

Preface to the Third Edition

The 9/11 Issue: Key to Avoiding World War III

During October and November of 2005, there was great hope that the Scooter Libby indictment, new evidence of Bush's lies, the Katrina debacle, and the Safavian and Delay-Abramoff prosecutions, combined with the two thousandth officially conceded US battle death in Iraq and growing losses in Afghanistan, might bring about the collapse of the Bush regime. By the spring of 2006, it was clear that this perspective had been illusory. The Bush-Cheney-neocon regime could count on a base of public support amounting to 35-40% of the US population. By March of 2006 – after Cheney's shooting incident again pointed to his mental instability, alcohol abuse, and flagrant violation of the law – Bush was again bumping along at the lower edge of this range. But it would be foolhardy to expect that he would decline much below the 35% level, unless an important sea-change had occurred. The most obvious and efficient sea-change was by way of spectacular public revelations overthrowing the Kean-Hamilton-Zelikow official account, and establishing the criminal participation of US military/intelligence rogue networks in the crimes of 9/11.

Nothing but 9/11 truth could effectively erode and attrite the Bush-Cheney base. These 35-40% were persons of limited political horizon, gulled by the controlled corporate media brainwashing machine. They had accepted the terror demagoguery, the Bush-Cheney regime's war on terror, and were simply scared out of their wits. Such hysterical fear presented an insuperable obstacle to arguments based on reason.

One is tempted to classify the 35-40% who support "pre-emptive war" as morally insane, or crazed by fear, but we must also remember that these gullible persons had been shamefully betrayed by the left liberal and radical liberal intelligentsia, the principal group in this society which might have been expected to take the lead in denouncing and rejecting the Bush regime's fantastic, racist, warmongering nightmare account of the events of 9/11 and the "war on terror" that was supposed to derive from them. Instead of loudly denouncing the official account, these liberals had prostrated themselves before it, even taking up the task of vilifying and ostracizing 9/11 skeptics and heretics.

The 35-40% were virtually impervious to arguments revolving around the criminal folly of the Afghan and Iraq wars, the suicidal insanity of a wider war with Iraq or Syria, and around such issues as Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib, torture, secret CIA prisons, illegal renditions, violations of the Geneva Convention, NSA wiretaps, and totalitarian police state measures in general. For the terrified 35-40%, any acts of genocide or aggression must necessarily appear as fully justified measures of self-defense, dictated by the hard necessities of a war on terror which had been imposed on the United States by treacherous killers from abroad. For Bush to fall substantially below 35%, and thus become vulnerable to the impeachment and criminal prosecutions which were so obviously his due, it was necessary to show parts of the 35% that the 9/11 attacks were provocations from inside the bowels of the Pentagon, CIA, NSA, and so forth, rather than from Bin Laden's myth-drenched cave in Afghanistan.

9/11 was the ultimate weapon against Bush; indeed, it was the only effective weapon – how ironic that it was the weapon which the hysterical left liberals categorically refused to take up. Here were persons who claimed they would do anything to stop the war in Iraq, anything to roll back the domestic police state. But address the truth about 9/11, where the absurdities of the official version cried out to heaven? Horrors! Never! – was the response of Noam Chomsky, Amy Goodman, Michael Moore, *The Nation* magazine, Greg Palast, and most of the broadcasters associated with Air America. From one plausible point of view, the left gatekeepers were, by their craven refusal to tackle 9/11, taking upon themselves a large measure of Afghan and Iraq (and Iran) war guilt, plus responsibility for totalitarianism on the home front.

What a wretched position was that of the gatekeepers! They were propounding the patent absurdity that, while Bush had been an inveterate liar all his life until September 11, 2001, he mysteriously began to tell the truth on that day – even if he relapsed into mendacity in the early days of January, 2002, before his “axis of evil” State of the Union speech. The left gatekeepers preened themselves on never believing Bush. If they were caught in public giving credence to Bush on any other issue – be it Iraq, the deficit, Katrina, Plamegate, prescription drug reform, or oil drilling in Alaska, they would have died of mortification and humiliation. But on 9/11, the biggest issue of them all, the fountainhead of all wars, the pretext for all police states, the true *caput horum et causa malorum* – they were eager not just to repeat Bush’s lies, but to aid in crushing anyone who dared to contradict them.

Was there any doubt that the 9/11 Big Lie was the basis for the Bush regime, the Republican Party, and of all their crimes? If so, one had only to listen to Karl Rove in his early 2006 address to the winter meeting of the Republican National Committee, when this notorious scoundrel announced that “Republicans have a post-9/11 world view and many Democrats have a pre-9/11 world view.” (*Washington Post*, January 21, 2006) It was clear from this that 9/11 would be the basis of the Republican campaign in 2006, just as it had been in 2002 and 2004. If even more documentation were needed to enlighten the gatekeepers, they could turn to hilarious variation on the same theme by Gary Trudeau in *Doonesbury*, including the strip published December 11, 2005, which went beyond Bush’s use of 9/11 as a universal excuse to illustrate how 9/11 could be cited as a free pass to bail out clumsy shop clerks, football players having a bad day, and adulterous husbands caught in the act by their wives.

Just how big a favor the gatekeepers were doing Bush was demonstrated by the courageous observations of the famous actor Charlie Sheen, who was interviewed on the Alex Jones radio program on Monday, March 20, 2006. Alex Jones, the dean of conservative 9/11 critics, is a valiant fighter against the police state and the globaloney new world order, and I have been a strong supporter of his efforts since my first interview on his program on the day before Thanksgiving, 2001. In his talk with Jones, Sheen expressed his strong skepticism about the 19 hijackers, about the nature of the flying objects shown hitting the WTC towers, and about the fall of the buildings. He called for a neutral, international panel – virtually identical to the Independent International Truth Commission described elsewhere in this book. For Sheen, the 9/11 case was not closed.

His remarks were not delivered on prime time television, but on a daytime radio broadcast on a decidedly anti-regime network. Yet they were destined to knock the US controlled corporate media on their ear. Thanks to the Internet, Sheen's views went around the world. On Wednesday, March 22, Sheen's critique of the official version was the centerpiece of Showbiz Tonight on CNN Headline News Prime Time Live. The show's New York host, A.J. Hammer, told the audience that he had never swallowed the official story, and proceeded to give a full airing to what Sheen had said. A short segment showed me recalling that, according to a Zogby poll, 50% of New Yorkers were already LIHOP in the late summer of 2004. This was a tiny fraction of the 15 to 20 minutes I had recorded that day at the CNN Washington DC studio, and it was not one of my signature issues, but it was the first time that a 9/11 author of the full, political, invisible government, MIHOP school had appeared on CNN. Showbiz Tonight returned to the same themes on the following two evenings, and was set to continue the following week when it was stopped, after no spokesperson could be found to defend the official side. CNN's viewer poll showed 83% supporting Charlie Sheen. On Friday, March 24, I appeared on the Alex Jones radio program along with Charlie Sheen.

On that same Monday, March 20, *New York Magazine* hit the newsstands and the internet with an article ("The Ground Zero Grassy Knoll") on the 9/11 truth movement by Mark Jacobson, who had attended my lecture at St. Mark's in the Bowery Church on January 15, 2006, as well as the spirited dinner discussion with Nick Levis and Nico Haupt which followed. In this article, I had in effect the honor of being the keynote speaker for the 9/11 truth movement. Given the obvious limits imposed by the circumstances, Jacobson's article was a notable achievement. He showed people now in their fifties, sixties, and beyond that they needed to challenge the 9/11 cover-up in the same way that so many of them had rejected the Warren Commission on the Kennedy assassination. Jacobson provided a wealth of facts, more than enough to strike down the government story. He also helpfully listed a multitude of movement websites where skeptics could find out more. He quoted a 9/11 widow saying that the 9/11 truth movement cared more than the official commissioners. It was an article which served the cause of truth. *New York Magazine* wields considerable influence in the publishing, glitterati, communications, advertising, and financial elites of the city. When CNN called me for an interview later that week, they had learned I was an authority from *New York Magazine*.

The conservative Alex Jones and the liberals at *New York Magazine* had provided the best 9/11 reality check in many months. It showed that the obsolete ideological categories of left and right were meaningless husks when it came to the cardinal question of our time. Because I was the single 9/11 author involved in both the Charlie Sheen/Alex Jones and the *New York Magazine* developments, this book affirmed itself as never before in the weeks after March 20. In the Amazon sales rankings, it outclassed the Kean-Hamilton-Zelikow official version, as well as the Ruppert and D. R. Griffin studies. This book appeared to be challenging the 500 barrier in those rankings when Amazon ran out of copies on March 28, and production of this third edition has had to be accelerated accordingly. The political significance of all this is that the US 9/11 reading public is becoming more sophisticated and more radicalized, and is no longer content with the government's

big lies, nor with a pale and diluted LIHOP, nor with an overall agnosticism about who did what to whom in the 9/11 big picture. Hypertechnical accounts, which focus on whether the murder weapon was an icepick, a hatpin, or an awl, rather than naming the murderer, also fall short. The public wants and deserves a comprehensive and consistent political MIHOP, and this is what I have done everything in my power to provide. My books stands as the only example of such MIHOP originally written in English; the great European studies by Meysan, von Bülow, Wisnewski, and Blondet are each in their own way MIHOP from the word go.

Charlie Sheen had spoken as a patriotic citizen concerned about his country. Bloggers went wild, pro and con. The entire neocon faction responded by collectively falling on the ground in apoplectic rage and chewing whatever carpet chanced to be nearby. When Alan Colmes asked Sean Hannity what he thought of Charlie Sheen, Hannity vilified Sheen as a leftist. When Colmes responded that conservatives were actually taking the lead, Hannity stammered that the bereaved families were certainly offended. Colmes responded that the families had shown gratitude for the skeptics' quest for truth. For once the bully was silenced. The chronicles of neocon invective against Charlie Sheen are too long to be reproduced here. Jerry Doyle and many others took part. But other broadcasters gave space to opponents of the government's lies: Rachel Madow of Air America hosted Mark Jacobson, while Lionel dedicated a program to Victor Thorn's book on controlled demolition, and Colmes interviewed Phil Berg about the civil RICO suit against Bush-Cheney. Then, in the last days of March, political philanthropist Jimmy Walter and North Tower hero William Rodriguez, speaking from Caracas, told Alex Jones that Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez's government was considering the advisability of a 9/11 truth summit, and the hope here was that it would be along the lines of the Independent International Truth Commission.

The expected countermoves of the US-UK intelligence establishment were not long in coming. On Thursday, April 6, 9/11 agent provocateur Ward Churchill was given an excellent soapbox by the witch-hunting reactionaries of the Students for Academic Freedom in a debate with David Horowitz at George Washington University, with the self-styled Weatherman bomb expert playing the leftist. The next evening, Fox News darling Ward Churchill was given an endless segment to spout his lunatic rant about the 9/11 victims being "little Eichmanns." Hannity, who had been silenced by Charlie Sheen two weeks before, had a field day. Remember that Churchill is the most rabid defender of the official version, condemning skeptics as racists who don't think the Arabs are capable of such great things. If the US public could be convinced that Ward Churchill was the spokesman of the 9/11 truth movement, the official version would be invulnerable forever, no matter how many lies it contained. On March 30, in a related counter-move, Democratic Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney of Georgia, the elected official who had the highest national profile on 9/11 truth, was deliberately harassed by a member of the Capitol Hill police as she entered the Congress. The provocateur was presumably one of the Bull Connor clones who have been hired by the reactionary Republican House leadership over the past years. The media assault on Rep. McKinney was unprecedented. Still, the Charlie Sheen flap proved that the entire pompous castle of 9/11 lies was exceedingly vulnerable. Imagine what a few senators could do with 9/11! Truly 9/11 truth offered the greatest bang for the buck.

Behind all these events loomed the likelihood that a minority faction of the US-UK ruling elite, correctly judging that the Bush-Cheney regime was unhinged, deranged, off the deep end, living in a bubble, and divorced from reality, had decided to brandish the threat of a limited hangout on 9/11 to discipline these two, and get them to address the main ruling class concern: the death agony of the US dollar, made worse by the end of the yen carry trade, and by the Iran oil bourse. The mood of elite discontent was expressed by calls in the London *Financial Times* for the immediate ouster of Cheney and Rumsfeld, and by a drum-beat in the *Washington Post* for the replacement of Treasury Secretary Snow; this latter point showed where the greatest concern was. The conclusive evidence on this came in a *Vanity Fair* article by Al Gore, who noted that Bush “was warned on Aug. 6, 2001, of an attack by Al Qaeda. ‘Bin Laden Determined to Strike in US,’ said the intelligence community in a message so important that it was the headline of the President’s daily briefing that day, five weeks before the attacks.” Gore lambasted Bush for his inaction: “Didn’t he see that clear warning?” asked the former Vice President. “Why were no questions asked, meetings called, evidence marshaled, clarifications sought?” This was the refurbished option of sinking Bush for his catatonic paralysis and non-feasance before 9/11, all well within the confines of the official version, an option developed in *Harper’s Magazine* of October 2004, and later stressed by Kean-Hamilton commission member Bob Kerrey. 9/11 Truth sectarians would always grumble, but a limited hangout was always better than no hangout at all, primarily because of the chance that enterprising truth activists might push it beyond any limits.

A major attempt to shore up the collapsing 9/11 myth came with the Zacharias Moussaoui show trial in Alexandria, Virginia. This wretched man was a classic patsy, half double agent and half psychotic dupe, several levels of acumen below Lee Harvey Oswald, and a long-time denizen of the FBI-Able Danger patsy stable. Moussaoui had already saved the government’s collapsing case against him once by pleading guilty, and for over three years his defense lawyers had argued that he was a part of a plot not related to 9/11. The government claimed that, if Moussaoui had spilled the beans, they would have mobilized to stop 9/11. If that had been the case, as I told KPFK Los Angeles on March 7, then the FBI’s David Frasca should have been a capital defendant as well, since it was he who had sabotaged the Minneapolis warnings and the Phoenix memorandum, as described in this book. In fact, the FBI had all the facts it needed to roll up the patsy network, were it not for the pervasive moles. The FBI could have stopped 9/11, not because the Arab patsies were really going to fly the planes into the towers, but because if the patsies had all been in jail, they could not have been made the scapegoats. FBI agent Harry Samit of Minneapolis, a colleague of Colleen Rowley, accused the FBI bigwigs of “criminal negligence” and “careerism” for ignoring his seventy messages warning of Moussaoui & Co. But this is exactly what invisible government moles are supposed to do. Michael Rolince had been Frasca’s boss at FBI headquarters, and he testified that he had never seen the critical August 18, 2001 warning from Minneapolis.

After severe prosecutorial misconduct in prepping witnesses, Moussaoui obligingly placed his neck in the noose by raving that he had indeed been a part of 9/11, since he and Richard Reid (the shoe bomber of December 2001!) had intended

to commandeer a Boeing 747 and crash it into the White House. As shown in this book, Reid was a psychotic derelict even more impaired than Moussaoui, and the two of them could not have hijacked a pushcart. Both were products of the British intelligence School for Patsies maintained at Brixton and Finsbury mosques in London. Moussaoui was reportedly wearing an electric stun belt when he testified – to encourage his eloquence, no doubt. He dumped his defense lawyers, who tried to save him by proving that he was a “paranoid schizophrenic;” it was an accurate diagnosis. Moussaoui rated lifetime confinement in a prison for the criminally insane.

Other theses of this book have been supported by recent events. Why did Bush refuse to go to the FISA court to get wiretap warrants? The FISA judges, everyone knew, would put a wiretap on a ham sandwich, if asked by the government. Why did Bush not use them? Evidently because Bush’s backers feared that any court supervision might disclose how the rogue networks infesting the government were running and directing ongoing terror activity, as in the case of the terror controllers of Able Danger. Bush’s proposal to Blair on January 31, 2003 to paint a US plane in UN colors and fly it over Iraq in the hopes of getting it shot down was straight out of Operation Northwoods (Philippe Sands, *Lawless World*).

In the haggling over the Congressional 9/11 resolution, Bush first demanded authorization to use military force to “deter and pre-empt any future acts of terrorism or aggression against the United States,” a declaration of war against the world which the Congress rejected. Just before the final passage, Bush demanded the go-ahead for “all necessary and appropriate force *in the United States* and against those nations, organizations or persons [the president] determines planned, authorized, committed or aided” the 9/11 attacks. This was also rejected, but the threatened use of force in this country clearly foreshadowed civil war. (Tom Daschle, “Power We Didn’t Grant,” *Washington Post*, Dec. 23, 2005) Since March 11, 2006 I have been discussing these issues with a series of distinguished guests on my program, World Crisis Radio, on www.RBNLive.com each Saturday from 4 to 6 PM eastern time.

As this book goes to press, the news is full of dire warnings of an imminent dollar disintegration, couched in such terms as “payment shock,” “tsunami,” “hurricane,” “cataclysm,” “systemic disruption,” “disorderly adjustment,” and “global financial collapse” coming from such figures as the head of the IMF, the Governor of the Bank of England, the European Union Finance Ministers, top officials of the Asian Development Bank and the US Office of Thrift Supervision, Danish pension fund managers and US bond salesmen. Equally prominent are the Strangelove threats of atomic bombing of Iran, or of a thermonuclear first strike against Russia and China, as ventilated in the March/April 2006 issue of *Foreign Affairs* by Lieber and Press – a stark reminder of why a mushroom cloud is displayed on the cover of this book. For those who oppose world economic breakdown crisis and thermonuclear war, 9/11 truth is the only road, and more urgent to travel than ever.

Webster Griffin Tarpley
Washington, DC
April 12, 2006