Questioning the 9/11 Commission:
Interview with David Ray Griffin

By James Hogue

On June 24, 2005, I interviewed Dr. David Ray Griffin, emeritus professor of philosophy of religion and theology at the Claremont School of Theology and author of *The New Pearl Harbor* and *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*. He is the author or editor of more than 25 books, most recently *Deep Religious Pluralism*. As a latecomer to 9/11 research, and as an academic theologian and scholar, Dr. Griffin’s questions and research have had a far-reaching impact on the 9/11 truth movement, to the degree that now National Institute of Standards and Technology, the mainstream media, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the official 9/11 Commission have ignored his work. Dr. Griffin begins with comments on the impact of *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions.*

**DG:** Although *The New Pearl Harbor* is a little more widely known, the second book, which in many respects is much more important and (many people have told me) much more convincing, is finally getting the kind of attention that I hoped it would. The words “Omissions and Distortions” are rather polite, and I often say that maybe I should have called it *The 9/11 Commission Report: A 571-Page Lie.* I wrote an article with that title, which is posted on the 9/11 Visibility Project (www.septembereleventh.org). I found that I had identified at least 115 lies: lies of distortion and lies of omission. Under omissions, I list the things that I had reported on in *The New Pearl Harbor*. For example, we have these stories from the British Press that at least six of the alleged hijackers are still alive. It’s widely known in Europe. Some of them have been interviewed by the British and European Press. One of them contacted the American Embassy and said “What’s this stuff about my having committed suicide on 9/11?” So how did the Commission deal with it? By simply ignoring the whole issue. And indeed, the one who walked into the American embassy was named Waleed al-Shehri. According to the official report, Waleed al-Shehri was on board Flight 11 and stabbed a flight attendant shortly before the plane crashed into the North Tower of the WTC. So when I say lies of omission, that’s the kind of thing I mean, where they simply take a story which, if they had to talk about it, would either refute the official story or they would have to tell a big lie, and so they just ignore it.

**JH:** I’ve heard the explanations of how the FBI made incorrect identifications of the hijackers—identity theft for example—but if they’ve got such a great cover, wouldn’t you think it would be in the official book?

**DG:** That’s how they deal with contradictory facts in general. 99 percent of them they just ignore. And the few of them where they think they can slip in a rebuttal, they distort the facts in order to do it. I learned something recently through my contact with William Rodriguez, who was the janitor who worked in the North Tower and was the last survivor to get out. He rescued several people and was a great hero. But suddenly the press can’t talk about him because he has Phil Berg, his attorney, suing the Bush administration for 9/11 because he knows the official story is wrong. He reports that he got there late that day, or he would be dead, because he should have been up on the floor that got hit in the North Tower. He says he’s not afraid for his life because he’s living on borrowed time anyway. He said, “I was in the basement checking in and heard this enormous explosion beneath me.” This was shortly before the plane hit the North Tower. He and fourteen others were in a room when Felipe David came struggling in, seriously burned, flesh hanging off of his body. He was in front of an elevator shaft. The explosion had sent flames up the
Where Do We Go from There? A Meditation on 9/11

Why, you may ask, would a small Vermont journal about independence pause to dedicate an entire issue to 9/11? Why bend now, four whole years after the murders, to poke a grim national wound most Americans seem to believe has been finally salved, bandaged, and healed with the publication of The 9/11 Commission Report a year ago? What’s to be gained, asking unanswered and likely unanswerable questions when even the most dogged and trenchant of investigators has concluded that 9/11 has been successfully mutated into “history,” a scene of desolation fast receding in our collective psyche’s rear window?


It was only later that infam ous day that I had the presence of mind to call many friends and relatives who were in various stages of recoil inside the city, flatly telling me not to visit (as had been my plan, later that week). Friends of two of my brothers were killed on L.A.-bound Flight 11. My closest old friend narrowly made his way out of Building 7 to spend the day wandering and the night stranded in a hotel on 23rd Street. H oled up, but lucky.

A day later, maybe two, waves of subtle nausea sounded inside me. Barraged by the media, I started to ask questions, to wonder out loud as the reports of the incidents of that Tuesday flooded in over the ensuing weeks: what about Building 7, how does steel melt at 1,700 degrees Fahrenheit, what were those reported explosions inside the two towers heard by firemen and other victims, how come the Israelis didn’t show up for work, what about the extraordinary United and American Airlines put options that made someone a fortune, why was there no photographic evidence of the crashed Boeing 757 shown in the Pentagon’s west wall, but only an impossibly small 15-foot hole, and how come the FBI snatched up that Arlington gas station’s video camera immediately, before anyone could see what was filmed, and no interceptions were launched in time, even to protect the world’s most defended structure, the military heart of the nation? And on and on. These questions ballooned out of me, building each upon the other, sickening in their scope and ambiguity.

Meanwhile the entire nation was in the grip of hysteria, a fear so deep that the mouth of freedom known as the Fourth Estate was sealed and catherized shut before our disbeliefing eyes. NO QUESTIONS! WE'RE AT WAR! Suddenly we had the monstrous, devastating, and massive USA Patriot Act—passed unread, hatched out of whole cloth overnight, in a gestation so swift even the eyebrows of those of us who are eternally gullible and guileless were raised a notch. And before a conversation could be started about the full scope and meaning of the attacks, their planning, true provocation and purpose, bang, our warplanes were slashing across the murky skies of far-off Afghanistan and our giant helicopter gunships were scouring the bleak and corrugated hide of a wolfish land that had eluded the grip of all empires past. The hunt for the demon bin Laden was on. (Four years later: still at large.)

As our founding and most elder statesman Benj ambnx Frank fn said, “Anyone who trades liberty for security deserves neither.” Isn’t that what we are about now, trading our liberty for a sham security? Some puny Fundamentalists bearing small arms and scattered in the hills of a medieval country have forced the mightiest power on earth to abrogate its own citizens’ inalienable rights—in favor of a nascent dictatorship.

Whose story is this?

And while the War on Terror was being wound up, what was happening to the forensic evidence of 9/11? Armies of trucks were carting it all off at breakneck speed, cheap steel bound for Mumbai, Shanghai, for the purlfying of the booming economies of Asia. In the end, astonishingly, given all the dead bodies, there was no forensic evidence left. The greatest “clean-up” in history took a mere six weeks. There was no need for forensic evidence. Our leaders “knew” who did the deed and our national “security” mandated what Henry Kissinger told us we needed, what would be tonic for us: “Let’s have rage. . . . a unified, unifying Pearl Harbor sort of purple American fury.”

So, in due course, we gave the world another round of “Shock and Awe” and shook our collective fist in its face. The murders that began on 9/11/01 have not been solved. They have not even been investigated, except by private, courageous individuals (some of whom are featured in this journal). Yet these murders are a public matter, a matter of persistent and profound national interest. And world interest. And, no less, of deepest concern to all Vermonters, whose sons and daughters perish in this war on terror, giving the highest per capita blood sacrifice of any state of the Union. And for the perpetual war in Iraq Vermonters paid $233 million last year. Good investments?

The destruction and suffering spawned by 9/11 grows apace. Each day the number of the dead, the maimed, the sick, the fatally diseased, the orphaned, the walking wounded, the lost, the peaceable-made-violent grows. These are the wages of our policy, the real-world manifestation of our “purple American fury.” Fury building the fires as we “hold the course.” For what end? For whom, exactly, do we die?

Here then is one answer about the questions of 9/11: There can be no liberty without truth. Lies bind and corrode the soul, no less the soul of one person than the soul of a people. It is nowhere written that the truth must be pleasant. Indeed, though it sets us free, it rarely does so without pain. At Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney’s July 22, 2005, Congressional Briefing on the 9/11 Attacks, Michael Ruppert was moved to observe the so-called Jersey Girls, whose husbands were killed in the Towers, that “these victimized women are in excruciating agony as the lights go on for them. They had trusted the Kean Commission because they were already devastated by the loss of their spouses.” In his exploration of the recent London bombings, publisher and writer Tony Brasunas reminds us that it is “difficult if not impossible painful even to conceive that a government would attack its own people.”

And yet anyone who has reflected on the history of even the last century knows that the govern ments of nations do sometimes willfully betray their people. And empires do not even consider their people, except in terms of cynical diversionary tactics—bread and circuses. The truth is we Americans are not exceptional in relation to power and its magnetic force, as our founders all knew. By the end of the Civil War the great debate between the Hamiltonians and the Jeffersonians was decisively decided in favor of the former’s thrust for centralized power. Events so proceeded, according to the historian T om as D i Lorenzo, that “by 1890 the federal government was vastly larger than our founders ever envisioned, and its purpose had changed from the protection of individual liberty to the quest for empire.”

The centralization of power has been a historical process known as American “progress”—a story told to children by law, as well as to adults—that has continued right up to the present hour, when we are witnesses to its climax, the apotheosis of empire. Reporter Ron Suskind captured this quote from a senior presidential advisor: “[You reporters are] in what we call the reality-based community . . . [you] believe that solutions emerge from your judicious study of discernible reality . . . That’s not the way the world really works anymore. . . . We’re an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you’re studying that reality . . . we’ll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study. . . . We’re history’s actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left just to study what we do.”

Hear the voice of the Commander-in-Chief, his spirit voice. Do you feel secure listening to it? Do you trust its inner posture? Do you feel its mantle protective of your interests? Your moral core? If you do, you will never be a secessionist.

If you don’t, you need to imagine, all over again, a new story. The story that was begun by Jefferson and his colleagues many, many long years ago. It is still vital. It too can be given a voice. Again.

—Ian Baldwin
SVR Convention in the Statehouse Oct. 28

On October 28 the Second Vermont Republic will hold the first statewide convention on secession in the United States since North Carolina voted to secede from the Union on May 20, 1861. The day-long event will take place in the House Chamber of the State House in Montpelier. Only in Vermont!

The theme will be “Vermont Independence: An Impossible Dream or a Vision of the Future?” The objectives of the Vermont Convention are twofold. First, to raise the level of awareness of Vermonters of the possibility of independence as a viable alternative to the tyranny of the U.S. Government, Corporate America, and globalization. Second, to provide an example and a process for other states and nations considering separatism, secession, independence, and similar revolutionary strategies.

The Governor, Lt. Governor, and all members of the Vermont congressional delegation have been invited to participate. Among those who have already agreed to speak are Kirkpatrick Sale, author of Human Scale; J. Kevin Graffagnino, Executive Director of the Vermont Historical Society; Professor Eric Davis of Middlebury College; Shay Totten, editor of the Vermont Guardian; Dr. Rob Williams of Champlain College; and Thomas Naylor, one of the founders of the Second Vermont Republic.

The convention will be open to the public and free of charge. Delegates from all fourteen Vermont counties are encouraged to express their views on Vermont independence, pro or con. Representatives from other states and foreign countries are also welcome. For additional information, contact Thomas Naylor at 802-425-4133 or Jane Dwinnell at 802-229-4008 or sky@vtlink.net.

SVR Names Executive Director

Jane Dwinnell of Montpelier has joined the Second Vermont Republic as its first Executive Director. Jane, a seventh-generation Vermonter (both sides of the family), has been interested in Vermont independence ever since she learned in grade school that Vermont was once its own country. Prior to joining the Second Vermont Republic, Jane worked in a variety of settings, including as nurse manager of Gifford Hospital’s Birthing Center, freelance writer, organic farmer, and Unitarian Universalist minister. Her passion is creating strong organizations that work for social change, with civil rights, a peaceful world, and environmental and economic sustainability being at the core. In her spare time, she and her partner, Sky Yardley, and their two children Dana and Sayer, are building a small, energy-efficient home a short walk from downtown Montpelier.
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out and interviewed him extensively, and so they got all of his reports about the explosions, and never breathed a word of it. So there are people at NBC who know that there are eye and ear witnesses and testimony to explosions in the sub-basement and other parts of the North Tower. And, by the way, he said he also heard the explosions in the South Tower. And knowing this, that the collapse of the WTC was an inside job, the press have to pretend day after day that the war on terror is perfectly justified because we were attacked by external enemies.

Many people have become very invested in the Osama bin Laden mythology. And we have the movie The Power of Nightmares that you will not see on American TV because it says that the threat of al Qaeda has been enormously hyped.

Osama would have been a man of miracles to have wired a controlled demolition in the Twin Towers and Building 7. There are plenty of people who have come forward, but I don’t understand how a fireman has the courage to run into a burning building but is afraid to tell the truth about 9/11. It’s what he’s trained to do, and he is risking only his own life. There is intimidation. People do get threatened, and some who might have come forward to tell the truth in some public forum suddenly decided to commit suicide. People know this. And regarding families, people say “I just can’t put my wife and kids at risk.”

And who would cover it? What agency would investigate it?

Richard Clarke, for example [author of Against All Enemies, former Counterintelligence Chief, Chief Advisor on Terrorism, and member of the NSC] begins the book by telling the story of his teleconference where Rumsfeld and General Myers were on camera, from the Pentagon, from about 9:15 throughout most of the rest of the day. And they were certainly there at the time that the Pentagon was struck. But Myers has said he was not in the Pentagon. He was up on Capital Hill talking to Max Cleland in his office. And then he came wandering out and saw smoke, and suddenly realized, “Oh, it looks like the Pentagon has been hit!” As if that could have happened and the acting head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff wouldn’t have known about the attacks! Nobody called him on his cell phone and said, “Dick, you know, little surprise here, the Pentagon, for the first time in history, has just been attacked?” The whole story is incredible on its face, plus the fact that you’ve got Richard Clarke saying that he was in the Pentagon and he was on camera all this time. And the 9/11 Commission Report simply tells us Myers’s story. They ignore Clarke’s story altogether. They report only Myers’s lie without even calling Max Cleland for confirmation—Max Cleland who was on the 9/11 Commission! Do they call Cleland to ask, “Hi, Max, was Dick Myers with you in your office there during the attacks on 9/11?” No. They ignore the whole issue. This is the level of cover-up they engage in. In retrospect they make the Warren Commission look good.

The same applies to Rumsfeld, who claims that he was surprised by the attack. The idea that he had not heard the reports that were heard by the rest of us is preposterous—there were two more planes out there, and one of them was heading toward Washington, DC.

It’s just so ludicrous, and yet our cowed newscasters, if any of them filed such a story and took it back to NBC or ABC or CBS or CNN or fair and balanced FOX News, not only would they not run it, they would say, “Joe, I think you’d better check yourself into a mental institution, because you are either deluding yourself into thinking that you had this interview with Rumsfeld, or you’re deluding yourself to think that you could get it run on our network.” So they censor themselves.

And some of the most respected and highly paid investigative journalists are writing gibberish.

Those two things go together: money and respect go together with holding pretty closely to the official story.

Bread and circuses.

Speaking of bread and circuses, I’ve just finished a piece comparing the Roman Empire to the U.S. Empire, and of course your reference there is how the Roman Empire kept the citizens entertained and amused while they were out destroying other cultures. As the famous saying has it, “They bring desolation and they call it peace,” just as we are doing in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are enter...
Conspiracies: How Do You Think We Got Here?

By Rick Foley

I don’t get why so many people shut off any conversation about 9/11 with “Don’t give me any of that conspiracy theory crap.” Especially Vermonters. We all know that any meeting between two or more public officials that involves a decision or vote on public matters and that hasn’t been publicly warned is illegal. If not, then it’s in conspiracy territory for sure.

Vermonters have long recognized the potential threat of “conspiracy” to the democratic decision-making process. That’s why we run all of our town, school board, and other governmental boards and many of our nonprofit entities according to the state’s municipal code. Furthermore, if someone has an issue to be considered for discussion and vote at town meeting, that issue needs be properly or fairly “warned.” You can get an article warned by either soliciting a specified number of voters’ signatures or by asking the Select Board to put it on the agenda. The Select Board, like many other governmental and chartered boards, must publicize their meeting times and places, keep written records, including votes, and can only make decisions or do meaningful work when a quorum is present.

These practices are meant to discourage conspiracies. Vermonters know all about conspiracies. Like Ethan Allen and his boys meeting at the Catahoula Tavern and planning to “pay visits” to Tories across the Green Mountains, especially over in Guilford. Or Ethan, his brothers and other Vermonters conspiring against New York and New Hampshire officials to keep ownership of their lands while avoiding additional purchase fees. Heck, most residents of the American colonies conspired against the British occupying forces. How do you think the Boston Tea Party got started? It took a while before conspirators went public and announced the War of Independence. After the colonists defeated the British with Vermont’s assistance, many leaders of the original thirteen conspired to keep Vermont out of their alliance. Vermonters then turned around to conspire against the colonies, especially New York and New Hampshire, to carve out our Republic of Vermont. Later on Vermonters played a critical role in the “underground railroad” to help slaves reach sanctuaries up north—in defiance of Federal law. In short, Vermonters know first-hand how effective conspiracies can be. Back then and even now.

Let’s jump to a typical conspiracy in modern-day Vermont. Let’s say that Dorset voters are going to vote up or down on a new grader for the town highway department. The road foreman, Jim Irving, wants the diesel engine option, but it’s $16,000 more expensive than the gas-powered base model. Jim knows that the school budget is a shoe-in and that the request for the grader—$180,000 (base model, trade-in allowance included) or $196,000 (diesel option, trade-in allowance included)—will stand out like a sore thumb as a line item in the town’s highway maintenance budget. Especially since his crew sand-blasted and painted the old grader just two years ago and the town’s roads are in great shape.

Here’s Jim’s dilemma. Does he play by the rules and go to the Select Board and tell them at a meeting in front of a dozen folks that he wants the diesel because of the better fuel economy, the longer engine life, and better low-end torque? But it is $16,000 more. Would he like to repeat that in March to 175-plus voters coping with an 8 percent increase in the $2.8 million school budget?

Or does he go the conspiracy route by meeting privately with Wally Free, Chairman of the Select Board, and ask Wally to convince the School Superintendent to suggest that the School Board slide $20,000 from the unused portion of this year’s highway department’s contingency account into the school system’s capital investment fund in return for recognizing that the town highway department may need access to those funds in the following year, especially if the highway department needs the money to ensure the safety and timeliness of the school bus routes? Remember, both Jim and Wally understand that they have a better chance to “sell” the cheaper base model grader than the diesel-powered one in March.

Vermonters have long recognized the potential threat of “conspiracy” to the democratic decision-making process. That’s why we run all of our town, school board, and other governmental boards and many of our nonprofit entities according to the state’s municipal code.

Now if the School Board buys their deal, both Wally and Jim also understand that the old grader will bite the dust early in the summer, that Jim can purchase the new diesel-powered grader using the town-approved $160,000 and the $20,000 squirreled away in the school budget. The extra $4,000 covers the cost of the optional “Communications Efficiency Enhancement Package,” which includes the GPS navigational system (in case the driver gets lost), a DVD player and monitor (for instructional films) and a 6-speaker Bose surround system (studies show that music blocks out engine and scraper blade noise and increases operator effectiveness). That and Wally’s 1.3-mile-long private driveway (technically a pent road that’s been “thrown up”) will get a new crown before the snow flies.

Which option does Jim pick? Duh, the conspiracy one. How do you think your town road foreman and his crew do such a great job year in and year out on their pinch-penny budgets?

The only difference between Dorset and Washington (no, not Washington, Vermont) is the size of their budgets. $41 million versus more than a thousand or so billions of taxpayer dollars. And Washington has tens of thousands of Jim- and Wally-type decision-makers.

So obviously conspiracies happen in Washington, by the tens of thousands. A minute doesn’t go by that Washington public servants aren’t meeting without public notice, quorum, proper reporting and the like. In Washington and every corner of the globe. Conspiracy Place. If two or more officials meet, the public’s not there, no meeting notes are made public, and the officials don’t want to admit that they met or what they decided to do, an outsider has to develop a theory of how the meeting may have played a role in a later event.

Back to Dorset for help here. Let’s say that Jim is grading Wally’s drive and old lady Maples pulls over to let the new machine squeeze by. When Jim opens the door of the grader to say hello (basic road foreman public relations), Ms. Maples hears a symphonic quality version of “That Don’t Impress Me Much” and catches a glimpse of both a strutting half-naked Shania Twain and a glowing green roadway map just above the windshield. She teases Jim, “If this is the stripped model, I’d like to see the fancy one.” Jim nearly swallows his peppermint Altoid, but recovers quickly, killing the DVD and launching bravely into some trade lingo about model availability, delivery schedule, and the necessity of the 16 gpm hydraulic pump and the electronic shuttle shift. “Oh, sounds pretty complicated.” Ms. Maples offers as she noses her 1994 Neon ahead. “So when did the Select Board take over the old pent road?”

You, Dear Reader, have just been introduced to the start of a conspiracy theory. Don’t think that Ms. Maples isn’t going to track down the relationship between the vote authorizing the $160,000 for the new grader model and the grooming of a private drive. She may well call on her friend, Matty Stuart, the fiscal conservative on the School Board, for some information and attend some more Select Board meetings before she constructs her final “conspiracy theory.” And if she’s successful, would you want to bet that she doesn’t explain to voters next March why they may want to look more closely at the intermingling of the school and highway department budgets before they make any decisions?

What else do you want to call Ms. Maples’ inquiry and line of reasoning? Snooping? Busy-bodying? Or some polysyllabic pathological condition related to living on a fixed income?

Now for the big question. Could some of the Washington players have been involved in conspiracies connected to the events of 9/11 before, during, and after the attack itself? Do you or someone you know have some unanswered questions about 9/11? Do you feel that you have a right to pursue those questions? Could you believe that more than a few Americans share lots of unanswered questions about 9/11? And that some questioners, like Ms. Maples, are making inquiries based upon a line of rational reasoning? •
“Unlike PSYOP, MindWar has nothing to do with deception or even with ‘selected’—and therefore misleading—truth. Rather, it states a whole truth that, if it does not now exist, will be forced into existence by the will of the United States… Infrasound vibration (up to 20 Hz) can subliminally influence brain activity… Infrasound could be used tactically as ELF waves endure for great distances; and it could be used in conjunction with media broadcasts as well.”

COL. PAUL VALLELY AND MAJ. MICHAEL AQUINO, PSYOP to MindWar: The Psychology of Victory

“In the introduction to his MindWar proposal (which can be found at www.xeper.org, the official website of the Temple of Set), former military intelligence–guy Michael Aquino says he was fascinated to see that some of his MindWar “prescriptions” had been applied during the first Gulf War and “even more obviously during the 2003 invasion of Iraq.”

So, on the morning of September 11, 2001, when CIA Director George Tenet was having breakfast with David Boren (former Oklahoma Democratic Senator) and was informed that a plane had struck the World Trade Center and said (before the end of the meal), “This is bin Laden. His fingerprints are all over it,” was that a currently true truth? Or a future truth—one that would be “forced into existence by the will of the United States”? And when, merely a few days later, all the talking heads on TV were repeating that bin Laden had done it, was the whole world being bombarded with ELF signals?

Well, actually, perhaps. “Shortly after the World Trade Center attack, and when the military went on highest DefCon Delta Alert, HAARP began transmitting during the day at maximum power on 6.965 MHz and could be heard by listeners around the world. The HAARP transmissions continued on and off on both 6.965 and 3.390 MHz at extremely high power both during the day and night. The transmission began on Tuesday, September 11, just several hours after the destruction of the World Trade Center and continued through early September 13.” (www.jpmkaren.org/frontpage/bj91601.html)

“Early September 13” would’ve been the time most Americans finally tore themselves away from their TV sets.

One of the program managers for HAARP is the Air Force Research Laboratory, Space Vehicles Directorate, which overlaps with the Directed Energy Directorate. The AFRL also runs the Information Directorate, the mission of which (no surprise here) has to do with “information dominance.”

The Wright Research Site is part of the Information Directorate. Their home page (www.wrs.af.mil) has a very cool image on it of a black stealth aircraft in the midst of a cone-shaped beam, surrounded by seven squiggly lines (the kind that might be produced by a pen in a lie-detector machine), one in each of the seven colors of the rainbow. The image seems potently illustrative of a “holographic projector.” National security expert William Arkin has written that the Air Force began working on a device as wild as that “for PSYOPS application” in 1994. “What if the U.S. projected a holographic image of Allah floating over Baghdad urging the Iraqi people and Army to rise up against Saddam, a senior Air Force officer asked in 1997?” A military physicist looked into it and deemed it feasible. Much easier would have been another plan that proposed flooding the Arab world with fake videotapes of Saddam Hussein in compromising situations. (www.voxflux.com/archives/00000095.htm)

Hmmm… all those bin Laden videotapes… Oh, conspiracy-shmacy, you’ll say.

Well, here’s a personal story: Dr. Carol Rosin, the President of the Institute for Cooperation in Space, relates that, in 1977, when she worked at Fairchild Industries, she attended a meeting there in a conference room called the War Room. There “were a lot of charts on the walls with enemies, identified enemies. There were other more obscure names, names like Saddam Hussein and Khadafy.” The conversation revolved around “how they were going to antagonize these enemies” to provoke “a war in the Gulf, a Gulf War.” It was part of a plan to justify the development of space-based weapons at a time when the term “Strategic Defense Initiative” had not even been coined yet. According to Rosin, “The room was filled with people in the revolving door game. There were people that I had seen once in a military uniform and other times in a gray suit and an industry outfit… I stood up in this meeting and asked if I was hearing correctly… that there was going to be a war in the Gulf, stimulated, created, so that they could then sell the next phase of weapons to the public and the decision-makers. This war was going to be created so that they could dump the old weapons and create a whole new set of weapons.”

Werner von Braun, the “father” of our space and rocket programs, served at the end of his life as mentor to Carol. According to Rosin, von Braun outlined to her over and over again the entire implausible multi-act play designed to sell us weapons in space, asserting that the first act—the first hoax—had been the Cold War. (Carol’s story can be found in Dr. Steven Greer’s book Disclosure.)


The relevant passage reads, “The process of transformation [of America’s military forces], even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor.” Additionally, a report issued in January of 2001 by a commission chaired by Donald Rumsfeld asked “whether the U.S. will be wise enough to act responsibly and soon enough to reduce U.S. space vulnerability—without a Space Pearl Harbor.” Was it merely coincidence that, according to Griffin, on 9/11/01 George W. Bush wrote in his diary, “The Pearl Harbor of the 21st century took place today?” Or was it exactly the problem that had been called for to induce a solution conceived decades earlier—a “forced” truth?

The authors of “Rebuilding America’s Defenses” call for the birth of a new service under the command of the Defense Department—U.S. Space Forces—to maintain our “unequivocal supremacy in space” by the “ability to deny others the use of space” and by “the application of force both in space and from space.” No kidding. According to Rosin, this is the path we were already well upon—unbeknownst to all but the most elite—back in 1977, during the midst of her brief stint in the military-industrial complex.

Imagine Dick Cheney or Donald Rumsfeld as Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Space Forces. Where would they locate border patrol then, I wonder? And what kind of aliens would be illegal? That’s right! According to the script that von Braun saw, ETs are slated to becom e a global menace. They’ll be capable of interplanetary and interdimensional travel—and they’ll enter, stage left, to play the role of next dreaded enemy with impeccable timing, no doubt. (Here’s where the “holographic projector” probably comes in. Or maybe ETs will intervene to prevent Cheney from dropping nuclear weapons on Iran—thank you very much!—and the new “they’re evil; they hate freedom” drumbeat will begin.)

There’s something rather abstract (not to mention absurd and utterly offensive) about waging a war in and from space. What might be needed to get Americans finally to fully buy into such madness? Well, the events of 9/11 catapulted us beautifully into this current quite abstract War on Terror, didn’t they?

So, is it real? Or is it Memorex?*
Betrayed Once, Shame on Them; Betrayed Twice, Shame on Us

By Rick Foley

My father was at Pearl Harbor. Almost everyone in Struthers, Ohio, back in 1941 knew that. After he retired to Vermont in 1959, Walter only mentioned it once, to the longtime waiter at the Quality Inn, a fellow who was a dead ringer for the young soda jerk in the Norman Rockwell painting hanging behind the cash register—the one of the folks at a diner listening to the radio that fateful Sunday morning. What no one knew was that for 55 years my father wrestled with the terrible knowledge that the attack was not a surprise.

On the morning of that “Day of Infamy,” my father, a noncommissioned damage control officer on the Battleship Pennsylvania, had dressed up to attend a gathering on the sister ship, the Battleship Arizona. He never made it. Walter lost more than thirty shipmates during the attack. Most to one bomb that came through one of the Penny’s imposing stacks. Luckily, she had been berthed in dry dock, so the repairs went quickly and the great battleship sailed into the Pacific theater in time for the Battle of the Coral Sea, carrying Walter and those crew members who realized that the entire Seventh Fleet and the garnisoned army Air Force at Pearl had been offered up to history as sacrificial lambs. They had been betrayed.

Walter, like so many of his World War II comrades, never really talked about his war experiences. Like so many who have survived war’s multiple forms of evil, he lived in a prison of secret torment. Only Walter’s family and few close friends acknowledged privately that my dad, the man who returned from the war, was not the same person they had known.

The stories I was told agreed that Walter left Struthers, Ohio, in 1939 at the top of his game. Walter was the life of the party. Telling stories, center of attention, just being himself. It didn’t hurt that your dad was—whoa—handsome! Better looking than Paul Newman, more like a cleaner, sharper version of Marlon Brando. The Football Star, the gifted, shifty halfback on offense, the man shore batteries, and by noon that day the decks were so bloody, you couldn’t tell a man over to the European theater, starting with convoy escort on the North Atlantic. “Toughest tour for me, ever. Never knew if our little tin-can would make it. Once, all of us below decks, huge storms out there, she rolled to 53, 54 degrees, knew what that meant.” Walter forced me to remember— but from Washington. Washington! When we get back to Pearl, they empty the ships. ‘Weekend pass? Take as many as you want. Two week pass? Yup. Wanna 30-day leave, wanna go stateside? Sure. Your mom is ill? How about an extended emergency leave? You name it.’ They put the Pennys in drydock. They bottle the battleships up in the harbor. No torpedo nets. Skeleton crews. You don’t just sail outta there like that. It takes time to build steam, you have to take on a harbor pilot before you make for open water. Even then no destroyers left to run interference for us, to keep the subs away. The carriers were long gone, so forget air cover once we’re well out at sea. But at least we’d have a fighting chance. See, we were set up. They lined us up like sitting ducks. When a fleet’s in a war, it’s gotta be at sea! It can’t be sitting at anchor!”

In retrospect, I thanked the gods that I had been preparing for that last summer with Walter. As a history buff I had read the literature for years to help get my mind around the Great Wars and the controversial aspects of America’s subsequent military and economic aggression, especially my generation’s war in Vietnam. Along the way I found Admiral Theobald’s The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor and John Toland’s Infamy: Pearl Harbor and Its Aftermath. Enough information for me to see that the full story around Pearl Harbor had not been reported, that the truth had been suppressed through a series of three carefully compromised hearings. In short, by the time Walter told his
story, I was open, if not hungry to hear about his war experience.

Among the many ironies that haunted my father's life, he passed away before a comrade's reasoned voice corroborated my father's personal story, validated his theory about Washington, and echoed his pain at the betrayal. Robert Stinnett's Day of Deceit: The Truth About FDR and Pearl Harbor, a superbly researched book, was published in 2000. Stinnett, a WW II Pacific Theater veteran, conducted an exhaustive, 17-year study of the pre-Pearl intelligence networks—dozens of interviews with radio operators and reviews of over 200,000 original source materials and recently released FOIA records.

Stinnett proves unequivocally that Walter's intuitions were straight on. President Roosevelt, with the support of a small group of confidants, including key military personnel, developed an eight-step strategy to provoke Japan into striking first in order to dislodge the American public's well-documented reluctance to engage in another war overseas. Despite the myth of Japanese "radio silence," U.S. cryptographers listened to and deciphered hundreds of the enemy's military and diplomatic transmissions. U.S. intelligence tracked the Japanese Task Force across the North Pacific from which the Japanese launched their planes two weeks later.

It took 59 years before Stinnett cracked the Pearl Harbor myth of initial deceptions and subsequent cover-ups—a litany of shredded documents, kangaroo-court hearings, intimidated witnesses, and the standard suppression of secrets under the "national security" seal. Not that Stinnett's impeccable research has dented the Pearl Harbor myth. Yes, the Internet is also chock full of excellent coverage (for example, James Perloff's synopsis at www.thesewarsthatneverhappened.com) awaiting a larger audience. But I wonder what would have happened if the official Pearl Harbor conspiracy had been uncovered in the three post-mortem hearings (1942–47) or even the Thurmond-Spence probe of 1995.

What if we Americans had come to grips with FDR's decision to provoke Japan into an overt act of aggression? How would we have regarded subsequent investigative reporting and so-called conspiracy theories in general? Would the American public have bought the subsequent mythic distortions that excused and fueled the Vietnam War (the fraudulent Gulf of Tonkin incident), the first Persian Gulf War (invasion of a sovereign state) or the ensuing UN sanctions against Iraq (WMDs)? Would the authors of "Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces, and Resources for a New Century" (members of the Project for the New American Century and currently top officials in the Bush administration) have dared to label an event equivalent to a "new Pearl Harbor" as the prerequisite trigger to spur public support for their goal of American "full spectrum domination" across the globe and into space?

How would we have responded to the searing images from 9/11? Would we, as a common majority, have considered motivations for attack from both sides of the equation? How would we have assessed the subsequent rush of officialdom's conflicting distortions and the hundreds of profound unanswered questions? The quality of investigations reluctantly implemented, limited in scope, underfunded and squeezed by artificial deadlines? And the Bush administration's call to a "War on Terrorism"? The invasion of Afghanistan? Iraq? Our privacy?

Since my father's passing, Memorial Day, the Fourth of July, and December 7 always spun me into uneasy periods of reflection. The events of 9/11 in 2001 stopped me cold in my tracks. The normal alignment of competing regular life priorities winked off my internal radar screen, replaced with a myriad of 9/11 question marks. While the white-haired shell of a professor attends something numbingly to the responsibilities of work, the son-of-Walter doggedly works the galaxy of 9/11 puzzle pieces. For four years now I have watched my rearrangements of the bits of 9/11 information configure themselves around the Pearl Harbor myth, like a loose pile of iron filings spread on a sheet of paper, aligning themselves as a magnet is positioned below their playing field.

All the while my heart whispers, "Deceit, deceit. Welcome to your own Pearl Harbor."
W hat is most striking about the various conspiracy theories that have emerged to explain 9/11 is that so many of them seem plausible. It is hard not to feel that the Bush government could well have been not merely incompetent but actually to some extent complicit—actively or passively—in the hijackings and crashes. There are a great many holes in the official version of things, as is well documented elsewhere in this issue.

Then there are the errors of omission. The failure of the various intelligence agencies to coordinate information on al Qaeda and know its agents were living in this country.

The failure of the government to take steps to avert planes being hijacked to attack buildings in the U.S. despite being clearly warned by at least four foreign governments that picked up intelligence on this in the summer of 2001. (As is made clear by the memo agent Catherine Rowley sent to the FBI about Moussaoui that summer.) The failure of the FBI to pay any attention to the field reports from at least two offices that some Arabs in their areas were taking flight lessons, though the idea that Al Qaeda planned to use airplanes as weapons was known back in the Clinton era.

The failure of NORAD to scramble any jets in time to intercept the hijacked planes, though the first indication of a hijack in action came at 8:25 that morning and the last two planes were in the air until 9:45 and 10:10. (NORAD claimed that it couldn’t locate the planes because the hijackers had removed the identifying transponders—for which there’s no proof—but the fact is, as they admitted, they didn’t have any jets scrambled up until around 10.)

All of that argues that the Bush administration at a minimum was certainly inept in not stopping the hijackings, evidence that the government is both too big and too complex to be able to function capably. It’s not just the intelligence agencies that are too bureaucratically overgrown—though that’s where the attention has been focused—but at all levels of a bloated government we find incompetence and incoherence. And it is typical that the solutions advanced—the Department of Homeland Security and the new intelligence czar—only add levels of bureaucracy and complexity to the central government. (I have a New York Times chart of the chain of command of Homeland Security, so crisscrossed with lines of responsibility that it looks like the drawing of the wiring of a superjet.)

But the failures of the government were so egregious, and in such a vitally important area, that it opens up the possibility that there was something beyond ineptitude at work. That, in fact, it knew of the threat and didn’t try to stop it. This idea—the Pearl Harbor line—seems perfectly plausible to many people (49.3 per cent of New Yorkers in a 2004 Zogby poll) for two obvious reasons.

First, we know the Bush Neocons wanted to have a war to gain public support for an extension of the American Empire in Central Asia and the Middle East, both to protect and secure oil fields and existing (and future) pipelines and to protect and secure Israel. And a war on terror is the most advantageous of all, since it is global and neverending, allowing the government to put all its resources behind it and for a good time into the future.

Second, we know the Bush Neocons manufactured reasons for the Iraq invasion, and if they fabricated that they certainly could have fabricated 9/11—or, more charitably, allowed 9/11 to happen and fabricated the reasons it happened and wasn’t stopped. That does suggest a true corruption at the heart of the Bush administration, but the fact is that this does not seem farfetched since it was the same kind of corruption that allowed them to decide shortly after taking office that they were going to war with Iraq, and lets them take upwards of 100,000 Iraqi and American lives for their project.

So what does all this mean for the rest of us—for Vermonters in particular.

Well, as I have suggested, it proves that we have a central government either too inefficient or too corrupt, and possibly both. One of the central virtues of the idea of secession is that it inevitably means a smaller government, one more in the control of the citizens, and thus not as bungling and easily corruptible. The small size of a nation does not guarantee that it is efficient and virtuous, but all history has shown that it is small states with some measure of democracy that are most successful in the long run.

I remember Leopold Kohr once telling me of his visit to the principality of Liechtenstein. He said he went to the prince’s castle and knocked on the door. It was opened by a man in a suit and Leopold asked to see the prince. “I am the prince,” the man replied. “Please come in.” They went into an office where they talked for a while and then the phone rang. “The prince picked it up and said, “Government.”

The Bush administration at a minimum was certainly inept in not stopping the hijackings, evidence that the government is both too big and too complex to be able to function capably.

The Lessons of 9/11

Well, that was a bit of an exaggeration, since Liechtenstein has a separate head of government and the prince is nominally head of state, and there are eleven communes where most of the day-to-day governing takes place. But it was true that any ordinary citizen could ring the prince (or knock on his door) and immediately make known a grievance or advance a request, and the person who heard it was in a position to do something about it. That’s the virtue of a state with only 33,000 people in it.

Another virtue of secession is that it ends the entanglement of law-abiding populations with imperial law-benders and adventurers, whether they are corrupt or not. There is no reason in the world why certain good citizens of Vermont, who happen to be in the Army Reserves as a patriotic duty, should be sent half a world away to kill and torture people in a senseless, ugly, and insane war whose outcome will have no practical effect on Vermont other than raising its taxes and dishonoring it in the eyes of the world as part of a rogue nation.

But that war is only an egregious example of policies that are taken by a government far away over whose actions the people of Vermont have no control. The votes and influence of a couple of Senators and a Representative, even if those politicians knew what their constituents wanted, are insignificant in the political process of this nation. But even if they were powerful, they would have to work through a Congressional system that is far too complex and far too undemocratic to have any influence and that operates in ways that are basically corrupt and beholden to corporate interests, as the passing of any law or budget makes glaringly clear.

Besides, the influence of Congress, even if it were really “the people’s voice,” is almost negligible on the actual administration in power, at least when it doesn’t mesh with the administration’s plans and programs. Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, and their cohorts don’t do what they do because they are following some Congressional mandate but because they are carrying out a Neocon vision of their own making. What’s worse, a great deal of that is done in secret, with off-the-books “black budgets,” and no one on the outside has a chance to have an influence on it, not even favored Congressional committee heads who may sometimes be told what is already going on.

The Bush administration and its series of misguided and dangerous actions is a clear and powerful argument for secession. But the virtues would be true under any government that tries to tend to 280 million people. The only way to have true democracy, real efficiency, and just governance is on a small scale—a population, say, of a little over 600,000.
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Besides, the influence of Congress, even if it were really “the people’s voice,” is almost negligible on the actual administration in power, at least when it doesn’t mesh with the administration’s plans and programs. Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, and their cohorts don’t do what they do because they are following some Congressional mandate but because they are carrying out a Neocon vision of their own making. What’s worse, a great deal of that is done in secret, with off-the-books “black budgets,” and no one on the outside has a chance to have an influence on it, not even favored Congressional committee heads who may sometimes be told what is already going on.

The Bush administration and its series of misguided and dangerous actions is a clear and powerful argument for secession. But the virtues would be true under any government that tries to tend to 280 million people. The only way to have true democracy, real efficiency, and just governance is on a small scale—a population, say, of a little over 600,000.
Most people I know have some intuitive sense that the stories told about the way the world works in our culture of daily “news” (and I use the term loosely) are suspect. The real stories about power and the ways power is exercised lie buried beneath the surface. But how deep, to quote The Matrix’s Morpheus, does this rabbit hole go? For those willing to crawl down the hole, U.S. investigative journalism has its own Morpheus, and his name is Michael Ruppert. A UCLA political science honors graduate and former LAPD narcotics investigator, Ruppert is the editor/publisher of From the Wilderness (www.fromthewilderness.com), a monthly newsletter now read by more than 16,000 subscribers in forty countries, including forty Congressmen, both Houses’ intelligence committees, and professors at more than thirty universities around the world. He is also author of a new and startling book called Crossing the Rubicon, in which he draws on From the Wilderness’s seven years of research to tell a disturbing story about the way the world really works.

What Ruppert shares is not for the faint of heart. He asserts, as other researchers have, that key members within the U.S. intelligence community and the Bush administration helped engineer the 9/11 terrorist attack in order to build U.S. public support for a military invasion and occupation of the greater Middle East. But Ruppert goes way beyond 9/11, arguing that the U.S. economy, built on an unsustainable “growth through debt” model and fed by more than $500 billion a year of laundering, has evaporated. 9/11 has become history. To focus on 9/11 is a waste of energy.

We’re also, by the way, seeing plans emerging to balkanize Iraq—suggestions to carve up Iraq into oil-rich and oil-poor regions; with the U.S. controlling oil-rich regions and making occupation that much more affordable, at least in the short term. Perhaps Dick Cheney said it best when he stated that “the American way of life is not negotiable.” But what about Vermont? Are we willing to work to find solutions? Vermont Commons talked with Michael Ruppert about Peak Oil, 9/11, and Vermont independence.

VC: In Crossing the Rubicon, you provide a book’s worth of evidence to suggest that key players within the Bush administration helped engineer the 9/11 terrorist attacks to provide a pretext for securing the globe’s remaining fossil-fuel energy reserves. What evidence has emerged since your book’s publication that further bolsters this argument?

MR: I think we’ve seen evidence emerging on two fronts. The first is oil and energy: Peak Oil is extremely real and threatening, and it’s more imminent than most people think. We are looking at serious major energy shortages this year, earlier than we anticipated, and the oil production numbers continue to perform as we thought they would, with decreasing supply, increasing demand, and rising prices.

Secondly, on the military front, we’ve seen the Bush administration’s actions to bolster this claim?

MR: We will never know for certain until we see Peak Oil in the rearview mirror. Rapid decline of major oil fields indicates that our predictions are much more accurate and more serious than we anticipated.
The British news magazine *The Economist* recently did a feature issue on oil in which they referred to Colin Campbell and Matthew Simmons, two researchers whose evidence you cite in Rubinow, as “petro-pessimists” who paint a far-too-urgent picture regarding Peak Oil. Your response?

**MR:** Here we are two months after *The Economist* published that issue, and our predictions seem dead on. Remember, *The Economist* has a vested interest in maintaining existing markets as long as possible, and that includes reporting on stories in a way that benefits the status quo.

**VC:** What concrete steps can all of us take to prepare for Peak Oil?

**MR:** Peak Oil is here, and will turn out to be the single most important event in human civilization. The subsequent energy shortfall will take us back to a carrying capacity of two billion people. It won’t be pretty. There will be survivors, who will figure out how to manage through place-based local cooperative efforts. I’m beginning to see this all over the country. The question is: Can people organize themselves in time?

**VC:** You’ve suggested, in your writings and talks, that American political culture is more and more resembling fascism. What recent evidence do you see?

**MR:** The list of things happening within the U.S. is truly frightening, in terms of both volume and speed. Congress is moving to throw out the 25th Amendment, which imposes a two-term limit on sitting presidents; the FBI can now issue its own subpoenas, without court involvement; It has just been proposed that U.S. military intelligence should work with local law enforcement agencies to weaken “pose comitatus”; Congressman James Sensenbrenner has now introduced legislation—HR 1528—to impose a mandatory five-year prison sentence for failing to inform on family members or friends guilty of marijuana possession or minor drug use; I predict we will soon see a national draft, and Canada will not harbor U.S. deserters as it did during Vietnam, as it is now a virtual U.S. colony. The list goes on and on.

**VC:** Paint a picture of our near-term future.

**MR:** We’ll see major blackouts, the dollar will collapse, we’ll experience massive unemployment, the housing market will tank, and there will be a national “fire sale” as people and businesses are stripped of their assets. My best financial advice, acknowledging that there is no “one size fits all” plan, is to stay liquid, get out of debt while you still can, and decide if your most valuable assets, including your own home, are worth hanging on to. If your home is on a few acres with running water and rich soil, then sit on it. If it’s a condo in downtown Manhattan, you might consider moving.

**VC:** What are your thoughts regarding Vermont independence and secession—the voluntary breakup of U.S. Empire through peaceful and cooperative means?

**MR:** The U.S. Empire will tank one way or another. I love Vermont, and have some old friends there. Any project that encourages cooperative efforts to reinvent some of our most basic and fundamental social and political policies around energy, agriculture, money, etc., is the best hope we have. •

continued from page 8

the time that the shoot-down order was given and when Flight 93 went down.

There is an enormous amount of evidence that Flight 93 was shot down by a U.S. military airplane. The 9/11 Commission won’t even mention that. They don’t mention any of the evidence even to refute the claim, such as the fact that people on the ground saw debris coming from the plane miles from where the plane finally crashed, and the fact that people (including Vietnam vets) said they heard a missile, and so on, including the fact that Assistant Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz said, “We had a military plane following Flight 93, on its tail, ready to shoot it down if need be.” And they ignored the fact that CBS news said that there were two military planes on the tail of Flight 93. They ignore all that. And here’s how they explain how this [shoot-down by the U.S. military] could not have been.

They said that Cheney didn’t go down to the underground bunker—the emergency operations center—until 10:00, and by the time he got organized and gave the shoot-down order it was 10:10. So you see the logic. Cheney didn’t give the order until after the plane had crashed. The military wouldn’t have gone ahead and shot down the plane without the vice-president’s order, even though (and they don’t mention this) the military regulations say that it’s the Pentagon who makes these decisions. They don’t need a presidential order, and certainly not a vice-presidential order. But their logic is that Cheney didn’t give the order until after the plane crashed, ergo the military couldn’t possibly have shot down Flight 93. We’ll ignore the fact that from all other reports, including Cheney himself, he went down to the bunker before 9:30. Richard Clarke has him going down there at about 9:10 or 9:15. Norman Mineta, Secretary of Transportation, reported to the 9/11 Commission on C-SPAN that he went down there at 9:20 and Cheney was already there, and had been there for some time, as there were ongoing conversations.

A young man came in and said that there was this plane 50 miles out, “Does the order still stand?” This was prior to the Pentagon strike. [And it referred to a plane heading toward DC.] So this is a direct refutation of the notion that nobody knew that there was something approaching the Pentagon, as if that notion were remotely possible. So what they did is they deleted Norman Minetta’s testimony. There is no reference to it in the 9/11 Report. He has Cheney in the bunker by 9:20, and the 9/11 Commission, in spite of knowing that, said that Cheney didn’t get down there until about 9:58. So they lie by almost 45 minutes, and that is their entire defense against the idea that Flight 93 was shot down. As I graded a former student: “F for plagiarism and F for cheating.” I give the same grade to the 9/11 Commissioners. They can’t even tell a plausible lie, and yet they’ve gotten away with it because they know they can cow the press into not speaking a word. •

Dr. Griffin will be speaking in Manchester on October 11 and in Burlington on October 12 as a guest of Southern Vermonters for a Fair Economy and Environmental Protection.
Five Painful Questions about 9/11

By Eric Hufschmid

1. Did the Towers Collapse Too Quickly?
The official story is that the collapse began when one floor broke, and the pieces fell to the floor below it. Those pieces shattered that floor, and so on, all the way down. However, when the pieces hit the floor below it, they would have slowed down slightly because some of their energy would be used to break the floor. Therefore, there should be a delay every time the pieces hit a floor. The towers had 110 floors, so if it took one second for each floor to be crushed, that would be 110 seconds.

However, the seismic data and video show that the North Tower collapsed in only 8.4 seconds. The collapse started at about the 94th floor. If you were to drop a rock from the 94th floor, it would hit the ground about 8.4 seconds later. This means that the pieces of the building were falling as fast as objects fall through the air. How can objects crash through steel and concrete floors as fast as they fall through the air?

There is only one explanation. Explosives were placed in these buildings before the attack. The collapse of the North Tower started when explosives at the 94th floor were detonated. The explosives were timed so that the floors were shattered before the rubble contacted it. The pieces of the building fell in only 8.4 seconds because none of the pieces crashed into a floor.

2. Why Has Fire Never Destroyed a Skyscraper Before?
A fire in a 32-story skyscraper in Madrid, Spain, became so intense that it spread from one floor to the next, causing the building to look like a torch. This fire was much larger than the fire at the World Trade Center. The next morning there were still a few fires in the lower floors. Everything inside the building had been burned. Some sections of the building broke. A few portions at the top of the building collapsed. However, the building remained standing, and it continued to support a large construction crane at the top. By comparison, the fire at the South Tower was so small that it never spread to the other side of the tower.

3. Why Does the Government Use the Same Engineer?
The government selected an engineer named Gene Corley to investigate the collapse of the World Trade Center towers and Building 7. Corley had also been selected to investigate the bombing of the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City in 1995, as well as the fire at the Branch Davidian complex in Waco, Texas, in 1993.

In all three cases, Corley supported the government’s theory. However, for those of us who have seen the evidence that the government was involved in those three crimes, we have to conclude that Corley was selected to investigate these crimes because he is one of the few people with engineering credentials who is willing to lie for the government.

A lot of people are willing to secretly commit or cover up a crime, but not many people want to publicly defend a crime. This seems especially true for people who have struggled for years to build up a reputation as a competent scientist or engineer. Therefore, when the government finds an engineer or scientist willing to lie for them, they have to turn to that person again and again.

A few university professors supported the government’s theory about the collapse of the towers, but they ignored the collapse of Building 7, and they have not yet responded to critics of their theory. It appears as if they published these theories only because they were pressured to do so, and then they quickly went into hiding.

4. What Happened to Building 7?
The collapse of Building 7 is the most obvious sign that the government was involved in the attack. This was a 47-story building with a steel frame. It was not hit by an airplane, and it was across the street from the towers. At 5:25 pm, this building collapsed into a tiny pile of rubble. Video and photos show that Building 7 collapsed exactly like old buildings that are brought down by explosives.

The U.S. Government investigated the collapse of this building, but after seven months of investigating, their conclusion was that they have no idea why the building collapsed. A few months later, the landlord of Building 7, Larry Silverstein, announced on television that the fire department demolished Building 7.

If the government was interested in understanding what happened on September 11, they would have asked Silverstein and the fire department to explain what happened to Building 7, but our government officials, university professors, and news reporters are ignoring Building 7. For the government to ignore such a major crime is simply more evidence that they were involved in this attack.

5. What Else Was the Government Involved With?
The government could have arranged for the airplanes to hit the towers at night, and the buildings could have been demolished at night, when nobody was looking. How could they have the confidence to blow up buildings during daylight, and with people around the world watching on television? The only explanation is that these people had committed major crimes before, and in front of everybody’s faces.

The Oklahoma City bombing, for example, was very similar. Explosives were placed in the building before the attack, and a couple hundred people were blown up while they were inside the building. The assassination of President Kennedy was also performed in front of everybody, but after 40 years our school textbooks continue to teach children that Oswald killed Kennedy all by himself.

The people who committed these crimes got away with them, which certainly gave them the confidence to do other crimes. When people ignore crime, morale in the nation is reduced, and the criminals are encouraged to act again.