

Re: ELEMENTARY 9-11 -- insider guilt established by new evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-06/1186.html>

From: Dick Eastman (*silver_at_nwinfo.net*)

Date: 06/21/04

Date: Sun, 20 Jun 2004 17:33:06 -0700

The three most important articles I've seen this month (below) put everything in proper perspective with irresistible intellectual and political force when combined. Read and you will agree. Be sure to use them.

-- dick eastman

MOYERS AND CHOSSUDOVSKY

Item #1:

Eastman introduction:

Bill Moyer's makes the case for a populist alternative (since progressivism is a Zionist psy-op to undermine true Jeffersonian liberalism-populism. This is an astounding summary of the domestic economic situation, not hidden in misleading numbers like GDP (which is anything but a measure of "growth" or "standard of living" or health of the economy) or "the interest rate" (which is really just the rate the Federal Reserve charges to lend to banks so they can afford to get closer to their reserve-requirement constrained lending limits -- and has nothing to do with the money supply or the availability of credit outside of the international finance loop etc.) -- but don't let me loose you -- scroll down from here to Bill Moyer's if are in a hurry

as phony as the political party difference between Republicans and Democrats is the ideological difference between conservatism and progressivism Bill Moyer's -- a miracle of the truth sayer amidst the PBS prostituted mouthpieces -- has made it clear how the real populist issues vital to the people of this nation go begging as the world is focused by the Zionist media monopoly on the sham causes of the "war on terror," and globalization from progressive John Kerry and conservative George W. Bush. Take what Bill Moyers has said here and add the hard finding that 9-11 has been proven to have been a mass-murder cover-up -- despite the evidence covering false-investigations of the Commission, and of Mike Myer's with his trivia-revealing limited hangout, and and of over three hundred sites with as many inconclusives-centered and established-trivia centered "worst evidence" websites and e-lists all burying the real investigations under a ton of glitz and spam "false-opposition" whose only purpose is to crowd you so you never see the best evidence etc.

Anyway, here is Moyer's most important article (WHICH, IF ANY OF YOU WERE REALLY BOTH RATIONAL AND ACTIVIST AT THE SAME TIME) should cause you too

seek a real populist alternative to Kerry-Bush-Nader.

Dick Eastman

Yakima

{The Chossudovsky article, The Big Lie, follows below -- and an article on the Bush-Greenspan coup d'grace intended to finish a middle-class sustaining economy once and for all follows that.)

Excerpts from Bill Moyers' keynote speech at New York University, "This is the Fight of Our Lives," delivered on June 3, 2004.

This is the Fight of Our Lives.

by Bill Moyers

"Nothing seems to embarrass the political class in Washington today. Not the fact that more children are growing up in poverty in America than in any other industrial nation; not the fact that millions of workers are actually making less money today in real dollars than they did twenty years ago; not the fact that working people are putting in longer and longer hours and still falling behind; not the fact that while we have the most advanced medical care in the world, nearly 44 million Americans -- eight out of ten of them in working families -- are uninsured and cannot get the basic care they need.

Astonishing as it seems, no one in official Washington seems embarrassed by the fact that the gap between rich and poor is greater than it's been in 50 years -- the worst inequality among all western nations. Or that we are experiencing a shift in poverty. For years it was said those people down there at the bottom were single, jobless mothers. For years they were told work, education, and marriage is how they move up the economic ladder. But poverty is showing up where we didn't expect it -- among families that include two parents, a worker, and a head of the household with more than a high school education. These are the newly poor. Our political, financial and business class expects them to climb out of poverty . . . on an escalator moving downward.

By the end of the decade most Americans were running harder but slipping behind, and the gap between them and prosperous America was widening. What turns their personal tragedy into a political travesty is that the vast majority of them are very patriotic. They love this country. But they no longer believe they matter to the people who run the country. Yet, by the end of the decade most of them were no longer paying attention to politics. They don't see it connecting to their lives. They don't think their concerns will ever be addressed by the political, corporate, and media elites who make up our dominant class. They are not cynical, because they are deeply religious people with no capacity for cynicism, but they know the system is rigged against them. They know this, and we know this. For years now a small fraction of American households have been garnering an extreme concentration of wealth and income while large corporations and financial institutions have obtained unprecedented levels of economic and political power over daily life. In 1960, the gap in terms of wealth between the top 20% and the bottom 20% was 30-fold. Four decades later it is more than 75-fold.

VCRs and television sets are cheap, but higher education, health care, public transportation, drugs, housing and cars have risen faster in price than typical family incomes. And life has grown neither calm nor secure for most Americans, by any means." You can find many sources to support this conclusion. I like the language of a small outfit here in New York called the Commonwealth Foundation/Center for the Renewal of American Democracy. They conclude that working families and the poor "are losing ground under economic pressures that deeply affect household stability, family dynamics, social mobility, political participation, and civic life."

We could prevent the polarization between the very rich and the very poor that poisoned other societies. We could provide that each and every citizen would enjoy the basic necessities of life, a voice in the system of

self-government, and a better chance for their children. We could preclude the vast divides that produced the turmoil and tyranny of the very countries from which so many of our families had fled.

Historically, through a system of checks and balances we Americans were going to maintain a safe, if shifting, equilibrium between wealth and commonwealth. We believed equitable access to public resources is the lifeblood of any democracy. So early on, primary schooling was made free to all. States changed laws to protect debtors, often the relatively poor, against their rich creditors. Charters to establish corporations were open to most, if not all, white comers, rather than held for the elite. The government encouraged Americans to own their own piece of land, and even supported squatters' rights. The court challenged monopoly -- all in the name of we the people.

But then class war was declared, a generation ago, in a powerful polemic by William Simon, who was soon to be Secretary of the Treasury. He called on the financial and business class, in effect, to take back the power and privileges they had lost in the depression and new deal. They got the message, and soon they began a stealthy class war against the rest of society and the principles of our democracy. They set out to trash the social contract, to cut their workforces and wages, to scour the globe in search of cheap labor, and to shred the social safety net that was supposed to protect people from hardships beyond their control. Business Week put it bluntly at the time: "Some people will obviously have to do with less...it will be a bitter pill for many Americans to swallow the idea of doing with less so that big business can have more."

The middle class and working poor are told that what's happening to them is the consequence of Adam Smith's "Invisible Hand." This is a lie. What's happening to them is the direct consequence of corporate activism, intellectual propaganda, the rise of a religious orthodoxy that in its hunger for government subsidies has made an idol of power, and a string of political decisions favoring the powerful and the privileged who bought the political system right out from under us.

Thomas Edsall of The Washington Post wrote: "During the 1970s, business refined its ability to act as a class, submerging competitive instincts in favor of joint, cooperate action in the legislative area." Big business political action committees flooded the political arena with a deluge of dollars. And they built alliances with the religious right -- Jerry Falwell's Moral Majority and Pat Robertson's Christian Coalition -- who mounted a cultural war providing a smokescreen for the class war, hiding the economic plunder of the very people who were enlisted as foot soldiers in the cause of privilege.

Look at the spoils of victory:

Over the past three years, they've pushed through \$2 trillion dollars in tax cuts -- almost all tilted towards the wealthiest people in the country.

Cuts in taxes on the largest incomes.

Cuts in taxes on investment income.

And cuts in taxes on huge inheritances.

More than half of the benefits are going to the wealthiest one percent. You could call it trickle-down economics, except that the only thing that trickled down was a sea of red ink in our state and local governments, forcing them to cut services for and raise taxes on middle class working America.

Now the Congressional Budget Office forecasts deficits totaling \$2.75 trillion over the next ten years.

These deficits have been part of their strategy. Some of you will remember that Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan tried to warn us 20 years ago, when he predicted that President Ronald Reagan's real strategy was to force the government to cut domestic social programs by fostering federal deficits of historic dimensions. Reagan's own budget director, David Stockman, admitted as such. Now the leading rightwing political strategist, Grover Norquist, says the goal is to "starve the beast" -- with trillions of dollars in deficits resulting from trillions of dollars in tax cuts, until the United

sci.econ: Re: ELEMENTARY 9-11 -- insider guilt established by new evidence

States Government is so anemic and anorexic it can be drowned in the bathtub.

There's no question about it: The corporate conservatives and their allies in the political and religious right are achieving a vast transformation of American life that only they understand because they are its advocates, its architects, and its beneficiaries. In creating the greatest economic inequality in the advanced world, they have saddled our nation, our states, and our cities and counties with structural deficits that will last until our children's children are ready for retirement, and they are systematically stripping government of all its functions except rewarding the rich and waging war.

And they are proud of what they have done to our economy and our society. If instead of practicing journalism I was writing for Saturday Night Live, I couldn't have made up the things that this crew have been saying. The president's chief economic adviser says shipping technical and professional jobs overseas is good for the economy. The president's Council of Economic Advisers report that hamburger chefs in fast food restaurants can be considered manufacturing workers. The president's Federal Reserve Chairman says that the tax cuts may force cutbacks in social security - but hey, we should make the tax cuts permanent anyway. The president's Labor Secretary says it doesn't matter if job growth has stalled because "the stock market is the ultimate arbiter."

You just can't make this stuff up. You have to hear it to believe it. This may be the first class war in history where the victims will die laughing. What we have here is a nationwide scheme to rip off the government and the poor.

Let's face the reality: If ripping off the public trust; if distributing tax breaks to the wealthy at the expense of the poor; if driving the country into deficits deliberately to starve social benefits; if requiring states to balance their budgets on the backs of the poor; if squeezing the wages of workers until the labor force resembles a nation of serfs -- if this isn't class war, what is?

It's un-American. It's unpatriotic. And it's wrong.

What we need is a mass movement of people like you. Get mad, yes -- there's plenty to be mad about. Then get organized and get busy. This is the fight of our lives.

>From the Wall Street Journal:

"Campaign cash has flooded over the gunwales of the ship of state and threatens to sink the entire vessel. Political donations determine the course and speed of many government actions that deeply affect our daily lives." Politics is suffocating from the stranglehold of money. During his brief campaign in 2000, before he was ambushed by the dirty tricks of the religious right in South Carolina and big money from George W. Bush's wealthy elites, John McCain said elections today are nothing less than an "influence peddling scheme in which both parties compete to stay in office by selling the country to the highest bidder."

"When powerful interests shower Washington with millions in campaign contributions, they often get what they want. But it's ordinary citizens and firms that pay the price and most of them never see it coming. This is what happens if you don't contribute to their campaigns or spend generously on lobbying. You pick up a disproportionate share of America's tax bill. You pay higher prices for a broad range of products from peanuts to prescriptions. You pay taxes that others in a similar situation have been excused from paying. You're compelled to abide by laws while others are granted immunity from them. You must pay debts that you incur while others do not. You're barred from writing off on your tax returns some of the money spent on necessities while others deduct the cost of their entertainment. You must run your business by one set of rules, while the government creates another set for your competitors. In contrast, the fortunate few who contribute to the right politicians and hire the right lobbyists enjoy all the benefits of their special status. Make a bad business deal; the government bails them out. If they want to hire workers

at below market wages, the government provides the means to do so. If they want more time to pay their debts, the government gives them an extension. If they want immunity from certain laws, the government gives it. If they want to ignore rules their competition must comply with, the government gives its approval. If they want to kill legislation that is intended for the public, it gets killed."

I'm not quoting from Karl Marx's Das Kapital or Mao's Little Red Book. I'm quoting Time magazine. Time's premier investigative journalists -- Donald Bartlett and James Steele -- concluded in a series last year that America now has "government for the few at the expense of the many." Economic inequality begets political inequality, and vice versa. That's why many Americans are turned off by politics. It's why we're losing the balance between wealth and the commonwealth. It's why we can't put things right. And it is the single most destructive force tearing at the soul of democracy.

=====

Michael Moore is coverup -- not only does he deliberately eliminate the best evidence of frame-up, i.e., the Pentagon crash photo evidence of too-small plane, too-small hole etc. -- he actually backs the official Pentagon story. Moreover the whole direction of his story is that we should have gone after Saudi Arabia -- Moore is false opposition -- I know by the way the man refused even to look at my data or respond to my letters. Even if his rejection had been sincere, he would have stated his reasons for discarding evidence that Prof. A. K. Dewdney and all of France also subscribe to. He has nothing about the thousands who say no Boeing crashed at the Pentagon. --Dick Eastman

An anonymous email on Michael Moore reached 9/11 truth alliance member and essayist Kurt Nimmo

"...I ..work in the entertainment industry and thus had the opportunity to see Fahrenheit 9/11 at its US premiere, at the Academy theater in Beverly Hills on June 8th.

...Moore plays directly into the neo-cons' hands because Saudi Arabia is the jewel in the neo-con crown -- it sets Americans up for the war that he implies SHOULD have been fought -- against SAUDI ARABIA. As far as I could tell (and I did take two potty breaks) no mention was made of PNAC, neoconservatives or the pro-Israel lobbies' driving of the invasion of Iraq..."

Read the rest of it at: <http://www.commondreams.org/views04/0616-09.htm>

Item #2:

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/911crimefile/message/14>

Centre for Research on Globalisation
Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation
GLOBAL RESEARCH (CANADA) FEATURE ARTICLE
September 11: The Big Lie
by Michel Chossudovsky

"Revealing the Lies" on 9/11 Perpetuates the "Big Lie"
Text of Michel Chossudovsky's keynote presentation at the opening plenary session (27 May 2004) to The International Citizens Inquiry Into 9/11, Toronto, 25-30 May 2004.

www.globalresearch.ca 27 May 2004

This is an abridged email version, which includes the first part of a lengthy review article. To read the complete text go to:

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO405E.html>

The Bush administration had numerous intelligence warnings. "Revealing the lies" of Bush officials regarding these "intelligence warnings" has served to uphold Al Qaeda as the genuine threat, as an "outside enemy", which threatens the security of America, when in fact Al Qaeda is a creation of the US intelligence apparatus.

America's leaders in Washington and Wall Street firmly believe in the

righteousness of war and authoritarian forms of government as a means to "safeguarding democratic values".

9/11 is the justification.

According to Homeland Security "the near-term attacks will either rival or exceed the 9/11 attacks".

An actual "terrorist attack" on American soil would lead to the suspension of civilian government and the establishment of martial law. In the words of Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge: "If we go to Red [code alert]... it basically shuts down the country,"

"You ask, 'Is it serious?' Yes, you bet your life. People don't do that unless it's a serious situation." (Donald Rumsfeld)

The "Criminalization of the State", is when war criminals legitimately occupy positions of authority, which enable them to decide "who are the criminals", when in fact they are the criminals.

Michel Chossudovsky is the author of War and Globalization, The Truth behind September 11 at <http://globalresearch.ca/globaloutlook/truth911.html>

* * *

Revealing a lie does not necessarily lead to establishing the truth.

In fact the experience of the 9/11 Commission which has a mandate to investigate the September 11 attacks has proved exactly the opposite.

We know that the Bush administration had numerous "intelligence warnings".

We know they had "intelligence" which confirmed that terrorists had the capacity of hijacking aircrafts and using them to target buildings.

Attorney General John Ashcroft had apparently been warned in August 2001 by the FBI to avoid commercial airlines, but this information was not made public. (See Eric Smith at

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/SMI402A.html>)

The Pentagon had conducted a full fledged exercise on an airplane crashing into the Pentagon. (See <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/RVA404A.html>)

We also know that senior Bush officials including Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice lied under oath to the 9/11 commission, when they stated that they had no information or forewarning of impending terrorist attacks. But we also know, from carefully documented research that:

There were stand-down orders on 9/11. The US Air force did not intervene.

see <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/ELS305A.html> , Szamuely at

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/SZA112A.html>)

There was a cover-up of the WTC and Pentagon investigation. The WTC rubble was confiscated. (See Bill Manning at

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/MAN309A.html>

The plane debris at the Pentagon disappeared. (See Thierry Meyssan,

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/MEY204C.html>)

Massive financial gains were made as a result of 9/11, from insider trading leading up to 9/11 (See Michael Ruppert,

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

There is an ongoing financial scam underlying the 7.1 billion dollar insurance claim by the WTC leaseholder, following the collapse of the twin towers (See Michel Chossudovsky,

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO403B.html>

Mystery surrounds WTC building 7, which collapsed (or was "pulled" down in the afternoon of 9/11 mysteriously (For details see WTC-7: (Scott Loughrey at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/LOU308A.html>).

The White House is being accused by the critics of "criminal negligence", for having casually disregarded the intelligence presented to president Bush and his national security team, and for not having acted to prevent the 9/11 terrorist attack.

The unfolding consensus is: "They knew but failed to act".

This line of reasoning is appealing to many 9/11 critics and "Bush bashers" because it clearly places the blame on the Bush administration.

Yet in a bitter irony, the very process of revealing these lies and expressing public outrage has contributed to reinforcing the 9/11 cover-up.

"Revealing the lies" serves to present Al Qaeda as the genuine threat, as an "outside enemy", which threatens the security of America, when in fact Al

Qaeda is a creation of the US intelligence apparatus. The presumption is that these forewarnings and intelligence briefs emanating from the intelligence establishment constitute a true and unbiased representation of the terrorist threat.

Meanwhile, the history of Al Qaeda and the CIA has been shoved to the background. The fact that successive US governments since the Soviet-Afghan war have supported and abetted the Islamic terror network is no longer mentioned, for obvious reasons. It would break the consensus regarding Al Qaeda as the outside enemy of America, which is a crucial building block of the entire National Security doctrine.

This central proposition that Islamic terrorists were responsible for 9/11 serves to justify everything else including the Patriot Act, the wars on Afghanistan and Iraq, the spiraling defense and homeland security budgets, the detention of thousands of people of Muslim faith on trumped up charges, the arrest and deportation to Guantanamo of alleged "enemy combatants", etc. The Central Role of Al Qaeda in Bush's National Security Doctrine Spelled out in the National Security Strategy (NSS), the preemptive "defensive war" doctrine and the "war on terrorism" against Al Qaeda constitute the two essential building blocks of the Pentagon's propaganda campaign.

No Al Qaeda,

No war on terrorism

No rogue States which sponsor Al Qaeda

No pretext for waging war.

No justification for invading and occupying Afghanistan and Iraq

No justification for sending in US special forces into numerous countries around the World.

No justification for developing tactical nuclear weapons to be used in conventional war theaters against Islamic terrorists, who according to official statements constitute a nuclear threat. (See <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO405A.html>).

The Administration's post 9/11 nuclear doctrine, points to Al Qaeda as some kind of nuclear power.

"The Pentagon must prepare for all possible contingencies, especially now, when dozens of countries, and some terrorist groups, are engaged in secret weapon development programs." (quoted in William Arkin, Secret Plan Outlines the Unthinkable, Los Angeles Times, 9 March 2002)

Central Role of al Qaeda in US Military Doctrine

The very existence of Al Qaeda constitutes the justification for a pre-emptive war against rogue states and terrorist organizations. It is part of the indoctrination of US troops fighting in the Middle East. It is also being used to justify the so-called "abuse" of POWs.

The objective is to present "preemptive military action" --meaning war as an act of "self-defense" against two categories of enemies, "rogue States" and "Islamic terrorists":

"The war against terrorists of global reach is a global enterprise of uncertain duration. America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed.

.Rogue states and terrorists do not seek to attack us using conventional means. They know such attacks would fail. Instead, they rely on acts of terror and, potentially, the use of weapons of mass destruction (.)

The targets of these attacks are our military forces and our civilian population, in direct violation of one of the principal norms of the law of warfare. As was demonstrated by the losses on September 11, 2001, mass civilian casualties is the specific objective of terrorists and these losses would be exponentially more severe if terrorists acquired and used weapons of mass destruction.

The United States has long maintained the option of preemptive actions to counter a sufficient threat to our national security. The greater the threat, the greater is the risk of inaction- and the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves, (.). To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if

necessary, act preemptively." (National Security Strategy, White House, 2002, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>)

To justify pre-emptive military actions, including the use of nuclear weapons in conventional war theaters (approved by the Senate in late 2003), the National Security Doctrine requires the "fabrication" of a terrorist threat, --ie. "an outside enemy." It also needs to link these terrorist threats to "State sponsorship" by the so-called "rogue states." But it also means that the various "massive casualty-producing events" allegedly by Al Qaeda (the fabricated enemy) are also part of the propaganda ploy which consists in upholding the Legend of an outside enemy.

9/11 and War Propaganda

In other words, the forewarnings sustain the Al Qaeda legend, which constitutes the cornerstone of the "war on terrorism". And the latter serves as a justification for America's "pre-emptive wars" with a view to "protecting the homeland".

One year before 9/11, the Project for a New American Century (PNAC) called for "some catastrophic and catalyzing event, like a new Pearl Harbor," which would serve to galvanize US public opinion in support of a war agenda. (See <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/NAC304A.html>)

The PNAC architects seem to have anticipated with cynical accuracy, the use of the September 11 attacks as "a war pretext incident."

The PNAC's declared objective is "Defend the Homeland" and "Fight and decisively win in multiple, simultaneous theater wars", perform global constabulary functions including punitive military actions around the World, and the so-called "revolution in military affairs", essentially meaning the development of a new range of sophisticated weaponry including the militarisation of outer space, the development of a new generation of nuclear weapons, etc. (on nuclear weapons see <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO405A.html> , , on the PNAC, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/NAC304A.html>)

The PNAC's reference to a "catastrophic and catalyzing event" echoes a similar statement by David Rockefeller to the United Nations Business Council in 1994:

"We are on the verge of global transformation. All we need is the right major crisis and the nations will accept the New World Order."

Similarly, in the words Zbigniew Brzezinski in his book, The Grand Chessboard:

".it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus [in America] on foreign policy issues, except in the circumstances of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat."

Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was National Security Adviser to President Jimmy Carter was one of the key architects of the Al Qaeda network, created by the CIA at the onslaught of the Soviet Afghan war (1979-1989). (See Brzezinski at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/BRZ110A.print.html>)

The "catastrophic and catalyzing event" as stated by the PNAC is an integral part of US military-intelligence planning. General Franks, who led the military campaign into Iraq, pointed recently (October 2003) to the role of a "massive casualty-producing event" to muster support for the imposition of military rule in America. (See General Tommy Franks calls for Repeal of US Constitution, November 2003, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/EDW311A.html>).

Franks identifies the precise scenario whereby military rule will be established:

"a terrorist, massive, casualty-producing event [will occur] 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." (Ibid)

This statement from an individual, who was actively involved in military and intelligence planning at the highest levels, suggests that the "militarisation of our country" is an ongoing operational assumption. It is part of the broader "Washington consensus". It identifies the Bush

administration's "roadmap" of war and "Homeland Defense." Needless to say, it is also an integral part of the neoliberal agenda.

The "terrorist massive casualty-producing event" is presented by General Franks as a crucial political turning point. The resulting crisis and social turmoil are intended to facilitate a major shift in US political, social and institutional structures.

General Franks' statement reflects a consensus within the US Military as to how events ought to unfold. The "war on terrorism" is to provide a justification for repealing the Rule of Law, ultimately with a view to "preserving civil liberties."

Franks' interview suggests that an Al Qaeda sponsored terrorist attack will be used as a "trigger mechanism" for a military coup d'état in America. The PNAC's "Pearl Harbor type event" would be used as a justification for declaring a State of emergency, leading to the establishment of a military government.

In many regards, the militarisation of civilian State institutions in the US is already functional under the facade of a bogus democracy.

Actual Terrorist Attacks

To be "effective" the fear and disinformation campaign cannot solely rely on unsubstantiated "warnings" of future attacks, it also requires "real" terrorist occurrences or "incidents", which provide credibility to the Washington's war plans. These terrorist events are used to justify the implementation of "emergency measures" as well as "retaliatory military actions". They are required, in the present context, to create the illusion of "an outside enemy" that is threatening the American Homeland.

The triggering of "war pretext incidents" is part of the Pentagon's assumptions. In fact it is an integral part of US military history. (See Richard Sanders, War Pretext Incidents, How to Start a War, Global Outlook, published in two parts, Issues 2 and 3, 2002-2003).

In 1962, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had envisaged a secret plan entitled "Operation Northwoods", to deliberately trigger civilian casualties to justify the invasion of Cuba:

"We could blow up a U.S. ship in Guantanamo Bay and blame Cuba," "We could develop a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area, in other Florida cities and even in Washington" "casualty lists in U.S. newspapers would cause a helpful wave of national indignation." (See the declassified Top Secret 1962 document titled "Justification for U.S. Military Intervention in Cuba"¹⁶ (See Operation Northwoods at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/NOR111A.html>).

There is no evidence that the Pentagon or the CIA played a direct role in recent terrorist attacks, including those in Indonesia (2002), India (2001), Turkey (2003) and Saudi Arabia (2003).

According to the reports, the attacks were undertaken by organizations (or cells of these organizations), which operate quite independently, with a certain degree of autonomy. This independence is in the very nature of a covert intelligence operation. The «intelligence asset» is not in direct contact with its covert sponsors. It is not necessarily cognizant of the role it plays on behalf of its intelligence sponsors.

The fundamental question is who is behind them? Through what sources are they being financed? What is the underlying network of ties?

For instance, in the case of the 2002 Bali bomb attack, the alleged terrorist organization Jemaah Islamiyah had links to Indonesia's military intelligence (BIN), which in turn has links to the CIA and Australian intelligence.

The December 2001 terrorist attacks on the Indian Parliament --which contributed to pushing India and Pakistan to the brink of war-- were allegedly conducted by two Pakistan-based rebel groups, Lashkar-e-Taiba ("Army of the Pure") and Jaish-e-Muhammad ("Army of Mohammed"), both of which according to the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) are supported by Pakistan's ISI. (Council on Foreign Relations at <http://www.terrorismanswers.com/groups/harakat2.html> , Washington 2002).

What the CFR fails to acknowledge is the crucial relationship between the

ISI and the CIA and the fact that the ISI continues to support Lashkar, Jaish and the militant Jammu and Kashmir Hizbul Mujahideen (JKHM), while also collaborating with the CIA. (For further details see Michel Chossudovsky, Fabricating an Enemy, March 2003, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO301B.html>)

A 2002 classified outline drafted to guide the Pentagon "calls for the creation of a so-called 'Proactive, Pre-emptive Operations Group' (P2OG), to launch secret operations aimed at "stimulating reactions" among terrorists and states possessing weapons of mass destruction -- that is, for instance, prodding terrorist cells into action and exposing themselves to 'quick-response' attacks by U.S. forces." (William Arkin, The Secret War, The Los Angeles Times, 27 October 2002)

The P2OG initiative is nothing new. It essentially extends an existing apparatus of covert operations. Amply documented, the CIA has supported terrorist groups since the Cold War era. This "prodding of terrorist cells" under covert intelligence operations often requires the infiltration and training of the radical groups linked to Al Qaeda.

In this regard, covert support by the US military and intelligence apparatus has been channeled to various Islamic terrorist organizations through a complex network of intermediaries and intelligence proxies. (See below in relation to the Balkans)

Foreknowledge is a Red Herring

Foreknowledge implies and requires the existence of this "outside enemy", who is attacking America. Amply documented, the Islamic brigades and Al Qaeda including the madrassas and the CIA sponsored training camps in Afghanistan are a creation of the CIA. The Taliban were "graduates" of the madrassas, which formed a US sponsored government in 1996.

During the Cold War, but also in its aftermath, the CIA using Pakistan's Military Intelligence apparatus as a go-between played a key role in training the Mujahideen. In turn, the CIA-sponsored guerrilla training was integrated with the teachings of Islam.

Every single US administration since Jimmy Carter has consistently supported the so-called "Militant Islamic Base", including Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda, as part of their foreign policy agenda.

And in this regard, the Democrats and the Republicans have worked hand in glove. In fact, it is the US military and intelligence establishment which has provided continuity in US foreign policy.

Media Reports on Al Qaeda and Pakistan's Military Intelligence (ISI)

It is indeed revealing that in virtually all post 9/11 terrorist occurrences, the terrorist organization is reported (by the media and in official statements) as having "ties to Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda". This in itself is a crucial piece of information. Of course, the fact that Al Qaeda is a creation of the CIA is neither mentioned in the press reports nor is it considered relevant to an understanding of these terrorist occurrences.

The ties of these terrorist organizations (particularly those in Asia) to Pakistan's military intelligence (ISI) is acknowledged in a few cases by official sources and press dispatches. Confirmed by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), some of these groups are said to have links to Pakistan's ISI, without identifying the nature of these links. Needless to say, this information is crucial in identifying the sponsors of these terrorist attacks. In other words, the ISI is said to support these terrorist organizations, while at same time maintaining close ties to the CIA.

In other words, the focus on foreknowledge has served to usefully distract attention from the US government's longstanding relationship to the terror network since the Soviet-Afghan war, which inevitably raises the broader issue of treason and war crimes.

The foreknowledge issue in a sense erases the historical record because it denies a relationship between Al Qaeda and successive US administrations.

The administration is accused of not acting upon these terrorist warnings.

In the words of Richard Clarke:

"we must try to achieve a level of public discourse on these issues that is simultaneously energetic and mutually respectful... We all want to defeat

the jihadists. [this is the consensus] To do that, we need to encourage an active, critical and analytical debate in America about how that will best be done. And if there is another major terrorist attack in this country, we must not panic or stifle debate as we did for too long after 9/11." (New York Times, 25 April 2004)

Bush and the White House intelligence team are said to have ignored these warnings. Richard Clarke who was in charge of counter terrorism on the National Security Council until February 2003 has "apologized" to the American people and the families of the victims. Had they acted in a responsible fashion, had they taken the intelligence briefings seriously, 3000 lives would have been saved on September 11, 2001. But bear in mind that Richard Clarke was part of an intelligence team which was at the time providing support to Al Qaeda in the Balkans. (See below)

This new anti-Bush consensus concerning the 9/11 attacks has engulfed part of the 9/11 truth movement. The outright lies in sworn testimony to the 9/11 Commission have been denounced in chorus; the families of the victims have expressed their indignation.

The debate centers on whether the administration is responsible for an "intelligence failure" or whether it was the result of "incompetence."

In both cases, the al Qaeda legend remains unchallenged. The fact that Al Qaeda hijackers were responsible for 9/11 remains unchallenged.

Source of Terrorist Warnings

Beneath the rhetoric, nobody seems to have questioned the source of these warnings emanating from an intelligence apparatus, which is known to have supported Al Qaeda throughout the entire post cold War era.

In other words, are the terrorist warnings emanating out of the CIA a "true" representation of the terrorist threat or are they part of the process of disinformation which seeks precisely to uphold Al Qaeda as an "Enemy of the Homeland".

Meanwhile, the issues of "cover-up and complicity" at the highest levels of the Bush administration, which were raised in the immediate wake of the 9/11 attacks have been shoved out.

The role of Bush officials, their documented links to the terror network, the business ties between the Bushes and bin Laden families, the role of Pakistan's Military Intelligence (ISI) which supported and abetted Al Qaeda while working hand in glove with their US counterparts (CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency), the fact that several Bush officials were the architects of Al Qaeda during the Reagan administration, as revealed by the Iran Contra investigation. (See Michel Chossudovsky, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO303D.html>)

"The Saudis Did It"

All of this, which is carefully documented, is no longer relevant. It is no longer an issue for debate and investigation. What the media, as well as some of the key 9/11 investigators are pushing is that "The Saudis did it". The outside enemy Al Qaeda is said to be supported by the Saudis.

This line of analysis, which characterizes the 1 trillion dollar law suit by the families of the victims led by Lawyer Ted Motley, is evidently flawed. While it highlights the business ties between the Bushes and the bin Ladens, it does not challenge the legend of the outside enemy.

"The Saudis did it" is also part of the US foreign policy agenda, to be eventually used to discredit the Saudi monarchy and destabilize the Saudi financiers, who oversee 25 percent of the World's oil reserves, ten times those of the US. In fact, this process has already begun with the Saudi privatization program, which seeks to transfer Saudi wealth and assets into foreign (Anglo-American) hands.

The Saudi financiers were never prime movers. They were proxies. They played a subordinate role. They worked closely with US intelligence and their American financial counterparts. They were involved in the laundering of drug money working closely with the CIA. The Wahabbi sects from Saudi Arabia were sent to Afghanistan to set up the madrassas. The Saudis channeled covert financing to the various Islamic insurgencies on behalf of the CIA.

In other words, the "Saudis did It" consensus essentially contributes to whitewashing the Bush administration, while also providing pretext to destabilize Saudi Arabia.

"The Bush Lied" Consensus upholds "The Big Lie"

This emerging 9/11 consensus ("Outside enemy", intelligence failures, criminal negligence, "the Saudis did it", etc.) which is making its way into American history books, is "they knew, but failed to act".

It was incompetence or criminal negligence but it was not treason. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq were "just wars", they were undertaken in accordance with the National Security doctrine, which views Al Qaeda as the outside enemy. It is worth noting that at the outset of the war on Afghanistan, a number of prominent Western intellectuals, trade union and civil society leaders supported the "Just War" concept.

While the Bush administration takes the blame, the "war on terrorism" and its humanitarian mandate remain functionally intact.

Meanwhile, everybody has their eyes riveted on the fact that Bush officials lied under oath regarding the terrorist warnings.

Yet nobody seems to have begged the key question:

What is the significance of these warnings emanating from the intelligence apparatus, knowing that the CIA is the creator of Al Qaeda and that Al Qaeda is an "intelligence asset".

In other words, the CIA is the sponsor of Al Qaeda and at the same time it controls the warnings on impending terrorist attacks.

In other words, are Bush officials in sworn testimony to the 9/11 commission lying under oath on something which is true, or are they lying on something which is an even bigger lie?

* * *

This is an abridged email version, which includes the first part of a lengthy review article. To read the complete text go to:

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO405E.html>

The Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG) at www.globalresearch.ca grants permission to cross-post original Global Research (Canada) articles in their entirety, or any portions thereof, on community internet sites, as long as the text & title of the article are not modified. The source must be acknowledged as follows: Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG) at www.globalresearch.ca. For cross-postings, kindly use the active URL hyperlink address of the original CRG article. The author's copyright note must be displayed.

© Copyright MICHEL CHOSSUDOVSKY 2004. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

www.globalresearch.ca

To subscribe send a message to editor@globalresearch.ca with unsubscribe in the subject line.

Item #3:

The financial elite at the apex of the ruling class are going to get us with hyperinflation just as the victors of World War One had the head of the German Central Bank use the printing press as an engine for hyperinflation, so the Federal Reserve is putting trillions in the hands of foreigners so that when the US economy crashes and the dollar heads towards worthlessness, all of the foreign dollar holders (and foreigners hold many times the number of dollars that American citizens hold!!!) will flood the US domestic market as they try to buy things here (land, houses, companies, and even the publically owned assets (government land etc. that will be sold in liquidation of the United States. as a corporation under Admiralty aw.) --Dick Eastman

<http://www.conspiracyplanet.com/channel.cfm?channelid=49&contentid=1331>

Federal Reserve: Prepared for Bush-Cheney Terror?

by CONSPIRACY PLANET

Will the Bush-Cheney Regime stage a pre-election terrorist incident that could cascade into a global economic debacle?

The unexplained and unprecedented expansion of the M3 money supply has resulted in speculation regarding the intent of the Federal Reserve.

Is the doubling of the money supply necessary to preserve liquidity in the capital markets if another terrorist incident is staged before the November election?

Political-economic analyst Al Martin reports that "there are more U.S. 10-year notes now sold short than there are 10-year notes in the float to cover those positions, and that is an enormous negative implication because the only time that the 'smart money' sells U.S. Treasury paper short in such size is when they expect an economic debacle.

"To have a record short position in the Treasury bonds," Martin continues, "means that a) you expect another market debacle; b), that debacle is going to be either something to do with inflation (an inflationary debacle), a sudden surge of inflation, or a sudden fall in the U.S. dollar. "This is the kind of short position that, combined with the very same people massively liquidating U.S. stocks, and massively purchasing gold (Greenspan has on several occasions noted the mass accumulation of gold by 'smart money' in the United States) -- these are things that the people who are doing it must be under the impression that there is going to be, not just a meltdown, but an economic collapse."

"It's interesting how these pro-Bush pundits try to fudge and maneuver around the truth. But we are now seeing market positions never before seen, a record short position in long-dated U.S. Treasury paper, which means somebody expects an inflationary surge and a debacle.

"There is also a record amount of insider selling, (selling of previously restricted stock now free to sell by corporate officers, principals, and directors) which is a proxy for 'smart money' selling.

Insider selling is now running at 53-to-1 on a dollar-volume basis. These are incredible amounts of money. The insider selling alone is now accounting for about \$50 billion a month coming out of U.S. equities. The only reason equities haven't felt it is because of, a) derivative long positions, and,

b), because of the increase that we've seen in the last 2 months in public buying from mutual funds and the so-called small retail 'sucker buying.'

'Sucker buying' is keeping it all afloat.

Martin's conclusion? "If you are a flag-waver and a NFWC (member of the Naïve Flag Waving Crowd), then you can count on being the ultimate bag holder."

=====

Sealed off by incendiary devices, the new Pentagon wedge became a killing field -- the 6 ft' diameter hole in "c" ring wall either an assault entry point or the site of an attempted escape by the conspiracy's targets.

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/pentagonconspiracy/message/78>

Correcting the distortion that 911 witnesses accounts of the Pentagon attack support the official version of what happened.

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/pentagonconspiracy/message/71>

Pentagon crash research archive shows history of Boeing vs. Small-plane Controversy

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/9-11-demonstrative-evidence-of-frameup/messages/1>

Dear halcon7roho,

I've been investigating 9-11 as long as any of you and I have seen enough of the evidence and complied enough of it -- to know that Michael Moore has systematically avoided the "best" evidence.

Many times I have written to him with links to the critical photo evidence establishing that there was a smaller plane and a missile involved in the Pentagon attack -- a view also held by Professor A.K. Dewdney, an editor of Scientific American and the distinguished researchers at Physics911.

Read what I paste below, for more insight into what Michael Moore really is and what his documentary (put out by Disney and opposed for promotional reasons) that is getting so much --ahem! -- sort of

sci.econ: Re: ELEMENTARY 9-11 -- insider guilt established by new evidence

negative publicity, but really is being puffed up.

Sincerely,
Dick Eastman
Yakima, Washington

Michael Moore is coverup -- not only does he deliberately eliminate the best evidence of frame-up, i.e., the Pentagon crash photo evidence of too-small plane, too-small hole etc. -- he actually backs the official Pentagon story . Moreover the whole direction of his story is that we should have gone after Saudi Arabia -- Moore is false opposition -- I know by the way the man refused even to look at my data or respond to my letters. Even if his rejection had been sincere, he would have stated his reasons for discarding evidence that Prof. A. K. Dewdney and all of France also subscribe to. He has nothing about the thousands who say no Boeing crashed at the Pentagon.
--Dick Eastman

An anonymous email on Michael Moore reached 9/11 truth alliance member and essayist Kurt Nimmo

"...I ..work in the entertainment industry and thus had the opportunity to see Fahrenheit 9/11 at its US premiere, at the Academy theater in Beverly Hills on June 8th....Moore plays directly into the neo-cons'

hands because Saudi Arabia is the jewel in the neo-con crown -- it sets Americans up for the war that he implies SHOULD have been fought -- against SAUDI ARABIA. As far as I could tell (and I did take two potty breaks) no mention was made of PNAC, neoconservatives or the pro-Israel lobbies' driving of the invasion of Iraq..."

Dick,

Gen. Shelton was no where to be found. Gen. Myers was engaged in a chat about terrorism in MCellans office and:-

<http://tomflocco.com/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=65&mode=&order=0&thold=0>

According to the personal written statement of Navy Captain Charles J. Leidig, Jr., entered into the record during today's hearings before the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, Leidig revealed that on September 10 he was asked by Brigadier General Montague Winfield to stand a portion of his duty as Deputy Director for Operations for the National Military Command Center (NMCC), which would require supervision and operation of all necessary communications as watch commander.

=====

Ronin writes:

Dick,

Is the 9/11 commission going to publish their report?

The reason I ask is that the commission seem to be releasing some of their findings to the media already.

Under the title "Panic and delay wrecked 9/11 response" we are told that Bush continued with the goat story (anyone see the significance here - Arab goat herders?) because his instinct was to project calm. If it wasn't so serious it would be laughable. How could he have the instinct of being calm himself when he didn't know the scope of the attacks. He said "We're at war ... Somebody's going to pay." What he should have said is I assume the FAA, Norad, the National Guard and the airforce are doing what they are being paid to do and have everything under control and I want to hear what is being done right this minute. I want to be brought up to the minute news - get on to it Andrew.

Have fighters been scrambled?

But he wanted observers to be calm despite the public in panic in front of their TV screens watching CNN and the media showing, in real time - at least from the time flight 175 was speeding towards the south tower, America under attack.

The article speaks of panic but the only panic I have seen is on the faces

of the people escaping from the WTC scene. It occurs to me that there was very little panic at the Pentagon. No pictures of people escaping from the Pentagon, as the world saw escaping from the towers. Oh yes we saw people being treated outside on the Pentagon lawn and staff members standing around on the lawn watching the Pentagon burn but there were no action shots. It could have been all part of a reconstruction that one sees on the TV for all we could tell. All part of an exercise.

But then no one seems to have thought that the Pentagon might be a target. The atc at Dulles, for some reason warned the secret service that the target was the capital building or the White House but it didn't seem to occur that flight 77 was heading also toward the Pentagon. According to a Los Angeles Times editorial the Pentagon's air defences were almost non-existent on September 11- according to the staff and any number of planes might have reached their targets.

It is reported that despite his instinct for calm the president authorised hijacked planes shot down - you know and I know that passenger planes cannot be shot down over cities but they can be tracked and potential target buildings can be evacuated. But the order was never passed on to pilots because senior commanders were "unsure how the pilots would, or should proceed with this guidance." For Christ sake viewers of the series "24" know that a helicopter can't be shot down over a city let alone a passenger plane. But potential target buildings can be evacuated. Hey, those in the plane are already "dead" but those in potential target buildings are able to be saved. Christ sakes why wasn't the Pentagon given a bloody warning???????????

Flight 77 are these bastards Achilles Heel and for 13 minutes a software anomaly meant that radar information did not reach air traffic control. Military commanders were unaware that flight 77 was missing because flight 77 had been confused with flight 11 which had already crashed. But who was on flight 11? Betty Ong and Ms Sweeney was on flight 11 and gave out information to American Airlines of the circumstances on board flight 11. So how could flight 77 be confused with flight 11?

According to my research flight 77 might have been confused with flight 175 not flight 11 because American Airlines had received reports that the SECOND plane could have been their flight 77. Perhaps other researchers might confirm this.

But I've seen this word "anomaly" before:-

"Two days later, Marilyn and Gary Pontell still hoped their youngest boy had been spared. Gathered at Darin and Devora's apartment in Gaithersburg on Thursday afternoon, they could barely process the idea that he was dead . .

"Navy officials gave garbled reports: One person said someone who looked like Darin walked from the scene. Somebody else claimed he was working far away, in the A-Ring. An officials said they couldn't find his Acura Integra in the Pentagon lot . . .

"The Nokia sang again, then silence. Too late. when she finally got to the phone, Marilyn scrolled through the menu. One missed call: 1:57 p.m. No message. But the incoming number was clearly identified. It was Darin's. "My God, maybe he was alive.

"For five more days, they waited. On Sept. 18, the Navy informed the Pontells that Darin's body had been positively identified. His cell phone was never returned to the family. They presume it was never found. Perhaps the flip-phone had somehow dialed Marilyn's number when the rubble shifted. But didn't all cell phones have to be turned off upon entry into the CNO-IP [Chief of Naval Operations Intelligence Plot]?

"The FBI offered a one-word explanation for that call: 'anomaly.'" Yes, Darin Pontell lost his life in the Pentagon but his Nokia rang. But all it was was a bloody "anomaly."

Can you imagine his family waiting a week to find out about their son? No you can't because it may never have happened to you.

We all know about software. Software that is used in a busy air traffic control area (how many aircraft are flying on internal and international

flights across America every day?) should not be anomalous. Private planes, evidently that have acted mysteriously have attracted attention and have been escorted by fighter planes. But the planes involved in 9/11 were passenger planes and yet the software had an "anomaly". No, the only way there was an "anomaly" in the software is if some folk was familiar with the software that knew there was a "back door" a weakness in the software that could be used and circumvented. But specifically it was radar information that did not reach atc.

So what did reach Dulles atc that caused the lady to give warnings to the capital on the basis of a blip on her screen and not give warnings to the Pentagon? The lady at Dulles did get radar readings that she thought, along with her colleagues, was a fighter and not a passenger plane.

I urge all 9/11 researchers to analyze what the 9/11 commission have released concerning flight 77 and the Pentagon attack because it is "their" Achilles Heel" and you will, at the same time be true to the name of Darin Pontell and the family he left behind not knowing his accomplishment on that terrible day.

"When the government fears the people, there is liberty. When the people fear the government there is tyranny." -Thomas Jefferson -

Mr. Eastman,

With all that oil in Iraq can it have no connection at all with the bombings and killings of Iraqi officials? Are the killings all associated with those fighting against the occupation? Can they all be groups with links to al-Qaida, links with Iran or links with any state? The killings have been professional jobs, may be inside jobs, may be the only way to avoid nationalists getting into the preliminary government. One thing that must be avoided are officials, even temporary one's having the ability to influence a following and turn the people to nationalism. There is nothing like the common cause of an opposition to an occupation rallying the people into feelings of nationalism. Take 9/11 for instance.

So what about this oil?

In 1994 the leader of the Kurdish Democratic Party, Masud Barzani had a nice business going on in smuggled Iraqi oil. Oil going over land by road tankers into Turkey. Some estimates by 1995 put the quantity as high as 100,000 barrels a day. The convoys had to cross territory controlled by Barzani and naturally he took his cut. Barzani, Saddam and the Turks and Iran were all happy.

Jalal Talabani was a likable rogue and the leader of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan. A Iraqi nationalist who seemed to genuinely want Saddam gone. Had Clinton supported Talabani back in March 1995 Saddam would probably have been toppled then.

They were fighting each other in a civil war and it had become a war of attrition.

Fast forward to June 2004 and Ghazi Talabani, the security chief in the state run Northern Oil Company, who was also the cousin of Jalal Talabani, was driven into a crowded market in the city of Kirkuk and was fired upon and killed when his bodyguard briefly left the vehicle. His bodyguard was wounded. Talabani was the third senior government official to be murdered in the past four days. And possibly the third to have died because of poor security.

What is most important to the west. Democracy and the recognition of human rights in Iraq or the oil in Iraq? If Iraq was famous for its gold or diamond mines, given the present occupation would the debate be centered on the democratization and the forthcoming creation of sovereignty on 30/6? The west are sitting on a "gold mine" in Iraq and surely it cannot b