

Thierry Meyssan

9-11 – The Big Lie

Introduction

The events of 11 September 2001 were followed live by millions of people, riveted to their TV screens. All the viewers, including the commentators, were put into a daze by stupefaction in the face of the scale of the attack and shock at the gratuitousness of the violence. The lack of information about the American authorities' attitude, as well as the spectacular violence of the images, drove the TV channels to show an endless loop of the suicide airplanes crashing into the towers of the World Trade Center, and the towers' subsequent collapse. The exigencies of live broadcast, confronted with the effect of surprise, limited the available information to a description of the immediately-known facts and prevented any overall understanding.

In the three days following the attacks, officials released very numerous supplementary bits of information to the press, regarding the misunderstood aspects of these events. But these bits of information were drowned in the uninterrupted flood of dispatches relating to the victims and to the rescuers. Other information did appear sporadically over the next few months, but in the manner of so many anecdotes, without being placed into context.

Several thousand people lost their lives this 11th of September, and a war has been waged in Afghanistan to avenge them. Nevertheless, these events remain mysterious. The way they're told is full of strangeness, uncertainty, and contradictions. Despite the ill-ease which they inspire, public opinion contents itself with the official version, it being understood that the imperatives of national security do not permit the U.S. authorities to tell everything.

This official version does not stand up to critical analysis. We will demonstrate to you that it is nothing but a montage. In certain cases, the elements which we have collected permit the truth to be reestablished. In other cases, our questions have, for the moment, remained unanswered; this is no reason, though, to persist in believing the authorities' lies. At all events, the dossier which we have put together already permits one to call into question the legitimacy of the American response in Afghanistan and of the "war against the Axis of Evil."

We invite you not to consider our work as a definitive truth. To the contrary, we invite you to skepticism. Have confidence only in your own critical spirit. To allow you to verify our imputations and to form your own opinion, we have enriched the text with numerous notes identifying our primary sources.

In this period when the USA is separating the world into Good and Evil, we are trying hard to recall that freedom does not mean believing in a simplistic vision of the world; it means understanding, extending the options, and multiplying the nuances.

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."
[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.
[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 1: The Phantom Airplane of the Pentagon

Do you remember the attack on the Pentagon? The events were so serious and so sudden that it was not immediately possible to notice the contradictions in the official version.

Shortly before 10:00 am Washington time on 11 September 2001, the DOD released a brief statement:

IMMEDIATE RELEASE September 11, 2001

EMERGENCY RESPONSE AT THE PENTAGON

The Department of Defense is continuing to respond to the attack that occurred this morning at 9:38 a.m. EDT. There are no casualty figures currently available. Injured personnel were taken to several area hospitals. Secretary of Defense Donald S. Rumsfeld has expressed his concern for the families of those killed and injured during this shameless attack and is directing operations from his command center in the Pentagon.

All personnel were evacuated from the building as emergency response personnel from the Department of Defense and surrounding communities responded to fire and medical emergencies. Initial estimates of the damage are significant; however, the Pentagon is expected to be reopened tomorrow morning. Alternate worksites for those affected parts of the building are currently being identified.

[Cut & pasted from

http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept_11/dod_brief03.htm]

First on the scene, the Reuters news agency announces that the Pentagon has been hit by a helicopter explosion. This news is confirmed by telephone to the AP by Democratic consultant Paul Begala. Several minutes later, the DOD corrects the information: it was an airplane. New accounts contradict the first ones and support the authorities' version: Fred Hey, legislative assistant to Sen. Bob Ney, saw a Boeing fall out of the sky while he was driving by on the highway adjoining the Pentagon. Sen. Mark Kirk was in the process of exiting the Pentagon parking lot, after having had breakfast with the Secretary of Defense, when a big airplane crashed. The Secretary himself, Donald Rumsfeld, leaves his office and throws himself on the scene in order to go to the aid of victims.

The Arlington County firefighters arrive on-scene. They are joined by four teams from FEMA, the federal emergency-response agency, and by special firefighters from Reagan National Airport. At around 10:10 am, the section of the Pentagon that was hit collapses.

The press is kept apart from the drama scene so as not to interfere with the rescuers, and has to content itself with filming the first body bags, which are being silently lined up in

an improvised field hospital. But the AP manages to get their hands on photographs of the arriving firefighters, taken by a private citizen from a nearby roadside building.

In the confusion, it takes several hours before the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Richard Myers, indicates that the "suicide plane" was a Boeing 757-200, American Airlines Flight 77, bound from Dulles to LAX, which air-traffic controllers had lost track of at around 8:55 am. Still working in haste, the press agencies add to the pressure, speaking of close to 800 casualties. An unorthodox figure which Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld kept himself from refuting until his press conference the next day, although the exact toll, fortunately four times less heavy, is precisely known.

For the entire world, after the attacks on the WTC, it's a further shock: the world's most powerful army was not capable of protecting its own headquarters and was subjected to heavy losses. The USA, which one had believed to be invincible, is vulnerable even on its own soil.

At first glance, the facts are undebatable. However, when you start looking at the details, the official explanations become embarrassing and contradictory.

The air-traffic controllers of the FAA explained to reporters of the Christian Science Monitor that, at around 8:55 am, the Boeing had descended to 29,000 feet and had not responded to radio calls. Its transponder had then gone silent, so that they had originally believed that an electrical failure had occurred. Then the pilot, who still was not responding, had intermittently keyed his radio transmitter, broadcasting a voice with a strong Arab accent who was threatening him. The airplane had then made an about-face in the direction of Washington, then the air-traffic controllers lost track of it.

In conformity with current operating procedures, the local air-traffic controllers had reported the hijacking to FAA headquarters. Most of the national officials were not there, having gone to Canada for a professional conference. In the panic of that morning, the officials on duty at FAA headquarters thought they were receiving yet another notification about the second airplane hijacked to New York. It wasn't until another half-hour had passed that they finally figured out that the report was about a third hijacking and informed military authorities. This mistake had caused the loss of 29 precious minutes.

Questioned on 13 September by the Senate Armed Forces Committee, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Richard Myers, was incapable of reporting the measures which had been taken to intercept the Boeing. From this animated exchange with the highest military authority, the congressmen concluded that no action at all had been taken to intercept the airplane (do, by all means, read the interview, in the Appendix below). But can one believe that the US Army had passively stood by during the attacks?

To thwart the disastrous effect of this interview, NORAD published a communique on 14 September. Filling in the holes in Gen. Myers' memory, NORAD indicated that it had not been informed of the hijacking until 9:24 am. It had immediately, they assured, ordered two F-16 fighters from Langley AFB (Virginia) to intercept the Boeing. But the Air

Force, not knowing where the Boeing was, had thought that the Boeing was going to commit a new attack on New York, and the fighters were sent away to the north. A military transport aircraft, taking off from the presidential Andrews AFB, had come across the Boeing by chance and had identified it. Too late.

It's not certain that NORAD's version is any more honorable than that of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Can one believe that the US military radar system is incapable of locating a Boeing in a zone of less than a hundred kilometers in radius [une zone de quelques dizaines de kilomètres en rayon]? And that a big passenger aircraft could shake off the powerful F-16s sent to pursue it?

Even if we suppose, then, that the Boeing had overcome this first obstacle, it should have been shot down on its way to the Pentagon. The security system which protects the DOD is quite clearly a military secret. Like that of the neighboring White House. At the most, we know that it was entirely redesigned after a series of events in 1994, notably the crash-landing of a small aircraft, a Cessna 150L, on the White House lawn. We also know that this anti-aircraft system is controlled at the presidential Andrews AFB. Two combat squadrons are permanently stationed there: the USAF 113rd Fighter Wing and the USN 321st Fighter Attack Squadron. Respectively equipped with F-16 and F/A-18 aircraft, they never should have let the Boeing approach.

But, as LCOL Vic Warzinski, Pentagon spokesman, put it: "We weren't aware that that airplane was heading for us, and I doubt whether before Tuesday [11 September], anyone would have been able to foresee such a thing."

So, having led its pursuers astray and harmlessly shaken off the most sophisticated air-defense system, the Boeing ended its flight at the Pentagon.

A Boeing 757-200 is a cargo plane, capable of transporting 239 passengers. It measures 47.32 m [155 feet] long and has a wingspan of 38.05 m [125 feet]. Fully loaded, this mastodon weighs 150 tons and can still attain a cruising speed of 900 Kph [560 mph].

As for the Pentagon, it is the largest office building in the world. 23,000 people work there every day. It gets its name from its original structure: five concentric rings, each with five sides. It was constructed not far from the White House, but on the other side of the Potomac. So it's located not in Washington itself, but in Arlington, in the neighboring state of Virginia.

To do the most important damage, the Boeing would have had to crash on the Pentagon's roof. And for all that, that would be the easiest thing to do: the building's surface area is 29 acres. To the contrary, the terrorists decided to crash into a façade, even though it was only 24 meters [78 feet] high.

The airplane suddenly approached the ground, as though to land. While remaining horizontal in attitude, it descended almost vertically, without damaging the streetlamps on the highway which borders the Pentagon parking lot, nor hitting them, not even by the blast caused by its air displacement.

When losing altitude, the landing gear deploys automatically. Although it measures 30

meters high, or the equivalent of three stories, the Boeing pierced the façade of the building only at the height of the ground floor and the second floor. The landing gear, then, must have been torn off before the airplane crashed into the base of the Pentagon. All this (see the cover photo) without damaging the magnificent lawn in the foreground, nor the wall, nor the parking lot, nor the heliport. Indeed, there is a landing pad for small helicopters in this area.

Despite its weight (100 tons) and its speed (between 400 and 700 kph[250 to 430 mph]), the airplane only destroyed the first ring of the building. This is what one observes distinctly in this photograph.

[photo: <http://www.defenselink.mil/photos/Sep2001/010914-F-8006R-002.html>]

The shock was felt throughout the Pentagon. The airplane's fuel, which is stocked in the wings, caught fire and the fire spread in the building. 125 people died from it, to which must be added the 64 persons on board the Boeing.

As fate (?) [sic] would have it, the airplane struck a portion of the Pentagon that was under construction. They were just putting the finishing touches on the brand-new Navy Command Center. Several offices were unoccupied, some were only occupied by civilian personnel in charge of the installation. Which explains how the majority of the victims were civilian personnel and how you won't find a single general among the military victims.

Half an hour later, the upper floors collapsed.

[photo: http://jccc.afis.osd.mil/images/sres.pl?Lbox_cap=356243&dir=Photo&vn=&ttl=010911-M-41221-021&ref=defenselink]

[photo: http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Sep2001/n09112001_200109114.html]

These first elements are not exactly verisimilar, but the rest of the official version is straight-out impossible.

If one superimposes the shape of the airplane onto the satellite photo, one notes that only the nose of the Boeing entered into the building. The fuselage and the wings remained on the outside.

[photo: <http://www.defenselink.mil/photos/Sep2001/010914-F-8006R-006.html>]

The airplane stopped cleanly, with its wings not touching the façade. No trace of impact is visible outside of that of the Boeing's nose.

We should therefore see the wings and the fuselage on the outside, in fact on the lawn. If the nose of the airplane is made of a composite alloy susceptible to melting quickly and if the wings—which contain the fuel—can burn, the fuselage of the Boeing is made of a matter comparable to the body of a car or a truck. Upon the outbreak of a fire, it would necessarily leave a wreckage burnt to ashes. If you take a look at the AP photograph (on the cover), you'll remark manifestly that there's no airplane. The snapshot was

nevertheless taken in the first minutes: fire trucks have arrived, but the firefighters haven't deployed yet, and the upper floors have not yet collapsed.

At the 12 September press conference, the Arlington County fire chief, Ed Plaughter, stated that his men were used to combat the spread of the fire within the Pentagon, but that they had been kept away from the exact site of the crash. Only the special (Urban Search & Rescue) FEMA teams had contact with the airplane.

Then a surrealistic dialogue was established:

Journalist: "What did the aircraft consist of?"

Chief Plaughter: "In the first place, the question about the airplane, there are some fragments of the airplane that one could see in the interior during the firefighting operations which I was talking about, but it wasn't a matter of lots of debris. In other words, there aren't pieces of fuselage or anything like that."

Journalist: "Chief, there are small bits of the aircraft spread out all over, even on the highway—miniscule fragments. Would you say that the aircraft exploded, literally exploded, at the moment of impact because of the fuel, or Ö"

Plaughter: "You know, I'd prefer not to express myself on that subject. We have numerous eyewitnesses who are able to inform you better as far as what happened to the airplane during its approach. So, we just don't know. Me, I don't know."

Journalist: "Where is the airplane's fuel?"

Plaughter: "We have what we believe to be a puddle just at the spot where we believe the nose of the airplane to be."

[This is my translation of Meyssan's translation; for a transcript, see http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Sep2001/t09122001_t0912asd.html]

Thus, although military and congressional officials claim to have seen the machine crash, no one saw the least bit of airplane wreckage, not even the landing gear: some non-identifiable fragments of metal is all there is. As for the video-surveillance cameras in the Pentagon parking lot, they didn't see the Boeing either, at any moment and from any angle.

Let's recapitulate the official version: a hijacked Boeing had shaken off F-16s sent to pursue it, and had slipped through Washington's air-defense system. It had landed vertically on the Pentagon parking lot, although remaining horizontal. It had crashed into the front of the building on the ground floor. Only its nose penetrated the building and it had stopped just before its wings went in. The fuselage was immediately disintegrated. The fuel, contained in the wings, burned just long enough to start a fire in the building, then transformed itself into a puddle which was shifted to the supposed site of the airplane's nose.

Notwithstanding the respect one owes to the high quality of the "eyewitnesses" (officers and congressmen), it's impossible to swallow such twaddle. Far from lending credence to

their depositions, the calibre of these witnesses only manages to underline the importance of the means the US Army went to to make a travesty out of the truth.

For all that, this zany fable has been built progressively, one lie leading to another. If you go back and check out the initial communique from the Pentagon, cited at the beginning of this chapter, you'll find that there was no question of a Boeing. The "kamikaze airplane" theory didn't appear until half an hour later. The same way there was no question of fighter planes trying to intercept the phantom airplane before the interview with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. It isn't until two days later that NORAD invented the wandering F-16s.

The official version is nothing but propaganda. What remains is that 125 people died at the Pentagon and that an airplane carrying 64 passengers has disappeared. What caused the explosion that hit the Pentagon? What has become of American Airlines Flight 77? Are its passengers dead? If so, who killed them, and why? If not, where are they? So many questions here which the the American administration must respond to

Above all, let's ask ourselves what it is that the official version tends to overshadow. Questioned on CNN the day after the attack, Gen. Wesley Clark, former supreme commander of NATO forces during the Kosovo war, declared: "We had been informed some time ago that certain groups were planning [an attack on the Pentagon], evidently we didn't know enough about it [to react]." This enigmatic affirmation makes no reference to any foreign aggressor, but to threats made by far-right militias against the Pentagon. It lets us catch a glimpse of the secret clashes which are tearing apart the USA's ruling class.

CNN interviewed Hosni Mubarak on 15 September. At that time, the Egyptian president didn't have the same information at his disposal that we had. He was unaware of what a detailed analysis of the attack teaches us. On the other hand, he was in possession of secret intelligence about the preparation of the attack which he had sent several weeks beforehand to the US government.

Mubarak: Precautions we take on the ground, people may hijack planes, do this.. do that, but we couldn't think not any intelligence in the world could have the capability in the world to say they are going to use commercial planes with passengers on board to crash the towers to crash the pentagon, those who did that should have flown in the area a long time, for example. The Pentagon is not very high, a pilot could come straight to the Pentagon like this to hit, he should have flown a lot in this area to know the obstacles which could meet him when he is flying very low with a big commercial plane to hit the Pentagon in a special place.

Somebody has studied this very well, someone has flown in this area very much.

Q: Are you suggesting it was an inside operation, I may ask, who do you think is behind this?

Mubarak: Frankly speaking I don't want to jump to conclusions, you in the United

States when you catch somebody, some rumors about somebody, you say "Oh no, it is not Egyptian, it is Saudi, it is Emirates...all this is inside any house of an Arab, the people say the Arabs are participating...you cannot fortell, it is better to wait."

You remember Oklahoma..there came rumors immediatly that the Arabs did it, and it was not Arabs, who knows..let us wait and see what is the result of the investiagaions, because something like this done in the United States is not an easy thing for some pilots who had been training in Florida, so many pilots go and train just to fly and have a license, that means you are capable to do such terroristic action. I am speaking as a former piolt, I know that very well, I flew very heavy planes, I flew fighters, I know that very well, this is not an easy thing, so I think we should not jump to conclusions from now.

[Cut & pasted from Egyptian government website

http://www.presidency.gov.eg/html/14-Sept2001_press_2.html -- all errors sic]

If the Bush administration falsified the attack on the Pentagon to cover up some internal problems, didn't it also hide certain elements of the attacks which took place at the WTC?

[END OF CHAPTER ONE]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 2: Accomplices on the Ground

Let's recall the presentation that we were given of the New York attacks. At 8:50 am, Tuesday 11 September 2001, the all-news TV channel CNN interrupts its programming to announce that a passenger aircraft has crashed into the North Tower of the WTC. As they don't have any pictures of the catastrophe, the network puts on the screen a fixed shot of the rooftops of New York City which allows one to see the wisps of smoke escaping from the Tower.

At first, it seems we're looking at a spectacular airplane accident. The American airlines, who are on the verge of bankruptcy, maintain their fleet of aircraft more and more poorly. Air-traffic controllers offer a none-too-reliable service. Generalized deregulation leads to the anarchic oversight of corporate agglomerations... What was bound to happen, therefore, has finally come to pass.

Nevertheless, one can't rule out, as CNN is quick to suggest, that this crash might not be accidental. We'd thus be talking about an act of terrorism. We remember that on 26 February 1993, a truck bomb had blown up on the second sublevel of the WTC parking garage, killing six people and injuring 1000 others. The attack had been attributed to an Islamist organization run, out of New York City itself, by Sheikh Omar Abdul Rahman. For the CNN commentators, if this crash is an attack, then it's probably the work of another Islamist, the Saudi former billionaire Osama bin Laden. In a fatwa dated 23 August 1996, this financier, having taken refuge in Afghanistan, called for a holy war against the USA and Israel. The attacks which took place on 7 August 1998 against the US embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, are attributed to him. In several years, he has become US "Public Enemy Number One." The FBI has put a \$5 million price on his head. The UN Security Council has asked the Taliban government to extradite him. Since 5 February 2001, the US has been in the process of trying him in absentia in New York.

One after another, the American TV networks set up direct links with New York. At 9:03 am, a second passenger aircraft strikes the South Tower of the WTC. The crash comes along right while numerous channels are broadcasting images of the North Tower burning. It is therefore filmed from various angles and watched live by millions of TV viewers. Judging by the evidence, the US is going to have to face terrorist acts on its own soil. Fearing carbomb attacks, the New York Port Authority closes down all bridges and tunnels to the borough of Manhattan (see, they fear the action of ground commandos!). At 9:40 am, the New York City police informs the population that new airplanes could hit other towers. At 10:00 am, while news of another attack on the Pentagon is being announced, the South Tower of the WTC collapses live on the TV screens, then at 10:29, it's the North Tower that collapses. A cloud of dust envelops Manhattan. They speak of a possible loss of several tens of thousands of dead. The burning airplanes had emitted such an intense heat that the metallic structures of the buildings couldn't stand up to it.

The governor of New York, George Pataki, closes all the official state offices and calls in the National Guard. "I have friends in those towers, I am thinking of them, of their

families, and we're trying hard to support all those who have been touched by this tragedy," he confesses. At 11:02, the mayor of New York, Rudolph Giuliani, speaking by phone from New York One, addresses the residents of New York: "Those who are not in Manhattan at the moment, stay at home or at your office. If you are in the financial district, walk calmly to the north, outside the attack zone, so as not to interfere with rescue efforts. We must save as many people as possible." A dense crowd of several tens of thousands of people crosses the bridges (already closed to motor traffic) to get out of Manhattan.

At 5:20 pm, the tower of Building 7 of the WTC, which wasn't hit by the airplanes, collapses without injuring anyone. The New York emergency services think that the building was damaged by the collapse of the two before it. By a sort of domino effect, other neighboring buildings are susceptible to falling down themselves. The New York mayor's office orders 30,000 body bags.

In the afternoon, and the following days, the scenario of the attack is pieced together: Islamic zealots, from the bin Laden network, organized into teams of five and armed with boxcutters, hijacked passenger planes. Fanatics, they sacrificed themselves, driving their kamikaze airplanes into the towers.

At first sight, the facts are indisputable. Nevertheless, the more one enters into the details, the more contradictions appear.

The two airplanes were identified by the FBI as Boeing 767s, the first belonging to American Airlines (Flight 11, Boston-LAX) and the second to United Airlines (Flight 175, Boston-LAX). The companies recognized having lost these planes.

Thanks to passengers who, armed with cellphones, telephoned their relatives during the operation, we know that the hijackers gathered all the passengers in the rear of the airplane, as is classically done to isolate the cockpit. Their action was made easier by the small number of passengers: 81 on Flight 11, and 56 on Flight 175, [for a total of 137] out of 239 seats, were occupied.

According to the information revealed by telephone by the passengers, the hijackers were carrying only bladed weapons [Except for Flight 93, which exploded [sic] above Pennsylvania. The passengers there indicated that the pirates had at their disposal a box which they said was a bomb.]. After American airspace had been closed, all airborne flights landed and were searched by the FBI. In two of them, Flight 43 (Newark-LAX) and Flight 1729 (Newark-San Francisco), identical boxcutters were discovered hidden under seats. Investigators concluded that all the hijackers were using this type of boxcutter. Later on, the CIA discovered bags of boxcutters in a house where Osama bin Laden had stayed in Afghanistan, which attests that the Islamic zealots had been trained in their use.

It is nevertheless difficult to conceive that the commandant of the attacks had neglected to furnish his men with firearms, taking the risk of seeing his operation fail, partially or totally. It's even more surprising when you consider that it's easier to get certain pistols

[Synthetic pistols are not detectable by airport metal detectors. See, for example, <http://www.glock.com>] through airport security than it is to get boxcutters through.

Why ask such questions? In the collective imagination, it's well known that Arabs, thus these Islamic fanatics, love to cut their victims' throats. The boxcutters allow one to induce that the air pirates were all Arabs, Q.E.D.

Before arriving at New York, the airplanes had to lose a considerable amount of altitude, enough so that the pilots could see the towers straight ahead of them, not below them. Seen from above, a city looks like a map, and all our visual points of reference disappear. In order to hit the towers, they had to be pre-positioned at very low altitude.

The pilots had not only to regulate the altitude of the crash, but also to position the aircraft laterally. The Twin Towers are 63.70 meters [209 feet] wide. The wingspan of a Boeing 767 is 47.60 meters [156 feet]. One observes in the videos that the aircraft struck precisely in the center of the targets. A simple displacement of 55.65 meters [182 feet] and the airplanes would have missed. At average speed (700 kph [435 mph]), this distance is covered in three-tenths of a second. Given the poor maneuverability of these machines, this would be a tour de force for seasoned pilots, even more so for apprentice pilots.

The first airplane arrived perfectly straight-on, in relation to the wind direction, which made stabilization easier. But the second one was obliged to execute a complex maneuver of rotation, particularly difficult into the wind. Nevertheless, it too struck its tower at just the right altitude, and dead-center.

Professional pilots assert that few of them are capable of envisioning such an operation, and they strictly rule it out for amateurs [et l'excluent formellement pour des pilotes amateurs]. On the other hand, there's an infallible way to achieve this end: using beacons. A signal, emitted from the target, attracts the airplane, which is automatically guided. Now, the existence of a beacon in the WTC has been attested to by radio amateurs who have made note of its signal. It has been detected because it interfered with emissions of TV antennas placed atop the towers. It is probable that the signal was activated at the last moment to avoid its being discovered and destroyed. It is possible that the hijackers had used two beacons, for a single one would have made the affair difficult in spite of the alignment of the targets. In any manner, they would have had to have accomplices on the ground. And if they had had them, it wouldn't have been necessary to deploy a lot of hijackers on board the airplanes. A small team would have been enough to put the aircraft on autopilot. It wasn't, furthermore, necessary at all to have hijackers on board, because there were no hostages to take: hacking into the on-board computers before takeoff, it's possible to take control of an airplane in flight thanks to Global Hawk technology, put into place by the DOD. The Boeing would thus become teleguided, like a drone—an unpiloted airplane.

Subsequently, the Twin Towers collapsed in on themselves. An investigative committee was commissioned by FEMA and carried out by the ASCE (American Society of Civil Engineers) [Une commission d'enquête a ÉtÈ confiÈe par la FEMA Ö ‡ la ASCE]. According to the preliminary report, the burning of airplane fuel had emitted a great heat

which had weakened the central metallic structure. This theory is vigorously rejected by the NYFD and by the professional journal Fire Engineering [Selling Out the Investigation, by Bill Manning, Fire Engineering, January 2002. See also WTC Investigation? A Call to Action (petition published in the same issue of the journal)] which, supported by calculations, maintain that the structures could stand up to fire for a long time. The firefighters assert that they heard explosions at the base of the buildings, and they call for opening an independent investigation. [For example, witness account of firefighter Louie Cacchioli (Brigade 47) <http://people.aol.com/people/special/0,11859,174592-3,00.html>] They ask questions about substances which were stocked in the buildings and, in the absence of answers, about criminal explosions implicating a team on the ground. A famous expert of the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Van Romero, assured that the collapse could not have been caused by anything but explosives [Explosives Planted in Towers, NM Tech Expert Says by Olivier Uyttebrouck, in Albuquerque Journal of 11 September 2001. Retracted in Fire, Not Extra Explosives, Doomed Buildings, Expert Says by John Fleck, in Albuquerque Journal of 21 September 2001 <http://www.abqjournal.com>]. He retracts his statements in the face of public pressure.

In any event, the airplane crashes do not explain the collapse of a third building, Tower 7. The hypothesis of a destabilization of the foundations was dismissed by the ASCE: in effect, Tower 7 didn't lean over, but collapsed in on itself. The question isn't Was the building dynamited? but rather What other hypothesis could you formulate?

Here's where a New York Times scoop [Secret CIA Site in New York Was Destroyed on Sept. 11, by James Risen, The New York Times, 4 November 2001, <http://www.nytimes.com>] comes in. The WTC, which was believed to be a civilian target, was actually hiding a secret military target. Perhaps thousands of people perished because they were serving, without knowing it, as human shields. Tower 7—but perhaps also other buildings and the underground areas—were hiding a CIA base [We have made the acquaintance of several witnesses according to whom the CIA base was located on the 9th and 10th floors of Tower 7. As a cover, they used the New York Electronic Crime Task Force attached to the Secret Service. The same sources have managed to get photographs of Tower 7 to us, taken after the collapse of the South Tower, in which one can neatly discern a fire on the 9th floor http://members.aol.com/erichuf/eh_wtc16.jpg. We have not been in a position to verify the authenticity of the photographs or the truthfulness of the information.] [The last link no longer works]. In the 1950s it was a simple office spying on foreign UN delegations; under Bill Clinton, this base had illegally extended its activities into Manhattan economic espionage. The principal resources of the American intelligence apparatus had been shifted from anti-Soviet espionage to economic warfare. The New York CIA base had become the most important world center of economic intelligence. This reorientation of intelligence was hotly contested by the most traditional branch of the CIA and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In retrospect, we can wonder whether the target of the attack on the WTC of 26 February 1993 (six dead, a thousand injured) wasn't this secret CIA station, albeit much less developed at the time.

Knowing that at the time of the first crash, 30,000 to 40,000 people were in the Twin

Towers, and that each tower has 110 floors, there would be an average of at least 136 people per floor. The first Boeing hit the North Tower between the 80th and 85th floors. The occupants of these levels perished immediately, whether it be from the effect of the shock or from the fire which followed. The people situated in the upper floors found themselves trapped, the fire climbing. Some preferred to throw themselves into the void rather than succumb to the flames. When all is said and done, the structure collapsed. All the people situated in the upper thirty floors therefore died. According to the law of averages, there must have been at least 4080.

Now, according to the official death toll of 9 February 2002, the two New York attacks caused a total of 2843 deaths (total number, including the passengers and crew of the Boeings, the police officers and firefighters who perished in the towers' collapse, and the towers' tenants) [The final death toll of WTC victims is 2,843, AP report of 9 February 2002. This figure is that released by the City of New York. As for the press agency itself, they came up with a lesser figure of 2,799 dead]. This death toll is much less than initial estimations and leaves one to think that, appearances to the contrary, the attacks were not aimed at provoking human losses at the maximum scale. To the contrary, there must have been some preliminary intervention, so that numerous people, at least those whose workplaces were on the upper floors, were absent from their offices at the stated time.

Thus, the Israeli daily Haaretz revealed that Odigo, a leading electronic-messaging firm, received anonymous warning messages informing them of the New York attacks, two hours before they happened. The facts were confirmed by Misha Macover, head of the firm [Haaretz, 26 September 2001, <http://www.haaretzdaily.com/>. Information taken up by Daniel Seberg on CNN: FBI Probing "Threating" [sic] Message, Firm Says (28 September) <http://www.cnn.com/> See also Instant Messages to Israel Warned of WTC Attack by Brian McWilliams, in Newsbytes 27 September, and Odigo Clarifies Attack Messages by the same author in the next day's edition <http://www.newsbytes.com/> This information was circulated, in a deformed fashion, by an Al-Jazeera commentator, who tried to use it to bolster an argument that the attacks were carried out by the Mossad, who had preliminarily warned Jewish WTC employees. The Qatari network immediately labelled the journalist a storyteller.]. All sorts of warnings could have been addressed to occupants of the North Tower, even if all of them probably weren't taken seriously in the same fashion.

Here one recognizes a schema comparable to that of the attack carried out at Oklahoma City on 19 April 1995. That day, a large group of functionaries who worked in the Murrah Federal Building had been given the morning off, so many so that the carbomb explosion killed only 168 people. An attack which we know today had been carried out by military personnel belonging to an extreme-right organization, which had itself been infiltrated by the FBI [A Force Upon The Plain: The American Militia Movement and the Politics of Hate by Kenneth Stern, Simon & Schuster, 1996. See also the first part of The Secret Life of Bill Clinton: the Unreported Stories by Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, Regnery Publishing [sic], 1997].

In Oklahoma City, the FBI had thus permitted an attack to be committed, an attack of which they had been informed, although they did limit its impact.

Now let's listen to this strange confession of President George W. Bush. This was during a meeting at Orlando, 4 December:

Q One thing, Mr. President, is that you have no idea how much you've done for this country. And another thing is that, how did you feel when you heard about the terrorist attack? (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Jordan. Well, Jordan, you're not going to believe what state I was in when I heard about the terrorist attack. I was in Florida. And my Chief of Staff, Andy Card -- actually, I was in a classroom talking about a reading program that works. I was sitting outside the classroom waiting to go in, and I saw an airplane hit the tower -- the TV was obviously on. And I used to fly, myself, and I said, well, there's one terrible pilot. I said, it must have been a horrible accident.

But I was whisked off there, I didn't have much time to think about it. And I was sitting in the classroom, and Andy Card, my Chief of Staff, who is sitting over here, walked in and said, "A second plane has hit the tower, America is under attack."

And, Jordan, I wasn't sure what to think at first. You know, I grew up in a period of time where the idea of America being under attack never entered my mind -- just like your Daddy's and Mother's mind probably. And I started thinking hard in that very brief period of time about what it meant to be under attack. I knew that when I got all of the facts that we were under attack, there would be hell to pay for attacking America. (Applause.)

[Cut & pasted from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/12/print/20011204-17.html>]

Therefore, according to his own declaration, the president of the United States saw images of the first crash before the second one had taken place. These images cannot be those taken by chance by Jules and G d on Naudet. Indeed, the Naudet brothers stayed at the WTC taking film all day long, and their video wasn't released until thirteen hours later, by the Gamma agency. So we're talking about secret images which were transmitted to him [Bush], without delay, into the security-communications room which had been set up in the elementary school in preparation for his visit. But if the US intelligence services were able to film the first attack, then they had been informed of it beforehand. And in that case, why didn't they do anything to save their compatriots?

Let's go back over our information: the terrorists had at their disposal logistical support from ground teams. They activated one or two beacons, warned some of the occupants of the towers so as to limit the human catastrophe, and dynamited three buildings. All of this under the gaze of intelligence services who were as attentive as they were passive.

Could an operation like this have been thought up and directed in an Afghani cave, and carried out by a handful of Islamic zealots?

[END OF CHAPTER TWO]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."]

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 3: Moles in the White House

Let's go back over the official version of that terrible day. As a response to the two attacks taking place in New York, the FBI director, Robert Mueller III, activates the CONPLAN [The United States Government Interagency Domestic Terrorism Concept of Operation Plan (CONPLAN), downloadable from <http://www.fbi.gov/publications/conplan/conplan.pdf>]: all government agencies are informed of the catastrophe and requested to put themselves at the disposition of the Strategic Information and Operations Center (SIOC) of the FBI and the Catastrophic Disaster Response Group (CDRG) of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Major public gathering places, susceptible to terrorist attack, are evacuated and closed off.

Suddenly, at around 10:00 am, the Secret Service (that is, the Service charged with protecting high-level individuals) gives a new type of warning: the White House and Air Force One are in danger. Vice-President Cheney is removed to the PEOC (Presidential Emergency Operations Center), the underground command facility located beneath the West Wing of the White House. The Continuity of Government (CoG) plan is put into effect. The country's top political leaders, government members and Congressmen, are taken away to safe places. Marine helicopters take them off to two gigantic nuclear-disaster shelters: High Point Special Facility (Mount Weather, Va.) and the Alternate Joint Communication Center, known as "Site R" (Raven Rock Mountain, near Camp David); veritable underground cities, vestiges of the Cold War, designed to accommodate thousands of people.

For his part, George W. Bush, who is en route to Washington, changes course. The Presidential airplane, Air Force One, lands at Barksdale AFB (Louisiana), then at Offutt AFB (Nebraska). The latter is the headquarters of the US Strategic Command, that is, the {home base from} where the nuclear defense system is controlled. Between the two bases, the presidential airplane keeps at low altitude, steering a zigzag course, with fighter escorts. At the bases, the president travels across the tarmac in armored vehicles so as to avoid sniper fire.

This plan of protecting high-level personnel remains in effect until after 6:00 pm, when George W. Bush gets back on board Air Force One to return to Washington.

Speaking with Tim Russert on "Meet the Press" [Full interview text available at <http://stacks.msnbc.com/news/629714.asp>] on 16 September, Vice-President Cheney describes the alert issued by the Secret Service and the nature of the danger (cf. Appendix).

According to his own testimony, the vice-president had been suddenly informed by his security officers that he was in danger, and he had been forcibly evacuated into the White House bunker. A hijacked Boeing, which would have to prove to be Flight 77, wheeled around above Washington. Not finding the White House landmarks, it's going to crash

into the Pentagon instead. While all government officials and Congressmen are being evacuated, the Secret Service is informed of another threat against Air Force One. A new hijacked plane is threatening to go and engage the presidential aircraft in air combat.

Once again, the official version does not stand up to analysis.

The vice-president's testimony is intended to identify the threat: suicide airplanes heading for the White House and Air Force One. He too takes up the lie spelled out in our first chapter: the story of Flight 77 crashing into the Pentagon. He even fixes it up some, picturing the suicide plane spinning around in the skies above Washington, searching for a target. It's nevertheless a struggle to admit that the Secret Service, instead of activating the air-defense system, can only think to stick the vice-president down in a bunker. More distressing, Cheney invents a new passenger plane chasing Air Force One like some outlaw out of a Western movie, looking to crash into the president in midair beneath the helpless gaze of the US Air Force.

Despite these non-verisimilitudes, this fable does not sufficiently explain everyone's behavior. Indeed, if the threat boils down to suicide planes, then why shield the president from eventual sniper fire, even on the very tarmac of strategic military bases? How can we believe that Islamic terrorists could have positioned themselves in such well-protected areas?

Dick Cheney's testimony, overall, is intended to make us forget the White House press secretary Ari Fleischer's declarations and the confidential statements of White House Senior Adviser Karl Rove [see notably *The Options* by Nicholas Lemann, in the *New Yorker* of 25 September 2001 <http://www.newyorker.com>]. Their information leads one to ask oneself about eventual interior trails, whereas war propaganda only wants to see outside enemies.

On 12 and 13 September, the press [For example: *White House Said Targeted* by Sandra Sobieraj, in the *Washington Post* of 12 September 2001, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/>; and *Inside the Bunker* in the *New York Times* of 13 September 2001, <http://www.nytimes.com>] asserts that, according to the White House spokesman (Ari Fleischer), the Secret Service had received a message from the assailants indicating that they were intending to destroy the White House and Air Force One. More surprising, according to the *New York Times*, the assailants had authenticated their call by using Presidential ID and transmission codes. And even more stunning, according to *WorldNetDaily* [*Digital Moles in White House? Terrorists Had Top-Secret Presidential Codes*, in *WorldNetDaily*, 20 September 2001 <http://www.worldnetdaily.com>], the assailants had, in addition, been in possession of codes belonging to the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), Air Force Intelligence (AFI), Army Intelligence (AI), Naval Intelligence (NI), Marine Corps Intelligence (MCI), and State Department and Department of Energy information services. Each of these codes is only held by a very small number of officials. No one is entitled to possess several of these. Also, to admit that the assailants possessed them presupposes either that there exists a means of cracking them, or that moles have

infiltrated each of these intelligence services. Technically, it does seem possible to recreate the American agencies' codes by using the computer system that created them, Promis. Now, these computer algorithms had been stolen by FBI Special Agent Robert Hansen, who was arrested for espionage in February 2001 [Bin Laden's Magic Carpet—Secret US Promis Software by Michael C. Ruppert, in *From the Wilderness* of 20 November 2001 <http://www.copvCIA.com>]. {As for} former CIA director James Woolsey, the codes would instead have been obtained by moles. And Woolsey, who today lobbies for the anti-Saddam Hussein cause, {has maintained} that that operation is the handiwork of the dangerous Iraqi secret services. A third hypothesis would be that the Secret Service was infiltrated and let itself be brainwashed: the assailants would never have had possession of the codes, but—thanks to complicities—they would have succeeded in making them believe they did.

Be that as it may, the secret-code affair reveals that there exist one or more traitors at the highest level of the American state apparatus. They're the ones who are liable to post snipers to attack the president even on the interior of strategic USAF air bases. And it's to protect himself from their traps that President Bush uses armored vehicles on the tarmac at Barksdale and Offutt.

Another aspect of this affair is that it reveals the existence of a parallel negotiation. If the assailants got in contact with the Secret Service and used secret codes to authenticate their call, they had a specific goal in mind. Their message contained either a demand or an ultimatum. From then on, if you admit that the threat had dissipated by the end of the day, the only conclusion you can draw is that President Bush negotiated with them and gave in to blackmail.

Having at their disposal the authentication and transmission codes for the White House and Air Force One, the assailants could usurp the position of the president of the United States. They could, as they pleased, give instructions to armies, including ordering a nuclear attack. The only way that could allow President Bush to continue commanding his armies was for him to physically put himself at the headquarters of the US Strategic Command at Offutt, and from there to issue or retract all orders personally. That's why he went there himself, in the flesh. To go there directly proved impossible, because of fuel. Air Force One, which isn't designed to fly at low altitude, had used up all its reserves, and it couldn't be refueled in the air without exposing itself to danger. A stopover was thus scheduled at Barksdale, one of Offutt's five alternate sites.

The secret-code affair isn't the only element of the official version to have disappeared. Another fact, duly noted, was forgotten. At 9:42 am on 11 September, ABC broadcast live footage of a fire at the White House annex, the Old Executive Building. The TV channel contented itself with showing a fixed shot of the building with curls of smoke escaping. No information filtered through about the blaze, nor about its exact magnitude. No one had the presumptuousness to attribute the fire to a kamikaze plane. 15 minutes later, the Secret Service took Dick Cheney out of his office and ordered the evacuation of the White House and its annex. Sharpshooters were deployed in the vicinity of the presidential residence, armed with rocket-launchers and capable of staving off an assault by paratroopers. In short, they had to prepare themselves for a threat whose nature was quite different from that described later by Vice-President Cheney.

Now let's re-read the text of President Bush's address, taken down at Barksdale and released with changes by the Pentagon at 1:04 pm:

THE PRESIDENT: I want to reassure the American people that the full resources of the federal government are working to assist local authorities to save lives and to help the victims of these attacks. Make no mistake: The United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these cowardly acts.

I've been in regular contact with the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, the national security team and my Cabinet. We have taken all appropriate security precautions to protect the American people. Our military at home and around the world is on high alert status, and we have taken the necessary security precautions to continue the functions of your government.

We have been in touch with the leaders of Congress and with world leaders to assure them that we will do whatever is necessary to protect America and Americans.

I ask the American people to join me in saying a thanks for all the folks who have been fighting hard to rescue our fellow citizens and to join me in saying a prayer for the victims and their families.

The resolve of our great nation is being tested. But make no mistake: We will show the world that we will pass this test. God bless.

[Cut and pasted from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-1.html>]

What hits you about this short speech is that the president carefully avoids naming the assailants. He no longer uses the words "terrorism" or "terrorist." He lets it be understood that we might be talking about the beginning of a classical military conflict, or just about anything else. He evokes a "test of our resolve" which will be passed, seeming to announce still more catastrophe. Most surprisingly, he doesn't offer any explanation at all of his absence from Washington, giving the impression that he ran away from the danger to which his fellow citizens remained exposed.

Ari Fleischer, the White House spokesman, gave two press briefings improvised aboard Air Force One during its long wandering. With the same meticulous care as President Bush, he too avoided the words "terrorism" and "terrorist."

In such a context, one can interpret the activation of the Continuity of Government (CoG) procedure in two different ways. The simplest explanation is to consider that the president and political leaders had to be protected from traitors who were liable to start a fire in the Old Executive Building and to steal the secret codes from the president and intelligence services.

One can also consider that, inversely, the CoG plan wasn't put into action in order to protect political leaders from traitors, but rather by the traitors themselves in order to isolate them. Indeed, Vice-President Cheney's testimony is strange. He maintains that Secret Service men took him out of his office and conducted him to the White House

bunker without waiting to see if he agreed. He lets it be understood that it was the same way with other government members and congressmen. And what is an operation where secret services carry off democratically-elected officials and assign them to bunkers "for their safety," if not a coup d'État, or at least a palace coup?

Let's go back over the available elements: a fire is announced in the White House annex. Responsibility for the attacks has been claimed [Les attentats ont ÈtÈ revendiquÈs] during a phone call to the Secret Service. The assailants have put forth demands, nay, an ultimatum, and authenticated their communication by using the presidential transmission and authentication codes. The Secret Service set into motion the CoG procedure and put the principal political directors under cover. President Bush negotiated in the afternoon and calm returned in the evening.

The attacks therefore were not commissioned by some fanatic who thought he was carrying out a divine punishment, but by a group deep within the apparatus of the American state, a group who succeeded in dictating policy to President Bush. Instead of a coup d'État aiming to overthrow governmental institutions, isn't this about a power grab by a particular group hidden within the breast of those institutions?

[END OF CHAPTER THREE]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 4: The FBI Gesticulates

With this mind-boggling sense of organization which reflects glory onto the USA, the FBI, during the day of 11 September, launched the vastest criminal investigation in human history: PENTTBOMB [sic] (a contraction of Pentagon/Twin Towers Bomb). It required one-fourth of its personnel, mobilizing 7000 employees, 4000 of them agents. It added detached personnel from other DOJ agencies to its own resources [A ses moyens propres, il a ajoutÈ ceux qui ont ÈtÈ dÈtachÈs par d'autres agences du dÈpartement de la Justice]: the Criminal Division, attorneys' offices, the INS. Besides which, the FBI relied on the "US intelligence community," particularly the CIA, the NSA, and the DIA. Finally, the FBI was given international police cooperation from overseas, whether by Interpol, or directly, by bilateral cooperation with the police forces of allied states.

To gather evidence, the FBI called for [witness] testimony starting the evening of the attacks. Over the course of the first three days, they received 3800 phone calls, 30,000 emails, and 2400 notifications from its intelligence agents.

The day after the attacks, the FBI had already managed to establish the terrorists' modus operandi [Briefing by Atty General Ashcroft, 12 September 2001, <http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/speeches/2001/0913pressconference.htm>]. Agents of the bin Laden network had entered US territory legally. There they had taken accelerated flight-school lessons. Formed into four teams of five kamikazes each, they had hijacked passenger airplanes, their mission being to crash into major targets. On 14 September, the FBI published a list naming the 19 alleged hijackers [Press conference of Atty General Ashcroft and FBI Director Mueller, 14 September 2001, http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/agcrisisremarks9_14.htm].

Over the course of the following weeks, the international press pieced together the story of the kamikazes' lives. It came out that [Elle a mis en Èvidence que] nothing had allowed their friends and neighbors to suspect their intentions, nor had Western police been able to spot them. Lost in the crowds, carefully avoiding any unveiling of their convictions, these "sleeper agents" wouldn't be "awakened" until the day of their mission was at hand. Other "sleeper agents," cloaked in the shadows, would probably be waiting for their turn. An undetectable menace hovered above Western civilization.

By a methodological approach [Sur le plan mÈthodologique], here's a visibly botched-up investigation. In a criminal proceeding, and dealing with complex matters, police officers would have had to construct many hypotheses, and follow each trail to its end, without leaving any out. The hypothesis of internal terrorism was thrown out on general principles, without ever having been looked into. In its stead, Osama bin Laden had already been pointed out by "sources close to the investigation" a few hours after the attacks. Public opinion wanted some guilty parties, and they picked some out forthwith.

In each of the four hijacked airplanes, the terrorists had been organized into five-man

teams, brought together at the last moment. However, there were only four terrorists on board Flight 93, which exploded [sic] above Pennsylvania: the fifth member of the commando team, Zacharias Moussaoui, had been apprehended a short time before for overstaying his visa. First off, the FBI asserted that all the hijackers had come together to sacrifice themselves. Second off, after a tape of Osama bin Laden was discovered, they claimed that only the pilot-hijackers were kamikazes, whereas their teammates hadn't been told until the last minute about the suicidal aspect of their mission. Be that as it may, the idea of kamikaze teams is a surprising one. Indeed, a suicide's psychology is eminently individual. During the Second World War, the Japanese kamikazes acted individually, even if their actions could be carried out in waves. More recently, members of the Japanese Red Army (Rengo sekikun), who exported that technique to the Middle East in their attack on Lod [Airport] (Israel, May 1972), acting in a group of three, but after having had special training to bond together. And even so, one of the Lod terrorists, Kozo Okamoto, was captured alive. We don't know of any example of kamikaze teams formed at the last minute.

Besides, as Salman Rushdie [Fighting the Forces of Invisibility in the Washington Post, 2 October 2001, <http://www.washingtonpost.com>] was moved to point out, you can maintain that if the hijackers were indeed kamikazes, then they were not Islamic fanatics. Indeed, the Quran forbids suicide. Islamic zealots could be exposed to death, as martyrs, with no chance of escape, but they would not deal themselves the fatal stroke [ils ne seraient pas eux-mêmes donnés la mort].

Nevertheless, the kamikaze theory is confirmed by manuscript documents written in Arabic which the FBI [Briefing of Atty General Ashcroft and FBI Director Mueller, 28 September 2001, http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/agcrisisremarks9_28.htm] published, translated into English, and which were reprinted in the international press. Three copies had been found: one in a lost suitcase which missed a connecting flight, belonging to Mohammed Atta; the second in a car left behind at Dulles Airport by Nawaf Alhamzi; and the third in the wreckage of Flight 93 which exploded [sic] above Stony Creek Township, Pa. [Several European newspapers erroneously reported that the FBI had found this document in the ruins of the Pentagon.]

It's a matter of four pages of pious advice:

"1. Take the vow of death and renew your intention. Shave your body and use some eau de cologne. Take a shower.

Make sure you're well-versed in all details of the plan, and wait for the counterstrike, for the enemy's reaction.

Read At-Tawba and Anfal [martial surahs of the Quran], think about what they mean, and think about all the things God has promised His martyrs."

Etc.

Couched in a classic theological style, frequently tinged with medieval references, these documents contributed greatly to sustaining the image of fanatics which American authorities had exposed to public condemnation. However, there are crude errors, the

incongruity of which any person familiar with Islam would remark. Indeed, the documents begin with the exhortation "In the name of God, myself, and my family [sic]," whereas Muslims—unlike many American puritan sects—never pray in the own name, nor in that of their family [Oddly, the celebrity journalist Bob Woodward pointed out this anomaly that very day, but he drew no conclusions from it. See *In Hijacker's Bags, A Call to Planning, Prayer and Death*, in the Washington Post, 28 September 2001 <http://www.washingtonpost.com>]. Likewise, the text includes {in a roundabout way} a Yankee language tic which is out of place in this Quranic vocabulary: "You have to confront it and understand it at 100% [sic]."

The FBI presents Mohammed Atta as the leader of the operation. In ten years, this 33-year-old Egyptian had traveled to Salu (Spain), then to Zurich (Switzerland)—where, according to investigators, he had of course paid with a credit card for some Swiss knives that were destined to hijack some planes—and finally to Hamburg (Germany). With two other terrorists, he had taken a course in electronics there, without attracting attention or revealing his extremist convictions. After he arrived in the United States, he had rejoined his accomplices in Florida, taking flight lessons in Venice, and he'd even paid for a few hours in a flight simulator in Miami. Careful to mask his fundamentalism, Mohammed Atta had even taken care to frequent the "Olympic Garden" in Las Vegas, the world's biggest topless cabaret. This peerless agent had gone back to Boston on 11 September on a domestic flight. Taking into account the short time between the two flights, his baggage got lost during the connection. Searching the bags, the FBI found Boeing pilot training videos, a Muslim prayerbook, and an old letter in which he stated his intention to die as a martyr. Atta was identified as the leader of the terrorist team by a flight attendant, who made a call with his cellphone during the hijacking; he gave out Atta's seat number: 8D.

Should we take information like this seriously? We'd have to suppose that Mohammed Atta had been at pains for ten years to disguise his intentions, and that he had been communicating with his accomplices by means of strict procedures so as not to tip off the intelligence services. Nevertheless, at the very last minute, he left behind a trail of evidence. Although he was the leader of the operation, he took the risk of missing his connecting flight on 11 September, and finally managed to catch American Airlines Flight 11, but without keeping his luggage. Anyways, why would you load yourself down with luggage on your way to kill yourself?

Still more ridiculous, the FBI asserts that they found Mohammed Atta's passport intact in the smoldering ruins of the World Trade Center! That's a genuine miracle; you even wonder how that document survived such an ordeal!

Evidently, the FBI produces proof of its fabrications. Maybe all we should see there is the panic-stricken reaction of a police force who proved their inability to prevent the catastrophe and who are trying by any means necessary to polish up their badges.

More disturbing, a controversy has arisen about the kamikazes' identity. The international press has discussed at length the FBI profile of the 19 alleged terrorists. All of them are males, between 25 and 35 years of age. They are Arab Muslims, mostly Saudis. They're well-educated. They're fighting for a cause, not out of desperation. The only shadow in the picture, this robotic portrait is based on a list which is subject to discussion. The

Saudi Embassy in Washington confirmed that Abdulaziz Alomari, Mohand Alshehri, Salem Alhazmi, and Saeed Alghamdi are in the very best of health, alive and well in their country. Waleed M. Alshehri, who currently lives in Morocco and is employed as a pilot for Royal Air Maroc, gave an interview to the London Arabic-language daily Al-Quds al-Arabi. Prince Saud al-Faisal, Saudi Foreign Minister, told the press: "It has been proven that five of the people listed by the FBI have nothing at all to do with what has happened." Meanwhile, Prince Nayef, Saudi Interior Minister, told an official American delegation, "Up till now, there exists no proof whatsoever that [the 15 Saudi nationals accused by the FBI] have any connection to 11 September. We have received nothing from the US on this subject." [Saudi Minister Asserts that Bin Laden is a "Tool" of Al Qaeda, Not a Mastermind by Douglas Jehl, in the Washington Post of 10 December 2001 <http://www.washingtonpost.com>]

So how were these terrorists identified? If you refer to the lists of victims, which the airlines published on 13 September, you'll be surprised not to see the names of the hijackers on them. It all looks as though the criminals were taken off the lists so as to keep only the names of the "innocent victims" and the crew members. If you count the passengers, you'll come up with 78 innocent victims on AA Flight 11 (which crashed into the North Tower of the WTC); 46 on United Flight 175 (which crashed into the South Tower); 51 on AA Flight 77 (allegedly crashed into the Pentagon); and 36 on United Flight 93 (which exploded [sic] above Pennsylvania). These lists are incomplete; several passengers were unidentified.

If you refer to the airlines' communiques [These communiques were broadcast by the AP] of 11 September, you'll note that Flight 11 was carrying 81 passengers, Flight 175 had 56 passengers, Flight 77 was carrying 58 passengers, and Flight 93, 38 passengers.

It is thus materially impossible for Flight 11 to have carried more than three terrorists, and for Flight 93 more than two. The lack of hijackers' names on the passenger manifests thus doesn't mean that they were taken off the list for "politically correct" reasons, but quite simply that they weren't there among the passengers. Bye-bye, attendant's identification of Mohammed Atta by his seat number (8D).

To sum it up, the FBI made up a list of hijackers out of which a robotic portrait of enemies of the West was drawn up. We are asked to believe that these hijackers were Arab Muslim zealots and that they acted as kamikazes. Exit the domestic American trails. In reality, we know nothing, neither the identity of the "terrorists" nor their M.O. All hypotheses are still open. As in any criminal affair, the first question to ask is Who would benefit from the crime?

It was stated precisely, the day after the attacks, that some financial transactions characteristic of "insider trading" took place during the six days before the attack [Black Tuesday: The World's Biggest Insider Trading Scam? by Don Radlauer, Int'l Policy Institute for Counterterrorism, Israel, 9 September 2001 [sic]. <http://www.ict.org.il/articles/articleDet.cfm?articleid=386>]. United Airlines (private company whose airplanes crashed into the South Tower and at Pittsburgh) stock

artificially dropped by 42%. American Airlines (private company whose airplane crashed into the North Tower of the WTC, and whose airplane would have crashed into the Pentagon) stock dropped by 39%. No other airline in the world was the subject of anything like this, except for KLM (Royal Dutch Airlines). So that we can deduce that one of the Dutch company's airplanes was maybe chosen to be the target of a fifth hijacking.

Identical activities happened with securities options of Morgan Stanley Dean Witter, which grew twelvefold during the week leading up to the attacks. Now, this company occupied 22 floors of the WTC. Likewise with the world's biggest stock trader, Merrill Lynch, whose registered office is located in a neighboring building in danger of collapsing, whose stock options grew by a factor of 25. And most of all, the stock of the implicated insurance firms: Munich Re, Swiss Re, and Axa.

The SEC in Chicago was the first to sound the alarm. They stated that in the Chicago stock market, investors made \$5 million in capital gains on United Airlines stock, \$4 million on American Airlines, \$1.2 million on Morgan Stanley Dean Witter, and \$5.5 million on Merrill Lynch.

Faced with an investigation, the investors prudently decided not to cash in \$2.5 million worth of American Airlines stock that they hadn't gotten a chance to cash in before the alarm was sounded.

Authorities at each major stock market took inventory of investors' capital gains. These investigations were coordinated by IOSCO, the International Organization of Securities Commissions [official website at <http://www.iosco.org/iosco.html>]. On 15 October, they held a video conference in which the national authorities presented the results to date of their investigations. It appeared that illicit capital gains went into hundreds of millions of dollars, constituting the "most important insider trading ever committed."

Osama bin Laden, whose financial assets have been frozen since 1998, doesn't have at his disposal the kind of money it would take for this kind of speculation. The Taliban government of the Islamic emirate of Afghanistan no longer has the financial means. Indeed, President Bill Clinton ordered that all financial holdings of bin Laden, his associates, and their associations and corporations be frozen, by Executive Order 13099, signed on the symbolic date of 7 August 1998 (the day of the reprisal for the Nairobi and Dar-es-Salaam attacks). [This is incorrect. Executive Order 13099 was signed on 20 August 1998. See <http://www.nara.gov/fedreg/eo1998.html>.] This decision was made international based on UN Security Council Resolution 1193 of 13 August 1998. Bill Clinton extended the measure to include the Taliban's bank accounts, and those of the Taliban's associates, with Executive Order 13129 of 4 July 1999. The worldwide freezing of assets of people and organizations connected with financing "international terrorism" was definitively pronounced by UN Security Council Resolution 1269, 19 October 1999. From that date forth, it became pretty silly to keep talking about "billionaire Osama bin Laden," seeing as how he no longer had any possible access to his personal fortune. The means which he still has at his disposal can no longer be the result of anything but secret assistance (whether it be state funds or no), which can no longer be assistance from the Islamic emirate of Afghanistan.

It was possible to establish that the majority of the transactions was "carried" by Deutsche Bank and its American investment partner Alex. Brown [Suspicious Profits Sit Uncollected, Airline Investors Seem to be Laying Low, by Christian Berthelsen and Scott Winokur, San Francisco Chronicle, 29 September 2001 <http://www.sfgate.com>]. That company was directed up until 1998 by a colorful personality, A.B. Krongard. A Marine captain, with a keen interest in guns and martial arts, this banker became Counselor to the Director of Central Intelligence, and then, since 26 March [2001], number three in the American intelligence service. Taking into account the importance of the investigation, and the influence of A.B. Krongard, you'd have thought that Alex. Brown would have willingly cooperated with authorities to help identify the investors. It wasn't that way at all.

Very strangely, the FBI stopped following this trail and IOSCO closed its investigation without resolving the matter. It's nevertheless easy to "trace" the movements of capital, as all interbank transactions are logged by two clearing houses [RÉvÉlation\$, by Denis Robert and Ernest Backes, Les ArÈnes ed., 2001, http://www.arenes.fr/livres/page-livre1.php?numero_livre=4&num_page=1]. You might suppose that, given the high stakes, it would have been possible to force out the bank secrets and determine who were the lucky beneficiaries of the 11 September attacks. It wasn't that way at all.

[The FBI is no longer interested in the owner of premonitory Internet domain names: according to domain-name registrar VeriSign, an unidentified computer user bought, for one year, 17 domain names which expired on 14 September 2001 and were never used. These names include: attackamerica.com, attackonamerica.com, attackontwintowers.com, august11horror.com, august11terror.com, horrorinamerica.com, horrorinnewyork.com, nycterroriststrike.com, pearlharborinmanhattan.com, terrorattack2001.com, towerofhorror.com, tradetowerstrike.com, worldtradecenter929.com, worldtradecenterbombs.com, worldtradetowerattack.com, worldtradetowerstrike.com, wterroristattack.com. See Internet Domain Names May Have Warned of Attacks and Investigators Can Access Internet Domain Data by Jeff Johnson in CNS-News.com, 19 and 20 September 2001.]

Having at its disposal an unprecedented array of investigative resources, the FBI was duty-bound to elucidate every one of the contradictions we have pointed out. They should have first of all studied the message the assailants sent to the Secret Service in order to identify them. They should have figured out what really happened at the Pentagon. They should have tracked down the financial investors. They should have traced, down to their source, the warning messages sent to Odigo to tip off the WTC occupants two hours before the attack. Etc.

Now, as we have just shown, far from conducting a criminal investigation, the FBI has applied itself to making clues disappear and muzzling testimony. It supported the external-attack version of events and tried to bolster it by divulging an improvised list of hijackers and by making up fake pieces of damning evidence (Atta's passport, kamikaze instructions, etc.).

This manipulatory operation was orchestrated by the Director, Robert Mueller III. This indispensable man was nominated by George W. Bush and precisely fulfilled his duties the week leading up to 11 September.

Was this pseudo-investigation conducted in order to assure a fair trial, or to overshadow the Americano-American [sic I have no idea what this means] responsibilities, and to justify the military operations to come?

[END OF CHAPTER FOUR]

[END OF PART ONE]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."]

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 5: Counter-Attack or Godsend?

On the evening of 11 September, President George W. Bush addresses the nation, a solemn televised message in mystical accents:

America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining.

Today, our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature. And we responded with the best of America -- with the daring of our rescue workers, with the caring for strangers and neighbors who came to give blood and help in any way they could.

The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts. I've directed the full resources of our intelligence and law enforcement communities to find those responsible and to bring them to justice. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them.

Tonight, I ask for your prayers for all those who grieve, for the children whose worlds have been shattered, for all whose sense of safety and security has been threatened. And I pray they will be comforted by a power greater than any of us, spoken through the ages in Psalm 23: "Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil, for You are with me."

This is a day when all Americans from every walk of life unite in our resolve for justice and peace. America has stood down enemies before, and we will do so this time. None of us will ever forget this day. Yet, we go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world.

Thank you. Good night, and God bless America.

[Cut & pasted from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html>]

Despite this message of unity, and at a point in time when Osama bin Laden's responsibility is only considered a hypothesis, two contradictory political options are being recommended within the bosom of his administration. The moderates, who have gathered themselves around Secretary of State Gen. Colin Powell and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Hugh Shelton, recommend a proportioned response, along the lines of the one ordered by Bill Clinton in 1998. Tomahawk missiles were fired that year, from submarines on patrol in the Sea of Oman, at Al-Qaeda training camps in Afghanistan and the Al-Shifa laboratory in Sudan, as a response to the attacks carried out against the US embassies in Dar-es-Salaam and Nairobi. On the other hand, the "hawks" point out that those strikes had no effect, seeing as how Al-Qaeda have resumed their attacks. As far as they're concerned, only a military ground campaign in Afghanistan will be able to definitively eradicate Osama bin Laden's bases. But the campaign had better not stop there; it ought to go on and destroy in a similar fashion all other potential dangers, that is, all organizations and states liable to become menaces like Al-Qaeda.

Old Henry Kissinger [The Crimes of Henry Kissinger by Christopher Hitchens], former Secretary of State, who oversaw all clandestine actions of the American secret services from 1969 to 1976, is the tutelary figure, the inspiration of the "hawks." The President's TV speech is barely finished when he posts an op-ed column on the Washington Post website. [President Bush's remarks started at 8:30 pm and Dr Kissinger's column appeared online at 9:04 pm. Destroy the Network by Henry Kissinger, Washington Post, 11 September, <http://www.washingtonpost.com>] He certainly dots his I's:

But then the government should be charged with a systematic response that, one hopes, will end the way that the attack on Pearl Harbor ended – with the destruction of the system that is responsible for it. That system is a network of terrorist organizations sheltered in capitals of certain countries. In many cases we do not penalize those countries for sheltering the organizations; in other cases, we maintain something close to normal relations with them.

We do not yet know whether Osama bin Laden did this, although it appears to have the earmarks of a bin Laden-type operation. But any government that shelters groups capable of this kind of attack, whether or not they can be shown to have been involved in this attack, must pay an exorbitant price.

It is something we should do calmly, carefully and inexorably.

[Cut & pasted from <http://www.mafhoum.com/press2/61P12.htm>, a mirror of the Post article]

While American public opinion is still reeling from shock and mourning its dead, the 12th and 13th of September are dominated, in the US administration and parliaments all over the world, by three questions: Is George W. Bush going to designate Al-Qaeda as the guilty party in these attacks? What kind of operation is he going to order in Afghanistan? And will he get his nation involved in a long, drawn-out war against all its enemies, real and supposed?

American officials increase the number of leaks to the press to designate Osama bin Laden and his Al-Qaeda organization as the commandant and performer of the attacks. CIA director George Tenet presents President Bush with a series of briefings on Al-Qaeda communications, intercepted on 11 September [Wednesday, September 12 by Bob Woodward and Dan Balz, Washington Post, 28 January 2002]. The attacks had been in preparation for the last two years, they would only be the beginning of a long series of attacks, the Capitol and the White House were numbered among the targets. Al-Qaeda leaders erroneously believed to have carried out several goals: they "thanked God for the explosions in the Capitol building," they praised the "destruction of the White House," and celebrated "the doctor's plan" (that is, Dr Ayman Zawahri, Osama's right-hand man). The operation had been initiated by Abu Zubayda, who was already suspected of having organized the attack on the destroyer USS Cole in October 2000. He had given the signal for "Zero Hour."

So President Bush addresses the press [[Remarks by the President In Photo Opportunity with the National Security Team](#),

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010912-4.html>]:

THE PRESIDENT: I have just completed a meeting with my national security team, and we have received the latest intelligence updates.

The deliberate and deadly attacks which were carried out yesterday against our country were more than acts of terror. They were acts of war. This will require our country to unite in steadfast determination and resolve. Freedom and democracy are under attack.

The American people need to know that we're facing a different enemy than we have ever faced. This enemy hides in shadows, and has no regard for human life. This is an enemy who preys on innocent and unsuspecting people, then runs for cover. But it won't be able to run for cover forever. This is an enemy that tries to hide. But it won't be able to hide forever. This is an enemy that thinks its harbors are safe. But they won't be safe forever.

This enemy attacked not just our people, but all freedom-loving people everywhere in the world. The United States of America will use all our resources to conquer this enemy. We will rally the world. We will be patient, we will be focused, and we will be steadfast in our determination.

This battle will take time and resolve. But make no mistake about it: we will win.

The federal government and all our agencies are conducting business. But it is not business as usual. We are operating on a heightened security alert. America is going forward, and as we do so, we must remain keenly aware of the threats to our country. Those in authority should take appropriate precautions to protect our citizens.

But we will not allow this enemy to win the war by changing our way of life or restricting our freedoms. This morning, I am sending to Congress a request for emergency funding authority, so that we are prepared to spend whatever it takes to rescue victims, to help the citizens of New York City and Washington, D.C. respond to this tragedy, and to protect our national security.

I want to thank the members of Congress for their unity and support. America is united. The freedom-loving nations of the world stand by our side. This will be a monumental struggle of good versus evil. But good will prevail.

Aside from the British Foreign Office, who add to the martial declarations, parliaments around the world observe President Bush's reaction with disquiet. They quickly understood that the German, Egyptian, French, Israeli, and Russian intelligence services had all alerted their American counterparts about what was going to happen, but in vain, as the CIA minimized the risk. They also wonder about the reliability of the CIA's briefings (suddenly so long-winded) and the progress the FBI were making in their investigation (too fast). They fear that President Bush, in order to reassure his countrymen, will hastily name a guilty party based on circumstantial evidence, and will engage his country in an immediate and disproportionate military counter-attack.

On the same day, the UN Security Council adopts Resolution 1368 [on the Web at <http://www.state.gov/p/io/rls/othr/2001/4899.htm>] which recognizes "the [United States']

inherent right of individual or collective self-defence in accordance with the Charter [of San Francisco]." It stipulates that "The Council Calls on all States to work together urgently to bring to justice the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these terrorist attacks and stresses that those responsible for aiding, supporting or harbouring the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these acts will be held accountable." In other words, the Security Council recognizes America's right to violate, if necessary, the sovereignty of States who protect the people who carried out the attacks, in order to apprehend these terrorists and to bring them before international justice. Nevertheless, it does not authorize the USA to mete out said justice itself, or to attack other States, or to overthrow their governments.

In the evening, the NATO Security Council meets behind closed doors. Member states decide to proffer assistance to the United States—not to involve their own forces—in order to face the attack of which they were the object. The Council was unusually tense. Certain members think that the attacks could have been commissioned from within the American apparatus of state, and they refuse to get involved in a "war on terrorism" with poorly-defined objectives and limits. Leaving the meeting, NATO Secretary General Lord George Robertson declares: "If it is established that this attack was directed from a foreign country against the United States [sic], it will be considered an action relevant to Article Five of the Washington Treaty" [NATO Reaffirms Treaty Commitments In Dealing With Terrorist Attacks Against The US, NATO press service, 12 September 2001. <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2001/0910/e0912a.htm>]. Uneasy with the way events are unfolding, the French President Jacques Chirac gives George W. Bush a phone call. Reminding him that France has always shown itself to be the United States' most faithful ally, or, failing that, the most docile ally, Chirac politely explains to him that the NATO Council's decision is not a blank check, not a blind adherence to American politics.

A few days later, Jacques Chirac heads for the United States, on the occasion of a visit planned long in advance. On the one hand, he adds to the warm declarations of solidarity with the American people. On the other hand, he organizes a joint press conference with the Secretary General of the UN, Kofi Annan, in order to cool the USA's jets. Without beating around the bush, he declares: "...it is the identified terrorists that must be sanctioned and eventually those countries and groups where we have evidence that they have provided assistance to those identified terrorists." [cut & pasted, with corrections, from <http://www0.un.org/News/Press/docs/2001/sgsm7964.doc.htm>; original French says "...la sanction doit porter sur les terroristes identiÉs et Éventuellement sur les pays ou les groupes dont on a la preuve qu'ils ont apportÉ une aide † ces groupes terroristes identiÉs." See <http://www.un.org/News/fr-press/docs/2001/SGSM7964.doc.htm>.]

The parliaments' fears seem to be confirmed by an incident which occurs during a joint press conference [Media Briefing at FBI HQ, 12 September 2001, at 9:30 am] with Attorney General John Ashcroft and FBI Director Robert Mueller III. The chief of police is explaining to the journalists that it's necessary that the investigation not be hastened, so that the necessary proof of guilt to convict the suspects can be collected, when the justice minister interrupts him brutally. John Ashcroft emphasizes that time is of the essence and that the FBI's mission is to arrest the terrorists' accomplices as quickly as possible, before

they have the chance to commit any more crimes. So much for proof.

The pitch rises on the 13th of September. In the morning, the White House is partially evacuated after an anti-terrorist alert—this is becoming a habit—and Vice-President Cheney is taken off to a distant safe place. A false alert, and some real psychodrama. In the afternoon, Paul Wolfowitz, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, delivers the Pentagon press briefing. Wolfowitz is the spokesman for the most extremist conservative group within the military-industrial lobby. He's been calling for years to "finish off the dirty work" in Iraq, and he sees an easy justification for the wished-for overthrow of Saddam in the events of 11 September. He does not mention any target during the course of the press briefing, neither Afghanistan nor Iraq. But he does emphasize that the American response will be "a campaign, not an isolated action." And he insists: "We're going to keep after these people and the people who support them until this stops. And it has to be treated that way." [DOD News Briefing, 13 September 2001: http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Sep2001/t09132001_t0913dsd.html]

Thinking to beat the "hawks" to the punch, Secretary of State Colin Powell names Osama bin Laden as the "primary suspect" and prepares full-speed-ahead an intervention, which he would prefer be limited, in Afghanistan. He issues an ultimatum of sorts to Pakistan, in order to convince Pakistan to put its entire military infrastructure at America's disposal, and to immediately cut off all political and economic relations with the Taliban regime. [US Asks Pakistan for Help to Track Down Bin Laden, Robin Wright and John Daniszewski, Los Angeles Times, 14 September 2001]

In reality, as we shall see, this isn't a new debate in Washington. The two options (strikes against Afghanistan or a general war on terrorism) were studied and planned before the attacks. They don't really have any connection with the events of 11 September [Leurs raisons d'Être sont sans lien avec les ÉvÈnements du 11 septembre], even if those events serve as an alibi for putting them into action. From then on, the quarrel starts up again, to see if public opinion will only put up with targeted strikes, or if the public is sufficiently shocked to accept a long, drawn-out war. After all is said and done, psychological shock will prove so important that the Washington strategists won't have to choose; they'll be able to activate both options.

In mid-July 2001, noticing that the Berlin negotiations on Afghanistan's future had suffered a setback, the American delegation led by Tom Simmons (former ambassador to Pakistan), Karl Inderfurth (former Assistant Secretary of State), and Lee Coldren (former State Dept expert) started making threats. According to Pakistan's former Ambassador to France, Niaz Naik, who took place in the negotiations, the Americans declared that they were going to invade Afghanistan in mid-October and that they were going to overthrow the Taliban. [US Planned Attack on Taliban, BBC, 18 September 2001, and Secret Memo Reveals US Plan to Overthrow Taliban Regime, The Guardian, 21 September 2001]

Starting in September, under cover of its annual military exercises in the Sea of Oman, "Essential Harvest," the UK proceeded with the most important naval deployment since the Falkland Islands war and massed its forces off the Pakistani coast. Meanwhile, NATO forces, on the occasion of the Bright Star maneuvers in Egypt, moved 40,000 soldiers into the region. Thus, Anglo-American forces were pre-positioned in the area before the

attacks.

As for the "War on Terrorism," the American Joint Chiefs of Staff had been preparing for it for a long time, holding two "war games": Global Engagement IV and JEFX 99 [A New Mindset for Warfare, William M. Arkin, Washington Post, 22 September 2001]. Tactical procedures were perfected during a later simulation in June 2000. But the "war game" originally planned for June 2001 had been canceled, which concerned officers had interpreted as a signal of an imminent act.

The Americans have always disliked starting wars. In the past, they have taken care to present their military actions as legitimate responses. With the 11 September attacks, they found the opportunity of a lifetime.

[END OF CHAPTER FIVE]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 6: From Funeral Oration to Holy War

It's rare to wage war without getting God on your side, so even more than military strategists, it's preachers who invade our TV sets. They all interpret the attacks as a divine message, calling upon America to mend its ways. "Almighty God has taken his protection away from us," writes Rev. Pat Robertson, leader of the influential Christian Coalition, "because we're wallowing in material possessions and sex." [These and the following quotes from Robertson and Falwell are my own translations of Meyssan's translations, not exact quotes.]

On his influential TV show 700 Club (Fox Channel [sic]), pastor Pat Robertson welcomes his guest, his friend the pastor Jerry Falwell. The two televangelists analyze the events which have just plunged America into mourning [God Gave Us "What We Deserve," John Harris, Washington Post, 14 September 2001]. "God will keep on raising the curtain and allowing America's enemies to inflict the punishment on us that we probably deserve," declares Falwell. "Jerry, that's what I think, too," Robertson replies. "I think we just discovered only the antechamber of this terror. We haven't even started to see what they can do to most of our population."

Falwell then blames the ACLU, federal tribunals, and all who are "chasing God out of the public sphere." The abortionists need to take their part in the blame, too, for God will not be mocked," he continues. "And when we destroy 40,000,000 innocent babies, God is enraged. I am convinced that atheists, abortionists, feminists, gays and lesbians who are actively promoting their alternative lifestyle, the ACLU, the People for the American Way, all who have tried to secularize America—I point to them and I say: You let this happen."

In this context, where religious rhetoric serves political and military interests, President Bush, posing as the spiritual leader of America and the civilized world, issues the following proclamation:

On Tuesday morning, September 11, 2001, terrorists attacked America in a series of despicable acts of war. They hijacked four passenger jets, crashed two of them into the World Trade Center's twin towers and a third into the Headquarters of the U.S. Department of Defense at the Pentagon, causing great loss of life and tremendous damage. The fourth plane crashed in the Pennsylvania countryside, killing all on board but falling well short of its intended target apparently because of the heroic efforts of passengers on board. This carnage, which caused the collapse of both Trade Center towers and the destruction of part of the Pentagon, killed more than 250 airplane passengers and thousands more on the ground.

Civilized people around the world denounce the evildoers who devised and executed these terrible attacks. Justice demands that those who helped or harbored the terrorists be punished -- and punished severely. The enormity of their evil demands it. We will use all the resources of the United States and our cooperating friends and allies to pursue those

responsible for this evil, until justice is done.

We mourn with those who have suffered great and disastrous loss. All our hearts have been seared by the sudden and sense-less taking of innocent lives. We pray for healing and for the strength to serve and encourage one another in hope and faith.

Scripture says: "Blessed are those who mourn for they shall be comforted." I call on every American family and the family of America to observe a National Day of Prayer and Remembrance, honoring the memory of the thousands of victims of these brutal attacks and comforting those who lost loved ones. We will persevere through this national tragedy and personal loss. In time, we will find healing and recovery; and, in the face of all this evil, we remain strong and united, "one Nation under God."

NOW, THEREFORE, I, GEORGE W. BUSH, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim Friday, September 14, 2001, as a National Day of Prayer and Remembrance for the Victims of the Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001. I ask that the people of the United States and places of worship mark this National Day of Prayer and Remembrance with noontime memorial services, the ringing of bells at that hour, and evening candlelight remembrance vigils. I encourage employers to permit their workers time off during the lunch hour to attend the noontime services to pray for our land. I invite the people of the world who share our grief to join us in these solemn observances.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this thirteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord two thousand one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-sixth.

GEORGE W. BUSH

[Proclamation by the President of the United States of America, 13 September 2001, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010913-7.html>]

An unprecedented ceremony takes place at the National Cathedral. President and Mrs Bush, four former presidents (Clinton, Bush père, Carter, and Ford), almost all of the Senate and the House of Representatives gather together for prayer. A cardinal, a rabbi, and an imam each take a turn at leading the ceremony. The world's most famous televangelist, the pastor Billy Graham, who converted George W. Bush 15 years ago, pronounces a homily:

President and Mrs. Bush, I want to say a personal word on behalf of many people. Thank you, Mr. President, for calling this Day of Prayer and Remembrance. We needed it at this time.

We come together today to affirm our conviction that God cares for us, whatever our ethnic, religious or political background may be.

The Bible says that He's "the God of all comfort, who comforts us in all our troubles."

No matter how hard we try words simply cannot express the horror, the shock, and the

revulsion we all feel over what took place in this nation on Tuesday morning. September 11 will go down in our history as a day to remember.

Today we say to those who masterminded this cruel plot, and to those who carried it out, that the spirit of this nation will not be defeated by their twisted and diabolical schemes. Some day those responsible will be brought to justice, as President Bush and our Congress have so forcefully stated.

But today, we especially come together in this service to confess our need of God. We've always needed God from the very beginning of this nation, but today we need Him especially. We're facing a new kind of enemy. We're involved in a new kind of warfare and we need the help of the Spirit of God. The Bible's words are our hope: "God is our refuge and strength, an ever present help in trouble. Therefore we will not fear, though the earth give way and the mountains fall into the heart of the sea" (Psalm 46:1,2, NIV).

But how do we understand something like this? Why does God allow evil like this to take place? Perhaps that is what you are asking now. You may even be angry at God. I want to assure you that God understands these feelings that you may have.

We've seen so much on our television, heard on our radio, stories that bring tears to our eyes and make us all feel a sense of anger. But God can be trusted, even when life seems at its darkest.

But what are some of the lessons we can learn?

First, we are reminded of the mystery and reality of evil.

I have been asked hundreds of times in my life why God allows tragedy and suffering. I have to confess that I really do not know the answer totally, even to my own satisfaction. I have to accept, by faith, that God is sovereign, and He's a God of love and mercy and compassion in the midst of suffering. The Bible says that God is not the author of evil. It speaks of evil as a "mystery." In 2 Thessalonians 2:7 it talks about the mystery of iniquity. The Old Testament prophet Jeremiah said, "The heart is deceitful above all things and beyond cure. Who can understand it?" He asked that question, "Who can understand it?" And that's one reason we each need God in our lives.

The lesson of this event is not only about the mystery of iniquity and evil, but secondly, it's a lesson about our need for each other.

What an example New York and Washington have been to the world these past few days! None of us will ever forget the pictures of our courageous firefighters and police, many of whom have lost friends and colleagues, or the hundreds of people attending or standing patiently in line to donate blood. A tragedy like this could have torn our country apart, but instead it has united us and we've become a family. So those perpetrators who took this on to tear us apart, it has worked the other way. It's backlashed, it's backfired. We are more united than ever before. I think this was exemplified in a very moving way when the members of our Congress stood shoulder to shoulder the other day and sang, "God Bless America."

Finally, difficult as it may be for us to see right now -- this event can give a message of hope -- hope for the present, and hope for the future.

Yes, there is hope. There's hope for the present because I believe the stage has already been set for a new spirit in our nation.

One of the things we desperately need is a spiritual renewal in this country. We need a spiritual revival in America. And God has told us in His Word, time after time, that we are to repent of our sins and we're to turn to Him and He will bless us in a new way.

But, there is also hope for the future because of God's promises. As a Christian, I have hope, not just for this life, but for heaven and the life to come. And many of those people who died this past week are in heaven right now, and they wouldn't want to come back. It's so glorious and so wonderful. And that's the hope for all of us who put our faith in God. I pray that you will have this hope in your heart.

This event reminds us of the brevity and the uncertainty of life. We never know when we too will be called into eternity. I doubt if even one of those people who got on those planes, or walked into the World Trade Center or the Pentagon last Tuesday morning thought it would be the last day of their lives. It didn't occur to them. And that's why each of us needs to face our own spiritual need and commit ourselves to God and His will now.

Here in this majestic National Cathedral we see all around us symbols of the Cross. For the Christian, I'm speaking for the Christian now, the Cross tells us that God understands our sin and our suffering, for He took upon Himself in the person of Jesus Christ our sins and our suffering. And from the Cross, God declares, "I love you. I know the heartaches and the sorrows and the pains that you feel. But I love you."

The story does not end with the Cross, for Easter points us beyond the tragedy of the Cross to the empty tomb. It tells us that there is hope for eternal life, for Christ has conquered evil and death, and hell. Yes, there is hope.

I've become an old man now and I've preached all over the world and the older I get the more I cling to that hope that I started with many years ago and proclaimed it in many languages to many parts of the world.

Several years ago at the National Prayer Breakfast here in Washington, Ambassador Andrew Young (who had just gone through the tragic death of his wife), closed his talk with a quote from the old hymn, "How Firm a Foundation"

We all watched in horror as planes crashed into the steel and glass of the World Trade Center. Those majestic towers, built on solid foundations, were examples of the prosperity and creativity of America. When damaged, those buildings eventually plummeted to the ground, imploding in upon themselves. Yet, underneath the debris, is a foundation that was not destroyed. Therein lies the truth of that old hymn that Andrew Young quoted, "How Firm a Foundation" Yes, our nation has been attacked, buildings destroyed, lives lost.

But now we have a choice: whether to implode and disintegrate emotionally and spiritually as a people and a nation -- or, whether we choose to become stronger through all of this struggle -- to rebuild on a solid foundation. And I believe that we are in the process of starting to rebuild on that foundation. That foundation is our trust in God. That's what this service is all about and in that faith we have the strength to endure something as difficult and horrendous as what we have experienced this week.

This has been a terrible week with many tears but also has been a week of great faith. Churches all across the country have called prayer meetings and today is a day that they are celebrating not only in this country but in many parts of the world.

And in the words of that familiar hymn that Andrew Young quoted -- it says:

"Fear not, I am with thee; O be not dismayed,
For I am thy God, and will still give thee aid;
I'll strengthen thee, help thee, and cause thee to stand,
Upheld by my righteous, omnipotent hand."

My prayer today is that we will feel the loving arms of God wrapped around us, and will know in our hearts that He will never forsake us as we trust in Him.

We also know that God is going to give wisdom and courage and strength to the President and those around him. And this is going to be a day that we will remember as a day of victory.

May God bless you all.

[Billy Graham's Message, 14 September 2001,
<http://www.billygraham.org/newsevents/ndprbgmessage.asp>]

President Bush steps up to the lectern and he, too, pronounces a homily. His homily was prepared by his assistant, the Biblical fundamentalist Michael Gerson:

THE PRESIDENT: We are here in the middle hour of our grief. So many have suffered so great a loss, and today we express our nation's sorrow. We come before God to pray for the missing and the dead, and for those who love them.

On Tuesday, our country was attacked with deliberate and massive cruelty. We have seen the images of fire and ashes, and bent steel.

Now come the names, the list of casualties we are only beginning to read. They are the names of men and women who began their day at a desk or in an airport, busy with life. They are the names of people who faced death, and in their last moments called home to say, be brave, and I love you.

They are the names of passengers who defied their murderers, and prevented the murder of others on the ground. They are the names of men and women who wore the uniform of the United States, and died at their posts.

They are the names of rescuers, the ones whom death found running up the stairs and into the fires to help others. We will read all these names. We will linger over them, and learn

their stories, and many Americans will weep.

To the children and parents and spouses and families and friends of the lost, we offer the deepest sympathy of the nation. And I assure you, you are not alone.

Just three days removed from these events, Americans do not yet have the distance of history. But our responsibility to history is already clear: to answer these attacks and rid the world of evil.

War has been waged against us by stealth and deceit and murder. This nation is peaceful, but fierce when stirred to anger. This conflict was begun on the timing and terms of others. It will end in a way, and at an hour, of our choosing.

Our purpose as a nation is firm. Yet our wounds as a people are recent and unhealed, and lead us to pray. In many of our prayers this week, there is a searching, and an honesty. At St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York on Tuesday, a woman said, "I prayed to God to give us a sign that He is still here." Others have prayed for the same, searching hospital to hospital, carrying pictures of those still missing.

God's signs are not always the ones we look for. We learn in tragedy that his purposes are not always our own. Yet the prayers of private suffering, whether in our homes or in this great cathedral, are known and heard, and understood.

There are prayers that help us last through the day, or endure the night. There are prayers of friends and strangers, that give us strength for the journey. And there are prayers that yield our will to a will greater than our own.

This world He created is of moral design. Grief and tragedy and hatred are only for a time. Goodness, remembrance, and love have no end. And the Lord of life holds all who die, and all who mourn.

It is said that adversity introduces us to ourselves. This is true of a nation as well. In this trial, we have been reminded, and the world has seen, that our fellow Americans are generous and kind, resourceful and brave. We see our national character in rescuers working past exhaustion; in long lines of blood donors; in thousands of citizens who have asked to work and serve in any way possible.

And we have seen our national character in eloquent acts of sacrifice. Inside the World Trade Center, one man who could have saved himself stayed until the end at the side of his quadriplegic friend. A beloved priest died giving the last rites to a firefighter. Two office workers, finding a disabled stranger, carried her down sixty-eight floors to safety. A group of men drove through the night from Dallas to Washington to bring skin grafts for burn victims.

In these acts, and in many others, Americans showed a deep commitment to one another, and an abiding love for our country. Today, we feel what Franklin Roosevelt called the warm courage of national unity. This is a unity of every faith, and every background.

It has joined together political parties in both houses of Congress. It is evident in services

of prayer and candlelight vigils, and American flags, which are displayed in pride, and wave in defiance.

Our unity is a kinship of grief, and a steadfast resolve to prevail against our enemies. And this unity against terror is now extending across the world.

America is a nation full of good fortune, with so much to be grateful for. But we are not spared from suffering. In every generation, the world has produced enemies of human freedom. They have attacked America, because we are freedom's home and defender. And the commitment of our fathers is now the calling of our time.

On this national day of prayer and remembrance, we ask almighty God to watch over our nation, and grant us patience and resolve in all that is to come. We pray that He will comfort and console those who now walk in sorrow. We thank Him for each life we now must mourn, and the promise of a life to come.

As we have been assured, neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor height nor depth, can separate us from God's love. May He bless the souls of the departed. May He comfort our own. And may He always guide our country.

God bless America.

[President's Remarks at National Day of Prayer and Remembrance,
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010914-2.html>]

The Washington Post subsequently prints an analysis of George W. Bush's metamorphosis: "For the first time since religious conservatism became a political movement, the President of the United States has become its de facto leader, an achievement which even Reagan, who was adulated by religious conservatives, was never able to perform. Christian magazines, TV and radio, show Bush in prayer while preachers declare from the pulpit that his leadership is an act of Providence. A procession of religious leaders who have met with him bear witness to his faith, Web sites encourage people to fast and pray for the President." [Religious Right Finds Its Center in Oval Office, Dana Milbank, Washington Post, 24 December 2001.] [The above is my translation of Meyssan's translation, not a direct quote.]

At noon on 14 September, the 43 EU states (including Russia) [800 Million Europeans in Mourning for Victims of US Attacks, and many other countries on all six continents, following the American president's prayer, observe three minutes of silence in memory of the attack victims. Thus they all also demonstrate their tacit acceptance of an inspired fundamentalist's leadership, a leader who has just announced to them that he intends to involve them in a "monumental struggle against evil." [Remarks by the President in Photo Opp with the National Security Team, 12 September 2001, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010912-4.html>] Is the televangelists' politico-mystical delirium contagious?

Neither psychological shock nor the respect one could feel for the fallen victims can explain this intense religious fervor. Even if the United States was originally a theocracy

founded by Puritans who were fleeing the British Crown's religious intolerance, it's still, for all that, not this bigoted nation where televangelists take the place of military strategists. There has never been any historical precedent of an American president declaring war inside a cathedral.

George W. Bush's call to "all the people of the world who share our sorrow to join in these solemn observations [religious ceremonies]" was observed even in secular France. So, the two chiefs of the executive, President Chirac and Prime Minister Jospin, signed a decree on 12 September which stated: "Thursday, 14 September 2001, is hereby declared National Day of Mourning in Honor of the Victims of the Attacks Committed on the USA on 11 September 2001" [Decree NOR:HRUX0101919D, Official Journal of the French Republic, 13 September 2001, page 14582]. Accompanied by a cohort of elected officials and ministers, they had gone the evening before to attend an ecumenical service at the American Church in Paris. In unison, they had intoned the famous canticle "God Bless America" ! [God Bless America is a canticle which Irving Berlin composed during WWII. It has become a sort of official national hymn.]

These prayers, imposed by decree, sparked lively polemics here and there. Some dissenters noted that this national gesticulation seemed to lend weight to the idea that that the thousands of American victims were worth more than all the victims of recent genocides, to whom no one ever paid any kind of similar tribute. Let's view this controversy as a refusal to let religious sentiment be manipulated by politics. Three minutes of silence to become aware that conflicts can be resolved peacefully, without recourse to terrorism, is what everyone agreed with, not a prayer for the only victims of terror on American soil. These ceremonies do not express a collective hope for peace, but serve to justify the upcoming vengeance.

This moment of prayer is a turning point in history. The United States has gone to war while the national hymn reverberated in the cathedral, the Washington Post later wrote [War Speech in a Cathedral: A Steadfast Resolve to Prevail, Balz/Woodward, Washington Post, 30 January 2002]. This observation could be enlarged upon: the world has gone to war via association with the American mourning.

From then on, let's ask ourselves how this unanimous tribute was organized. Unlike mobilizing military alliances, there's no international treaty that obligates one to stand in silent remembrance while the USA is in mourning. It was nevertheless easier and quicker to decree an international day of mourning than to put the NATO, ANZUS, and OAS treaties into action [ANZUS is Australia, New Zealand, and the US; OAS is the Organization of American States]. Looking at it more closely, you'll notice that the French decree was signed by Chirac and Jospin on 12 September, that is, before George W. Bush called for the American day of mourning. For an operation like this, of such scope, there needs to be a powerful network of influence that can put pressure on just about all the governments of the world. Above all, this political operation has a political goal: by manipulating religious feelings, the American government has made their version of events just as sacred as the victims of the attacks. Henceforth, any questioning of the official version will be looked upon as sacrilege.

The system that was used to impose this international mourning was formalized in secret

in October 2001. The Office for Strategic Influence [the creation of this office is the end result of a long-term study of the American armed forces; see Information Dominance by Martin C. Libicki in issue 132 of Strategic Forum: <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/forum132.html>] was created at the Pentagon and placed under the command of Gen. Simon Pete Worden, former leader of the US Space Command. This body is explained in the State Department's International Information Programs [official website <http://www.state.gov/r/iip>], who control the radio transmissions of Voice of America, by the intermediary of Col. Brad Ward's International Military Information Group. It will work henceforth at top speed to manipulate public opinion and Western governments.

[END OF CHAPTER SIX]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 7: Full Powers

On the morning of 14 September, the United States Congress authorizes President Bush to

use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.

[Senate Joint Resolution 23, see <http://allen.senate.gov/PressOffice/SJRES23.pdf>]

This joint resolution, carried out by both houses of the legislature, is adopted unanimously, almost without debate, with one voice in opposition, that of California Democratic Rep. Barbara Lee [she accounted for her vote to her constituents, publishing *Why I Opposed the Resolution to Authorize Force in the San Francisco Chronicle* on 23 September 2001]. The way it's written leaves President Bush plenty of latitude to act against non-governmental terrorist groups, but "emergency powers" are not exactly "war powers." Bush still has to inform Congress before engaging in hostile actions against a foreign state [National Emergency Powers, Harold C. Relyea, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 18 September 2001, http://www.fpc.gov/CRS_REPS/powers.pdf%5D].

To carry out the initial actions, Bush asks Congress to authorize a special \$20 billion fund. With real patriotic spirit, the two legislative assemblies double the amount and, after five hours of debate, vote to release a fund of... \$40 billion. [Congress Clears Use of Force, \$40 Billion in Emergency Aid, John Lancaster and Helen Dewar, *Washington Post*, 15 September 2001; also Congress Passes \$40 Billion in Homeland Defense Funds by Steven Kingsley, *Homeland Defense Journal*, 7 January 2002, <http://www.homelanddefensejournal.com>]

In addition, Bush authorizes the mobilization of up to 50,000 reservists [Executive Order, 14 September 2001, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010914-5.html%5D>]. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld immediately calls up 35,500 of them (10,000 for the Army; 13,000 for the Air Force; 3,000 for the Navy; 7500 for the Marines; and 2,000 for the Coast Guard). The preceding mobilization dates back to the Persian Gulf War. That mobilization had involved 5,000 more soldiers, as that was a matter of reuniting a powerful armada.

Bush gives an important address [Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People, 20 September 2001 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>] before Congress, meeting in a plenary session, on 20 September. He is accompanied by several public personalities including British Prime Minister Tony Blair. On this occasion, he officially names Osama bin Laden and his organization as the parties responsible for the attacks,

and he delivers an ultimatum to the Taliban regime:

Deliver to United States authorities all the leaders of al Qaeda who hide in your land. (Applause.) Release all foreign nationals, including American citizens, you have unjustly imprisoned. Protect foreign journalists, diplomats and aid workers in your country. Close immediately and permanently every terrorist training camp in Afghanistan, and hand over every terrorist, and every person in their support structure, to appropriate authorities. (Applause.) Give the United States full access to terrorist training camps, so we can make sure they are no longer operating.

These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion. (Applause.) The Taliban must act, and act immediately. They will hand over the terrorists, or they will share in their fate.

He also announces the creation of an Office of Homeland Security, which has Cabinetary powers and will report directly to him. This new organization "will direct, supervise, and coordinate an overall national strategy to protect our nation against terrorism and to react to any future attack." In the same breath, the President announces that he has named ex-Marine and former Pennsylvania governor Tom Ridge as the head of this Office.

In extending these measures, President Bush makes various decisions to reinforce the secret defense mechanism. The day after the attacks, 12 September, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld had declared during his press conference at the Pentagon: [DOD News Briefing, Secretary Rumsfeld, 12 September 2001, http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Sep2001/t09122001_t0912sd.html]

Questioned by reporters on 25 September about whether he intended to tell lies in order to protect military secrets, Rumsfeld replies that he personally was clever enough to act otherwise, but that his colleagues would get by as they could:

[DOD News Briefing, Secretary Rumsfeld, 25 September 2001, http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Sep2001/t09252001_t0925sd.html]

On 2 October, Under-Secretary of Defense Pete Aldridge Jr sends a memo to all the defense-industry suppliers [see <http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2001/10/aldridge.html>]. He informs them that the secret defense measures depend upon their commercial activities, it being understood that seemingly anodyne information could reveal a lot about the DoD's activities and intentions. From now on, civilians are enjoined to be discreet.

On 4 October, USAF principal deputy assistant secretary for acquisition, management and logistics [whew] Darlene Druyun sends an email [see <http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2001/10/druyun.html>] to Air Force suppliers to make Aldridge's letter explicit. The email forbids all the suppliers to discuss any contracts with the media, contracts under negotiation as well as those already signed. [I don't see where Meyssan got this.] This blackout is in effect in the United States as well as in any foreign country where the suppliers might participate in weapons symposiums or forums. [Reading a bit into it?]

On 5 October, President Bush, in violation of the Constitution, orders several members of

his Cabinet not to give information to the legislature (see Appendix).

On 18 October, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz addresses a memo [see <http://www.fas.org/sgp/news/2001/10/wolfowitz.html>] to all DoD office heads, to be distributed to all hands. He writes:

It is therefore vital that Defense Department employees, as well as persons in other organizations that support DOD, exercise great caution in discussing information related to DOD work, regardless of their duties. Do not conduct any work-related conversations in common areas, public places, while commuting, or over unsecured electronic circuits. Classified information may be discussed only in authorized spaces and with persons having a specific need to know and the proper security clearance. Unclassified information may likewise require protection because it can often be compiled to reveal sensitive conclusions. Much of the information we use to conduct DOD's operations must be withheld from public release because of its sensitivity. If in doubt, do not release or discuss official information except with other DoD personnel.

At the same time, federal authorities take measures to ensure the secrecy of their investigation of the attacks. On 11 September, the FBI asks the airlines not to talk to the press. Nonetheless, their account would allow us to mark that the airplanes were not full, and that the hijackers' names were not on the passenger manifests as well. The same evening, the FBI pays a visit to the home of the Naudet brothers, Jules and GÈDÈon, who were in Manhattan when the crashes happened. The FBI confiscates their five hours' worth of video, which the two journalists had taken inside the towers and outside on the streets. Only six minutes of footage, depicting the first airplane's crash, is returned to them. This document, which could well add to our understanding of the WTC's collapse, is sealed and put away. The FBI also asks the Odigo company not to communicate with the press. It would still be interesting to know about the exact wording of the warning message Odigo received, and what measures were taken to limit the number of people in the towers. In just the same fashion, the military forbids all contact between its implicated personnel and the press. Thus, journalists can interview neither the fighter pilots nor the ground crews at Barksdale and Offutt. As for the American Bar Association, knowing that {damage and liability suits} [des procÈs en dommages et intÈrÍts] would be opportunities to uncover state secrets, it announces that it will disbar any attorney who files suit on behalf of the victims' families. This ban is set out for only six months, coroners' examinations [of dead bodies] not being possible beyond that timeframe.

President Bush personally contacts Congressional leaders to ask them not to put national security in jeopardy by opening an investigation into the events of 11 September. In order to save face as well as to move on, Congress decides to create a joint investigative board to look into the measures taken since 11 September to prevent further terrorist attacks [Congressional Panels Join to Probe US Intelligence, Walter Pincus, Washington Post, 12 February 2001].

On 10 October, National Security Advisor Condoleeza Rice, brings the heads of the major TV networks (ABC, CBS, CNN, Fox, Fox News, MSNBC and NBC) to the White House to appeal to their sense of responsibility. If freedom of expression is to remain in effect, the journalists are invited to exercise their own "editorial judgement" and to

abstain from releasing any information that might put the safety of the American people at risk [The "Shadow War": American Media Between Info and Propaganda, Agence France Presse, 11 October 2001].

The print media gets the message loud and clear. Immediately, Ron Gutting (editor-in-chief of the Texas City Sun) and Dan Guthrie (editor-in-chief of the Daily Courier [Oregon]), who had dared to criticize Bush, were sacked.

"Pravda and Izvestia in the former USSR would have had a hard time surpassing the American press in hewing to the official lineÖ they have abandoned the notion of objectivity or even the idea of a public space where issues are discussed and debatedÖ It's a scandal which betrays the work of a propaganda system, not that of a free press, which is essential in a democratic society," comments Edward Herman, political science professor at the University of Pennsylvania [cited by Olivier Pascal-Moussellard in TÈLÈrama, 30 January 2002]. [My translation of Meyssan's translation.]

Finally, at the end of three weeks of debate, Congress adopts the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act (its acronym is USA PATRIOT). This exceptional legislation suspends various fundamental civil liberties for a period of four years so as to give the administration the means to effectively combat terrorism. It does not escape anyone that the four-year period covers all the rest of the Bush administration's tenure, including the electoral period for his reelection. It suppresses "terrorists and those who support them" according to a very extensive definition. So, collecting money to support the families of IRA militants in UK prisons has become a federal crime. The time period that suspected terrorists can be held is extended to a week. If they need to be questioned (for any reason at all, not necessarily connected with suspected terrorism), suspects can be held in secret for a six-month period, infinitely renewable if the Attorney General deems them "a threat to national security, the safety of society, or that of any person." Immediately, 1200 immigrants are placed in detention for an indeterminate period on unnamed charges. Foreign consulates denounce the withdrawal of their citizens' basic rights, following the example of the Pakistani Consulate General in New York, which declares: "In the majority of the cases, we have been given neither the identity of our nationals, nor the location where they are being held. [The American government] at least deigns to tell us how many of them are being heldÖ Authorities are also pressuring them not to stand up for their right to contact their consular representatives or lawyers. This is simply inadmissible."

The USA PATRIOT Act finally allows the FBI to intercept communications without a warrant [This very controversial arrangement was agreed to by the Democratic Party. See the op-ed column penned by John Podesta, former White House secretary-general under Clinton, Tools for Counterterrorism, in the Washington Post, 18 September 2001.]. This measure applies to communications between foreign nationals, between foreign countries, which pass through American territory via the Internet.

On 31 October, the Justice Department suspends the right of those being held in detention [garde-à-vue] to consult alone with their lawyers [Atty General Ashcroft Outlines Foreign Terrorist Tracking Task Force, DOJ, 31 October 2001,

http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/speeches/2001/agcrisisremarks10_31.htm]. Henceforth, these meetings can be listened in on and transcribed, and their content can be used against the suspects, which eradicates any possibility of the suspect and the lawyer working out a defense strategy together.

On 13 November, President Bush decrees that foreigners "suspected of terrorism," including "members and former members of Al-Qaeda," and those who have aided them (even unwittingly) in conspiring to carry out attacks (even if they weren't carried out), will not be tried in federal court, not even in military court, but by military commissions [Detention, Treatment, and Trial of Certain Non-Citizens in War Against Terrorism, 13 November 2001, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011113-27.html>]. These commissions will be arbitrarily staffed by the Secretary of Defense and will establish their own Code of Procedure. Their sessions may take place in secret, behind closed doors. The "military prosecutors" are not required to divulge to the defense the nature of the "evidence" at their disposal. Decisions are made by a two-thirds majority (not a unanimous vote, as is the international norm in criminal matters).

The same day, the DOJ snatches up 5000 suspects of Mideastern origin, nearly all of whom are legal aliens and have committed no infraction whatsoever, for "questioning."

Relying on the anti-terrorist committee [see <http://www.state.gov/p/io/rls/othr/2001/5108.htm>] created by UN Resolution 1373 of 28 September, the State Department orders its UN allies to pass similar legislation. On that day, 55 nations (including France, under the "everyday security law" [See http://www.interieur.gouv.fr/rubriques/c/c2_le_ministere/c21_actualite/La_loi_relative_a_la_securite_quotidienne for more information on this French legislation]) adopted certain measures from [ont ainsi transcrit en droit interne certaines dispositions de] the USA PATRIOT Act. The objective is not to protect local populaces from terrorism, but to allow American police services to extend their range of activity into the rest of the world. Basically, it's a matter of prolonging the delays in [garde-à-vue] in terrorist affairs, limiting the freedom of the press, and allowing security forces to intercept communications without judiciary control. In the UK, the anti-terrorist law authorizes the detention of foreign suspects without a hearing, in violation of the European Human Rights Convention. In Canada, the anti-terrorist law forces journalists to reveal their sources to a magistrate, under pain of immediate incarceration. In Germany, intelligence services are granted judiciary police powers to turn themselves into a political police force. In Italy, the secret service is authorized to commit all sorts of offenses on national territory, in the interest of national defense, and without being held at all legally responsible. Etc. [See The Top 15 Liberty-Killing Nations, by the Enduring Freedoms collective, at <http://www.enduring-freedoms.org/pdf/RAPPORTL.pdf>]. Finally, Secretary of State Colin Powell heads for Europe to make certain that European police forces are able, in future, to send any information in their possession straight to the FBI, with no formalities, and to install an FBI antenna in Europol offices.

"Since September 11, the government has enacted legislation, adopted policies, and threatened procedures that are not consistent with our established laws and values and would have been unthinkable before," writes the prestigious New York Review of Books [see The Threat to Patriotism by Ronald Dworkin, 28 February 2002,

<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/15145>]. Exulting in its patriotic mystique, the land of free expression and political transparency has withdrawn into an extensive idea of the rightness of the State and secret defense measures [du sÈcret-DÈfense] applicable to all sectors of society.

The official version of the events of 11 September does not justify such a reversal. If the enemy are a bunch of wretches cowering in Afghani caves, then why fear conversation between colleagues in the heart of the Pentagon? How can we imagine that a handful of terrorists could obtain and exchange sparse information about arms deals and deduce from them the plans of the US Army? Why suspend the normal operations of institutions and keep legislators from hearing, even in closed session, indispensable information for democracy?

And if the official version, according to which the attacks were carried out by foreign terrorists, is true, then why prevent any congressional inquiry and any investigation by the press?

Are we not watching a change of political process that was planned well in advance of 11 September? Many times over the past half-century, the CIA has tried to get a law passed that would forbid the press to mention state affairs and criminalizing the officials and journalists who would break that law. In November 2000, the extremely reactionary Sen. Richard Shelby, who is chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, had the "Official Security Act" passed, which was vetoed by President Clinton. Shelby repeated this maneuver in August 2001, hoping for a better result from President Bush [Reviving a Misconceived Security Bill, NYT editorial of 21 August 2001; No More Secrecy Bills, Washington Post editorial, 24 August 2001, etc.]. The bill was in committee when the attacks intervened, and it was then partially incorporated into the Intelligence Act of 13 December 2001. Atty General Ashcroft immediately created a special unit charged with evaluating ways to prevent leaks of classified information. It will submit a report six months later. In the meantime, though, many official websites have already been cleaned up: public information has been taken away, with the explanation that their availability could allow "terrorists" to deduce official secrets.

The forces of justice, the congressional inquiry boards and the press, that is, all the counter-powers, having been neutralized, the executive branch is equipped with new structures that allow it to apply to domestic politics the methods already tested out by the CIA and the armed forces in other places.

The creation of the Office of Homeland Security (OHS), announced before Congress by President Bush on 20 September, doesn't actually take place until 8 October. It's not a question of circumstantial measures, but of a profound reformation of the American apparatus of state. From this point forward, the administration will make a distinction between internal and external security. The head of OHS, Tom Ridge, will be a peer of the National Security Adviser (Condoleezza Rice). Each of them will preside over a Council: the Council of Homeland Security and the National Security Council. Their distinct specialties will overlap each other in numerous areas. President Bush named, as well, an adjunct national security adviser in charge of anti-terrorist operations, who, although subordinate to Condoleezza Rice, will be at the disposal of Tom Ridge. This key

pivotal position was awarded to Gen. Wayne A. Downing, who boasts a particularly muscular resume. [Bush Names Army General to NSC Post on Terrorism, Mike Allen and Thomas Ricks, Washington Post, 30 September 2001, and Two Key Advisers Are Filling New Posts to Fight New War, Mike Allen and Eric Pianin, Washington Post, 10 October 2001] Among other positions, Downing was the manager of Special Operations Command's stay-behind network. [The stay-behind is the most secret of all secret services. It was founded at the time of Liberation, "returning" Nazi agents to fight the expanding Communist influences. Infiltrating the highest level of Western governments, it was used to rig democratic elections. The Italian stay-behind branch is known to the public by the name Gladio.] He will also keep in place the contacts between the Councils and the Office for Strategic Influence, which is in charge of manipulating public opinion and foreign governments.

The Office of Homeland Security holds vast powers of coordination, which could grow and change to suit changing times. It's difficult to say whether it will play a role comparable to that of the Office of War Mobilization (OWM) during the Second World War, or comparable to that of the current Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), which oversees military operations in Latin America. [Homeland Security: the Presidential Coordination Office by Harold Relyea, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 10 October 2001, downloadable at http://www.fpc.gov/CRS_REPS/crs_hsec.pdf] Be that as it may, we're watching a takeover of civil life by the military and intelligence services. [Pentagon Debates Homeland Defense Role, Bradley Graham and Bill Miller, Washington Post, 11 February 2001]

Historians will record that between November 2000 and February 2002, democracy-as envisioned by the creators of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution-effectively came to an end. As democracy died, the Fascist American Theocratic State ["The State"] was born

[cut & pasted from <http://english.pravda.ru/columnists/2002/02/18/26452.html>] [That's right, I found the full text at Pravda!] These were the words of two major journalists, John Stanton and Wayne Madsen. [The Emergence of the Fascist American Theocratic State, 10 February 2002]

[END OF CHAPTER SEVEN]

[END OF PART TWO]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."
[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.
[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 8: It's bin Laden's Fault!

On the morning of 11 September, while CNN was broadcasting the first images of one of the towers of the WTC on fire, while we still didn't know if we were looking at an accident or an attack, the commentators of the all-info channel began to evoke the possibility of Osama bin Laden's responsibility. As time went on, this hypothesis began to impose itself as the only humanly acceptable explanation. Such barbarous attacks could only be the act of a monster, radically estranged from the civilized world, filled with an irrational hatred towards the West, whose hands were covered with blood. This demented soul had already been identified: it was US Public Enemy Number One, Osama bin Laden. The rumor was originally helped along by leaks to the press by "generally well-informed sources" or "sources close to the investigation." It became official when Colin Powell publicly named bin Laden as a "suspect." It then became dogma when President Bush named bin Laden as the guilty party. On this day, this accusation wasn't publicly backed up [with evidence]. But American authorities considered themselves excused from doing so by showing a video of bin Laden which, in their eyes, was tantamount to a confession.

Osama bin Laden [Numerous sources recount bin Laden's biography. Most of them smack more of propaganda or sensationalism than of rigorous investigation. The best-selling works, such as *Bin Laden, The Man Who Declared War on America* by Yossef Bodansky (Prima Publishing, 1996) (Bodansky, by the way, is a Congressional consultant) or *Au nom d'Oussama ben Laden* ("In The Name of Osama Bin Laden"), by Roland Jacquard (Jean Picollec Press, 2001), are based on unpublished intelligence-service reports, thus on unverifiable sources. Some more serious works include those of the PBS magazine *Frontline*, notably *Hunting Bin Laden* (2001) and *Inside the Terror Network* (2002). See transcripts at <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows>.] is one of the 54 children of Sheikh Muhammad bin Laden, who founded the Saudi Binladen Group (SBG) in 1931. This holding, Saudi Arabia's most important, has half of its turnover in construction and public works, and the other half in engineering, real estate, distribution, telecommunications and publishing. It formed a Swiss investment society, called SICO (Saudi Investment Company), which created several societies with subsidiaries of the Saudi National Commercial Bank. The SBG holds important participations in General Electric, Nortel Networks, and Cadbury Schweppes. Its industrial activities are represented in the USA by Adnan Khashoggi (Mohammed Al-Fayed's former brother-in-law), while its financial holdings are managed by the Carlyle Group. Up until 1996, the [montages] of the SBG's subsidiaries were prepared in Lausanne by its advisor, the Nazi banker FranÁois Genoud, executor of Dr Goebbels' will and patron of terrorist Carlos [the Jackal]. The SBG is inseparable from the Wahhabite regime, to the point where it was the sole official construction and management contractor for the Kingdom's holy places, Makkah and Madinah. Likewise, it got most of the BTP contracts for building US military bases in Saudi Arabia, and for the reconstruction of Kuwait after the Gulf War. After the accidental death of Sheikh Muhammad bin Laden in 1968, he was succeeded by his eldest son Salem. Salem, for his

part, also died in an "accidental" plane crash on the way to Texas in 1988. From then on, the SBG has been directed by the founder's second son, Bakr.

Born in 1957, Osama got his degree in management and economics from King Abdul Aziz University. He could pass for a sensible businessman. In December 1979, he was solicited by his tutor, Prince Turki al-Faysal as-Saud (director of the Saudi secret service from 1977 to Aug. 2001), to manage the financial aspects of the CIA's secret operations in Afghanistan. Over the course of ten years, the CIA invested \$2 billion in Afghanistan to thwart the USSR, engaging in its most costly operations ever. The Saudi and American secret services recruited Islamists, trained them, armed them, and put them into a Jihad (holy war) to fight and defeat the Soviets in their stead. [See *Les dollars de la terreur, les Etats-unis et les islamistes* by Richard LabÈriviÈre (Grasset, 1999), and *Jihad, expansion et dÈclin de l'islamisme* (Editions Gallimard, 2000).] Osama bin Laden organized the needs of this heterogeneous world into a database called Al-Qaeda (literally "the base" of data).

After the defeat of the USSR, the USA became so disinterested in Afghanistan's fate that they left it to the hands of warlords and to mujahedeen whom they had hired from all over the Arab/Muslim world to fight against the Red Army. Osama bin Laden stopped working for the CIA and took these fighters under his own control. In 1990, he proposed to the Saudi monarchy to put his men at their service to eject the apostate Saddam Hussein from Kuwait, and he did not appreciate seeing that they preferred the coalition led by President Bush pÈre, Dick Cheney (Secretary of Defense at that time), and Colin Powell (at that time Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff).

Soon the Islamists split into two camps, according to whether they were allies or enemies of the American-Saudi pact. Bin Laden was in the group led by Sudani leader Hassan at-Tourabi, as was Yasser Arafat as well. They participated together in Arab and Islamic conferences in Khartoum.

In 1992, the US embarked on a mission in Somalia, with a UN mandate to "Restore Hope." Some Afghan veterans took potshots at American GIs over there. They took part in an operation during the course of which 18 American soldiers were killed. Osama bin Laden was held responsible for the clash. The US Army hit the road. In the collective imagination, bin Laden had just defeated the Americans after already having whipped the Soviets.

Osama bin Laden was thus stripped of his Saudi citizenship and set himself up in Sudan. Breaking off relations with his family, he received his inheritance, estimated at \$300 million. [On Osama bin Laden's financial investments, see *Ben Laden, la vÈritÈ interdite* ("Bin Laden, The Forbidden Truth") by Jean-Charles Brisard and Guillaume DasquiÈ (Editions DenoÎl, 2001).] He invested this sum in creating several banks, agroalimentary societies, and local distribution societies. First with the support of Col. Omar Hassan al-Bashir, then of Hassan at-Tourabi, he developed various companies in Sudan, building an airfield, highways, installing a pipeline, and controlling most of the production of gum arabic. Despite these investments, he was expelled from Sudan in 1996, under pressure from Egypt, who accused him of having fomented a plot to assassinate President Hosni Mubarak. So he went back to Afghanistan.

In June 1996, 19 American soldiers were killed in an attack on a military base in Khobar, Saudi Arabia. The US accused Osama bin Laden of having led the attack. In response, he called for jihad against the USA and Israel in his famous fatwa entitled "Expel the Polytheists from the Arabian Peninsula." In this announcement, he used the same argument he had used with the CIA in Afghanistan: it had become every Muslim's duty to liberate Islam's occupied territories. Except it's difficult to compare the bloody Soviet occupation of Afghanistan with the contract-driven presence of US military bases in Saudi Arabia. The billionaire's exhortations not having resonated with the Muslim populations as had been hoped, in 1998, he created, along with the Egyptian leader Ayman az-Zawahiri, the International Islamic Front Against Jews and Christians.

On 7 August 1998, attacks devastated the US embassies in Dar es-Salaam, Tanzania, and Nairobi, Kenya, killing 298 and wounding more than 4500. The US accused Osama bin Laden of having led the attack. President Clinton fired 75 cruise missiles at camps in Jalalabad and Khost (Afghanistan) and at the Al-Shifa laboratory complex in Sudan. The FBI judged bin Laden guilty and put a \$5 million price on his head. All his financial assets were frozen.

On 12 October 2000, a bomb in a motor launch damaged the destroyer USS Cole in the port of Aden (Yemen), killing 17 sailors and wounding 39 others. The US accused Osama bin Laden of having led the attack.

On 8 May 2001, Donald Rumsfeld revealed that US Public Enemy Number One had at his disposal not only bacteriological and chemical weapons, but was also on the point of putting together an atomic bomb and putting a satellite into orbit.

Interviewed by the PBS magazine "Frontline," Milton Bearden, former CIA COS in Sudan during the 1980s and one of the primary leaders of secret operations in Afghanistan, expressed his skepticism: "To simplify matters to the extreme and to establish a link between him [bin Laden] and every terrorist act of the past decade is an insult to most Americans' [intelligence]. And it definitely doesn't encourage our allies to take us too seriously on this subject." Milton Bearden, who got back his freedom of speech when he retired in 1994, went on: "There's a whole lot of fiction in all this. It's all the mythology surrounding bin Laden. It's part of the spectacle. We don't have an enemy hostile nation. We haven't had an enemy hostile nation since the collapse of the USSR in 1991. And I think we love it. We love all this pretty bizarre international terrorism at a point in time where real terrorism is undergoing a dramatic change in character." [My translation of Meyssan's translation of Bearden's remarks.]

Be that as it may, "the show must go on." [In English in the original.] The USA accused bin Laden of having led the 11 September attacks. In the face of skepticism, Gen. Colin Powell appeared as a guest on NBC's "Meet the Press" and said: "We are hard at work bringing all the information together, intelligence information, law enforcement information. And I think, in the near future, we will be able to put out a paper, a document, that will describe quite clearly the evidence that we have linking him to this attack." [See <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2001/5012.htm>.] Announced several times, this document has still never been published.

On 4 October, British PM Tony Blair presented a report to the EU, entitled Responsibility for the Terrorist Atrocities in the United States. For every argument, one can read that: "No organization possesses simultaneously both the motivation and the capacity to carry out attacks such as those of 11 September, other than Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda network." [My translation of Meysan's translation of Blair's comments.] On the same day, the Pakistani Foreign Minister, Riaz Muhammad Khan, declared that the "proofs" which the American government had sent to his government "constituted a sufficient base to bring [bin Laden] to justice." These "proofs" were classified Top Secret and have never been made public.

On 7 October, the US and British ambassadors to the UN informed the UN of the military actions which their governments had commenced in Afghanistan [Letter from Ambassador Negroponte to President of Security Council, document UN S/2001/946. See also Ambassador Eldon's letter, UN S/2001/947.]. John Negroponte (USA) wrote: "My government has obtained clear and indisputable information that the Al-Qaeda organization, which is supported by the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, played a central role in the attacks." These "clear and indisputable" facts have never been given to the Security Council.

On 10 November, the Sunday Telegraph revealed the existence of a videotape (mailed on 20 October) in which Osama bin Laden had claimed responsibility for the attacks: "The twin towers were legitimate targets. They constitute a pillar of American economic might. These events have been greatly overblown from every point of view. What was destroyed wasn't just the twin towers, but the moral towers of this country." Bin Laden had also threatened the American president and the British prime minister: "Bush and Blair only understand the language of force. Every time they kill us, we'll kill them, until we reach a balance of power." These revelations were confirmed the same day by Tony Blair, who told the EU that he had had access to a transcription. This mysterious cassette is cited in the published version of Blair's report [see <http://www.pm.gov.uk/file.asp?fileid=2590>]. In fact, what it was was an interview obtained by the all-news channel Al-Jazeera and broadcast by CNN in January 2002.

A theatrical moment: on 9 December, the Washington Post revealed, on the front page, the existence of a new videotape [New Tape Points to Bin Laden, by Walter Pincus and Karen De Young, 9 December 2001]. Sent by a proxy agent of Public Enemy Number One on 11 September, it showed bin Laden's reactions and definitively proved his responsibility in planning the attacks. According to Reuters, citing an anonymous official, the al-Qaeda leader even said that most of the hijackers weren't kamikazes and didn't know they were on a suicide mission.

Appearing as a guest on ABC's "This Week," the Under-Secretary of Defense, Paul Wolfowitz, commented: "It's repugnant. I mean, here's a man who brags and takes pleasure in killing thousands of innocent people. This confirms everything we already know about him. There's nothing new or surprising about it. It's just a confirmation. And I hope that this is going to definitively silence the insane conspiracy theories that are saying that in a way, the US or somebody else is responsible." [My translation of Meysan's translation of Wolfowitz's comments.]

This videotape was disseminated by the Pentagon on 13 December 2001. Osama bin Laden made "confessions" therein, which conformed in all respects to the official version, which we know to be quite detached from reality. "I thought that the fire caused by the jet fuel would weaken the metallic structure [of the WTC] and that it would cause the damaged area to collapse and just the floors above it. That's all we were hoping for. We had finished our work for the day, and we turned on the radio. We changed the station to catch the latest news out of Washington. The news bulletin went as usual. The attack wasn't mentioned until the very end. Then, the newscaster announced that an airplane had just struck the WTC. A moment went by, then they announced that a second airplane had hit the WTC. The brothers who heard the news were delirious with joy. The brothers, those who conducted the operation, all they knew was that they had a martyr mission to carry out, and we asked each of them to go to America, but they didn't know anything about the operation, not a single word. But they were trained, and we didn't reveal anything about the operation to them right up until the moment when they were there and were getting ready to get on board the airplanes. They were filled with a delirious joy when the first airplane crashed into the building, and I told them, Be patient. The time lapse between the first and the second airplanes that crashed into the towers was 20 minutes, and the one that crashed into the Pentagon was an hour." [The State Department's transcription of the tape is reproduced in full in the appendix.]

The bin Laden agent not only backs up the fable of the towers collapsing through combustion, that of the kamikaze teams, and even the crash at the Pentagon, but it also takes care to refute the evidence. The video, indeed, ends with its acolyte's commentary: "They [the Americans] were terrified and thought a coup d'État was happening." If Public Enemy Number One says so.

Recidivist bin Laden's guilt in the 11 September attacks was therefore beyond doubt, because he had even taken responsibility for events that never happened. But has bin Laden really broken it off with the CIA, and has he really become an enemy of America?

From 1987 to 1998, the formation of Al-Qaeda combat units was overseen by Ali Mohammed, an Egyptian officer incorporated into the US Army. Mohammed taught simultaneously at the JFK Special Warfare Center and School, where he formed the members of the most secret networks of influence, the stay-behind, and also US Special Forces officers. [The Masking of a Militant by Benjamin Weiser and James Risen, New York Times, 1 December 1998.] Knowing the security procedures of the American secret services, which reckoned on a constant surveillance of agents among them, can one believe for a second that Ali Mohammed would have been able to switch back and forth between working at a military base in the US and working at Al-Qaeda camps in Sudan and Afghanistan without immediately being unmasked? Ali Mohammed's arrest, covered in the press, at the end of 1998, isn't enough to hide the fact that the stay-behind formed the Al-Qaeda combatants and that bin Laden thus continued working for the CIA at least up until 1998!

Moreover, how could one not see that the bin Laden legend is a coverup, stitched together out of various pieces by the CIA? You're asking us to believe that bin Laden

managed to kick the most powerful army in the world out of Somalia with only a couple dozen fighters!

Or again, we're asked to believe that the attacks in Nairobi and Dar es-Salaam were anti-American, when not a single one of the eleven people killed in Dar es-Salaam were American, and in Nairobi, only 12 of the 213 dead were Americans. Whoever launched these falsely anti-American attacks took care to make somebody else deal with the consequences. [Terrorism: US Response to Bombing in Kenya and Tanzania, A New Policy Direction? by Raphael Perl, Congressional Research Service (Library of Congress, 1 September 1998). See <http://www.house.gov/crstmp/98-733.pdf>, and Significant Incidents of Political Violence Against Americas, State Dept (1998), <http://www.dsosac.org/publications/documents/sig1998.pdf>.]

In reality, the CIA continued to avail itself of bin Laden's services against Russian influence just as it had been doing against the Soviet Union. You don't mess with a winning team. Al-Qaeda's "Arab Legion" was used in 1999 to help the Kosovar rebels against the Belgrade dictatorship. [Osamagate by Michel Chossudovsky, Center for Research on Globalization, 9 Oct 2001, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO110A.html>, and Les Soldats de Ben Laden en Bosnie et Kosovo by Kosta Christitch, Balkans-Infos, October 2001.] The Legion was operational in Chechnya, at least up until November 2001, just as the NYT reported [War on Terror Casts Chechen Conflict in a New Light by Michael Wines, NYT, 9 December 2001]. Bin Laden's claimed hostility against the USA allows Washington to deny its responsibility in these warped coups.

The connections between the CIA and bin Laden weren't severed in 1998. Gravely ill, he went to an American hospital in Dubai, UAE, for treatment, from 4 to 14 July 2001. "During his hospitalization, [he] received visits from several family members and Emirati and Saudi personages. During the same visit, the local CIA representative, whom lots of people in Dubai knew, was seen taking the main elevator on his way to Osama bin Laden's room," wrote Le Figaro [La CIA a rencontrÉ Ben Laden † Dubai en juillet by Alexandra Richard, Le Figaro, 31 October 2001.] "The night before the 11 September terrorist attacks, Osama bin Laden was in PakistanÖ he was discreetly admitted to a military hospital in Rawalpindi to undergo dialysis," the CBS correspondent reports [Hospital Worker: I Saw Osama by Barry Petersen, CBS, 29 January 2002].

The man who called for jihad against the USA and Israel, the man on whose head the FBI put a \$5 million price, the man whose training camps were bombed with cruise missiles, receives treatment in an American hospital in Dubai, where he has a chat with the CIA chief of station, then he goes for kidney dialysis under the protection of the Pakistani army in Rawalpindi.

The trickery implicates people close to bin Laden and Al-Qaeda combatants. For example, according to the American official version, the Ash-Shifa laboratory in Sudan had been used by bin Laden to manufacture chemical weapons of mass destruction. That why it had been bombarded by the USAF in 1998. Nevertheless, international observers, come to inspect the ruins, denied that the factory had been used to manufacture anything other than aspirin. This factory was co-owned by Osama bin Laden and Salah Idris. The

CIA accused the latter of complicity in the manufacture of chemical weapons and financing the Islamic Jihad group in Egypt. They froze his financial assets, but then quietly lifted that measure in May 1999. The "terrorist" Salah Idris today controls 75% of IES Digital Systems and 20% of Protec through the offshore intermediary Global Security Systems. Now, IES Digital Systems is currently responsible for video surveillance of British government and military sites, just as Baron Cox revealed to the EU [Terror Links TVs Guard UK by Antony Barnett and Conal Walsh, The Observer, 14 October 2001; Inquiry Call Over Company Guarding UK Nuclear Plant, Barnett/Walsh, The Observer, 4 November 2001]. Meanwhile Protec oversees security for eleven British nuclear plants.

As for Mohammed Atta, whom the FBI accuse of being the Al-Qaeda agent responsible for leading the kamikaze commandos on 11 September and whose bank account was used to finance the operation, he was an agent of the Pakistani intelligence service (ISI)—the ones who have always been considered a branch of the CIA [Pakistan's Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI) by B. Rahman, South Asia Analysis Group, Paper 287, 1 August 2001, <http://www.saag.org>]. In July 2001, Gen. Ahmed Mahmud, ISI director, transferred \$5000 into Mohammed Atta's American bank account, according to the Times of India [India Helped FBI Trace ISI-Terrorist Link, Times of India, 9 October 2001]. This revelation didn't raise a single question in America. Calls were redoubled for Gen. Mahmud to take retirement, not without his having taken care to pick his own successor.

The measures the USA took against bin Laden are no more convincing. The 75 cruise missiles [The BGM-109 Tomahawk missiles were manufactured by General Dynamics in collaboration with McDonnell Douglas. They are invoiced to the US military at a cost of between \$600,000 and \$1.2 million each, depending on the model. The cost of munitions alone in this reprisal operation was thus somewhere between \$45 million and \$90 million.] which were fired at Al-Qaeda training camps and the Ash-Shifa factory killed 21 Islamist fighters, which really doesn't seem in proportion either to the amount of munitions expended or to the 298 people killed in Nairobi and Dar es-Salaam.

"Since the Cold War era, Washington has consciously supported Osama bin Laden, while at same time placing him on the FBI's "most wanted list" as the World's foremost terrorist. While the Mujahideen are busy fighting America's war in the Balkans and the former Soviet Union, the FBI --operating as a US based Police Force- is waging a domestic war against terrorism, operating in some respects independently of the CIA which has --since the Soviet-Afghan war-- supported international terrorism through its covert operations," writes Professor Michel Chossudovsky of the University of Ottawa. [<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO109C.html>]

On the one hand, Osama bin Laden is not an enemy, but an agent of the United States; and on the other hand, he never broke off with his family, who are essential trading partners of the Bush family [We have dealt with these relations in detail in The Secret Financial Ties of the Bushes and bin Ladens, in Notes d'informations du rÈseau Voltaire, 16 October 2001].

We have already noted that the Saudi Binladen Group's financial holdings are managed by the Carlyle Group.

Created in 1987, the Carlyle Group today manages a \$12 billion portfolio. It has a majority interest in Seven-Up (who oversees bottling operations for Cadbury Schweppes), Federal Data Corporation (who, for example, furnished the civil air-traffic monitoring systems equipment for the FAA), and United Defence Industries Inc. (the principal furnisher of equipment for the US, Turkish, and Saudi armies). Through the companies it controls, the Carlyle Group is the 11th largest US arms supplier.

In 1990, the Carlyle Group became the subject of an extortion lawsuit. A Republican lobbyist, Wayne Berman, had diverted pension funds and given them to the Bush campaign; one of these had paid a million dollars to the Carlyle Group to obtain a public contract in Connecticut.

This management fund is presided over by Frank C. Carlucci (former CIA assistant director, then Secretary of Defense). Advisors include James A. Baker III (former Reagan chief of staff, then Secretary of the Treasury, finally Secretary of State under Bush père) and Richard Darman (former budget director). To represent it overseas, the Carlyle group retains the services of John Major [John Major Link to Bin Laden Dynasty, Sunday Herald, 7 October 2001], former British Prime Minister, and George H. W. Bush [Bush of Arabia, The Nation, 27 March 2000, and Elder Bush in Big GOP Cast Toiling for Top Equity Firm, New York Times, 5 March 2001] (former CIA director, then President of the United States).

Among the other directors of the Carlyle Group, we find Sami Mubarak Baarma, who is Khaled Ben Mahfouz's authorized representative, and one Talat Othman two people with direct ties to the current President of the United States.

Indeed, George W. Bush obtained his personal fortune through the good business deals he was able to make as head of the Harken Energy Corporation [which was originally named Arbusto]. This small Texas petroleum company held the Bahraini oil concessions, as a retrocommission of the American-Kuwaiti contracts negotiated by President Bush père [Fuel for Fantasy, Forbes magazine, 3 September 1990, and Ex-Bush Aide Turns to Stumping for Kuwait While Junior Reaps Oil Windfall, The Guardian, 12 December 1990]. This, of course, is a completely illegal operation.

Khaled Ben Mahfouz was a Harken shareholder to the tune of 11.5%. His actions were "carried out" by one of his representatives, Abdullah Taha Bakhsh. Talat Othman was an administrator. Meanwhile, Osama's eldest brother, Salem, was represented on Harken's board of directors by his American representative, James R. Bath.

This whole little world (the Bush family, their political creditors, their financial partners, and the ineluctable CIA) isn't even done here with their first manipulations [Tout ce petit monde... n'en sont pas ¶ leurs premiÈres manipulations]. They were at the center of the huge banking scandal of the 90s: the BCCI collapse [The BCCI scandal has spawned quite a large body of literature. Here we have consulted principally The BCCI Affair, a report by Sens. Joseph Kerry (D-Mass.) and Hank Brown (R-Colo.) to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Narcotics, and International Operations, 30 September 1992. See the complete text at http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/1992_rpt/bcci. See also Evil Money, Encounters Along

the Money Trail by Rachel Ehrenfeld (Harper Business, 1992); False Profits, The Inside Story of BCCI, The World's Most Corrupt Financial Empire by Peter Truell and Larry Gurwin (Houghton, 1992); A Full-Service Bank, How the BCCI Stole Billions Around the World (Simon and Schuster, 1992); The Outlaw Bank, A Wild Ride Into the Secret Heart of BCCI by Jonathan Beaty and S.C. Gwynne (Random House, 1993); and Bankrupt, The BCCI Fraud by Nick Kochan and Bob Whittington (Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1991)].

The Bank of Credit and Commerce International (BCCI) was an Anglo-Pakistani establishment with branches in 63 countries. It was jointly held by three large families: the Gokals of Pakistan, the Ben Mahfouz family of Saudi Arabia, and the Geith Pharons of Abu Dhabi [The French chargé d'affaires of Geith Pharon, Farid Djouhri, took out a two-page ad in Le Figaro and Le Monde in October of 2001. This communication project was intended to deny any connections between Geith Pharon and Osama bin Laden and to assure its integrity. Nevertheless, the FBI and the IRS still have a warrant out for Gaith Pharon's arrest over the BCCI affair. Gaith Pharon is also involved in a lawsuit in Argentina in an arms-trafficking cadre implicating former president Carlos Menem. See Gaith Pharon s'offre la presse française, Intelligence Online, 18 October 2001, <http://www.intelligenceonline.fr/>]. Ronald Reagan used it to bribe the Iranian government to delay the release of American hostages from the US Embassy in Tehran, and thus to sabotage the end of Carter's presidency (what was called the "October Surprise"). Then, at the insistence of the former CIA director, Vice-President Bush (père), the Reagan administration used the BCCI again to transfer Saudi donations to the Nicaraguan Contras, and to transfer CIA funds to the Afghan mujahedeen. The BCCI is additionally implicated in the Syrian Sarkis Sarkenalian's arms deals, in the Keating scandal in America, in trader Marc Rich's affairs, in financing the Abu Nidal group, etc. For sure, the bank went down when it came out that the bank was also laundering money for the Medellin cartel. A million small investors were swindled out of their money when the bank shut its doors.

The fact that the BCCI was able to be manipulated, if not actually created, by the CIA, shouldn't come as a surprise. There's a long-standing banking tradition in the US intelligence services, ever since the founding of the OSS by corporate lawyers and Wall Street courtiers. Two former CIA directors, Richard Helms and William Casey, worked at BCCI, just as did two prestigious CIA influence agents [deux prestigieux agents d'influence de la CIA], Adnan Khashoggi [Adnan Khashoggi, The Richest Man in the World, by Ronald Kessler (Warner Bros. Books, 1986)] and Manucher Ghorbanifar (the central Irangate trader). Not to mention Kamal Adham (King Faisal's brother-in-law and head of the Saudi secret service until 1977), Prince Turki al-Faisal (head of the Saudi secret service from 1977 until August 2001, tutor to Osama bin Laden), and Abdul Raouf Khalil (adjunct director of Saudi secret service).

If memory serves, you'll note also that the BCCI seems to have played something of a supernatural role in France as well. Notably, it served to disguise the transfer of American/French nuclear technology to Pakistan and to pay for hostage releases. A businessman with close ties to Charles Pasqua, Dominique Santini was ejected from the country for his role in BCCI [L'Enigme Pasqua, by Thierry Meyssan (Editions Golias,

2001)], independently of his being sued in France in the Elf-Thinet affair. Three years after the bank's collapse, its former directors acted as intermediaries in getting the Sawari-II contract passed, and they organized a system of retrocommissions which was supposed to finance Edouard Balladur's presidential campaign. The questioning brought forth by this star sale to Saudi Arabia led Jacques Chirac, upon his arrival at the Elysée, to have François Leotard, Edouard Balladur's former Defense Minister, listened in on. [??] [Les interrogations soulevées par cette vente de vedettes à l'Arabie Saoudite conduisirent Jacques Chirac, dès son arrivée à l'Elysée, à faire placer sur écoute l'ancien ministre de la Défense d'Edouard Balladur, François Leotard.]

The BCCI worked in very close collaboration with SICO [originally called CYGNET], a Swiss investment subsidiary of the SBG, and one will notice one of Osama bin Laden's brothers, Salem, among the ranks of its administrators.

Held solely responsible for the BCCI's failure, Khaled ben Mahfouz was put on trial in the United States in 1992. He managed to have the charges against him dropped in 1995, with the issue of a transaction with the bank's creditors in the amount of \$245 million.

If it is the case, as numerous American officials aver, that the bin Laden family continues to maintain relations with Osama and to finance his political activities, then the Carlyle Group, which manages the financial holdings of the Saudi Binladen Group, would necessarily be implicated in insider trading. George Bush père would therefore be one of the lucky beneficiaries of the stock-trading maneuvers of 11 September 2001. A pretty good reason for the FBI and IOSCO to close the shutters on the investigation.

[END OF CHAPTER EIGHT]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 9: The Affairs Continue

On 7 October 2001, George W. Bush solemnly gives an address on TV. His speech isn't transmitted out of the Oval Office, but from the White House treaty room: the war has just begun.

Good afternoon. On my orders, the United States military has begun strikes against al Qaeda terrorist training camps and military installations of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. These carefully targeted actions are designed to disrupt the use of Afghanistan as a terrorist base of operations, and to attack the military capability of the Taliban regime.

We are joined in this operation by our staunch friend, Great Britain. Other close friends, including Canada, Australia, Germany and France, have pledged forces as the operation unfolds. More than 40 countries in the Middle East, Africa, Europe and across Asia have granted air transit or landing rights. Many more have shared intelligence. We are supported by the collective will of the world.

More than two weeks ago, I gave Taliban leaders a series of clear and specific demands: Close terrorist training camps; hand over leaders of the al Qaeda network; and return all foreign nationals, including American citizens, unjustly detained in your country. None of these demands were met. And now the Taliban will pay a price.

[Ö] the oppressed people of Afghanistan will know the generosity of America and our allies. As we strike military targets, we'll also drop food, medicine and supplies to the starving and suffering men and women and children of Afghanistan.

The United States of America is a friend to the Afghan people, and we are the friends of almost a billion worldwide who practice the Islamic faith. The United States of America is an enemy of those who aid terrorists and of the barbaric criminals who profane a great religion by committing murder in its name.

[Ö] We did not ask for this mission, but we will fulfill it.

[<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011007-8.html>]

In London, Tony Blair addresses the British people from 10 Downing Street. He confirms that Her Majesty's troops will fight alongside the Americans.

While a rain of fire crashes down on Kabul, the Qatari TV channel Al-Jazeera broadcasts a pre-recorded response from Osama bin Laden:

"Here is America, struck by Allah in its most vulnerable spot, destroying, thanks be to God, its most prestigious buildings, and we give thanks to God for this. Here is America filled with terror from the north to the south and from the east to the west, and we give thanks to God for this. God has directed the steps of a group of Muslims, a group in the vanguard who have destroyed America and we implore God to elevate their rank and to

receive them into paradise. [Ö] After what has taken place and after what the high officials of the United States, at the first rank of which the world's chief infidel, Bush, have said, and after they'll have mobilized their men and their horses and have set against us the countries which claim to be MuslimÖ they have set out to fight a group which hews to its religion and which cares not for this world, they have set out to combat Islam and to attack people under the pretext of terrorism. [Ö] These events have divided the entire world into two parts: those who have faith and are free of hypocrisy, and those of the infidels, from whom God preserve us. Every Muslim must set himself to defend his religion, for the wind of faith and change has blown in order to annihilate injustice in Muhammad's peninsula [the Arabian Peninsula, where the prophet of Islam was born]. To America I address these words, I swear to God that America will never know safety until Palestine knows it, and until all the atheist Western armies have quit the holy lands." [Translated from Meyssan's French]

This televisual dialogue between President Bush and CIA agent bin Laden having confirmed to the world that the war in Afghanistan is a response to the 11 September attacks, the affairs may commence.

The collapse of the USSR and the independence of the Central Asian states re-opened the "Great Game" [The expression "the Great Game" came back into vogue through articles by Ahmad Rashid in the Far Eastern Economic Review. See The New Great Game in Muslim Central Asia by M. Ehsan Ahrari, McNair Paper no. 47 (Nat'l Defense University, 1996), downloadable at <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/mcnair/mcnair47/mcnair47.pdf>; Central Asia: A New Great Game? by Dianne L. Smith (US Army War College, 1996), <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/ssipubs/pubs96/centasia/centasia.pdf>; The New Great Game: Oil, Politics in the Caucasus and Central Asia (Heritage Foundation, 1996); Jihadi Groups, Nuclear Pakistan, and the New Great Game by Ehsan Ahrari (US Army War College, 2001), <http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/ssipubs/pubs2001/jihadi/jihadi.pdf>. See also Oil Rivalries in the Caspian Sea by Comité 4 of the 51st session of the Institut des Hautes Etudes de la DÉfense Nationale, <http://www.ihedn.fr/>]. The expression, coined by Kipling in the 19th century, refers to the power struggles which the great empires waged in the region without actually directly facing one another.

The region possesses very important oil and natural gas reserves. There are also precious stones to be found in the mountains. Poppies are also grown there [Taliban and the Drug Trade, by Richard Perl (Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 5 October 2001, http://www.fpc.gov/CRS_REPS/crystalib.pdf; and Central Asia: Drugs and Conflict by the International Crisis Group, http://www.crisisweb.org/projects/asia/centralasia/reports/A400495_26112001-2.pdf].

When he took over the White House, George W. Bush put together his governmental team with high-level people from the oil lobby. Such as Condoleezza Rice [Critics Knock Naming Oil Tanker Condoleezza, by Carla Marinucci, San Francisco Chronicle, 5 April 2001], is a former director of Chevron-Texaco [Ms. Rice was a Chevron administrator and shareholder up until her nomination as National Security Adviser. Chevron is the

new name of the firm founded by John D. Rockefeller, Standard Oil of California, called Esso Standard. Chevron and Texaco merged on 9 October 2001. With a market capitalization of 124 billion euros, the new company is the second largest US multinational country after Exxon-Mobil (worth 242 billion euros).], or the Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton, who represented BP-Amoco's interests [BP-Amoco is the third-biggest worldwide oil company, worth 157 billion euros. BP-Amoco merged some of their European operations with Mobil.] and those of the Saudi company Delta Oil. Dick Cheney, former president of Halliburton, the biggest worldwide petroleum equipment supplier [<http://www.halliburton.com>; worth 12.5 billion euros], founded a National Energy Political Development group. Its meetings are top-secret, the list of participants is a state secret, and it's forbidden to commit the meetings' minutes to paper. Everything about it is so secret that the Washington Post quickly called it a "sort of secret society." [Energy Task Force Works In Secret, by Dana Milbank and Eric Pianin, Washington Post, 16 April 2001.]

Commentators, who still aren't aware of what will be the great weakness of Enron, the world's biggest energy broker, agree to think that the essential objective of the NEPD is to exploit the Caspian Sea hydrocarbon resources. The question is to figure out how to transport oil and gas without having to negotiate with Russia and Iran. A pipeline will be built to connect the Caspian with the Mediterranean by crossing Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Turkey (this is called the "BTC project," for Baku, Tblisi, and Ceyhan). In the meantime, another has been carried out to connect the Caspian with the Black Sea, unfortunately crossing Russia, who will deduct their tithe. It connects Tengiz with Novorossisysk and was officially opened on 27 November 2001. A third one, the most promising of the lot, will have to connect the Caspian with the Indian Ocean (a project of UNOCAL with the assistance of Delta Oil) [in order to bring its project to light, UNOCAL first created the Central Asia Gas (CentGas) consortium with Delta Oil, Gazprom, and Turkmenogaz. It ran up against the unforeseen concurrence of the Argentine Bidas. Then UNOCAL created the Central Asian Oil Pipeline Project with the Saudi company Delta Oil, the Turkmenistan government, Indonesian Petroleum (INPEX), the Japanese company ITOCHU, the Korean firm Hyundai, and the Pakistani Crescent Group.]. Problem: it would have to cross not only Pakistan, but also Afghanistan, which is rife with internal struggles during which all forms of government disappeared in the Soviet debacle. In December 1997, UNOCAL had to shelve its project, faced with the incomprehension of the Taliban. All attempts to get it going again have since run aground, although the VP of the company, John J. Maresca, was named US Ambassador to Afghanistan.

To revive the discussion, Secretary of State Colin Powell approves a \$43 million subsidy, in May 2001, to the Taliban regime, for the "redeployment" of peasant poppy growers. After having gotten approval at the G-8 summit (which India attended as observer), multipartite negotiations are held in Berlin which bring together America, the UK, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Russia. Germany acts as host country, for Germany runs the UN group monitoring Afghanistan. But with which Afghans should they talk? With the legal government of President Rabbani, internationally recognized, but who really doesn't control much of anything; or with the Islamic emirate governed by a medieval sect: the Taliban? The decision is made to invite the latter, in violation of a UN Security Council resolution which forbids dealing with them. Holding genuine visas, the Taliban

dignitaries benefit from their trip to Germany by preaching and raising funds in Hamburg.

The Taliban [Shadow of the Taliban, by Ahmed Rashid, Editions Autrement, 2001] are a closed brotherhood, a Sunni sect, who profess a return to a primitive brand of Islam. Their directors are veterans of the Soviet war, all with war wounds. They recognize the authority of a rural mullah, Omar, who has never traveled in his life and is not even familiar with one-third of his own country. In the chaos which followed the Soviet exodus, the Taliban succeeded in playing their game quite well at bringing ethnic solidarity into play: like most of the leaders of the Pakistani secret service (ISI), they are Pashtuns.

Mullah Omar proclaimed himself Commander of the Faithful and created an emirate, recognized only by Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and the UAE. Having no training at all in international relations, they got back in touch with some of their American friends with whose help they fought the Soviets. So they're represented at the UN by Leila Helms, niece of Richard Helms, who was CIA director from 1966 to 1973. As far as internal policy, the Taliban imposed an iron discipline on their population, segregating women and forbidding impious acts. After having long tolerated the poppy-cultivating culture, they forbade it, cutting off a sector of the peasantry from their only source of income. The sect ceded a vast portion of territory to Osama bin Laden.

The Taliban, not well-versed in diplomatic protocol, attempt to obtain international recognition in exchange for allowing the pipeline. Seeing that there's no question of that happening, as the UN recognizes a different government for Afghanistan—that of the inconsistent President Rabbani—they cut off negotiations. According to the Pakistani diplomat Niaz Naik, the American delegation becomes belligerent and announces in mid-July that they're going to settle the dispute with arms.

The USA plans on eliminating the main players in the Afghan factions, mainly Mullah Omar or the commandant Massoud (whose anti-American feelings are legendary), and to substitute a puppet government in their place. He [?] pulls an apparent legitimacy from the extreme unction of former king Zahir Shah, the forgotten old monarch breathing his last in exile in Rome.

In mid-July, the major powers give their blessing to the plan. This is evident in the final communiqué from the meeting between Hubert Védrine (French minister of foreign affairs) and Francesc Vendrell (head of the UN Special Mission to Afghanistan) on 17 July 2001: "The two parties together explored the paths which would permit an eventual favorable evolution, particularly the encouragement which the international community could bring to the efforts of the King [sic] to reunite with him representatives of Afghan society. They also evoked the usefulness of reinforcing dialogue with Pakistan. Hereafter, one will have to naturally consider the supposed reconstruction of Afghanistan, once the conflict has come to an end [sic]." [Press conference of 17 July 2001.]

Yes, from the month of July on, one speaks of the deposed sovereign Zahir Shah as the King of Afghanistan, and one evokes parallel debates about the "conflict" and the "reconstruction" of the country!

The negotiations are pursued, in London, then in Geneva, under the aegis of the Business Humanitarian Forum [sic] [<http://www.bhforum.org>]—whose budget is generously funded by the UNOCAL oil company—but with different objectives and different guests (including the Japanese, who have a particular hope for Caspian oil deposits). As Messrs. VÉdrine and Vendrell foresaw, nobody's preparing for peace, but for war and reconstruction.

Fearing too much pressure Anglo-American pressure, Pakistan looks for new allies before the tempest gets underway. It invites a Chinese delegation to Islamabad and promises them to open a door for China to the Indian Ocean in exchange for military support. Irritated, the Anglo-Americans decide to go on the offensive more quickly than previously planned, in any case before the Chinese can get into the Great Game [Never-broadcast video interview with Niaz Naik by BenoÓt Califano, Pierre Trouillet and Guilhem Rondot (ITV-Dokumenta coproduction, October 2001)]. The Sea of Oman sees the biggest British naval deployment since the Falkland Islands war, while NATO assembles 40,000 men in Egypt. On 9 September, the charismatic leader of the Islamic Front, the very anti-American commander Massoud, is assassinated [The assassination of Shah Massoud was kept secret for a few days and wasn't revealed until after the attacks in the US. It was then attributed to Osama. Now, the official version of his death doesn't correspond at all with the breaking-story reports from the French journalist FranÁoise Causse. At the moment, Shah Massoud's entourage had attributed the assassination rather to the ISI.]. The 11 September attacks allowed what's nothing but a classic colonial expedition to pass for a legitimate operation.

The operation had to be called "Infinite Justice," but that message resonates terribly in the Muslim world. It will thus be redubbed "Enduring Freedom" [The best analyses of "Enduring Freedom" are those assembled by the British parliamentary research service: 11 September 2001, The Response (Research Paper 01/72, 3 October 2001), Operation Enduring Freedom and the Conflict in Afghanistan, an Update (Research Paper 01/81, 31 October 2001), and The Campaign Against International Terrorism, Prospects After the Fall of the Taliban (Research Paper 01/112). You can download these documents from <http://www.parliament.uk/commons/lib/research/rp2001/rp01-072.pdf> (rp01-081.pdf and rp01-112.pdf, respectively).]. It's supported by a circumstantial diplomatic alliance, the Global Coalition, which consists of 136 nations [for a state-by-state analysis, see Operation Enduring Freedom: Foreign Pledges of Military and Intelligence Support, Congressional Research Service (Library of Congress, 17 October 2001), http://www.fpc.gov/CRS_REPS/crsfree.pdf] who offered the USA their military assistance [The Global War on Terrorism, The First 100 Days, official document of the Coalition Information Center, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/12/100dayreport.pdf>]. The Americans keeping in mind how the Soviets got bogged down in a ground war during the 1979-1989 war, they abstain from sending GIs over there. They prefer to buy war chiefs at high prices and send them to fight in their stead against the Taliban. This method evidently entails arming rival factions in violation of the UN embargo. In view of this turn of events, Russia massively arms Massoud's Islamic Front, while Iran arms the Shiite Hazaris. The USAF contents itself with precision bombing to prop up the anti-Taliban forces, and sometimes also to contain them. Indeed, the various factions' war objectives

have nothing in common with those of the Global Coalition (to apprehend Osama bin Laden), nor with the official oil ambitions.

So the Anglo-Americans change their tactics. They go back to traditional carpet bombing under which they vitrify their irksome foes. The Taliban are unable to keep up their dictatorship over their territory and find themselves isolated in separate groups. At the same time, the Islamic Front, rebaptized the "Northern Alliance" for the expediency of international communication, penetrates the disorganized front lines of the Taliban.

The USAF hounds the runaways. The Taliban try to rally at Kandahar, while the victors hand out various massacres, notably at Mazar-e-Sharif under the command of Gen. Dostum. After all is said and done, one or two thousand fanatics, Taliban and Al-Qaeda members together, hole up in the mountains at Tora Bora under a deluge of steel, then negotiate their surrender into the hands of their Pakistani friends. In total, the Anglo-American air forces flew 4700 sorties, in the course of which they dropped 12,000 bombs, killing more than 10,000 combatants [AFP dispatch, 6 December 2001] and "collateral damage" of at least a thousand civilians [Operation Enduring Freedom: Why A Higher Rate of Civilian Bombing Casualties, Project on Defense Alternatives, Briefing Report #11 (18 January 2002), <http://www.comw.org/pda/0201oef.html>; US Silence and Power of Weaponry Conceal Scale of Civilian Toll, Sydney Morning Herald, 26 January 2002; Afghans Are Still Dying As Air Strikes Go On, But No One Is Counting by Ian Traynor, The Guardian; and Civilian Toll in US Raids Put at 1000 by John Donnelly and Anthony Shadid, Boston Globe, 17 February 2002]. The military escalation led the USAF to abandon the idea of "surgical strikes" and to use weapons of mass destruction, BLU-82 bombs (called "daisy cutters") [The BLU-82 wasn't originally designed for combat, as the damage they cause are important and blind, but for engineering. They were used in Vietnam to clear jungle and to cut landing pads for helicopters.], to neutralize the least remaining fighters spread out in the mountains.

The war ends with UN Security Council Resolution 1378 [<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/01111512.htm>]. It sets the scope of negotiations at Bonn where the various Afghan factions agree on a new government [Strange Victory: A Critical Appraisal of Operation Enduring Freedom and the Afghan War, by Carl Conetta, Project on Defense Alternatives, Monograph #6, 30 January 2002, <http://www.comw.org/pda/0201strangevic.html>]. The round table puts in place a provisional administration which it wishes to be presided over by the ex-king Zahir Shah. Zahir Shah withdrawing, as foreseen, Hamid Karzai becomes Prime Minister. During the Soviet war, he had personal ties with the then-CIA director William Casey. Afterwards, he had emigrated to the United States, where he became a friend of the Bush family and was employed by an UNOCAL subsidiary [Afghanistan, the Taliban, and the Bush Oil Team by Wayne Madsen, Democrats.Com, 23 January 2002]. Gen. Abdel Rasheed Dostum, nicknamed "Genghis Khan" in honor of the atrocities he committed over the course of 20 years, succeeds in bringing together the Global Coalition in time. He's not sought for war crimes, but brought into the new administration. This plan of action is validated on 6 December 2001 by UN Security Council Resolution 1383 [<http://www.un.org/docs/scres/2001/res1383e.pdf>]. The hundreds of thousands of Afghans who fled their country to escape from the bombardments take the way back

home.

Operation "Enduring Freedom" was steered through the National Security Council by Zalmay Khalilzad [The Roving Eye, Pipelineistan, a two-part investigation by Pepe Escobar, Asia Times, 25-26 January 2002]. Son of an advisor of the ex-king Zahir Shah, he studied in America at the University of Chicago. He fought in his country in connection with the CIA during the Soviet war after having gained US citizenship and having become a State Dept advisor under Reagan. During the first Bush administration, he was named undersecretary of defense and played a key role in "Desert Storm" against Iraq. During the Clinton years, he worked for Rand Corporation and for UNOCAL. While the negotiations with the Taliban were rolling right along, he took their side in in the Washington Post, writing that they "do not at all practise the anti-Americanism which Iranian fundamentalists espouse." He changed his point of view once the oil negotiations wore out, and became the Bush administration's reference expert after 11 September [See his portrait in Bush's Favorite Afghan, by Jacob Weisberg, in Slate (<http://slate.msn.com/>), 5 October 2001, and New US Envoy to Kabul Lobbied for Taliban Oil Rights by Kim Sengupta and Andrew Gumber, The Independent, 10 January 2002. One will carefully read the writings of Zalmay Khalilzad: Speech Before the LA World Affairs Council (9 March 2000), <http://www.lawac.org/speech/khalilzad.html>, and the article co-written with Daniel Byrman: Afghanistan, The Consolidation of a Rogue State, in The Washington Quarterly, Winter 2000.]. At the outbreak of the war, he is named special representative for Afghanistan. He will have to oversee the construction of the so-coveted pipeline.

The international press is invited to visit the vestiges of Taliban and al-Qaeda facilities. They discover miserable tumbledown cottages where hand-me-down weapons from the Soviet war lie heaped up. But no journalist manages to locate the chemical-and-bacteriological weapon factories, nor the atomic bomb plants, and even less the satellite launching pads which Rumsfeld had denounced.

The affairs continue. Poppy cultivation can finally bloom, destined for the North American market [Opium Farmers Rejoice at Defeat of the Taliban by Richard Lloyd Parry, The Independent, 21 November 2001; and Victorious Warlords Set To Open The Opium Floodgates, by Paul Harris, The Observer, 25 November 2001]. And on 9 December 2002, Hamid Karzai and his Pakistani homologue, Gen. Musharraf, conclude an agreement for construction of the Central Asian pipeline [Musharraf, Karzai Agree Major Oil Pipeline in Cooperation Pact, Irish Times, 9 February 2002].

[END OF CHAPTER 9]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 10: Secret Ops

In a note drafted by Leonard Wong for the US Army Institute of Strategic Studies entitled "Maintaining Public Support for Military Operations" [<http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usassi/public.pdf>], one can read the following: "Public support for military action is at levels that parallel public reaction after Pearl Harbor. Americans believe military action is appropriate, support a protracted war, and are willing to endure negative consequences from that war. Despite favorable polls, public support is bound to be fickle. As they return to [their normal] lives, their support of military action will diminish unless the military continually shows progress in the war against terrorism, keeps the nation connected to its armed forces, and provides domestic security that is effective, but for the most part unseen." In other words, public opinion is massively tied up with American politics in the war on terrorism, as long as the suspense holds up.

Operation "Enduring Freedom" began on 7 October 2001. The sound of arms goes away in Central Asia. Taking into account the force ratios, the Coalition's victory is assured before even giving battle. American public attention begins to fade out. Indeed, while Osama bin Laden's hideout is attacked and while Osama is threatening America on TV, no terrorist action from the "sleeper cells" hidden out on American territory is signaled. One began to doubt the danger. What do you reckon happened?

On 12 October, press agencies broadcast some alarming information. Journalists and congressmen had received letters tainted with anthrax spores. All in all, five boobytrapped letters were sent to the National Enquirer, NBC, the New York Post, and to the offices of Sens. Daschle and Leahy. The letters claimed five victims. Americans' daily lives came to a halt. They can no longer open their mail without rubber gloves and surgical masks. Survival-kit and gas-mask vendors are burgled. The postal system shuts down. A psychosis contaminates allied countries. All over Europe, one discovers letters containing the deadly white powder: Al-Qaeda had decided to go on the attack and to use the chemical and biological weapons which it had amassed with the help of Saddam Hussein. The US and its allies decide to build a stockpile of anti-anthrax vaccine. They revive the pharmaceutical industry, ordering millions of doses. And then: nothing. Except for five letters, the whole thing was a schoolboy joke, a collective hallucination.

It turns out that the five letters contained a strain of anthrax which was produced in US Army laboratories. The menace was internal. Barbara Hatch Rosenberg, of the Federation of American Scientists, notes that only about fifty researchers, all of them immediately identifiable, were in a position to get their hands on the stocks and mess with them [Is the FBI Dragging Its Feet? by Barbara Hatch Rosenberg, FAS, 5 February 2002, <http://www.fas.org/bwc/news/anthraxreport.htm>]. An anonymous letter, addressed to the military base at Quantico at the end of September (that is to say, before the press had been informed of the anthrax attacks), denounces the intrigues of a former director of the US AMRIID [Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases], one Dr Assad. The FBI gesticulates yet again and explains nothing.

Once the panic has passed and the lightning-flash Operation "Enduring Freedom" is

finished, the public now thinks it's time to turn the page. The DOD's job is to remind the public of the danger. With a great deal of shocking images, "particularly dangerous terrorists" are imprisoned at the military base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. They're shipped by airplane from Afghanistan after being drugged and strapped to their seats. Once there, they undergo a program of sensory deprivation: masks over their eyes, plugs in their ears, cork stoppers in their noses. DOD lawyers [On this polemic: Trying Terrorists As War Criminals by Jennifer Elsea, Congressional Research Service (Library of Congress, 29 October 2001), http://www.fpc.gov/CRS_REPS/trying%20terrorists.pdf] explain without batting an eye that only federal law prohibits torture, and these laws don't apply in Guantanamo Bay, which is not on US soil. As for the Constitution, it hasn't got a word to say on this subject. The "international community" riots. Mary Robinson, high commissioner of the UN Human Rights Commission (and former president of the Republic of Ireland) expresses public indignation and calls the US government to order [UNHCR Document HR/02/4 [Can't find this one online]]: the detained persons should enjoy POW status as defined in the Geneva Convention. They should be treated in a humane manner and should receive fair and equitable trials.

While public opinion bubbles and simmers with passion, the shadow "war on terrorism" begins. Now, terrorism is neither a state, nor an organization, nor a doctrine, but a mode of action. It can be used by governments (the Robespierre dictatorship of 1793 is known as the terror), just as it can be used by oppressed minority groups. Sometimes, terrorism is plainly justified [sic!!]. Thus, during WWII, the French resistance engaged in terrorist actions against the occupation and collaboration forces, both civilians and military personnel. The expression "war on terrorism" in itself doesn't mean any more than "war on war."

It is true that George W. Bush has a very limited conception of terrorism. Thus, he doesn't consider the actions of death squads in Nicaragua to be "terrorism," even naming their former protector, John Negroponte, US ambassador to the UN [Negroponte Enters UN On Unanimous Senate Vote by Jean-Guy Allard, Granma International, October 2001]. For him, in a world which, after the collapse of the USSR, has become unipolar, "terrorism" seems to be defined as "any violent form of protest against American leadership."

Relying on the confidences of several participants and after consulting the meeting minutes, Bob Woodward (one of the two journalists who broke the Watergate story) described in detail in the Washington Post a Bush cabinet meeting, in the course of which the CIA was granted unlimited powers to wage "war on terrorism" [Saturday, September 15, At Camp David, Advice and Dissent by Bob Woodward and Dan Balz, Washington Post, 31 January 2002]. This was on 15 September 2001, at a governmental summit at Camp David.

The meeting began, of course, with a moment of prayer, led by George W. Bush, which everyone present was invited to join in. Then, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State described their respective actions. CIA director George Tenet then presented two plans in draft, supported with documents presented with particular care.

The first was entitled "Initial Move: Destroy al-Qaeda, Shut Down the [Afghan] Sanctuary." Tenet described the need for secret actions against Al-Qaeda, not only in Afghanistan, but all over the world, necessarily in cooperation with non-democratic countries. Having gotten everyone's agreement, he asked for unlimited powers to realize this objective. "Tenet wanted a decree of allocation sufficiently general to enable the CIA to conduct any and all secret operations necessary without having to get formal approval for every particular operation. Tenet insisted that he needed a new competence to permit the agency to operate without restrictions, and that he was waiting for the President's encouragement to take some risks. He had brought with him a draft of a presidential decree giving the CIA the power to use all the instruments of secret operations, including murder." A second proposition was that the CIA strengthen its ties with important foreign secret-service organizations. Tenet hoped to obtain the assistance of these agencies with the hundreds of millions of dollars he was hoping to receive in his budget. Using services like these as subcontractors could triple or quadruple the CIA's efficacy. Like so many things in the world of secret operations, these kinds of arrangements aren't without risks: that would connect the USA with doubtful agencies, some of which have dismal human-rights records. Some of these services have reputations for brutality and have recourse to torture to get information." [My translation of Meysan's translation of Woodward's article]

The meeting continued in a less-strained manner, Tenet announcing his strategy in Afghanistan. Then, drawing a deep breath, he presented the second document, entitled "Matrix of Worldwide Attack." "It described secret operations in eighty nations which were already in progress or which he was now recommending be carried out. The actions ranged from routine propaganda to murder in preparation for military strikes." Rumsfeld, laying aside the traditional CIA/Pentagon rivalries, warmly approved. "When the CIA director finished his presentation, Bush left no doubt about what he was thinking, shouting enthusiastically: Good work!"

This secret war got underway. In the shadows, the CIA took a few strikes all over the world at Bush's political opponents. Journalist Wayne Madsen has identified four famous victims [J'accuse – Bush's Death Squads by Wayne Madsen, MakingNews.Com, 31 January 2002]:

- On 11 November 2001, the leader of Western New Guinea, Theys Eluay, was kidnapped by a special unit of the Indonesian army, KOPASSUS. This unit, implicated in the East Timor massacres, was formed by the American stay-behind and is trained by the CIA. Theys Eluay was fighting for his country's freedom and was opposed to Freeport McMoran (a Louisiana-based company whose director emeritus is Dr Henry Kissinger himself) pillaging the country's mineral resources.
- On 23 December 2001, Chief Bola Ige, Nigerian Justice Minister, was assassinated in his room by an unidentified commando group. He had been an unsuccessful candidate for President on the Pan-Yoruban Alliance for Democracy ticket and was against the privileges enjoyed by Chevron (a company of which Condoleezza Rice was a director) and ExxonMobil [Death of a Patriot, Newswatch, 30 December 2001, <http://www.newswatchngr.com>].

- In January 2002, the governor of Aceh province wrote a letter to the leader of the Aceh Liberation Movement, Abdullah Syaffi, inviting him to participate in peace talks. Syaffi didn't want to just reclaim independence, but was opposed to ExxonMobil's drilling as well. Claiming filiation with non-violence – he is a member of the UNPO in the Netherlands – he carried out underground fighting. The letter contained a bug which allowed NSA satellites to pinpoint his location. He was assassinated on 22 January by a KOPASSUS commando team.
- The far-right leader Elie Hobeika, leader of the Lebanese Christian militia, and his bodyguards, died on 24 January in a carbomb attack. Hobeika, who was the main person responsible for the 1982 massacre at Sabra and Shatila, had come back out against Israel and was waiting to testify against Ariel Sharon if Sharon went to trial in Belgium for war crimes. The operation was jointly carried out by the CIA and Mossad [Elie Hobeika, the Shock of an Assassination, and Exclusive Details on the Attack, in L'hebdo Magazine, 22 February 2002, <http://www.magazine.com.lb>].

Did you say "war on terrorism?"

On 13 February, the Washington Post prints a long essay by Dr Henry Kissinger [Phase II and Iraq]. The founding father of American foreign policy relates the debates going on in the capital. Three options are possible after victory in Afghanistan.

First, to consider that the work is done and that anyone who'd be tempted to imitate the Taliban will have learned their lesson; second, to put pressure on certain terrorist-supporting states such as Somalia and Yemen; or, third, to concentrate on overthrowing Saddam Hussein in Iraq as a manifestation of America's continued resolve and to change the regional equilibrium in the Middle East.

And Kissinger argues for a decisive attack on Iraq which would combine deployment of forces and assistance to the [anti-Saddam] opposition.

The essay having been called "in-bounds" [Le ballon d'essai s'Étant averÉ positif], the Bush administration gets going.

On 29 January, the President of the United States gives his traditional "State of the Union" address before Congress, this time with the Prime Minister of the transitional Afghan government, Hamid Karzai, in attendance. He announces the new objectives of the "war on terrorism:"

Our nation will continue to be steadfast and patient and persistent in the pursuit of two great objectives. First, we will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice. And, second, we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world. (Applause.)

Our military has put the terror training camps of Afghanistan out of business, yet camps

still exist in at least a dozen countries. A terrorist underworld -- including groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, Jaish-i-Mohammed -- operates in remote jungles and deserts, and hides in the centers of large cities.

Our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction. Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September the 11th. But we know their true nature. North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens.

Iran aggressively pursues these weapons and exports terror, while an unelected few repress the Iranian people's hope for freedom.

Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax, and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens -- leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections -- then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.

States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world.

[<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>]

To the allies of the US, the pressure is too strong. It's been five months that they've had to stand by and silently swallow garter snakes. No decent criticism of the US drift has been possible during the period of mourning following the 11 September attacks. And the USA took care to extend the mourning to their allies and to prolong them by means of all kinds of commemorative ceremonies and TV shows.

Nevertheless, on 6 February, the French minister of foreign affairs, Hubert VÉdrine, takes a step. He acts with the endorsement of the prime minister and the president. On the France-Inter channel, he declares:

"We are allies of the United States, we are friends of the American people. We were sincerely and profoundly brought together in the 11 September tragedy, in the face of that terrorist attack. Not simply in solidarity with the American people, but there is a logic [to the response] and we must eradicate this evil. We must also deal with [the problem] at its roots. And today we are endangered by a new simplistic way of looking at things which is to reduce all the problems of the world into one single "war on terrorism." This is irresponsible. One cannot solve all the problems of the world together in one single "war on terrorism," even if it is necessary to fight terrorism, uniquely by military force. The problem has to be dealt with at its roots. We have to deal with the issues of poverty, injustice, humiliation, and so forth. Europe must stand up for itself. If we do not agree with American policy, we have to say so. We can say so, and we must say so. Being friends of the American people, being American allies in NATO, doesn't mean we're

strung together. It doesn't mean we have to renounce all thoughts on anything that happens. We shall have a dialogue with the United States, and we shall do so in friendship. We will not ask that the US stay at home; to the contrary. We wish for the US to be engaged on the world scene, because there are no serious problems that can be solved without the United States. We will ask them to be engaged, but to be engaged on a multilateral basis, in partnership, such that others can discuss matters with them. If we have to raise our voices a bit in order to be heard, so be it."

In Washington, Colin Powell receives the French minister's proposal with disdain and sniffs about "those Parisian intellectuals who get the vapors."

Two days later, the Prime Minister, Lionel Jospin, takes the opportunity at an EU parliamentary summit to break the blister in front of an international audience:

"The day after the 11 September attacks, we manifested an unwavering solidarity with the US and contributed by their side to the response which this aggression called for. This common action against terrorism will be pursued with determination. But that does not at all mean that we must not reflect in a lucid manner on the lessons which it is advisable to pay heed to after the 11 September events. Indeed, one cannot reduce the world's problems to the single dimension of a war on terrorism, whatever its pressing necessity might be, nor can one count on resolving those problems by predominantly military means. Our conception of the world is aimed at putting together a more balanced international community, a more certain and a more just world. This conception is founded on the principle of multilateral action. It makes use of all forms of cooperation which permit the members of the international community to attack together the deep-seated problems, for no one among them can claim to be able to resolve them all by themselves. We wish that the US, not giving in to the strong temptation of unilateralism, would rejoin us in this view, for without them, the new balances we're looking for will be more difficult to attain. As far as we're concerned, we will continue to work to advance these conceptions."

The skepticism spreads throughout Europe. The next day, it's Chris Patten's (the EU Commissar for Foreign Relations) turn to "break the silence." In an interview with *The Guardian*, on 9 February, he develops the French criticisms of "absolutism and simplism," seasoning them with bittersweet remarks on the US's need to listen to its allies: "Gulliver cannot go it alone, and it's not a good thing that we're thought of as Lilliputians who dare not raise their voices." On 10 February, the contagion takes hold at the conference of European ministers of foreign affairs, who are meeting in Cuencas, Spain. They all unite behind the unexpected combo of Vèdrine and Patten.

On the occasion of the Berlin NATO summit, rebelliousness grips the Alliance. The Canadian PM, Jean Chrétien, recalls that the UN and NATO resolutions are only binding in Afghanistan and that they did not include unilateral US engagement in other conflicts [Chrétien Resists American Pressure on Iraq by Sandra Cordon, *The Halifax Herald*, 18 February 2002, and US Worries About PM's Position on Fighting Iraq, by Daniel Leblanc, *The Globe and Mail*, 18 February 2002].

Could we be heading for the moment of truth?

[END OF CHAPTER 10]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Chapter 11: The Conspiracy

The elements which we now have at our disposal allow us to think that the 11 September attacks were commissioned from inside the American state apparatus. Nevertheless, this conclusion upsets us, as we have gotten used to the legend of the "bin Laden plot" and because it is painful for us to envision Americans who could have cynically sacrificed nearly 3000 of their compatriots. Nevertheless, in the past, the US Joint Chiefs of Staff planned – but never carried out – a terror campaign against their own population. We need to take a look back into history here.

In 1958, in Cuba, guerrilla operations carried out by Cols. Fidel and Raul Castro, Che Guevara, and Camilo Cienfuegos overthrow the puppet regime of Fulgencio Batista. The new government, which is no longer communist, puts an end to the well-ordered exploitation of the island which a group of US multinational corporations (Standard Oil, GM, ITT, GE, Sheraton, Hilton, United Fruit, East Indian Co.) has been carrying out for the last six years. Back home, these corporations convince President Eisenhower to overthrow the Castroites.

On 17 March 1960, President Eisenhower approves a "Program of Covert Operations Against The Castro Regime," comparable to George Tenet's "Matrix," although limited just to Cuba. Its goal is to "replace the Castro regime with another one, more faithful to the true interests of the Cuban people and more acceptable to the United States, by means which avoid any appearance of US intervention." [Declassified CIA document dated 16 April 1960.]

On 17 April 1961, a brigade of Cuban exiles and mercenaries, more or less quietly trained by the CIA, attempts an invasion at the Bay of Pigs. The operation turns into a fiasco. President Kennedy, who just took office, refuses to send in the USAF to support the mercenaries. 1500 men are taken prisoner by Cuban authorities. Kennedy disavows the operation and dismisses CIA director Allen Dulles, adjunct director Charles Cabell, and stay-behind director Richard Bissell. He orders an internal investigation from his military advisor, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, but it's not followed up by any concrete measures. Kennedy wonders about the attitude of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who approved of the operation even though they knew it was doomed to failure [The Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Willard J. Webb and Ronald H. Cole, DOD, 1989. Swords and Plowshares, Maxwell Taylor, 1972].

Everything seems to have happened as if those generals had been trying to implicate the US in an open war against Cuba.

If President Kennedy disapproved of the CIA's methods and failures, he didn't bring into question the hostile politics of Washington toward the power in place at Havana. He creates a "Special Group (Augmented)" whose mission is to plan and carry out the anti-

Castro struggle. This group is composed of his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy; his military advisor, Maxwell Taylor; National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy; Secretary of State Dean Rusk, assisted by an advisor, Alexis Johnson; Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, assisted by an advisor, Roswell Gilpatric; the new CIA director John McCone; and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer.

This "Special Group" plans a collection of secret actions assembled under the generic title "Operation Mongoose." In order to carry them out, operational coordination between the Dept of State, the DOD, and the CIA is assigned to Gen. Edward Lansdale (assistant to Secretary of Defense in charge of special operations, and under this title, director of the NSA). Meanwhile, at the CIA, an ad hoc group is put together, "Group W," led by William Harvey.

In April 1961, the US Army is faced with a serious crisis: Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, who created the Little Rock race riots before taking command of the infantry in Germany, is dismissed by President Kennedy [See our study "Secret Special Forces," in Les notes d'information du rÉseau Voltaire 235. For further details, see Edwin A. Walker and the Right Wing in Dallas, by Chris Cravens, South Texas State University, 1993]. He is accused of having developed a system of right-wing proselytization in the armed forces. He himself is a member of the John Birch Society and the True Knights of the KKK.

The Senate Foreign Affairs Committee opens an inquiry into the military far right. Hearings are held by Sen. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.), father of the future American VP. The senators suspect the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Lemnitzer, of taking part in the "Walker plot." [Since the end of the Korean War, Maj. Gen. Walker was convinced that the US government was engaging in a policy of giving up in the face of Communist progress. After having been relieved of his duties by Secretary of Defense McNamara, and having received a reprimand, he fomented a riot at the University of Mississippi to protest the hiring of a black professor. He was then pursued by Attorney General Robert Kennedy, and arrested for seditious conspiracy, insurrection, and rebellion. Benefitting from the support of the conservative press, who designated him "The Kennedys' Political Prisoner," he was freed after he paid a \$5000 fine. He was later to be found financing an OAS plot to assassinate Charles de Gaulle, then driving "Committee 8F" which is suspected in the JFK assassination.] Gore knows that Lemnitzer is a specialist in covert ops: in 1943, he personally ran the negotiations for bringing Italy back into the Allied fold against the Reich, then, in 1944, he and Allen Dulles conducted the secret negotiations with the Nazis at Ascona, Switzerland, preparing the surrender (Operation Sunrise) [The Secret Surrender, Allen Dulles, 1967]. He participated in the creation of the NATO stay-behind network, turning Nazi agents into spies against the USSR, and in the exfiltration of human-rights criminals in Latin America. But Gore did not manage to prove his responsibility in current events.

Secret correspondence of Gen. Lemnitzer, recently made public, shows that he conspired with the commander of US forces in Europe, Gen. Lauris Norstad, and other high-ranking

officers, to sabotage Kennedy's policies.

Military extremists denounce Kennedy's refusal to intervene militarily in Cuba. They hold civilians at the CIA responsible for the bad planning of the Bay of Pigs invasion, and consider Kennedy a coward for having refused air support. To unfreeze the situation, they plan to give Kennedy a political pretext for military intervention. This plan, called "Operation Northwoods," gives rise to studies which are formalized by Brig. Gen. William H. Craig. It's presented to the "Special Group (Augmented)" by Gen. Lemnitzer himself on 13 March 1962. The meeting is held at the Pentagon, in the Secretary of Defense's office, from 2:30 to 7:30 pm. It goes very badly: McNamara rejects the plan outright, at which Gen. Lemnitzer becomes threatening. Six months of permanent hostility between the Kennedy administration and the Joint Chiefs of Staff follow, then Lemnitzer's dismissal and his nomination as head of US forces in Europe. Before leaving, the general gives the order to destroy all traces of the Northwoods project, but McNamara keeps a copy of the memo which had been given to him (see Appendix).

[The Operation Northwoods documents were first published in Australia by Jon Elliston (Psy War on Cuba: The Declassified History of US Anti-Castro Propaganda, Ocean Press, 1999) with no reaction at all from the US. They were used again by ABC News journalist James Bamford in his history of the NSA (Body of Secrets, Doubleday, 2001), arousing a lively commotion among historians.]

Operation Northwoods was supposed to convince the international community that Castro was irresponsible to the point of posing a threat to peace in the West. In order to do this, it was planned to orchestrate, then blame Cuba for, major damages suffered by the US. Here are some of the planned provocations:

- Attack the American base at Guantanamo Bay. The operation would be carried out by Cuban mercenaries in Cuban Army uniforms, and would include various sabotages and the destruction of the ammo dump, which would necessarily have had a high cost in materials and in human life.
- Sink an American ship in Cuban territorial waters in a manner so as to remind people of the destruction of the Maine in 1898 (266 dead), which provoked American intervention against Spain [At that time, Cuba was a Spanish colony. The USA intervened militarily to decolonize Cuba and make it a US protectorate]. The vessel would really be empty and remote-controlled. The explosion would be visible from Havana or Santiago so that there would be eyewitnesses. Rescue operations would be carried out so as to make reports of losses more credible. The list of victims would be published in the papers and fake funerals would be held to stir up public indignation. The operation would be carried out at a time when Cuban ships and airplanes happened to be in the area so as to be able to blame an attack on them.
- Terrorize Cuban exiles by setting off plastic explosives against them in Miami, and even in Washington. Fake Cuban agents would be arrested and would

"confess." Fake compromising documents, set up in advance, would be seized and printed in the papers.

- Mobilize Cuba's neighbors by making them afraid of a threat of invasion. A fake Cuban airplane would fly night bombing missions over the Dominican Republic or some other nation in the region. The bombs used would appear to be of Soviet manufacture.
- Mobilize international public opinion by shooting down a manned spacecraft. To really damage people's spirits, the victim would be John Glenn, the first American to orbit the earth (the Mercury flight).

One provocation was even more carefully looked into:

- "It is possible to create an incident which would demonstrate convincingly that a Cuban airplane attacked and shot down a civilian charter flight on the way from the US to Jamaica, Guatemala, Panama, or Venezuela." A group of accomplices, say a group of students, for example, would board a charter flight by an airline subcontracting for the CIA. Over Florida, their plane would be met by an identical one, or apparently identical, but empty and remote-controlled. The accomplice passengers would be sent back to a CIA base, while the drone would continue on their flightpath. The airplane would send out distress signals indicating that they were being attacked by a Cuban jet, then it would explode in mid-air. [The surveillance of airspace is such that it would today be difficult to switch airplanes without air-traffic controllers knowing it. But it isn't completely impossible. We know that each airliner is equipped with a transponder which emits a signal giving its identification and flight data (altitude, airspeed, etc.), such that the air-traffic controllers don't just see a dot on their radar screens, but the airplane's registration information. Nevertheless, the exact picture of air-traffic is protected by the national security apparatus; also, civilian radars are equipped with a filter which "blinds" them when they receive transponder signals indicating military aircraft codes. In order to switch airplanes, you'd have to have a military code and shut off the civilian transponder during the substitution. One notices that on 11 September, the transponders of the four officially hijacked airplanes quit emitting their signals, for some unknown reason. According to official policy, air-traffic controllers are supposed to immediately establish radio communications when that happens, in order to make sure the airplane isn't in distress, and, if they can't establish communications, to inform NORAD so that they can establish visual contact with fighter airplanes.]

To carry out these operations would necessarily entail the death of numerous American citizens, both civilians and military. But it's precisely that human cost that would make them worthwhile actions to manipulate public opinion.

To John F. Kennedy, Lemnitzer is a hysterical anti-commie propped up by unscrupulous multinational corporations. The new president understands the warning sounded by his

predecessor, Eisenhower, one year before, in his farewell address:

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

[Eisenhower's Farewell Address, <http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/ike.htm>]

For sure, John F. Kennedy resists Gens. Walker and Lemnitzer and their friends, and refuses to get American involved too far in a war of attrition against communism, in Cuba, in Laos, in Viet Nam, or elsewhere. He is assassinated on 22 November 1963 [JFK, Autopsy of a State Crime, William Reymond, Flammarion, 1998].

Gen. Lemnitzer retires in 1969. But in 1975, while the Senate opens investigations into the CIA's exact role in the Nixon administration, Gerald Ford, who has held the interim presidency since the Watergate scandal, asks Lemnitzer to participate in this investigation. After he had helped him bury the controversy, Ford comes to him once again, to ask him to take over the CPD (Committee on the Present Danger). This group is a CIA creation (the CIA director at the time was George Bush père). The CPD runs anti-Soviet campaigns. Among its administrators, one finds various CIA officials as well as Paul D. Wolfowitz (current adjunct Secretary of Defense, in charge of operations in Afghanistan). In parallel, Ford names Brig. Gen. William Craig, who conducted the initial studies for Operation Northwoods, as NSA Director. Gen. Lemnitzer dies on 12 November 1988.

In 1992, American public opinion on the Kennedy assassination is re-sparked after the release of the Oliver Stone film which showed the incoherencies of the official version. President Clinton orders that very numerous archives from the Kennedy era be declassified. In Defense Secretary McNamara's papers, the only surviving copy of the Northwoods project plan comes to light.

This historical precedent reminds us that an internal US plot, with plans to sacrifice American nationals within the scope of a terror campaign, is sadly not impossible. In 1962, JFK resisted his Chiefs of Staff's delirium. He probably paid for it with his life. We do not know what George W. Bush's reaction would have been had he been faced with the same situation.

Recent US history shows us that internal terrorism is an ongoing practise. Since 1996, the FBI has been publishing an annual report on internal acts of terror [Terrorism in US, FBI. See <http://www.fbi.gov/publications/terror/terroris.pdf>, also terr97.pdf, terror98.pdf, terror99.pdf]. They report four in 1995, eight in 1996, 25 in 1997, 17 in 1998, and 19 in 1999. They have mostly been carried out by military and paramilitary far-right groups.

The existence of a conspiracy within the US armed forces to carry out the 11 September attacks is attested to by the deposition of Lt. Delmart Edward Vreeland before the Canadian Supreme Court in Toronto. [This affair was the subject of four articles by Nick Pron in the Toronto Star: Did This Man Predict Sept. 11? (23 October); US Looks Into Inmate's Story, Jail Man Says He Tried To Warn About Attacks (25 October); Plot To Murder Judge May Never Have Existed (31 October); Was Embassy Worker Poisoned? (21 January 2002). The third of these also refers to testimony on the planned assassination of a magistrate. The police's turning around in this other affair seems to have been used to discredit Vreeland. Besides, Michael Ruppert, editor of From The Wilderness, who is in contact with Vreeland's attorneys, has posted several articles on this affair at <http://www.cpovcia.com/>.]

Arrested for bank-card fraud, Lt. Vreeland defended himself by citing his belonging to US Naval Intelligence. He told the police that he had been to Russia collecting information about the assassination of Marc Bastien, a computer worker at the Canadian Embassy in Moscow, and about the preparations for attacks in New York. After being assured that Marc Bastien hadn't been assassinated, but was dead of an overdose of antidepressants that he had taken while inebriated, the police dismissed Vreeland's statements as a pathetic attempt at excuses. He was put in jail.

On 12 August 2001, Vreeland sent a sealed note to prison authorities containing his testimony on the attacks which were to come. Canadian authorities did not consider it important. On 14 September, they opened the envelope and found a precise description of the attacks which had happened three days before in New York. Immediately contacting the Pentagon, they learned that Delmart "Mike" Vreeland had left the US Navy in 1986, because of his mediocre performance, and had never been involved with Naval Intelligence. The federal prosecutor dismissed Vreeland's statements, exclaiming in front of the Toronto Supreme Court: "Is this story possible? I wouldn't go so far as to say it's impossible, just that it is implausible."

The first new development: medical examiner Line Duchesne reviews diplomat Marc Bastien's cause of death and concludes that he was assassinated. Vreeland's statements regain credibility. The second new development, in front of a public session of the Toronto Supreme Court, 25 January 2002: Lt. Vreeland's lawyers, Rocco Galati and Paul Dlansky, make a phone call, with a speaker phone, to the Pentagon switchboard. In front of magistrates who were listening to the conversation, they obtain confirmation that their client was currently on active duty in the Navy. Besides that, when they ask to speak to his superiors, the operator connects them on a direct line to Naval Intelligence.

So, these attacks were known about by five intelligence services (German, Egyptian, French, Israeli, and Russian), by a Naval Intelligence officer like Vreeland, anonymous senders of warning messages to Odigo, to say nothing of the insider trading going on in the stock market. How far will the leaks spread? Where will the implications lead to?

Bruce Hoffman, VP of Rand Corporation, declared during his hearing in the House of Representatives that, by their magnitude, the attacks were "unimaginable."
[<http://www.rand.org/publications/CT/CT182/CT182.pdf>] That's the indisputable opinion of the most-quoted expert. With an annual budget of \$160 million, the Rand Corporation is the most important private research center for military strategy and organization in the world. It is the prestigious voice of the American military-industrial lobby. Presided over by James Thomson, among its administrators are Ann McLaughlin Korologos (former president of the Aspen Institute) and Frank Carlucci (president of the Carlyle Group). Condoleezza Rice and Donald Rumsfeld were formerly administrators, as much as their official functions permitted. Zalmay Khalilzad was an analyst there.

Now, Bruce Hoffman is lying: in a conference at the US Air Force Academy last March (that is, six months before the attacks), he envisaged precisely that "unimaginable" scenario of 11 September [21st Century Terrorism, in *The Terrorism Threat and US Government Response: Operational and Organizational Factors*, USAF Academy, Institute for National Security Studies, March 2001. Hoffman's remarks are at <http://www.usafa.af.mil/inss/foreword.htm>]. Addressing an audience of high-ranking Air Force officers, he noted that "we are trying to prepare our forces against Al-Qaeda, the organization – or perhaps the movement – associated with bin Laden. Think for a moment about the bomb attack at the WTC in 1993. Now, consider that it is possible to bring down the North Tower onto the South Tower, killing 60,000 people. They will find other weapons, other tactics, and other means to destroy their targets. They have an obvious choice of weapons, drones [that is, remote-controlled aircraft]."

What prescience, right?

In order to calm the Republican Party's bellicose ardor, the Democrats accept, voting on the 2000 finance law, the setting up of a commission to assess US national security space management and organization. The commission delivers its report [Report of the Commission to Assess US National Security Space Management and Organization, <http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/space20010111.html>] on 11 January 2001, several days before its president, the Hon. Donald Rumsfeld, becomes the Bush administration's Secretary of Defense and leaves his seat on the Rand Corporation's board of directors. Eight of its twelve members are retired generals. All are partisans of the "missile defense shield," such that the 32 days of the commission's work weren't given over to an audit of the situation, but were instead used to look into arguments justifying a posteriori the common convictions of its members.

For the "Rumsfeld Commission," outer space is a military domain comparable to earth, sky, and sea. It ought to have its own branch of the military, the same as the Army, Air Force, and Navy. The US must occupy this territory and prevent any other power from establishing itself there. Thanks to this asymmetry of means, their military supremacy will be incontestable and unlimited.

The Rumsfeld Commission released ten propositions:

The outer-space armed force should report directly to the President.

The president should appoint an outer-space advisor so that the US might exploit its advantage to the fullest.

The various intelligence agencies should be coordinated and subordinated to the outer-space armed force within the National Security Council.

The outer-space armed force being simultaneously a source of intelligence and a lethal weapon, its use supposes a coordination between the Secretary of Defense and the various intelligence services, which should be placed under the sole authority of the CIA director.

The Secretary of Defense should appoint an Under-Secretary of Outer Space.

The Space Command should be distinct from the Air Command.

The outer-space armed force should be able to use the services of other forces.

The NRO (agency of space imagery) should be put under the command of the under-secretary of the Air Force.

The Secretary of Defense should personally oversee space research and development investments, so as to increase the asymmetry between US forces and those of other military forces.

Extremely important budgetary assets should be set aside for the military space program.

Besides going against the 1972 ABM treaty, this ambitious space-militarization program entails such reforms of American organization and strategy as to seem unworkable. That's why the Rumsfeld commission writes: "History is full of situations where we ignored the warnings and resisted change until an outside event, heretofore deemed 'improbable,' came along to force the hand of reticent bureaucracies. The question here is whether the US will have the wisdom to act responsibly and to reduce, as quickly as possible, its spatial vulnerability. Or whether, as has already been the case in the past, the only event capable of galvanizing the energies of the nation and forcing the US government to act, will be a destructive attack against the country and its populace, an 'outer-space Pearl Harbor.' We have been warned, but we are not on the alert."

For Rumsfeld and the Air Force generals, the events of 11 September constitute, in a way, a "divine surprise," to use the expression that the French fascists used when their defeat allowed them to reverse "The Beggar" and to grant full powers to Marshal Pétain.

On 11 September at 6:42 pm, Rumsfeld held a press conference at the Pentagon [DOD News Briefing on Pentagon Attack, http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Sep2001/t09112001_t0911sd.html]. To manifest American unity at this difficult moment, the Democratic and Republican leaders of the Senate Armed Services Committee joined him. There was no news from President Bush, and the world nervously awaited the US response. Now, in the middle of the conference,

right in front of the international press, Rumsfeld took Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.) to task:

Rumsfeld: Senator Levin, you and other Democrats in Congress have voiced fear that you simply don't have enough money for the large increase in defense that the Pentagon is seeking, especially for missile defense, and you fear that you'll have to dip into the Social Security funds to pay for it. Does this sort of thing convince you that an emergency exists in this country to increase defense spending, to dip into Social Security, if necessary, to pay for defense spending -- increase defense spending?

A fit of rage which could be interpreted as a confession.

[END OF CHAPTER ELEVEN]

[END OF PART THREE]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Epilogue

If the energy lobby is the main beneficiary of the Afghan war, the military-industrial lobby is the big victor of 11 September. Their wildest dreams have been gratified from now on.

Before anything else, the ABM treaty, which set limits on arms development, has been unilaterally denounced by President Bush.

Then, not only was the CIA director not fired after the apparent failure of 11 September, but the agency's budget was immediately increased by 42% in order to put the "World Attack Matrix" into operation.

The US military budget, which had not stopped shrinking since the collapse of the USSR, saw an increase as sudden as it was vertiginous. If you count the extra funds allocated right after the attacks and the predicted increased budget, the first two years of the Bush administration will see a 24% increase in military spending. Over five years, the US military budget will represent more than \$2 trillion, even though the arms race is finished and there's no longer any major opponent. The US military budget from now on is equal to the total budgets of the twenty-five largest armies behind it.

The best-equipped posts are those concerning space and secret operations, thus manifesting the new predominance in the American apparatus of state of the alliance between those who run the secret operations (rallied around George Tenet) and the Star Wars partisans, who are gathered around Donald Rumsfeld and Gen. Ralph Eberhart, current NORAD commander-in-chief and the commanding officer who led air-traffic-control operations on 11 September 2001.

The evolution taken by the American administration with the events of 11 September seems to be the harbinger of lots of "blood, sweat, and tears," as Winston Churchill put it. Now it remains to be seen who on the planet will bear the brunt of it.

Paris, 20 February 2002

Washington DC, 11 June 2002

[END OF EPILOGUE]

[This document is part of the English translation of "L'effroyable imposture."]

[(c) 2002, Christopher Schroen.

[See <http://www.boss-tweed.com/gpdl.txt> for copying conditions.

Appendices and Documents

- Military Budgets of Major Countries (from <http://www.cdi.org/issues/wme/>) (182)
- State Dept Research Note on Osama bin Laden (184)
- "American Holy War" by William S. Cohen, from Washington Post, 12 September 2001 (188)
- Gen. Myers' Senate Hearing (191)
- Interview with Cheney (<http://stacks.msnbc.com/news/629714.asp>) (195)
- "State Sponsors of Terrorism Should Be Wiped Out, Too" by Richard Perle, from Daily Telegraph, 18 September 2001 (198)
- "A New Kind of War" by Donald Rumsfeld, from Washington Post, 27 September 2001 (202)
- Bush: "Disclosures to the Congress" (205, facsimile included)
- "Opsec Throughout DOD" by Wolfowitz (208, facsimile included)
- Laura Bush's Address to the Nation (
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/images/20011117-2.html>
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/images/20011117-2.html>)
(211)
- "Martial Justice, Full and Fair" by Alberto Gonzales, from New York Times, 30 November 2001 (214)
- The FBI's list of the 19 hijackers (218)
- Transcript of Osama Videotape Published by DOD (222)
- Operation Northwoods (236, facsimile included)
- Photographs starting on page 244