller works on the US eastern seaboard. Thomas called his contact **Deep Sky**. Deep Sky confirmed that the chemicals being spread in the exercises were acting as electrolytes, enhancing conductivity of radar and radio waves. Additionally, the spread of the material was actually degrading, not enhancing, ATC radars so there had to be some other purpose behind the sprayings. It is significant that many of the exercises were conducted out of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, in Ohio, which, according to Thomas, has long been deeply engaged in **HAARP's electromagnetic warfare program**. HAARP is a US government radio wave project in Alaska which could be related to weather modification. HAARP's huge powerful transmitters and arrays of antennas are, according to the official website, designed to heat up the atmosphere above it. Phasing the antennas can skew the heating effect directionally, and may even interact with reflective layers of metal particles in Chemtrails. What is interesting is that HAARP's location is at the 65th parallel, just south of the arctic circle. This position corresponds to the atmospheric boundary where relatively moist southern air moving northward collides with cold arctic air coming south. When these dissimilar air mass meet they rise and form new storm systems. Heating the atmosphere directly under this boundary layer would tend to accelerate storm development. Finally, through a series of questions, Deep Sky confirmed that the US tankers were indeed involved in **climate modification experiments**.

At this point in the article, Thomas launches into a theory that the reflective clouds are being used to reduce the effects of **global warming (Edward Teller's theory)**. He discusses the Welsback patent, issued in 1994 to **Hughes Aircraft**, [*long involved in government black operations*] which involves the use of a reflective blanket of aluminum-laced cloud cover to cool the earth. However, I think Thomas was fed *disinformation* here. The government often uses phony patents to lead investigators down the wrong trail--especially when dealing with HAARP. Global warming is a fraud. There is no way the US government would engage in this massive a cover-up and risk illness to the US population over a theory with little basis in

fact and even less evidence of actual damage.½ Besides, government sponsored aerosol spraying has been going on before global warming became an issue.½

However, the **weather modification** process is, in my opinion, the best explanation so far as to the widespread use of spraying.½ The reflective aluminum particles or fibers in the created cloud barriers cause cool spots over normally warm areas, which influence the rise or fall of air masses.½ These reflective layers may also react with HAARP transmissions in some way.½½ Radio transmissions need reflective layers to channel the energy in specific directions.½ The creation of sun or radiation shielding may explain why spraying occurs at high altitude, during the daytime, and in cloudless areas--where the reflective shield would be visible and effective for a long time.

None of these characteristics fit a biological or chemical warfare test scenario.½ If the government was testing delivery methods of biological or chemical agents, it would be more likely to mix the chemicals in clouds at much lower altitudes where it would more easily precipitate downward on the population.½ The chemtrail sprayings always take place at high altitudes where the materials can linger or drift long distances: hardly an accurate delivery method.½ The sprayings are also done only in clear areas of the sky--which, again, points to weather modification.

What I½m convinced of now, is that the widespread flu-like and Alzheimer½s symptoms have been mere side effects of the sprayed chemicals, and not the direct purpose of the sprayings.½½ The extensive use of **aluminum oxide**, found as the primary component of these reflective clouds, does have serious medical side effects and may well explain the upsurge in **Alzheimer½s disease** in the US--which is reaching epidemic proportions.½ I think it is also clear that the government has been experimenting with different types and mixes of chemicals, which explains why the observations and effects differ over time.½ Several years ago, there were many sightings of sticky droplets falling from the sky, trailing spider-web-like

strands behind. Upon contact they made people very ill. Later chemical analysis has shown a lot of aluminum oxide and micro fibers, also composed of barium and aluminum. People living under these spray patterns have developed Alzheimer's-like symptoms.

As expected, the **US continues to deny any spraying as well as any experimentation in weather modification.** The media is totally complicit in this cover-up as well. The allegations have been widespread over the internet for years. Thousands of inquiries have gone out to the media over the years and not once has the major media ever done a story on this issue. The health consequences are huge. Even the politically correct environmental movement has had no luck in pressing the media for coverage. There is no way to explain the media's refusal to investigate or give coverage to this story except that they are fully aware of it and are under bogus national security orders to spike the story.

A US Air Force Colonel, according to Thomas, told a senator: The Air Force is not conducting any weather modification and has no plans to do so in the future. But as Thomas retorts, In fact, attempts to steer hurricanes by spraying heat-robbing chemicals in their paths began in the 1950s. The recipe for creating cirrus shields was outlined in an unusually arrogant US Air Force study. Subtitled, **Owning the Weather by 2025,** the 1996 report explained how weather force specialists were dispersing chemicals behind high-flying tanker aircraft in a process the air force calls aerial obscuration. Sounds just like what people are describing as chemtrails. Even members of Congress know about Chemtrails. The term is in the list of prohibited Space activities of Rep. Kucinich's HR 2977 Space Preservation Act. Because of the variety of different chemicals used in Chemtrails over the past 10 years and the changing patterns of spraying, I'm convinced the government is still experimenting and hasn't actually found a predictable way yet to harness the weather. Sadly, this only means the secret experiments will continue and people will suffer.

EMERGENCY HEALTH POWERS ACT SPREADS TO THE STATES

The **Neal Knox Report** (<http://www.shotgunnews.com/knox/knox.dog>) mentions that The Centers for Disease Control, which calls gun violence a public health epidemic, has sent a model law to state legislatures which would give state agencies unprecedented powers in the event of a public health emergency -- including the power to seize private property. The first draft of the **Model Emergency Health Powers Act** -- the version introduced in some of the 14 states where it has been filed -- specifically includes the power to control, restrict and regulate ... firearms Other sections of the bill authorize seizure and destruction of private property and exempt the state from liability. Whenever the government engages in illegal activities they always seek for official immunity.

Columbine Shooting

UNEXPLAINED ASPECTS OF THE COLUMBINE HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTINGS.

As usual the media isn't very good at asking key questions that might reveal a different solution that what is desired.

A. It is obvious to most observers that the two teenage shooters had help. Transporting and repositioning the number of bombs into the school exceeded what two boys could carry in even a dozen trips. Bombs the size of 20 lb. propane cylinders cannot be hidden under a trenchcoat. How did they get them into the school without detection? Taking the bombs into the building would have required numerous trips. This could not have been done during daylight or

when the school was open since the bombs were large and impossible to conceal under clothing. They must have had a key or access through an accomplice. How did the bombs go undetected since some were not so well hidden?

B. Live news coverage showed several older "students" (looking like men in their mid 20s) being apprehended early on in the conflict. It was interesting that even as the media kept talking about potential conspiracy in this issue, they kept repeating the law enforcement claims that they "had no other suspects." At no time did any reporter ask them about the persons earlier seen on video being apprehended. Later on as other talk radio hosts illuminated the inconsistencies, the media released the story that the "students" were released because it was determined these suspects were "not involved." Rather than asked how this was determined, the media simply accepted the report.

C. The media barely covered the existence and action of the armed guard present in the school who fled after exchanging a few rounds. He was a bona fide police deputy. What was he doing there? Why did he flee? Why was he not prosecuted for leaving the students undefended?

D. The suicide story of the two shooters went without question. There are important details that the press should have asked. How were they shot? What caliber bullet was found? Strangely, no details about these "suicides" have come forth. Of course, as has been shown in numerous other government cover-ups, it is easy for government to find autopsy doctors willing to falsify any outcome the government desires. Frankly, it is very difficult to kill oneself with a .22 caliber bullet. It is so small, it must hit some very critical area to be fatal. Most attempts by a .22 do not result in a successful suicide.

ANALYSIS: The Columbine shooting has launched a massive media campaign against gun possession, as predicted. The reach of their calls for action even extend to prohibiting concealed weapons holders to carry on school grounds. How in the world do they invent any linkage between concealed weapons permits and this shooting? If anything, a concealed weapons holder could have only helped in this situation. Touting the image of a "gun free" school zone only clouds the issue. Schools "free" of defensive guns (police or concealed weapons holders) clearly are more at risk in these surprise attacks--not less.

The media moguls cried crocodile tears and beat the emotional drums for the victims for days on end--not because of true sympathy, in my opinion, but rather because they were savoring the opportunity of using this incident to help destroy Second Amendment rights. Even more troubling is the potential that agent provocateurs were involved. I find it very difficult to believe that it was simply coincidental that this incident happened at the same time the NRA had scheduled their national conference in Denver. Both before and after the OKC bombing, the government has been involved directly in numerous attempts to infiltrate right wing militia organizations--not with clean cut agents trying to simply monitor their activities--but rather with thug-type criminals paid to induce attacks against the government and otherwise engage in unlawful activities. Virtually every militia organization in the US has numerous documented accounts of government attempts to provoke illegal actions.

The implications of such tactics to create an enemy that wouldn't exist otherwise is strong evidence of conspiracy to destroy liberty. All of my subscribers should read Rodney Stich's book *Defrauding America* (1-800-292-2831) for one of the best compilations of first hand experiences of federal agents who have had personal experiences with the dark side of government. In *Defrauding America*, several CIA agents make a dramatic case for the fact that Denver is one of the largest centers of government illegal activity. The dark side of government controls many government, police and financial figures in this area. They operate real estate companies, banks, and savings and loan organizations to launder covert funds. They also operate a special CIA covert operations base out of Buckley Airfield near Denver, complete with a fleet of black helicopters.

JFK

THE JFK ASSASSINATION.

The evidence is really quite overwhelming that this murder was committed by government agents (of the "black" variety) on orders from very high

up. There are several books that outline the evidence. The best one is called *Best Evidence* by David Lifton. Lifton is no right-wing crazy--he doesn't believe in conspiracy (at least he didn't when he started). He was a liberal engineering student in southern California. And just happened to take a class on the Warren Commission Report. The professor was no other than the chief legal counsel to the commission, Wesley J. Liebeler. Lifton dutifully starts to go through the whole report and begins to notice gaping holes in logic and unanswered questions. The professor doesn't have good answers and eventually starts to evade critical issues that clearly start pointing to a cover-up. Lifton spends nearly the rest of his life digging into this mess. He avoids any conclusions, but they are all too obvious to the savvy reader.

What comes out so clearly is not so much who specifically did it, but that government agents were literally everywhere covering up the facts, falsifying evidence, threatening witnesses to change their stories, and in every way attempting to manipulate the outcome of the investigation, so that it will point to only one person, Lee Harvey Oswald (who, it turns out, worked for the CIA). This is the classic fingerprint of conspiracy: multiple attempts to cover up and change the facts. This kind of pressure shows up in virtually all of the recent assassinations and murder committed by these government hit squads. Most importantly, we layman can trace the presence of conspiracy by looking closely at these cover-ups and coercion of witnesses. Here are some cogent facts uncovered by Lifton and others--just a sampling.

|_ | Government agents swooped down upon anyone in the crowd who had taken pictures of the assassination and confiscated their cameras and film.

|_ | They altered the Zapruder movie film of the assassination, cutting and splicing frames to change the outcome.

|_ | Secret Service removed and replaced the windshield of Kennedy's limousine so they could cover up the fact that it had a bullet hole coming from the front (the grassy knoll).

|_ | At least two clean, unreformed bullets were planted by agents--one in the limo, and one on Connally's stretcher (which was a mistake--they intended it for Kennedy's stretcher).

|_ | There were at least two coffins being transported back to Washington--the one riding with Jackie was empty--the real one was flown to Walter Reed Army hospital via helo from the back of Air Force One, where doctors

extracted all bullets that showed a frontal entry. They made a huge entry into the front of the neck to extract a bullet that had entered the neck from the front. A false bullet wound was also created in the back with a pristine bullet showing no deformation, and which only penetrated an inch into soft tissue (the mysterious "magic bullet").

|_↓| When the real body arrived at Bethesda Naval Hospital for autopsy, it came in a gray military coffin zipped in a body bag. Two FBI agents in the room took detailed notes, and described the autopsy physician exclaiming that this body has already been dissected. In fact the top of the head came off on the table, and the brain had been removed. The report of these two agents was suppressed by J. Edgar Hoover.

|_↓| All navy personnel present were threatened with dire consequences if they mentioned anything they saw. Some eventually spoke out about what happened when Congress held the second Kennedy investigation.

|_↓| The autopsy physician at Bethesda admitted to burning his initial report and rewriting one that he had been "instructed" to write--conforming to the altered body.

|_↓| Photographs of the autopsy were locked up and the Warren Commission only allowed artist sketches to be presented. When the real photos surfaced years later, it was evident the artist had been instructed to alter the appearance of the photos.

|_↓| Earl Warren and his Commission had a mandated outcome to arrive at, which they did so despite massive evidence to the contrary. I believe Warren knew very well what he and others were doing was false. Arlen Specter was an assistant legal counsel to the Commission and also knew of the need for a predetermined outcome. Notice where he is today. The "good old boys" take care of their own.

|_↓| A former CIA team member in Dallas, Marita Lorenz admitted in a letter to JFK's mother that she had overheard various members of her team bragging about how they were going to kill JFK. She left the team before the assassination, but later on sent the letter of apology to Rose Kennedy.

|_↓| Oswald was shot by Jack Ruby before he could talk about his CIA relationships. Oswald knew he had been set up for this hit, and the single shooter scenario was foisted upon the American public to cover for the government hit squads--both of whom were former workers with CIA and

the underworld. The close relationship of the CIA with the underworld is detailed in book *1/2Crossfire1/2* (see book list).

| ↓ | Numerous witnesses were badgered and threatened to keep silent, especially the numerous ones who knew about the shots from the grassy knoll. Over 20 witnesses who would not change their stories met with mysterious deaths.

WHAT WAS THE MOTIVE FOR KILLING 1/2ONE OF THEIR OWN?1/2

I believe the reason the government conspiracy group killed one of their own (JFK) was that he was in real trouble politically, and that his personal life of constant extra-marital affairs left him open to defeat in the next election. None of his radical legislative agenda was going anywhere in Congress. I believe they killed him for the *martyr effect*. Do not underestimate what I am saying. In one swoop, they changed the whole political landscape for years to come--his death virtually silenced the opposition conservatives. Lyndon Johnson won the next presidency easily and Congress rubber stamped the entire radical legislation known as the 1/2Great Society1/2 welfare scheme they had rejected under JFK.

Martin Luther King Jr.

Martin Luther King was another public figure that was assassinated for the martyr effect. As the evidence below shows, the evidence of King's corruption, womanizing and Communist sympathies, was becoming more a liability to the Civil Rights agenda than an asset. It was only a matter of time before King's

reputation would self-destruct. By engineering his death and blaming it on a supposed racist, the Powers That Be could turn MLK into a hero. With the assistance of controlled judges, they could have his records sealed and make sure the public would not have access to the real Martin Luther King.

MARTIN LUTHER KING--THE MAN BEHIND THE MEDIA MASK

Every year America endures the same propaganda media-blitz on Martin Luther King day--the false portrayal of the Reverend King as an American hero; a saintly, self-sacrificing religious martyr for the cause of civil rights. He was everything but that and certainly no hero that any American should look up to. I have written extensively about the defense of true civil rights, no one can accuse me of hating the cause. I say this by way of introduction in anticipation of the fury my remarks will generate among the media attempting to perpetrate this growing myth upon American culture. Everything about Martin Luther King is a fraud. Here are the real facts.

1) NAME CHANGE: MLK is really Michael King, Jr. His father was a minister and arbitrarily decided to rename himself and his son, Martin Luther King Sr. and Jr.

2) PLAGIARISM IN HIS DOCTORAL THESIS: The most complete analysis of King's chronic plagiarism in his academic career was done by Gerry Harbison, professor of Chemistry at University of Nebraska: In 1988, the Martin Luther King Jr. Papers Project made a discovery that shocked it to its core. The Project, a group of academics and students, had been entrusted by Coretta Scott King with the task of editing King's papers for publication. As they examined King's student essays and his dissertation, they gradually became aware that King was guilty of massive plagiarism - that is, he had copied the words of other authors word-for-word, without making it clear that what he was writing was not his own. The Project spent years uncovering the full extent of King's plagiarism. In November 1990, word leaked to the press, and they had to go public. The revelations caused a minor scandal and then were promptly forgotten. Suppressed would be a more accurate description. The National Endowment for the Humanities actively suppressed the story in preparation for

celebrating King. Its then director was **Lynne Cheney**, wife of the current Vice President. For the full story see Prof. Harbison's website: <http://chem-gharbison.unl.edu/mlk/plagiarism.html>

3) COMMUNIST BACKGROUND AND CONTACTS: It appears that King established an early liaison with the American Communist Party and sought to create civil unrest in support of the revolution. His own biographer, **David J. Garrow** admitted that King once privately described himself as a Marxist. King constantly surrounded himself with Communists, hired them, and even went to great lengths to keep them on through secret relationships. King's personal secretary in the 1950s was communist and homosexual **Bayard Rustin**. According to **Sen. Jesse Helms**, King was repeatedly warned about his associations with known Communists by friendly elements in the Kennedy Administration and the Department of Justice [DOJ] (including strong and explicit warning from President Kennedy himself). King took perfunctory and deceptive measures to separate himself from the Communists [**Stanley David Levison** and **Hunter Pitts O'Dell**] against whom he was warned. He continued to have close and secret contacts with at least some of them after being informed and warned of their background, and he violated a commitment to sever his relationships with identified Communists.

4) IMMORAL AND ABUSIVE BEHAVIOR: Dr. King had an ample reputation as a philanderer and abuser of women of ill repute. The FBI under J. Edgar Hoover had run surveillance on King and his entourage for years attempting to gather data on his Communist connections. While the Bureau did surveil King's attendance at Communist meetings, but most of the surveillance records show an extreme preoccupation after hours with illicit sex. In deference to King's usefulness in promoting a national holiday for civil rights, US Federal judge **John Lewis Smith, Jr.** ordered all the FBI records sealed up in the National Archives for 50 years (till 2027). When I was Executive Editor of Conservative Digest, I called retired Acting FBI Director L. Patrick Gray and asked him what was in the evidence locked away. His answer surprised me. He said there were approximately 15 file cabinets of evidence on King--14 of them were full of recordings and transcripts of his illicit relationships

with prostitutes. Only one file cabinet contained evidence of his Communist relationships.

Even former co-workers have blown the whistle on King's scurrilous conduct. The **Rev. Ralph Abernathy**, in his book, *And the Wall Came Tumbling Down*, King spent his last night in the motel having an immoral liason with three women and then beat one of the woman in the morning before he was shot. Assistant Director of the FBI **Charles D. Brennan** wrote a letter to Sen. **John P. East** (R-NC) in which he stated that King's conduct consisted of "orgiastic and adulterous escapades, some of which indicated that King could be bestial in his sexual abuse of women." The FBI surveillance records covering his first night in Stockholm, Sweden, where he was to receive the Noble Peace Prize, document that his only interest was how to secure prostitutes for he and his entourage. An orgy followed. King's surveillance and wiretaps were personally authorized by then Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. If these allegations are true, this man should never have been put forward as a national hero. Yes, I am aware that other national heroes have had there weaknesses, but King's conduct borders on a Clinton-like sexual addiction.

Here is a synopsis of the problems with the official version of events:

Source: www.whatreallyhappened.com

On April 4th, 1968,... Martin Luther King was in Memphis Tennessee, trying to pick up the pieces of a peace march that on March 28th had been disrupted by a gang of agents provocateur called "The Invaders," later revealed to be connected with COINTELPRO.

When Martin Luther King announced his return to Memphis, the FBI, with direct approval of J. Edgar Hoover, circulated to friendly press contacts a memo ridiculing Martin Luther King for staying at the white-owned Holiday Inn instead of the Motel Lorraine, which was black-owned. King fell for the ruse and booked himself into a ground floor room at the motel. An unknown individual, claiming

to be King's advance man, changed the booking to the second floor room with the balcony, claiming that King liked to look at swimming pools.

This new room, in the rear of the building and facing open alleys, was a security disaster, wide open to sniper fire from numerous angles.

At 6PM, while standing on the balcony and speaking to his driver, Martin Luther King was shot and killed.

Conveniently placed individuals immediately pointed to the bathroom window of Bessie Brewer's boarding house. Those individuals who claimed that the shot had been fired from a hedge next to the building were ignored and ridiculed. James Earl Ray was arrested, urged to confess by his lawyer, then retracted his confession. He is still in jail, at present dying of liver disease (but probably not fast enough to suit the FBI).

There are numerous reasons to doubt the official story.

1. James Earl Ray, not unlike his lone-nut cousin Lee Harvey Oswald, was a poor shot in the Army.

2. At Ray's evidentiary hearing, a former FBI ballistics expert testified that not even the most skilled gunman could have accurately fired a rifle in the manner claimed by the government prosecution. According to the expert, to effectively line up the rifle for such a shot, the butt of the rifle would have had to stick six

inches into the wall. The prosecution countered that Ray had contorted himself into position around the bathtub in order to make the kill shot, which seems equally incredulous.

3. After the assassination, Wayne Chastain, a reporter at the Memphis Press Scimitar, came across an unpublished Associated Press photograph in the newspaper's files which was taken from the boarding house bathroom window, through which Ray allegedly shot King. The sniper's view was obscured by branches from trees growing between the boarding house and the Motel Lorraine. The City of Memphis ordered the sanitation department to cut those trees down shortly after the assassination, making it impossible to conclusively determine how the tree branches may have interfered in a shot fired from the boarding house bathroom. (Students of one of the other assassinations from that period, that of President John F. Kennedy, will recall how the government of Dallas almost immediately replaced and relocated all the street signs in Dealey Plaza, some of which were reported to have had bullet holes).

4. Only one witness claimed to have seen Ray leaving the boarding house bathroom, a man named Charles Stephens. According to two other sources, Stephens was extremely inebriated at the time. The first three descriptions Stephens gave didn't resemble Ray at all--in fact, Stephens' first two descriptions of the alleged assassin were of a black man. Stephens admitted that he did not get a good look at the alleged assassin. It wasn't until the FBI paid \$30,000 in bar tabs for Stephens that he fingered Ray as the hit man. Charles Stephens, it should be noted, did not see the actual shooting. According to another witness, Stephens was busy urinating in some bushes when the killing actually occurred.

5. Two other witnesses saw someone leaving the boarding house bathroom. One witness, Bessie Brewer, the owner of the boarding house, could not identify the individual and refused to identify Ray as the man she had rented a room to. The other witness, Stephens' common law wife Grace, said she did get a good look at him, and that it was definitely not James Earl Ray. Grace's drunken husband became the preferred witness. Grace was committed to a mental institution. According to her lawyer, C.M. Murphy, she was committed illegally, and after

she was committed, the Memphis prosecutors removed her records from the hospital. After years of imprisonment under heavy sedation, Grace still refused to recant her story.

6. In addition to Brewer, two other witnesses at the boarding house insisted that the man who rented Ray's room looked nothing like James Earl Ray.

7. Less than two minutes after the fatal shot was fired, a bundle containing the 30.06 Remington rifle allegedly used in the assassination and some of Ray's belongings was conveniently found in the doorway of the Canipe Amusement Company next door to the boarding house. Ray would have had to fire the shot that killed King from his contorted position in the bathroom, exit the sniper's nest, go to his room to collect his belongings and wrap and tie it all in a bundle, leave his room, run down the stairs and out of the boarding house, stash the bundle next door, and then get away from the scene unnoticed--all within two minutes! (Again, students of the JFK assassination will recognize a familiar pattern in the superhuman running skills attributed to the patsy).

8. A service station manager told an investigator for Ray's defense team that he saw Ray several blocks from the boarding house at the time of the shooting. He was stabbed soon after he started talking to the defense team. After changing his story about his involvement in the assassination, Ray himself was stabbed while in the library of the Brushy Mountain Prison.

9. Martin Luther King's brother, an excellent swimmer, was found drowned in his pool following Martin Luther King's assassination.

10. Finally and most telling, the FBI lab was never able to ballistically match the bullet recovered from the body of Martin Luther King with the James Earl Ray rifle conveniently found in the doorway.

PART 4: THE JAMES EARL RAY RIFLE

The only basis for James Earl Ray's imprisonment is his confession, one offered under coercion by his court-appointed attorney and immediately retracted. There exists no evidence at all that James Earl Ray was the killer of Martin Luther King.

James Earl Ray is now trying to avail himself of a Tennessee law which allows the re-opening of his case in the face of new investigative technologies that might exonerate him.

Even worse, when the evidence of wrongdoing is really hot, colluding judges will **seal the evidence** for 50+ years in official archives to make sure that by the time the public finds out about it, all the guilty parties will be out of office or dead.½ This is precisely why the FBI files on **Martin Luther King** were sealed prior to the debate on whether King would be worthy to honor in a national holiday.½ According to a former Asst. Director of the FBI, who had first-hand knowledge of the facts, 14 of the 15 file cabinets full of the sealed surveillance files document Reverend King's chronic pornography and prostitution habits, including his raunchy activities while in Sweden accepting his Nobel Prize.½ The other file cabinet full of evidence traces his connections to the far left and the Communist Party.½ Had the public known of this information, King would have been disgraced rather than honored. What we need is a piece of legislation making it a crime to classify as secret any evidence of a crime committed by government officers or agent.½½ But then again, as long as only government insiders are allowed to view and judge the contents of classified material, the public will never know the truth--except through a leak by some patriotic government employee--which is exactly what this kind of legislation is trying to preclude.

OKC Bombing

Cover-up in OKC
by William F. Jasper

In trying to pin the blame for the bombing solely on despicable mass-murderer Timothy McVeigh, federal officials have ignored and covered up evidence of a wider conspiracy.

Readers of The New American are familiar with many of the charges leveled by Jannie Coverdale, Kathy Wilburn, Jane Graham, and others personally affected by the Oklahoma City bombing (see page 12). The extensive investigation carried out by this magazine over the past six years has confirmed that their fears and charges of cover-up, coercion, deception, and obstruction are fully justified.*

Our investigation has led to several major conclusions that completely contradict the official government line, which holds that Timothy McVeigh masterminded and carried out the terrorist assault on the Murrah Building, with his only significant assistance coming from former Army buddy Terry Nichols. Those conclusions, more fully examined in the remainder of this article, are summarized in the following bullet points:

- **Multiple Accomplices** — Credible witnesses saw McVeigh with John Does in Junction City, Kansas, where the Ryder truck was rented, in the days before the bombing. Many additional credible witnesses saw McVeigh with one or more John Does in Oklahoma City on the morning of the bombing. Still more credible witnesses saw McVeigh with one or more John Does in or around the Murrah Building in the days before the bombing. In fact, the

prosecution did not present *any* eye-witnesses in Oklahoma City who saw McVeigh alone on the day of the bombing; virtually every eyewitness saw him with one or more John Does.

- **Multiple Bombs** — Physics, the available forensic evidence, official records, eyewitnesses, and an impressive array of world-class experts compellingly argue that the Ryder truck bomb could not have caused the terrible damage and deadly destruction of the federal building without the help of explosive charges placed on the columns of the building. This clearly put the bombing operation beyond McVeigh's level of technical expertise and necessitated two or more additional accomplices.
- **Prior Knowledge** — Documents from the ATF, FBI, and U.S. Marshal's Service, as well as witness testimony and the testimony of federal undercover informants, indicate that high officials in the federal government were given prior warning about the impending attack on the Murrah Federal Building.
- **Misconduct, Coercion, and Cover-up** — In an astonishing number of instances, vital evidence was ignored, suppressed, tampered with, and even destroyed. Witnesses were coached, harassed, and coerced in attempts to get them to change their testimony.

Making the "John Does" Disappear

Many credible

witnesses reported seeing another individual with McVeigh strongly resembling the infamous sketch of John Doe #2. Among them, Vickie Beemer, who handled the rental transaction of the Ryder truck used in the bombing, informed the FBI of John Doe #2 only to have investigators claim that she had mistaken him for a different man.

Shortly after the bombing, eyewitnesses provided the FBI with descriptions of two suspects, which formed the basis for the famous FBI sketches known as "John Doe No. 1" and "John Doe No. 2." The John Doe No. 1 sketch turned out to be a pretty close depiction of Timothy McVeigh, who was arrested by an Oklahoma Highway Patrolman on a routine traffic stop as he fled north on the interstate highway after the bombing. John Doe No. 2, who for weeks was the "world's most wanted" fugitive, was never arrested. Attorney General Janet Reno and FBI officials swore that "no stone will be left unturned" in the pursuit of this elusive suspect. Instead of turning over stones, however, the Department of Justice and FBI were soon *burying* evidence and leads. The DOJ-FBI sleuths soon concocted a cover story, still used by the media, that John Doe 2 was a product of faulty memory and mistaken identity. According to this story, the witnesses at the Ryder truck rental agency in Junction City, Kansas, had mistakenly fingered Army Private Todd Bunting, who had come in to rent a truck with Sergeant Michael Hertig the day after McVeigh, and who had no connection to the bombing.

There were many problems with this story. For one, it conflicted, in many details, with the original accounts provided by the three Ryder witnesses to the FBI. Besides, Vickie Beemer, who handled the rental transaction, knew Sgt. Hertig and was not likely to confuse him with a stranger.

What's more, she remained steadfast in her sworn testimony before the

grand jury and the trial jury that she was "absolutely 100% certain" that the "Robert Kling" who rented the Ryder truck used in the bombing (whom the government says was McVeigh) was accompanied by another individual.

Another major problem with the government theory is that even if the Ryder witness mix-up story were true, there are still many additional eyewitnesses who saw McVeigh with a man resembling the John Doe 2 sketch. And still more witnesses also saw McVeigh with several other individuals immediately before the bombing. In any criminal case — and especially in one this important, involving the "most deadly terrorist attack on U.S. soil" — the prosecution normally desires to use eyewitnesses who can establish the connection of the accused directly to the crime, and particularly to the crime scene. Prior to the McVeigh trial, the prosecution filed a list of 327 witnesses with the court. Only 141 were called. Very few were eyewitnesses, and none placed McVeigh in Oklahoma City. There were many witnesses who could have placed him there. Why were they not called?

One of the eyewitnesses never called was Mike Moroz, who worked at a tire store several blocks from the Murrah Building. Moroz picked McVeigh out of the FBI lineup, providing identification that led to McVeigh's arraignment. According to Moroz and his co-worker, Brian Marshall, McVeigh pulled the Ryder truck into the tire shop's parking lot around 8:40 a.m., about 20 minutes before the explosion. Moroz spoke briefly to McVeigh, who was driving, and also saw a passenger in the truck with McVeigh.

About five minutes later, McVeigh stopped his truck in front of the Regency Towers, one block west of the Murrah Building, and purchased two sodas and a package of cigarettes from Danny Wilkerson, who ran the Towers' convenience store. The truck was caught on the Regency surveillance tape. Wilkerson stated that a male passenger accompanied McVeigh. This remained his death-bed testimony, when he died of cancer in 1998.

Around 8:58 a.m., about five minutes before the explosion, Rodney Johnson, a paramedic, was driving in front of the Murrah Building when

he was forced to brake for two men walking from the direction of the Murrah Building to the parking lot across the street, where another witness saw McVeigh and a John Doe get into McVeigh's Mercury Marquis and hurriedly drive away. Rodney Johnson notified the FBI that night, and his description of the two suspects closely matched McVeigh and John Doe No. 2 — before the FBI sketches were made public.

Many other important eyewitnesses saw McVeigh in or near the Murrah Building with one or more John Does, including:

- Kyle Hunt, a Tulsa banker;
- Morris John Kuper, an employee of the nearby Kerr-McGee Oil Company;
- Debbie Nakanashi, a U.S. Postal Service employee;
- Dr. Paul Heath, a public affairs officer with the Veterans Administration;
- Danielle Hunt, the former operator of the Murrah Building daycare center;
- Priscilla Salyer, an employee of the U.S. Customs Service; and
- Germaine Johnson, a HUD branch chief.

Other eyewitnesses who saw Timothy McVeigh with John Does in the Junction City, Kansas area, where he stayed before driving to Oklahoma City, or who saw John Does in McVeigh's motel room, include:

- Jeff Davis, who delivered Chinese food to McVeigh's motel room;
- Hilda Sostre, a maid at the Dreamland Motel where McVeigh stayed;
- Joan Van Buren, a Subway sandwich clerk;
- Donald and Connie Hood, visitors at the Dreamland Motel; and
- Barbara Whittenberg, owner of the Santa Fe Trail Diner.

How compelling is the cumulative eyewitness testimony? According to John Douglas, the FBI's legendary criminal personality profile expert, it is *very* compelling. Mr. Douglas, the author of the nonfiction bestsellers *Mind Hunter* and *Journey Into Darkness*, is a 25-year veteran with the FBI and a consultant to law enforcement agencies nationwide. He was interviewed for the September 3, 1996 broadcast of

NBC's *Dateline* segment on the bombing investigation. Douglas stated that based upon his personality profiles of McVeigh and Nichols, as well as practical considerations involved in building and delivering the truck bomb and the compelling testimony of so many witnesses with no apparent motive for lying, he is convinced there must be other co-conspirators. According to Douglas: "I believe there has to be someone who looks like the sketch because there are too many people who have looked at the sketch and said 'that's who I saw on or about that day.'"

John Douglas suggested that "the FBI may be in trouble here. There are other people involved in this and they'd better find them. I don't know what happened precisely, but I do know the criminal personality. But when I look at Nichols and I look at McVeigh — these two people are solely and exclusively responsible for this type of crime? I doubt it." Later, in 1997, when this writer discussed the Oklahoma City bombing case with Douglas, the famed consultant and crime fighter stated that additional evidence and witnesses had made his earlier opinion even stronger. "I think the government's position, in light of all the evidence to the contrary, is absurd," he said.

Science Is Silenced

Almost before the dust had cleared from the explosion, the official government line was that the attack on the Murrah Building had involved only a truck bomb, composed of ANFO (ammonium nitrate and fuel oil) and parked on the street next to the building. From that point on, the government story on the size and composition of the bomb mutated several times to fit the official line. As the McVeigh trial was about to start, the Department of Justice issued a report by the Office of the Inspector General that particularly censured the work of Special Agent David Williams of the FBI lab explosives unit, and Williams' supervisor, Thomas Thurman. Williams, the main explosives analyst for the prosecution in this case, had grossly fudged evidence on all of the major points: the size and composition of the truck bomb; the velocity of the explosives; the type of detonator used; the containers that supposedly were used; and the presence of explosive residue on clothing and other articles belonging to Timothy McVeigh. The Inspector General's critique found that Williams' forensic report was flawed, unscientific, biased, improper, unjustified,

invalid, and appeared "to tailor the opinion to evidence associated with the defendants."

Long before this, however, many genuine experts had already concluded that it would have been physically impossible for the truck bomb alone to have accomplished the massive structural destruction of the heavy concrete, steel-reinforced columns. The evidence pointed overwhelmingly, they insisted, to the detonation of high-explosive contact charges on the columns inside the building. This stellar group of experts includes legendary physicist and defense analyst Sam Cohen, inventor of the neutron bomb; Brigadier General Benton K. Partin, former director of the Air Force Armaments Technology Laboratory; Dr. Frederick Hansen, professor of physics at the University of Oregon, former research scientist with NASA, and former head of earth and astro sciences at the General Motors Defense Research Laboratories; Dr. Ernest B. Paxson, an engineer with over 30 years' experience in civilian and defense-related projects and a published author in many professional journals; and Dr. Robert G. Breene, author, former professor of physics, and formerly a visiting scientist at the Max Planck Institute in Germany.

In addition to the authoritative assessments of these and other experts, there is the equally compelling testimony provided by eyewitnesses; official police, military, and fire department logs; and television video coverage showing that there were additional internal charges within the Murrah Building that failed to detonate and that were later removed by bomb squads. (See, "Proof of Multiple Bombs," in our issue for July 20, 1998.) This matter could have been settled with finality if an independent, technically competent analysis of the crime scene and the forensic evidence — especially from the concrete columns — had been allowed. But, incredibly, one month after the bombing, before such an evaluation could be made, the crime scene and evidence were destroyed, as the building was imploded by commercial demolition blasters. Then the massive evidence of the crime scene was hauled away and buried. This happened at the very time that heated arguments in the O.J. Simpson trial, "the trial of the century," centered on charges that the Los Angeles Police Department had failed to preserve the crime scene and other important evidence in that case. It is elementary doctrine and procedure

to preserve the crime scene and preserve evidence; why in this, of all cases, was there such a rush to destroy the evidence?

Prior Warning

On the morning of April 19, 1995, the second anniversary of the federal assault on the Branch Davidian church complex in Waco, the ATF office at the Murrah Building was all but abandoned. Had they been warned of a possible attack? Compelling evidence led many survivors to begin asking questions about this. Bruce Shaw rushed to the building immediately after the blast to try to find his wife, an employee with the Federal Credit Union. In an interview with this reporter, and in sworn affidavits, Shaw said he was informed by an ATF agent at the scene that the ATF staff had been warned on their pagers not to come in. Two paramedics at the scene, in separate incidents, also reported hearing similar statements from ATF agents. The paramedics, Katherine Mallette and Tiffany Bible, have provided sworn affidavits of their testimony.

The ATF responded immediately, claiming "malicious rumors" of prior ATF warning "are entirely false." The ATF rushed to cover the fact that only two, three, or five (depending on which account one takes) of the agency's 17 employees were in the office that morning. ATF spokesman Lester Martz presented an apocryphal tale of ATF heroism to counter the mounting concern, claiming that Agent Alex McCauley was in an elevator with a DEA agent when the bomb exploded. "The elevator dropped in a free fall from the eighth floor to the third," said Martz. "The two men were trapped in the smoke-filled elevator.... On their fourth attempt, they managed to break through the doors and escape from the elevator. The agents made their way to the stairwell and brought with them 10 or 15 people they found along the way...."

This ludicrous scenario soon proved to be a lie, and an embarrassment to the ATF. The New American interviewed Oscar Johnson, the president of Midwestern Elevator, and his technicians who were at the Murrah Building minutes after the blast. They certified that "none of the elevators fell," and that "all of the elevators' cables were intact." They presented photographs and their official reports to back up their assertions. Johnson and other elevator experts we consulted assured us that although the

elevator free fall is a staple of Hollywood action films, "it is not something that happens in real life." Moreover, as Johnson pointed out, if a free fall of five stories *had* occurred, those inside would have suffered *severe* injuries. (See "Prior Knowledge," in our issue for December 11, 1995.)

At least two undercover federal informants repeatedly warned federal authorities weeks in advance of the April 19, 1995 attack of specific plots to blow up federal buildings: Carol Howe, an ATF informant in "Elohim City," a rural enclave providing refuge to violent criminals and members of the Aryan Republican Army, the Ku Klux Klan, and Aryan Nation; and Cary Gagan, an informant for the U.S. Justice Department amongst a group of narco-terrorists operating through Mexico that included foreign nationals of Middle Eastern extraction, as well as domestic Caucasian-Americans. Both Howe and Gagan had formal, written agreements with federal authorities, and both provided substantial documentary evidence to back up their claims that they had provided ample warning to their federal superiors to have foreseen and prevented the devastating attack. (See "Undercover: The Howe Revelations" in our September 15, 1997 issue, and "Fighting for Answers in OKC" in our issue for August 4, 1997.)

Obstructing Justice

We have already mentioned the incredible destruction of the Murrah Building crime scene and the Inspector General's report on the fraudulent FBI analysis of the truck bomb. Decorated FBI scientist Dr. Frederick Whitehurst has charged that the abuses at the FBI Crime Labs are serious, conscious, and systemic. Senator Charles Grassley was far more critical than the IG report, suggesting that criminal charges against FBI agents may be in order.

Title 18 USCS 1512 provides criminal penalties for intimidation, physical force or misleading conduct directed at a witness. Other sections of the code provide additional penalties for other forms of conduct aimed at falsifying, misrepresenting, or improperly influencing a witness. Penalties would seem to be in order with regard to FBI and DOJ treatment of many OKC witnesses, including: Jeffrey Davis; Danny Wilkerson; Debbie Burdick; Jane Graham; Arlene Blanchard; Morris John Kuper; Paul Heath;

David Kochendorfer; James Miller; Kimberly Tolson; Russell Stuart Green; Lana Padilla; Barbara Whittenberg; Eldon Elliot; Vickie Beemer; and Tom Kessinger.

As important as the sins of commission in the OKC bombing case are, it may prove that the FBI's and DOJ's sins of omission are even greater. Following the Nichols trial, Kathy Wilburn made an issue of the fact that the FBI had only checked the more than 1,000 fingerprints in the case against a very small number of suspects (12), many of whom were members of the Nichols family (including two-year-old Nicole Nichols). They had, however, refused to run checks on prime suspects such as Andreas Strassmeir, Dennis Mahon, Michael Brescia, Tony and Peter Ward, Chevie and Cheyne Kehoe, Mark Thomas, and others. Wilburn said FBI Agent John Hersley told her that they would run the prints later. The Justice Department, though, has announced that there is no on-going investigation and "no evidence" of other suspects in the case.

* See www.thenewamerican.com/focus/okc for access to the text of more than 30 trail-blazing, investigative articles on the OKC bombing).

PanAm 103

CIA COVER-UP OF PAN AM 103 EXPLOSION

On December 21, 1988, Pan Am Flight 103 was destroyed by a bomb that detonated in the baggage compartment as the plane made its climb out from London passing over Lockerbie, Scotland en route to New York. A total of 270 people died including 11 residents of the Scottish town. According to investigators, the bomb was built into a Toshiba radio cassette player and packed in a brown hard-case Samsonite suitcase that was being unlawfully shipped as unaccompanied baggage. This would later prove to be questionable or planted evidence.

Unraveling this case has been very difficult due to the shadowy players involved who might have had terrorist motives. Libyan Dictator Col. Gadhafi may have been trying to avenge a US air strike against him in 1986. Iran may have been seeking to avenge the shoot-down of Iran-Air Flight 655 by the US cruiser *Vincennes* in July of 1988. Our own CIA was also deeply involved in drug operations in the Middle East (drug operations are one of the CIA's main sources of income for black operations in order to avoid budgetary explanations to Congress) as well as trading weapons with Syrian, Palestinian, Libyan, and German terrorists to assist in getting hostages released--something the US claims they never do.

The CIA's involvement in this tragedy is particularly prominent. They had regular dealings with all the terrorist nations and groups now suspected of the bombing--including Libya. In the Iran-Contra affair the CIA supplied Syrian and Palestinian terrorists with arms in exchange for drugs. Similarly, while still claiming that Libya was a terrorist nation, the CIA regularly supplied Gadhafi with weapons and explosives. When one of its cut-outs (an agent being paid through a secret third-party) was arrested for shipping explosives to Libya, the CIA used the standard procedure of simply denying he ever worked for them. I believe the quid-pro-quo with Libya was that Gadhafi agreed to keep his terrorists in check. The US government wants America reserved for domestic terrorism so it can portray the right-wing elements as radical enemies.

Just as the CIA can easily have one of their own agents arrested (when the agent gets queasy about all the illegal activities) simply by tipping off the authorities to an illegal act the CIA assigns an agent to do, they can easily frame any number of cooperating terrorist/drug dealers for acts the CIA itself pays them to perform. When the CIA has multiple operations going on and is regularly transporting drugs and weapons via civilian airliners, it is easy to finger any number of their partners involved in these transports to take the blame for the

CIA's own purposeful sabotage. This appears to be what they did in the current attempt to prosecute the two Libyans **Abdel Basset Ali al-Megrahi** and **Lamen Khalifa Fhimah**. These two men have a long history of involvement in black operations, and were most likely involved in some type of drug transshipment known to the CIA. So it was a simple matter to write them into the script of Pan Am 103 and say they shipped a bomb rather than drugs.

HERE IS THE OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT SCENARIO:

Within days of the 1988 shutdown of Iran-Air 655 in the Persian Gulf, the fundamentalist regime in Tehran gave orders to its surrogates in Syria--led by the renowned terrorist Ahmed Jibril of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP)--to plan an attack on a US airliner. Jibril's chief bomb-maker, Marwan Khrebat traveled to Germany and built five bombs into Toshiba portable cassette-radios designed to detonate at altitude, Jibril's preferred method of operations (MO). However, in October Khrebat was arrested by German security police who had been tracking his movements. Conveniently for this version, the police reportedly confiscated one of Khrebat's Toshiba radio bombs. Supposedly this is how the CIA is certain the Pan Am bomb was in a Toshiba radio. The CIA claims that Jibril then went to Col. Gadafy in the fall for help to carry out the plot--which is hardly plausible since Jibril still reportedly had other bombs made by Khrebat and other terrorist assets available to him in Europe. It is then claimed that Gadafy tasked two Libyan agents working undercover for Libyan Arab Air in Malta to assemble another Toshiba radio bomb (activated by time delay) and tag it as unaccompanied baggage to Frankfurt with a final destination of New York. One of the Libyans supposedly left a diary behind to be discovered where he mentioned his intent to tag the luggage (highly unlikely for a trained terrorist who had the expertise to build a sophisticated bomb). At Frankfurt it is alleged that Jibril's agents were able to smuggle the suitcase past Pan Am security, still unaccompanied, on the first leg of Pan AM Flight 103 to Heathrow (London) where it continued on to New York.

This was the **official version in 1991**, but it was full of holes. Since it was against regulations for such unaccompanied baggage to be allowed on Pan Am, the probability of the suitcase getting through two separate security checks was slim. Obviously they couldn't have used an altitude triggering device so it is presumed that they used a timer. Conveniently the CIA claims to know the type and manufacturer of the timer by a fragment of a circuit board found a year

after the crash in the pocket of a piece of clothing (if you can believe that). The CIA was making furtive contacts with this same Swiss timer company 8 days after the crash, so the claim tying this Swiss timer to forensic evidence found a year later is suspicious. Of course, the Swiss company sold several to the Libyans, but they also sold hundreds to others as well which have turned up in terrorist arsenals. The whole timer theory is suspect because of the difficulty in estimating where the suitcase was going to be when it went off.

Enter version #2:

Now the CIA claims that the Libyans still planned the attack and built the bomb but got Jibril to induce a Lebanese-American named **Khalid Jafaar** to check the suitcase onboard, telling him it was a heroin shipment. The young Jafaar was part of a major Syrian drug dynasty operating out of the Bekaa valley and was accustomed to such assignments. In Jafaar's mind, getting the heroin into the US was no problem since the CIA had Mafia contacts throughout the Kennedy Airport system that could divert the baggage around customs inspectors. Jafaar, according to Lester Coleman, ex-CIA/DEA whistleblower and author of *Trail of the Octopus*, was also working for the CIA. While stationed in the DEA Cyprus office, he had seen Jafaar there, so he knew he was a CIA asset. When Coleman challenged the official version in his book, he found himself under indictment for a passport violation (using an alias assigned him by the CIA) and had to flee the country. Under government persuasion, no US publisher would touch the book.

The official CIA response to Coleman's charges and its normal cover for its secret drug operations was the term, **controlled delivery**. Ostensibly, in order to catch all the participants in a giant drug ring, the CIA allows a few drug shipments on board civilian airlines in order to trace how it gets into the US. However, Coleman and others in the DEA couldn't help but notice that a much greater quantity was being allowed to go through than would be necessary for a sting operation. In addition many military pilots and ground operations personnel have discovered large quantities of drugs moving even on military cargo aircraft--which certainly couldn't have qualified as controlled delivery or a sting operation.

In any case, one German baggage handler claims the CIA told them to let it through without checking. The CIA has admitted to this specific practice before, but claim they didn't have any such operations in December of 1988 (plausible deniability at work). This is false. There is other testimony that on 21 December the CIA sent two brown "Samsonite" suitcases from Berlin via

Frankfurt to Seattle in a drug operation called "Korea". One of these suitcases was subsequently discovered in Lockerbie, the other one did arrive in Seattle on a different flight. Is it only coincidence that the CIA uses the same kind of brown Samsonite suitcases that terrorist bombers use?

Even more ominous are the stories coming from Scottish police and investigators claiming they were prohibited from going through the wreckage in Lockerbie for two days while CIA and FBI plainclothes agents feverishly searched through and hauled off numerous pieces of baggage. They were then threatened if they revealed anything about the US interference. So, some big questions remain: what was the CIA trying to recover that was so sensitive? and did the CIA know it was heroin or a bomb when it gave instructions to let the suitcase pass in Frankfurt? Heroin was also found among the wreckage, so obviously both drugs and a bomb were on the plane.

DID THE US GOVERNMENT KNOW THE PLANE WAS DOOMED?

As in the OKC bombing case, there is evidence here that certain government personnel were warned in advance to cancel reservations on Pan Am 103. At least two warnings about a bomb on a US airliner came through the FAA and various agencies in Germany. Here is a partial list of US and South African officials who suddenly backed out of flight 103 to New York: **John McCarty**, US ambassador; **Steve Green**, assistant administrator, office of intelligence DEA; **Oliver Revell**, son of Buck Revell, FBI-head investigation for the Lockerbie case; **John McCarty**, US ambassador to Cyprus; **Pik Botha**, the former South African foreign minister (who sold out SA to the globalists); and Botha's entire delegation of 22 persons, including **General Mallon**, Defense Minister, and **General Van Tonda**, head of the South African Secret Service (BOSS).

Enter scenario #3:

Strangely, one group of the CIA's own, a Middle East team who had knowledge of CIA illegal drug and weapons operations, was not warned. CIA agents **Charles McKee**, **Matthew Kevin Gannon**, **Daniel Emmet O'Connor** and **Ronald Albert Lariviere** died in the explosion of Flight PA-103. At least one source from within the government has claimed that McKee and his team had complained about CIA weapons shipments to Syrian terrorists as well as about the large quantities of drugs the CIA was facilitating for shipment to the US. Higher-ups in the CIA had allegedly tried to stonewall their demands for answers (as has been the case in several other documented cases

involving drug operations in the military and the DEA). In frustration they were flying home on their own accord, against orders, to present evidence to Congress. It is my opinion that the CIA likely considered them a substantial threat, and chose to eliminate them before they could reach the US.

If true, this is a story that will never see the light of day in the mainstream press. Due to space considerations in this brief I have left out myriad details relative to the so-called forensic evidence against the two Libyan patsies. There are books full of troubling data on this issue, pointing out the CIA's fantastic claims (e.g. clothing inside the bomb suitcase miraculously surviving the blast so that it can be traced to a single shop in Malta). The conclusions I have drawn are my own. It's relatively easy to come to other conclusions due to the CIA's entanglement in drugs and all the main suspects, including terrorists. But I have learned over long experience that *the story the government tries to suppress the most is usually closer to the truth*. Other bits and pieces will undoubtedly leak out from time to time, but my basic suspicion that the CIA was silencing a group of its own whistleblowers probably won't change. Of one thing I am certain. The dark side of the US government is so deeply involved in illicit activities and is so intent on keeping them secret that they will stoop to almost any means to suppress the truth.

LOCKERBIE CLOSURE OR COVER-UP?

The Scottish court did the bidding of the US and found one of the two Libyan agents guilty in the bombing attack that brought down PanAm Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland. Like all other cover-ups involving dark-side CIA crimes, guilt was diverted away from the real culprits and transferred to a token patsy. The court refused to hear any of the evidence of CIA involvement with drug shipments and terrorists in the Middle East, or how commercial airliners, in knowing collusion with the CIA were used for transshipment of dangerous materials and illegal drugs. Nor did the court allow attorneys to question US government officials about why CIA agents took complete control of the crash site on the first day and removed numerous articles of baggage and whisked them out of the country before Scottish police were allowed to investigate. The US was, in my opinion, trying to cover up their purposeful sabotage of this civilian flight, which happened to be carrying an entire CIA team coming home from the Middle East, in direct rebellion against CIA orders, with the intent to testify to Congress about secret US government

involvement in drug and arms trafficking with terrorist organizations. Review my Sept. 8, 2000 brief for more details on this issue.

RFK

This is the official version of the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy, as put forward by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and the LA District Attorney's office (LADA).

c

On 5th June 1968, 12.15am, Senator Robert F. Kennedy was making his way from the ballroom at the Ambassador Hotel, Los Angeles, to give a press conference, after winning the California Primary. The prearranged route went through a food service pantry. While making his way through this area, a Palastinian Arab, Sirhan Sirhan, stepped forward and fired a .22 revolver at the Senator. Although Sirhan was quickly subdued, Kennedy and five others were wounded, although only Kennedy was fatally wounded. Sirhan was arrested at the scene, charged and convicted of first degree murder. He was to have been executed, but the U.S. Supreme Court voided the constitutionality of the death sentence before the sentence could be carried out. Sirhan has been incarcerated at Corcoran State Prison, California, since then. Under Californian law, he should have been automatically scheduled for release in 1984, but this was not the case.

The Complications

The problem with this scenario is that the physical evidence and eyewitness reports would seem to show that Sirhan was incapable of inflicting the wounds attributed to him.

The autopsy carried out by Coroner Thomas Noguchi showed that Senator Kennedy had been shot three times. One shot entered the head behind the right ear, a second shot near the right armpit and a third roughly one and a half inches below the second. All shots entered the body at a sharply upward angle, moving slightly right to left. These shots are incompatible with eyewitness reports of the shooting. Sirhan had no access to the Senator's rear, and Kennedy never turned more than sideways to Sirhan. In addition, Sirhan fired with his arm parallel to the floor, i.e. straight ahead. Maitre d' Karl Uecker, who had been leading Kennedy forward by the right hand at the time the shooting started, grappled Sirhan after his second shot and pushed the gun away. All these points, as well as the fact that the gun was one and a half to six feet from Kennedy, prove that Sirhan could not have inflicted the fatal wounds to the Senator.

Sirhan's .22 revolver contained eight bullets and he had no chance to reload. This caused a problem for the official version of the assassination as all bullets had been accounted for, except for one which was lost in the ceiling space. Reports indicated that a wooden door jamb contained two bullets. This frame and as many as five or six ceiling tiles were removed from the crime scene for tests. Photographs of the crime scene show at least this many tiles missing and more besides. Los Angeles Police Department criminologist DeWayne Wolfer was quoted as saying "it's unbelievable how many holes there are in the kitchen ceiling." This suggests that LAPD found more bullets (or traces of bullets) than could be accounted for by Sirhan's eight shot revolver, at least seven and probably more.

As well as the problems noted above, there are the reports of suspicious people in the area at the time of the assassination. The first policeman on the scene, Sergeant Paul Schraga, was approached by a couple who told him that they had encountered a young man and woman fleeing the Ambassador Hotel shouting "We shot him! We shot him." When

asked who they had shot, the young woman joyously replied, "Senator Kennedy." Schraga sent out an All Points Bulletin on the two suspects. This was the start of the "Polka-dot Dress Girl" controversy. In one of the most intuitive pieces of police deduction since the JFK assassination, LAPD declared that Sirhan was the sole assassin within minutes of the crime. Schraga was asked to cancel his APB, and when he refused, it was canceled by his superiors.

The couple's story was explained by the LAPD as a case of mishearing, stating that the young woman must have said "They shot him!" However, a young woman sitting on a staircase outside the Ambassador Hotel, Sandra Serrano, corroborated the couple's story.

Two witnesses in the pantry also saw armed men, aside from Sirhan and security guard Thane Eugene Cesar. Lisa Urso noticed a blond haired man in a grey suit putting a gun into a holster. A second, unnamed, witness saw a tall, dark-haired man, wearing a black suit, fire two shots and run out of the pantry.

The Cover-up

In 1968 it was not a federal offence to murder a presidential candidate. The case, therefore, came under LAPD jurisdiction. The investigation was based on the wish of Police Chief Ed Davis that it would not be "another Dallas." Whether this meant an intense, professional investigation or a tighter cover-up is debatable.

As the case was the responsibility of the LAPD, there was no pressure to release their findings, the "Summary Report". Researchers into the RFK Assassination finally forced the Report and the LAPD's files to be released, in 1988. Compare this to 1964 for the Warren Commission Report (the year after JFK's assassination) and it becomes obvious why the official version of the assassination has been unchallenged, despite the obvious complications.

After the release of the files, it became clear to what extent the cover-up had been carried out. Evidence which contradicted the official version

was destroyed. The more extreme acts of destruction included: 2,400 photographs burned because they were "duplicates." In fact, there were no lists precise enough to show that all the photos destroyed were indeed duplicates.

Ceiling tiles and the door frame from the pantry destroyed, because, according to then Assistant Chief Daryl Gates, they wouldn't fit into card files.

In addition, LAPD records showed that they had recorded 3,470 interviews during the course of the investigation. Only 301 interviews were released. Examination by researchers showed that for 51 key "conspiracy" witnesses, there were no interviews.

The LAPD were not alone in conducting this cover-up. The Los Angeles District Attorney's Office was also involved. The scope of this involvement was seen in the files released to researchers in 1985, due mainly to the inclusion of a box of tapes, videos and documents sent from the LADA branch at Van Nuys. This box contained evidence which went against the official version. The most graphic examples were the video reconstructions from 1968 and 1977, which prove that Sirhan could not have inflicted the wounds on Senator Kennedy. However, by using selected stills from the reconstructions, the official version was supported.

The coverup of the RFK assassination has been maintained because the facts are simply not known. Whereas the Warren Commission report was released the year following the JFK assassination, LAPD's "Summary Report" was not released until 1986. The files were released two years later. Both of these achievements were made despite strong LAPD/LADA resistance, for obvious reasons.

The RFK assassination was not investigated in by the House Select Committee on Assassinations because of the seemingly open and shut nature of the case. Now that the facts are known, perhaps it is time that the RFK assassination was investigated. While the JFK assassination has reached the point where the answer is "Oswald might have done it or he might not have", there is no possible way that Sirhan could have inflicted the wounds on Senator Kennedy. All that is required is the official investigation.

BOOK RECOMMENDATION: Melanson, Philip H. The Robert F. Kennedy Assassination: New Revelations on the Conspiracy and Cover-Up, 1968-1991. New York: Shapolsky Publishers, 1991. 362 pages.

There are more than thirty JFK assassination books for every book on the RFK assassination, but in some respects the implications of the latter are more alarming. Philip Melanson, a professor of political science at Southeastern Massachusetts University and director of the Robert F. Kennedy Assassination Archives, has made an outstanding contribution on this difficult subject.

The problems with the official version can be summed up in several points: 1) More bullets were recovered than could fit in Sirhan's gun; 2) Nitrite deposits and powder burns indicate that shots were fired at point-blank range, but witnesses are consistent that Sirhan's gun was never closer than two or three feet; 3) Sirhan was seen before the shooting with an associate or handler who has never been found; 4) Evidence suggests that he was in a hypnotic trance during the shooting; 5) The LAPD suppressed or destroyed evidence, and intimidated witnesses who contradicted the official line. The "robot assassin" angle in this assassination seemed incredible in 1968, but since then we have learned much more about the CIA's long history of research into mind-control. It's no longer easy to dismiss such a possibility, nor is it easy to accept it.

TWA 800

GOVERNMENT USES DISINFORMATION TO SQUASH TWA MISSILE EVIDENCE

Retired Navy Cmdr. William S. Donaldson III, head of the Associated Retired Aviation Professionals, discovered hard evidence that the FBI not only knew that a missile had been fired at TWA 800 but that they hired several scallop trawlers in the Long Island Sound area to scavenge the bottom to recover and hide the actual missile parts. One of the scallop trawler crewmen recovered the first stage of the missile rocket before the FBI arrived on board and had already thrown it back into the water. The FBI placed agents aboard each trawler with an operations manual showing pictures to show the crew what they were looking for. They swore everyone to secrecy and had instructions to use special coded cell telephone numbers to report discoveries to headquarters. Agents showed one such drawing to the trawler crewman who confirmed that he had found it and thrown it back into the sea. It is probably still down there. The hunt went on for a few days to recover it, but no one has revealed to the public if it was found again. However, Donaldson's investigation hit paydirt when it was discovered that one FBI agent on a trawler apparent left behind his secret FBI instructions, which Donaldson recovered. The found documents were posted on several sites on the Internet for all to see. They provide strong evidence that the FBI not only knew there was a missile involved but that they also knew the specific type--a US built Stinger missile from the Afghan era. These were the same missiles that the Muslims had tried to get the US to buy back or take back from them, which the Clinton Administration refused.

Donaldson's discovery blows away the FBI denial of any missile theory. Heretofore, the FBI has consistently covered up any and all evidence about missiles. They have suppressed witness statements attesting to the missile sightings as well as other specific forensic evidence. The only other hard evidence made public was the misdirected fax from a missile drone manufacturer to the FBI (received by someone whose fax number was one digit different than the FBI) confirming the serial numbers on the missile part as being of American manufacture. But now the conspirators in government have an even bigger problem to cover-up. Donaldson's finding of the FBI operations manual provides new evidence that points factually to an FBI cover-up of the truth when they denied having no evidence of missile participation in the disaster. So now comes the disinformation squad to defuse the impact of this evidence.

Donaldson's revelations came to light in late April of 1999, published on Worldnetdaily.com, the top conservative Internet news site. See the following URL for the complete 3 part story:

[http://www.worldnetdaily.com/bluesky_bresnahan/](http://www.worldnetdaily.com/bluesky_bresnahan/19990428_xex_were_missile.shtml)

19990428_xex_were_missile.shtml So in early May, the government leaks to the Washington Post that the FBI had tried to suppress an ATF report early on pointing to mechanical failure as the cause of the TWA 800 crash. The supposed reason for the FBI intransigence was, as Sen Charles Grassley said, was to prolonged its criminal investigation with fears about missile threats and terrorism that could be used to increase its budget. He claims that "The FBI didn't want to hear about anything but a missile or a bomb, because otherwise there was no FBI case,"

ANALYSIS: This is patently false and puts Grassley into the position of being a shill for government attempts to put a favorable spin on this case. The FBI had the prime role in covering up any evidence of a missile shoot down. It was the FBI that intimidated and threatened missile witnesses. It was the FBI lab that kept falsifying data and denying the evidence of explosive residue on aircraft and interior parts. This trumped up report claiming that the FBI was early on in favor of a missile theory and then came on board the establishment falsified fuel tank explosion explanation is a pure fabrication. Here's the reason: since they would have a hard time denying Donaldson's discovery of the FBI ops manual looking for Stinger parts, they can now say that it was simply part of the FBI's early-on misguided efforts to prove a missile shoot down--which the FBI is now "wise enough" to realize was mistaken! But nothing, anywhere, either at the beginning of the investigation or the end, in actions or in words, points to FBI favoring a missile theory at any time--except in this newly leaked (and perhaps newly created) memo trying to suppress the alleged ATF report. This appears very suspicious to me. In fact, it heightens my awareness of how far and to what lengths the government will lie or create new "evidence" to cover-up any honest evidence of conspiracy that is forthcoming. As long as the press continues to tip toe around these propaganda stories and avoid asking penetrating questions, the cover-up and dumbing down of the American public will continue.

Vince Foster

MORE EVIDENCE OF COVER-UP AND CONSPIRACY IN VINCE FOSTER DEATH

One thing high profile scandals such as Nixons Watergate demonstrate is that a scandal itself rarely brings down a president. Rather, it is the concerted effort by government officials to *cover up the scandal* that does. Why? Because a cover-up always involves a conspiracy of various persons in government violating, in one way or another, their sworn duty to uphold the law and prosecute illegal activity.

In like manner, government officials who engage in **dark side operations** are constantly having to cover up for their crimes. Successful cover-ups of these operations always point to a broad conspiracy at work because higher officials must join in to cover for what lower echelon henchmen did a fact that must be kept even more secret than the crime itself. The extension of such collusion across government agency boundaries is proof of systematic corruption in government, which is a whole different ballgame in terms of criminal evil than the actions of mere rogue agents. To cover up a crime that is part of systematic government corruption, the perpetrators must consistently stop or sabotage investigations in a wide range of jurisdictions around the country. This means many years of cultivating, subverting and corrupting other key law enforcement personnel, judges and prosecutors, all from different agencies.. All of this constitutes high crimes and treason as the very nature of constitutional government is subverted in the process.

The **murder of White House counsel Vince Foster** was a classic dark-side operation. Vince Foster was the man who knew too much. As a former partner with Hillary in the Rose Law Firm, he was the one person in the Clinton entourage who had comprehensive knowledge of all the personal affairs of Bill and Hillary and their secret financial dealings. He knew about all of the illegal activities in Whitewater; the lucrative no-risk stock trades made with the help of highly placed insiders; the collusion with the CIA to run drugs from Central America through Mena, Arkansas; the subversion of the Arkansas State bond markets with secret partner Jackson Stevens; and the corruption of the State Police to cover for Bills philandering.

Fosters danger to the Clintons as a potential defector was even greater since Foster reportedly set up the Clintons secret bank accounts in Switzerland with the help of criminal minds like Marc Rich (the same one who was given a last minute presidential pardon for income tax evasion). There were indications that Foster was getting cold feet and wanted out just as Congressional investigators were moving in to interrogate him. Someone above the Clintons decided he had to be eliminated to protect the first couple and the NWO system they were fronting for.

In brief, Vince Foster was shot by hit men and the body was subsequently taken to Marcy Park in Washington, DC and dumped in the bushes. An auto-loading pistol was placed in his hand to make it look like a suicide. Later, someone drove Fosters car over to the parking lot at Marcy Park to make it look like he had driven there on his own. It was a sloppy hit job. The perpetrators made lots of mistakes, which had to be covered up later on by falsified and altered government reports.

- The gun in Fosters hand was switched by some government agent to one actually owned by Foster a 1913 Colt revolver only *after* the body was discovered, *after* paramedics had noted the original weapon and *after* Marcy Park police had taken charge of the crime scene.
- The body showed no blood pooling around the body in its original position. Only when the body was moved up the hill (against standard procedures), head down, did blood begin to flow out the wound. New photographs were taken there as if it were the original crime scene.

- Paramedics saw (and photographs of the crime scene show) a neck wound. The official report suppresses these photos and makes the claim that Foster shot himself through the mouth.
- There was a witness (Patrick Knowlton) to the fact that it was NOT Fosters gray Honda that was in the parking lot at the time of the alleged suicide, but rather another different colored, older Honda.

Beyond these obvious mistakes made by the hit men themselves, there is ample evidence of official collusion to falsify the evidence and obtain a different conclusion than the original facts would allow. Among other things:

- Both paramedics were subjected to intense interrogation by the FBI, in the attempt to get them to change their story about the wound, the gun and the position of the body. One paramedic stuck with his original conclusions despite FBI attempts to shake him. The FBI succeeded in confusing the other paramedic by continually writing down his testimony in a way that distorted his original meaning.
- The FBI altered Patrick Knowltons witness statement so that the Knowltons description of the vehicle in the parking lot matched Fosters Honda. When Knowlton discovered the error, he demanded the record be corrected. The government refused and Knowlton sued in court. Plain clothes government agents began a harassment and threat campaign against Knowlton wherever he went in public. Later, Knowlton identified one of these harassing agents as an FBI agent on Ken Starrs staff at the Independent Counsels office.
- Independent Counsels Robert Fiske and Kenneth Starr falsely claimed that a quantity of blood was observed where the body was first discovered. In fact, as mentioned above, the blood only appeared after the body was moved a fact these counsels wanted suppressed.
- Fiske and Starr also allowed false testimony that a rescue worker, early on the scene, had moved Foster's head to check for a pulse. This false story was planted to help explain away certain contradictions between the statements of paramedics and Park Police (who were partially involved in the cover-up).
- Crime scene photos of the body in its original position when discovered were allowed to disappear. As in the JFK assassination cover-up, the

photos later presented as evidence were of the body after it had been moved and its position altered to mask the neck wound.

- The White House and others knew of the Foster death even before the body was discovered at Marcy Park and 911 was called.
- The Foster suicide note was forged and was planted in his office after White House officials invaded the office, searched it and removed all incriminating documents.

Starr hired liberal prosecutor **Michael Rodriguez** in October 1994 to lead the grand jury investigation into Foster's death, assuming he would be a good team player. Rodriguez testified, I was told what the result was going to be [*namely, that it would be termed a suicide*] from the get-go. When Rodriguez insisted on bringing up the facts that contradicted the suicide conclusion, his supervisor, Mark Touhey, refused to allow him to follow up on leads and to issue subpoenas and call witnesses before the committee. Rodriguez was also subjected to numerous threats from the FBI. He said, The FBI told me back off, back down. Later he was communicated with again and told to be careful where I tread.

In disgust, Mr. Rodriguez resigned from Starr's office of Independent Counsel in the spring of 1995. He attempted to tell various journalists and Congressmen how the investigation was rigged, but his efforts were met with a wall of inaction. His story was boycotted by the press. The threats by FBI agents accelerated to such an extent that he backed off and quit trying to alert the public. However, he did allow Patrick Knowlton to edit and distribute a tape recording of one of his conversations about the cover-up.

I was able to obtain a copy of the **transcript of that tape** from AIM.org, where you can listen to the whole recording. The context of the original recording is not given, but what is clear to me is that Rodriguez was under a great deal of stress at the time. His sentences are halting and interrupted with many ums, ahs, and pauses with sometimes erratic changes of thought patterns. I think this interview took place at a time when he was under intense pressure to keep silent.

What is **most significant about the Rodriguez revelations** is the following: 1) He is not a conservative, nor was he anti-Clinton, so when he addresses the issue of the evidence pointing to a government conspiracy to cover up the murder, his

credibility is high. 2) He correctly counters the prevailing popular notion that for a conspiracy to exist, or to be successful, virtually all of the players, however minor, have to be involved. Here are some relevant excerpts: [*my comments in brackets*]

[T]he whole notion of (Special Counsel Robert Fiske and Starr) doing an honest investigation is laughable The FBI conducted the first investigation along with the Park Police. The FBI reinvestigated Foster's death under Independent Counsel Fiske, then, Kenneth Starr used the very same FBI agents in his investigation The American press misled the American public by reporting that there have been several independent investigations, when, in fact, all of the investigations were done by the FBI.

Everyone makes a very big mistake when they believe a lot of people are necessary to orchestrate some results All people need to know is what their job is, not why be a good soldier, carry out the orders. . . And there are a lot of people from starting at the very night that the body was investigated, all the way down the line, there were, there were, people told to do certain things and they didn't and there and their rationale was that they were following orders, being told what to do.

Nobody, ah, and this goes for all the FBI agents they all, they don't necessarily know the big picture [*about the purpose of the cover-up*] they don't know what other people are writing in their reports. When you write a report all you have to do is make sure that it's consistent with other colleagues [*higher up*] who have made a conclusion already. All you need to do is just have a couple of people involved. you control the central figures in the investigation. We don't need all these Park Police and all these FBI agents to know the overall crime. [End of Rodriguez quote.]

WACO

NEW LIES FOR OLD--RENO SPINS THE NEW WACO REVELATIONS

Here is a summary of the latest revelations on FBI cover-up and lies concerning the Waco, Mt. Carmel compound.

There is photographic and physical evidence that the FBI fired M651 40mm explosive CS (tear gas) rounds into the compound, despite repeated denials to the contrary.

One US Army Colonel and one US Army Brigadier General, both experts in special warfare operations, were dressed in civilian clothes and flown from Washington to Waco in FBI aircraft to plan to help execute the final destruction of Waco. These procedures were clearly done to avoid discovery of Army Special Forces involvement, in violation of the legal prohibition of Army personnel being used in civilian cases.

US Army weapons, aircraft and high tech surveillance equipment were used in the attack, without Army markings, also in violation of existing law.

Newly released (by FOIA demand) Forward Looking Infra-red (FLIR) camera film taken by the FBI during the assault not only shows men emerging from a tank and firing automatic weapons into the rear of the compound (to stop anyone from escaping) but comes complete with government pilots describing the movements of the men, dressed in black, as it happens. FBI spokesman Byron Sage admitted these recordings contained tactical conversations of the FBI HRT (Hostage Rescue Team) and contained discussions of use of CS explosive shells. These tactic conversations were transmitted in real time via satellite uplink to the White House situation room.

ANALYSIS: For Janet Reno to continue to deny knowledge of this is predictable but beyond justifiable belief. The physical evidence of the use of explosive CS grenades has been in the custody of Texas Rangers for years, but prohibited from being seen by any one except by direct permission of the Justice Department

(which was never granted). For the Justice Department to demand jurisdiction over who sees the evidence, is good evidence that they knew of its damaging significance to the official story. The Rangers confirm that the Feds have always known what was in their custody. The cover-up continues today with the collusion of a local federal judge who has seized the evidence and put it under court seal. The two special forces field officers (Col. Boykin and Gen. Shoomaker) are obviously accessories to the illegal Army participation. According to a former CIA officer, Gene Cullen, as reported in The Dallas Morning News, their surreptitious travel arrangements in civilian clothes via the FBI rather than military aircraft was meant to leave no paper trail of their presence in Waco. The systematic lying and official denials from several government agencies points to some form of conspiracy. These arrangements could not have been made except through the highest official channels, since they involved illegal acts of more than one agency. As World Net Daily pointed out, the two officers have since been well rewarded for this and other services to the dark side of government. They have both been promoted rapidly in rank over their contemporaries--Col. Boykin to Lt. Gen. in command of US Army Special Ops (the dirty tricks side of Delta Force) and Shoomaker to CIC of US Special Operations Command (the boss over all Army black operations that Congress has no knowledge of). After reviewing this and other data on a television special, Ted Kopel could not resist calling for Reno's resignation. But that won't help. This conspiracy of government control goes well beyond any individual player. When Reno goes, they will simply give us a "kinder, gentler" face who will still carry out the same policies. The establishment has long learned that all they have to do is make the appearance of doing something and the public will go back to sleep. A Justice Department spokesman told CNN that Reno is looking to appoint an "outside investigator" to look into this matter. It won't help. They have any number of yes-men in the sidelines, like Ken Starr, who will spend a lot of money and make a splash, but won't ever indict the top leaders responsible. They will dismiss a few fall guys in the FBI or Justice Department (who will be quickly hired by big corporations closely connected to the PTB [powers that be], and it will be business as usual.

JOEL SKOUSEN: HISTORICAL DECEPTIONS

European Union

DANGERS OF THE NEW EU AND HOW IT AFFECTS EVERYONE

Every nation of the world can learn crucial lessons about the dangers inherent to the emerging New World Order by taking a close look at the evolution of the European Union, from a harmless commercial alliance of

independent states to a regional all-controlling government-in-the-making. Of all the attempts in recent history to consolidate nations into regional governments, preparatory to the establishment of a one world government, the European Union has been the most successful, paving the way for the eventual realization of the globalists' vision. The EU is clearly the forerunner or testing ground on how to get sovereign citizens to cede essential sovereignty in exchange for euphemistic promises of world peace and free trade. The process should be scrutinized closely. The EU's method of establishing pervasive control through carefully staged progressions, leveraging off one crisis after another, sets a pattern for how globalist leaders in Britain, the US, and other nations will attempt to coax citizens away from national sovereignty and into global interdependence.

The world is being enticed to join in this globalization movement with the tantalizing promised benefits of freer trade, cheaper prices and fewer barriers to impede cross-border exchanges of labor and products. But all of this, in my opinion, is merely bait luring nations into the growing control system that is being written into the fine print of the WTO, NAFTA, GATT, and the EU. Since nations are still somewhat free to abstain or withdraw from these regional organizations, globalist leaders have been careful to minimize the effects of the **control aspects, which are just now getting started in earnest**. Now that European nations have had a chance to taste of the (perceived) benefits of regionalization, and are committing themselves more solidly to EU membership, these control aspects will begin to attain mandatory status in the EU. A **fundamental shift in sovereignty is planned**, moving dramatically away from nationhood and toward regional government. The most dangerous provision proposed in the new constitution is that secession from the EU will no longer be an option. In short, opting out will no longer be an option. In the long-term as these mandatory regional laws and regulations evolve; given the current declining trend in world economies, I think we will see a diminution of free trade and an increase in calls for higher benefits, taxation, and other uniformly socialist "solutions."

Currently there is significant conflict between the decrees of **the European court**, whose jurisdiction has been growing ever more expansive, and local laws within the member nations. But these intrusions

have generally only attacked one small sector at a time (government whistleblowers, anti-war protestors, or Christian broadcasters), rarely rising to inconvenience the masses all at once. This will change once a new European Presidency and Foreign Minister is installed, as per proposals currently on the table. The conflict in jurisdiction between the new powers of the EU elected leadership, which are more than symbolic, and the powers of the member nations themselves will, I predict, lead to a call for more legislative control at the EU level--something heretofore resisted. Notice how an increase in power on one side of the EU ledger generates, in reaction, a demand for a counter force of power *on a different side of the same EU system*--but rarely at the nation-state level where sovereignty should reside.

Background on the transition from Common Market to European Union. Just as its name suggests, the Common Market began as a modest alliance of completely sovereign and independent nations whose first task was to try to harmonize their various and different economic regulatory barriers (tariffs, taxation, subsidies, regulations, and immigration) in order to facilitate trade. Frankly, harmonization through voluntary means never worked out in practice. There were too many special interests within the socialist economies to which every politician was beholden to. These politicians knew they could never get reelected by promising to take away benefits or relinquish a protected status, if such benefits protected a special interest group of any size. This is why socialism, in a raw democracy, never diminishes significantly or votes itself out of existence. It merely sags deeper into the morass of inefficiency until politicians, faced with the inevitable economic crisis, are forced to loosen some of the burdens on the productive class, so that these semi-free capitalists can continue to be harnessed for the "benefit of society."

The highly innovative and industrialized north countries of Europe got a real boost after WWII with the destruction of their former socialist governments and a healthy (albeit temporary) dose of less-regulated capitalism encouraged by the presence of the Americans and Marshall Plan guidelines. But it was not to last. Just as the economic miracle was beginning to take off in the 1950s, socialism began to reemerge, with voters demanding an increasing share of the benefits via redistribution

schemes. Over the next several decades, the northern European countries experienced a rise in GNP, innovation and industrial might, along with a steady increase in protectionist measures. They have created a host of complex **subsidy schemes** to protect inefficient, heavily unionized labor and costly (but high quality) local products as their economies have outpaced the more slowly growing economies of southern Europe.

Spain, Italy, and Turkey, the "poor southern cousins" of Europe, fostered a form of competition (itself a semi-socialist mix, but with a cheaper labor component) which, in the eyes of some in the north, threatened their coveted protected status as primary suppliers of higher-priced local products. As with labor unions worldwide, whose members always view cheaper non-union workers as the enemy, so it was with subsidized local producers throughout the European Common Market. The consuming public of northern Europe wanted to enjoy the cheaper products of southern Europe, but their fellow subsidized producers were resistant to competition and applied political pressure to legislators to maintain protective barriers. This problem was never successfully addressed, despite occasional strikes, riots and other social protests against freer trade, until the decision making process got further removed from local and national leaders.

This is where Common Market leaders were able to instigate **beneficial changes in the economy** of Europe and at the same time strengthen their own position of authority over the individual nations. The failures of harmonization were finally overcome step by step by gradual deregulation--enacted not by local politicians, who could never have survived at the polls, but rather by unnamed distant bureaucrats in Brussels, the headquarters of the Common Market. Being removed several stages from the direct vote of the people, European leaders in Brussels could issue rules which locally affected people would feel relatively powerless to fight. One step at a time, the Common Market began to knock down regulatory barriers (actually, a good thing) aimed at various trade imbalances (causing some economic pains in the corresponding protected sectors), which would then exacerbate, in turn, different but related imbalances. This would then lead to a subsequent round of deregulation, and so forth.

Over time, the resulting economic dislocation engendered both a **backlash against a European union** among protectionists, and an increased desire on the part of pro-unification politicians in each nation to somehow gain more control over the regulatory process. The more individual nations felt threatened by the larger powers, and the more they attempted to forge coalitions and alliances to increase their collective share of power within the union, the deeper they were pulled into the emerging EU system. In effect, the (mostly futile) attempts of each nation to gain some measure of control over the regulation process only lent more credibility to the regulatory union itself. A few nations (Austria and Denmark) tried to opt out at various times, but the Common Market leaders knew how to penalize them in trade so as to induce them back to the table. England is one of the few nations today that is not yet fully integrated due to its wise decision to hold onto the British Pound Sterling--something Tony Blair is determined to undermine.

An early obstacle to unification that globalists in Europe needed to address was the **cultural identity** that each country retained with respect to the other European nations. One of the earliest effective steps at breaching each nation's cultural homogeneity was to introduce small numbers of **foreign workers** into the industrialized north. These foreigners brought competition to the protected local labor markets, providing an initial benefit of cheaper labor, increased productivity, and lower prices to the host nations. But there was also a downside. The burgeoning social welfare state in prosperous northern Europe served as a magnet to workers from Turkey, Spain and elsewhere--especially after the fall of the Iron Curtain--and the initial inflow of foreigners soon became a flood due to purposefully lax immigration controls. The long-term price was a heavy one--not only in terms of indigenous job loss and increased infrastructure costs (housing, schools, roads), but in terms of the strained the cultural and political homogeneity of the host country.

Naturally all of this has led to a greater polarization of the European society, and interestingly enough, greater political power to the forces of globalism. How, you may ask? The working foreign poor teamed up with their sympathetic allies on the far left and began to look to the newly empowered EU to give them the political edge they couldn't otherwise achieve against the mixed socialist center-right parties in Germany and

France. Thus, the **next level of authority in any unresolved conflict is the natural benefactor in any appeals process in regulatory law.** In fact, for those that track conspiracy, these higher globalist leaders have been known to help foment crises that rebound power back to themselves. Not only do they accrue more political power, but when their edicts are disregarded, they have more justification to call for increased enforcement power. That's partly what the EU's plans for a small non-NATO rapid reaction force are all about.

Military pacts, like NATO, have brought their own brand of consolidation impetus to Europe. For the first 50 years of NATO, everyone was trying to see who could contribute the least in money and troops, letting the USA shoulder the largest share of the burden. Naturally, the US wanted to call the shots, which ultimately led to increased resentment toward American hegemony in Europe. This resentment has come to a peak recently due to the Iraq war, where Europe has made a quantum leap forward in its resolve to stand up to the US on foreign policy issues. President Bush's trip to the G8 meeting in Europe this past week was partly intended to rebuild relationships with Europe, but it will only be cosmetic in my opinion. I think the **rift is now permanent.** Europe doesn't trust the US anymore to be an honest partner. They all know the US wants to run the whole show. Again, this has driven Europe to lessen emphasis on internecine rivalries and concentrate on presenting a more solid front against the US. All of this has resulted in less resistance to the upcoming changes in EU power, as proposed in this latest draft of the coming constitution, which offer less sovereignty to individual nations but more power to confront the US jointly. This same thinking is affecting the expansion of NATO, where smaller nations are voting for the inclusion of Eastern bloc nations to counter the traditional Big 4 (US, Britain, France, and Germany). In turn, the expanding membership in NATO to include countries like Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary provides a perfectly natural transition into EU monetary and political union.

There is some outright manipulation of this whole process. The unionization of Europe has not proceeded simply out of mutual national interests. The failure of voluntary harmonization was merely the sticking point that instigated the call for radical solutions. The real planning and drive for unionization came from the core cadre of European globalist

leaders who had an agenda far beyond the advancement of socialism. If they had only been Fabians or Marxists like the majority of other politicians in Europe, they would have been more interested in protecting their home turf with subsidies and high labor rates. The fact that this clique was the driving force for **breaking down the barriers of socialist protectionism**, in opposition to the majority will of most benefit-corrupted voters, indicates they had an alternative agenda beyond socialism itself. In other words, socialism was one of many tools to be used--not an end in and of itself with them. It is the realization of this distinction, however tardy, that has finally turned the radical left against globalism. The far left realizes that the globalist leaders are not really as committed to socialism as they are to an elitist form of control that mixes both the benefits of partially free markets with the voter corrupting potential of the limited welfare state. Libertarians and conservatives should not relax because the left is out there demonstrating against the global NWO. Their solution is not liberty, but their own version of control.

Conservatives in both the US and Britain need to wake up and realize that they have the most to lose in this battle and that conservative leaders who continue to promote globalism are not doing so in their best interest. There is nothing wrong with globalist cooperation and alliances as long as such alliances maintain the rigid sovereign status of the individual states, a characteristic which was the original genius of the US constitutional model. The states within the US have long since relinquished most of their sovereignty to federal control, but still, America's tradition of liberty makes it a potential enemy of globalist control. Naturally, US globalist leaders know this and work hard to make sure Americans are *as isolated as possible from the inconveniences of globalism so as to keep them passive*.

In short, with each crisis of resistance to the barriers of partially free trade, the globalists in the EU have sought to expand the power of the EU as the solution. The 1992 **Maastricht Treaty** was another major advancement in the attack on European national sovereignty. With the implementation of a single European currency, member nations ceded away the power to regulate their own currency--one of the key pillars supporting the inefficient but politically appealing welfare state. All EU nations were Keynesian in orientation, essentially holding to the theory

that they could spend their way to prosperity, and they financed their spending levels by creating budget deficits and debasing local currencies as opposed to raising taxes--which were already very high. Naturally, some European states were much more profligate at the spending and inflation game than others. To accomplish the formidable task of unifying the currencies, the EU spent the next decade in chipping away at some of the most pernicious imbalances in the European economy: differences in rates of inflation, and differences in deficit spending levels between member countries.

The Maastricht Treaty, of necessity, placed **strict criteria** upon each nation's rate of inflation and public spending, as a percentage of GNP, in order to ease the transition to a single currency. These criteria did bring a lot of financial discipline to Europe, but in the end every nation had to fudge their economic statistics in order to qualify for monetary union. The leaders in Belgium were only too willing to look the other way, desiring as they did that no nation be excluded if possible. It was interesting to watch this process during the final months of the transition. There was a flood of cash buying across borders as people sought to spend their hidden hoards of cash before it became worthless.

I am not a believer in fiat currency, and thus do not sympathize with the complaints of the various EU countries when it finally distilled upon them what they had lost in monetary union. Suddenly, they had lost the means of direct currency creation to hide government expenses from their taxpaying citizens. With the EU now setting the rate of monetary expansion, each nation has been forced into the same policy mold. Now EU states are left only with the options of either direct borrowing from central or international banks or tax increases. The latter is politically unfeasible now that EU member countries have incorporated, on top of previous taxation levels, a **Value Added Tax (VAT)** currently taxing most purchases at a rate of between 17% and 22%. This is an example of how a flat tax grows to become a monster--with precious few ways to avoid it.

Besides monetary policy, there are several other legs upon which sovereignty stands: **foreign policy, legislative and executive powers, judicial authority, and police power**. With the new EU constitution coming to a vote this month, the EU is attempting to make yet another

step towards full political union with the election of a real European President. The proposal provides for a term of 2 ½ years, as opposed to the current system of short-term rotating 6-month presidencies that have only ceremonial significance. There is already an EU Parliament, but it has a limited role since many of its decisions are not binding. The formation of a viable executive branch of government will be the last hurdle to leap in the EU's quest for mandatory powers.

The current constitutional proposal continues to give lip service to individual member states' powers, but the fine print says otherwise: Where member nations' law, policies or interests conflict with the Union, **EU law will have "primacy over the law of member states."** "They are most alarmed," as **Ambrose Evans-Pritchard** stated, "by the concept of shared competence put forward in the text, an innocuous sounding term that would prohibit member states from legislating in everything from public health to social policy, transport, justice and economic management unless Brussels waived its powers first." The EU already controls a common fiscal policy. Now it will be given the power to define and implement a common foreign and security policy and eventually a defense policy. Even if the UK does not join the EU in accepting the Euro, its freedom to set its own economic policy will diminish step by step under its duty to harmonize its interests with the "Objectives of the Union," which, more and more will dictate all European policy. Naturally, the European Court's powers will continue to grow as each conflict is adjudicated.

The new president (chairman of the EU Council) will be picked by the sitting national leaders in a majority vote. The candidate must be a current or past Prime Minister or president, thus, limiting the field to establishment politicians. **Front runners for the future presidency** are Spain's **Jose Maria Aznar**, Britain's **Tony Blair** and Germany's **Joschka Fischer**. Aznar and Blair have the disadvantage of having backed the American war in Iraq, with all its tenuous and unpopular rationalizations. However, since the EU desperately wants to bring a reluctant Britain into full EU participation (currently outside the monetary union), putting Tony Blair on the throne may be just the ticket to allowing him another six years to propagandize his people into the benefits of giving up the time-honored British Pound. Then again, if the

US doesn't finally manufacture some evidence of Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq, Blair may become the laughing stock of all England. Both Aznar and Blair are nearing the ends of their terms and looking for something big as a follow-on. They don't want to fade into relative oblivion like Bill Clinton. Fischer, the current German Foreign Minister, is a Marxist, and so will be the favorite of the far left, which controls much of the EU. One obstacle to his election is the growing fear of German dominance by the smaller EU nations. They will most likely vote for Denmark's **Anders Rasmussen**, the Dutch Labor politician **Wim Kok**, or former Belgium PM **Jean-Luc Dehaene**.

The EU Charter of Human Rights While not currently part of the draft of the new Constitution, there is widespread support among EU globalists for simply blending this charter into the Constitution seamlessly as a "bill of rights." The Charter has all the euphemistic catch words like *respect* and *dignity*, but a careful reading demonstrates that it is full of ambiguous and imprecise pronouncements, allowing for a host of dangerous interpretations, as well as statements directly contradictory to each other, and hence legally impossible to adjudicate. Here are a few examples:

From the *Preamble*: "[The Charter] is based on the principles of **democracy and the rule of law**." Actually, raw democracy is the unfettered will of the majority and is in opposition to the rule of law-which in its finest incarnation (US Constitution, as originally conceived) places absolute restrictions on the will of the majority so that government's powers are restricted to the defense of fundamental rights, as opposed to the distribution of direct benefits.

Preamble, again: "the principle of **subsidiarity**: Enjoyment of these rights entails responsibilities and duties with regard to other persons, to the human community and to future generations." Weeding through the jargon, this means that fundamental rights are not absolute, but are

subservient to the whims of the community or the "public good." The EU Charter can make all kinds of pronouncements that "no one shall be subjected to involuntary servitude," but that is exactly what this means. If one's rights are subject to duties and responsibilities imposed by the majority via democracy, there is no actual limit to such subservience. One can justify all kinds of involuntary service to the community with this doctrine. (See the section on Law and Government at my website, www.joelskousen.com for a workable definition of fundamental rights and a full exposition of what it takes to defend those rights.)

Article 1: "**Human dignity** is inviolable. It must be respected and protected." Dignity is one of those words that are almost impossible to define. This statement leaves everyone open to the threat of legal action for supposed violations of someone's dignity.

Article 2: "Everyone has the right to life. No one shall be condemned to the **death penalty**, or executed." Without a serious death penalty provision, the right to life of all potential victims of crime is put at risk.

Article 3: "Everyone has the right to **respect for his or her physical and mental integrity**." Once again, "integrity" is so difficult to define as to lead to interminable legal challenges. The second part guarantees "free and informed consent" for all medical procedures, but there are a host of exceptions to this provision, such as forced incarceration due to mental incapacity. Once again, the rights of the individual are subordinated to the rights of the community.

Article 4: "No one shall be subjected to torture or to inhuman or **degrading treatment or punishment.**" Torture can be defined with some effort, but "inhuman or degrading treatment" as applied to punishment for crimes is another imprecise wild card. All punishment is degrading to some extent. Are we to be left with nothing but country club prisons?

Articles 7, 8: "Everyone has the right **to respect for his or her private** and family life, home and **communications and data.**" Besides the terribly imprecise key word, "respect," the fine print in point #3 of this article says: "Compliance with these rules shall be subject to control by an independent authority," who, I am sure, will be appointed by the government. Government-appointed authorities are never "independent" because they are predictable yes-men to the system--or they wouldn't have been selected in the first place.

Article 9: "The right to marry and the **right to found a family** shall be guaranteed in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of these rights." This looks like a statement of an unconditional right, but in fact, it is tied with the applicable restrictions in law--to be decided and/or changed in the future. Rights subject to constant amendment are not guaranteed in any sense of the word. The EU definition of family includes homosexual unions.

Article 10: "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right includes freedom to change religion or belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or in private, to manifest religion or

belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance." Of course the EU isn't anxious to recognize that this pronouncement is in clear contradiction to the EU laws prohibiting any person from expressing religious beliefs critical of others, such as homosexuals or adulterers. Once again, the Charter makes the following qualification: "the right to conscientious objection is recognized, in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of this right," meaning, restricting what is recognized as a conscientious objector to war. These are not rights, if one has to read the fine print before exercising them.

Most nations already have **constitutions full of sloppy language** that easily allows for the degradation of individual and family rights for "public purposes." Those who live with written or unwritten constitutions that more clearly address civil liberties and fundamental rights (almost exclusively limited to the British/American traditions of common law) should be very concerned about the ease in which Europe is sinking into the quagmire of politically correct law, with only a fig leaf of protection against the total loss of liberty. Even if you don't believe there are forces conspiring to undermine the British and American legal traditions of liberty, you should be unwilling to join in a NWO based upon such flimsy documents masquerading as a constitution and Bill of Rights.

Fall of Communism

MORE CRUCIAL EVIDENCE THAT THE "FALL OF COMMUNISM" WAS A DECEPTION

Once in a while a rare source comes forth that adds significant confirmation to my contention that the "fall of Communism" was a carefully crafted deception. This is one of those opportunities to see the truth. Pieces of the puzzle have surfaced in Romania, Bulgaria and Poland (where even the famed **Solidarity** opposition movement under Lech Walesa was found to be controlled by the Communists). However, the following interview of Petr Cibulka, conducted by Czech expatriate **Jan Malina**, blows open the façade of deception in Czechoslovakia. I am indebted to **Jeff Nyquist** for publishing this interview on the web. The original transcript can be found at http://www.jrnyquist.com/petr_cibulka_2003_0310.htm.

Petr Cibulka is a Czech journalist and dissident (imprisoned five times so far) who publishes the newspaper **Uncensored News** specifically to counter the official information blackout about continued Communist control in Czechoslovakia. In 1992 Cibulka acquired and published data from secret police files revealing the names of over 160,000 Communist officers and collaborators still in government positions, and demanded their removal from government and prosecution for crimes against human rights. Subsequently he became a target of aggressive attacks from "former" Communist officials in the Czech government under the leadership of the internationally acclaimed and presumed dissident leader Vaclav Havel. My comments in the following interview excerpt are included in *[brackets]*.

Cibulka: "After the so-called Velvet Revolution, the revolution that supposedly overthrew communism in November 1989, I asked many times for justice and the punishment of the communist cadres in power at that time. That would have meant a recall from power for all communists and a true public trial for their crimes against innocent people.

"I was unpleasantly surprised when I discovered that **Vaclav Havel** and **Civic Forum** [*Havel's political organization*] were against my efforts. That was a real shock to me, and I refused to go along with it. I organized massive protests against the leadership of the country's

second largest city (Brno) where I lived at the time. After that I found that Civic Forum stands even more against me and against those who were fighting the communist dictatorship. Civic Forum became a great protector of the communist criminals and cadres that remained in power. I also realized, very quickly, that the censorship applied to dissidents remained strong. Therefore we put together the *Uncensored News* publication.

JM: "How long have you been a journalist and can you tell us something about the STB [secret police] files you've published?"

Cibulka: "Since the fall of 1990 we tried to publish *Uncensored News* under the auspices of the anti-communist wing of Civic Forum, but that was totally dismantled, liquidated and defeated by the Havel regime. But shortly after that I was contacted by some people from Prague who invited me to begin publishing a true conservative newspaper. We all agreed on working together and in the spring of 1991 we published the first issue of *Uncensored News* in about 70,000 copies. Our newspaper was then published bi-weekly and later as a weekly issue. Unfortunately for Vaclav Havel's regime this newspaper was too true and uncensored and was informing people too thoroughly about conditions in the Czech Republic. Our paper debunked many lies widely believed about the November revolution [of 1989] and the fact it was not an anti-communist revolution at all. It was a privatization coup organized by the reform wing of the Russian KGB. It was accomplished in order to install the self-invited new administration, turning them into the country's rulers and lawful owners. And that was achieved in full measure by the communists, the STB and KGB structures under the leadership of Vaclav Havel. As a result there was a fraudulent privatization of state wealth that in fact ended up in the hands of communist and STB/KGB structures only.

This was shown fully and accurately in 1992 when, by blind luck, *Uncensored News* acquired and published the names of 160,000 officers and collaborators of the communist secret police, STB, and its Second Department (the department charged with the struggle against interior enemies). For the first time the people had a chance

to read the truth about the level of infiltration and the level of control of this society by communist and STB powers and structures.

JM: "How much interest was there from the government and also from the public to publish the communist dossiers? Were there any obstacles put up by the state to block publication?"

Cibulka: "The public was, from the first day, insisting on a full disclosure and publication of all communist secrets (including those of the Soviet occupation government). Unfortunately, all the people in power, and that means President Havel, and all the others (Vaclav Klaus, Milos Zeman, Dienstbier, Pithart and others) were very strongly against it, against any publishing, against any openings of communist archives, against any punishment of communist criminals to whom they had guaranteed immunity! [*The same thing happened in Germany after the fall of the Berlin Wall.*] In fact, punishment was blocked by this revolutionary bunch through a law rubberstamped by the Czechoslovak Parliament - a law that in fact guaranteed legal continuity with the previous communist regime. So today it is impossible to bring the communist criminals to justice.

JM: "How do you view President Vaclav Havel and his role in the so-called Velvet Revolution?"

Cibulka: "Havel's family used to be one of the richest families in Prague. They worked very hard and reliably for the Gestapo in World War Two. In 1945, after the defeat of Nazi Germany, Havel's family was not charged with collaborating with the Nazis. Almost immediately, it is believed, they began cooperating with Soviet military intelligence and also the KGB and therefore were protected by the communists. Vaclav Havel himself signed up with the communist STB and was regarded as a totally reliable cadre. To this day the Communist Party and the secret police do not regret their decision to recruit Vaclav Havel.

JM: "Can we say that the speech President Havel gave in the early 1990s to the US Congress was a carefully prepared deception based on lies?"

Cibulka: "Of course. Vaclav Havel told them then: 'If you want to help Czechoslovakia then you must help the Soviet Union!' I think that this is again the same old communist strategy. They're realizing that Western Europe is already under their rule indirectly through communist agents of influence [*including the highest national leaders, who are under Moscow's influence via their membership in the Socialist International*] - corrupt and compromised politicians. Western Europe is not a threat to Moscow. On the contrary, Moscow has a strong position there. This is now apparent when we look at the relationship between Western Europe and the United States. At the moment there is no desire on part of most European countries to support the USA. In the spring of last year, as reported by *The Guardian* newspaper in Britain, there was a shipment of weapons that originated from the Czech Republic and ended up in Iraq. What kind of people are running the Czech military industrial complex and why did the Czech Republic, as a NATO member state, send weapons to people that are in total opposition to the United States?

"I'm convinced that the communists and their secret services, connected to Moscow, never lost any power in the Czech Republic. So admitting the Czech Republic into NATO did nothing to damage Moscow's position. Leading circles in the United States have been misled to think that Moscow was forced out of its former satellites in Central and Eastern Europe. Quite the opposite is true. Instead of NATO marching East, Moscow moved its borders very far to the West and now it has more power than ever. Of course, the Czech Republic will support the USA through declarations and with words; but the Czech government's deeds will always threaten American liberties and values. If America continues to deal with communist criminals as it has done over the last 13 years she will be overthrown and victimized for her political and economic errors. [*Here is where Cibulka shows his naivety. He fails to see that Presidents George Bush Sr., Bill Clinton and George Bush Jr. have all known about this deception and have their own globalist reasons for protecting this Communist deception. During the Clinton administration it came to light that Czechoslovakia, under Havel, had kept secret the fact that Russia still had hundreds of medium range missiles in underground tunnels in Czechoslovakia, as well as in Bulgaria. Our current president never made an issue of it and continues to promote the facade of Russian cooperation.*]

JM: "Do you think that this sale of [Czech] biological weapons to terrorists was an individual operation done by some unreliable Czech army officers or is there something more involved here?"

Cibulka: "I am absolutely certain that the Czech Republic is still being controlled and directed by the Russian KGB. There are no anti-communist heroes in power in the Czech Republic, but only KGB agents and the Czech secret communist police STB. Therefore, everything that's happening in the Czech Republic is part of their plans. I don't believe in the fiction that $\frac{1}{2}$ underpaid army officers $\frac{1}{2}$ are behind this. We are looking at a large worldwide communist organization that is systematically working to destroy the United States.

JM: "So we can safely say that, regarding weapons sales from Russia and from other countries of the $\frac{1}{2}$ former $\frac{1}{2}$ communist bloc to terrorist nations, the idea that East European military officers are uncontrollable and are selling weapons to terrorists without supervision is totally absurd?"

Cibulka: "Yes, that's exactly it! I'm saying that Russia and other post-communist countries are directed the same way as organized crime. When there's a scandal of one kind or another they all say that these are operations run by out-of-control individuals without any state involvement [*the $\frac{1}{2}$ rogue agent $\frac{1}{2}$ excuse*]. I'm saying that these countries are criminal from the beginning and their politics are nothing else but the criminal communist politics of deception. Our $\frac{1}{2}$ Uncensored News, $\frac{1}{2}$ before it was liquidated by Havel's regime, devoted a lot of time to monitoring and describing Czech $\frac{1}{2}$ organized $\frac{1}{2}$ crime and its connections to the government.

JM: "I wanted to ask about Bill Clinton. There was an article published in a Czech Daily newspaper in 1992 about Bill Clinton's possible co-operation with the Czech secret service. Can you tell us something more about that?"

Cibulka: "I've read that article myself. It was written by a former STB agent, a writer for the Czech Daily $\frac{1}{2}$ Lubor Kohout. $\frac{1}{2}$ He was able to document Bill Clinton's visit to Prague in January 1970 when he stopped

on his way from Moscow. Clinton stayed with the Kopold family. Mr. Kopold, a communist operative, used to work for the Czech Army. The Kopolds are one of the highest communist families connected with Jan Sverma, who died in WWII. This ultra-communist family was very friendly to Clinton and he felt at home with them. Clinton has written many thankful letters about his stay with this communist family in Prague during the Red Army occupation. Clinton of course was not against the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia, but quite the opposite. I'm convinced that Bill Clinton has been a communist for decades. In my judgment, his activities as United States president prove it 100 percent. [*I disagree. Bill Clinton's behavior can be better explained by his being part of the globalist conspiracy, paving the way for WWII and covering for Communist war preparations in the meantime.*]

JM: "You've told me that Europe is already under Russia's control. Is there any information that would confirm this opinion?"

Cibulka: "There's a lot of information. For example, according to analysis published by *Uncensored News* a few years ago about the Gestapo's *Operation Vampire* carried out at the end of World War Two, and also according to analysis done by French intelligence officer **Pierre de Villmarest**, the Gestapo infiltrated most of the underground anti-Nazi organizations in Europe with its best agents and gave them instructions to wait until the end of the war to join European communist parties, legislative power structures, armies, intelligence services and state apparatuses and to keep active in implementing National Socialism. This operation was according to every available information very successful; but after Germany's defeat most of the Nazi intelligence archives ended up in the hands of the Red Army. [*The communists had their names from the start.*] That means the Red Army acquired many Nazi agents that could be turned against the United States [*in Operation Paperclip the US used many Nazi agents for dark side operations as well*]. Of course, the Russians never revealed or made public any information about their agents unless these agents refused to co-operate. Only then are compromising materials published [*also by dupes in the Western press*]. Those agents who were ready and willing to work for Moscow were supported and protected by Moscow and so their children and family members are still obliged to work for Moscow today

JM: "Are the Russians still trying to install communist regimes all over the World?"

Cibulka: "Yes, that's Moscow's basic objective. The communist movement is global, it is worldwide. The communist target is to conquer the entire World. [It's more complicated than this. South Africa and Zimbabwe are prime examples of nations where Western governments knew that the opposition parties were Communist but helped bring them to power anyway - so the spread of Communism isn't just a Moscow driven operation or deception.]

JM: "I was surprised that none of the Czech newspapers published President Bush's State of the Union speech. The Czech description of Bush's message looks to me like disinformation or incompetence on the part of local journalists. Can you explain this?"

Cibulka: "The entire Czech mass media, TV, radio and newspapers are under control of the KGB's cover companies. The KGB, GRU and all the communist structures did not lose control over the information networks even during Vaclav Havel's presidency because they've known that whoever owns the information monopoly owns the power monopoly as well [as in Nazi Germany and in the US presently]. Furthermore, I think we are engaged in a fundamental fight as to which side the Czech Republic will join in the up-coming Third World War: if the Czech republic will be fighting on the United States' side or against it, on the Russian side." [End of Cibulka interview.]

Again, Cibulka views this as a struggle only between Communism and the United States. He fails to see the presence of a third, predominant force which carefully controls the US government and micromanages these deceptions. This force is the Globalists, who conspire to undermine all national sovereignty and replace it with a controlled, superficially democratic, New World Order - with exclusive powers to use force.

"NOVA" CONTINUES TO PROPAGANDIZE AMERICA ABOUT THE RUSSIAN DEMISE

A couple of years ago I reported on the program NOVA produced, entitled "The Missileers," in which NOVA journalists joined forces with naïve US Gen. Eugene Habiger to tour and film an old and decrepit Russian missile facility, supposedly demonstrating how weak Russia is and how important it is for the US to help "safeguard" Russia's nuclear arsenal with US taxpayer dollars. NOVA claimed to have gained "unprecedented access to Russia's largest missile base." It was pure propaganda, including Habiger's wistful references to the camaraderie he felt with his fellow Russian missileers. The base they toured was indeed decrepit, but it was maintained only for show and tell for the benefit of US inspectors and eager media liberals at PBS and NOVA. The disinformation involved is that the show masks the existence of Russia's top-of-the-line missile facilities (for the Topol M series ICBMs) which are anything but decrepit. Naturally, NOVA journalists and US inspectors are not allowed inside these latter facilities, although US officials have been given a superficial view of the Topol M. Russia's state of the art facilities are all underground and out of sight of US inspectors.

Now NOVA is at it again, **beating the drums about the threat of bioterrorism** and the proliferation of biological weapons from the "former Soviet Union." NOVA producer **Kirk Wolfinger** (of "*The Missileers*") also produced this new program, entitled "*Bioterror*." He used the same format, showcasing men on both sides of the war on bioterror and labeling them "bioweaponeers." Much of the information presented is true and beneficial - especially the interview with former US bioweapons expert Bill Patrick and Russian defector Dr. Kanatjan Alibekov (whose name has been changed to Ken Alibek). Alibek defected in 1992 and brought with him intimate knowledge of the Soviet Union's biological weapons program, including Russian cheating on all international treaties related to the ban of such weapons. He should know - he was deputy chief of Biopreparat, the main Soviet agency in charge of bio weapons.

"Bioterror," first aired in November of 2002, concentrates on showcasing the threat (which is real), and spotlights the decrepit condition of the older Russian facilities opened to NOVA. That's where the disinformation starts. By showcasing the old facilities, the program again gives the impression that Russia is no longer a threat. NOVA makes a big deal out

of the claim that "former" bio weapon scientists are "for sale" for practically nothing. But, this is more false than true. Russia still keeps tight control over the terrorist organizations it allows to have bioweapons. Yes, bioweapons are allowed to escape, but not via the free market.

Here's a critical review on the NOVA special from J. Adams, one of my sources. "The NOVA special included parts where Judith Miller and U.S. DOD officials were in the former Soviet Union to tour former biological weapons facilities in Kazakhstan and other such places (specifically, the Stepnogorsk plant, purportedly the largest biological weapons plant in the history of the world). As they entered the Stepnogorsk plant, they went through a rusted old gate into what appeared to be an abandoned old factory. There was one part where they visited the anti-plague institute in Kazakhstan and entered a secret room, never before seen by Western journalists, where there's a bunch of old refrigerators with signs on them, in English, [*very suspicious*] saying Plague or Anthrax and the like. They opened the Plague refrigerator and there were old pea cans and soup cans filled with vials of various strains and samples of the given pathogen. There's little sheets of old paper in the cans with listings of what's there suggesting an archaic cataloguing system where something could easily go missing unnoticed. Also notable was the flimsy security of the room that had a simple locked door and a great big window in the back.

"Next, they visited the home of the former director of the Stepnogorsk facility. The director had supposedly been relieved from his job just days before NOVA arrived and so he was seemingly drunk and singing with his dog about what will he ever do now that he has no job. NOVA took the clue and reported about concerns of how these scientists with super lethal bioweapons expertise could sell out to the highest bidder since Moscow can't afford to keep things running. They noted how Kazakhstan and Tajikistan where these facilities are located are not far from Afghanistan and the home of Moslem terrorist networks and rogue states like Iran that could take bioweapons and use them for horrible acts of bioterrorism.

"Needless to say, given my perspective on Russia's deceptive pursuits, I considered what I saw in the program classic disinformation. Why would

such flimsy security and cataloguing be used for substances that could reap such tremendous harm on the world by terrorists... including Russia that is supposedly threatened by Moslem extremists angered by the Chechen war? Why would these scientists with such dangerous know-how be left payless and desperate such that they'd go work for rogue states and terrorist groups bent on using biological weapons for terrorist purposes? What is contained in the NOVA program is nonsensical disinformation." [End of Adams quote.]

There was one interesting and candid exchange between Patrick and Alibek which speaks volumes about US claims that it knows today what is going on in Russia: Alibek, commenting on what surprised him after defecting, said, "What was amazing to me, when I came to the United States, I realized I knew practically everything about the United States program." Patrick then responded, , "Right. And we knew absolutely nothing about yours. I never will forget when you started giving me the potential production figures for your various weaponized agents. If you recall, I just put my head down on the table where we were talking and said, "Oh, my God. Oh, my God." It was a revelation that was just unbelievable to me."

Earlier in the 90s Alibek had told *Reader's Digest* about Russia's multiple violations of bioweapons treaties it signed. Naturally, these violations were never mentioned in the NOVA special. According to Alibek the threat of a Russian attack is greater today than ever. Russia has never disarmed its newest and best weaponry. If Alibek mentioned any of these things in the NOVA interview, they were edited out.

George W. Bush

THE BUSH RECORD AFTER THREE YEARS GETTING WORSE

I keep wondering why each week it becomes harder to fit even a portion of the top news stories into my weekly analysis. The sheer quantity of bad news emanating from the bowels of government and brought to light by concerned libertarians and civil liberty watchdogs has become a flood, even as traditionally watchful conservatives choose to "see no evil, and hear no evil" by the Bush administration.

There are obvious signs of outright betrayal of our laws and culture, such as the administration's latest version of **amnesty** (euphemistically called a "guest worker" program) that even the most fervent Bush apologists are having trouble explaining away. But there are also many crucial signs that this administration is working silently and stealthily behind the scenes to undercut liberty and increase the size and power of government, contrary to its "conservative" pretensions.

We would have expected a truly conservative administration, with control over both houses of Congress, to create havoc among the opposition in its efforts to undo the historic evils of entrenched bureaucracy:

replacing old **leftists at the State Department** and firing **extremist environmentalists** entrenched in the forest service, BLM and EPA;

rooting out **dark side agents** in the CIA, FBI, DEA, INS, etc., who have been hiding US involvement in drugs, and underworld criminal protection;

eliminating **Clinton cronies** as federal prosecutors in higher ups in the Justice Department; and

reigning in the IRS to stop it from using tax audits as a tool to persecute governments perceived enemies.

Have you heard any howls of protest from any of these agencies about current or past witch hunts or purging? You have not. That's because there hasn't been any purges. The Bush White House has never cleaned house. It simply added tens of neoconservative liberals in the Pentagon and West wing. Leftist sympathizers, spies, and socialist camp followers continue to prosper under this administration in all of our most sensitive branches of government.

Instead of reigning in the socialist drift of big government, this Republican administration continues to operate "government as usual," as reports from insiders attest:

The **FAA** continues to harass and block airline pilots from becoming armed, as provided by law.

The **INS** still refuses to enforce immigration laws strictly regarding Mexicans, Muslims and Indians. Only white European aliens are vigorously pursued and deported.

The **DEA** continues to allow sealed trucks to cross the border from Mexico with cargos of drugs.

The **IRS** continues to harass small tax payers while letting the big fish like Enron go scot-free. (For all the hue and cry over the Enron accounting scandal, there were no audits of Enrons 800+ offshore tax shelters.) The IRS this week issued **Revenue Ruling 2004-6** creating a broad new set of ambiguous standards which special interest groups like the principled Gun Owners of America, Conservative Caucus and others must follow or risk losing all or part of their tax-exempt status. If any alert is issued to Americans via letter or email (not just television or radio, as prohibited by **McCain Feingold** campaign finance reforms), which negatively mentions an issue or officeholder that is subject to an upcoming election (within 60 days), the alert would not meet the new IRS "balance test" and would be outlawed. The ruling is a convenient way to persecute principled organizations that publish information and viewpoints hostile to the establishment version.

The Justice Department, despite Ashcrofts verbal support of the Second Amendment, continues to allow the **BATF** to persecute legitimate and legal gun owners and dealers at gun shows for minor infractions and trumped-up charges. The feds continue to keep background records on gun purchases beyond legal limits. Neither does the DOJ press the Supreme Court to back crucial gun rights issues when they come before the court.

Russia and China continue to be given access to sensitive technology and military secrets.

Homeland Security continues to ramp up its control and surveillance of every passenger boarding a plane. The errors of Christmas day (US demanding that six Air France flights be cancelled), where the US made unsubstantiated and erroneous allegations about passengers whose names were similar to those on terror watch lists, will be amplified many times when the new **Red/Yellow/Green passenger coding system** is implemented soon. As is the case with watch lists, if your name gets in a yellow or red category, you will have no procedural rights to challenge that classification or purge your name from the blacklist. As Pastor **Chuck Baldwin** said, "Passengers would be assigned a red, yellow, or green color. A red coded passenger would be stopped from boarding; yellow would require additional screening at security checkpoints, and green would mean only standard security for boarding. The government plans to implement the new system next month. To any person familiar with the incremental methods used by totalitarian regimes to regulate and control their populations, this latest measure being enacted by President Bush can only be regarded as scary. By now, it should be obvious to every thinking person that the Bush administration is composed of a bunch of control freaks who are attempting to turn America into a police state!" Yes, but NOT because they are control freaks. A better explanation is the fact that this administration is controlled by globalists who must incrementally undermine US constitutional protections in order to merge the US into their evil New World Order the real future control system.

A week after pledging to "**cut the budget deficit** by half," President Bush unleashes another pie-in-the-sky boondoggle by announcing two new expensive space projects: a **space station** on the moon and a manned flight to Mars. Are these essential in a time of severe economic crisis and continual warfare? Bush deceitfully projects the cost of these projects to be a mere \$12 billion. Even NASA is shocked at the understatement of costs.

The White House is also proposing that the Executive Branch of government decide what and when the public would be told about any emergency. The Bush team wants final control over release of **emergency declarations** not only on terrorism (which they already have) but on public health, safety and the environment, whether that be an outbreak of mad cow disease, a terror attack, a nuclear plant accident or any other crisis. What they really want is control of the information, not simply control over the declaration of an emergency. This proposal was floated by the White House **Office of Management and Budget** in an attempt to divert attention from the President in the matter, but this is clearly another attempt to lock down America with totalitarian authority.

WHOS REALLY RUNNING THE BUSH PRESIDENCY?

Its no secret that Bush was a know-nothing playboy businessman living off papas reputation and power prior to being allowed to move up the stepping stones of public office. After being interviewed by kingmaker George Shultz in San Francisco, and having been declared "ready" to serve the establishment, he still had to be briefed for weeks on foreign and domestic policy by the likes of Kissinger, Scowcroft and Talbot before he could face the cameras - something he has rarely done without a written script. Even now, savvy analysts still consider Bush only a step above a script reader. Whenever he tries to wing it on his own, his answers are grammatically incorrect, poorly worded, confused, or simply a rehash of overworn "tough guy" phrases he memorized previously. So, whos the real power behind the throne?

A rash of articles have been emerging in the alternative media lately on the topic, all pointing to VP Dick Cheney as the real power in the Bush administration. The details are generally correct, but the conclusions about Cheneys overall role and power are wrong. He is directing the president, but hes only a middleman. Heres a sampling:

Ritt Goldstein of the Sydney Morning Herald writes, "A former Pentagon officer turned whistleblower says a group of hawks in the Bush Administration, including the Vice-President, Dick Cheney, is running a shadow foreign policy, contravening Washington's official line." **Karen Kwiatkowski**, a former air force lieutenant-colonel in the Pentagon claims, "George Bush isn't in control . . . the country's been hijacked." She describes how key areas of neoconservative concern were strategically placed throughout the White House and in government agencies. She ought to know. She worked under one of Cheneys boys, Undersecretary of Defense for Policy **Douglas Feith**. However, Kwiatkowski is wrong about the presidency being "hijacked." Bush is a knowing, but lower level participant.

Another significant article describing how Cheneys boys control the other key posts in the administration was written by **Jim Lobe**, a journalist for *Altnet.org* and other liberal publications. In todays world we often have to rely on the Left to do the initial critical analysis of Bush administration policies. Most conservatives writers either have gone to sleep or have become inveterate yes-men to Bush.

In general, keep in mind that Lobe and other leftists believe there is a **natural tension** between liberal-leaning Sec. of State Colin Powell (including the traditionally leftist State Department), and the "right wing" neo-cons of the White House and Pentagon. They believe the "right wingers" in power run a capitalist conspiracy for greed and power, which Powell and other token liberals in government try to resist. This is not true, in reality. They do resist a little, but few of the liberals at mid-levels of government are quitting in protest. All those in high position, without exception, are participants, to one degree or another, in a conspiracy of governmental control, for globalist purposes. The degree of difference between various players is in how much of the game plan they are actually aware of. Occassionally a nave and subservient conservative is

given a top level agency to run, in order to help preserve the facade of conservatism in the Bush administration. They too know there is a powerful control system, but they think it is benevolent, with good intentions. I don't consider Attorney General Ashcroft as one of these naive conservatives. He's told too many lies to qualify as an honest man any more.

Colin Powell certainly knows he is part of a powerful control system. The system brought him up the chain of military command as Powell fulfilled his "uncle Tom" role. He was a useful minority officer who could be relied upon to cover-up for military mistakes. Bush has been the recipient of a lot of favors from the establishment as well. The control system is what has covered for his errors and missteps throughout life, and provided him the wealth making opportunities that otherwise would have eluded someone of average abilities. Neither Powell nor Bush, I believe, are aware of the big picture. They only know they are part of the system and protected by it as long as they don't cross anyone higher up. As far as **Cheney** is concerned, I think he is the **point man** within the Bush administration for the real Powers That Be (PTB), who rarely hold public office. Taking his orders from others higher in the power structure, Cheney then directs the president, sometimes openly, but usually by suggestions. Besides directly influencing the president, Cheney was also in charge of selecting the staff of the White House, the Pentagon, and some positions within State Department.

Most of Lobes conclusions are wrong because he doesn't understand the over-arching conspiracy of power that is above the office of the President. He thinks narrowly only about people trying to "hijack the presidency." But his analysis is still useful. I'll insert my comments in [*brackets*] to give insight into what's really going on.

"While the mainstream media mostly continue to cast Bush as the captain of his ship, hints that Cheney is the dominant figure shaping Washington's diplomatic policy have become too numerous to ignore. A recent Washington Post article assessing Condoleezza Rice's performance as national security adviser revealed a most stunning example of this lopsided state of affairs. According to the Post, Bush had ordered Cabinet officials not to give any preferential treatment to Ahmed Chalabi's Iraqi

National Congress (INC) when US forces moved into Iraq last spring. But soon after, in flagrant violation of his directive, the Pentagon flew Chalabi and 600 of his armed followers into southern Iraq in early April, with the approval of the vice president. *[The facts are right, but Lobe doesnt have the whole story. The original Bush directive was only make a pretense of fairness for all of those staff members in the White House and Pentagon who still think our government tries to do whats right. The Cheney directive was Bushs intent all along. Cheney did and does assume the power to issue orders directly-which no other VP has ever exercised, to my knowledge.]*

"It would not be the first or last time that Cheney simply ignored his commander-in-chief. The extent of Cheney's power is not surprising given the degree to which Bush relied on him during his presidential campaign and in the administration's early days. *[Relied on is not correct. Whenever the PTB bring in a relatively nave and unqualified person such as Bush to serve as president, they assign him several advisors and one main "handler," whom the president knows he is never to disregard-despite his position as president. Cheney, I believe, is Bushs handler.]* And the fact that Cheney, who was asked by Bush to recommend his running mate in 2000, picked himself for the job *[a foregone conclusion anyway; the entire "selection process" was only for show]* reveals that he expected to wield extraordinary power if Bush won the election.

"Cheney has played a much more important role than Rice since the early days of the administration, despite her closer personal relationship with the president. *[True, and this will always be the case. Rice is a second rate academic still in training for higher things. She rarely thinks for herself. No previous National Security advisor has had this level of inexperience. Most, like Kissinger, Scowcroft and Talbot, were high level conspirators placed at NSA to control presidents like Nixon and Ford. Rice is a shamefully apologist for everything Bush says or does. She has little credibility when she does this, among the old guard of Kissingers group, and thus is not trusted with any crucial decisions. Llike Powell, she must be corrected often by Cheney and his plants within the State Department.]* It was Cheney's choices that prevailed in the appointment of both cabinet and sub-cabinet national-security officials, beginning with that of Donald Rumsfeld as Defense Secretary. Not only did Cheney

personally intervene to ensure that Powell's best friend, Richard Armitage [a CIA drug smuggling spook, despised by the neo-cons], was denied the deputy defense secretary position, but he also secured the post for his own protégé, Paul Wolfowitz. Moreover, it was Cheney who insisted that the ultra-unilateralist John Bolton be placed in a top State Department arms job - a position from which Bolton has consistently pursued policies that run counter to Powell's own views. [True. That's because, while Powell is a "player" and yesman, he is not trusted to know the overall game plan. Only those who are high enough to know the big picture are capable of understanding why the US plays both sides in the wars on drugs, terror, and tyranny. Powell, being a naive liberal, is a natural pick to head the State Department, which is full of hard core leftists. Cheney had to put someone in State that the leftists there would tolerate and trust to some degree.]

"Moreover, Cheney's own national-security staff is the largest ever employed by a vice president. Its members have largely been chosen for both their ideological affinity with their boss and proven Washington experience. [Good point. The size of Cheneys staff is a huge indication of his hidden role as handler.] They play to win, said one State Department official. Cheney's chief of staff and national security adviser, I. **Lewis Scooter Libby**, a Washington lawyer and Wolfowitz protégé, is considered a far more skilled and experienced bureaucratic and political operator than Rice. [This is a gross understatement. Libby is one of the real evil players to watch. Hes a ruthless operator-the kind the PTB bring up in the ranks to control others, but from behind the scenes. Libby has a Lenin type face and would never be trusted by the public. Cheney, on the other hand, has a cherubic expression capable of deceiving conservatives-so hes who they put out front nowadays.] With several of his political allies on Rice's own staff - including deputy national security adviser Stephen Hadley and Middle East director Elliott Abrams - Libby is able to run circles around Condi [true, indeed], noted a former NSC official." [End of Lobe quote.]

Israel

MY IMPRESSIONS OF ISRAEL:

I recently returned from my fact-finding trip to the Middle East. What follows is my frank and personal assessment of the modern state of Israel, without the embellishments of rose-colored glasses. Millions of religious pilgrims trek to the "*Holy Land*" each year, skimming the surface of the country in almost total isolation from reality. Their guided tours, cushioned by air-conditioned tour buses and 5 star hotels, concentrate on what was, not what is. Churches dot the Judean landscape, each laying claim to a piece of the past that, with few exceptions, doesn't exist anymore. I would estimate that fully 80% of the "holy sites" are not the actual location where the original events occurred--which in most cases is virtually impossible to determine. The famed "*Via Dolorosa*" tracing the presumed path of Jesus' agonizing trek to Golgotha is merely an arbitrary walk through 14th century streets built on 40 foot deep rubble left over from the numerous destructions of Jerusalem's past. The few holy sites that are authentic are encumbered by heavy stone medieval churches with dark interiors that do not, in my opinion, impart any of the spiritual feeling of the original place.

The Israeli government itself helps perpetuate the mystical, romantic illusions of the past, being acutely aware of the millions of dollars each year generated by religious tourism. The old city of Jerusalem is bathed in soft rosy artificial light at night to give tourists that romantic feeling they can write home about. But the selective rosy views only mask the chronic tension enveloping this relatively hostile land, a region bereft of natural beauty--except for about 5 weeks during the spring when wild flowers briefly bloom, and commercial photographers descend to work their art of selective embellishment that makes Israel look so enchanting in tourist brochures. So great is the contrast between promotion and reality that psychological clinics in Israel have a special term to describe the disillusionment that often affects religious pilgrims. It's called the "*Jerusalem Syndrome*" and refers to a chronic form of depression that can afflict those who cannot deal with the extreme contrast between holy and unholy. But with all that said, and in spite of the crass commercialization of religious antiquities, I must admit that one can still sense the God of Israel hovering over the land. I have no doubt that He intends to redeem Israel someday--and believe me, it needs redemption.

LAND: I was struck by the *steep ruggedness* of terrain in the Judean and Samaritan hill country. One doesn't get an accurate impression of the stark hostility of this terrain from photographs. Though not very high in altitude the hills of Israel are almost barren, extremely rocky and punctuated by deep ravines and gorges that make travel in central Israel a strain on man and machine. From Biblical stories and movies one gets the impression that trips to Bethlehem, Bethany or even Nazareth are relatively peaceful walks in the pastoral countryside. In reality, there is almost no greenery, only rocks and sand of a fairly bland hue-- completely lacking in the brilliant colors and shapes characteristic of the deserts in Utah and Arizona. Travel involves major descents into gorges often over a thousand feet in depth and climbing back up again repeatedly.

It was also sad to note how little topsoil had been allowed to develop in the hill country. Although the rainfall is extremely sparse here, I attribute the main cause to *extreme overgrazing*. For centuries the Judean hills have been used to graze sheep and goats which have extracted the last ounce of nutrition from this land and not given anything back. Even today herds of sheep and goats, mostly *Bedouin-Arab* owned, forage on almost

bare ground with no visible grass--only tiny bits of stubble. This destruction of the long term soil development is typical of many things I witnessed in Israel on Arab lands. There seems to be a politically correct notion that Arab tribal nomadic culture requires that they be left to age-old practices, no matter how damaging they are to the land agriculturally. The Israeli government is also under severe pressure internationally to let the Arabs do whatever they want. AGRICULTURE: There are two fertile plains in Israel, one along the Mediterranean coast and the other around the sea of Galilee and the Jordan river (which is more like a small creek). Both areas have been put into intensive cultivation by the Israelis. While there have been many comparisons to the Biblical adage of making the "desert blossom," the extreme efforts applied to maximize water resources in relatively poor soil have had many negative environmental effects. Water is extremely scarce, and thus Israel has been at the forefront in the development of drip irrigation systems that conserve the maximum amount of water. Large diversion projects of Jordan river water have, however, overtaxed the northern water resources in order to expand agriculture to the Negev desert to the south, where the sandy soil is much less fertile. Maximum utilization and reuse of fixed water supplies tends, over time, to concentrate contaminants and salt content, leading to the corruption of the aquifers. Both Israeli and Arab controlled agricultural areas pump large quantities of water out of the ground with deep wells. Overpumping from the aquifers has resulted in an increase in the saline content as water from the Mediterranean sea seeps in to replace it. Excessive chemical and fertilizer use in agriculture and industry has also led to extreme *pollution levels* in rivers and groundwater sources. Some rivers are actually toxic.

The Israelis are reacting to the problem with some earnest. More strict environmental regulations are being implemented, but the Arab controlled areas are exempt for political reasons. There is also a growing movement in Israel to switch to *organic farming*. I visited a few *Kibbutzim* (collective farms) and *Moshavim* (cooperative farms) that are on the cutting edge of organic farming. Israel has developed a *special fabric covering that allows them to grow vegetables free from insects* inside a greenhouse type enclosure. It is more costly, so much of this elite produce goes to markets serving the orthodox Jewish communities world wide that require certified insect-free food.

Israel has established a significant *agricultural outreach* to other nations who desire to implement the unique low-water farming techniques it has developed. The Arabs in Israel and neighboring Jordan have especially benefited from Israeli's willingness to share their agricultural expertise. Jordan has been radically transformed into an agricultural Mecca due to the willingness of the late *King Hussein* to work with the Israelis rather than reject all contact as the more radical Arab factions have done. For Arabs living next door to productive Jewish agro projects, the lure of becoming productive farmers has in many cases overcome the innate hostility between the two cultures. I saw it with the *Druse Arabs* in the Golan heights and in the Arab areas in Galilee. In these areas orchards may not be as well kept as the Jewish farms but at least they are vastly more productive than before. Only in PLO controlled areas did I find such a strong hatred of everything Jewish that they refused to join in the new green wave of agro-prosperity. As one example of extreme resentment, young Arab radicals regularly destroy trees that the Jews plant as part of their national reforestation effort. This kind of hatred is an all too common byproduct of constant PLO propaganda and incitement to exterminate all Jews. ECONOMY: Most Americans don't realize that Israel has one of the most tightly controlled statist economies in the world. *It is socialist in the extreme* due to a combination of early Zionist collectivist fervor and the influence of Russian and Eastern European Marxists that came to Israel and formed the core of the ruling Labor Party. Israeli's *Histadrut*, a kind of super labor union, controls every aspect of Israeli's economic life--at least until recently. During the last decade, there has been a slow but persistent movement toward free-market reforms in Israel--not because the Jews have much of a free market philosophy in their heritage, but rather because they have a naturally competitive spirit and were forced to compete in a fast-paced international economy. When the government refused to implement needed reforms, there began a ground swell of rebellion in the 1980s and 90s against Israeli's ponderous education, medical, tax and regulatory establishment. The more the government tried to suppress the gray and black markets, the greater the "brain drain" in Israel became as thousands emigrating to the US and Europe.

The government's virtual *monopoly* on television was broken after private illegal cable services began sprouting up all over Israel. The

Histadruti's monopoly on health care was broken by a persistent gray market for after-hours surgery performed by low paid doctors eager for extra money. Even Israel's ponderous "free" public education establishment is under attack as religious and private schools are being formed in ever-increasing numbers to supplement low quality public education. Often the best teachers can make more money teaching privately on the side than in their state controlled teaching jobs. In Israel, public money is doled out even to orthodox Jewish schools which tends to keep them tied to certain political parties which promote those subsidies in the Knesset.

Dependency upon government is a chronic addiction in all of Israel, keeping taxes so high that Israel has to beg for American aid and loan guarantees every year, producing a very high ratio of foreign debt to GNP. Income taxes have been as high as 80% in modern Israel, so naturally, tax evasion is rampant. Recently, to help stem the growth of the underground tax-evading economy, income tax rates were reduced to below 50%, and new taxes imposed such as the 17% VAT tax. But I noticed that only established storefront businesses (mostly Jewish) collected the tax. In the Arab markets (part of the underground economy) I was never charged the VAT tax. POLITICS: There are no free-market political parties in Israel, only shades of statism. Parties on the "right" are orthodox religious parties who are opposed to "land for peace" concessions, but otherwise have their hands in the public coffers as much as the parties on the "left." Except for the recent change to popular election of the Prime Minister, all voting in Israel is for political parties--not individual candidates. You vote for the party of your choice and the party produces a list of who will serve in the Knesset. Thus, the Israeli model of parliamentary politics is very close to Lenin's dictum of maintaining rigid "*party discipline*." Members of the Knesset owe their entire political existence to the party, and only indirectly to the electorate. Thus, the powers at the top can and do demand total conformity to the party line. For this reason, Israeli politics are rampant with corruption. Payoffs and personal enrichment are commonplace as is the inevitable blackmail that comes when a party official tries to oppose the party line. Virtually all high political offices, including those in the court system are part of the political patronage system. Hence, it is almost impossible for a beleaguered Knesset member to recur to the courts for justice, if the Powers That Be

are against him. The mere threat of prosecution is turned off and on like a spigot to induce the desired leverage on wavering politicians. This week's announcement that the investigation into Benjamin Netanyahu's corruption charges is being dropped is a tell-tale sign that the PTB are intending to resurrect Netanyahu as a leader in the Likud. This is part of the ongoing evidence pointing to external control of both major parties in Israel.

The Labor Party has undergone a continual stream of factionalization since 1948 when they began with an outright majority of the 120 seats of the Knesset. Now they hold less than 20 seats and must build coalitions with other parties in order to rule. The Labor Party still has two major factions within its ranks--one allied with *Shimon Peres* who is tightly controlled and financed by the European NWO globalists, and the other aligned with *Ehud Barak*, the current Prime Minister who, in turn, is controlled by the US faction of the NWO globalists (Kissinger and group). The other two major parties Likud and Shas range in support between 15-17 seats and must form coalitions with other opposing parties in order to govern.

The Likud Party is the Israeli equivalent of the American Republican Party. While the Likud has several members who are pro-free market in orientation, the leadership under *Ariel Sharon* and *Benjamin Netanyahu* is as corrupt as the Labor Party. Sharon is a close friend of Shimon Peres, so there is little difference in their politics except that Sharon pretends to be the opposition. Bibi Netanyahu owes his entire political career to the Henry Kissinger group in the US who financed his education, got him a job on Wall Street and guided his rise in Israeli politics.

The Shas Party is a "right wing" party of Sephardic Jews whose base of support resides primarily among the Moroccan Jews who have immigrated to Israel. Its most prominent leader (Deri) is currently in jail on corruption charges stemming from years of taking bribes from his coalition partners in the Labor Party--who blackmailed Deri in order to keep the Shas Party aligned with the leftist Labor agenda--something the Shas membership nearly rebelled over.

What is ironic is that the Arab population in Israel controls 10-12 seats and thus has become the determining faction that can make or break any coalition. For this reason, it would be political suicide for the Israelis to allow a repatriation of millions of Arab refugees to Israel, who would then be able to command a majority of votes in the Knesset. It is specifically for this reason that Arafat is demanding not only an independent state, but that Israel (not the Palestinian state) absorb almost all the Arab refugees. Arafat fully intends to take back Israel either by militarily conquest (after Israeli's security position is weakened by "land for peace" deals), or by democratic conquest via forcing the return of refugees to Israel. PEOPLE: There are notable exceptions to the generalizations I will make here about Jews and Arabs, but I find these general observations do correctly describe some of the underlying reasons for long-term conflict between the two groups. The Jews represent about 80% of the population of Israel, and perhaps only 20% of these could be considered deeply orthodox. The rest are composed of traditional and secular Jews, most of whom have some feeling for generic Zionism (support of a homeland for the Jews) but who are otherwise very liberal and left-leaning in their politics. The *Sephardic Jews* are Semitic peoples and tend to be more fervent in their defense of Israel as a nation. The *Ashkenazi Jews* come from eastern Europe and Russia and tend to provide most of the high intellectual power in Israel, as well as a disproportionate amount of its socialist and Marxist policies.

There is a fair amount of conflict among the Jews themselves, as the various factions hardly agree on anything. In contrast to this innate competition, however, there is a general feeling of collective unity that keeps them from splitting apart entirely, borne out of a common heritage and welded together by persecution. This same *collective mentality* has allowed the Jews to prosper under socialism (at least in the incipient phases of economic development) that normally proves disastrous in other cultures. For example, none of the collective farms the Israelis helped develop in Africa survived, even when managed by Israelis. Israeli's brand of socialism has, itself, had to give way to free market techniques in order to compete in the world economy. Many Kibbutzim have dropped their most onerous collective policies or have converted to Moshav-type cooperatives. The Jews are clearly the most industrious

group of people in the entire Middle East and thus are destined to lead economically.

On a negative note, I found a certain amount of insensitivity to the feelings of conscience among both Jews and Arabs. Everywhere we drove in Israel, there was a pervasive discourteousness, a quickness to anger, and a reluctance to give way in heavy traffic. Although Jews are, generally, highly rational and quick mentally, they have a certain tendency to reject, in a very off-handed manner, new concepts that didn't fit into existing patterns of thought. Despite their quick minds, Israeli Jews are almost totally blind to the deceptions and corruption involving many leaders at the national level. They have almost no concept of the dangers of the NWO and the globalist agenda to subjugate Israeli sovereignty for the "global good." Even though approximately 80% of Israel knows about Barry Chamish's startling investigations documenting the role of the Israeli secret service (Shabak) in the murder of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, they do nothing. So while there is a subtle collective feeling on behalf of their national survival, it gets mistakenly mingled with a reliance upon national leaders which produces a uniform type of apathy concerning individual action.

There is perhaps an overconfidence inherent in the Jewish mind as well. In intellectual discussions I find it very difficult to get thinking Jews to consider other points of view. On more than one occasion while interviewing some of the best and brightest Jewish intellectuals, I found them completely insensitive to certain spiritual and libertarian ideals. At the same time, ironically, there seems to be a fascination in the Jewish mind with intricate conceptual thought as evidenced by the great time invested in study of the tiniest details in the Talmud and in other rabbinical writings. Why they cannot see through the complexity of global or national deceptions and conspiracies eludes me.

Factionalism is rampant in Israel due to the intensity with which debate is embraced, especially on religious points, which are highly subject to the special interpretations of each different school of rabbinical thought. I will say, however, that I found the orthodox Jewish settlers to be happy, industrious group, filled with passion for life and for Israel. Their cooperative Yeshivot (schools) are a model of self-help and sacrifice in

order to provide a better life for their children. They are certainly not the "right wing" fanatics the liberal media in Israel makes them out to be. Without this small core of faithful orthodox Jews, Israel might not have received the many small miracles that led to national independence and subsequent victories over a determined enemy with a massive quantitative advantage.

The Arabs are generally less intense than the Jews, more likable when not agitated, but less industrious as a whole. Part of the Arab apathy in overcoming environmental deficiencies of their Middle East surroundings may be tied to the problematic and fatalistic Islamic doctrine asserting that much of the bad that happens is the "will of Allah." In contrast, the Jewish concept of being treated by God as a collective (The chosen people, the House of Israel) seems to motivate individual initiative to assist the salvation of the group. Despite this collective view the Jews have of mutual protection the Jews tend to be independent thinkers. In contrast, Arabs tend to be greatly swayed by group psychology. If they have good leaders, they are peaceable and friendly. If they have bad leaders, as is presently the case in the extreme, they can be capable of mass hysteria and panic or even aggression. Both Jews and Arabs are somewhat captivated by materialism, but in different ways. The Jews view material gain as an ongoing tool for progress while many Arabs tend to view material gain as an end in and of itself. Thus, possession of "things" is a sign of prestige in the Arab world. Sadly, because of this, petty theft is a common way of life among many Arabs and is a constant source of irritation for the Jews. Some Jewish settlements have a hard and fast policy of not hiring any Arab labor. However, because Jews tend to rise to entrepreneurial levels quickly in life, the Arabs provide most of the basic labor pool. Thus, Arabs working among the Jews are a permanent fixture in Israel, and of benefit to both Jew and Arab. However, the constant problem of things "disappearing" keeps a barrier of distrust between the two peoples.

There is another imbalance in the relationship between Jews and Arabs that must be aired. Except in times when border areas are sealed during terrorist attacks, Arabs can come and go among the Jewish controlled areas in perfect safety, with no fear of reprisals and vindictive behavior. Yet Jews can never go into Arab controlled areas of the

Palestinian Authority and have that same assurance of safety. In the Gaza strip there is a separate strip of land owned by Jewish settlements on the coast. The Jews must pass through Palestinian controlled land to get to their zone, and often they must be accompanied by armed convoys of Israeli troops. This week, two Israeli soldiers were wounded (one fatally) in an Arab attack on a military convoy trying to protect Jewish civilians trying to get to their homes in Netzarim--a Jewish settlement in the Gaza strip. Clearly this is evidence that only the Israelis can be trusted to provide overall security to the lands where a mixed population of Jews and Arabs exist. I don't believe this is a reflection of the common Arab himself, who has a tradition of hospitality, but rather of the hostile Palestinian leadership that is itching for a fight.

Also in the news this week was a deliberately-staged Arab riot protesting the entrance of Ariel Sharon and a group of Knesset members onto the temple mount. By prior agreement with the Arabs, Jews have a right to free access to the temple mount. But wherever the Palestinian Authority (PA) has been given security authority over a sector occupied by both Arabs and Jews, they refuse to allow Jews safe passage. Worse yet, the Israeli government lets the PA get away with it and the international community says nothing. In this case, the Palestinian Police chief made clear and provocative statements about the impending visit designed to encourage Arab radicals to gather at the temple mount and prepare to attack--which they did, resulting in minor wounds to 34 Israeli policemen. But I suspect that Sharon was *not* simply trying to publicize the fact that the Arafat would not be fair or even handed in the management of the temple mount. Likud may well be helping the Labor Party's initiative to give away sovereignty of the temple mount to the United Nations. By precipitating a nasty Arab reaction on the temple mount, it helps move the international community to a position that rejects both Jewish and Arab sovereignty over the contested holy site. The UN tries hard to maintain the image of fairness, but historically the UN has only acted to curtail Jewish self-defense, not Arab aggression. It will happen again if the UN has its way.

ISRAEL: THE BUSH ROAD MAP TO NOWHERE BUT WAR

How many "peace process" failures does it take to prove to the world that international "peace plans" which cover up the root problem of terrorism always lead to more war-especially in the Middle East? The Bush administration is promoting the same old **failed Oslo formula** whereby Israel trades away occupied land in exchange for a temporary peace-a peace that is becoming more temporary with each new attempt. The Oslo accords merely allowed Arafat's PLO to develop a safe haven (with funding from Israel, the US, and other nations) from which to stockpile arms and explosives in preparation for the last two *Intifada* uprisings. Trading "land for peace" has never worked before, because terrorists were never rooted out of the Palestinian side of the political formula. The US has always simply declared them "reformed" -even while possessing hard intelligence of continued terrorist planning and training. But, dressed up in a new title-**Road Map to Peace**-we are expected to believe Bush's proposal is something new. The only thing new about this fraud is the heightened order of deception inherent in its appearance of balance and neutrality.

The promoters of this plan (US, Russia, UN, and EU) have gone so far as to give themselves a new name-**the Quartet**-so as to appear benign and unified. Politically, the reality is otherwise. This is a US initiative from beginning to end; the other participants are merely on board for window dressing and globalist propaganda value.

| ↓ | □ Russia, as the longest standing supporter of terrorism worldwide, has no business being part of any peace plan-especially in Israel where it has provided the Palestinians with Russian advisors against Israel. The US even has direct evidence of Russian intelligence liaisons with and support of Iraq before and during the current war. The US continually allows Russia to play these charades of supporting peace and countering terrorism, despite the mounds of evidence that suggest otherwise, to further the deception that Communism is dead and that Russia is reformed.

| ↓ | □ Including the EU in the promotional group is merely a ploy to allow France to have a major say in the process. There has

long been a deep connection between French financing sources and the Pro-Oslo Labor Party. France also played loose with the rules in Iraq, allowing several sets of Roland 2 and Roland 3 anti-aircraft missile launchers to find their way into Iraq, which were subsequently used to down American aircraft.

|_J| □The UN itself is anathema in Israel, having always used its international offices to promote the Arab agenda and undermine Israeli sovereignty in key areas of Jerusalem.

The Bush **Road Map** itself is a **hodgepodge** of every past "peace innovative" from the Oslo accords to the initiative of anti-American Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah, selectively cobbled together into one giant proposal. In true allegiance to Bush globalist objectives, every pertinent UN resolution is listed and applied, together with other past US initiatives such as the Tenet (CIA) and Mitchell (State Department) Plans. Each of these contain deadly pieces of fine print that undermine Israeli security issues.

To briefly summarize, here is what the Road Map lays out, in three phases meant to finalize a comprehensive settlement by the year 2005. [*My comments on the prognosis for success are included in brackets*]

Phase I: By the end of May 2003,

A. The Palestinian Authority must:

1. Officially recognize "Israel's right to exist in peace and security" and call for an immediate and unconditional cease-fire. [*This is easy for the PA to do verbally, while impossible for the international community to verify the PA's sincerity.*]

2. "Undertake visible efforts on the ground to arrest, disrupt and restrain individuals and groups" engaging in terrorism against Israel. [*This is a page right out of Oslo. Again, easy to do in a few token ways, impossible to verify. These kinds of requirements have never been effective.*]

3. Dismantle "terrorist capabilities and infrastructure." [*This will not happen. There is not enough time and all is well hidden. The US will certify this requirement as complete without sure knowledge-in stark contrast to its Iraqi policy.*]

4. End all incitement against Israel. [*In the past, the PA ended incitements in English, but not in Arabic. The US media will again fail to report on incitements in Arabic. Also, school textbooks, which are full of incitements, will not be replaced*]

5. Bring all security organizations under control of interior minister Mohammed Dahlan. [*Dahlan is a former protï½gï½ of Arafat, and former Chief of security over all of Gaza. As for his track record of curtailing terrorism, Dahlan permitted Gaza to become a safe haven for the hundreds of fugitive terrorists fleeing Israeli police, including his boyhood friend Mohammed Dief, a top Hamas Terrorist. On Dahlani's watch, Gaza became the primary launching grounds for the hundreds of Kesseem rockets and mortars fired at Israel.*]

6. Hold free, open, and fair elections. [*Another requirement that is easy to satisfy superficially. However, no one expects anyone opposed to the PLO to run for office-it would be a sure death sentence. Former Arafat cronies like newly appoint Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen is his nomme de guerre) appear to be opposing Arafat, but it is only a show to help justify US support for this phony peace process.*]

B. Israel must:

1. Publicly commit to "the two-state vision of an independent, viable, sovereign Palestinian state" [*The US will make sure Israel never backs out of this commitment, even though the US has never held Arafat accountable for breaking his tenuous commitment to recognizing the "right of Israel to exist."*]

2. Make a call for "an immediate end to violence against Palestinians anywhere." [*As if there were ever any Israeli government incitement. This statement was put in to make it look like both sides have been inciting to violence, which is patently untrue.*]

3. Freeze all construction in Jewish settlements.

4. Immediately dismantle illegal settlement outposts built since March 2001. [*Israel has already begun this process in a ruthless way, demonstrating that they had already succumbed to US pressure before the release of the Road Map. PM Sharon had promised never to do this.*]

5. "Take no actions undermining trust, including deportations, attacks on civilians, confiscation and/or demolition of Palestinian homes and property, as a punitive measure. [*These are all key strategic tools in a proper war against terror. A prohibition against attacks on civilians means the IDF simply cannot combat terror in the future, since virtually all terrorists are dressed as civilians, or intermixed with other civilians.*]

6. Withdraw progressively from the occupied territories of the 1967 and successive wars. [*These territories correspond approximately with the new Green Line security fence Israel has been building over the past year-another sign of advanced complicity with the US Road Map. As I have covered in prior briefs, satisfaction of this demand will result in the dismantling of over half of Israeli's key military bases on the strategic high ground, and the loss of half of Israeli's water supplies. It is this core provision that is fatal to Israel security and guarantees Israeli's vulnerability in the coming war.*]

Phase II: By the end of 2003.

1. Israel must provide "enhanced territorial contiguity" for the Palestinians. [*This is very dangerous. It means that Israel must provide corridors of travel between all separate Palestinian areas, free of Israeli security forces. This guarantees the Palestinian's future ability to transfer arms from one sector of their new state to another. Can you imagine the US allowing Saddam Hussein to negotiate something like this?*]

2. Palestinian constitution must be ratified. [*Without the specification of any criteria for the constitution, this is meaningless in promoting real change.*]

3. An international conference will launch the process leading to the establishment of a Palestinian state with provisional borders. [*This implies the conference has the power to impose final conditions on the two parties.*]

4. Quartet members will promote international recognition of the Palestinian state and UN membership. [*It's all bet they will! What's another terrorist nation among the many already in the UN?*]

Phase III: By 2005:

A second international conference will finalize the permanent-status solution for the Palestinian state in 2005, including the issues of borders, the division of Jerusalem, the status of refugees, and the ownership of settlements -- leading to peace between Israel and other Arab states. [*The list of final issues is the most contentious and, in my view, impossible to settle via negotiations. Despite the fact that Phases I and II of the Road Map will give the Palestinians 98% of what they want, they will push for that last 2%. One of the hottest issues here is the "right of return" for the extensive number of descendants of original Palestinian refugees, kept all these years in prison communities for this purpose-but only for relocation to Israel, so the Arabs can become the political majority in Israel too. This is political suicide for the Jews. No Israeli government can get away with allowing that kind of repatriation, but the Arabs won't settle for less.*]

The timing is the tell-tale giveaway. The most striking thing about the Road Map is the sheer audacity of its proposed timing. To even imagine that centuries of animosity and near constant warfare is going to give way to a benign resolution within the next two years is ludicrous. To me, this is a dead giveaway indicating the true purposes behind this proposal. I believe the aggressive timing schedule is only aimed at Israeli compliance. As I have pointed out before, the world court of opinion never held Arafat's feet to the fire over his constant and blatant violations of the Oslo Accords. And yet Israel-because its commitments were fiscal, visible and verifiable-was required to fulfill its part in full while the world was still giving Arafat's PA the benefit of the doubt. Israel is being set up for this same dual standard for the future.

As part of the Road Map, Israel will have to withdraw **physically from all strategic bases** in the occupied territories and dismantle tens of settlements, leaving thousands of other Israelis unprotected within the new Palestinian state. Meanwhile, the Palestinians will be given near sovereign protected status to rebuild their armed camp, free from Israeli intrusions. With each new terrorist attack, the PA will always claim such terrorism is beyond their control, yet Israel will have to continue withdrawing or be ruled out of compliance—just like during the Oslo years. The timetable is aimed at Israel. The Palestinian commitments are almost all verbal and unverifiable. They can appear to comply and still be hiding terrorism. Israel cannot comply without actual and verifiable destruction of its security.

As for Palestinian reform, this is a sham. The US officially declared that it will not deal with Yasser Arafat anymore, and demanded a new PA cabinet with a Prime Minister who has legitimate powers to act. So why did the US allow the other three members of the Quartet to rush over to Chairman Arafat and present the plan to him? The US is playing as if **Abu Mazen**, the newly ordained Prime Minister of the new PA cabinet, represents a "new PA" supposedly committed to peace and free from terrorism. President Bush naively praised Abu Mazen last week as "a man dedicated to peace," and indicated that he would soon invite him to the White House for talks. Let's look at Mazen's record.

Mahmoud Abbas, aka Abu Mazen, was, in fact, the PLO's paymaster who doled out the money to the PLO offshoot **Black September** prior to that organization's launching of one of the 20th century's most infamous terrorist attacks: the killing of the 11 Israeli athletes (including American David Berger) at the Olympic Games in Munich, Germany in 1972. Naturally, Mazen claims he didn't know what they were going to do with the money. Really? Black September was supposed to have been such a radical splinter group that the PLO had disavowed any further relationship after their split. So why did the PLO continue to fund Black September, if it was truly repugnant to the PLO's goals?

As far as Mazen's supposed opposition to Arafat, there is much evidence to suggest otherwise. For instance, the new Prime Minister is demanding no less than the total removal of the siege on Arafat's Mukata

compound in Ramallah where Arafat has been quarantined by IDF forces for the past year and a half, due to his responsibility for the Oslo war and continued terrorist attacks on Israel. Additionally, although the US expects Abu Mazen to dismantle the terrorist organizations **Hamas, Islamic Jihad**, and Arafat's own **Al-Aksa Brigades**, all three have announced that they have no plans to disarm or cease terrorist attacks on Israel. Do we really expect that Mazen is going to attack them with military force (still controlled by Arafat), his only recourse now that they have openly defied him?

In typical compromising fashion, the Bush administration is demanding that Israel provide some "**welcoming gestures**" for the new Prime Minister, such as the release of hundreds of Palestinian terrorists in Israeli jails, plus an immediate withdrawal from Northern Gaza. Of course, there are no provisions for Israel to recapture those prisoners or regain lost ground once terrorism resumes and the Israeli gestures are flaunted. As Israeli General Security chief **Avi Dichter** said, "Terrorists have taken advantage of Israeli largesse [in the past] to improve their capabilities and carry out attacks. Every gesture by Israel carries a price."

A BETTER SOLUTION

Tourism Minister Benny Elon has proposed a new outline for peace, according to Arutz-7 in Israel. "Elon, successor to the assassinated Rehavam Ze'evi as head of the Moledet Party in the National Union, conceived the plan as an alternative to the Road Map currently under consideration. He says that the Road Map is merely a rehashing of the decades-old goal of trying to seat two peoples on the western side of the Jordan River -an objective he calls unworkable and dangerous. Giving the Arabs of Yesha a quasi-state will not solve the fundamental problems of borders and refugees, Elon says, but will instead guarantee the next round of terrorism and warfare.

"Elon's plan offers what he calls the genuine and original two-state solution, proposing that it encompass the full extent of Mandatory Palestine on both sides of the Jordan River. Its six points include the following:

|↓| □The Palestinian Authority will be dissolved;

|↓| □Israel will put a firm end to Palestinian terrorism by expelling terrorists, collecting weapons, and dismantling terror-hotbed refugee camps;

|↓| □The international community will recognize the Hashemite Kingdom [Jordan] as the sole representative of the Palestinians, and will help it economically as it absorbs a limited number of refugees;

|↓| □Israel will become sovereign over Judea, Samaria and Gaza, and the Arabs living there will be Jordanian citizens living under a form of autonomy to-be-determined;

|↓| □The exchange of Jewish and Arab populations begun in 1948 will be completed, and the international community will help rehabilitate the refugees in their new countries;

|↓| □Israel and Jordan-Palestine will declare the conflict ended and will work together as neighbors.

Though political opponents say that Elon is ignoring the reality of the Palestinian Authority, the Elon Plan states that just as the evil regimes of the Taliban and Saddam Hussein were destroyed, the same must befall the PA, one of the most dangerous regimes. [end of Arutz-7 quote]. Absolutely correct! I would add that this would only be workable if a true system guaranteeing equal fundamental rights to Arab citizens of Israel were implemented. Again, the rule of law restricting government strictly to the defense of fundamental rights, properly defined, also outlaws socialist redistribution schemes as a violation of ownership rights-something the Israelis need to come to grips with. They can never have peace as long as citizens inside a country are competing for pieces of the productive pie-taken away from others by force of taxation.

ISRAEL: SHARON AND BUSH PULL OFF MUTUALLY SUPPORTING SUMMIT

Both President Bush and Israeli PM Ariel Sharon are battling for their political lives at home. As the war in Iraq simultaneously revives and turns sour, with mounting US casualties (which are at least double the figures released by the US military), public approval ratings for the President are slipping. In Israel, Ariel Sharon is facing his stiffest opposition since his embattled re-election.

From the left, Sharon is being attacked on corruption charges (which are true, but are being covered up or downplayed by the major media). However, his biggest fight is with the Israeli right, his increasingly disillusioned constituency. Not only has Sharon crossed the red line in lending credence to a Palestinian state (even worse, he is joining with Bush to hand them that state unilaterally without any cessation in terrorism), but he has turned against the very settlements he used to champion and protect. Hundreds of settlers lined the streets of Jerusalem as Sharon left for his American summit, bearing posters saying, "You have no mandate" – meaning no legal mandate to pursue this course of betrayal. That's nothing new for Sharon. He has pursued a leftist, sellout agenda ever since his first term in office when he struck up a coalition government with the leftist Labor Party.

Sharon's own right wing Likud Party is being torn apart by the controversy over yielding key military outposts and billion dollar cities. The referendum is giving party leaders a chance to vote on the issue of Sharon's plan to unilaterally withdraw from all strategic settlements in the Gaza Strip. That referendum was rescheduled by Sharon's henchmen in the party with the token excuse that it would conflict with a basketball tournament. Everyone knows it was delayed so that Sharon could rush to the US and gain some sort of approval from the US on his planned withdrawal. He got what he came for, plus more.

President Bush not only came out declaring Sharon's plan "historic and courageous," but he also declared, in rejection of Palestinians' claimed "right of return," that Palestinian refugees would have to resettle in the new Palestinian state rather than in Israel, where their homes and lands were originally located prior to the war of independence in 1948. Now that Sharon is returning with a great victory (the Bush approval), he will be able to lobby the Israeli right with warnings that a vote against his

plan would destroy "all that I won in America." As I have said in previous briefs, I have suspected all along that the US road map and subsequent US refusals to go along with Sharon were only a façade, a Hegelian strategy to undercut Israeli opposition and divert the attention of the mainstream voters away from how one-sided this giveaway of strategic territory is. Only renewed Palestinian terror can again save Israel from succumbing to this latest ploy.

ISRAEL: SHARON'S LATEST MANUEVERS TO DECEIVE THE ISRAELI RIGHT

Israel's conservative right-wing Likud Party is on the verge of an internal struggle that may split it apart into two factions. The main controversy is over PM Ariel Sharon's insistence on abandoning key Jewish cities in Gaza and in the West Bank, in return for nothing on the part of the Palestinians: no cessation of terrorism, no stopping of the infiltration of arms and explosives from Egypt, nothing. The more important issue however, looms even larger. Sharon's unilateral "disengagement" is meant to force upon both Israelis and Arabs a physical separation leading to the establishment of a Palestinian State with increased powers to prepare future attacks upon Israel with the protection of state sovereignty. What the US Road Map could not accomplish through negotiations, Sharon will force upon his supporters under the guise of disengagement from terror.

"Close to 8,500 people living in Gush Katif and the northern Shomron are slated to be expelled from their homes and relocated to as-yet unknown locations if the evacuation plan goes through," Arutz-7, Israel's most reliable news service, reports. Adding insult to injury, Arabs who lobbed mortars at these communities will be allowed to take up residency in these homes the Jews built and fought for so many years.

On May 2, Likud Party members will vote on this issue in a **party-wide referendum**. Close to 3,000 volunteers will begin visiting the homes of the approximately 200,000 Likud members, in a directed effort to explain to them personally the dangers of the plan of evacuation/expulsion from Jewish Gaza and northern Samaria, according to Arutz-7. Prime Minister

Sharon, along with many other Cabinet ministers, say they will abide by the rank-and-file's decision.

Sharon, returning from his US summit with Pres. Bush's approval in hand, is now using US support as the big stick to **threaten his constituents** into compliance with his radical proposals. Speaking to the Knesset, Sharon told lawmakers to back his proposals or risk losing unprecedented US assurances to support the Jewish state. This is a hollow threat. No US president could back out of US commitments to Israel without facing a huge public backlash from the majority of Christian and Jewish voters in America. What Sharon is really telling his Likud cabinet members is that he finally got Bush to go along with a major Israeli negotiating point forcing all descendants of refugees to resettle into the new Palestinian state, rather than in Israel, as the Arabs are demanding.

Despite Sharon's collusion with President Bush in this latest move to shrink Israel to an indefensibly small state, polls are showing that Likud members are almost evenly split on the issue of unilateral disengagement. The half of the Likud members that support Sharon are comparable to American conservative Republicans who support Bush without thinking critically. They see Sharon as their only hope and will back him no matter how badly he compromises or betrays them. But Sharon is taking no chances. **BREAKING NEWS:** Sharon has just announced he will NOT be bound by the results of the referendum. After changing positions on almost everything he has ever stood for in Israel, are we to be surprised by this latest deception?

Sderot Mayor Moyal said it best that no matter what the results of the referendum, "the Likud will never be the same party it was beforehand certainly not with the same personal make-up and the same leadership. Some people will have to leave, because the common denominator bonding the party will have been lost." He's right. The Likud was built on the issue of Israeli sovereignty and the right to create a homeland for the Jews through settlements. Sharon used to be the champion of those ideals. Now he will use party discipline against those who are allied with the core roots of the Likud. This is all too similar to the

National Republican Party's leadership in the US, who view their party's constitutional conservative core as radicals and extremists.

Operation Keelhaul

OPERATION KEELHAUL The prime source for this US-led travesty is Julius Epstein's Operation Keelhaul *The Story of Forced Repatriation* (Devin-Adair, 1973). Julius Epstein was one of the prime researchers for the belated Congressional investigation of the State Department's cover-up of Russian involvement in the Katyn Forest murders. While searching through military archives during his investigation, he discovered evidence of a top secret program of forced repatriation, called Operation Keelhaul, which is still classified to this day. Obviously the US has some very dirty secrets they still want hidden.

Although the US signed international agreements opposing forced repatriation, and verbally assured the world they would never countenance such actions, they inserted fine print in these documents excepting from the ban all those who originated from nations given over to the Soviets at the close of WWII. While claiming to "make the world safe for Democracy," Roosevelt and his cronies condemned millions to slave labor camps. The Allies even kept secret from the world the fact that Stalin was holding over 5,000 Allied soldiers as

hostages in order to make sure that the West complied with his demands for repatriation. US and British troops had to beat, drug, and drive at gunpoint these millions of liberty loving people back to Russia. Even after doing so, Stalin never did return American and British prisoners. They died in the Soviet Gulags. The US still refuses to open the archives about their fate.

Even refugees that had fled from WWI and who had already been integrated into Western society were driven back into Stalin's work camps. Thousands of Eastern Germans had fled the advancing Russian armies in order to find a haven in the West. Most were driven back to slavery. Almost a million anti-Communist Russian soldiers under Russian General Vlasov had defected to the Germans in hopes of freeing Russia from Stalin's grasp. They had never become Nazis, but had agreed to fight on the German side solely for purposes of achieving Russian liberty. At the war's end, they pushed West desperately trying to seek asylum, or to at least the designation of prisoners of war, so they could be protected under the Geneva Convention. US military leaders expressly guaranteed that Gen. Vlasov's men would never be turned back over to the Soviets. But under General Eisenhower, in consultation with the State Department, the US went back on their word of honor. Headquarters refused to designate them POWs or give them asylum, and eventually turned them over to the Russians. All their military leaders were shot or hanged. The rest went to Soviet labor camps. Some committed suicide before falling into Russian hands, knowing of their fate.

This entire operation was filled with horror stories. Let there be no ambivalence in our conclusions. US and British leaders were guilty of war crimes. Allied soldiers shot innocent men trying to escape as they were being forcibly repatriated. Soldiers used clubs to beat hundreds of men senseless, then dragged them onto trucks and ships. When deportees would disable a Russian ship, Americans would come aboard, subdue the resisters and make the repairs. Americans and British leaders have on their heads the blood of hundreds who committed suicide rather than being sent back, as well as of all those who eventually died in Stalin's work camps. These were criminal acts and American soldiers and officers should have refused to follow orders. Only a handful did and they were treated with severe threats and/or punishments. A few American servicemen allowed prisoners to escape, having pity on them. But, by in large, American and British servicemen were no more moral or courageous in standing up against evil military orders than their German counterparts.

The Allies used grand deceptions and lies to trick victims into submitting to forced repatriation. Here is one egregious example from Epstein's book.

General Shkuro and his Ukrainian Cossack troops had long been known to be anti-Bolsheviks. Gen Shkuro, himself, had emigrated after World War I and had never been a Soviet citizen. He felt he was safe from repatriation. The Cossacks had fought for Germany and surrendered to British troops. They demanded political asylum for which they easily qualified. The British confiscated all their Western currency and held them in detention. They were told on May 28 that all officers and enlisted men were to attend a conference with higher British authorities, and would be transported by truck. This seemed implausible. Why transport everyone in trucks when the British could come to them? When the Cossacks started to feel nervous about the destination, an English Lieutenant said, "I assure you on my word of honor as a British officer that you are just going to a conference." Another British officer gave the same assurance. The convoy was guarded, which did nothing to alleviate the Cossacks' anxiety. A few jumped from the trucks and escaped into the forest. They were the smart ones. Those that trusted the British ended up at a prisoner of war camp in Spittal, Austria (in the Russian sector of control). A British officer then informed them that, in accordance with an agreement concluded between the military authorities of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, all officers will be put at the disposal of Soviet military authorities. A Cossack General asked the officer when the agreement was signed. He replied, "On May 23 of this year (1945)." According to Epstein, one Cossack officer remarked, "The NKVD or the Gestapo would have slain us with truncheons, the British did it with their word of honor." There were multiple suicides that night in the camp, and all of the others had to be subdued by clubs and rifle butts as none would leave the camp voluntarily.

The US and Britain represented the highest images of liberty and freedom for the rest of the world laboring under Nazi or Communist domination. To have betrayed these 6 million persons (quite another holocaust) certainly caused many behind the iron curtain to vow never to trust the West again. Indeed, the Communists used this very argument with those who had been forcibly repatriated. To those who had been released after years of camp labor, a commissar said, "Whether they were Vlasov men or prisoners of war who did not want to return to the motherland does not matter now. All their sins have been forgiven. But the English and American bayonets, truncheons, machine

guns and tanks used against them will never be forgotten. No Russian will ever forget Lienz, Dachau, Plattling, Toronto and other places of extradition, including New York, And they must never be forgotten. It is a lesson all Russians must learn well. For it show that you cannot trust the capitalist states in the future.½ The West had provided the Communists with the best argument for deterring future defections from the Soviet state.

Pearl Harbor

BOOK REVIEW: **DAY OF DECEIT** by Robert Stinnett

Roger Mansell, Assoc Editor, Mansell Publications said it well: "Stinnett's *Day of Deceit* is, without a doubt, the most important book ever written about World War II. His spectacular research effort, in the now declassified intelligence files preceding Pearl Harbor, reveals an evil that corrupts Washington to this day. Every premise, every assumption, every statement by military and political leaders-nearly every "fact"- about the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor are now proven to be lies. Stinnett proves that FDR and other leaders were actually tracking the Japanese fleet across the Pacific- right up to the moment of attack. They were fully aware the purpose of the fleet was to attack Pearl Harbor."

More importantly, Stinnett uncovered a detailed 8-point plan to provoke Japan into the attack, adding another link in the chain of proof that government insiders use provocations and war to manipulate changes in the balance of world affairs. Overall, he has provided a body of evidence

so compelling that all but the most die-hard FDR apologists will finally be forced to concede the truth--that our own government set us up for war. But what is sad is that so few can see the deception while it is occurring. Most, like Stinnett, have to wait 50 years till there are enough security leaks to put the pieces together. Incredibly, even those who finally see the perfidy of FDR's "day that will live in infamy" fail to see the extensions of those same conspiracies and deception still going on.

Stinnett is one of those who fail to see that Pearl Harbor was not unique--that the same patterns of deceit persist today. In his introduction, Stinnett not only fails to be outraged by the material he uncovers, he goes to some lengths to excuse FDR's sacrificing the lives of more than 2,000 Americans in Hawaii, in order to "save the world for Democracy."

That wasn't **FDR's motive** at all. The pattern of events surrounding the strange prosecution of the war in both Europe and the Pacific paints an entirely different picture (unless one carefully understands the insider's definition of "democracy"--a global massing of ignorant, manipulated majorities for the purpose of undermining US constitutional protections of true fundamental rights). There were many secret US/British maneuvers executed during WWII to ensure a Soviet victory over Eastern Europe, the transfer of atom bomb technology to Russia, the forcible return of unwilling Soviet "expatriates" to Stalin (Operation Keelhaul) and the shifting of valuable military supplies from MacArthur to Russia in the Far East (that came back at us in Korea). All of these actions, and many many more, point to a much broader plot to use Hegelian "**create your own enemy**" tactics designed to keep the world in constant conflict, inexorably leading to a destruction of national sovereignty and the dominance of a global "peacekeeping" regime--a process that continues today.

Stinnett can be partially excused for his naiveté. Just as the Pearl Harbor plot was a carefully crafted secret, so is this larger, over-arching plot. Ironically, Stinnett served under **Lt. George Bush** during WWII, who was later to become the prime insider president using the Gulf War to facilitate a giant leap forward in the *New World Order* strategy. Despite the author's weak conclusions, you should all have a copy of this book

in your personal library. It's a major part of the puzzle on conspiracy in government that may help convince others to look deeper.

War in Afghanistan

Historical Deceptions: War in Afghanistan

From the 20 March 2004 World Affairs Brief:

<

THE CONTINUING MESS IN AFGHANISTAN

There is never going to be a clean solution to the problems in Afghanistan. Afghanistan has few natural resources and has for centuries been a cross border no-mans land of smugglers, dope peddlers and tradesmen. The US has no business trying to remake this country after the Western image of a manipulated democracy. Afghanistsans people, with their multiple dialects and multiple ethnic allegiances, have little potential to become unified. Because of all the disparate groups and tribal warfare, its nearly impossible to identify friend from foe. To make matters worse, Afghan males have learned to play multiple roles, shifting their allegiance according to whoever is winning. According to Rear Admiral John Dickson **Stufflebeem**, the US Navy Deputy Director for Operations, It's a shadow war. These are shadowy people who don't want to be found....They've got multiple identity cards. They've got multiple passports. They've got multiple names and certainly multiple stories.

It is little wonder that the **US has bombed both friendly and enemy groups** throughout the war, and civilians as well. Simply put, this is not a war that lends itself to fighting from the safety of the air alone. Rather than take the time to establish reliable and long-term sources on the ground (which the US could have started doing long ago, seeing as they have been planning this invasion with the Russians since the year 2000), US military officials continue to direct long distance attacks from the safety of their arm chairs in Washington. Even more dangerous is the fact that the CIA operates completely independently of the US Army. The area commander Gen. Tommy Franks reportedly has no authority to veto the CIA's military operations, although he is consulted as a courtesy.

Nothing is more symbolic of this technological arrogance than the latest incident of the CIA using a remote controlled **Predator Aircraft** to launch a hellfire missile at a lonely APC (Armored Personnel Carrier) traveling along a mountain highway, heaped with men dressed in various native outfits. How could the CIA possibly tell from their video monitors in Washington whether these people were friendly or enemy fighters or even some of the thousands of Afghans who have taken to the scavenging for military gear to sell on the black market? All of the various tribal units on both sides of the conflict use the same kind of Russian equipment. The **Washington Post** quoted residents of the area saying that three innocent civilians had been killed in the missile strike. In a separate incident, there are charges being investigated of a US helicopter gunship machine gunning men women and children fleeing a house under attack. There are many more horror stories, but it takes time for the word to leak past the suppression of US censorship and denials.

Finally, one of the biggest anomalies of the entire war on terrorism in Afghanistan is the utter **lack of any significant numbers of Arab detainees by the Americans**. There were numerous reports by the US government, prior to the invasion, that Osama bin Laden had employed and was in the process of training thousands of Arab mercenaries and terrorists in the camps, and that the country was being controlled by these henchmen of bin Laden. Either this was mere propaganda or these Arabs have all been allowed to escape--for only a handful have been rounded up. I suspect they were allowed to escape, along with bin Laden. Nothing would take the air out of this phony war faster than bin Ladens capture or death.

War in Iraq

IMPERIAL AMERICA ON THE MARCH

Americans used to scoff with confidence at Soviet and Chinese Cold War propaganda during the Vietnam era, that charged America with imperialistic intentions in Southeast Asia. The propagandists were wrong. America had no intentions of occupying or colonizing these areas. The McNamara, Kissinger and CFR insiders had only one prime intention in jumping into the quagmire of that guerrilla war, which was exacerbated by rules of engagement favorable to the enemy and prolonged by allowing Russia and China to feed unlimited supplies of war materiel into the theater of operations. The Vietnam debacle was designed, among other smaller goals, to eradicate any current or future desire by the American public to directly confront Communism's subversion of third world nations. It served its purpose. America got its fingers burned trying to make the world safe for democracy, and a period of isolationism reigned in the USA - until the George H. W. Bush administration reversed the course of American foreign policy and began a deliberate and

calculated series of wars of intervention in order to reengage Americans in global conflict.

The same old verbiage about opposing tyranny and saving democracy was there, but this time the globalist insiders would trumpet their vaunted New World Order to the world openly. They obviously had something bigger in mind than mere nation building via non-coercive, helpful means. Neither were they targeting the larger threat of Communist Russian, still feigning weakness after allowing a spontaneous uprising of the former Soviet states. In this new round of intervention, the US would exclusively target smaller tyrants who couldn't fight back, almost as if their goal was to antagonize the post Soviet world with American hegemony. The change in tactics was also notable in its different approach to war and its commensurate justification. In earlier wars, the US simply played soft with Communism and waited for the inevitable domino effect of small revolutions that would justify US intervention. Coup d'etat were often facilitated by small hints from the US State Department that the US would not intervene to support the corrupt pro-Western regime being threatened.

But with the initiation of more directly controlled conflict in the 90s, the small circle of globalist planners used, more than ever before, behind-the-scenes provocations and agent provocateurs to falsify the appearance of war crimes in Kuwait, Bosnia and Kosovo, and otherwise manufacture justifications for intervention that could be trumpeted by the media. It is obvious in the aftermath that US intentions of managing the news had the full cooperation of the heads of all establishment media outlets. The vaunted fourth estate was clearly unwilling to acknowledge, much less publish, the obvious contradictions brought forth by a minority of foreign journalists.

Today, we hear renewed charges from the left of US imperialism in Afghanistan and Iraq. This time the charges are justified. The US is clearly acting as conqueror rather than liberator of Iraq. While the Bush administration continues to pretend that the Iraqi people are free, and that this whole exercise is about allowing for self-determination, the facts speak otherwise. The US is obviously

determined to control any potential democratic outcome in Iraq, just as they do in the US. Their manipulations have been so transparent as to invite international disdain for US pretensions. Despite fostering great expectations internationally for an Iraqi interim governing council, the US quickly disbanded the council when insufficient servility to US whims was manifest. Talk of imminent elections was quieted soon thereafter. Later, a smaller, more hand-picked and controllable council was selected, but still no elections. As a tide of criticism arose from the emerging Iraqi free press, the US quickly shut down any newspapers espousing anti-US views. That's imperialism, not democracy, nor freedom.

A few key quotes in the news have hit upon the growing colonial and paternalistic sentiment among American administrators in Iraq. Time magazine caught administrative Tsar Paul Bremer referring to Iraq as if it were his own personal fiefdom: We've got oil, we've got water, we've got fertile land, we've got wonderful people. We've got? Why not? Their? Whose country is Iraq, anyway? Along the same lines, the Associated Press quoted an unnamed source in the Pentagon (most likely a political appointee) enthusing on US intentions in Iraq, You have to go in and tell them: We're gonna do what we did in Germany and Japan. We're gonna write your constitution. We're gonna install your government. We're gonna write your laws.

Far from being idle statements of arrogance, these statements hint at the real purpose behind US continued presence in Iraq. With big name corporations like Halliburton and Bechtel maneuvering to justify their huge no-bid contracts, Americans think US contractors are solely engaged in rebuilding essential utilities and infrastructure in Iraq. But there is a large contingent of smaller contractors tasked to completely change the social and legal structure of Iraq. I don't recall the administration ever getting a mandate from Congress to engage in this kind of change. The administration is clearly no longer a servant of the people, but a change agent of its own.

Arizona Republican Jim Kolbe sounded a clear warning when he said, "They are going to lose their credibility with the Iraqi people if we don't get services up. But they are going to lose their credibility with the American people if they are not up front and tell us what the cost is, what we can expect." This is even more true as the American people find out that only a tiny part of the billions being doled out in Iraq are going toward getting essential services up and running.

The US is busy revamping Iraqi judicial system, the education system, the agricultural sector, the tax structure, pension systems, social security and the medical system. The Observer (UK) reports, "An American law firm with ties to the Bush administration has been hired to help set up a legal system in Iraq. The firm, Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, has been drafted in by USAID to advise on privatizing former government-held industries, structuring government economic and regulatory agencies, and developing a tax structure. The legal deal is part of a larger package worth up to \$79.6 million taken on by Bearing Point, formerly called KPMG consultants, to advise on the restructuring of Iraq. The deal is expected to lead to several million dollars of work for Squire, Sanders, effectively as sub-contractor. It was also announced on Friday that the administration in Iraq has appointed a JP Morgan-led consortium that includes France's Credit Lyonnais to set up and manage a trade bank for Iraq."

Who authorized this kind of reform? Certainly not Congress. Aside from the patent illegality of such interference, whether or not such revisions are necessary or proper depends on exactly what kinds of legal structures are envisioned and implemented. The reason Japan and Germany rebounded so quickly following their own American-led restructuring was that the socialist system within both nations was to a large extent dismantled. While the legal and constitutional structures and laws imposed upon Japan and Germany were by no means perfect in free-market terms, they did unleash sufficient entrepreneurial spirit to cause both countries to make tremendous gains in economic growth and stability - before the inevitable reversion to democratic socialism took place.

In contrast, In Iraq the US has no pretense of creating a real broad-based free-market economy. It will build a privileged economy whereby only compliant businessmen and corporations get sufficient economic liberty to prosper. Opposition forces will be denied prosperity mostly by being denied access to American aid, and the necessary permits to do business.

All of this meddling in non-essential infrastructure will be costly and politically unpopular both in Iraq and with the American public as US citizens see domestic spending being cut at home while Iraqi social programs are being given priority over American needs. It is little wonder that the Bush administration is very cryptic and evasive about what Iraqi operations are costing. It seems the Bush administration throws out low ball figures on Iraq and then waits for more scrupulous watchdogs to ferret out better figures. Only after a couple of months does the administration admit to the higher figures. By then the real expenditures have climbed higher still. Thus far, the Bush administration's cost analysis has gone from \$2 billion per month to \$4 billion, and the numbers are still rising. All this is on top of the ongoing expenditures of a billion dollars a month in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Kosovo, and other lingering quagmires none of which get much press any more. Some analysts are predicting costs in Iraq will reach \$10 billion per month, and for good reason as the US tries to alter Iraq's judicial, educational, and medical systems to mimic US controlled systems, it creates a constant and growing need for more funding - never less. Such is the nature of benefit-corruption in socialism, and government mandated standards of quality.

Let me return briefly to the subject of US imperialism in Iraq. It is not, as the left assumes, a mere exercise in power and greed, a manifestation of Capitalism gone bad. US warmongering and colonial paternalism in Iraq has a higher globalist purpose that of using conflict and the appearance of peaceful resolution to slowly accustom the America people to constant globalist intervention. Even the apparent bungling of US efforts in Iraq may have some perverse purpose to the globalists. After bashing the UN about its failure to attack Iraq, the US is notably eager (as always) to lead American public opinion back to the premise that we must keep going back to the UN to establish

legitimacy. Indeed, US heavy handedness makes people forget how corrupt and incompetent UN peacekeeping efforts have been in times past.

As both the US and UN jockey for control of the New World Order, each plays off the evils and excesses of the other in order to make themselves look like the Saviors of the world. And yet, neither have any other intent but to dominate and subject the world to their brand of international control.

The tactics of the US negotiators at the UN are telling. It is obvious they want a larger UN role in Iraq at almost any price *i.e.* except loss of control. Thus, the core demand prevails that all UN peacekeeping forces be under a US commander, just like in Kosovo and Afghanistan. The reasons for US insistence on a UN presence have nothing to do with saving US taxpayers any expense. The US can't get any allies to send more than token forces into this sniper's den without offering to bribe them with direct or indirect payments. If the UN joins, the costs and inefficiencies will also rise, and Americans will pay later through increased UN dues.

The key to understanding the dual personality of the US in foreign policy (its love-hate relationship with the UN) is that US globalist leaders are trying to simultaneously foster antagonism towards the US and respect for globalist institutions. The antagonism is meant to lead to the ousting of the US as the reigning knight in shining armor, policeman of the world. Meanwhile, the world is quickly and predictably being lured into accepting the UN as benevolent, despite its bloody history. It's the old *i.e.* good cop, bad cop *i.e.* routine on an international scale.

THE US IN TROUBLE IN IRAQ

The guerrilla movement is growing as Islamic Jihad fighters stream in from neighboring countries, eager to have a go at the *i.e.* great Satan. *i.e.* Bush may not regret his *i.e.* bring *i.e.* em on *i.e.* challenge, but his troops highly resent it. They are the intended targets. Syria is actively recruiting *i.e.* liberators *i.e.* Iraq via its surrogate *i.e.* minaret network *i.e.* of fundamentalist cells. The Saudis

allow similar networks to operate under the umbrella of the burgeoning Wahabi movement despite that nation's eager appearance to be a partner in the war on terror. All of the Middle Eastern nations know they have to play up to the US, but each is eager to stab us in the back. Sadly, it is not the front-line, heavily armed US forces that are taking the brunt of the ambushes and sniper attacks; it's the rear echelon columns of truck drivers and other non-combatants, many of whom are women.

US casualties have risen to an average of ten killed and wounded per day. The Washington Post reported, "The number of those wounded in action, which totals 1,124 since the war began in March, has grown so large, and attacks have become so commonplace, that US Central Command usually issues news releases listing injuries only when the attacks kill one or more troops. The result is that many injuries go unreported. Although Central Command keeps a running total of the wounded, it releases the number only when asked - making the combat injuries of U.S. troops in Iraq one of the untold stories of the war... Since the war began, more than 6,000 service members have been flown back to the United States. The number includes the 1,124 wounded in action, 301 who received non-hostile injuries in vehicle accidents and other mishaps, and thousands who became physically or mentally ill."

US troops are growing weary and angry as the promised short war turns into an indefinite deployment. A "stop loss" order is in effect, whereby no one is allowed to leave the military (with certain exceptions such as that of General Tommy Franks, who decided he'd seen enough of this boondoggle and wanted out). Extensive use of National Guard units is wreaking havoc in an uncertain employment market as employers of guardsmen are required to hold their jobs open for them during their deployment. In desperation, Sec. of Defense Rumsfeld is now considering activating three reserve divisions to relieve troops in Iraq. The Congressional Budget Office predicts that the Pentagon cannot continue to keep current troop levels deployed past a year without destroying morale and negatively impacting future recruitment. Enlistments are already drying up. According to the CBO, to sustain a suitable rotational deployment schedule for the long-term, with existing manpower, the US can only maintain a maximum of 64,000 troops in Iraq. Watch out for the draft. While there is little

support for a draft considering the growing unpopularity of the war in Iraq, a sudden flair up of terrorism or war in Korea or Syria could be conveniently used to suppress public resistance.

The killing of Ayatollah Hakim is a bad omen for the US occupiers. This Shiite cleric, recently returned from exile in Iran, was revered as perhaps the great unifier of Shiite political hopes in post war Iraq. His death has spawned many Shiite suspicions that the US may have had some hand in the deed. There is little evidence of that, but it is indicative of how surprise events can undermine the most carefully laid US plans for the pacification of the Shiite majority of fundamentalist Muslims.

US RECORD ON REGIME CHANGES IS MIXED

The American public has been led to believe that with this war in Iraq, the US is engaging in compelling a "regime change" in another nation for the first time. This is only nominally true, in the overt sense of using direct military force to accomplish such a change. However, if we count the employment of covert actions to overthrow other governments, the US has a long history of such practices. US involvement in regime changes in other nations, for good or for ill, has always been a little complex because of two major factors:

First, the **takeover** of the American Republic by *socialists and globalists* **has been gradual**. During the first half of the twentieth century, these agents of influence were a minority in government and had to hide many of their motives for championing "progressive" changes. At the same time, they had to deal with the anti-Communist sentiment that prevailed among the American public, in Congress, and among most government employees (including the military). There were **active and contending ideological factions** in the media, the public, the military, in universities and Congress. There were even multiple factions within the secret world of US intelligence (OSS, ONI, DIA, CIA, FBI, etc.) whose dark-side operations, which ran counter to US best interests, had to be hidden from the many loyal and patriotic agents who would not have approved.

Second, even as socialists and globalists gained effective control of all facets of the federal government (including Congress) during WWII and the 1950's, they still had to play as if they were "centrists" and moderates-**hiding the more radical NWO agenda** that has as its main goal the demise of US Constitutionally derived sovereignty. The public had to be prepped for the globalist transition, cleansed of residual awareness of and loyalty for our Constitutional Republic and indoctrinated with the principles of raw democracy. This took time. It also took time to gain more comprehensive control of the media and public education institutions which would be the prime indoctrinators. In sum, the domestic and foreign policy of the US involved playing two simultaneous roles: 1) nominally defending legitimate US interests-mostly through hollow rhetoric, and 2) undermining those same interests, in secret, through collusion with third party socialists and Communists along with the selective use of their own covert teams (black ops).

To understand the conflicting record of US regime changes and government overthrows, one more key point is necessary to understand. There is a **line of demarcation** that occurred during the Carter administration that helps explain in part what happened before and after that era. Before the Carter administration, the CIA still had an active human intelligence (HUMINT) network of spies throughout the world, who were mostly interested in ferreting out Communists and other hostile double agents. James Angleton, the longtime CIA head of these operations, was targeted for removal by the leftist factions within government. The same was true of J. Edgar Hoover, longtime head of the FBI. Both men kept files on leftist political leaders to stave off reprisals from other leftist factions in government.

The **US State Department and White House staff** were the hotbed of Communist agents of influence beginning with the Roosevelt administration and continuing to the Carter era. Leftist sympathizers saw themselves at war with the "right wing" factions within the security and military services. It was the US State Department, in collusion with the Executive Department and controlled media, that actively attempted to overthrow pro-Western regimes and replace them with Communist revolutionaries masquerading as "reformers." This latter association was amply played up to the public by key leftist reporters such as Herbert

Matthews, Drew Pearson, Edward R. Murrow, Walter Winchell, and Walter Lippman. The CIA and ONI, on the other hand, were primarily behind the attempts to overthrow Communist regimes in the pre-Carter years.

This explains why the US was at various times both **installing and overthrowing Communist regimes** before the Carter era. For instance, the US covertly worked to *install* Communist regimes in **China, Cuba, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Angola, Mozambique and Nicaragua**, among others. Hard as this is for most Americans to believe, there is in each case strong documentation published by patriotic witnesses who tried to stop these betrayals and who were consequently removed from government or otherwise sanctioned. Naturally, none of these testaments made their way into establishment histories. Two of the most detailed and accurate of the dissenting views are found in the following accounts: *Foreign Policy Failures in Cuba* by **Mario Lazo** (the US ambassador to Cuba at the time of US covert assistance to Castro) and *Nicaragua Betrayed* by **Anastasio Samoza** (the former President of Nicaragua who meticulously documented his conversations and dealings with leftist State Department officials as they systematically betrayed Nicaragua to the Communist rebels). Neither books are currently in print, but you can find them in used bookstores.

Let's look at the other side of the equation. At the same time that socialist and globalist factions were working to install Communist regimes, other factions within the US government covertly *overthrew* various regimes, some democratically elected, that had significant secret ties to Communist movements and that presented a threat to indigenous anti-Communist leaders or American business interests (due to land confiscation policies, etc.). Notable examples that have enraged the liberal press ever since include: the 1953 attempt to overthrow Mohammad Mosaddeq in **Iran** and restore the shah; the 1954 coup to remove President Jacobo Arbenz in **Guatemala**; the 1961 Cuban **Bay of Pigs** attempt to remove Castro; and the 1973 overthrow of Salvador Allende in **Chile** by Augusto Pinochet. Each of these operations was planned and executed by anti-Communist factions within the CIA. The Cuban **Bay of Pigs failed** because the leftist elements of the State

Department and White House were able to convince Kennedy to deny air support at the last minute.

Since the Carter administration, however, these **conflicting factions have been for the most part eliminated or neutralized**. Carter appointed leftist Stansfield Turner as CIA chief, and he eagerly purged some 800 espionage officers, many of whom were connected to James Angleton, chief of the CIA's counterintelligence from 1954 to 1974 and an ardent anti-Communist. (See <http://edwardjayepstein.com/archived/whokilled2.htm>.) Almost all other remaining anti-communist agents had been eliminated or withdrawn by the time the **Aldrich Ames** spy case blew open in 1994. According to the Senate investigating committee, "Ames had been an employee of CIA for 31 years, with most of his career spent in the Directorate of Operations, which is responsible for carrying out CIA clandestine operations around the globe. While the precise extent of Ames's espionage activities was unclear at the time of his arrest, Justice Department officials confirmed that Ames was believed to have caused the death or imprisonment of a number of Soviets who had been sources of the CIA and FBI."

Some conservatives have theorized that the **dismantling of the anti-Communist spy sections** was either attributable to US stupidity, or due to the control exercised by the many secret Communist agents that had infiltrated the State Department during and since WWII. However, it is my theory that this dismantling was intentional at some level to further globalist objectives which required, among other things, playing along with grand deception of the "collapse of Communism" in Russia. I believe that the globalist control system actively uses predictable socialists to further the leftist agenda, and facilitates Communist espionage to undermine US sovereign interests-while avoiding the prospect of getting caught doing so directly.

True, the US government has attacked and facilitated the overthrow of Communist governments since the purge of anti-Communism from government agencies, but it has done so for different reasons. No longer are operations like Kosovo and Bosnia the work of residual patriotic factions inside the CIA or military intelligence. Rather, the Communist leaders and regimes in Serbia, Afghanistan and Iraq were targeted for

globalist reasons - either because they resisted the transition to globalist control, or because their removal was necessary to serve other longer range globalist purposes (control of oil resources, antagonism of the Slavic and Muslim worlds towards the US, getting the US military used to acting as global cop, etc.). Eventually, all Communist regimes, even those brought to power with US influence, will be brought down by the globalists after they have served their usefulness.

The Newest Target: North Korea. According to leaked documents from the Pentagon, Sec. of Defense Donald Rumsfeld is calling for a regime change in Pyongyang. This is not, in my analysis, because the Bush administration wants a truly disarmed or reformed Korea in the near future. Remember, the US has worked behind the scenes with the UN for years to preserve this ruthless Communist regime, which is a surrogate of China and Russia. Some evidence of these efforts: 1) The Truman administration established safe areas for Chinese troops and aircraft, thus prohibiting McArthur from winning the Korean war through hot pursuit; 2) The US failed to sanction Russia and China for turning N. Korea into an armed camp with WMD; 3) The US has known about N. Korean transfers of Scud missiles for years and has never intervened; and 4) The US has provided billions in food, oil, and nuclear power plant technology transfers, in spite of a constant flow of evidence of Korean non-compliance with non-proliferation issues.

In my analysis, it appears that the tensions between China and its neighbors Taiwan and N. Korea are being preserved to serve as future trigger events for the next World War. The other potential trigger is the Israeli-Arab conflict. Globalist planners may view it as necessary to avoid a confrontation with N. Korea now since that would force China and Russia to come to N. Korea's aid, and trigger a World War neither side is ready for. Thus, both N. Korea and Syria are being encouraged to play moderate so the US has an excuse NOT to attack militarily. Syria is being compliant (for now), so Rumsfeld is focusing on N. Korea, pushing China to remove Kim Jong-il and replace him with someone more stable and compliant.

The talks this week in Beijing between the US, N. Korea, and China have broken down. Rather than be conciliatory, the Pyongyang representative

Ri Gun bragged openly that N. Korea actually possesses operational nuclear weapons. He also claimed it has an ongoing program of reprocessing spent fuel rods, allowing it to increase production and export plutonium to other countries. This brash in-your-face boast was presented in order to provoke the US into a sense of urgency, hoping to force the US to accept N. Korea's demand for direct one-on-one talks-a demand that Sec. of State Colin Powell and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice have rejected. The Bush administration wants first and foremost to push the international agenda of multilateral talks. The US only settles on a course of unilateral action when the UN refuses to go along with US intentions and the US doesn't mind inflaming world opinion.

MOUNTING COMPLICATION IN THE REGIME CHANGE OF IRAQ

The US is quickly digging itself a hole in terms of world opinion as it continues to act unilaterally even after the collapse of Saddam's regime.

Control Over Oil: The US has fallen into a legal quagmire of its own making. According to Reuters, "After extending until June 3 emergency arrangements for Iraq's oil-for-food plan, the UN Security Council faces contentious US demands that U.N. controls be struck entirely from the multibillion-dollar plan. President Bush has said several times he wants the sanctions, imposed in 1990, lifted entirely and diplomats said the United States was crafting a resolution that would guarantee that proceeds from future oil sales be held in trust for an interim Iraqi authority [*US puppet regime*] rather than the United Nations."

This, of course, would give the US direct access to all the oil revenues. Russia and France are teaming up to use their veto powers to stop the US from dismantling current UN authority over oil. No oil company is allowed to purchase Iraqi oil while sanctions are in place, and the US has no legal standing to sell Iraq's oil.

Weapons Inspections. The biggest charge of hypocrisy has been in response to US refusal to allow UN weapons inspectors into the country. Bill O'Reilly and former US weapons inspector Scott Ritter have

correctly pointed out that this looks very suspicious. The US is short on manpower, and should welcome all the help they can get. Suspicions run high that the US is desperate to find something major that can be used to justify the war-even if they have to bring something in. This is what Ritter had to say in a recent interview:

"The Bush Administration is desperate at this point in time to find evidence of retained prohibited capability, because this would in one fell swoop legitimize the entire invasion. People have to take a step back and understand that the Bush Administration fabricated and misrepresented information going into this conflict about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. If they don't find it, there is every reason to believe that they will fabricate and misrepresent information to legitimize the other end of the conflict.

"I would recommend that everybody take a long hard look at the people involved in this [inspections] process. **Charles Duelfer**, the former deputy executive chairman of UNSCOM. He is a State Department employee who served with the weapons inspectors from 1993 to 1999. As a state department employee, he implemented unilateral American policy of regime removal - containment, destabilization, and removal through intelligence collection, using the weapons inspections process to achieve this. He was not there to disarm Iraq. This is a man who leaked film images to the media in 1996 of burning leaves claiming to be burning documents. This is a man, whom in the presence of myself and others, said to a senior CIA official out of frustration of not finding weapons, *Why don't you put a missile in Iraq for us to find?* This is a man who deliberately misrepresented the body of data held by the weapons inspectors in their final report to the Security Council so as to achieve American political objectives. This is the man now - a senior participant in this effort with this exploitation team that they are ready to send into Iraq. Why should I trust Charles Duelfer? Why should any American trust him? If the U.S. is serious about legitimizing any potential weapons of mass destruction, they should have the U.N. weapons inspectors go in and do the work, with an independent objective and an implementation of a Security Council mandate." [End of Ritter quote.]

UN Weapons Chief Inspector Hans Blix has correctly warned that any US finds of WMD would be suspect unless confirmed by international inspectors. The US has even demandeđ that Syria return weapons it was hiding on behalf of Saddam Hussein, quietly admitting that the US has known all along where the bulk of Saddam's weapons went. Will the American public put two and two together and see the duplicity here? I doubt it.

Any Kind of Democracy You Want-Except Religious. The US is very clear that it does not intend to allow the Iraqis to choose a leader or government if that government is Muslim fundamentalist in orientation. "If you're suggesting, how would we feel about an Iranian-type government with a few clerics running everything in the country, the answer is: That isn't going to happen," Donald Rumsfeld told the AP in a recent press conference. Notice the pejorative manner in which he rephrased the question to make it look undemocratic: "a few clerics running everything."

This kind of selective democracy is actually typical of what the US government sets up every time it intervenes formally or informally in a nation. I have personal experience of this from working in Latin America as a political advisor to emerging political parties, and can assure my readers that the US never allows any nation to install a type of government modeled after the US Constitution, or anything close to it.

The Shiite majority is demonstrating loudly against the US occupation of Iraq. Not only have they been underrepresented relative to their population percentage (above 60%), but they know that the US is intending to exclude them from power. The US said as much when it issued public warnings to Iran not to "interfere" in Iraq-meaning sending in political organizers to help the fundamentalist cause. Iran already has a fundamentalist government.

US Puppet Regime Will Never Be Accepted by Most. Iraqi exile leader **Ahmad Chalabi** is being touted as the future leader in Iraq. But if the Bush administration thinks that all Shiites will emulate Chalabi and come together under a future secular government, they are kidding themselves. The Bush administration is in a form of denial about the passion of the Iraqi Shiite community who have not had the freedom to

express themselves for years. They are doing so now, and the US is treating them as if they are loud minority. They are not admitting that the rising anti-Bush sentiment is causing many Iraqis, Shiites and Sunnis included, to form alliances that were impossible before. These alliances won't last for the long term, but they do guarantee tough going for the US if it tries to impose its will for long. As for Chalabi, Iraqis view him as a nobody or as a Western lackey, and they particularly distrust the fact that he was allowed to arrive with a small army of trained mercenaries. No other leader has been allowed his own private army. It has not been lost on the Iraqis that Chalabi and his men still carry foreign passports and don't intend to give up their escape plans, should things not work out. In other words, they aren't in it for the long haul, unless they are propped up by US power.

US Occupation of Military Bases. When I watched Defense Secretary Rumsfeld deny any US intention to maintain a long-term military presence in Iraq, I sensed he was lying. He gets a disturbed look on his face when he is being less than honest, and he was looking very troubled as the media peppered him with questions. He even got angry at one point, realizing he wasn't being believed despite his absolute verbal assurances that reports of US long-term intentions to stay were "inaccurate and unfortunate." When he said, "I have never heard the subject of a permanent base in Iraq discussed," he was probably thinking in Clintonian terms-"That depends on the meaning of permanent." He definitely began to get uncomfortable when probed about "how long." He grabbed at three or four excuses, all of which were quite open-ended. It would depend on "how rapidly an interim Iraqi government evolves and how successful external influences might be in destabilizing the country." Well, that says it all-it wouldn't be hard to imagine those criteria lasting forever!

US Soldiers Caught Stealing Millions and Robbing Artifacts. Photos taken of US soldiers prying archeological artifacts off the wall of a museum to keep as souvenirs have been circulating on the internet, causing outrage among viewers, as they should. Causing similar outrage are reports that troops from the 4th Battalion of the 64th Army Division found millions in US bills and cached some of it away to smuggle back to the States for personal enrichment.

We expect better of our troops. This is one of the reasons why I refrain from showing unconditional support of our troops-as if they were all homogeneous. I cringe when I hear of self-serving generals praising our troops as if all are the greatest people in the world. Many individuals are truly outstanding, especially in the elite units, but most show a real lack of motivation, or are motivated by swaggering bravado and other dangerous macho attitudes. Having been a Marine officer myself, I have wide experience handling enlisted men. Only a small minority are really sharp and faithful to the high standards the Marines set. Drug and alcohol problems are common, especially among those who enlist for lack of anything better to do back home. I am actually surprised there are not more incidents such as these. In a longer term war involving much more discouraging conditions, there probably would be. Morality problems in the military are epidemic. **The new policies of intermixing women and men in military units is a disaster.** Since the military never preaches anything but a pragmatic "don't get caught" form of sexual morality, it is no wonder that thousands of single males on board a ship mixed with a few females don't control themselves. A lot of women in the navy end up pregnant.

In terms of the artifacts incident, a larger issue here is the refusal of the Pentagon to **forestall looting of Iraq's archeological museums.** The looting was preplanned and systematic-done by professionals. The Iraqi archeological community had forewarned the US through various sources and on more than one occasion that they expected theft and specifically requested the US prepare to protect these museums and artifacts. How does it look to the world that the US prepared special teams to secure all oil infrastructure and even oil related administrative buildings and did nothing to protect the museums?

MEETING OF 300 IRAQI LEADERS NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF IRAQ

In Baghdad, retired US General Jay Garner, the interim administrator in charge of Iraq's reconstruction, organized his second conference to prepare to name a provisional government within the next 30 days. The first conference was two weeks ago at Ur and was poorly attended by

around 60 Iraqi representatives. Monday's attendance was nearly 300 due to the return of so many Iraqi exiles, who have little support within the country. The US clearly intends to install many of the exiles in the new government. The Shiites have generally boycotted these meetings protesting the obvious US intent to exclude the majority Shiites from governing in post war Iraq. However, they did place a few representatives in this meeting in order to keep track of what Garner is promoting.

These tactics are in stark contrast to **President Bush's televised claims** that "we aren't going to impose any form of government on Iraq. They are going to be free to choose who they really want." No one believes Bush on that one. One thing Bush said was actually true: "We aren't going to impose our form of government." Too bad-a constitutionally restricted Republic with guarantees against majoritarian tyranny would be just the thing to keep one Iraqi group from imposing its will on another. But it won't happen because such restrictions also preclude a socialist redistribution schemes, which all politicians use to buy votes.

IRAQI CIVILIAN SHOOTINGS

American soldiers are not being trained in how to maintain good fire discipline when confronted by civilian demonstrators. Two times now, agent provocateurs have shot at American troops under the cover of civilian demonstrations. In a third this last week, soldiers opened fire on the crowd when no shots were fired-only when a youth threw a shoe and hit a soldier. In response to all these cases, some justified and one not, US troops have open fire with automatic weapons on the unarmed crowds, leaving many dead and wounded.

The US cannot afford to continue to feed the Iraqi people's growing hatred of American occupation by responding in this manner. In 2 out of the 3 recent cases, Americans were in protected buildings where they could have taken cover and determined where the shots were coming from. Instead they blasted the crowds in an over-reaction to the perceived need to "return fire" with maximum force. That's what they are taught in training. In contrast, the Israel Defense Force (IDF) is carefully trained on how to avoid firing on civilians merely throwing rocks, sticks or shoes,

and to target the few with rifles hiding behind the crowds. Yes, some rock throwers occasionally get hit, but civilian casualties are kept to a minimum. The US will no longer be able to chastise the IDF for civilian casualties after our own soldiers' poor use of fire discipline. It's not blaming the soldiers as much as our military officers for not preparing them on how to handle these kinds of situations. There is much the US did not do to properly prepare its troops to attack a country and keep order in the aftermath.

US LEAVING SAUDI AIR BASE, BUT NOT FOR GOOD

Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld announced this week in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia that the US would withdraw its forces from the nation, now that the military mission of the Iraq war is ended. This is only partially true. The US is only putting the its facilities at Prince Sultan Air Base in mothballs and will keep it operationally ready for a quick return when the next Middle East crisis arises. To this end, 400 to 500 military personnel will remain to keep the facilities operational. I view the withdrawal as only a token move to appease the Saudi regime. US forces have long been a thorn in the side of this fundamentalist Muslim nation. There are thousands of other Americans in numerous operations through the Saudi Kingdom-many working with corporate/government partnership deals. However, the need for a fully staffed military base in Saudi Arabia has been lessened since the US invasion of Iraq. Having four new airbases in Iraq under US control has allowed this gesture to the Saudis to go forward. I fully expect the US to maintain a very substantial military presence in Iraq for future intervention in the region.

HALLIBURTON ESCAPES SCRUTINY FOR ARMS VIOLATION

The **High Energy Access Tools** (H.E.A.T) company has been indicted on charges of unlicensed exportation of defense services and use of explosive materials-a felony. The company had contracts with government anti- terrorism teams, many foreign, to train them in the use of explosives. Bob Gorence, the attorney for H.E.A.T's president David Hudak, told reporters this week that it was Halliburton Corporation which solicited Hudak to purchase the 2,400 warheads-an illegal transaction for both Halliburton and H.E.A.T. Hudak says Halliburton offered the

warheads as demolition charges and not as government-owned military items which are illegal to possess. Frankly, I find this hard to believe given that these finned warheads are not easily dismantled or detonated outside of their normal use. This looks like an illegal weapons transfer to me. So guess who is taking the rap? It's not Halliburton, VP Dick Cheney's company, and a prime contractor in the Iraq reconstruction.

BUSH'S 3-ZONE OCCUPATION PLAN FOR IRAQ-OR IS IT 4 ZONES?

There are reports that Iraq is to be divided into three or perhaps four sectors patrolled by troops led by the United States, Britain and Poland. The Warsaw government says the United States is planning to divide Iraq up into four military sectors, each patrolled by a force of between 7,000 and 9,000 soldiers from one of the three nations. Who will occupy the fourth area - which probably encompasses Baghdad proper - has not yet been determined.

Polish Defense Minister Jerzy Szmajdzinski said back on April 29 that the US gave Poland assurance of large grants of money if it would take part in the occupation. The US did make it very clear to Poland that the US would be in overall control of all occupation forces. This is not surprising given US desires to control everything in Iraq, including the next government and Iraq's oil. So far Poland claims to be ready to put 3,000 troops on the ground, and perhaps as many as 4,000 if other countries will pony up more funds. Germany and Denmark just reported this week that they are refusing Poland's requests to add their own troops to the mix-unless the US steps down and allows the UN to manage the occupation and reconstruction.

Why Poland? Poland has been very much a bit player in this war, with only 200 soldiers in Iraq and a mere 50 who engaged in actual combat. The Polish language barrier will only add to the friction of occupation as hardly any Iraqis speak Polish. Why should Poland get such a big stake in the prestige contest of being a team player with the US? On one hand, the inclusion of Poland might be a US attempt to play up the new Eastern Block nations just approved for joining NATO. The US Senate formally approved NATO's newest expansion, voting 96-0 to add seven Eastern

European nations to NATO: *Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria and Romania*. Poland had been previously approved for membership in the first expansion.

Another possibility might be related to Poland's recent **contract to pay \$3.5 billion** for 48 American-made Lockheed Martin F-16 fighters. These kinds of deals with supposedly "reformed" Communist countries typically include **"offset"** deals on the side that indicate such contracts are merely a cover for technology transfers to the buyer. In this case, in exchange for buying the fighters, Poland extracted a commitment from Lockheed and other American companies to build a factory in Poland to construct GE engines for the Lockheed F-16s as well as factories for GM cars and Motorola telecommunications gear. This is the kind of deal China finagles all the time, to ensure that US military technology stays when the next World War begins-when the world discovers that Communism really wasn't dead after all in Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, China, and many other "reformed" nations.

I'm not surprised by the **US move to create different semi-autonomous zones of occupation**. The potential of ethnic dissatisfaction with any centralized control in Baghdad is high. If the US wants a successful outcome, it will allow Iraq to separate into three smaller autonomous regions, corresponding to Iraq's natural ethnic groups: Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds. Turkey is violently opposed to a Kurdish state, or even autonomous region, as this would enliven the hopes of the insurgent Kurds trapped in Turkey to break loose and secede from Turkish control.

BACKGROUND ON PAUL BREMER, NEW POINTMAN IN IRAQ

The public has been fed the line that Paul Bremer has been appointed as the "civil administrator" of Iraq in deference to the wishes of Sec. of State Collin Powell. Reconstruction Tsar Jay Garner (a Rumsfeld man) will fall under Bremer's jurisdiction. Frankly, I don't think it is a turf battle at all, but rather a consolidation of control of Iraq in the hands of a globalist trained protégé of Henry Kissinger-necessitated by the increasing complexity of the emerging political unrest in Iraq, which is clearly out of Garner's league.

Bremer has all the right credentials. He was ambassador-at-large for Counterterrorism during the Reagan Administration (when the CIA was busy funding numerous terrorist groups like the IRA). He is a member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies and the CFR, a recent Managing Director of Kissinger and Associates, and a speaker at the globalist World Affairs Council. He also served as an advisor for Americans for Victory over Terrorism (AVOT), a project of the neoconservative www.empower.org and www.globalsecurity.org organizations that promote the interventionist vision of US hegemony around the world, supposedly for the sake of democracy.

In an interview on PBS Frontline, Bremer candidly said, "We're going to be on the ground in Iraq as soldiers and citizens for years. We're going to be running a colony almost." He'd better hope the Iraqis don't hear that.

PLAN TO ATTACK IRAQ HATCHED RIGHT AFTER 9/11

CBS National Security Correspondent David Martin reports, "CBS News has learned that barely five hours after American Airlines Flight 77 plowed into the Pentagon, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld was telling his aides to come up with plans for striking Iraq, even though there was no evidence linking Saddam Hussein to the attacks. That's according to notes taken by aides who were with Rumsfeld in the National Military Command Center on Sept. 11 - notes that show exactly where the road toward war with Iraq began." [See www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/09/04/september11/main520830.shtml]. Rumsfeld was overruled, however, by others in the administration who (in collusion with Russia) had been planning to attack Afghanistan for over a year. Obviously, the 9/11 attack provided the excuse to move ahead on the Afghanistan offensive, and Iraq had to wait till the Taliban were replaced by Hamed Karzai, a US lackey.

Despite the US victory in Iraq, the rest of the world is still suspicious that US motives for the intervention are very much different than those stated publicly. As **Peter Preston** of *The Guardian* (UK) proclaims, "Victory in the desert hasn't made a blind bit of difference," Preston writes. "The rest of the world is neither forgiving nor forgetting. Its rulers may, or may not.

Mr. Putin, [may] be trying to change the record, but the people they rule have elephants' memories and a view which mere outcomes do not affect." Preston cites, in particular, the sudden loss of US interest in finding any large stocks of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq-the supposed evidence needed to prove why Iraq was such a threat to US interests. Yes, a few remnants of WMDs have been found, but nothing of any significant magnitude-especially since none of these chemical weapons were launched at US or British troops during the war.

Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, a group of former military intelligence types, has issued the following warning to the Bush administration concerning the importance of not looking devious in the eyes of the world:

"Prominent pundits (and, quite probably, some of your own advisers) are now saying it does not matter whether so-called weapons of mass destruction are ever found in Iraq. Don't let them fool you. It matters a great deal. The Wall Street Journal had it right in its page-one lead article on April 8: Officials Debate Involving the UN in Verification. American forces in Iraq are rapidly confronting two other tasks (besides hunting down Saddam Hussein) of enormous importance: finding any weapons of mass destruction and convincing the world the finds are real. The weapons search is a critical one for the Bush administration, which went to war charging that the Iraqi leader had hidden huge amounts of chemical and biological weapons and could pass them on to terrorists. If the US doesn't make any undisputed discoveries of forbidden weapons, the failure will feed already-widespread skepticism abroad about the motives for going to war. And the controversy has now become acute, since you have been backed into the untenable position of assuming the former role of Saddam Hussein in refusing to cooperate with UN inspectors." [End of VIPS quote.] Perhaps this explains why Bush came out this week, more adamant than ever, vowing that "we will find Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq." Not a few expect this kind of decree to lead to the planting of weapons, or the making of small finds into large issues.

TRANSITION IN IRAQ - THE LATEST DECEPTION

Coalition Provisional Administrator Paul Bremer has announced that the US is giving up on its December 15 deadline for the Iraqi Council to form a new constitution and set a date for elections. Bremer also gave the impression that US forces would remain in Iraq, with a different mandate. "Our presence here will change from an occupation to an invited presence." The "invitation" will no doubt be courtesy of the slavishly compliant regime that the Bush administration has announced will be installed in a "temporary" capacity by June. Undoubtedly the new leader will be Ahmed Chalabi, currently the US-installed chairman of the Iraqi Governing Council. Bremer enthused, "I'm sure the Iraqi government is going to want to have coalition forces here for its own security for some time." Given the growing instability from guerrilla attacks and the continued antagonism by US forces who are now resorting to major air strikes against mere "suspected" insurgent targets, I'm sure this will turn into a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Bremer also said, "Iraqi leaders should write a constitution first, then hold elections." That's what he said about the 15 December election. By announcing the "change," US leaders have used sleight of hand to merely give the whole process another half a year. Keep in mind that the 15 December deadline was supposedly a major concession to France, Germany and Russia to gain their agreement on the recently passed US resolution on Iraq. Somehow I find it strange these three "partners" are not complaining about the US defaulting on its promise. Could it be that each of the three already have what they want? A secret US agreement to pay off their outstanding Iraqi military loans?

Earlier this week, while in Japan, Sec. of Defense Rumsfeld said that American troops will not be withdrawing from Iraq under an accelerated timetable even with provisional Iraqi self-rule. He made it a point to emphasize that political transition does not mean military needs will change. I fully suspect that the US will find every pretense to stay in Iraq for years to come. The central location of Iraq's major military bases would provide the US massive leverage in any future Arab-Israeli conflict, and allow the US a safe haven when other bases in Saudi Arabia become untenable due to the growing hostility of the Saudis to the US presence.

All of this must be put in context and compared to EU Foreign Minister Javier Solana's surprising statement this week that "US forces will quickly come under international control" in order to avoid humiliating confrontations with Europe in the handover of power. Obviously Solana, a rabid Marxist, would not have made this kind of presumption without some grounds. His position is bolstered by the fact that Sec. of State Powell is visiting NATO this week to hammer out details of some form of US-NATO cooperation in Iraq.

According to the NY Times, "Colin Powell, the US Secretary of State, arrives in Brussels tonight for talks with EU ministers, which he will combine with a meeting with the retiring NATO secretary general, Lord Robertson of Port Ellen [*also a Marxist*]. Diplomats say that Mr. Powell is expected to test the water about the involvement of the transatlantic alliance in Iraq. The litany of setbacks, growing US casualties and the recent killing of 18 Italian servicemen has brought intense domestic and international pressure on the Bush administration to give the occupying force more legitimacy." Such continued danger for foreign troops will make it just that much harder for NATO to take over the tough job the US wants relief from. My best guess is that the US will have to give NATO some very big financial inducement to take over day to day patrolling responsibilities in Iraq. The US is hoping to convince them that the Iraqi opposition won't target UN troops as badly as they have US occupiers. All this is far from proven. But if the handover were to take place, such a strategy would allow American troops to retreat behind the high security barriers of their major military bases, and save face at home.

IRAQ: CAPTURE OF SADDAM HUSSEIN RAISES MANY QUESTIONS

US claims regarding this week's capture of Saddam Hussein leave many questions unanswered. Here's a synopsis of the **official story**: Saddam was discovered in a sealed pit close to a shack on a farm located in the town of Adwar, 10 miles from Tikrit. The US military claimed they had an informant from Saddam's elite Special Security Organization (who is yet to be identified) telling them where Saddam was hiding. Soldiers, part of a 600 man sweep, say they were drawn to the hiding place by the sight of two men running away from a small walled

compound. They cordoned off the area. There was a carpet on the dirt, out in the open, which they removed and then began to dig in the spot it had been covering. After removing earth and bricks, they found a foam lid which opened to the hole in which Saddam was lying down, with a gun nearby. He made no attempt to use the gun and readily identified himself. This was on a Saturday night.

By Sunday afternoon American military officials were claiming DNA confirmation as well as visual confirmation by Tariq Aziz, the former Iraqi Foreign Minister who is now cooperating with US officials. The two room hut next to the hiding place had a bed, a chair, a sink and some clothes. Soldiers also found two rifles, a pistol, and a suitcase with \$750,000 US dollars. Saddam was reported to be subdued and compliant, but unwilling to admit to any wrongdoing under conditions of secret interrogation. His beard showed many months of growth, and his face showed signs of small abrasions or wounds.

Now, let's examine the anomalies of this story and what is absent from US claims:

1. **The Hole:** I find it very hard to believe that this was a real hiding place for Saddam. A ruler of a nation who had built dozens of bunkers for various purposes certainly would have had access to progressive levels of secret hide-outs far more sophisticated than this hole. The hole had no secondary escape route, no food, no light, no water supply. Even rudimentary Vietcong tunnels had all of these contingencies, including numerous secondary concealed exits. In contrast this hole obviously was not intended for even short-term habitation. Neither would the location have acted as a suitable hideout to be used only for short-term threats, as we are led to believe. The only entrance was out in the open, instead of inside a building or among bushes, where the considerable effort of covering and uncovering the entrance could have been suitably concealed from view. The entrance was marked by a carpet-why? It only served to give away the location. A carpet out in the open on the dirt is not smart concealment. Clearly this carpet was meant to mark a cell of captivity-not a hiding hole-to which the supposed ransom seekers could direct the Americans.

2. The Fake Photograph: A photograph was released to the press of two American soldiers standing beside a date palm tree with the foam lid, close to the site of the hole. We are supposed to believe that the photo was taken on the day of Saddam's capture. But the biology of date palms places the time of the photo in question. As the NY Village Voice pointed out, "unharvested dates fall off the tree before December, and even if they don't, they are brown and dry, not yellow, as they are in the photo." Obviously, this hole was known to the Americans much earlier.

3. Saddam's Appearance: The unbathed, unkempt condition of Saddam tends to indicate he was a prisoner, not simply on the run. The US claims he was moving every day. This is improbable. Once a person has a good hideout, with secondary concealed exits, the best policy is to stay put and avoid movements, which only serve to dramatically heighten the probability of discovery. As for using the hole as a hideout, even Saddam's facial abrasions and disheveled appearance are not proof of his having remained in that hole for long periods. With no food and water and no easy access to the outside, he could not have been in there very long. Neither would he have been stupid enough to use the crude and labor intensive open-surface entrance on a daily basis to go back and forth between the hole and the hut. Besides, the conditions of the hut hardly correlate with the financial resources he had sitting in the suitcase. Nothing here makes sense if you ask the right questions.

To bring up another anomaly, Saddam's hair and eyebrows had been dyed so recently that no gray roots were showing. At 65 years old, Saddam Hussein had lots of gray hair which he dyed regularly. The recently dyed hair and eyebrows indicate he had not been in that hole for a long period of time. Nor were any dye bottles found in the hut. In reality there wasn't any reason for continuing to dye the hair, if he had wanted to change his appearance. A better disguise would have been to let the gray hair grow out. The undyed, graying beard mixed with the dyed hair and eyebrows indicates something very conflicting. It doesn't give evidence of a savvy leader looking for a consistent disguise.

4. The Entire Security Operation: Why did they only cordon off the area after seeing the two men run away? The US had searched this area many times before, they said. Why did they not cordon off the area before

beginning the search? With 600 soldiers, they obviously had the manpower. In addition, the US had information that Saddam had several **look-alike doubles**. Why, if the US has been diligently searching for Saddam Hussein, do we not have a record of them having arrested any of these doubles? Certainly, the doubles would have had no reason to be hiding, and would have attracted attention everywhere they went.

5. The Continued Secrecy: If this really is Saddam, why not put him before the cameras and let reporters and the Iraqi people question him publicly? Instead, just like supposed "mastermind of 9/11" Sheik Khalid Mohammed, Saddam is whisked away to a secret location for months of interrogation and we are left only with periodic leaks about juicy things the US claims their captive has revealed. There has been zero independent corroboration about any of these claims. Actually, the US has good reason to be reluctant to put their captive on trial. A phony Saddam would likely be found out, and the real Saddam could well attempt to tell all, including his secret collusion with US leaders over the years, just as Milosevic tried to do at the Hague. So, whatever War Crimes venue the US chooses to subject Saddam to, you can bet it will be secret and closed to the public.

6. The DNA Claims: The US claims to have made the match in less than 18 hours, an inordinately fast turnaround for DNA analysis. Wired News reports, "In routine practice, a commercial lab that is handling thousands of DNA samples develops a DNA profile from a given sample in a month or so. For an extra fee, that can be hurried up to five days." Of course, the US has dedicated and unlimited resources, so we can assume they could have done the job. However, we have been given no evidence that they had a provable sample of Hussein's actual DNA to start with.

Is this really Saddam Hussein? I don't know. We are denied sufficient information. It certainly could be, but the evidence so far raises so many questions about the US story that I have my doubts. If it is Saddam, I would be expecting the US to offer him a deal in order to get him to admit to the locations of WMDs. The US is desperate to extricate itself from the growing reputation that they falsified the evidence - especially on the heels of this week's report that the US Senate was assured in secret session by US intelligence officials that Iraq had the

means of threatening the US directly with their WMDs. The US is also leaking the story that they want to find out from Saddam whether or not he shipped his WMDs to Syria. But this is disinformation. They already know this and are attempting to make out as if they are unsure. They want "new" corroboration so they can justify going after Syria more than a year after they really found out.

The bottom line, however, is that Saddam's capture will only serve to accelerated hatred toward the US occupiers - especially if the US stays in Iraq as long as it intends (a long time). With Saddam supposedly out of the way, the US has even less reason to delay its withdrawal. Other Iraqis, who dislike the US, but heretofore have not wanted to be seen siding with pro-Saddam forces, will now feel free to join in the opposition.

QUESTIONABLE US TRACK RECORD ON DNA ANALYSIS

US claims to have achieved a DNA match for Saddam Hussein brings up more credibility questions. In fact, the US has a track record of claiming **phony DNA evidence**. After the Pentagon crash, which supposedly caused a fire so hot that almost all the aluminum skin of the Boeing airliner was consumed, the US claimed to have recovered parts of every person's body and matched it to their DNA (though the names of the supposed hijackers are conspicuously absent). But no one is asking how a 100% success rate is possible given the level of destruction. They also neglect one crucial part of the DNA puzzle. You can't do a DNA match unless you have a certified sample of the person. That's very hard to do once the person is gone. The US made no claims that they went back to the homes of each of the relatives and collected DNA samples. Even if they did, it's difficult sorting out hair or skin flake samples from different members of the family. So when dealing with multiple false samples of "original DNA" and comparing it to DNA from thousands of burned body parts in the wreckage, I am inclined to believe you couldn't get 100% matches in less than two years of work. Maybe 20%, but the US claims too much.

The FBI lab has already gained a reputation for falsifying reports to meet government prosecutorial requirements. I'll quote from a CNN story from February 2003: "The FBI provided the [NY] medical examiners' office

with DNA profiles of the 10 hijackers, said Ellen Borakove, a spokeswoman for the New York Medical Examiner's office. Examiners a few days ago matched two of the profiles to remains collected after the twin towers' collapse, she told CNN. Examiners could not say which of the hijackers' remains had been discovered because the FBI did not identify which of the DNA samples belonged to which hijacker, she said. The samples [according to the FBI] came from items recovered from locations such as the scene of the crashes, a hotel or other places where the hijackers stayed, said a law enforcement official."

The FBI's admissions have the telltale signs of fraud. The matching samples the FBI provided could even have come from two known victims, since the FBI mentions collecting samples "at the scene of the crash." The FBI couldn't verify the identities of the samples because either they were false, or because they had no certified original samples from the real hijackers. How would they know any body part at the crash site belonged to the hijackers? The government's claim to have found the intact passport of one of the hijackers is equally improbable. We know now that the FBI grabbed the names of the hijackers out of their computer systems. Several are still alive, even according to admissions of Director Mueller. If the FBI doesn't know which hijacker's DNA corresponds to what human debris they found in the hotel rooms, then what are the chances out of thousands of victims, the medical examiner is going to find a match, especially given that many of the victims bodies were not intact? There were probably 5,000 body parts collected-and the FBI was doing some of the collecting. Perhaps that's the source of the "original" DNA they presented to the lab.

