

Global Watch Weekly Report

A Weekly Global Watch Media Publication (www.globalreport2010.com)


September 19th, 2014

THE TRUTH ABOUT 911



The Global Watch Weekly Report is a publication of Rema Marketing (www.remamarketing.com) and is published every Friday. For any queries regarding this service please contact us at admin@remamarketing.com. ©Rema Marketing 2014. All Rights Reserved.

Global Watch Weekly Report



“The Number one weekly report which provides concrete evidence of a New World Order & One World Government agenda”

www.globalreport2010.com

This is a FREE report. Please pass this on to others who you may feel would benefit from this information. Web site owners please feel free to give this away to your site visitors or email lists

Not yet on our mailing list? Then visit the web site link below and sign up to ensure you don't miss out on these free weekly reports

www.globalreport2010.com

Global Watch Weekly Report

Welcome to the Global Watch Weekly Report

Last week witnessed the 13th anniversary of the September 11th attack on the twin towers and still 13 years later the debate rages regarding whether the event was planned by the US government as a pretext for justifying the occupation of the Middle East through the pretext of a war against terror. The debate should never detract from the absolute fact that terrorism does exist and that there are Islamic fundamentalists out there who are hell bent on attacking and destroying the infrastructure of the United States and other Western nations. However was the attack on the twin towers completely the mastermind of Islamic fanatics or were they simply pawns being used by a much greater architect.

Barrie Wallace Zwicker is a Canadian alternative media journalist, documentary producer, and political activist. He is most famous for his documentary work, which has dealt primarily with 9/11 conspiracy theories such as his documentary, *The Great Deception*. However his most famous work is *The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw*, a 70-minute sequel to *The Great Deception*. It premiered at The Citizens' Commission on 9-11. In this work, Zwicker contends that fear was used to control the public after 9/11, and states that the "War on Terrorism" is a public control mechanism. He also analyses the military breakdown on 9/11 and claims that former president Bush and his aides acted entirely inappropriately that day.

In this weeks edition of the Global Watch Weekly we revisit the key critical points addressed by Zwicker in an article that he produced in 2005 based on the video documentary, *The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw* which is still highly relevant today.

Enjoy

Rema Marketing Team

The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw

According to Barrie Zwicker, “It is from the mainstream media that most people get most of their information, most of the time, on most subjects.” The fact that the US mass media universally supported the ‘official story’ of 9/11 explains why most Americans still believe it. However, when *VisionTV*, Canada’s only independent television network, questioned Bush and company’s conspiracy theory by airing Barrie’s 6-part commentary series, “The Great Deception” in 2002, it got the greatest viewer response in the channel’s 15-year history.

He has now updated this series with a sequel – just released. It is being hailed by 9/11 activists as “the best ready-for-prime-time DVD out there on the subject by far.” Here is the complete transcript.

Hello. I’m Barrie Zwicker, journalist and media critic. Welcome to *The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw*.

On this program, we ask questions the 9/11 Commission and the media never asked. We introduce experts you’ve never seen before, and provide background you never get. We recommend books, magazines, videos and DVDs you’ve probably never heard of, and websites the media keep under wraps.¹ We avoid thought-stoppers such as ‘anti-American’ and ‘conspiracy theorists’, and that new word, ‘believedto-belinkedtoal-Qaeda’.

US President Franklin Delano Roosevelt declared: “The greatest thing we have to fear ... is fear itself.” And indeed, fear may well be the greatest single human motivator. It can serve us and it can save us. But ill-founded fear – that’s another story. For instance, before we commit to a war based on a threat we’re told to fear, before we commit our children’s blood, and billions of dollars to that war, we’d better be sure the threat is real, that a clear and present danger exists. Because war *itself* is to be feared.

The ‘War on Terrorism’

US President Franklin Delano Roosevelt fought fear. Today’s leaders traffic in it, chiefly the fear of ... terrorism. That’s it. Not global warming. Not the end of oil. Not domestic and worldwide injustice. Not rampant militarism, not war itself, or even war without end. Just ... terrorism. The words are hypnotically repeated: terrorism, terrorist, terrorist threat, and of course, ‘believedtobelinkedtoal-Qaeda’. These words appear in millions of newspaper and magazine headlines and are embedded by the billions in stories.

But it’s the so-called “war on terrorism” that’s in our faces practically 24/7 as the inescapable focus of our existence and the justification for great sacrifice.

Donald Rumsfeld: “One day our grandchildren will look

back on this time and ask, ‘How was the War on Terror won?’ And we will tell them about the brave men and women who gave their lives so that we could live in freedom.”


BZ: Some would have it that our support for this new quasi-religion, the so-called war on terrorism, is the measure of our commitment to country and civilization. This program explores interwoven fictions that make up the fabric of the so-called war on terrorism. It explores the promiscuous issuing of terror alerts. It explores the biggest secret and dirtiest deception of all: bloody terrorist events carried out, not by foreign but by *our* governments, to trick the public into supporting war and police state agendas. We explore, in particular, the radioactive core of today’s terrorist hysteria, namely the official story of 9/11, the over-arching fiction and crime and cover-up of our time.

Before you see this program, or after you do, there may well be another state-sponsored dirty deception. If there is, and the information in this program helps you to see it for what it is, it will have been worthwhile.

The ‘OfficialStory’

The sacred text at the heart of the so-called war on terrorism is the official narrative of what happened on September 11th, 2001. Namely, that the whole of US intelligence, civil aviation, military and the political apparatus is caught completely off guard by one evil man and his small network of co-conspirators.

George Bush: “America was targeted for attack because



Host Barrie Zwicker

The Great Conspiracy

we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world, and no one will keep that light from shining."

BZ: That provides ready-made, easy-to-hate villains and their motives. "They hate our freedoms," George Bush repeats, over and over. But the official story just doesn't make sense, as we will show. It's exploited, as planned, by its creators, the government. But final responsibility for the unbelievable story, living on to the extent it does in the public mind, lies with the vast majority of my colleagues in the mainstream media. If they ever start to do their job properly and examine it skeptically, the official story will crumble into dust finer than that of the Twin Towers.

Now absolutely no one disagrees that 9/11 was a conspiracy. Conspiracy is at the heart of the official story, after all – a conspiracy perpetrated allegedly by Osama bin Laden. But what if the conspiracy were hatched not in a cave in Afghanistan, but in Washington, D.C., at the highest levels of the US government? What if the public found out the official story is a Big Lie? How might that change plans for endless war?

There are other paths to true security and lasting peace. The first step on those paths is to expose the official 9/11 story for what it is, a contrived fiction. And then to demand a true accounting of what happened on 9/11 and who was behind the events of that day.

Retail and Wholesale Terrorism

Terrorism has been with us for a long time. It tends to be the last resort of the powerless suffering under acute injustice. And as such, one person's terrorist is seen by another as a freedom fighter. This is what Noam Chomsky calls retail terrorism, that carried out by angry or paid individuals. But then there's *wholesale* terrorism, that carried out by states.

Robert Jensen writes in the *Houston Chronicle*: "For more than five decades, throughout the Third World, the United States has deliberately targeted civilians or engaged in violence so indiscriminate that there is no other way to understand it except as terrorism. And it has supported similar acts of terrorism by client states."

He could have reached back further. In his new book *The American Empire and the Fourth World*, Anthony J. Hall, according to one reviewer, "connect(s) the unspeakable crimes visited upon indigenous people since the conquest by Columbus in 1492 to ... today's so-called war on terror ..."

According to Hall himself, "the imagery of terrorism (has) replaced that of savagery and (then) communism as the main explanatory catch-all to describe the real, illusory or manufactured enemies of the American way of life."

So, on one side – ours – the use of terror either is not admitted or is simply defined as not terror, and the other side's terror is defined as the only kind of terror. Terror, then, needs to be put into perspective. 'Perspective,' writes Lawrence Martin, former Washington correspondent for *The Globe and Mail*, "is a ghost in American journalism. ... Last year, acts of terrorism killed 300 to 400 people, ranking it so far down the list of dangers... that it is barely visible." He might have added that 300 is the number of Americans struck by lightning each year.

Another note about appearance and reality: the vast majority of people arrested as terrorism suspects are released without charges being laid. It's the arrest stories with those Arab names and pictures that remain in the public mind as reality. Isn't there a pattern of state-sponsored, media-abetted, deception here?

The Reichstag Fire – 'Fact is Stranger than Fiction'

But the dirtiest secret about terrorism is also by far the largest. Many spectacular acts of terrorism are fearsome fakes carried out by cabals within governments. And I mean our own governments. The gold standard is the attack on one's own country to mobilize public opinion for power, political gain and profit.

The Nazis masterminded the torching of the Reichstag – the German Parliament buildings – on February 27th, 1933, one week before a national election. That they did so is historical fact, portrayed best in William L. Shirer's masterpiece,

The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich. Within hours, Hitler and his henchmen designate the Communists as the villains, and label them terrorists. The government promises proof but never provides it. The communists did not do it. A single communist was the patsy.

The Big Lie of who torched the Reichstag is used by Hitler to sow fear. He bullies the German President to sign a decree suspending seven main articles of the German Constitution. The claim is that the Fatherland – think 'Homeland' – is under threat. Ensuing arrests and murders of communists and socialists terrorize anti-Hitler dissent. In the ensuing election Hitler does not get the majority he needs to rule, but soon after, he essentially seizes power. He then is free to launch pre-emptive strikes against other countries and wage a world war sold as patriotic. The ultimate result for Germans is calamitous: 600,000 civilians dead, seven and a half-million homeless – their country broke and in ruins. The Reichstag fire was a major turning point.

Within hours of the planes crashing into the World Trade



February 27, 1933
German Parliament Burns

The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw

Center, the Bush White House designates the alleged villains. Within 30 days the US Constitution and the civil liberties of Americans are weakened by near unanimous passage of the Patriot Act. A war on terror is announced. Within months pre-emptive strikes are launched against Afghanistan and Iraq, though no evidence is produced that Iraq took part in 9/11. Dissent in the USA is under fire even as millions in the USA and worldwide oppose the Iraq war. The White House announces that the 'war on terror' – in effect, world war – may never end. At least a thousand Americans are soon to die in Iraq alone. Expenditures mount into the trillions.

The so-called war on terrorism justifies the mounting deaths of US soldiers and civilians in Iraq and elsewhere, justifies the little-publicized construction of giant new US military bases overseas and is the basis for the doctrine of pre-emptive war, contrary to international law and basic morality. It's responsible for grotesquely ballooning deficits to pay for all this – debts being passed on to coming generations – and plans for even more expenditures on terror-fighting bureaucracies.

The so-called war on terror is cited as the ultimate basis for sharp increases in domestic spying and reduction in freedoms and civil liberties at home and attempts to criminalize dissent.

All this because the official, authorized truth is that foreign terrorists attacked the USA on 9/11. As we tape this in the Summer of 2004, fear grows as authorities and pundits predict more terrorist events – on the scale of 9/11, or greater. The I-word – 'inevitable' – is increasingly used.

Cui Bono – Who Benefits?

The designated scapegoats of 9/11 gained nothing positive from it. On the other hand, even the hardliners in Washington themselves agree 9/11 boosted their agenda. Who benefits from more of the same? The fear campaign, always resting on the official 9/11 story, looks deliberate.

Again, what if the official story of 9/11 is a Big Lie? You probably don't know if you're trapped inside the cocoon spun by the North American media industry, that there is in fact widespread skepticism about who was behind 9/11.

30% of Germans, according to reliable polls, think the US government had a hand in it. They remember that big Reichstag deception. A poll done in Canada in May 2004 showed 63% of Canadians think "individuals within the US

government including the White House had prior knowledge of the plans for the events of September 11th, and failed to take appropriate action to stop them."

In this program we present some of the accumulating evidence indicating that lying behind the Great Deception of 9/11 is the Great Conspiracy of 9/11. But first, more historical context. When we come back, three true stories of fake attacks on America.

* * *

Film narrator: Let's find out about despotism. This man makes it his job to study these things.

This man: Well, for one thing, avoid the comfortable idea that the mere form of government can of itself safeguard a nation against despotism.

* * *

BZ: Welcome back to *The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw*.

If 9/11 is a Big Lie, a fake attack, an inside job, is it unique? No, quite the reverse. Most war-triggering incidents are great deceptions.

Pretext War Incidents

The Mexican-American War, the Spanish-American War, the attack on Pearl Harbor – all involved secretly contrived attacks on Americans planned or encouraged by American presidents. The Vietnam War and Desert Storm in 1991 also were triggered by deceptions involving US presidents. If 9/11 is not such a deception, it's an exception to the rule.


Most people want peace most of the time. That's a problem for rulers bent on war. History teaches that rulers arranging for their country to be attacked, or appear[ing] to be attacked, is the fastest method for these rulers to get their way when they want war.

1. Operation Northwoods

Consider only three cases, starting with the book, *Body of Secrets*. Author James Bamford is a former Washington Investigative Producer for ABC's World News Tonight with Peter Jennings. I learned of this book on ABC's website.

Bamford's information comes from interviews with, for instance, the former Dean of the US intelligence community and from government documents. It takes 80 pages to list Bamford's more than 600 sources.

Here is the story. It's 1962; John F. Kennedy is US President; Robert McNamara is Secretary of Defense and



'Operation Northwoods' – 1962 Document Declassified – 2002

The Great Conspiracy

General Lyman Lemnitzer heads the US Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The CIA fails in its illegal Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba. “JFK decides,” Bamford writes, “to back away from military solutions to the Cuban problem.” But Lemnitzer, the CIA and others at the top remain obsessed with Cuba. Writes Bamford: “As the Kennedy brothers appeared to suddenly ‘go soft’ on Cuba, Lemnitzer could see his opportunity to invade ... quickly slipping away. ... Attempts to provoke the Cuban public to revolt seemed dead. Lemnitzer and the other chiefs knew there was only one option left that would ensure their war. They would have to trick the American public and world opinion...”

Lemnitzer comes up with ‘Operation Northwoods’.

“We could blow up a US ship in Guantanamo Bay and blame Cuba ... casualty lists in US newspapers would cause a helpful wave of national indignation.”

“We could develop a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area, in other Florida cities and even in Washington.”

An elaborate variation: create “an exact duplicate for a civil registered aircraft. ... At a designated time the duplicate would be ... loaded with ... selected passengers, all boarded under carefully prepared aliases. The actual regis-

tered aircraft would be converted to a drone [a remotely controlled unmanned aircraft] ... the destruction of (that) aircraft will be triggered by radio signal.” The Cubans would be blamed.

Finally, another variation is described by Bamford: “On February 20th, 1962 (John) Glenn was to lift off from Cape Canaveral ... on his historic journey. Lemnitzer “proposed ... that should the rocket explode and kill Glenn, the objective is to provide irrevocable proof that ... the fault lies with (Cuba) ... by manufacturing various pieces of evidence which would prove electronic interference on the part of the Cubans.”

Thus, Bamford notes, “as NASA prepared to send the first American into space, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were preparing to use John Glenn’s possible death as a pretext to launch a war.”

The Operation Northwoods plan shows the Pentagon was capable, according to Bamford, “of launching a secret and bloody war of terrorism against their own country in order to

trick the American public into supporting a (war on Cuba).”

In light of this, does Pentagon complicity in the events of Sept. 11th sound entirely far-fetched? Now fast forward just two years from Operation Northwoods, to August 2nd, 1964.

2. The Gulf of Tonkin Incident

In the Gulf of Tonkin, North Vietnamese torpedo boats attack the US destroyer Maddox. The *Associated Press* story for some reason is datelined Pearl Harbor. The lead: “Three PT (patrol torpedo) boats, identified by Secretary of State Dean Rusk ... as North Vietnamese, attacked ...” Later a second US destroyer is attacked, according to news reports.

Although no US sailor suffers a scratch, the American public is outraged.

President Lyndon Johnson goes on television to ask the country to support war action. Two days later the Tonkin Gulf Resolution is approved by the US House of Representatives, unanimously, then by the Senate, 88 to 2. The resolution becomes the entire justification for the United States’ war against Vietnam. Before that’s over 58,000 American soldiers and three million Vietnamese die.

One small problem. There never were any North Vietnamese PT boats. The events never happened, as Secretary of State Rusk, the President, and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara well



Headlines in Toronto’s *Globe and Mail* – part of an elaborate deception planned by the US government to sway public opinion. There never were any PT boats that attacked the US destroyer Maddox.

know. They know because they planned the entire deception.

One source for this is former Admiral James Stockdale in his book *In Love and War*. On the night in question Stockdale is at the controls of a fighter jet flying cover for the two destroyers. He sees nothing.

Another source is Ben Bradlee, much-respected former managing editor of the *Washington Post*. Bradlee, in a public lecture in England in April 1987, states: “The ‘facts’ behind this critically important resolution were quite simply ... lies.” Fast forward, again, to August 2nd, 1990.

3. The Kuwaiti Incubator Baby Deception

Iraq attacks Kuwait, claiming the Kuwaitis are slant-drilling into Iraq’s oil fields. US President George Herbert Walker Bush pushes for a land war against Iraq. But polls show the US public is split 50-50 on that idea.

The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw

Then comes this eyewitness testimony before a Congressional committee, from a 15-year-old Kuwaiti girl. The claim is she cannot be identified for fear of reprisals.

15-year-old Kuwaiti girl: “While I was there I saw the Iraqi soldiers come into the hospital with guns. They took the babies out of incubators” (her voice breaks; there’s a long pause while she snuffles and wipes tears from her eyes), “took the incubators, and left the children to die” (her voice rises tremulously into crying) “on the cold floor.”

BZ: The US public is outraged. The result? Support for land war zooms. It’s a turning point. Desert Storm is launched. One hundred and thirty-five thousand Iraqis are killed. An estimated one million Iraqis, many of them children and old people, then die as a result of 10 years of sanctions.

One small problem. There never were any incubator baby deaths. Not one.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation’s investigative flagship program, *the fifth estate*, reveals the girl to be the Kuwaiti Ambassador’s daughter, given her lines and coached in acting by the giant American PR firm Hill & Knowlton. It’s one phase in a ten-million-dollar joint US-Kuwaiti campaign of deception.

This man is lying. [Picture of Kuwaiti man in dark glasses.]

The Man in dark glasses: “I myself buried 14 newborn babies that had been taken from their incubators.”

BZ: This man is lying. [Picture of President George Bush Sr.]

George H.W. Bush: “...kids in incubators and they were thrown out of the incubators so that Kuwait could be systematically dismantled.”

BZ: There were a lot of people who participated in the conspiracy – yes, an out-and-out conspiracy – of fake organizations, false documents, fraud and disinformation.

So, if a new man named Bush is in the White House and helps engineer a brazen deception in order to achieve global geopolitical goals as well as domestic and personal ones, it wouldn’t be a first, would it? After a short break, a detailed look at the events of September 11th, 2001.

Film narrator: Today democracy can ebb away in communities whose citizens allow power to become concentrated in the hands of bosses.

Boss: What I say goes see? I’m the law around here (gleeful laughter).

Film narrator: The chance of despotic power is that it can disregard the will of the people.

BZ: Welcome back to *The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw*.

The events of 9/11 begin with aircraft going wildly off-course. Incredibly, despite radar tracking for almost two hours, the whole of the mighty US Air Force goes AWOL that morning. It’s a mind-bending anomaly.

Not a single US Air Force interceptor turns a wheel until it’s too late. There are no jets at all. It’s a matter of historical record.

That could happen only two ways. Either it was staggering multiple simultaneous coincidental incompetence at all levels in many agencies, defying known laws of averages, a 54-million-to-one chance, which is the 9/11 Commission official story. [Or] there’s another explanation: the US Air Force is neutralized by design. The evidence indicates this is about a one-to-one chance.

An ‘Intended Paralysis’

Standard procedures for dealing with aviation emergencies of all kinds have been in place and have worked for years. David Ray Griffin is the author of *The New Pearl Harbor*, the most widely respected critique of the official story of 9/11. He quotes the Federal Aviation Authority’s Aeronautical Information



The ‘Anonymous’ Kuwaiti Girl

Manual: *Official Guide to Basic Flight Information and Air Traffic Control (ATC) Procedures*. It states: “If you are in doubt that a situation constitutes an emergency, or potential emergency, handle it as though it were an emergency.”

As for the military, the guiding document is *ACCI 13-SAOC, Volume 3, US Air Defense Command and Control Operations*. At the top of the first page it reads “Compliance with this order is mandatory.” The first paragraph reads, in part: “The ADC (Air Defense Command) is to provide ... North American Aerospace Defense Command [NORAD] ... with the means to detect, monitor, identify, intercept, report and if necessary destroy any airborne object that may pose a threat to North America in the fulfillment of the tactical threat warning attack assessment and to provide such information to collateral missions of NORAD.”

Michael C. Ruppert

Michael Ruppert, a former Los Angeles Police Department detective, was the first major 9/11 skeptic and researcher in the world and remains one of the foremost. He was one of 40 experts on 9/11 who testified at the six-day International Citizens’ Inquiry Into 9/11, held in Toronto in May of 2004. I helped organize that event. At the Inquiry, Michael Ruppert addresses the absence of jet interceptors, but the un-

The Great Conspiracy

likelihood of a simple stand-down order, and asks...

Michael Ruppert: "What if they were so confused, and had been so deliberately confused, that they couldn't respond?"

BZ: Michael Ruppert is standing by at his office in Sherman Oaks, California. Michael, thanks for this. What is the reason for the failure of US military jets to show up in a timely fashion on 9/11?

MR: Well, the simple fact is, Barrie, that they didn't know where to go. The reason that they didn't know where to go was because a number of conflicting and overlapping war game exercises were taking place, one of which, Northern Vigilance, had pulled a significant number of North American fighter aircraft into Canada and Western Alaska and Northern Alaska in a mock Cold War hijack exercise. There was another drill, Vigilant

Guardian, which was a hijack exercise, a command post exercise but it involved the insertion of false radar blips onto radar screens in the Northeast Air Defense Sector. In addition we have a con-

firmation thanks to General Richard Myers who was Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, who told Richard Clarke as reported in Clarke's (recent) book that there was another exercise, Vigilant Warrior, which was in fact, according to a NORAD source, a live-fly hijack drill being conducted at the same time.

With only eight available fighter aircraft (and they had to be dispatched in pairs) they were dealing with as many as 22 possible hijacks on the day of 9/11 and they couldn't separate the war game exercises from the actual hijacks.

BZ: But this was done deliberately though?

'Crossing the Rubicon' – Ruppert's Evidence

MR: Apparently so and I will be saying that in my forthcoming book *Crossing the Rubicon – The Decline of the American Empire at the End of the Age of Oil*. We have done an extensive investigation on that to show that these war game exercises were apparently very well planned by someone, (who I will show, I believe was Dick Cheney) in the United States government, who deliberately confused FAA, NORAD and US Air Force fighter response to fulfill a prophecy that another man once said, "Let one happen and stop the rest."

BZ: On that very point we have a recording.

FAA: Hi, Boston Center TMU, we have a problem here. We have a hijacked aircraft headed towards New York. We need someone to scramble some F-16's or something up there, help us out.

N.E. Air Defense Sector: Is this real world or exercise?

FAA: No, this is not an exercise, not a test.

* * *

BZ: Now the 9/11 Commission didn't mention the war games, is that right?

MR: No, in their final report they did mention I think in one paragraph Vigilant Guardian, but the response given by NORAD Commanding General Ralph Eberhart and other Air Force spokespeople was absolutely nonsensical and it made no mention of any of the other war game exercises. Eberhart's position was, in fact, (and this is a very ludicrous position) that the Vigilant Guardian exercise, leaving aside the others, actually helped speed response on 9/11. That is absolutely not the case.

BZ: How does this relate to the 9/11 Commission report which says that planes had gone in the wrong direction?

MR: Well, that is a separate issue that remains to be clarified, but what I will be disclosing in my book, in effect, is that there were two simultaneously operating command-

and-control systems functioning on the day of 9/11 and sometimes they were issuing conflicting orders. We do not have a clear explanation for why fighters from [Langley] Air Force Base were sent out over the sea first and couldn't

turn around because the 9/11 Commission seemed to change all the evidence just arbitrarily right before it issued its final report. So we don't have a clear explanation. But certainly it is all consistent with a motive that said, make sure that the fighters don't get to any place in time to stop the three critical attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

BZ: I have called that in my own research an "effective stand-down". Would you say that would be a correct characterization?

MR: Well, it is a de facto stand-down. That was the intended result. I would really call it "an intended paralysis." With only eight available fighters and fighters have to be scrambled in pairs, you only had a chance for four responses out of what we have confirmed were as many as 22 possible hijacks showing up on radar screens.

BZ: That is fascinating and damning information. I look forward to your book. What about the motivation for the whole of 9/11?

MR: Well, overall the primary motivation was something we call 'peak oil', the fact that the world has either passed or is now at its permanent peak of hydrocarbon or oil production and now about to go into a condition of permanent and irrevocable decline in oil production, even as demand is soaring exponentially, both in the West and in China and Asia and the developing countries. This has set off what we at *From the Wilderness* and certainly in my book... will describe as a very bitter sequence of conflicts, (as Dick Cheney told us, in a "war that will not end in our lifetimes") to secure the last remaining oil reserves on the planet.

We have seen a lot of other instances where this kind of

The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw

attack was predicted and stated as a requirement for the American empire to mobilize its military resources. Zbigniew Brzezinski did it in his book *The Grand Chessboard* in 1997; the Project for a New American Century called for “a new Pearl Harbor” in [2000]. So there’s a lot of evidence here showing very clearly that this attack was needed, it was planned and all of the evidence that has been so diligently compiled has just been absolutely ignored by the Kean Commission.

BZ: And finally Michael, (I certainly for one accept your motive of peak oil), what about other motives that could be involved?

MR: Well, if you are going to, as Zbigniew Brzezinski wrote, have some kind of direct external threat, [you need] an attack like Pearl Harbor basically. [Then] you [can] scare the bejesus out of the American people to get them to support the ‘imperial mobilization,’ (those were his words), necessary to secure those vital resources in these strategic geo-political regions on the planet. Without that, the American people would never have gone to war, and of course, in late 2004 we’re beginning to see that the American people aren’t going along with it now either.

BZ: Michael, thank you for this today.

MR: Bye Barrie.

Dr. Robert M. Bowman

BZ: Dr. Robert M. Bowman is a veteran of 101 combat missions in Vietnam. His 22-year Air Force career culminated in his job as Director of Advanced Space Programs Development for the Air Force Space Division during the presidency of Ronald Reagan. He’s President of the Institute for Space and Security Studies. His presentation to the Citizens’ Inquiry was titled “A Fighter Pilot Looks

Back at 9/11 and Forward to a Resurrected America.”

Robert Bowman: 9/11 is related to just about everything else, particularly the war against Iraq. These two things have one aspect very much in common. They are both in my opinion, *treason*.

The cabal of neo-conservatives at PNAC, ... [The Project for a New American Century], who planned this war: Cheney, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Libby, Perle, Jeb Bush, even before W. became president – I don’t say ‘elected’, I say ‘became’ president – this cabal knew the American people

would not stand for a war against Iraq, unless there was, as they put it in their own document, “a new Pearl Harbor.” 9/11 supplied that.

BZ: In other words, 9/11 was a false flag operation. That’s one term to describe an act carried out to make it appear it was done by someone else. Next, the man who’s written the book on false flag operations.


Webster G. Tarpley

Webster Tarpley is an historian and journalist based in Washington, D.C. He has studied the dark world of intrigue peopled by patsies, paid killers known as operators, and moles – government officials who flout their own country’s laws. He made two presentations to the International Cit-

izens’ Inquiry Into 9/11. They are uncompromisingly titled, “The 9/11 Terror Fraud: A Coup Against World Civilization, Parts One and Two.”

Webster Tarpley: Now here I would like to present a very important diagram that I commend to your attention and I want to tarry and look at it for a moment. (See p. 25)

We are dealing with state-sponsored, false flag terrorism. I don’t mean state-sponsored in the sense that it has to be



PNAC’s website: www.newamericancentury.org

The Great Conspiracy

sponsored by the entire command structure of the country in question, but, that it is carried forward by a private network ensconced and infesting decisive nodal points in the state apparatus of that country. I'll try to show you what I mean.

The Patsies: Here we have to distinguish a world of patsies, the people that you hear about (I'll try to show you some of this in detail), the people we can call the dupes, the useful idiots, the fanatics, the police agents, the double agents, the provocateurs, in short the Oswalds, the fall guys. [Remember the] Lee Harvey Oswald 'I'm just a patsy' direct quote? That's one group.

The Moles: This is the group of government officials – the network of government officials – whose loyalty is not to the command structure, the Constitution or their country in some diffuse sense, but rather their loyalty goes to a private intelligence network. A private clique faction, a group of putschists if you will, people trying to have a coup d'état.

The Professional Killers: You also have to distinguish the professional killers. These are the cold-blooded technicians of murder. This is the sort of area where you see retired veterans of the Special Forces – the Delta Force, the CIA Operations Directorate, and so on down the line – the old boys. At the end of the '80s and the beginning of the '90s, the term for this group in Washington was *the asteroids*.

The Corporate Media: They are the indispensable ingredient because without them you can't have anything. You have to have mass propaganda to accredit and spread and pound the official version of the events into the minds of people, and to smooth over the inevitable absurdities, contradictions, impossibilities and so forth of the official story. Mass brainwashing in the Anglo-American tradition is what they propose.

BZ: You are watching *The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw*. When we come back, the classic question: what did the President know about 9/11 and when did he know it?

* * *

Film narrator: When a competent observer looks for signs of despotism in a community he looks beyond fine words and noble phrases ... "one nation indivisible, with Liberty and Justice for all. ..."

* * *

BZ: Welcome back to *The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw*.

What Did George W. Know?

What did George Bush know about the events of 9/11

and when did he know them? I'm not asking what George Bush – or Bill Clinton for that matter – knows or should have known in the weeks or years before, based on this or that so-called intelligence report that he sees, or should have seen, about vague or not-so-vague alleged terrorist threats. No, my questions are much more restricted. I'm asking what specific advance information George W. Bush has about the first plane hitting the World Trade Center, before it strikes. How does he get that information and from whom? Why does he act as if he has far less information than the record shows he must have had? Initial news reports show the President informed of the gravity of the situation that morning ... That famous whisper in the ear must be put into context. It takes place at 9:05 am.

That's one hour and five minutes after the first hijacking – forty-five minutes after the FAA is aware of multiple errant airliners, 20 minutes after the first aircraft smashes into the Trade Center; 18 minutes after CNN breaks into regular programming. In other words, a torrent of hot water churns under the bridge before whisper time.

Researchers Jared Israel and Ilarion Bycov of emperorsclothes.com write shortly after 9/11: "The President of the United States travels with an entire staff including the Secret Service, which is responsible for his safety. The members of this support team have the best communications equipment in the world. They maintain contact with, or can easily reach, Bush's cabinet, the National Military Command Center in the Pentagon, the FAA..." Information concerning these alarming events


must be shared with the President by his staff. Otherwise they would be derelict in their duties.

Not surprising then, is this report by ABC's John Cochrane, travelling with the President, here speaking to Peter Jennings not long after the President left his hotel:

"Peter, as you know, the President's down in Florida talking about education. He got out of his hotel suite this morning, was about to leave, reporters saw the White House Chief of Staff, Andy Card, whisper into his ear. The reporter said to the President, "Do you know what's going on in New York?" He said he did, and he said he will have something about it later. His first event is in about *half an hour* at an elementary school in Sarasota, Florida."

Something is very odd about the President's behavior. The President is aware, by his own words, that something serious is happening in New York. He additionally has to be aware of a great deal more about the situation. You have John Ashcroft later in the day at a press conference.

John Ashcroft: "Immediately after the first report of a



Andy Card whispers in Bush's ear

The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw

plane crashing into the World Trade Towers numerous federal agencies coordinating with the White House mobilized their resources.”

BZ: You have Vice President Dick Cheney on September 16 on NBC’s Meet The Press. He tells host Tim Russert, “The Secret Service has an arrangement with the FAA. They had open lines after the World Trade Center was...” Then he stopped himself.

You have Laura Brown of the FAA. She attends hearings of the 9/11 Commission that bear witness on the aviation aspects of the day. Embarrassed by previous non-forthcoming testimony about the FAA’s role, she sends an e-mail in May of 2003 to members of the media whose business cards she had collected.

“Within minutes after the first aircraft hit the World Trade Center,” she states in her e-mail, “the FAA immediately established several phone bridges that included FAA field facilities, the FAA Command Center, FAA Headquarters, DOD, the Secret Service, and other government agencies. The US Air Force liaison to the FAA immediately joined the FAA Headquarters phone bridge and established contact with NORAD on a separate line. The FAA shares real-time information on the phone bridges about the unfolding events, including 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.”

So, in light of all this, here’s the odd thing about George Bush’s behavior. He and his staff could cancel or postpone an easily-postponable photo-op, but they don’t. Why?

On 9/11 Bush acts, and I emphasize *acts*, as if he doesn’t know, as if he is not in touch, he proceeds with, or feigns, normality. Now to something else that’s puzzling.

When Did He Know It?

At a Town Hall session in Orlando, Florida on December the 4th, 2001, here’s the President’s own account of the early morning of 9/11.

Jordan (a third grader): “How did you feel when you heard about a terrorist attack?”

George Bush: “Well, thank you, Jordan (applause). Well, Jordan you’re not going to believe where, what state I was in, when I heard about the terrorist attack. I was in Florida. And my Chief of Staff Andy Card, well actually I was in a classroom talking about a reading program that works, ...and I was sitting outside the classroom waiting to go in, and I saw an airplane hit the tower – you know, the TV was obviously on...”

BZ: The President tells us he sees, on an ordinary TV set outside a school classroom, the first plane hit the World Trade Center. He gives the oddly reinforcing detail that “the TV was obviously on.” He continues:

George Bush: “I used to fly myself and I said, well, there’s one terrible pilot and I said it must have been a horrible accident, but I was whisked off there and didn’t have much time to think about it.”

BZ: “Didn’t have time to think about it?” As if his being told, “Time to meet the kids, Mr. President” stops all his thought processes concerning the remarkable image of what he told us he’s just seen on an ordinary TV, on top of all his knowledge of the unprecedented situation from earlier in the morning. But anyway, could George Bush have seen, on

ordinary TV, the first plane hit the World Trade Center? No, he could not have.

The footage of that first strike only shows up on television the next day, September the 12th, 2001. It was taken by a French documentary crew that happened to be in downtown New York.

Bystander: “Holy shit!” (Explosion)

BZ: The Orlando Town Hall session takes place seven weeks after 9/11, so it can be suggested Bush confuses the second plane with the first. But, how to explain this? We’ve all seen Andy Card do that. None of this can ever be retracted. It is an interlocking historical record.

Why go on at length about this? Because it may one day become the basis for criminal court proceedings. When we come back: Is George Bush one of a group of conspirators involved with the attack?

* * *

BZ: Welcome back to *The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw*.

George Bush is very convincing that he saw the first plane strike the World Trade Center the morning of 9/11 on regular TV. He provides supporting details, has repeated the story, and never retracted it. It has run on the White house web site. Since he cannot have seen it on regular TV as he claims, it is not unreasonable to conclude that he sees the first plane on private, closed-circuit TV earlier that morning, or in a private holding room later?

Prior Knowledge of the First Plane Strike

Either way, I submit this could mean that someone had to arrange for cameras to be positioned and rolling to record the first plane strike. Those involved had to know precisely that the first plane was in the air, where and when the plane would hit.

In other words, people closely associated with the

The Great Conspiracy

President of the United States had very specific prior knowledge of the existence of the first plane, its destination and its purpose.

More clues: Bush's itinerary is well known. There are plenty of live news media reports concerning the President's whereabouts from the time he gets up that morning in his hotel, until the time he arrives at Booker Elementary School, and how long it will take him to get there. Remember ABC's John Cochrane and the *half-hour* [photo op]? Yet the Secret Service, for at least a full half hour after he is notified that "America is under attack," takes no steps to remove the President to safety. What happens instead?

This footage also appears in Michael Moore's film *Fahrenheit 9/11*. No one claims this footage is doctored. The President continues reading a story about a pet goat, for at least seven minutes. One columnist absurdly suggests that the President doesn't want to alarm the children. But could the President not have said, "Kids, I'm sorry I have to excuse myself, there's some important business I have to attend to. You just carry on with your reading, y'hear?"

Conspiracy to Commit Treason

Any reasonable analysis suggests that the President and his handlers share sufficient real time and prior knowledge of the unprecedented events of that day. The public record shows the President and his associates fail to act appropriately – that they, in fact, create a fiction and play-act their assigned roles.

This evidence alone constitutes grounds for proceeding with an indictment on charges of conspiracy to commit treason.

But if, let's be dogged here, if the official story is true, and an astoundingly successful sneak attack from diabolical Muslims caught America totally off guard, then the White House surely must be highly motivated to turn heaven and earth, (to use one of their own favourite clichés), to investigate the events of that day as quickly and thoroughly as possible. The White House must rush to appoint a respected chairman and commissioners, give them the widest powers to call witnesses, spare no expense.

Except for the Reichstag fire, that's how it's usually done. Six days after the sinking of the Titanic a chairman is appointed to head an investigation. Nine days after Pearl Harbor, the first of four investigative Commissions is struck. The JFK assassination, the Challenger disaster, seven days each. How many days after 9/11 is it that President Bush names someone to head an investigation?

George Bush: "This Commission has been charged with a crucial task."

BZ: It is four hundred and [forty-one] days. Call it ... foot dragging?

Notorious Henry Kissinger is Appointed First

And then, whom does Bush appoint? He appoints Henry Kissinger. Naming Kissinger sets a new standard for cynicism – or for being out of touch – or both. A *New York Times* editorial suggests the choice was "to contain an investigation (the White House) long opposed." But Kissinger at least is an expert on the date September 11th. It was on that day in 1973 that the CIA-assisted overthrow of the democratically-elected government of Chile takes place, masterminded by Kissinger for Richard Nixon. President Salvadore Allende is murdered. In his 2001 book, *The Trial of Henry Kissinger*, Christopher Hitchens notes Kissinger as "a crucial figure at all stages of this crime and cover-up."

Now, this is in reference to a bloody and unnecessary Kissinger-driven episode in Indochina which cost the lives of 64 US servicemen. But it also sums up Kissinger's role in the bloody Chilean operation: the cover-up is as important as the crime.

The White House tries to install Kissinger, an expert at cover-ups, to head the 9/11 investigation. After a universal backlash, Kissinger backs off.

Bush then names – it's [461] days now – Thomas Kean and Lee Hamilton as co-chairmen. Kean's Azerbaijan oil connections and other conflicts-of-interest should make him ineligible from the outset. He earlier co-chairs the Homeland Security Project. Observers have noted that huge profits are to be made in the surveillance and security industries these days. The more alarmed the public, the bigger the profits.

As for co-chair Lee Hamilton, Washington investigative journalist Joyce Lynn says he should be called Mister Cover-up. He is zero for four, she says, in finding any malfeasance in the four previous investigative Commissions on which he's served. These include the Iran-Contra affair and the October Surprise which denied Jimmy Carter the Presidency.

The White House chooses all the Commissioners. Lynn calls them "key insiders rife with conflicts-of-interest."

The White House brazenly appoints as the executive director one Dr. Philip Zelikow, a right-wing Republican hawk deeply involved in the Bush circle, a member of the Bush-Cheney transition team, and a National Security Council advisor with Condoleezza Rice under Bush 1 [G.H.W. Bush].

Time it took for investigations to start:	
Sinking of the Titanic	– 6 days
JFK Assassination	– 7 days
The Challenger Disaster	– 7 days
Pearl Harbor Attack	– 9 days
The Events of 9/11	– 441 days

The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw

The So-Called Independent 9/11 Commission

The editor of *Vanity Fair*, Graydon Carter, sums it up: “The Bush White House ... did everything in its power to derail an open inquiry. Then, when faced with its inevitability, the President and his aides sought to limit its scope, its access, and its funding.”

The Commission’s full title is The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. Reflecting extreme laziness in research and wording, the mainstream media keep referring to it as “the independent 9/11 Commission.” This Commission was about as independent from White House control and manipulation as the abused prisoners at Abu Ghraib were from their jailers.

Mandate? The Commission itself says “We’re not out to blame anyone.” In other words, accountability is not part of the mandate.

Budget? In January 2003, the Bush administration allots the Commission three million dollars. This compares to five million for a 1996 Commission that looked into casino gambling and 50 million each for the inquiries into the Columbia shuttle explosion and the Clinton’s failed Whitewater deal. [This extended to the Starr inquiry and Monica. – BZ] The dollar amount is later grudgingly raised but never exceeds 15 million.

The White House releases only 25% of 11,000 documents requested. It blacks out portions of the released documents, resists requests that the administration officials testify under oath and tries to rush the Commission’s deadline.

After a cat-and-mouse game Bush and Cheney meet the Commission. But it is behind closed doors, they refuse to testify under oath, no tape recorders are allowed, no transcript is allowed, Bush makes no opening statement, and those taking notes must submit them to security personnel.

All this is what is called in law ‘guilty demeanour’. The behaviour of the White House in relation to the Commission from start to finish only makes sense if the official story is a lie and the truth needs to be kept secret.

The term whitewash doesn’t do justice to the report of the 9/11 Commission. Omission-riddled inventive cover-up, maybe.

The Commission finds that the ultimate reason the events of 9/11 took place was... “a failure of imagination.” They ought to know. Imagination was something the Commission had in abundance. The Commission imagines US intelligence received insufficient specific warnings of an impending event. Even though CIA head George Tenet says in an unguarded moment that, “The system was blinking


red,” the Commission imagines there’s nothing to go with. When we return, an American researcher on the number of published warnings.

* * *

Film narrator: A community rates low on an information scale when the press, radio and other channels of communication are controlled by only a few people. And if books, newspapers and the radio are efficiently controlled, the people will read and accept exactly what the few in control want them to.

* * *

BZ: Welcome back to *The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw*



Sanctioned by the White House

American Paul Thompson has created the definitive timeline of events related to 9/11. It’s drawn exclusively from published reports. Thompson takes almost an hour at the Toronto Citizens’ Inquiry to list a fraction of the published reports dealing with early warnings.

Paul Thompson

Paul Thompson: In late August, according to some news reports from *Der Spiegel* and *Die Zeit*, and also reported in the BBC and *Ha’aretz* in Israel, (this is really interesting), supposedly Israel gives the US a list of 19 terrorist names, so there are 19 people on the flight, and here they are giving 19 names, we don’t know if they are the exact same list, but we do know according to these reports, that four

of the names are the same including Nawaf al Hasmi, Khalid Almidar, Marwan al Sheeche, and Mohammed Atta. So these are like the big leaders of the 9/11 attack, and here Israel is saying that these people are inside the United States and planning an imminent attack.

Then in early September, Egypt warns the US saying, al Qaeda is in the advance stages of a ‘significant operation’ against an American target, probably *within* the US.

So, just as an aside, remember that virtually every one of these things that I’m talking about is talking about an attack *inside* the US. Remember that George Tenet said that all the information they had pointed to an attack *overseas*.

BZ: In the context of this program, it’s important to note these warnings are from individuals, agencies and whole governments who are obviously not in on the plot. It should be observed that, in the main, the controversies over who knew what and when about the ‘attacks’ are diversionary mini-dramas that reinforce the official fiction. What these individuals and agencies and governments discover are plants and patsies being prepared to play their roles.

Paul Thompson: Even if – and this is the most

The Great Conspiracy

charitable explanation – it was only incompetence, then *that* incompetence was so severe. How many warnings do you need? Not only that but it was followed after 9/11 by a cover-up, and it is often said that it's not the crime but it's the cover-up that they end up going to jail for. Between the incompetence and the cover-up, that alone should lead to impeachment of President Bush and all of his top people."

The 9/11 Commission Imagines ...

BZ: Speaking of Bush and his top people, the Commission imagines (on p. 35 of the *Report*) that at 8:46 am, when Flight 11 hits the north tower of the World Trade Center, neither the President, nor anyone "in the White House or traveling with the President knew that Flight 11 had been hijacked at 8:14 that morning." Wrong!

The Commission imagines (page 39) that as late as 9:30 "no one in the (President's) traveling party had any information ... that other aircraft were hijacked or missing." Wrong!

The Commission imagines (on p. 39) it can get away with such claims even though millions of people saw TV news reports about the hijackings on CNN beginning at 8:48.

The 9/11 Commission fails to ask many, many questions. Why, for instance, was protective cover not provided for Air Force One? The Commission makes no mention of the extensive connections between the Bush and bin Laden families.

The Commission imagines, and it's utterly right, that the media will fail spectacularly in their duty to notice these and other glaring omissions. The Commission counts on the media failing to be skeptical or to ask probing questions. As columnist Lawrence Martin puts it: "You would think that given the Presidential record of duplicity – Bill Clinton on Monica, Ronald Reagan on Iran Contra, Richard Nixon on Watergate, Lyndon Johnson on the Gulf of Tonkin, John Kennedy on the missile gap – that journalists might catch on one day. Not in America." Martin adds: "If media buttons weren't so easy to push, it's a safe bet that the terrorism threat wouldn't get half the airtime." Well, half the airtime would still be billions of hours!

The Commission imagines, and it's right again, that the *New York Times* will devote pages and pages of coverage to the Commission's report without batting an eye at the shortcomings dealt with in this program. Subsequently, scores of *New York Times* stories quote the findings of the 9/11 Commission as dependable truth – on anything to do with 9/11.

The FAA's 'Uh Report'

The Commission imagines, and it's right on the money, that TV networks will air without question, and newspapers

publish without question, this alleged exchange on 9/11 between the FAA's Herndon Command Center and FAA Headquarters. I call it the "Uh Report."

FAA Command Center: "Uh, do we want to think about, uh, scrambling aircraft?"

FAA Headquarters: "...Oh God, I don't know."

FAA Command Center: "Uh, that's a decision somebody's gonna have to make probably in the next 10 minutes."

BZ: Can we hold it right there? Imagine anyone, say yourself, learning of a major emergency. A neighbor calls to tell you, "Your house is on fire!" And you say, "Yeah, somebody's gonna have to make a decision about that in probably ten minutes." The fact is that on the morning of 9/11 there's a good chance that you leaped into action.

Millions of ordinary people did. They call family and friends to turn on the TV. Many – I was one – try to get through to loved ones in New York. We find

the phone system down. We call others to see if they've gotten through and they call us. But at FAA Headquarters?

FAA Headquarters: "Uh, you know, everybody just left the room."

BZ: Yes, sir. I've noticed that. When there's a really big emergency, such as we have with the "Uh Report" here, key people just walk out of the room, with fishing rods.

When we come back, comments about the FAA and the 9/11 Commission Report from David Ray Griffin, author of the book, *The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11*.

* * *

'The New Pearl Harbor'

Welcome back. David Ray Griffin's book *The New Pearl Harbor* is widely admired as the definitive critique of the official story of 9/11. Griffin has gone on to draft a critique of the report of the 9/11 Commission. Griffin concludes that the Commission sets up the FAA as the fall guy (or patsy) to protect the US military – and thereby the Bush administration.

In one case, the Commission claims officials at FAA Headquarters "had to debate whether the report of a hijacked airliner with a bomb aboard was enough to justify bothering the military."

"The Commission," says Griffin, "portrays most FAA personnel as hopeless bunglers," – in fact, in Griffin's words, "guilty of criminal negligence of the most extreme sort." Yet this is the same Commission that says it cannot find any particular people deserving of blame – a remarkable contradiction.

Another one. The Commission itself points out, that the FAA did have *one* truly unprecedented task to perform that day – namely immediately landing thousands of aircraft

The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw

in the air wherever they were. The Commission agrees the FAA and I quote, “executed that unprecedented task flawlessly.”

“Is it not strange,” asks Griffin, “that FAA personnel carried out (this) unprecedented task ... flawlessly ... and yet failed so miserably with tasks they had been performing on a regular basis?”

Additionally Griffin observes, according to the Commission “the US military is itself blind, being wholly dependent on the FAA to inform it about what is going on in US airspace.”

The Commissioners would have us forget, as they do, the billions of dollars NORAD spent building detection systems second to none. As Thierry Meyssan writes in his book *Pentagate*, the military in fact possess “several very sophisticated radar monitoring systems, incomparable with the civilian systems.” The website for one of these systems, called Pave Paws, states it is “capable of detecting and monitoring a great number of targets that would be consistent with a massive Submarine Launched Ballistic Missile, or SLBM, attack.” (www.pavepaws.org.)

“Are we to believe,” Griffin asks, “that our military’s radar systems, which could simultaneously track dozens of missiles, could not track a single airliner headed for New York City?”

Griffin and others list several serious matters in which the 9/11 Commission shows no interest. They include the puzzling nature of the collapse of the Twin Towers: jet fuel cannot burn hot enough to melt structural steel. Why surface-to-air missiles at the Pentagon were not triggered to protect the building. The question of what hit the Pentagon: the hole in the building was much smaller than a 757 would make. The connections between the Bush and bin Laden families. And the startling case of World Trade Center Building 7.

The Mysterious Collapse of Building 7

Michael Kane, (NY 9/11 Truth activist): I’m standing on a location that has come to be known widely across the world simply as ‘Ground Zero’. Right behind me is where the Twin Towers had once stood. Currently the area is under renovation and what will become in part, a memorial to the some 3000 victims from over 80 different countries who were murdered on September 11th, 2001. Many of us will never forget the images that were broadcast on that tragic day. But largely and widely unknown across the world is the fact that a third building also went down on the morning of September 11. World Trade Center 7 stood 100 yards across from Towers 1 and

2, clear across an entire city block. We see now that World Trade Center 7 is currently under reconstruction and the new building stands 40 stories tall.

In the early afternoon of September 11, fires broke out in World Trade Center 7. And when we look at the photographs and video available from that day, we can see the fires are mostly on the lower floors and they’re largely contained and actually very small. Regardless, at 5:25 pm about seven hours after the first two buildings went down, World Trade Center 7 implodes. And it implodes in a free-fall that’s about the speed of gravity. And it does so into its own footprint and when World Trade Center 7 comes down it does not damage either of the buildings significantly on either side of it. Now if you were to ask a structural engineer, or a demolition expert about World Trade Center 7, with the facts that



Collapse of Building 7 on 9/11/01 Ignored by Mainstream Media

have just been presented to you, they would likely not call it a collapse, they would likely call it a work of art. World Trade Center 7 was a controlled demolition.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) conducted an investigation into what caused the towers to fall. It concluded that whatever it was that caused World Trade Center 7 to come down, it remains unknown. *Fire Engineering Magazine* the 125-year-old paper of record amongst the fire engineering community, came out in January of [2002] and called FEMA’s investigation a ‘half baked farce’ working on a

‘shoestring budget’. Now the question you should be asking yourself is why? Why did World Trade Center 7 need to be taken down in a controlled demolition? Well, when you look closely at the tenants in the office spaces in World Trade Center 7, effectively it was a military building.

The CIA had a clandestine bunker on the 23rd floor of World Trade Center 7. The Secret Service had offices in World Trade Center 7. Rudolph Guliani’s Office of Emergency Management was located in World Trade Center 7 which would have been the perfect center to respond to an emergency such as 9/11 except that the tragedy caused them to evacuate the bunker at 9:25 am in the morning. Additionally the Security and Exchange Commission (the SEC) had offices at World Trade Center 7. Now this was late 2001. This was at the height of the investigation into Enron, so the majority of Enron’s SEC filings were likely destroyed when World Trade Center 7 came down.

Now, in September of 2002, PBS aired a documentary entitled “America Rebuilds” and in this documentary, Larry Silverstein was interviewed. Larry Silverstein leased the World Trade Center complex just a few months before 9/11

occurred. And in this documentary, Silverstein is seen making a shocking commentary in which it appears he himself states World Trade Center 7 was a controlled demolition.

Silverstein: "I remember getting a call from the fire department commander telling me that they were not sure they were going to be able to contain the fire, and I said, 'You know, we've had such terrible loss of life maybe the smartest thing to do is, is pull it.' And they made that decision to pull and then we watched the building collapse."

Now the term 'pull' which you just saw Larry Silverstein use, is an industry term that means to demolish – a controlled demolition. What did Larry Silverstein exactly say here? Did he say World Trade Center 7 was a controlled demolition? If so, is it conceivable that through all the melee and hysteria that was going on, on the morning of September 11th a demolition crew could have come in and taken down WTC 7 within seven hours? Most controlled demolitions take up to two weeks in intense planning to make it happen. If this is the case, the only explanation that makes sense is that a controlled demolition was planned – way in advance of September 11th 2001.

The '9/11 Cover-Up Commission'

This, and other overwhelming evidence, ignored or explained away by the 9/11 Commission, which should be called the "9/11 Cover-up Commission," suggests 9/11 was planned and executed at the highest levels of the US government.

People forget what immense powers and resources governments and shadow governments have to organize covert operations, fabricate false evidence, destroy real evidence, issue misleading statements, organize cover-ups and generally make things happen, through deploying agents, career inducements, bribery and threats, subtle or otherwise. Governments have the powers to kill, maim and imprison and they use them.

One example is the endless arrests of 'suspected terrorists', the vast majority eventually released without any charges being laid. On any other subject this would create a huge outcry.

And of course, governments have the powers of propaganda, PR spin, news management, and not least, secrecy.

Media Complicity

In the face, though, even of this overwhelming evidence, people still find reasons to remain blind to the possibility that 9/11 was an inside job. They say a conspiracy this large could not be kept secret. But most large covert operations

are kept secret.

People say they – meaning the Bush administration – wouldn't dare, for fear they'd be found out. As for being found out by the media, well, what's to fear so far?

Upholding the US Constitution obligates one to guard against "enemies foreign *and domestic*." The Founders of the country included that for good reason. They knew that for centuries governments have turned toxic. "The price of freedom is eternal vigilance," and not just from outside threats. The trumpeting of outside threats, in fact, is the commonest ploy used by internal rogues. Today's media feast on, profit from, and join in the trumpeting of outside threats and the demonisation of designated villains.

We expect more of the media than we've been getting. We expect them to remember something of history, to be watchdogs for democracy and to have some backbone. Won't just one major paper do what the *Washington Post* did with Watergate? Get onto this and not let go until the rest of the media have to pay attention?

I've been a media critic for 35 years. I've watched the media become more and more corporate, more and more ideological, more and more dishonest, more and more part of a power structure which manufactures and manipulates fear and excuses death and destruction and thereby become complicit in it.

But I've also learned a big lesson, belatedly. And that is that too many of us want to be shielded from troublesome truth, want our inner child to be reassured, want, in short, to be lied to.

With knowledge comes responsibility. We who are finding the scales falling from our eyes must also find the courage to make our media and government accountable. Many peaceful means for doing this still exist.

This is Barrie Zwicker signing off for *The Great Conspiracy – The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw* but that I live in hopes that you will.

Notes:

1. For complete list of books, magazines, videos, DVDs and websites visit: www.greatconspiracy.ca.

* * *

Barrie Zwicker is an author and broadcaster. He produced *The Great Deception*, a video that strongly suggests US government complicity in the events of 9/11. He has been for 15 years the regular media critic for Vision TV, a Canadian national cable channel. Copyright belongs to the author. All rights reserved. ■



Larry Silverstein, the man who ordered Building 7 to be 'pulled' as reported on CBS