

The 9/11 Conspiracy Facts

“The individual is handicapped by coming face to face with a conspiracy so monstrous, he cannot believe it exists”

- J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director 1935-1972

Volition

“Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor.”

- Cheney, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz et al

On the evidence that we have to hand, the case begins in September 2000, with the publication of a very important document. “Rebuilding America’s Defenses” <http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf> was the last major neo conservative white paper to come out prior to the inception of the Bush administration. Its members included a significant number of men in important positions in the US government on and up to 9/11. It could be seen, therefore, not only as a blueprint for neo-conservative policy, but also of the policy of the administration that was to take office in January 2001. Such a suspicion would be proved accurate in time.

What is so extraordinary about this document, is that what it lays out in black and white, is, to a startling degree, what we now call the “War on Terror”. It is not perfect, but it’s pretty good. It need not be stated to an educated audience that the “War on Terror” is not in fact a war against terrorism, something which the US still quite openly supports; nor against terror- to fight an abstract noun is something that not even the Bush administration would take seriously; but it is a large lattice of policies, aimed at developing and entrenching US hegemony for the decades to come through aggressive military means. The War on Terror is not the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; those wars are but a small part of the spectrum. Much larger, and more important changes are being pursued under its aegis- the militarization of space, the use of cyberspace as a defense tool, enormous increases in military budgets and personnel, renewal of material, transformation of the DoD, repositioning of global forces to protect strategic interests, securing of such interests... I could go on. But I need not- anyone who has read the PNAC document will be familiar with the processes that are happening right now, because they are, to a great degree, what was called for by the document. Except now, they are being pursued, not under the banner of “Rebuilding America’s Defenses”, but rather the War on Terror. In short, these 2 are essentially the same thing.

Coincidence? No. All design and no luck; that is almost certain. For the document is very specific about how such transformations should be achieved. They should not occur one by one by one; that would be useless. There needs to be a global framework for all these changes, aligned, moreover, with domestic policy.

“Any serious effort at transformation must occur within the larger framework of U.S. national security strategy, military missions and defense budgets. The United

States cannot simply declare a “strategic pause” while experimenting with new technologies and operational concepts.”

How long will it take for these crucial changes to happen? Many decades; we as readers can gauge that this would potentially vitiate the goal of the 21st Century being an American one; so how to do it quickly? Well, the document does tell us.

“Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor.”

This is the only sentence in the doc that covers how, soon. Given that such crucial transformations happening fluidly in months/years, rather than with difficulty over decades is favourable to the neo conservative ideologues who formed the heart of the Bush administration, then we can conclude that a new Pearl Harbour is deemed propitious to policy for the Bush administration as of September 2000.

Now, although this doesn't prove anything, it does do one thing. It gives us a very useful frame of reference for assessing the possibility of government complicity in the “new Pearl Harbour”. The chances of a new Pearl Harbour happening, absent government complicity are remote. It is a once in a lifetime event. The chances of it happening, absent government complicity, when said government has, effectively stated the need for it only months earlier, is now close to inconceivable. And finally, the chances of all this happening at the most useful time for the government; not only 9 months in, thus allowing the government 3 or 7 years to pursue the policy said PH was going to catalyse; but also, as the document states quite clearly, it happens crucially just before the 2001 QDR, a vital moment since it is when the new president makes the choice of whether to “increase military spending to preserve American geopolitical leadership, or (to) pull back from the security commitments that are the measure of America's position as the world's sole superpower and the final guarantee of security, democratic freedoms and individual political rights.” In short, everything that neo-conservative policy stands for. The chances of this all being a coincidence, though existing, are almost too small to be taken seriously. Hence, the chances of 9/11 having happened absent government complicity, are equally almost too small to be taken seriously. So already we have built a pretty robust case for the goal of the Truth Movement- namely that there is sufficient evidence of US criminal complicity in 9/11 to warrant a new investigation into such. But in any case, take such chances seriously we shall, and we shall have a look at the rest of the evidence.

Foreknowledge

“No warnings”

Ex- White House spokesman Ari Fleischer

Now, what a number of people maintain against the TM, is that the scale for government complicity to be feasible is impossible. It is surely too great a task. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth. All that is required for the CT to be correct, is that the government brings a few heads of food chains into line, gets a whole load of warnings, ignores them all, and bam! The attacks happen. Afterwards you will hear tons of complaints about how there were loads of warnings, how intelligence agents were barred from doing their jobs, how leads went un-followed up, how the White House was warned countless times, how agents threatened to resign in protest, how people knew that these guys were in the country etc... followed by subterfuges that would be completely unbelievable under any other circumstance for why things didn't happen- the CIA and FBI were too proud to talk to one another; it was a foreign attack happening on domestic soil, so no one knew who was in charge; and then a whole load of unanswered questions that nobody acts on. In any case, let's look at the forewarnings.

Some of you may be aware of Paul Thompson's 9/11 Timeline, as featured in the film "9/11 Press for Truth". This is a collation of mainstream media articles which illustrate forewarnings of 9/11 as reported by the MSM. There are about 150 of them relating to Bush.

http://www.cooperativeresearch.org/timeline.jsp?timeline=complete_911_timeline&before_9/11=warnings

To give just a random selection:

- May- July 2001: Over a two-month period, the NSA reports that "at least 33 communications indicating a possible, imminent terrorist attack."
- May 16-17, 2001: US Warned Bin Laden Supporters inside US and Planning an Attack
- May 29, 2001: Clarke (ex US Head of Counter Terrorism) Asks for More to Be Done to Stop Expected Al-Qaeda Attacks
- May 30, 2001: FBI Is Warned of Major Al-Qaeda Operation in the US Involving Hijackings, Explosives, and/or New York City
- June 2001: Germans Warn of Plan to Use Aircraft as Missiles on US and Israeli Symbols
- June 2001: US Intelligence Warns of Spectacular Attacks by al-Qaeda Associates
- June-July 2001: Terrorist Threat Reports Surge, Frustration with White House Grows
- Summer 2001: Threat Alerts Increase to Record High
- Summer 2001: Israel Warns US of 'Big Attack'
- Summer 2001: Al-Qaeda Plot Described as Upcoming 'Hiroshima' on US Soil
- June 21, 2001: Senior Al-Qaeda Officials Say Important Surprises Coming Soon
- June 22, 2001: CIA Warns of Imminent Al-Qaeda Suicide Attack
- June 23, 2001: White House Warned 'Bin Laden Attacks May Be Imminent'
- June 25, 2001: Clarke Tells Rice That Pattern of Warnings Indicates an Upcoming Attack
- June 28, 2001: Tenet (ex CIA Director) Warns of Imminent Al-Qaeda Attack

- June 28, 2001: Clarke Warns Rice That Threat Level Has Reached a Peak
- Late Summer 2001: Jordan Warns US That Aircraft Will Be Used in Major Attack Inside the US
- July 2001: India Warns US of Possible Terror Attacks
- July 1, 2001: Senators Warn of Al-Qaeda Attack Within Three Months
- July 5, 2001: Ashcroft (ex US Attorney General) Is Warned of Imminent, Multiple Attacks from Al-Qaeda
- July 6, 2001: CIA Warns Upcoming Al-Qaeda Attack Will Be 'Spectacular' and Different
- July 6, 2001: Clarke Tells Rice to Warn Agencies to Prepare for 3 to 5 Simultaneous Attacks; No Apparent Response
- July 10, 2001: FBI Agent Sends Memo Warning That Inordinate Number of Muslim Extremists Are Learning to Fly in Arizona
- July 10, 2001: CIA Director Gives Urgent Warning to White House of Imminent, Multiple, Simultaneous Al-Qaeda Attacks, Possibly Within US
- July 16, 2001: British Spy Agencies Warn Al-Qaeda Is in The Final Stages of Attack in the West
- Late July 2001: Taliban Foreign Minister Tries to Warn US and UN of Huge Attack Inside the US
- Late July 2001: Argentina Relays Warning to the US
- Late July 2001: Egypt Warns CIA of 20 Al-Qaeda Operatives in US; Four Training to Fly; CIA Is Not Interested
- Late July 2001: CIA Director Believes Warnings Could Not 'Get Any Worse'
- August 2001: Russia Warns US of Suicide Pilots
- Early August 2001: Government Informant Warns Congressmen of Plan to Attack the WTC
- Early August 2001: Britain Warns US Again; Specifies Multiple Airplane Hijackings
- August 6, 2001: Bush Briefing Titled 'Bin Laden Determined to Strike in US'
- August 8-15, 2001: Israel Reportedly Warns of Major Assault on the US
- August 15, 2001: CIA Counterterrorism Head: We Are Going to Be Struck Soon
- August 23-27, 2001: Minnesota FBI Agents 'Absolutely Convinced' Moussaoui Plans to Hijack Plane; They Are Undermined by FBI Headquarters
- August 23, 2001: Mossad Reportedly Gives CIA List of Terrorist Living in US; at Least Four 9/11 Hijackers Named
- August 30, 2001-September 4, 2001: Egypt Warns al-Qaeda Is in Advanced Stages of Planning Significant Attack on US
- September 4, 2001: Mossad Gives Another Warning of Major, Imminent Attack
- September 10, 2001: NSA Intercepts: 'The Match Begins Tomorrow' and 'Tomorrow Is Zero Hour'
- September 10, 2001: US Intercepts: 'Watch the News' and 'Tomorrow Will Be a Great Day for Us'
- September 10, 2001: US Generals Warned Not to Fly on Morning of 9/11

What is important here, is not just that there were so many specific warnings, but that in response, NOTHING was done. Absolutely nothing, absent 1 cabinet meeting on the 4th September. This is not surprising of course, given that a catastrophic terrorist attack on US soil had been stated to be propitious to US policy only months earlier. In fact, the wheels had started to turn pretty early. On 25th January, Dick Clarke, the counter terrorism czar (whose book "Against all Enemies" should be read by all who want to know more on the Bush

administration's apathy to the unprecedented threat of a catastrophic terror attack) sent a document to Condoleezza Rice, entitled "Strategies For Eliminating The Jihadist Threat Of Al Qaeda". The response? Demotion. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A20349-2004Mar24.html>

A pretty effective way of turning the volume down on warnings of an AQ threat. Clarke was now dealing with deputy/junior cabinet members- slowing down any anti-terror measures "by months". Indeed Bush had been warned in November by both Clinton and Sandy Berger of the "urgent and deadly threat" AQ were going to pose to the incumbent administration. So their actions are no surprise. A new Pearl Harbour, with Al Qaeda as the most convenient perpetrators, was openly stated neo-conservative policy, so it's understandable that they would take every step possible to prevent such an attack from being hindered.

Now... let's keep that in mind for the following. As we know from the 9/11 Commission Report, Bush was warned 40 times prior to 9/11 of the threat of an AQ attack on US interests, just by Tenet, just at Presidential Daily Briefs. And how urgent was this threat? "Unprecedented" in Tenet's words; even greater than the millennium terror threat. Tenet was running round "with his hair on fire", according to Dick Armitage. The warnings "had never been so bad", according to an FBI source. But nothing, nowhere, never.

Moreover, as we know from Bob Kerrey, Bush was even aware that the terrorists were in the country: "I]n the summer of 2001, the government ignored repeated warnings by the CIA, ignored, and didn't do anything to harden our border security, didn't do anything to harden airport country, didn't do anything to engage local law enforcement, didn't do anything to round up INS and consular offices and say we have to shut this down, and didn't warn the American people... The president says, if I had only known that 19 Islamic men would come into the United States of America and on the morning of 11 September hijack four American aircraft, fly two into the World Trade Center, one into the Pentagon, and one into an unknown Pennsylvania that crashed in Shanksville, I would have moved heaven and earth. That's what he said. Mr. President, you don't need to know that. This is an Islamic Jihadist movement that has been organized since the early 1990s, declared war on the United States twice, in '96 and '98. You knew they were in the United States. You were warned by the CIA. You knew in July they were inside the United States. You were told again by briefing officers in August that it was a dire threat. And what did you do? Nothing, so far as we could see on the 9/11 Commission."

Most astonishingly of all, is the testimony of Kabir Mohabbat, who was the middleman between the US government and the Taliban leading up to 9/11. After the bombing of the USS Cole in 2000, he had been charged with securing either the capture, or the killing of Osama Bin Laden for the US. In an interview with Counterpunch, <http://www.counterpunch.org/cockburn11012004.html>, he states very clearly that "the Bush administration could have had Osama bin Laden and his senior staff either delivered to the US or to allies as prisoners, or killed at their Afghan base". Further, upon delivering this testimony to the 9/11 Commission, their main concern was that he did not divulge his testimony to anyone else.

The refusal to have the biggest individual threat to the lives of your civilians, and the man who is responsible for the deaths of dozens of Americans already, handed over to you, or killed, is at first something so bizarre, so out of place. But we know that it can be explained very easily by one thing- 9/11, as a catalyst for the War on Terror, with Bin Laden as potential bogeyman, was openly stated policy.

Now, let's bear in mind what our goal is here- to illustrate whether there is a need to "re-open 9/11", to investigate government complicity. I think it is clear, just from the above, that the case for an independent investigation is pretty unshakable.

What we have here in terms of forewarnings is at the very least a clear instance of criminal negligence. But what makes things much clearer (and murkier) is the fact that the people who would be guilty of such neglect in ignoring this mass of warnings of a large scale attack, had only months earlier advocated the importance of such an attack happening. The threat of a new Pearl Harbour, one that would allow the Neo Cons to create their "arsenal of democracy", and the geo-political order so explicitly outlined in "Rebuilding America's Defences", was in front of their very eyes from the day they took office. But it was actively and consciously ignored, and led to the desired results- a new Pearl Harbour, and the rebuilding of America's defenses.

9/11

There is such a chasm between the facts of this day, and what has been reported in the mainstream media, that the majority of people are not even aware of the most rudimentary facts of the day, one of the most newsworthy days any of our lives. I will address 2 smoking guns.

WTC7

Another indication of how little the public knows about 9/11 can be gauged from the fact that the vast majority of people in this country are not even aware how many buildings fell on 9/11. And those that are will most likely never have seen the 3rd and final building to fall that day, World Trade Center 7, collapse. It is unprecedented, that in an age where information travels so freely, that so many people are unaware of one of the most rudimentary facts of the most newsworthy day of our lives.

WTC 7 was a 47 storey building, 100m north of the North Tower that housed the offices of the CIA, the Secret Service, the Mayor's Emergency Management Office, the IRS, and the SEC, among others. At 5.20 pm on 9/11, it was taken down in a manner that raised eyebrows. In the words of top Dutch implosion expert Danny Jowenko:

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=HgoSOQ2xrbI> "This is controlled demolition. Absolutely certain. This is a hired job done by a team of experts." Or to quote emeritus Professor in structural analysis and construction at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Hugo Bachmann: "In my opinion WTC7 was with the utmost probability brought down by controlled demolition done by experts". Also, emeritus Professor in structural analysis and construction at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Joerg Schneider: "WTC7 was with the utmost probability brought down by explosives". <http://www.911blogger.com/node/2925>

The official government story is that the tower was damaged by falling debris, and so fell in a manner that just looked like an implosion, but it was actually structural failure. Any doubts as to this can be put to bed by the testimony of 1st responders both at the time, and subsequently, who state they were told to get away from the building, because it was about to be imploded:

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=2073592843640256739&q=wtc7+the+smoking+gun+of+9%2F11&total=29&start=0&num=10&so=0&type=search&plindex=0>

In line with this notion of foreknowledge as to the collapse of WTC7, is the astonishing recent revelation that the BBC and CNN both reported the collapse of the building while it was still standing, and in the case of the BBC, while the reporter was standing in front of it.

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=ltP2t9nq9fl>

Incidentally, another interesting fact about 9/11 is that the owner of the WTC complex, Larry Silverstein, had his offices on the 88th floor of the North Tower. But by a surprising coincidence, on this day, Larry didn't make it in, as he had a doctor's appointment, and his 2 kids, Lisa and Roger, who worked with him, didn't make it either- they were running late.

Luck of the devil I guess.

Let's not forget our aim- is this sufficient evidence to warrant a new independent investigation?

William Rodriguez et al

Another fact that has not seen a speck of daylight in the mainstream media, is the multiple, identical reports, of a bomb going off in the basement of the North Tower seconds before the 1st plane had hit. This bomb injured and hospitalised civilians, yet was completely ignored by the authorities, not investigated anywhere, and whitewashed from the 9/11 Commission Report.

Witnesses to this include William Rodriguez, Felipe David, Jose Sanchez, Salvatore Giambanco, Mike Pecoraro and Philip Morelli. Rodriguez is the foremost proponent of this in the public eye, having gained a measure of celebrity post 9/11- he was the last man out of the North Tower, being in fact pulled from the rubble. He was the master janitor in the building, having worked there for 20 years, and as such he had the master key. When the attacks happened, he was helping the firefighters, running up and down the stairs, unlocking doors, and helping people get out, until the towers collapsed. After 9/11, he was honour at the WH 5 times, and the Republicans wanted him to be their poster boy for the War on Terror. One problem though- he was urging an investigation into the bombs that went off in the basement, and that he claimed were going off all over the building as he was running around (he assumed at the time that they had been planted by the terrorists). He was soon ditched by the GOP, and every reference he has made to bombs has been edited out by the MSM, as you will all be able to testify.

<http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=8536008651248732897&q=william+rodriguez>

Please name 1 instance in history, in an advanced society, where there has been multiple, independent testimony, in addition to injury and hospitalisation of civilians, of a bomb in an important and populous location (the North Tower, rather than the basement), that has not been investigated by authorities, and has indeed been actively whitewashed from mainstream public record (e.g. the 9/11 Commission Report) by the government/mainstream media- and which has not involved government conspiracy? Such an occurrence is clearly enough to raise serious suspicions, and as such, deserves a full independent investigation (including into the non-investigation).

Refutations

I hope that having read all of this you will be able to come to your own conclusions about the events of that day, a day that will probably define the rest of our lives. Whether you come to the same conclusions as myself, or that you have concrete refutations alibis for the facts presents above, do let me know especially in the case of the latter. Let me just deal with some of the most common counters to what I have presented:

- With such a huge plot, surely someone would have squealed by now/ Bush can't be that bad a guy/ This administration isn't smart enough to pull something like this off.

I group all of these together, since they all appear to have the same flaw. In assessing the validity of a conclusion, you should assess the validity of the propositions that lead to the conclusions, ensure that they do lead inexorably to that conclusion, and then you know that your conclusion is valid. What you shouldn't do, as all the above statements do, is look past the propositions at the conclusion, and then refute it based on any deductions that might get drawn from it. No one has squealed yet, so well done to them. Bush would I'm afraid, appear to be such a bad guy (maybe not so hard to believe); and as should be clear, this was not well executed - as I hope to have shown, this could not be much more of a blatant, and bunglingly executed inside job.

- Surely the anti-Bush press would be all over this if it was credible

As well as falling foul of the problems I listed above, as has been shown compellingly by Chomsky and Herman, the mainstream media, certainly in the US, functions as a tool of government propaganda; there is little reason to believe the UK press functions otherwise. I may write another post on this later, I think it's pretty important, but should you wish to find out more about it, please read "Manufacturing Consent" by the aforementioned authors; it is generally recognised as one of Chomsky's most important works. 9/11 could not be a stronger instance of the self censoring function of the mass media at work- 2 startling examples have already been listed in the William Rodriguez testimony and the WTC 7 story.

The Play's the Thing

Let's conclude by imagining that we can place Bush in the dock, and a la Claudius, posit the guilt in front of him, and gauge his reaction. This might help us in our conclusions.

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=4j9Bj8JJwco>

The evidence is overwhelming, the stakes are higher than they have ever been, the world needs a new investigation now, so we can stop the War on Terror while we still can.