# The War on Terrorism
# The Future Is Calling (Part Four)


Revised 2012 July 6

## THE WAR ON TERRORISM

Finally we come to the end of our travel through time and arrive at the present. Again, we must consider the question stated at the beginning of our journey. Is the War on Terrorism a repeat of history? To answer that question, first, let's consider the parallels. The leaders of the War on Terrorism, as in the past, are members of the Round Table and the Council on Foreign Relations. They advocate a world union of nations built on the model of collectivism. As before, they seek to change the social and political structure of the free world to accommodate that goal. Every move they make in this war results in strengthening the United Nations. Even when there is apparent disunity at the UN, a closer examination reveals that, as always, there is no disagreement over the goal of world government. It is only a squabble between Rhodesians and Leninists over who will dominate. Both sides in the contest continue to call for more power to the UN.

## THE LENINIST GAME PLAN

The Leninist faction publicly pretends to oppose terrorism; but, covertly, they are the primary *sponsors* of terrorism, which they use as a weapon against the Rhodesian faction. Their game plan is to exhaust the United States and her Rhodesian allies in nuclear or bio-chemical war with puppet regimes so that Russia and China can emerge, unscathed, as the dominant world power. No one should underestimate the capacity of the Leninist network to implement that scenario. It would be foolhardy to take comfort in the thought that Communism is dead. Communism is only a word. The people who put Communism on the map seldom called themselves Communists. They referred to themselves as Leninists, and they still do. Don't be fooled by the word game. Communism may or may not be dead, but Leninism *lives* and is stronger than ever.

## THE RHODESIAN GAME PLAN

The Rhodesian game plan is to become the preeminent force in the world through economic and military dominance, particularly in the Middle East where that region's vast oil reserves constitutes an extra prize. The plans for military occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq were drafted long before the terrorist attacks of 9/11. All they needed was a dramatic justification that would be acceptable to world opinion.[1]

The Rhodesian strategy for the United States has been vividly described in numerous books and reports written by CFR members. One of the most explicit carried the innocent-sounding title of *Rebuilding America's Defenses* and was released in September of 2000 by a think-tank group called The Project for The New American Century. One third of the participants were members of the Council on Foreign Relations. The ninety-page document is too long to quote, so I have prepared a summary. You're not going to like it, and you may

[1] "U.S. planned for attack on Al-Qaeda; White House given strategy two days before Sept. 11," MSNBC, May 16, 2002, MSNBC. (Article in Internet archive.)

wonder if I have distorted or exaggerated its meaning. Please be assured that I have been careful not to do that. The document really says everything in this summary – including the mention of Pearl Harbor. For those who want to check for themselves, the complete text is available on the Internet.[1] *This* is the Rhodesian game plan:

> The United States is the strongest nation in the world with little fear of opposition. This is a wonderful opportunity for the American government to dominate the world for the betterment of mankind. It is our destiny and our obligation to usher in an American Peace, a *Pax Americana* similar to the *Pax Romana* of the Roman Empire. It is our destiny to do so, and we must not shrink from the challenge. We must establish our military presence in every part of the world as the visible expression of our power. Such bold action will be costly and may require the sacrifice of lives, but that is the necessary price for world leadership. Our military must develop new technology, which, unfortunately, may be slow to develop due to public resistance to the large expenditure required. However, this transformation could be accelerated to our advantage if an enemy should attack us, as happened at Pear Harbor. In the Middle East, the presence of Saddam Hussein is justification for maintaining a military presence in the region, but even if Hussein did not exist, we should be there anyway to maintain the *Pax Americana*.

That same theme was expressed even more succinctly by another Rhodesian theorist, Fareed Zakaria. When he wrote the following words, Zakaria was Managing Editor of *Foreign Affairs*, the official magazine of the CFR. He said:

> Maintaining a long-term American presence in the gulf would be difficult in the absence of a regional threat…. If Saddam Hussein did not exist, we would have to invent him. He is the linchpin of American policy in the Mideast. Without him, Washington would be stumbling in the dessert sands…. If not for Saddam, would the Saudi royal family, terrified of being seen as an American protectorate (which in a sense it is), allow American troops on their soil? Would Kuwait house more than 30,000 pieces of American combat hardware, kept in readiness should the need arise? Would the king of Jordan, the political weather vane of the region, allow the Marines to conduct exercises within his borders? … The end of Saddam Hussein would be the end of the anti-Saddam coalition. Nothing destroys an alliance like the disappearance of the enemy.[2]

CFR member, Charles Krauthammer, wrote an editorial in the March 5, 2001, issue of *Time* Magazine that explained the new doctrine this way:

> America is no mere international citizen. It is the dominant power in the world, more dominant than any since Rome. Accordingly, America is in a position to reshape norms, alter expectations and create new realities. How? By unapologetic and implacable demonstrations of will.[3]

One of the most influential advocates of a *Pax Americana*, is neo-conservative Michael Ledeen, a consultant to the U.S. National Security Council, the U.S. State

---

[1] The link is http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf.

[2] "Thank Goodness for A Villain," by Fareed Zakaria, *Newsweek*, Sept. 16, 1996, p. 43. (Article in Internet archive.)

[3] "The Bush Doctrine," by Charles Krauthammer, *Time*, Mar.5, 2001. (Article in Internet archive.)

Department, and the Department of Defense. He also is an avid disciple of Rocollò Machiavelli and an admirer of fascism under Italian dictator Benito Mussolini. It was Ledeen who contributed the concept of a "new Pearl Harbor" to condition Americans to support U.S. military aggression in the Middle East and passively pay the bill. In his view (published in 1999), an attack against the U.S. would be a "lucky" event. This is how he expressed it:

> … of course, we can always get lucky. Stunning events from outside can providentially awaken the enterprise from its growing torpor and demonstrate the need for reversal, as the devastating Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 so effectively aroused the U.S. from its soothing dreams of permanent neutrality.[1] …
>
> This is total war. We are fighting a variety of enemies. There are lots of them out there. All this talk about first we are going to do Afghanistan, then we will do Iraq, … is entirely the wrong way to go about it. If we just let our vision of the world go forth and we embrace it entirely, and we don't try to piece together clever diplomacy but just wage a total war, our children will sing great songs about us years from now.[2]

That is the Rhodesian game plan for the United States. It's not about fighting terrorism but building *Pax Americana.* However, there is more to it than that. This grandiose plan for U.S. hegemony is but a transition phase of something even more important. These planners are well aware that nation empires do not last forever and eventually are destroyed by their own internal weakness or external superior force, and they built that reality into their long-term plan. Michael Ledeen explains:

> If there were no foreign enemies, the cycle might go on forever, but in practice, very few states survive long enough to return to Go. During one of its moments of degeneracy, weakness, or chaos, a stronger neighbor takes it over or wipes it out. …
>
> Machiavelli reminds us that all political systems are fragile and can be toppled from either within or without. Given the history of the race, it should surprise no one that rulers fall, or when one country is conquered by another, or even when mass uprisings take place. Such events are the nature of politics, because each type of government is fundamentally defective. …
>
> The tempo may vary from moment to moment, but stability exists only in the grave, not in this life. It therefore behooves the man or woman of action, and especially those who would lead great enterprises, to be ready at all times to change strategies and tactics. … The imperative for leaders is absolute: get ready for change.[3]

---

[1] Michael A. Ledeen, *Machiavelli on Modern Leadership* (N.Y. St. Martin's Press, 1999), pp.159,160.

[2] "The Battle for Ideas in the U.S. War on Terrorism," American Enterprise Institute, Oct. 29, 2001, http://www.aei.org/event/364. The transcript of the speech in which this statement was made had been removed from the Internet at the time of preparing this manuscript. If it is not restored by the time you read this, key excerpts continue to be available on other sites, including http://surrenderingislam.com/surrendering-islam/total-war. (Article in Internet archive.)

[3] Ledeen, pp. 6-8.

What is that change? As we shall see further along in this book, when it finally is time for *Pax Americana* to fall, the strategy is to use the chaos that such an event will entail to drive the world into the final phase of the long-range goal: a "New World Order" based on the model of collectivism. At that point, America will have been reduced to an exhausted, crippled, de-fanged, and obedient component of the whole.

**AGGRAVATE**

With that background in mind, let us return to the issue of the supposed war on terrorism and consider the evidence that the Rhodesians within the United States once again have followed a strategy to *aggravate, facilitate, and insulate*. Let's deal with *aggravate* first.

In the historic conflict between Israelis and Arabs, the Rhodesians have consistently directed the United States government to take sides with Israel, even to the extent of supplying military equipment used against Palestinian civilians. This predates 9/11. It should come as no surprise that, when you choose sides in a war, the other side will consider you as an enemy.

Since 1991, the United States, under the control of Rhodesians, has routinely bombed Iraq and blocked the importation of food and medical supplies. This led to the death of a half-million children through malnutrition and lack of medication.

In 1996, CBS reporter Lesley Stahl interviewed the American ambassador to the UN, Madeline Albright (a member of the CFR). In the course of the interview, Stahl asked this question: "We have heard that a half-million children have died [as a result of this policy]. Is the price worth it?"

Albright replied: "We think the price is worth it."

That interview was widely circulated in the Middle East. It was not merely an unfortunate choice of words. It was a forthright statement of collectivist morality: The sacrifice of a half-million children *is* acceptable because of the greater good of supposedly de-stabilizing Hussein's regime, the greater good of world peace, the greater good of the New World Order. Remember, in the collectivist mind, anything can be justified by theorizing a greater good for a greater number, and a half-million children is a small number compared to the population of the world. In any event, these policies are well designed to aggravate whole populations into becoming enemies of America, and some of them will be willing to sacrifice their lives in revenge.

At the time of the 9/11 attacks, the United States government, under the tight control of Rhodesians, had a quarter of a million soldiers in 141 countries. Since World War II, they have launched military strikes against Panama, Kosovo, Albania, Bosnia, Serbia, Iraq, Kuwait, Sudan, Haiti, Granada, Somalia, Afghanistan, Syria, and Libya – supposedly in pursuit of eliminating terrorism, stopping drugs, or defending freedom . In most cases, these objectives were *not* achieved. The single, most consistent result has been hostility toward America.

I am reminded of the story of a young man in medieval times who wanted to become a knight. He obtained an audience with the king and offered his services, explaining that he was an excellent swordsman. The king told him that the realm was at peace, and there was no need for a knight. Nevertheless, the young man insisted that he be allowed to serve. To put an end to the discussion, the king finally agreed and knighted him on the spot. Several

months later, the young knight returned to the castle and requested another audience. When he entered the throne room, he bowed in respect and then reported that he had been very busy. He explained that he had killed thirty of the king's enemies in the North and forty-five of them in the South. The king looked puzzled for a moment and said, "But I don't *have* any enemies." To which the knight replied, "You do *now*, Sire."

**FACILITATE**

The evidence that terrorists have been *facilitated* in their attacks is so plentiful that it's difficult to know where to begin. Most of it has received extensive exposure in the press, but it has been invisible to the average person. Because we find it inconceivable that anyone in our own government would deliberately facilitate terrorism, because we cannot imagine a *motive* that would lead them to do that, we look right at the evidence and see it only as well-intentioned mistakes, inefficiency, or blundering. Now that we have identified a possible motive, let's take the blinders off and re-examine the facts.

Since the early 1980s, the United States government, under the control of Rhodesians, has provided covert funding and training for just about every terrorist regime in the world. Bin Ladin and Hussein are prominent on the list, but they are not alone. The list is very long. We are told that this was a well-intentioned policy to create opposition to the Soviets, particularly in Afghanistan but that, somehow, it backfired on us. That's called the blowback theory. It is, of course, a smokescreen. How do we know that? Because the aid to terrorist regimes did not stop when the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan. It continues to this day.

In July of 2009, FBI whistleblower, Sibel Edmonds, who had been a translator at the FBI with access to important documents relating to activities in Turkey and the Middle East, revealed in a radio interview on the Mike Malloy radio show that she told the 9/11 Commission that Bin Ladin had been working closely with intelligence agencies of the United States government right up until 9/11. There was no mention of her testimony in the Commission's final report except a single footnote stating that her comments were "classified."[1]

Support of terrorist groups by agencies of the United States government is no longer covert; it's right out in the open. The Rhodesians currently are sending technology, money, and trade to Russia and China, countries that, by now, everyone knows are suppliers of the very terrorist regimes we are fighting, and that includes weapons of mass destruction. One can only shudder at what the so-called blowback of that policy will be in the future.

**RUSSIAN SUPPORT OF TERRORISM UNDER PUTIN**

In November of 2006, the world was shocked by the news that Alexander Litvinenko, a former lieutenant colonel in the Soviet KGB, had been murdered in London by radio-active poisoning. Litvinenko had defected to the West and became an outspoken critic of corruption within the Russian government. He had accused Vladimir Putin of being a paedophile, working closely with organized crime, and ordering the assassination of dissident Russian journalist, Ana Polikovskaya; but more important to our topic of terrorism, he said that the Russian government, under the direction of Putin himself, had

[1] "Bombshell: Bin Laden worked for U.S. till 9/11," Daily Kos, July 31, 2009. http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2009/7/31/760117/-Bombshell:-Bin-Laden-worked-for-US-till-9-11

orchestrated the 1999 apartment-building bombings in Moscow that killed more than 300 people. They did this so the blame could be put on Chechan seperatists, knowing that public outrage would create popular support for a military operation against Chechnya, which was a high agenda item for the Russian government.

He claimed that other terrorist incidents also were orchestrated by the Russian government. The *Wikipedia* on-line encyclopedia says:

> Litvinenko stated in a June 2003 interview, with the Australian SBS television programme *Dateline*, that two of the Chechen terrorists involved in the 2002 Moscow theatre hostage crisis – whom he named as "Abdul the Bloody" and Abu Bakar" – were working for the FSB [formerly the KGB], and that the agency manipulated the rebels into staging the attack. Litvenko said: "When they tried to find [Abdul the Bloody and Abu Bakar] among the dead terrorists, they weren't there. The FSB got its agents out. So the FSB agents among Chechens organized the whole thing on FSB orders, and those agents were released." The story about FSB connections with the hostage takers was confirmed by Mikhail Trepashkin.

When the Russian government proudly carried the banner of Communism, it was well known for its deep involvement in sponsoring, training, and supplying international terrorists. This was an important part of the Leninist strategy for conquest called "wars of national liberation." When Leninists changed their banner to Democracy, they did not abandon this strategy, but they did take care to keep it hidden from view. When Litvenko was with the FSB, one of his assignments was counter-terrorist activities. He saw with his own eyes that terrorism was viewed by the government as necessary for manipulating public opinion into uncritical support of its leaders. Once again quoting *Wikipedia*:

> Litvenko said that "all the bloodiest terrorists of the world" were connected to FSB-KGB, including Carlos Ramfrez the "Jackal", Yassir Arafat, Saddam Hussein, Abdullah Öcalan, Wadie Haddad of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, George Hawi who led the Communist Party of Lebanon, Ezekias Papaioannou from Cypres, and Sean Garland from Ireland. He said that the "terrorism infection creeps away worldwide from the cabinets of the Lubyanka Square and the Kremlin." These claims are supported by the Mitrokhin archive.

In a 2005 interview with the Polish newspaper *Rzeczpospolita*, Litvenko said that the number-two man in the Al Qaeda terrorist network, Ayman al-Zawahiri, was trained by the Russian FSB before being sent to Afghanistan, where he became Osama bin Laden's next-in-command.[1]

## CHINA'S SUPPORT OF TERRORISM

The Chinese government, under the control of Leninists, still classifies the United States as, what it calls, "Number One Enemy." In 1999, the Chinese People's Liberation Army published a document entitled *Unrestricted Warfare*. The main theme of that study was how to defeat the United Sates. It said that a new type of unrestricted war against

[1] "Bin Laden aide had KGB link," Gulf Times, p. 1, July 17, 2005. http://www.gulf-times.com/site/topics/article.asp?cu_no=2&item_no=44835&version=1&template_id=57&parent_id=56.

America could be launched by "an intrusion of [Internet] hackers, a major explosion at the World Trade Center, or a bombing attack by bin Ladin." That was two years before 9-11.[1]

Soon after that prediction was fulfilled and two thousand Americans lost their lives in the rubble, the London *Telegraph* published this report:

> The Chinese state-run propaganda machine is cashing in on the terrorist attacks … producing books, films, and video games glorifying the attacks as a humbling blow against an arrogant nation.[2]

Beijing Television produced a documentary entitled *Attack America*. As the video shows jets crashing into the Twin Towers, the narrator says: "This is the America the whole world has wanted to see."[3]

In spite of easy access to this information, the Rhodesians within the United States government pretend they don't know any of this and continue sending technology, money, and trade to China – and Russia – on the pretext that doing so will encourage them to change their ways. At least that's the official explanation. But before we rush to conclude that they are just making another well-intentioned mistake, we must consider the possibility that they are *not* making a mistake at all, that they have a hidden agenda. The agenda is to sustain terrorism as a credible threat so the unsuspecting public will be frightened into acceptance of a collectivist police state in exchange for safety. The reality is that terrorist regimes and their Russian and Soviet sponsors could not exist today without the continuing support of the U.S. government and CFR-controlled corporations. These regimes are the best enemies money can buy.

There was a joke making the rounds in the days leading up to the U.S invasion of Iraq in April of 2003. A newspaper reporter asks the President if there is any proof that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction. "Of course," is the reply. "We saved the receipts." Unfortunately, this is too close to the truth to be funny.

**WELCOME MAT FOR TERRORISTS**

It is now clear that terrorism was greatly facilitated by policies of the U.S. Immigration Service, policies that are so lax as to be ludicrous. In her book, *Invasion*,[4] Michelle Malkin documents how Immigration officials stretched the rules in order to make it easy to enter the United States from hostile countries at the very time alerts were being circulated that terrorists were expected to be making entry. Instead of tightening security, they loosened it.

Michael Springman was the former head of the U.S. Visa Bureau in Jeddah, Egypt. In June of 2001 (three months *before* the attack on the World Trade Center) he was interviewed on BBC News. This is what he said:

> In Saudi Arabia I was repeatedly ordered by high-level State Dept officials to issue visas to unqualified applicants. These were, essentially, people who had no ties

---

[1] Liang, Qiao and Xiangeui, Wang, *Unrestricted Warfare* (Panama City, Panama: Pan American Publishing Co., 2002), p. 122.

[2] "Beijing produces videos glorifying terrorist attacks on 'arrogant' US," by Damien McElroy, London *Telegraph*, April 11, 2002, (Article in Internet archive).

[3] Ibid.

[4] Michelle Malkin, *Invasion* (Washington, DC, Regnery Publishing, 2002)

> either to Saudi Arabia or to their own country. I complained bitterly at the time there. I returned to the US, I complained to the State Dept here, to the General Accounting Office, to the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, and to the Inspector General's office. I was met with silence…. What I was protesting was, in reality, an effort to bring recruits, rounded up by Osama bin Ladin, to the US for terrorist training by the CIA.[1]

The time frame for this action was during the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, and so this policy is defended as having been necessary to oppose the Soviets. It's the blowback theory, again. But, long after the Soviets left Afghanistan, and long after U.S. intelligence agencies knew that the Al-Qaeda terrorist network was planning an attack inside the United States, the pattern did not change.

Fifteen of the nineteen hijackers obtained their visas from U.S authorities in Saudi Arabia. After 9-11, their visa applications were reviewed, and this is what was found: One of the hijackers said he was a teacher but couldn't spell the word. One said he was going to school but didn't know where. Another said he was married but didn't give the name of his spouse. One of them listed as his destination: "Hotel." In each of the applications, there was important information incorrectly entered or missing altogether. Not one of them was filled out properly, yet they all were approved.[2]

One of the organizers of the terrorist cell that carried out the first bombing of the World Trade Towers in 1993, was Sheik Omar Abdel-Rahman**.** During the 1980s, Rahman had traveled throughout the Middle East calling for Jihad, or "Holy War," against America. Because of that, he was on the State Department "watch list" of suspected terrorists who were not to be allowed into the U.S. Yet, there he was, and he had entered the country under his real name. How did that happen? It happened because, in July of 1990, a CIA agent, posing as an embassy official, gave him a visa. Then, when his visa was revoked four months later, the Immigration Service located him and, instead of expelling him from the country, granted him a work permit! That is how he was able to plan and direct the first bombing of the World Trade Towers.[3] It was the same kind of protection that had been given to Takeo Yoshikawa at Pearl Harbor fifty-two years earlier.

The pattern of facilitating terrorists' entry into the United States has continued unabated after 9/11. Thousands of illegal aliens enter the country across unprotected borders every year, and it is known that a substantial number of them are from Middle Eastern countries. Yet, the federal government does nothing about it. Field agents with the Border Patrol repeatedly have complained about being hampered in their job by their own agency, but the response from their superiors has been public denial of any problem and disciplinary action against the whistleblowers. In June of 2004, a small-town newspaper in Arizona, the *Tombstone Tumbleweed*, reported that local Border Patrol agents had encountered at least

---

[1] Has someone been sitting on the FBI?" an interview by Greg Palast, *BBC News*, June 11, 2001, (Article in Internet archive).

[2] "Sneaking into America," by Martha Raddarz, *ABC News*, Oct. 23, http://abcnews.go.com/sections/wnt/DailyNews/hijack_visas021023.html. Also see "Series of red flags missed before Sept. 11, panel says," by Mimi Hall, *USA Today*, Jan. 27, 2004, p. 2A.

[3] Bin "Laden's 'Logistical Mastermind'," *New York Newsday*, Sept. 21, 2001, http://www.nynewsday.com/ny-wodoc212376902sep21,0,7718988.story. Also "Behind the Terror Network," by William Grigg, *The New American*, Nov. 5, 2001, pp. 5, 6. Also "Powell defends department, admits visa errors occurred," by Cassio Furtado, *The Miami Herald*, July 12, 2002, posted to http://www.usbc.org/info/everything2002/0702powelldefends.htm.

seventy-five illegal aliens who were of middle-eastern descent. One agent told the newspaper: "We discovered they spoke poor English with middle-eastern accent; then we caught them speaking to each other in Arabic. This is ridiculous that we don't take this more seriously, and we're told not to say a thing to the media, but I have to." Andy Adame, the spokesman for the Border Patrol, responded with a flat-out denial. He said that all of those in question were Mexicans. However, Adame did admit that, from October 2003 though June 2004, Border Patrol agents just in the Tucson, Arizona, area had apprehended 5,510 illegals from countries *other* than Mexico or other Central or South American countries. He was careful not to reveal that any of them were from the Middle East.[1]

In spite of denials by the government, it was becoming increasingly known to the public that there was a *big* security problem along our borders, including the Canadian border and the vast unprotected beaches of the Pacific Northwest. In December of 2004, Congress passed the National Intelligence Reform Act, which vastly expanded the power of the government to control the lives of American citizens – all in the name of weeding out terrorists. Part of the veneer that made this seem genuine was a provision to add 10,000 border patrol agents to the Immigration Service. Here was proof that our leaders were finally getting serious about this problem. However, when the law was passed through the filter of the President's annual budget, the number of new agents was slashed from 10,000 to only 210. The explanation was that the government lacked the money to hire and train these forces.[2]

**BOJINKA**

The official position of the Bush Administration on 9/11 is that it was impossible to predict that terrorists would use airplanes as weapons of attack, and that is the reason the government was not able to prevent it. On May 9, 2002, President Bush's national security advisor, Condoleezza Rice – a member of the CFR – faced reporters and said: "Nobody could have predicted that these people would take an airplane and slam it into the World Trade Center … that they would try to use an airplane as a missile."[3] That's what she said. Please remember that statement as we now examine the record.

In 1995, a terrorist cell was uncovered in the Philippines. Its members were part of the bin Ladin network. An accidental fire in their bomb factory had aroused the curiosity of local officials and, when they arrived to investigate, Abdul Hakim Murad was arrested as he attempted to flee. Murad revealed that his group was planning to assassinate the Pope during his upcoming visit to Manila. But that isn't all. He said he had trained in New Bern, North Carolina, to fly commercial jets. Why? Because that was part of a plan called Project Bojinka, which is a Yugoslav term for big bang. The Bojinka was to blow up eleven airliners in the same day, fly others into landmark targets such as CIA headquarters, the Pentagon, the TransAmerica Building in San Francisco, the Sears Tower in Chicago, and the

---

[1] "Terrorist Crossing: Cover-up on the U.S.-Mexico Border," *The New American*, Nov 29, 2004, p. 8, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1288222/posts.

[2] "Bush budget scraps 9,790 border patrol agents," *San Francisco Chronicle*, Feb 9, 2005, http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2005/02/09/MNGOKB837T1.DTL.

[3] "1999 Report Warned of Suicide Hijack," by John Solomon, Associated Press, *Yahoo News*, May 17, 2002.

World Trade Center in New York. All of this information was passed on to U.S. intelligence agencies and also to the security service for the Vatican.[1] That was 6 yrs before 9-11.

In 1996, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed was indicted in the United States for a plot to blow up airliners and crash one of them into CIA headquarters. It was the Bonjinka plot. The FBI put him on their most-wanted list of terrorists; so someone obviously took the plan seriously, which means the government was fully aware of the plan to use passenger planes as flying bombs at least 5 years before 9-11.[2]

During hearings before the Joint House-Senate Intelligence Committee to Investigate 9-11, Eleanor Hill, who was the committee Staff Director, testified that, in August of 1998, intelligence agencies learned that a group of Arabs planned to fly an explosive-laden plane into the World Trade Center. A few months later, she said, it was learned that groups connected with bin Ladin would target New York and Washington and seek an event that was "spectacular and traumatic." That was three years before 9-11.[3]

In September of 1999, the National Intelligence Council, which is attached to the CIA, issued a report entitled "Sociology and Psychology of Terrorism." It warned against the possibility of suicide hijackings of airlines by Al-Qaeda terrorists. The report went to the White House and was shared with federal agencies. It also was placed into the Library of Congress. That was 2 years before 9-11.[4]

In February of 2005, a report of the 9/11 Commission revealed that, in the months before the attack, federal aviation officials had received fifty-two intelligence reports warning of the possibility that Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda would launch terrorist attacks against the U.S., and some of those specifically warned of airline hijackings and suicide operations. According to *The New York Times*: "The Bush Administration had blocked the public release of the full, classified version of the report for more than five months, officials said, much to the frustration of former commission members."[5]

**THE DATE OF THE ATTACK IS KNOWN**

In the third week of June, 2001, Richard Clarke, who was National Coordinator for Counterterrorism in the White House, called together the major domestic security agencies and told them that a Bonjinka-style attack was imminent. The following report in the *New Yorker* magazine, dated January 14, 2002, tells it all:

> Intelligence had been streaming in concerning a likely Al-Qaeda attack. "It all came together in the third week in June," Clarke said. The C.I.A.'s view was that a major terrorist attack was coming in the next several weeks." On July 5th, Clarke

---

[1] "Could We Have Prevented the Attacks?" by William Grigg, *The New American*, November 5, 2001, pp. 29, 30. Grigg also cites the Sept. 23 edition of the *Washington Post*. Also see "Terror Trail," by William Jasper, *The New American*, July 1, 2002, p. 20

[2] "Arrest of 9/11 suspect yields 'lots of names, information'," by Kevin Johnson, *USA Today*, March 3, 2003, pp. 1,2A, (Article in Internet archive).

[3] "What Went Wrong." *Online News* PBS, Sept. 18, 2002, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/terrorism/july-dec02/bkgdfailures_9-18.html. Also "Burying the Truth," by Norman Grigg, *The New American*, Dec. 30, 2002, p. 18, http://www.thenewamerican.com/tna/2002/12-30-2002/vo18no26_burying.htm.

[4] "1999 Report Warned of Suicide Hijack," by John Solomon, Associated Press, May 17, 2002, http://starbulletin.com/2002/05/18/news/story1.html.

[5] "9/11 Report Cites Many Warnings About Hijackings," by Eric Lichtblau *The New York Times,* Feb. 10, 2005, http://www.nytimes.com/2005/02/10/politics/10terror.html?th&oref=login.

> summoned all the domestic security agencies – the Federal Aviation Administration, the Coast Guard, Customs, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the F.B.I. – and told them to increase their security in light of an impending attack.[1]

That was 10 weeks before 9-11.

A few weeks later, the CIA received a report from independent sources in Afghanistan. The report said: "Everyone is talking about an impending attack on the United States."[2] That was 8 weeks before 9-11.

On January 6, 2002, the *Orlando Sentinel* (in Orlando, Florida) reported that a prisoner in the local county jail had tipped off the FBI a month before September 11 that he had information about a pending terrorist attack in New York City and other targets. Walid Arkeh was an American citizen who had spent prison time in England where he became friendly with three Muslim inmates who had been involved in the 1998 bombing of the American embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Tanzania.

Arkeh told the FBI that the terrorists said something big was about to happen in New York. He thought the FBI would be eager to have this information, but such was not the case. The *Orlando Sentinel* reported that the FBI agents didn't appear impressed, and one stood with his hand in his pocket impatiently asking, "Is that all that you have? That's old news." After 9-11, the agents returned to Arkeh's cell and threatened that he could be charged with co-conspiracy if he told anyone that he knew about the attacks ahead of time. The impact this had on him is evident in the *Sentinel*'s report:

> When pressed by the *Sentinel* about whether he knew about the Sept. 11 hijacking and targets ahead of time, Arkeh, a compact and muscular man, paused a long time and looked down at the ground. Then he raised his head and smiled: "No. If I did, that would make me a co-conspirator."[3]

Arkeh's tip off to the FBI was four weeks before 9-11.

Incidentally, shortly after that, he was moved to an undisclosed location. His name, his photograph, and all traces of his presence in the system disappeared from the Department of Corrections web site. To the outside world, he ceased to exist.[4]

Between September 6 and 10, Wall Street was hit with a massive wave of short-selling shares of United Airlines and American Airlines stock. Short selling is a bet that the value of a stock will decline. When the value of those stocks plummeted after the attack,

---

[1] "The Counter Terrorist," by Lawrence Wright, *The New Yorker*, Jan. 14, 2002, http://www.newyorker.com/fact/content/?020114fa_FACT1.

[2] "Warnings not passed down, 9/11 inquiry says," by Kathy Kiely, *USA Today*, Sept 18, 2002, http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2002-09-18-congress_x.htm. Also "Burying the Truth," by William Grigg, *The New American*, Dec. 30, 2002, p. 18, http://www.thenewamerican.com/tna/2002/12-30-2002/vo18no26_burying.htm.

[3] "Inmate says he told FBI about danger to New York," by Doris Bloodsworth, *Orlando Sentinel*, Jan. 6, 2002, http://www.orlandosentinel.com/news/local/seminole/orl-asecterror06010602jan06.story?coll=orl%2Dhome%2Dheadlines. I have a hard copy of this report as it originally appeared on the Internet; but, when the FBI protested this article, it was withdrawn from the newspaper's web site. I will scan it and make it available from the Reality Zone site. Meanwhile, a copy of the article is available on the Internet at the following site: http://www.unansweredquestions.org/timeline/2002/orlandosentinel010602.html.

[4] George Orwell, in his book, *1984*, describes such individuals as becoming "unpersons".

those who had done this stood to make a gain of eight-hundred percent.[1] It was obvious that someone had inside knowledge. The CIA routinely monitors stock market movements and, by Sept 8, the agency was aware that something very unhealthy was planned for the airlines. That was 3 days before 9-11.

For many weeks prior to the September attacks, The National Security Agency had monitored transcontinental conversations between bin Ladin and his Al-Qaeda members. On Sept 10, they intercepted such remarks as: "Good things are coming," "Watch the news," and "Tomorrow will be a great day for us." That was 1 day before 9-11. Yes, they knew the exact date.[2]

## FLIGHT SCHOOLS

The FBI had been collecting evidence that terrorists were anxious to learn how to fly jumbo jets since at least 1995.[3] At first, the reports were vague; but, by 2001, the information was very specific. It involved names, dates, and places. For example, two months before the fateful attack against the Twin Towers and the Pentagon, Kenneth Williams, who was a counter-terrorism agent in the Phoenix office of the FBI, requested permission from his superiors to canvass flight schools in the U.S. to see if any of their students fit the profile of potential terrorists. Williams included a list of eight Arabs who then were taking flight training at the Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University in Prescott, Arizona. He reported that one of them had a picture of bin Ladin on his wall, while another had been in telephone contact with a known Al-Qaeda supporter. In view of the flood of information about terrorists planning to use planes as bombs, Williams felt this was a sensible precaution. His request was turned down.[4]

On August 13 of 2001 – just four weeks before the attack on 9-11, the Pan Am International Flight Academy, located in Eagan, Minnesota, called the FBI to report that one of its students was acting suspiciously. They said that Zacarias Moussaoui claimed to be from France but, when French was spoken to him, he declined to speak the language. He had requested Boeing-747 flight simulator training but only wanted to know how to steer the plane, not how to take off or land.[5] It was quickly determined that Moussaoui was in the country illegally, so the next day he was arrested and held for deportation.[6] So far so good, but that is where the matter stopped. When FBI agents of the local counter-terrorism team

---

[1] "Suspiciously timed bets against airlines expire today," by Greg Farrell, *USA Today*, Oct. 19, 2001, p. 1B. Also "Burying the Truth," by Grigg, *op. cit.*

[2] "U.S. had agents inside Al-Qaeda," by John Diamond, *USA Today*, June 4, 2002, p. 1A, http://www.orlandosentinel.com/news/local/seminole/orl-asecterror06010602jan06.story?coll=orl%2Dhome%2Dheadlines.

[3] That was when Abdul Hakim Murad, arrested in the Philippines, revealed the Bojinka plot.

[4] Williams submitted his testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 21, 2002. See "FBI Memo's Details Raise New Questions." By Dan Eggen and Bill Miller, *Washington Post*, May 19, 2002, p. A01. Also "FBI Pigonholed Agent's Request," by Dan Eggen, *Washington Post*, May 22, 2002, p. A01, www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A53054-2002May21?language=printer.

[5] "Eagan flight trainer wouldn't let unease about Moussaoui rest," by Greg Gordon, Minneapolis *Star Tribune*, Dec. 21, 2001, http://www.startribune.com/stories/1576/913687.html. Also "Did We Know What Was Coming?" by William Grigg, *The New American*, March 11, 2002, http://www.thenewamerican.com/tna/2002/03-11-2002/vo18no05_didweknow_print.htm.

[6] "France opened Moussaoui file in '94," by Jim Boulden, CNN, Dec. 11, 2001, http://www.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/europe/12/06/gen.moussaoui.background/.

requested permission to investigate Moussaoui's activities and his associates, their request was denied from Washington. They were also denied permission to search his computer or even his apartment.[1]

According to the January 27 issue of the *Washington Post*, when Moussaoui was arrested, the FBI already had a five-inch thick file on him.[2] Much of that probably came from the French government, but that means they already knew everything about him, what his intentions were, and who his friends were. In other words, they already had the information they needed to deport him but they ignored it until they were forced into action by the fact that the flight school had reported his bizarre behavior.

Moussaoui was not the only terrorist at that flight school. Another was Hani Hanjour, who became one of the hijackers on September 11. Officials at the school had raised questions about Hanjour's inability to speak English, the international language of aviation. When they shared this concern with the Federal Aviation Agency, instead of disqualifying Hanjour from training, the FAA sent a representative to sit in on a class to observe him and then requested school officials to find a translator to help him with his English.[3]

**THE FBI IS PARALIZED BY ITS OWN LEADERS**

After all this effort on the part of local FBI agents to be allowed to investigate what certainly looked like potential terrorists in flight schools, and after continually being denied permission to do so by headquarters, FBI Director Robert Mueller faced the press on September 15, 2002, and, with a straight face, said: "The fact that there were a number of individuals that happened to have received training at flight schools here is news, quite obviously. If we had understood that to be the case, we would have – perhaps one could have averted this."[4]

The truth, of course, is quite different. The FBI had filing cabinets full of information about probable terrorists receiving flight training. The refusal of headquarters to allow local counter-terrorism agents to do their job at first baffled them and, eventually, drove them to desperation. One of them was Special Agent, Coleen Rowley, from the Minneapolis office. She became so upset after 9-11 that she risked her career by sending a scathing letter to Mr. Mueller. She said that her application for a warrant to search Moussaoui's computer had been deliberately altered by her superior in Washington so it would not pass the necessary legal review. Then she said:

> [Headquarters] personnel whose jobs it was to assist and coordinate with field division agents … continued to almost inexplicably throw up roadblocks and undermine Minneapolis' by now desperate efforts to obtain a FISA[5] search

---

[1] "Justice had denied Minneapolis FBI request on suspected terrorist," by Greg Gordon, Minneapolis *Star Tribune*, Oct. 3, 2001, http://www.startribune.com/stories/843/730512.html. Also "Unheeded Warnings," *Newsweek*, May 20, 2002, www.msnbc.com/news/751100.asp?cpl=1. (This web page is no longer functioning. I will check to see if I have saved a copy to disk. If not, a copy is available at http://www.bulatlat.com/news/2-16/2-16-readerNEWSWEEK.html.)

[2] "America's Chaotic Road to War," by Dan Balz and Bob Woodward, *Washington Post*, January 27, 2002; Page A01, http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A42754-2002Jan26.

[3] "Eagan flight trainer," by Greg Gordon, *Star Tribune*, *op. cit*. Also Grigg, *The New American*, March 11, 2002, *op. cit*.

[4] "Agent Claims FBI Supervisor Thwarted Probe," by Dan Eggen, *Washington Post*, May 27, 2002, p. A01, www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A53054-2002May21?language=printer.

[5] Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act

> warrant…. HQ personnel brought up almost ridiculous questions in their apparent efforts to undermine [the request]…. Why would FBI agents deliberately sabotage a case? I know I shouldn't be flippant about this, but jokes were actually made that the key FBI HQ personnel had to be spies or moles, like Robert Hansen, who were actually working for Osama bin Ladin.[1]

The man who personally blocked the search warrants for these hijackers was Michael Maltbie. One would think that he would have been fired on the spot or at least demoted. Not so. After 9-11, he was moved up to a position of even greater responsibility.[2]

Maltbie was part of a national security unit headed by "Spike" Bowman, and it is certain that Bowman approved, if not directed, everything Maltbie did. On December 4, 2002, at a ceremony in Des Moines, Iowa, Bowman received a framed certificate for distinguished service, signed by President Bush, and a cash bonus equal to one-third of his salary. People are not rewarded for failure. Maltbie and Bowman were rewarded, not because they failed their mission, but because they succeeded.[3]

**STANDARD OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE**

Perhaps the most compelling evidence of all that the attacks on 9-11 were facilitated comes from analyzing the breakdown of standard operational procedures for responding to aircraft emergencies. The FAA requires all pilots to file a flight plan before they take off. It includes the destination and fixed points along the way. If radar shows that the plane deviates more than a few miles or degrees from the plan, the first response is for an FAA controller to attempt radio contact with the pilot. If that fails, the next step is to send up a military interceptor to visually make an assessment. Usually that results in leading the off-course plane back to its flight plan or to an emergency landing. The interceptor pilot has a required routine. First, he will rotate his wings or fly from side to side in front of the plane to catch the pilot's attention. If that fails, he fires a tracer across the path of the plane. If that fails, he asks his commander at home base for instructions. If a plane is identified as enemy aircraft or if it is a civilian plane threatening other planes or headed on a crash course into a populated area, high-level military commanders have the authority to give the order to shoot it down. This is all established procedure that was in place long before 9-11.[4]

The military has its own radar system called NORAD (The North American Aerospace Defense Command). It integrates civilian flight data from the FFA, but its primary role is to be on the lookout for enemy craft and missiles. NORAD makes an independent evaluation of any situation involving national security. It does not have to wait for directions from the FAA.

---

[1] "Coleen Rowley's Memo to FBI Director Robert Mueller," *Time Magazine*, May 21, 2002, http://www.time.com/time/covers/1101020603/memo.html.

[2] *"Has FBI promoted 9-11 ball-dropper?"* by Paul Sperry, *WorldNetDaily News*, June 7, 2002, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=27876.

[3] "Bogus bonus rewards FBI failure," by Gene Collier, Pittsburgh *Post Gazette*, http://www.post-gazette.com/columnists/20030108gene4.asp. Also "9-11: FBI Futility and Failure," by William Grigg, *The New American*, January 27, 2003. (I have the printed magazine version of this article but it is not on line. I will see if I can get it from TNA. Otherwise, we will scan it.)

[4] The pertinent FAA and military procedures are posted at http://www.standdown.net/FAAstandardinterceptprocedures.htm.

There are numerous air force bases around the country where crews are on alert twenty-four hours a day. Planes are fueled and armed. Pilots are quartered in buildings just a few yards away ready to scramble at a moment's notice. Under normal conditions, aircraft are launched within five minutes of request. Under combat-alert conditions, they are in the air within less than three minutes.[1] Please note that this is an *automatic* response. It may require higher authority to shoot down a plane, but not to get those interceptors into the air.

The December, 1999, issue of *Airman* magazine gives us a glimpse into the daily routine at these air bases:

> Day or night, 24-7, a pair of pilots and two crew chiefs stand alert in a secure compound on Homestead [Air Force Reserve base near Miami, Florida], the base Hurricane Andrew nearly razed in August 1992. Within minutes, the crew chiefs can launch the pilots and send them on their way to intercept "unknown riders," whether they're Cuban MIGs, drug traffickers, smugglers, hijackers, novice pilots who've filed faulty flight plans or crippled aircraft limping in on a wing and a prayer.
>
> "If needed, we could be killing things in five minutes or less," said Capt. "Pickle" Herring, a full-time alert pilot….
>
> "I've been scrambled at every conceivable, inopportune time – eating supper, sleeping at 3 a.m., but the worst is the shower. I just jump out soaking wet, wipe the soap off my neck and go," said Herring, a 33-year-old Air Force Academy graduate. "We go full speed when that klaxon sounds, and people know not to get in front of us, because we take scrambles very seriously."…
>
> The pilots and crew chiefs form a tight bond because of the close quarters. They live together in a two-storey blockhouse with a kitchen, dining room, briefing room, separate bedrooms and a community dayroom boasting a big screen television and four recliners. Another building offers a gym and library. Some of the men found similarities between their jobs and a firefighter's.
>
> "We're like coiled springs waiting for the alarm to go off," said Master Sgt. Jerry Leach, a crew chief from Cutler Ridge, Fla. "I only wish we had a fire pole to slide down." …
>
> The Air National Guard exclusively performs the air sovereignty mission in the continental United States, and those units fall under the control of the 1st Air Force based at Tyndall [Florida]. The Guard maintains seven alert sites with 14 fighters and pilots on call around the clock. Besides Homestead, alert birds also sit armed and ready at Tyndall; Langley AFB, Va.; Otis Air National Guard Base, Mass.; Portland International Airport, Ore.; March AFB, Calif.; and Ellington Field, Texas.[2]

**THE PROCEDURE IS SUSPENDED ON 9-11**

---

[1] "Newspaper Article Contains Inaccuracies," NORAD News Release #00-16, Nov. 1, 2000, http://216.239.33.100/search?q=cache:5yQis-6rHkYJ:www.norad.mil/rel0016.htm+%22Air+Force%22+%22response+time%22+scramble%22&hl=en&ie=UTF-8.

[2] "FANGs Bared; Florida's Eagles stand sentry over southern skies," by Master Sgt. Pat McKenna, *Airman*, Dec. 1999, http://www.af.mil/news/airman/1299/home.htm.

Now, let's compare that standard response with what happened on 9-11. On that morning, all four commercial planes involved in the attack took off within a forty-three-minute period, between 7:59 and 8:42 A.M.

- At 8:20, FAA flight controllers knew that the first plane, American Airlines Flight 11, had been hijacked. According to news reports, the pilot had engaged the radio transmitter button on the steering yoke, and the controllers on the ground could hear the hijackers shouting orders.
- At 8:28, radar showed that Flight 11 had turned around and was headed for Manhattan Island.
- At 8:38, NORAD was notified to take appropriate action. Why it took eighteen minutes after knowledge of hijacking to place that call is anyone's guess, but the President would have been informed immediately after that.
- At 8:43, ground controllers knew that the second plane, United Airlines Flight 175, had been hijacked and also was headed for New York.
- At 8:45, Flight 11 slammed into the North Tower.
- At 8:50, FAA controllers knew that the third plane, American Airlines Flight 77, had turned around and was headed for Washington DC.
- At 9:03, Flight 175 smashed into the South Tower.
- At 9:40, Flight 77 hit the Pentagon.[1]
- At about 10:06**,** Flight 93 plunged into the ground in an open field in Pennsylvania.

The total elapsed time for Project Bojinka was one hour and forty-six minutes. The Air Force can scramble its interceptors in less than three minutes. Yet, on 9-11, there was no scramble until *after* the Pentagon was hit, which means that, after NORAD had been notified, the response time was more than one hour and two minutes.

The government now denies this; so let's take a look at the facts. On the morning of September 11, General Richard Myers, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was on Capital Hill in Washington attending a meeting with Senator Max Cleland.[2] This is how *The American Forces Press Services* reported the general's description of what happened that day:

> While in an outer office, he said, he saw a television report that a plane had hit the World Trade Center. "They thought it was a small plane or something like that," Myers said. So the two men went ahead with the office call. Meanwhile, the second World Trade Center tower was hit by another jet. "Nobody informed us of that,"

---

[1] Although the official story claims that Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon, there is no solid evidence that this is true. *Something* hit the Pentagon, but photographic evidence from the many nearby surveillance cameras has never been released by the government except a few frames from one camera that merely show a fireball, not an aircraft. Many have speculated that it was a remote-controlled drone or other craft carrying a warhead, which would explain the lack of aircraft debris and the absence of damage to the building from the impact of large aircraft wings and engines.

[2] Myers' official rank was Vice-Chairman but, since the Chairman, General Hugh Shelton, was out of the country on that day, Myers was the *Acting* Chairman. The purpose of his visit to Senator Cleland was to discuss his pending appointment to replace General Shelton, which happened shortly thereafter.

Myers said. "But when we came out, that was obvious. Then, right at that time, somebody said the Pentagon had been hit."

Somebody thrust a cell phone in Myer's hand. Gen. Ralph Eberhart, commander of U.S. Space Command and the North American Aerospace Defense Command [NORAD] was on the other end of the line "talking about what was happening and the actions he was going to take."[1]

Let's see if we have this right: The top military officer in the country didn't know about the first attack until he saw it on television, which means the TV networks were better informed than he was; and no one informed him of the second attack, either. He didn't learn about that until after he finished his meeting with the Senator. Then, *after* the Pentagon was hit, someone thrust a cell phone into his hands, and General Eberhart told him of "the actions he was *going* to take." That means, when the Pentagon was hit, the actions had not yet been taken.

This was consistent with the general's testimony two days after 9-11 to the Senate Armed Services Committee. He was asked when the scramble order was given, and his reply was: "That order, to the best of my knowledge, was after the Pentagon was struck."[2]

On that same day, the *Boston Globe* printed an interview with a NORAD spokesman who confirmed that fact. The article said: "The command did not immediately scramble any fighters…. The [NORAD] spokesman [Major Mike Snyder] said the fighters remained on the ground until after the Pentagon was hit."[3]

**THE STORY IS REVISED**

When the significance of these statements became obvious**,** there was no way to explain why it took one hour and two minutes to scramble. So, rather than explain, they simply changed their story. By the next week, everyone was in agreement that they *did* scramble *immediately* after being notified by NORAD. The General and the Major apparently just had bad memories.

But that's not the end of it. The speed of response is not the only factor. How close you are when you *do* respond is also important. The closest interceptors were located at McGuire Air Force Base, just 71 miles from New York City. They could have been on the scene in a few minutes. But they didn't scramble from McGuire. Instead, they chose the Otis Air National Guard Base at Cape Cod, Massachusetts, 188 miles away.[4]

---

[1] "We Hadn't Thought about This," By Kathleen Rhem, American Forces Information Services, Oct. 23, 2001, http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Oct2001/n10232001_200110236.html. Also Ahmed, pp 164, 165.

[2] General Richard B. Myers Senate Confirmation Hearing, Senate Armed Services Committee, Sept. 13, 2001. A copy of the original report is posted at: http://216.239.33.100/search?q=cache:CCxvkuSStbkJ:www.attackonamerica.net/genrichardbmyerssenateconfirmationhearing9132001.htm+%22Senate+Armed+Services+Committee%22+%22confirmation%22+%22Myers%22+%22response%22&hl=en&ie=UTF-8.

[3] "Otis Fighter Jets Scrambled Too Late To Halt The Attacks," by Glen Johnson, *The Boston Globe*, Sept. 15, 2001. A copy of this article was purchased at: http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=doc&p_docid=0EE9B623D90937D6&p_docnum=1&s_accountid=AC01030522233544406931&s_orderid=NB010305222335230687 9&s_dlid=DL010305222336160699 4&s_username=gedwardgriffin.

[4] "Fighter jets were sent to intercept airliner," *The Province Journal*, September 18, 2002, http://cfapps.bouldernews.com/printpage/index.cfm. (This is the original page but it no longer works.) A copy is still available at http://web.dailycamera.com/news/terror/sept01/18anor.html.

If this revised story is true, it would provide a plausible excuse for being too late for the first impact, but there still would have been ample time to intercept the others, especially at the Pentagon, which wasn't hit until more than an hour after the revised scramble time. F-16s can travel at 2½ times the speed of sound, which is about thirty-one miles per minute. That means they would have taken six minutes to scramble, one minute to climb to altitude, eleven minutes to travel from Cape Cod to Washington DC, and could have arrived in about seventeen minutes after receiving the order. And yet they missed a one-hour deadline at the Pentagon. It is obvious we still are not being told the truth.[1]

**BOSTON AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER SAYS IT WAS AN INSIDE JOB**

On December13, 2006, a former Boston Center air traffic controller consented to a telephone interview by Pilots for 911 Truth, an organization of pilots and others in the aircraft industry who have challenged the government's official version of 9/11. Robin Hordon, with eleven years of experience in air traffic control and emergency procedures, said that 9/11 was an inside job and that Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, at the Pentagon, tracked three of the four flights every minute of their journey right up to the instant of impact. He said that air traffic controllers have been ignored or silenced to protect the true perpetrators within the government.

Hordon said that only a small part of the radio transmissions between air traffic controllers has been released to the public, and some have even been shredded. That is what happened to the recordings of conversation between six Air Route Traffic Control Center controllers in New York. Otherwise, they would clearly show who was really behind the attack. He said:

---

[1] There is evidence, although far from conclusive at the time of this writing, that the fourth plane, United Flight 93 that crashed in a field in Pennsylvania, *was* shot down. It has been speculated that when its flight path headed for the White House, decisive action was taken. If this turns out to be true, it will be doubly painful in view of the legendary "let's roll" heroism of the passengers. Of course, even if the plane was shot down, that would not detract from the passengers' heroism, nor would it mean that whoever issued the order acted improperly. It would merely be another gut-grinding example of how important facts often are hidden from the public by collectivists who believe the common man needs to know only those things that create confidence in his leaders.

At first glance, it may seem that authorizing the destruction of Flight 93 would be inconsistent with the principles of individualism, which state that individuals may not be sacrificed for the so-called greater good of the greater number. However, such action *is* consistent with individualism when viewed in context of protecting life. As stated in Part One (*The Chasm*), we are justified in taking the life of another to protect our own lives, but that justification does not arise from the superiority of our numbers. It arises from each of us separately. This airline episode complicates the issue, because the decision to take the lives of a planeload of innocent passengers was made by people whose own lives were not threatened at the moment. That leads to the related question of whether we are justified in using deadly force to protect the lives of *others* as well as ourselves. The answer is not as clear-cut as with self-defense, but most people would say yes. In fact, they would say it is not only justifiable; it is obligatory. However, we sometimes are faced with a deadly conflict between two people or two groups – such as in war – and we may feel compelled to choose sides. This is where numbers may actually make a difference – or perhaps some other criteria may come into play, such as the seriousness of the threat and the perceived merit of those to be saved. However, while it is true that the *decision* may be based on numeric superiority or some other logic, the *justification* is not. The justification comes from our individual obligation to defend the lives of others. Therefore, if Woodrow Wilson or FDR truly believed that a sacrifice of two thousand American citizens was necessary to protect the lives or liberty of the American people at large, their actions would have been consistent with the principles of individualism. But if they merely feigned this concern as an excuse for other agendas, such as the expansion of economic and political power or building a New World Order "closer to the hearts desire," then they were following the ethics of collectivism. Were such agendas their primary motivation? The historical record strongly suggests that they were, but each of us will have to make that judgment for ourselves.

> They cherry picked transmissions, communication, and statements made on these four flights that were able to paint and write a story that the public would look at and say: Oh wow! This really happened; but it wasn't factual. It was just a story and it did not tell anything other than what the high perps [perpetrators] wanted the public to hear.[1]

## THE PRESIDENT TAKES CHARGE

What was the President doing at this time? On the morning of 9-11, President Bush was scheduled for a publicity appearance at the Emma E. Booker Elementary School in Sarasota, Florida. His mission was to be photographed listening to children read. When he left his hotel that morning, the first plane had already struck. A reporter asked if he knew what was going on in New York. Bush answered yes but said he would give a statement later.[2]

Let's freeze that frame. The President knew that the nation was under attack by terrorists, but he didn't let that interfere with business as usual. Americans might have expected their president and commander-in-chief to become a human dynamo, to return immediately to Air Force One to take command. They might have expected him to be concerned for the safety of himself, his entourage, and especially the school children who might become collateral victims of a possible strike against the President, but none of that happened. His top priority at that critical moment was to be photographed listening to children read.

By now, almost everyone has seen the photos and video of the moment President Bush was informed of the impact of the second plane. His Chief-of-Staff Andrew Card whispered the news into his ear; a somber look came across the President's face; but there was absolutely no sign of shock or surprise.

Now that the second plane had struck, did the President *then* leap out of his chair, contact his commanders, and initiate counter measures? No. He just continued to sit there listening to children read about a pet goat. Then he gave a short speech, and didn't leave the school until another half-hour had passed.[3]

This reaction or, more precisely, *lack* of reaction, speaks volumes and it leads to three conclusions:

1. The President did not appear surprised because he *wasn't* surprised. Why should he be? The government had been expecting Bonjinka for six years, and they even knew the exact date on which it would be executed.
2. He was not concerned about his safety because he knew the probable targets. Please notice that *he* was not in the White House on that day. And we might be excused for noticing that General Myers was not at the Pentagon, either. Neither

---

[1] To hear a recording of the entire interview, go to: http://www.pilotsfor911truth.org/.

[2] Special Report, "Planes Crash into World Trade Center," ABC News, Sept. 11, 2001. Copy of report is archived at http://www.unansweredquestions.net/timeline/2001/abcnews091101.html.

[3] The second impact occurred at 9:03 A.M. The President began his speech at 9:30 and left shortly thereafter. See "Remarks by President Bush after two planes crash into World Trade Center," White House Press Release, http://www.azcentral.com/news/specials/sept11/key-911schoolstatement.html.

was his former superior, General Shelton, who was somewhere over the Atlantic on his way to Europe.[1]

3. He did not leap into action to direct counter measures, because there was a prior decision to "standown" and allow the attacks to succeed. In other words, it was a decision to *facilitate*.

In military terms, *standown* means to deliberately refrain from defense as a strategic move to implement some higher objective. For example, military commanders might deliberately allow enemy forces to advance into an area where, at a later time, they could be surrounded and easily defeated. Allowing terrorist attacks to succeed is a classic standown strategy to implement a goal that has a higher priority than merely protecting the lives of a few thousand American citizens. That goal, as we have seen, is to create justification for establishing a *Pax American* on the road to world government based on the model of collectivism.

**INSULATE**

We come now to the third prong of the strategy. Is there any evidence of an effort to *insulate* the victims of 9-11 from knowledge that might have allowed them to escape their fate? The answer is: the evidence is everywhere.

While those at the top echelons of government were being inundated with memos, reports, and briefings, none of that information was ever passed to the intended victims. Government agencies were told to increase security for their own top personnel, but not the tenants of the buildings targeted for attack, and that includes the Pentagon, itself.

The airlines were given no information that was specific enough to suggest increasing security measures either at airports or within cockpits. Even after the date of September 11 was known with a high degree of certainty, they were still not warned to increase security. But there was no such inefficiency when it came to warning high-ranking government officials. For example, seven weeks before the attack on 9-11, Attorney-General John Ashcroft stopped using commercial airlines and began flying in a private jet leased by the Justice Department – at a cost to taxpayers, incidentally, of $1600 per hour. When asked by reporters why he changed his routine, he replied that it was in response to a "threat assessment" received from the FBI.[2] San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown told reporters that, eight hours prior to the 9-11 attacks, he had been warned by his airport security staff that his scheduled flight to New York that day was not advisable,[3] and *Newsweek* magazine reported that, on the day before the attack:

> … a group of top Pentagon officials suddenly cancelled travel plans for the next morning, apparently because of security concerns.[4]… Why that same information

---

[1] "We Hadn't Thought about This," by Kathleen Rhem, *op. cit.*

[2] "Ashcroft Flying High," CBS News, July 26, 2001, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2001/07/26/national/main303601.shtml.

[3] "Willie Brown got low-key early warning about air travel," by Phillip Matier and Andrew Ross, *San Francisco Chronicle*, Sept. 12, 2001, http://www.sfgate.com/today/0912_chron_mnreport.shtml.

[4] "Bush: 'We're at War'," by Wvan Thomas and Mark Hoseball, *Newsweek*, Sept. 24, 2001, http://www.msnbc.com/news/629606.asp#BODY.

was not available to the 266 who died aboard the four hijacked commercial aircraft may become a hot topic on the Hill.[1]

Unfortunately, it never did become a hot topic on the Hill, because an inquiry would certainly have exposed the fact that the victims had been carefully *insulated* from any knowledge of the pending attack – which means that some Americans had sacrificed the lives of other Americans for what they think is the greater good for the greater number.

**THEN AND NOW**

The final piece of evidence I would like to offer today is perhaps the most compelling of all. It is simply to look at what has happened to our way of life. Forget all the theories and the plausible explanations and the good excuses. Just look at where we were – and where we are today. I am speaking, now, primarily to Americans. Prior to the Wilson Administration, America was the envy of the world. Although it was far from perfect, it was abundant with freedom and opportunity, which is why hundreds of thousands of immigrants flocked to her shores.

That began to change when she was led into World War I by Col. House and his Rhodesian associates. The ethic of collectivism was planted, not only into political life, but also into academic life where it was destined to grow and propagate into the minds of future generations. Laws that were contrary to the principles of the Constitution began to appear and finally were accepted as virtuous. A banking cartel, called the Federal Reserve, was created. An income tax was passed; and, along with that, tax-exempt foundations came into being with a mission of controlling education in the guise of philanthropy. Government agencies began to proliferate. Government projects and programs appeared everywhere: public works, Social Security, welfare, farm subsidies; the New Deal was a huge political success as voters eagerly exchanged precious pieces of freedom for economic benefits. The floodgate was open.

By the time of World War II, collectivism was already becoming the new religion. We were so focused on the horrors of war and the evil deeds of our enemies that we failed to notice we were becoming like them. Thousands of wartime emergency measures were calmly accepted as a reasonable and necessary price for victory in time of war; and when most of those measures continued after the peace, we accepted them without complaint.

Now we are engaged in a war on terrorism, and the process has been accelerated. Congress uncritically passes just about any measure to restrict personal freedom so long as, somewhere in the text, it says that it is needed to fight terrorism. The so-called Patriot Acts, bills creating a Homeland Security Agency, and the Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 are notable examples. The provisions of these measures were drafted long before September 11. Their origin is a series of reports issued by a group created in 1998 called The United States Commission on National Security/21st Century – often referred to as the Hart-Rudman Commission because its co-chairmen were former Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman.[2]

---

[1] "'We've Hit the Targets'," by Michael Hirsh, *Newsweek*, Sept. 13, 2001, http://propagandamatrix.com/weve_hit_the_targets.html.

[2] These reports can be found at the organization's web site: http://www.nssg.gov/reports.htm.

To the casual observer, this appeared to be a government study group but, in fact, it was a front for the Council on Foreign Relations. The Commission was sponsored by Congressman Newt Gingrich, a member of the CFR. Both Hart and Rudman were members of the CFR. The Commission based its findings on the work of futurist author, Alvin Toffler, a member of the CFR. Executive Director Charles Boyde and Study Group Director, Lynn Davis, were members of the CFR. Commissioners Lee Hamilton and James Schlesinger were members of the CFR. One of the better-known commissioners was Leslie Gelb, who was *president* of the CFR.[1]

As a result of new laws based on the recommendations of this group, state National Guard units have been consolidated into a national police force; local law enforcement is under control of the federal government; state laws have been "harmonized," as they put it, into compliance with federal laws; personal property may be searched and seized without a court order; citizens may be arrested without a warrant and imprisoned without trial; public surveillance cameras are appearing everywhere; the government has implemented a national identification and bio-recognition system; and the FBI places wiretaps on telephones without a court order. In December of 2001, the FBI revealed an operation called "Magic Lantern" that allows it to use the Internet to secretly plant a program in anyone's computer so that every stroke made on the keyboard will be reported back. That means the government now can capture a record of everything you create on your computer, including passwords, encrypted files, and even deleted files.[2]

## MORE SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT

While the government clamors to prevent citizens from having any secrets whatsoever, it moves in the opposite direction for itself. In November of 2001, President Bush issued an executive order that forbids public access to presidential papers, even those belonging to previous administrations. The only researchers who now have access to these important sources of historical data are those who are deemed to have a "need to know" – which means only those who support the CFR spin on important issues.[3]

During a press conference at the White House on March 13, 2002, President Bush was asked why the newly appointed Director of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge, had refused to testify before a bipartisan group of Congress. The President's reply revealed the new face of American government. It no longer has three branches, each to check and balance the power of the others. It is a throwback to the Old World concept of supreme power in the hands of one man. The purpose of Congress now is merely to give advice to the President and to approve funding for his programs. This is what the President said:

> He doesn't have to testify. He's part of my staff. And that's part of the prerogative of the executive branch of government, and we hold that very dear…. We consult with Congress all the time. I've had meaningful breakfasts with the leadership in the House and the Senate. I break bread with both Republicans and

---

[1] "Building Big Brother," by Steve Bonta, *The New American*, Nov. 5, 2001, p. 37, http://www.thenewamerican.com/tna/2001/11-05-2001/vo17no23_bigbrother.htm. Also "Rise of the Garrison State," by William Jasper, *The New American*, July 15, 2002, http://www.jbs.org/visitor/congress/alerts/homeland/garrison.htm.

[2] "FBI confirms "Magic Lantern" exists," MSNBC, Dec. 12, 2001, http://www.msnbc.com/news/671981.asp.

[3] "Bush Clamping Down on Presidential Papers," by George Lardner, Jr., *Washington Post*, Nov. 1, 2001, http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A20731-2001Oct31.

> Democrats right back here in the Oval Office and have a good, honest discussion about plans, objectives, what's taking place, what's not taking place…. We understand the role of Congress. We must justify budgets to Congress…. [But] I'm not going to let Congress erode the power of the executive branch."[1]

## THE TRIUMPH OF COLLECTIVISM

We have come a long way since 1912 when Col. House wrote *Philip Dru Administrator*. His vision has come to pass, not just in America, but everywhere. The so-called free world no longer exists. What few freedoms we have left are now subject to restriction or cancellation at any time the government says it's necessary for fighting crime, drugs, terrorism, pornography, discrimination, or any other bugaboo that supposedly stands in the way of the greater good for the greater number. Collectivism has triumphed everywhere in the world. There is no longer any barrier to having the United States comfortably merged with the Soviet Union – or any of its clones, including modern Russia and China. The dream of Cecil Rhodes is now in the final stages of becoming a reality.

Shortly after World War II, giant tax-exempt foundations such as the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Guggenheim Foundation set about to change the social and political fabric of America to embrace world government based on the model of collectivism. They said that the most reliable means to accomplish that was war. When people are fearful for their personal safety and national security, they will meekly accept totalitarian measures from their own government and offer no resistance to the surrender of national sovereignty.

This strategy continues to be applied today. The environmental group called Friends of the Earth, which promotes the CFR drive for more government and abandonment of national sovereignty, expresses it this way: "What price would most people be willing to pay for a more durable kind of human organization – more taxes, giving up national flags, perhaps the sacrifice of some of our hard-won liberties?"[2]

"The sacrifice of some of our hard-won liberties" is a gentle way of describing it. A more graphic explanation was provided by General Tommy Franks, the U.S. Commander in the first Persian Gulf War and, later, in Afghanistan and Iraq. Franks said:

> The western world, the free world, loses what it cherishes most, and that is freedom and liberty…. What does that mean? It means the potential of a weapon of mass destruction and a terrorist, massive casualty-producing event somewhere in the western world – it may be in the United States of America – that causes our population to question our own Constitution and to begin to militarize our country in order to avoid a repeat of another mass-casualty producing event. Which, in fact, then begins to potentially unravel the fabric of our Constitution. [3]

Perhaps the most graphic description of this process was provided by no less an authority than Hermann Goering, the number-two man in Nazi Germany and the designated

---

[1] "Transcript of Bush press conference," March 13, 2002, http://www.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/03/13/bush.transcript/index.html.

[2] Garrett de Bell, ed., *The Environmental Handbook* (New York: Ballentine / Friends of the Earth, 1970), p. 138.

[3] "General Tommy Franks," *Cigar Afficionado*, December, 2003, p.90.

successor to Adolph Hitler. Speaking from his prison cell during the Nuremberg Trials, Goering said:

> Naturally, the common people don't want war; neither in Russia nor in England nor in America nor, for that matter, in Germany. That is understood. But, after all, it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy, and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy or a fascist dictatorship or a parliament or a Communist dictatorship…. The people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same way in any country.[1]

**BEHOLD THE GRAND DECEPTION**

At the beginning of this presentation, I told you what I was going to tell you. Now that I have finished telling you, it is time to tell you what I told you. Behold the grand deception: What is unfolding today is, not a war on terrorism to defend freedom. It is a war on freedom that requires the defense of terrorism. It is the final thrust to push what is left of the free world into global government based on the model of collectivism. Its purpose is to frighten us into abandoning our freedoms and traditions in exchange for protection from a hated and dangerous enemy. This ploy has been used many times before, two of which have been described in this narrative. Each time it moved us closer to the final goal, but was not sufficient to achieve it in full. This time it is expected to be the final blow.

We have allowed this to happen because we have been denied the knowledge of our own history, and so it seems we are doomed to repeat it. But all of that can be changed. In the twilight zone from which we came, it is said that knowledge is power. But in the reality zone, we know that is a myth. Men with great knowledge are easily enslaved if they do nothing to defend their freedom. Knowledge by itself is *not* power, but it holds the potential for power if we have the courage to use it as such, and therein lies our hope for the future. If we *act* upon this knowledge, it is an opportunity, not just to know about history, but actually to change its course. The big question I leave with you is "how?" Is there anything we can do, especially at this late date, to change the course of history? My answer is a resounding "YES!" Is anyone interested?

That will be the topic of my next presentation. In the words of Victor Hugo, it is an idea whose time has come.

– End of Part 4 –

---

[1] *Nuremberg Diary* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1947), pp. 278-279.