

The Myth of Foreign Terrorism

The events of 9/11 weren't the acts of terrorism they are portrayed as being

By Hans Sherrer

December 19, 2002

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
THE BASTARDIZATION OF WORDS FOR POLITICAL ADVANTAGE.....	4
WORDS IN ENGLISH HAVE KNOWN DEFINITIONS.....	6
HOW IS TERRORISM DEFINED?.....	8
WHAT ARE ACTS OF TERRORISM?.....	10
THE MYTH SEPTEMBER 11TH WERE ACTS OF FOREIGN TERRORISM.....	11
THE USA PATRIOT ACT ONLY INCIDENTALLY CONCERNS TERRORISM.....	14
THE ILLUSION OF HOMELAND SECURITY.....	16
A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF HOW SEPTEMBER 11TH HAS BEEN USED TO UNDERMINE THE LIBERTY OF AMERICANS.....	23
WHO BENEFITED FROM THE EVENTS OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001?	31
THE TERRORISM AFTER SEPTEMBER 11TH.....	33
THE TRUE TERRORISM OF SEPTEMBER 11TH	36
FINAL WORDS.....	43
FOOTNOTES.....	46

Introduction

It is a myth the events involving four diverted airliners on the morning of September 11, 2001 were acts of foreign terrorism. Furthermore, there is no definitional basis to even suggest, much less substantiate such a claim. Clearing away the semantic fog that has generated false public perceptions about those events reveals the simple truth that the terrorism against Americans related to September 11th wasn't perpetrated by foreigners.

In stark contrast to the absence of foreign terrorism, a systematic and very public campaign of domestic terrorism against Americans by the President and his Cabinet, members of Congress, and officials of multiple federal agencies was begun minutes after the World Trade Center buildings were struck. That terrorist campaign is disconcerting in the absence of any other consideration. However, it is compounded by the suspicious circumstances of what occurred prior to and on September 11th, the scale of the operation necessary to orchestrate those events, and that the federal government and those associated with it are not just the most conspicuous beneficiaries of those events, but they are the *only* visible beneficiaries of them. Thus the factors of motive, opportunity, magnitude, and who benefited from September 11th all point to seriously considering that the events were acts of terrorism by elements within, and associated with the federal government against Americans.

However, one need look no further than that the events of September 11th were not acts of foreign terrorism to understand the federal government's alleged War on Terrorism is a sham, and that the legislation justified as a response to those events was enacted under false pretenses. Why? Because the only terrorism the American people have been, and are being subjected to is being perpetrated against them by the federal government in the form of such things as the Patriot Act of 2001, the Homeland Security Act of 2002, the federalization of airport screeners, and the establishment of the Defense Department's Information Assurance Office. It is disturbing in its implications that widespread public and political support for those legislative responses that were pre-planned to varying degrees, is solely attributable to the trigger events of September 11th.

Consequently the threat to Americans is not from without the country by foreigners who can do nothing to undermine the liberty of Americans, but by people, agencies and groups within the United States directly or indirectly associated with the federal government. It is only they that can obliterate the liberty of Americans, by unleashing the Constitution from the symbolic constraint provided by the Bill of Rights.

I

The Bastardization of Words For Political Advantage

Although most well known for his prophetic 1949 novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, George Orwell was a renowned social and political essayist in the 1930s and 40s. Many of the ideas in his novel about the use of language to politically control people are a refinement of what he wrote about in his 1945 essay: *Politics and the English Language*.¹ That essay explains among other things, the crucial role of words in galvanizing support by the general population for and against a particular political cause or action. Orwell explained that clouding the meaning of words is an important element of that process, because slovenly use “of our language makes it easier for us to have foolish thoughts.”² Since we concretize thoughts in terms of words, any corruption of the language one uses inevitably leads to a corruption in the expression of one’s thoughts and actions related to those thoughts.

So those who influence the use of a language can manipulate the images created in the minds of people that they transpose for reality. Thus an enduring cultural contribution of George Orwell’s essay was clarifying how bastardization of a language’s use is essential to publicly mask the reality of political events and rallying support for rationally unsupportable policies. Orwell explained this process in a passage of *Politics and the English Language* that is as important in its implications as any written in the 20th Century:

“In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defense of the indefensible. Things like the continuance of British rule in India, the Russian purges and deportations, the [Americans] dropping of the atom bombs on Japan, can indeed be defended, but only by arguments which are too brutal for most people to face, and which do not square with the professed aims of the political parties. Thus political language has to consist largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness. Defenseless villages are bombarded from the air, the inhabitants driven out into the countryside, the cattle machine-gunned, the huts set on fire with incendiary bullets: this is called *pacification*. Millions of peasants are robbed of their farms and sent trudging along the roads with no more than they can carry: this is called transfer of *population* or *rectification of frontiers*. People are imprisoned for years without trial, or shot in the back of the neck or sent to die of scurvy in Arctic lumber camps: this is called *elimination of unreliable elements*. Such phraseology is needed if one wants to name things without calling up mental pictures of them. Consider for instance some comfortable English professor defending Russian totalitarianism. He cannot say outright, “I believe in killing off your opponents when you can get good results by doing so.” Probably, therefore, he will say something like this:

“While freely conceding that the Soviet regime exhibits certain features which the humanitarian may be inclined to deplore, we must, I think, agree that a certain curtailment of the right to political opposition is an unavoidable concomitant of transitional periods, and that the rigors which the Russian people have been called upon to undergo have been amply justified in the sphere of concrete achievement.”

The inflated style itself is a kind of euphemism. A mass of Latin words falls upon the facts like soft snow, blurring the outline and covering up all the details. The great enemy of clear language is insincerity. When there is a gap between one's real and one's declared aims, one turns as it were instinctively to long words and exhausted idioms, like a cuttlefish spurting out ink. In our age there is no such thing as “keeping out of politics.” All issues are political issues, and politics itself is a mass of lies, evasions, folly, hatred, and schizophrenia.”³

The relevance of Orwell’s observations about the use of language as a tool of political obfuscation is greater today than in his day. The sphere of political influence in daily life is infinitely greater than in 1945 when Orwell wrote his essay, and the use of language as a tool to muddle the perception people have about events with political implications has grown apace.

Linguistic concealment of political actions and motives is the single greatest threat to the people of any society, because they permit the imposition and continuation of policies that would be laid bare for what they are if words were used that accurately described the policies, and/or the events that may have precipitated their enactment. This is true regardless of a country's political structure or language, since as Orwell notes, language bastardization is prevalent in countries of different political persuasions.⁴ When it comes to the bastardization of words for political advantage, the U.S. doesn’t take a backseat to any country, and that is amply demonstrated by the false description of the events of September 11, 2001 as foreign terrorism.

II

Words in English have known definitions

The key to understanding the events of September 11th weren't acts of terrorism is that a feature of the English language is all words have one or more specific and identifiable meanings. Those meanings relate to other words or phrases that describe what is meant by use of the word. A word's primary and secondary definitions help facilitate meaningful communication by enabling the concepts and ideas contained in the definition to be transmitted by use of the word alone.

So a word can accurately be characterized as a shorthand expression for what is represented by its definition. When one word proves inadequate to convey the meaning of a thought, it is common for two words to be combined by a hyphen to make a more expressive word. It is also possible for entirely new words to be created for expressing a concept or idea in a new or unique way.

The adaptability of English by the free-flow combining of existing or addition of new words is one way that English retains its vibrancy and relevance in a changing world.

There is consequently no need to risk confusing people by summarily and unilaterally altering or changing the definition of an existing word to express a new thought or idea: since English imposes no impediment to the instant creation of a new word that will have a definition accurately expressing that thought or idea.

The free-flowing nature of English is exhibited by its heritage. When Shakespeare was writing his plays there was no comprehensive English dictionary. His audience would understand his use of English due to their educational backgrounds and geographical proximity to him.

As the mobility of people and the geographical audience of what was written increased, the need for people in different areas or educational backgrounds to comprehend the use of words in a mutually understandable manner also increased. That need to communicate clearly contributed to the creation of the dictionary as a method of linking a word with its meaning(s) and forms of use. The most complete of the early dictionaries was Samuel Johnson's, first published in 1755. ⁵ It remained the most comprehensive dictionary of the English language

until the first installment of the Oxford English Dictionary was made available to the public over 100 years later.

The value of dictionaries to facilitate understanding has been proven during the past 250 years. The reliance on dictionaries to document a word's meaning has become so universal that today there are a multitude of general and specialized dictionaries. Some words have technical and non-technical definitions. Medical terms for example, are specifically defined in a medical dictionary, and they may or may not be generally defined in lay person terms in a popular dictionary.

Legal terms are the same. Many words commonly used in newspapers, magazines, books, on television and in daily conversation - such as guilt, innocence, custody and assault - are legally defined. However, their common use doesn't affect the words legal meaning, which may be consistent with the lay meaning.

Some legal terms that have lay person meanings are also statutorily defined by a legislative enactment.

There are also words with *general*, *legal* and *statutory* connotations that are ascribed a definition by *law enforcement* agencies. Terrorism is one such word.

III

How Is Terrorism Defined?

Terrorism is an over 200 year-old word that on September 11, 2001 was specifically defined *generally, legally, statutorily* and by *law enforcement* agencies.

The best selling dictionary of any kind in the United States is *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*. The tenth edition *generally* defines terrorism as: “the systematic use of terror esp. as a means of coercion.”⁶ That meaning directly links to that dictionary’s definition of terror: “violence (as bombing) committed by groups in order to intimidate a population or government into granting their demands.”⁷

The most widely used legal dictionary in the United States is *Black's Law Dictionary*. The seventh edition *legally* defines terrorism as: “The use or threat of violence to intimidate or cause panic, esp. as a means of affecting political conduct. – terrorist.”⁸

Since 1983 the U.S. government has relied on the statutory definition of terrorism in 22 United States Code §2656(f)(d)(2) for statistical and analytical purposes. That *statutory* definition is: “the term “terrorism” means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents [usually intended to influence an audience.]”⁹

Furthermore, the FBI’s *law enforcement* definition of terrorism has remained unchanged for years: “...terrorism is the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.”¹⁰

Those four definitions reflect a common understanding that there are two prongs that must be satisfied for an act to be classified as terrorism.

The first prong is the act *must* be intended to influence political policies (“intimidate a ... government into granting their demands,” *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*; “affecting political conduct,” *Black's Law Dictionary*; “politically motivated violence,” 22 U.S.C. §2656(f)(d)(2); and, “in furtherance of political ... objectives,” F.B.I.’s definition).

The second prong is the act is perpetrated by one or more persons allied with an identifiable group (“committed by groups” *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*; “The use

or threat of violence ... [by a] terrorist” *Black’s Law Dictionary*; “by subnational groups or clandestine agents” 22 U.S.C. §2656f(d)(2); and, “unlawful use of force or violence” F.B.I.’s definition.). 11

So all four classes of defining terrorism are complementary in recognizing that the two prongs that must be satisfied for an act to be considered as terrorism are it is intended to affect political policies, and it involves people associated with a group.

IV

What Are Acts Of Terrorism?

Some of the purest and most undisputed acts of terrorism are bombings and other acts of violence by the IRA over a more than 30-year period against civilian and military personnel and targets in Northern Ireland and England. These events have been widely reported in the news media. How is it known the IRA was involved? The IRA claimed responsibility. How is it known they were intended to influence political policies? The IRA made it plainly known the purpose of their actions was to influence the British to abandon their political policy of occupying Northern Ireland, to withdraw their troops from the country, and to accept the unimpeded political self-determination of the country. Furthermore, the IRA's claims of responsibility were credible: the violence occurred in areas and situations that would maximize publicity for their cause, and they were consistent with the sort of activity the IRA was known to be involved in. ¹² The IRA openly claims responsibility for acts of violence it is involved in, and so its denial of involvement in an action is credible.

The detonating of bombs strapped to Palestinians amongst crowds of people in Israel as a political tactic is another example of self-evident terrorism. The Palestinian's responsible readily take credit for the bombings that are specifically intended to influence Israel to grant their political demands. It can't be overlooked that the Palestinians are routinely setting off bombs and engaging in gunfights with Israeli troops and police, even though Israeli has draconian "anti-terrorism" legislation in effect and is run closer to the model of a total police state than any other country in the world.

There are numerous other violent acts by groups around the world that clearly fall within terrorism's spectrum of being specifically intended to influence political policy to the perpetrator's advantage. During the Vietnam War several groups in the U.S. committed violent acts they readily took credit for that were intended to influence the federal government to end its involvement in that conflict. Those domestic groups clearly met the two primary prongs defining an act as one of terrorism: 1) an action intended to affect political policies, 2) by people associated with a group.

V

The Myth September 11th Were Acts of Foreign Terrorism

Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaida associates have been publicly accused by high-ranking U.S. government officials of masterminding and executing the events of September 11, 2001. The news media in this country have duly and uncritically reported those accusations. However, when those events are looked at from the perspective of the *general, legal, statutory* and *law enforcement* definitions of terrorism, it is evident that neither Osama bin Laden nor anyone associated with him has been accused of an act of terrorism at any time since those events occurred. Why? Neither bin Laden nor anyone identifiable as acting under his direction has made any demands or attempted to politically influence the U.S. government or any governmental organization in *any* country related to the events of September 11th. Furthermore, neither bin Laden nor anyone allegedly acting under his direction has publicly taken credit for the events of September 11, 2001. That is consistent with the lack of anyone linked with bin Laden exerting any pressure or making any political demands on the U.S. government. That fact is also consistent with the reported inability of the U.S. government to find a link between *any* of the alleged nineteen hijackers of the four airplanes and bin Laden or al-Qaida after more than a year of intensive investigation. 13

Thus the public accusations against Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida do not allege they committed or were involved in acts of terrorism. Since terrorism's first prong cannot be satisfied, even if it is ever proved beyond a reasonable doubt that bin Laden and his associates were involved in the events of September 11th, their role could only have been to further crimes and not terrorism. Consequently, they would be entitled to the procedures built into the criminal law and assured by the Bill of Rights – including the right to consult with an attorney, bail, and a speedy and public trial by a jury of lay people.

Furthermore, not only are bin Laden and *all* of his associates excluded from having been involved in an act of terrorism related to the events of September 11th, but no group of *any* political, ethnic or religious persuasion has taken credit for those events. That is reflected in the fact that *no demands* have been made of the federal government related to the events of September 11th by *any* group claiming credit for them as part of a demand to influence political policy in the U.S.

Relying individually or collectively on the four definitions of terrorism makes one fact crystal clear. Even if one were to accept argumentum that the scenario pawned off by the federal government - that nineteen allegedly foreign hijackers allegedly commandeered four airliners on September 11, 2001 - bears some relationship to the truth, those people can not be considered to have been involved in an act of foreign terrorism, much less one involving Osama bin Laden, al-Qaida, or any other foreign NGO or government. That conclusion is self-evident by simply relying on the accepted premise that using words in a manner consistent with their definitions is essential to clearly communicating ideas and concepts.

That leads one to make the inescapable conclusion the media has been complicit in fostering the politically generated myth that the events of September 11, 2001 were acts of foreign terrorism by Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida Islamic fundamentalists. The events of September 11th are not the first time an illusory event has been transformed by political and media forces into an act of foreign aggression against the U.S. The media similarly acted as confederates with the federal government by reporting as a true event, the manufactured story that an American destroyer was subjected to an intense torpedo attack by North Vietnamese PT boats in the Gulf of Tonkin on August 4, 1964. An employee of the Department of Defense at the time, Daniel Ellsberg gives a first hand account in *Secrets: A Memoir of Vietnam and the Pentagon Papers* (2002), of the duplicity by military and political leaders in lying to the American people about the non-existent North Vietnamese attack. 14 Reported as if it actually happened, that fictitious attack was used to justify passage of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution on August 7, 1964. 15 Although it was based on a non-existent provocation, that Resolution paved the way for escalation of the U.S.'s involvement in Vietnam's civil war that ultimately led to the deaths of over 50,000 American servicemen and the maiming of tens of thousands more.

Even closer to our time, the 1991 Gulf War was based on a non-existent lie perpetrated on the American people by the U.S. government. The justification for the Gulf War of 1991 was the Iraqi army was alleged to have been poised for an imminent attack on Saudi Arabia. The U.S. government claimed that such an event would endanger the national interest of the U.S. by potentially affecting Saudi Arabia's supply of oil to this country. To sell the idea that Iraq was prepared to attack Saudi Arabia, the U.S. government, under the leadership of President George Bush Sr., claimed that "classified satellite images showed that up to 250,000 Iraqi troops and 1,500 tanks had amassed on the border of Saudi Arabia." 16 At the time Saddam Hussein denied he was preparing to attack Saudi Arabia. It took 11

years, but proof has finally been uncovered that Saddam Hussein was telling the truth, and President George Bush Sr. told a monstrous lie to justify launching Operation Desert Shield in 1991. In the fall of 2002 reporter Jean Heller of the St. Petersburg Times obtained two commercial satellite images of the area between Iraq and Saudi Arabia taken at the time the classified photos allegedly showed Iraq's army poised for an attack. The commercial photos show an empty desert. 17 Which means the Gulf War of 1991 was based on nothing but a fabrication by the U.S. government that was perpetrated on the American people as the truth by the Bush administration and its willing dupes in the news media. As in the Vietnam conflict also created from thin air by the lies of politicians reported as the truth, hundreds of thousands of American servicemen were harmed due to the Gulf War. 18

The federal government's manufacture of a justification out of thin air for the 1991 Gulf War was consistent with, and added another chapter to the U.S. government's rich history of bending the truth or simply creating untruths from whole cloth to publicly justify its intention to become involved in an armed conflict. Tactics of fabrication and deceit were also used by the U.S. government to involve the U.S. in the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, WWI, WWII and numerous other politically approved military adventures.

The media not only failed to perform its "watch dog" function over the government related to those military adventures, but by and large it served as a fourth branch of the government by functioning as little more than a shill promoting the position of whoever controlled the White House at a given time.

The same thing is happening today in regards to the multitude of responses by the U.S. government to the events of September 11th based on the unfounded and untrue allegation they were acts of foreign terrorism against this country, when they weren't.

The perpetrators of the events of September 11th committed criminal acts for sure – but the acts themselves were not acts of foreign terrorism, and they don't justify retaliation against "foreigners" or any country based on the false allegation they were. Consequently the entire alleged war on terrorism is a fraudulent illusory sham. That means among other things, that the dropping of over 22,000 bombs on Afghanistan in the fall of 2001 was an abominable crime against humanity by President Bush and other U.S. and British political and military leaders, since it caused the murderous slaughter of 5,000+ innocent Afghani's, including women, children and old people. That slaughter of civilians was compounded by the destruction of that country's minimal public health infrastructure that resulted in more needless deaths and suffering of innocent people.

VI The USA Patriot Act Only Incidentally Concerns Terrorism

Although Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida did not engage in terrorism related to the events of September 11th and there is no available evidence that they had anything to do with them, and those events have had a virtually negligible effect on how Americans choose to conduct their daily life, there is one area that those events have been used as a cause célèbre that profoundly affects Americans. They have been used to justify significant modifications to how the federal government relates to people living in the U.S. and other countries in ways that are totally unrelated to those events themselves.

In other words while the events of September 11th negatively affected the lives of a few thousand Americans, the federal government's response to them has impacted the almost three hundred million Americans and hundreds of millions of people in other countries. The USA Patriot Act of 2001 (UPACT) is one of the two most well-known legislative responses to September 11th that affects how the federal government relates to Americans and "foreigners." 19 Within days after September 11th the U.S. government immediately jumped on the bandwagon of using those events to advocate and push the UPACT through Congress. It was enacted just 6 weeks later on October 24, 2001, without a single congressman or senator having had the opportunity to review the entirety of its contents prior to voting for its enactment. Those legislators were cowed into voting for the UPACT by intimations that only an unpatriotic person would not wholeheartedly support its contents sight unseen.

The reality of the UPACT is that if those elected officials are given the benefit of the doubt that they had good intentions, then they were clearly fooled by President Bush, Attorney General Ashcroft and other officials within the U.S. government into supporting legislation that goes far beyond its trumpeted purpose of being a tool to fight terrorism. 20 The UPACT's preamble clearly states that dealing with terrorism is only one of its *unspecified* many purposes.

AN ACT

To deter and punish terrorist acts in the United States and around the world, *to enhance law enforcement investigatory tools, and for other purposes.* (emphasis added to original) 21

As the preamble makes plain, the UPACT is shrouded in secrecy because only two of its actual purposes are revealed – and only one of those even facially concerns terrorism. That

envelope of secrecy about the unknown number of “other purposes” of the Act that are unspecified may have been the primary reason the text of the Act was concealed from lawmakers until *after* they had voted to enact it.

So contrary to the public exhortations by administration officials that were designed to generate public support for the UPACT before its provisions were publicly disclosed, the Acts preamble plainly reveals that it is only incidentally concerned with deterring and punishing terrorist acts.

Whatever questions there are about the UPACT’s mysterious purposes, one thing is known for certain about the broad and extraordinary police powers granted the executive branch in its many provisions related to enhancing “law enforcement investigatory tools, and for other purposes.” That is those provisions have no relationship to deterring and punishing terrorism that was the reason used to induce Congressional members to vote for its enactment sight unseen.

It was perhaps unbeknownst to all but a few members of Congress that the UPACT’s authors, the U.S. Department of Justice, took advantage of the secrecy surrounding the Act’s contents to include the large body of provisions that it openly concedes in the preamble are unrelated to fighting terrorism. The meaning and implications of those provisions has never been publicly disclosed and are still only known by Attorney General John Ashcroft and other administration insiders. In an effort to gain an understanding of the UPACT, a year after its enactment a Senate subcommittee had to resort to threatening to subpoena Attorney General John Ashcroft to answer 50 questions about the meaning of its contents. 22

The USA Patriot Act’s only incidental concern with combating foreign terrorism is consistent with the fact that the events of September 11th were not acts of terrorism by Osama bin Laden associated al-Qaida Islamic fundamentalists. So it is logical that legislation relying on non-existent foreign terrorist events for its passage would not be particularly concerned with deterring and punishing actual “terrorist acts.”

VII The Illusion of Homeland Security

More than a year after the events of September 11, 2001, no full scale investigation of what occurred, or who planned and executed the events was begun by any federal agency. 23 Furthermore, although Senate and House committees have broad and far-reaching subpoena powers that enable them to conduct extensive investigations into matters related to the federal government, no committee used those powers to do so prior to passage of the UPACT or for more than a year afterward. In fact, President Bush personally lobbied members of Congress *not* to conduct an investigation into September 11th, claiming it would interfere with, and endanger national security. 24

Officially then, every proposed course of action and proposed and/or enacted legislation related to the events of September 11th has been based on sheer speculation about the why and wherefore of what happened. There can consequently be no rational political response to those events, since knowing the answer to who, what, why and how they occurred is critical to formulating a strategy for how to appropriately respond to them.

Yet, while in a state of blindness about the events of September 11th, Congress passed the USA Patriot Act of 2001 just six weeks after they occurred. The UPACT's proponents were able to rush it through Congress because an insufficient number of its members insisted on taking the time to study its provisions. The majority caved into heavy behind the scenes lobbying and public exhortations by its supporters that only unpatriotic Americans could oppose it. Thus, due to the circumstances of its enactment, it can not reasonably be claimed that the UPACT has anything to do with preventing a reoccurrence of events on the scale of September 11th, since its provisions have no known relationship to what underlies events.

Similarly disassociated from the events of September 11th is the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (HSA) that goes beyond the UPACT by merging such diverse agencies as the INS, the Coast Guard and Customs into an enormous new cabinet level federal bureaucracy. Given that no detailed investigation has been conducted and hence no supportable conclusions about the why and wherefore of those events has been made, there is no basis to link *any* provision of the HSA or the bureaucracy it creates with an effort to prevent such events from occurring again. Supporting the lack of a link between the HSA and the events of September 11th are two of its key components, one is related to collection of data on Americans and the other is related to the smallpox inoculation of Americans.

The provision related to the collection of data on Americans authorizes the creation and maintenance of the most extensive database of a country's population ever seriously proposed, much less undertaken. 25 Referred to in the HSA as *Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection*, the Defense Department's secretive Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has a budget of \$120 million a year to bring such a data collection and analysis program to life. 26 Referred to in the Defense Department as Total Information Awareness (TIA), the program is designed to store and analysis literally every collectable piece of public and private electronic information about a person's life. 27 The information analysis provision of the HSA makes that data of indispensable value to the Homeland Security Department, and for all practical purposes, it would also be available to federal law enforcement agencies. This super-sized centralized database would accumulate every one of a person's credit card purchases, magazine and newspaper subscriptions, prescriptions, emails sent and received, bank transactions, airplane, train and cruise trips, library books checked out, videos rented, one's driving record, school transcripts, divorce and other court records, even complaints by their neighbors to the police. In addition to centralizing a person's lifetime paper and electronic trail, their biometric information would enable them to be remotely identified, and face recognition technology would make it possible for any surveillance recording they may appear in to be linked to them. This all pervasive "watching" and the personal analysis of a person's life it makes possible, fulfills the sickest fantasies of the most perverted Peeping Tom or Jane. 28

Yet, there is no identifiable relationship between the centralized collection of this life encompassing data on the nearly 300 million people in the U.S. and the prevention of acts of terrorism. Particularly given that the Total Information Awareness data system would not have contributed to preventing the events of September 11, 2001. 29

The level of personal intrusiveness authorized in the HSA is only made possible by the government's active funding of advances in computer data storage, retrieval and analysis capabilities. 30 It was too strategically timed to have been coincidental that just *one day prior* to the November 20, 2008 passage of the HSA by the Senate, IBM announced plans to construct a supercomputer for the federal government that is *10 times faster* than any existing computer. 31 Code named Blue Gene/L, the computer will be able to perform 360 trillion mathematical operations a second, and it will be the first of two computers the federal government is paying IBM \$290 million to construct. 32 The HSA and its companion Total Information Awareness project exponentially increases the data processing needs of the federal government to incorporate real-time analysis of the many thousands of bits of

information compiled on each of the nearly 300 million people in the U.S.

The federal government's intensive level of surveilling Americans epitomized by the HSA far surpasses what George Orwell prophesized in *1984*. In his futuristic society the common folk – known as the Proles – were typically only subject to surveillance by snitches willing to trade information for favors. Similar to the DOJ's nationwide network of several million snitches under its TIPs program.

The other component of the HSA that has no known link to September 11th is Section 304, Subsection C, titled Administration of Counter Measures Against Smallpox. That section has two prongs. The first of those prongs is the compulsory requirement that the smallpox vaccine be administered to any individual or group designated by the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, if he or she “declares an actual *or potential* bio-terrorist *or other kind of incident.*” 33 This provision was included, even though the events of September 11th had nothing to do with smallpox, and there has been no credible threat of the U.S. being subjected to a deliberate attempt to spread the smallpox virus. Furthermore, there are compelling scientific and experiential reasons to believe that the smallpox virus poses no possible potential, much less actual threat of causing a disease outbreak in the U.S. 34

The second prong of the smallpox provision is that anyone harmed by side effects of a mandatory inoculation cannot sue anyone for their injuries: not the government, the person administering the inoculation, or the drug's manufacturer. This provision was inserted even though it is known that at least 3% of everyone receiving the vaccine will suffer serious negative side effects that can include death. 35 A spokesperson for the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons described the smallpox provision of the HSA in the following way:

“This section will give the Secretary unlimited power to define a real or potential threat, to take any measures he decides and to do it for as long as he wants. It's Alice in Wonderland time again – an emergency is just what he says it is. ... Just what are the ‘counter measures’ allowed? Forced immunizations? Quarantines? It's not clear, but the powers seem virtually unchecked by any other agency. We need an honest accounting of how this will work. It's too frightening to allow it to be rammed through.” 36

Consistent with the fact that there is no known relationship between any provision of the HSA and the prevention of another event on the scale of September 11th, is that provisions were surreptitiously added to the HSA during the night before the House of Representatives voted to approve it on November 13, 2002, and the text of the HSA was not even made available to the Representatives voting for or against it until after they did so. 37 That subterfuge was repeated the

following week in the Senate.

On the day of the Senate vote, Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV) expressed his outrage on the floor of the Senate over the way the HSA was being rammed through Congress at blinding speed without any deliberation whatsoever. His incisive comments are worth quoting at length:

“I remember years ago, when I was in the House of Representatives, sending out a little booklet to the people in my then-congressional district of how our laws are made ...[describes the process of hearings, committees, debate, reports, etc. etc.]... we all remember how those laws are made according to the script as prepared there in those handsome little booklets that we send out. That is how the American people expect this Congress to operate. That is the way we are supposed to operate.

But the way this bill was brought in here, less than 48 hours ago, a brand-new bill. It had not been before any committee. It had undergone no hearings, not this bill. It is a bill on our desks that has 484 pages. There are 484 pages in this bill.

It has not been before any committee. There have been no hearings on this bill. There have been no witnesses who were asked to appear to testify on behalf of the bill or in opposition to it. It did not undergo any such scrutiny.

It was just placed on the Senate Calendar. It was offered as an amendment here. And so here it is before the Senate now. There it is. That is not the way in which our children are taught how we make our laws--not at all.

The American people expect us to provide our best judgment and our best insight into such monumental decisions. This is a far, far cry from being our best. This is not our best. As a matter of fact, it is a mere shadow of our best. Yet we are being asked, as the elected representatives of the American people, those of us who are sent here by our respective States are being asked on tomorrow to invoke closure on these 484 pages.

If I had to go before the bar of judgment tomorrow and were asked by the eternal God what is in this bill, I could not answer God. If I were asked by the people of West Virginia, Senator Byrd, what is in that bill, I could not answer. I could not tell the people of West Virginia what is in this bill.

There are a few things that I know are in it by virtue of the fact that I have had 48 hours, sleeping time included, in which to study this monstrosity, 484 pages. If there ever were a monstrosity, this is it. I hold it in my hand, a monstrosity. I don't know what is in it. I know a few things that are in it, and a few things that I know are in it that I don't think the American people would approve of if they knew what was in there.

Even Senator Lieberman, who is chairman of the committee which has jurisdiction over this subject matter, even he saw new provisions in this legislation as he looked through it yesterday and today. As his staff looked through it, they saw provisions they had not seen before, that they had not discussed before, that had not been before their committee before.

Yet we are being asked on tomorrow to invoke cloture on that which means we are not going to debate in the normal course of things. We are going to have 30 hours of debate. That is it, 30 hours. That is all, 30 hours; 100 Senators, 30 hours of debate.

And this is one of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation I have seen in my 50 years. I will have been in Congress 50 years come January 3... Never have I seen such a monstrous piece of legislation sent to this body. And we are being asked to vote on that 484 pages tomorrow. Our poor staffs were up most of the night studying it. They know some of the things that are in there, but they don't know all of them. It is a sham and it is a shame.

We are all complicit in going along with it. I read in the paper that nobody will have the courage to vote against it. Well, Robert Byrd is going to vote against it because I don't know what I am voting for. That is one thing. And No. 2, it has not had the scrutiny that we tell our young people, that we tell these sweet pages here, boys and girls who come up here, we tell them our laws should have.

This is a hoax. This is a hoax. To tell the American people they are going to be safer when we pass this is to hoax. We ought to tell the people the truth. They are not going to be any safer with that. That is not the truth. I was one of the first in the Senate to say we need a new Department of Homeland Security. I meant that. But I didn't mean this particular hoax that this administration is trying to pander off to the American people, telling them this is homeland security. That is not homeland security. Mr. President, the Attorney General and Director of Homeland Security have told Americans repeatedly there is an imminent risk of another terrorist attack. Just within the past day, or few hours, the FBI has put hospitals in the Washington area, Houston, San Francisco, and Chicago on notice of a possible terrorist threat.

This bill does nothing -not a thing - to make our citizens more secure today or tomorrow. This bill does not even go into effect for up to 12 months. ...” 38

The Senate ignored Senator Byrd's carefully reasoned concerns based on his 50 years in Congress, and on November 20, 2002, voted 90-9 in favor of the HSA without making a single alteration to the 484 page bill. After making a reasoned analysis of the HSA, Norman D. Livergood, Ph.D, concluded its possible effect on the U.S. is eerily similar to German President Hindenberg's *A Decree of the Reich President for the Protection of the People and State* issued on February 28, 1933. 39 That decree provided the legal foundation necessary to legitimize everything the National Socialist Workers Party, led by Adolf Hitler, did from 1933 to 1945.

The subterfuge surrounding the passage of the HSA is compounded by the fact that its history is a perfect example of the story about the frog in the pot of cold water that is cooked by imperceptible increases in the water temperature to the boiling point. Since at least 1999, the concept of a Homeland

Security Department was openly discussed in Washington D.C.'s inner circles of power. One proof of that is homeland security was the underlying theme of the Phase I Report of the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, dated September 15, 1999. Among other things, that report discusses how spectacular terrorist events would counteract diminishing engagement of people with federal politics, the reduced need for a large U.S. military with the end of the Cold War, the growing attitude of people that the U.S. doesn't need to be actively involved in the domestic affairs of other countries, and the trend of Americans to focus on local and state politics. 40 Preparing for a prospective terrorist threat is presented in that report as a crucial antidote to offset trends that would lead to a reduced federal military presence around the world: "In the absence of such a [terrorist] threat, we have experienced mostly periods of heated but inconclusive debate over the American mission in the world."

41

Evolvement of the Commission's strategy into open advocacy of a Department of Homeland Security was evident in its Phase III Report, issued on February 15, 2001. Titled, *Road Map for National Security: Imperative For Change*, all of the essential structural features of the HSA are outlined in that report issued *seven months* prior to September 11th. 42 One notable exclusion from the HSA is the Commission's mention of using the military for domestic police purposes, which would require repeal of 1878's Posse Comitatus Act. 43 Although the possible repeal of that Act has publicly been mentioned by President Bush and others.

So after years of behind the scenes preparation, President Bush publicly floated the idea of an office of Homeland Security to members of Congress and the American people after September 11th by telling them it was a simple reorganization of existing agencies and it wouldn't cause an increase in federal spending. That seemingly innocuous proposal grew into a 32 page bill creating a new federal Department of Homeland Security. The proposal grew once again into a 282 page bill creating a new federal bureaucracy with a projected annual budget in excess of \$3 billion. The bill again grew at the last minute during the night before it was to be voted on by the House of Representatives into a 484 page bill that authorized creation of a massive cabinet level federal bureaucracy controlling two dozen existing federal agencies, and that is estimated to increase federal spending by at least \$30 billion. 44 It was in the dead of that last night that the provisions were covertly inserted into the HSA authorizing the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection and the Administration of Counter Measures Against Smallpox.

Thus the Homeland Security Act mimics the UPACT in two important ways. First, the

provisions of neither Act have any known relationship to the events of September 11th nor to the prevention of their reoccurrence. Second, the actual text of both acts was withheld from members of the Congress until the day were to be voted on – when a no vote, or even a desire to delay voting so its provisions could be studied would have been politically painted by President Bush and his supporters as unpatriotic. By painting anyone as lacking patriotism who even dared to question the wisdom of voting on monumental legislation without knowing its details, the Bush administration borrowed the tactic used by the National Socialists (Nazis) to rally support by the German people for their political policies that included sending military forces into Czechoslovakia, Austria, France, Poland, Greece, etc. This tactic was explained in the following way by Hermann Goering - first in line to succeed Hitler as leader of the Nazi Party - who was tried, convicted and sentenced to death as a war criminal at Nuremberg in 1946:

“[I]t is the leaders of the country who determine the policy, and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy, or a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the peacemakers for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country.” 45

It was also convenient for the HSA’s proponents that days before the House was to vote on that Bill, an alleged audio recording of Osama bin Laden warning of spectacular attacks against the U.S. exceeding those of September 11th was broadcast on an Arabic television network. The fortuitous timing of that recording’s broadcast helped to cement the votes of otherwise wavering Representatives. Although U.S. law enforcement agencies declared at the time it believed the recording was authentic, after the HSA was passed by Congress and days after it was signed into law by President Bush, a group of Swiss voice recognition experts declared it is a near certainty the recording is a fraud. The researchers used sophisticated audio equipment to compare the voice on the recording with twenty known recordings of bin Laden’s voice. 46 Yet, whoever created the fraudulent recording had sufficient resources to employ an imposter able to “fool” the CIA – unless that agency was behind the tapes manufacture.

Consequently, it is a carefully crafted illusion that the HSA has anything to do with preventing terrorism, particularly considering that the events on September 11th underlying the purported need for its passage were not acts of foreign terrorism. Given that the real purpose behind the HSA has been concealed from many members of Congress and the public, it can only be presumed that those reasons are so nefarious that the HSA and the previously enacted UPACT would summarily be rejected if their real purpose was openly acknowledged by their proponents.

VIII

A Historical Perspective of How September 11th Has Been Used To Undermine The Liberty Of Americans

Consistent with the fact that the events of September 11, 2001 were not acts of foreign terrorism is the fact that there is nothing inherent about those events that by any stretch of the imagination threatens the national security of the U.S., the personal security or freedom of Americans, or the American way of life. However, all of those things are accomplished by the artificial fear of terrorism generated by the response of federal officials and politicians to the events of September 11th. The federal government's racist demonization of Arab appearing and Islamic worshipping people in general, and its saber rattling against Iraq in the absence of any provocation, has endangered Americans by making the U.S. subject to possible retaliation. 47 Furthermore, the security, freedom and way of life of all but the wealthiest Americans is endangered by the USA Patriot Act that arguably does nothing to prevent terrorism, but unquestionably includes provisions that grant the federal government the power to pry into every aspect of a person's life and deprive them of the basic protections afforded a criminal suspect by simply labeling the person as a suspected terrorist.

The events of September 11th have been used by politically influential forces to serve as a crucial stepping stone for the federal government to openly alter its public relationship with Americans. The USA Patriot Act's provisions that effectively suspend application of the Bill of Rights to an American classified by the federal government as a suspected terrorist or enemy combatant, or a sympathizer of either, are a visible representation of the federal government's brazen assumption of the role as a trampler of those rights, and not their protector. When the power of the government is unchecked by a recognition that a person has fundamental rights inseparable from their existence as a human being, its exercise of power against that person is unlimited. The UPACT does that.

Although unintended by its authors, the UPACT has served as a much-needed reminder that the Bill of Rights is philosophically inconsistent with the Constitution it is appended to. The Constitution creates a federal government whose power is not limited by any external authority. 48 In contrast, the Bill of Rights symbolically shields American's from the wanton exercise of governmental power inconsistent with its enabling provision's. Consequently, the Bill of Rights' restraints and mandates related to the use of governmental power against individual Americans is

inconsolable with the Constitution grant of unlimited power against those very same people. 49 That fundamental conflict is precisely why a Bill of Rights was deliberately excluded from being embodied in the Constitution. Furthermore, its authors and other supporters adamantly opposed including an enumeration of the rights of Americans, since that could interfere with the exercise of the government's power against them. The founding fathers wanted no part of a Bill of Rights precisely because its inclusion would have checked employment of the federal government's power against Americans in a way that was carefully avoided from being possible by any other Constitutional provision. 50

It is a matter of historical record that the Constitution's authors and supporters were so vehemently opposed to incorporating a declaration of rights in that document, that they *unanimously refused* to do so when it was drafted and submitted to the thirteen independent nation-states for approval. Those proceedings are recounted in *Creating the Bill of Rights: The Documentary Record from the First Federal Congress*:

“At the 1787 Federal Convention in Philadelphia George Mason of Virginia and Edbridge Gerry of Massachusetts had proposed that the Constitution include a bill of rights to reassure the people that the vastly strengthened federal government would not oppress them and to secure individual rights for the longterm. *The convention refused unanimously* - a critical error that almost proved fatal to ratification. Antifederalist Richard Henry Lee of Virginia unsuccessfully attempted to attach several amendments to the Constitution in September, before the Confederation Congress submitted it to the states for ratification.” 51

The ten amendments that comprise the Bill of Rights were appended to the Constitution *years* after it was written, approved by the Convention's delegates and submitted to the states for ratification. Public support for the Constitution sans a Bill of Rights was so weak that a significant majority of Americans – estimated to be upwards of 75% - were opposed to its adoptions as a replacement for the Articles of Confederation. 52 As the Constitution's opponents – known as the Antifederalists – passionately pointed out, the Constitution places the people in a position of overt servitude to whoever is control of the federal government. Absent the restrictions of a Bill of Rights, the Constitution permits the exercise of unchecked power by whoever is in control against their political opponents and unpopular minorities. 53 In other words, the Constitution is neither a document promoting human liberty, nor was it intended as such. On the contrary, it was designed so Americans would be subject to absolute control by the

government of the United States and whoever handles the reins of its power at any given moment.

As would be expected under those circumstances, the Constitution's champions were the political heavyweights and wealthy people of the day: the very people who stood to benefit the most from its enactment and whose connections would generally shield them from needing to worry about the lack of a Bill of Rights. The Antifederalists on the other hand, understood the corrupting influence of power on the most well intentioned person. William Pitt the Elder expressed this concept in a speech to the House of Lords on January 9, 1770, "Unlimited power is apt to corrupt the minds of those who possess it." 54 Powers corrupting influence means power can never be trusted with those who seek it, and those power seekers, which included the Constitution's proponents, are the people most in need of having their conduct held in check by the symbolic shield provided by a declaration of rights. Unlike the Founding Fathers, the Antifederalists grasped the full import of the maxim that no more power should be granted to one's friends than to one's worst enemy – and they clearly saw the supporters of the Constitution for what they were: the enemies of liberty. The general distaste the Founding Fathers had for those outside their power clique is amply evidenced by their official classification of slaves as only 3/5ths human, and the Constitution's failure to abolish slavery. 55 This is to be expected considering the background of its proponents, and their financial interest in the trafficking of human flesh. George Washington was typical of those men in that his immense wealth was due in no small part to his active purchase and ownership of slaves that continued throughout his Presidency, and right up to the time of his death.

Given the Constitution's absence of a Bill of Rights, it isn't surprising that many of the most vociferous advocates for liberation of the American colonies from England, including Patrick Henry and George Mason, were also the most passionate opponents of the Constitution. The Antifederalists were well aware a Bill of Rights is spiritually aligned with the concepts of human autonomy, personal worth, individual dignity, and a decentralized and accountable government. 56 In stark contrast, the Constitution is spiritually aligned with the idea of an all-powerful centralized state to which all but the most financially able and politically connected must blindly kowtow.

The most renowned public speaker of his day, Patrick Henry is most well known to Americans today for his resounding proclamation in 1775 of "Give Me Liberty or Give me

Death!” Thirteen years later, after the American colonies had firmly been established as separate nations loosely aligned with each other by the Articles of Confederation, Patrick Henry summoned all of his considerable oratory skill and powers of persuasion to convey the danger posed to the liberty of the American people by the Constitution, the country of the United States it created, the subjugation of the independent American nation/states to it, and the federal government it authorized to administer its affairs. 57

In a speech on June 5, 1788 Patrick Henry described the drive to institute the Constitution as “a revolution as radical as that which separated us from Great Britain.” 58 He continued on to eloquently warn:

“Revolutions like this have happened in almost every country in Europe: Similar examples are to be found in ancient Greece and ancient Rome: Instances of the people losing their liberty by their own carelessness and the ambition of a few.” 59

Among the dangerous aspects of the silent revolution embodied in the Constitution was the thirteen independent American nation-states would effectively surrender their national sovereignty by merging into a super nation-state, and the liberty of Americans would become subservient to the federal government it created. 60 The Antifederalist’s concerns were in acknowledgement of the obvious: the United States created by the Constitution would smother the autonomy of the people and the States it was overlaid on top of, and with it the liberty of Americans. While it isn’t well known today, America existed prior to the United States and is not the same thing as the United States. Patrick Henry clarified this on June 7, 1788 when he stated in a speech prior to creation of the United States: “The voice of tradition, I trust, will inform posterity of our struggles for freedom. If our descendents be worthy of the name of Americans, they will preserve and hand down to their latest posterity, the transactions of the present times; ... The first thing I have at heart is American liberty; the second thing is American Union, and I hope the people of Virginia endeavor to preserve that Union [Articles of Confederation].” 61

The Constitution’s scheme of creating a central government that in principle could exercise virtually unlimited power against those within its domain was abhorrent to a lover of liberty like Patrick Henry, who warned all who would listen that they should, “Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect every one who approaches that jewel.” 62 The people he was referring to as needing to be suspected for their sabotage of liberty, were the men

today referred to as the Founding Fathers. The Constitution's haughty answer to the ageless question posed by Juvenal – "Who guards the guardians?" – was no one. 63

Patrick Henry continued his verbal barrage on June 7, 1788 when he warned of the unseen but real danger the proposed Constitution posed to the liberty of common Americans:

"And yet who knows the dangers that this new system may produce; they are out of the sight of the common people: They cannot foresee latent consequences: I dread the operation of it on the middling and lower class of people: It is for them I fear the adoption of this system." 64

George Mason, author of the 1776 Virginia Bill of Rights that the eventual federal Bill of Rights was modeled after, was an Antifederalist as fervent in his written opposition to the Constitution as Patrick Henry was verbally opposed. 65

It was in response to the Antifederalists pointed exposure of the Constitution's provisions impairing the liberty of Americans and the autonomy of the independent nation-states, that the Federalist Papers were written to try and assuage the widespread fear of the powerful centralized government *that would* be created by the Constitution. Consistent with the maxim that what is pawned off as history isn't the truth of what happened so much as it is what the winners want people to think happened, the Federalist Papers remain well known while the voluminous reasoned arguments of the Constitution's opponents are relegated to being preserved in a few books and known to a relative few people.

Alexander Hamilton was a primary behind the scenes architect of the Constitution, and the principle author of The Federalist Papers used to drum up support for it when it was headed for rejection by the state legislatures. As the Constitution's spiritual Godfather, Hamilton's quest to create an all-powerful central federal government is amply indicated by his unrequited desire for the United States to be ruled by a *King* – not a President, and the First Bank of the United States he founded in 1791 while serving as the first Secretary of the Treasury, was a quasi-private/public commercial bank that was the conceptual forerunner of the Federal Reserve created in 1913. 66

So even though it is not widely known today, there was fierce opposition to the Constitution throughout the thirteen colonies by those who loved liberty. Their most basic fear was it served as a blueprint for the creation of an authoritarian federal government that would suppress the liberty of the common person in America. 67 After realizing the depth of opposition

to the Constitution could block its ratification, its proponents finally caved in and agreed to the political compromise of appending a Bill of Rights to it. They won the war to ratify the Constitution by conceding their battle to exclude a Bill of Rights. More than *four years* after the Constitutional Convention the Bill of Rights was ratified on December 15, 1791. For more than 200 years those original ten amendments have been the gadfly like nuisance to the wielders of federal power that the Founding Fathers desperately wanted to avoid.

The UPACT undermines what Patrick Henry and other advocates of liberty insisted on in exchange for their reluctant support for adoption of the Constitution: it provides for suspension of the protections afforded by the Bill of Rights and its check on the exercise of unlimited governmental power against Americans. The UPACT's Section 802 - Definition of Domestic Terrorism - also makes those provisions easier to apply to ordinary Americans. It does that by radically altering the statutory definition in 18 United States Code §2331(a) of what can be considered as domestic terrorism to potentially cover non-violent activities of virtually all concerned Americans that voice disapproval of local, state or federal government policies. This could potentially include the writer of a letter to the editor of a newspaper or magazine, a caller to a radio program or the office of an elected official, a media commentator, or a peaceful marcher. It would not be an act of prognostication to predict that the UPACT will be used against such people at some point, because it makes no distinction between peaceful political and social critics, and alleged terrorists. The ghosts of Patrick Henry, George Mason and the other Antifederalists are rolling over in their graves because the UPACT is representative of legislation that brings their worst fears about the federal government into reality.

The wake of September 11th has left the liberties of Americans assaulted from multiple angles, not the least of which is the UPACT that literally reads like a document that could have been written by German lawyers during the Nazi era. 68 On the state level there have also been laws of varying kinds enacted since September 11th narrowing protections against invasion of one's privacy by government agents. Liberty is dependent on respect for privacy, so any impairment by the government of one's privacy is an attack by it on one's liberty. 69

As disturbing as they may be, the recent actions by the federal government are not without precedent. The acronym Nazi was shorthand for the National Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP). The Nazi's were neither a rogue organization nor did they lack popular support. Quite to the contrary, they were a political party duly elected to power like the Republicans and

Democrats are in this country. Furthermore, the legal system and civil service apparatus maintained their pre-Nazi functions throughout the years the Nazi Party controlled the German government, and continued to do so after it was removed from power. The Nazis depended on the seemingly normal people in the German bureaucracy to efficiently carry out their political policies. One example of this is that 10 years after WWII ended, about 50% of Germany's judges had served as judges during the Nazi era, and had dutifully enforced the laws that enabled all the horrors of that era to be committed.

It is also worth remembering that not only was the German Constitution of Hitler's era modeled after the U.S. Constitution, but so was Soviet Russia's. 70 The Nazi's weren't slowed in the slightest by the German Constitution from victimizing many millions of people, even though it offered *more* written protections than does the U.S. Constitution. 71 Likewise, the Soviet's weren't deterred in the slightest by their Constitution from murdering over 43 million innocent people during the almost 30 year reign of terror under Stalin, even though the Soviet Constitution provided many more protections for individuals than either the German or U.S. Constitution. 72

The foregoing makes it clear that there is *nothing* in the U.S. Constitution proper to prevent a Nazi or Stalinist like police state and reign of terror in this country. Although the Bill of Rights appended to it poses no physical bar, it does serve as a symbolic shield that at least give pause to those wanting to do so. That was the premise in *The R Document* by best-selling novelist Irving Wallace. His book's scenario is that suspension of the Bill of Rights, the internment of dissident Americans in concentration camps, and a declaration of martial law would be the federal government's response to a national security crisis manufactured out of thin air by a federal law enforcement agency with the initials: F.B.I. Mr. Wallace's book was published in 1976.

It is eerily reminiscent of *The R Document's* theme that the UPACT provides conditions under which the Bill of Rights application to a U.S. citizen can be suspended, and they can thus be treated similar to dissidents in Nazi Germany, Soviet Russian and Communist China. This aspect of the UPACT has not gone unnoticed by astute observers. On August 14, 2002 the Los Angeles Times reported on Attorney General John Ashcroft's "hellish vision" of setting up concentration camps for Americans stripped of their protections under the Bill of Rights by being administratively labeled as an "enemy combatant;" and numerous government agencies, including

FEMA, are known to have plans ready for activation when martial law is declared. 73 After realizing the implications of the federal government's actions justified by the events of September 11th, one can't be faulted for having the response of exclaiming: "Yikes!"

Remarkably, the foreign press openly recognizes what is largely concealed by the media in this country: the philosophical shift that has publicly occurred between government in the U.S. and Americans since September 11th. It is also noteworthy that by doing nothing to impact the Constitution proper, the UPACT reveals that all that is necessary for the U.S. to function as a de facto police state is for the federal government to be freed one way or another from the symbolic restraint of the Bill of Rights. The UPACT's authors were devilishly ingenious by leaving the Bill of Rights intact, but nullifying it through suspension of its application to a person simply labeled by the government as a suspected terrorist. It is childishly naïve to think that such perfection in the UPACT's design is accidental. That is as likely as the duplication of the Mona Lisa by a blindfolded monkey wielding a paintbrush.

The philosophical consistency between the UPACT and the Constitution sans a Bill of Rights is no mere coincidence. Known as Federalists, the Constitution's founding fathers hated the very concept of a Bill of Rights and successfully excluded it from the body of the Constitution. Similarly, key public supporters of the UPACT, including Attorney General John Ashcroft, are members of the Federalist Society headquartered in Washington DC that is dedicated to promoting the ideals expressed in the Constitution. Thus the Federalists of today are continuing the revolution against human liberty that the Antifederalists warned is embodied in the Constitution.

The UPACT is a huge step to severing the restraints imposed on the federal government by the declaration of rights that Patrick Henry, George Mason and other advocates of liberty valiantly fought to have it bound by. Although at this point it is academic, the UPACT is another validation of the Antifederalists worst fears about how liberty in America could easily be victimized by normal operations of the centralized federal government created by the Constitution. That lesson was hastened by those who have made every effort to politically and financially profit from falsely characterizing the events of September 11th as foreign terrorism. 74

IX

Who Benefited From the Events Of September 11, 2001?

When considering that the events of September 11, 2001 were not foreign terrorism, the natural question to ask is: what were they? A key to answering that question is who stood to benefit from those events, who stood to benefit from them being falsely described as acts of foreign terrorism, and who has in fact benefited from them.

Neither al Qaida, Iraq, nor any other foreign organization or country meets the criteria of being a beneficiary, which is consistent with the fact that those events were not acts of foreign terrorism.

It is very telling, however, that three domestic groups perfectly meet those three criteria. Those are politicians, federal agencies, and private defense and security oriented companies. The President, and the vast majority of Senators, Representatives and other politicians have not missed an opportunity to capitalize on the events of September 11th to increase their public visibility and boost their poll numbers. Federal agencies such as the FBI, Customs, INS and the IRS have benefited from those events by an increase in the scope of their police powers and/or sphere of authority. While defense contractors are benefiting from the hundreds of billions of dollars in increased military spending attributable to those events, and security companies are in line to benefit from the tens of billions to be spent on security within the U.S. 75

None of those three groups would have benefited to anywhere near the same degree, if at all from September 11th, if those events had not been characterized as acts of foreign terrorism. Integral with the careful cultivation of that enormous lie has been an unleashing of federal power and the projected expenditure of hundreds of billions to allegedly prevent their reoccurrence. Thus the drumbeaters promoting September 11th as acts of foreign terrorism are not disinterested patriots, but financially, politically and/or professionally self-interested parties. They are the proponents, beneficiaries and/or active participants in the carefully orchestrated effort to construct and profit from an atmosphere of “terror” in this country built on the ashes of September 11th, and the bodies of its innocent victims.

Among those in the media exposing the political and financial underpinnings of the Bush administrations self-proclaimed war on terrorism, which would have no legs to stand on without being supported by the events of September 11th, is nationally syndicated columnist Sean

Gonsalves. One of many examples of Mr. Gonsalves' fine reporting is his summarization in *Connecting the Energy Dots* that the alleged war on terrorism, including all the drum beating about Saddam Hussein and the alleged menace of Iraq to the security of the United States, is driven by politicians and businessmen seeking to respectively maximize their popularity and profits from the deaths and maiming of innocent Americans on September 11th. 76

An understandable reaction of people to the events of September 11th was shock that they occurred, horror at the devastation, sadness for the people on the airplanes and in the buildings who died or were injured, and sympathy for their family members and friends.

However, given that those events were an aberration and not acts of foreign terrorism, they would have faded from the daily consciousness of most Americans if the print and broadcast media had not gone along with the desire of politicians, government officials and business people to ghoulishly use those tragic events as a public relations vehicle to respectively benefit by boosting their popularity, legislated powers and profitability.

Regardless of any other considerations, there is no speculation involved in recognizing that the federal government and those people, organizations and companies associated with it have been the most conspicuous beneficiaries of what occurred on September 11th. Furthermore, those same parties have done *everything* possible to maximize their benefits by using the destruction of the World Trade Centers as the focal point to create an artificial atmosphere of terror in the U.S.

X

The Terrorism After September 11th

Although the events used to justify the extreme actions taken by the federal government since September 11, 2001 were not the acts of foreign terrorism that politicians, government officials, and the mass media in this country have portrayed them as being, that doesn't mean they didn't spawn terrorism against Americans, or that they weren't acts of domestic terrorism.

We know by looking to the origin of the word *terrorism* that it came into being during the French Revolution to describe the terror created by the government to intimidate the French people into complying with its edicts. The etymology of *terrorism* is explained in the *Dictionary of Word Origins*: “*Terrorism* and *terrorist* were coined in French in the 1790s to denote the activities of the Revolutionary government during the ‘Terror,’ when thousands of its opponents were put to death.” 77 Correspondingly, a *terrorist* etymologically originated as one who aids the government in its campaign of terrorism against people considered to be a domestic menace to its rule.

As the single most authoritative dictionary one can consult about the meaning of a word in English, the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) confirms that *terrorism* dates from the 1790s and the French government's systematic campaign of intimidation and terror against people under its rule:

“A system of terror.
Government by intimidation as directed and carried out by the party in power ...
A policy intended to strike with terror those against whom it is adopted; the employment of methods of intimidation;” 78

The OED also recognizes the word *terrorist* likewise dates from the 1790s and the activities of the French government against people in France:

“1. “The terrorists, as they were justly denominated, from the cruel and impolitic maxim of keeping the people in implicit subjection by a merciless severity.”
2. One who entertains, professes, or tries to awaken or spread a feeling of terror or alarm; an alarmist, a scaremonger.” 79

In stark contrast to the fact the OED's definition of a terrorist or someone engaging in terrorism against the United States doesn't fit Osama bin Laden, al-Qaida or any other Islamic group or country, the OED's definition of a terrorist perfectly applies to the conduct of many

federal and state politicians, judges and agency officials since September 11th. Those people have diligently worked to create an atmosphere of impending terror from foreigners and insecurity about the ability of the government to prevent or adequately respond to such an event, in order to generate support for the UPACT, the HSA and a general resigning of Americans to their need to abandon the Bill of Rights' symbolic shield against abuses of power by federal agents. Thus, in accord with the OED's definition of terrorism, since September 11th they have "spread a feeling of terror or alarm," and acted as an "alarmist, a scaremonger" to keep "the people in implicit subjection by a merciless severity." 80

Thus based on the etymological roots of terrorism, it is apparent the extremeness of September 11ths events have been used to justify an avalanche of domestic terrorism by the federal government against Americans. Furthermore, politicians and federal agents are the only identifiable terrorists in the U.S. So in spite of being told every day that there is a war on terrorism – it doesn't exist – because the federal government would have to be warring on itself.

Although the major profiteers from the tragic events of September 11th have been politicians, federal agencies and government defense and security contractors, they could not have done so without the active and deliberate complicity of the mass media in deceiving the American people. 81 The staged media events on September 11, 2002 commemorating the events of the previous year can even be classified as terrorism by the federal government against Americans, since the manner in which they were conducted contributed to "spreading a feeling of terror or alarm" about an alleged threat of foreign terrorism.

The 2001 edition of the New Oxford American Dictionary, that is a condensed American English version of the OED, defines *terrorism* and *terrorist* in a manner consistent with the Oxford English Dictionary. Terrorism is defined as "the use of violence and intimidation in the pursuit of political aims." Terrorist is defined as "a person who uses terrorism in the pursuit of political aims." 82

Those definitions, along with the one's previously cited, support the conclusion federal and state officials have engaged in terrorism since September 11, 2001 by incessantly beating the drum that Americans must be on guard against foreigners wanting to commit acts of terrorism. They have shamelessly used the spectre of that alleged threat to justify a quantum expansion in the invasive presence of the federal government in the lives of Americans – most evidently by

enactment of the UPACT and the HSA - even though foreigners did not committed any act of terrorism in this country on September 11th, *nor have they since*.

Furthermore, the federal government has acted consistent with the OED's definition of terrorism since September 11th by engaging in various policies "intended to strike with terror those against whom it is adopted; [by] the employment of methods of intimidation." Federal officials such as President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft have clearly been engaging in efforts to intimidate or cause a feeling of panic in Americans "as a means of affecting political conduct." Those tactics were used to push passage of the UPACT through Congress without a single Congressman or Senator having read its text, they were used to push the federalization of airline screeners through Congress without meaningful debate about its necessity, and those same tactics were also used to push the HSA – the most radical reorganization of the federal government in six decades – through Congress without any Committee hearings, open debate, or any Congressperson studying the Acts provisions, since its text was changed up to the night before it was voted on. The creation of those circumstances and the intimidating conduct by federal and state officials for political purposes perfectly fits the spectrum of definitions of terrorism engaged in by terrorists set forth in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the *New Oxford American Dictionary*, *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary* and *Black's Law Dictionary*. In other words, the terrorism occurring in the United States since September 11th hasn't been by foreigners, but by the federal government.

XI

The True Terrorism Of September 11th

Among the plethora of facts consistent with identifying the response by the federal government to September 11th as terroristic, is the acknowledgment by federal officials that there is no known link between any of the nineteen men allegedly involved in the four alleged hijackings on September 11th and al-Qaida. 83 Even more remarkably, Thierry Meyssan reveals in *9/11: The Big Lie* that none of those nineteen alleged hijackers was on the passenger manifest of any of the four hijacked airliners, there is no proof that any of them were in fact on any of those airliners, and at least seven of those men are known to have been alive *after* September 11, 2001. 84 One of the alleged dead hijackers, for example, is a very much alive pilot for Royal Air Maroc living in Casablanca, and who gave an interview to *Al-Qods, al-Arabi*, a London Arab language daily. 85 Mr. Meyssan pulls no punches in describing what those facts mean when contrasted with the official version of September 11th pawned off on the American people by officials of the federal government:

“To sum things up, the FBI invented a list of hijackers from which it drew an identikit portrait of the enemies of the West. We are asked to believe that these hijackers were Arab Islamic militants who were acting as kamikazes. The domestic American leads were dismissed. In reality, we know nothing, neither the identity of the “terrorists” nor their operational method. All hypotheses remain open. As in all criminal affairs, the first question that should be asked is, “Who profits from the crime?” 86

As has been explained in previous chapters, including *Who Benefited From the Events of September 11th 2001?*, the beneficiaries have been President Bush, members of Congress, federal agencies, significant campaign contributors (such as drug manufacturers immunized from lawsuits triggered by negative side-effects of their products), and companies catering to the defense department and domestic security needs of the federal government.

Consistent with their efforts to capitalize on the events of September 11th are the numerous reports that federal agencies and high ranking officials, including President Bush, had prior knowledge of what was to occur. 87 Cogent cases have also been made that the federal government actually orchestrated the events. 88 There are compelling but largely ignored reasons pointing directly to the federal government’s involvement in the planning and execution of the events on September 11th. One of those raises grave concerns in the absence of any others. It is the maxim

that *all large scale crimes are inside jobs*, and the crimes committed on September 11th were certainly executed on a grand scale. A second reason is the almost too fantastic to be believed fact that *not a single employee or official* at any level of any agency in the federal government was reprimanded as a result of their lack of performance on or prior to September 11th. 89

The foreign press and investigators have been more conscientious than those in the U.S. at ferreting out and reporting the truth related to what did and did not occur on September 11th. One of the several books written and published abroad is *9/11: The Big Lie* by French think-tank leader Thierry Meyssan. In that book and his previous book *Pentagate*, Mr. Meyssan presents the compelling thesis that contrary to popular belief and what is reported in this country, American Airlines Flight 77 did not crash into the Pentagon. 90 The conclusion that the purported plane crash didn't occur is supported by a significant body of hard evidence, including numerous photographs of the Pentagon taken after the explosion by reporters, private parties and government photographers. Among other things those photographs clearly reveal the conspicuous absence of debris strewn about from an airliner fuselage, wings or cabin contents, no bodies or jet fuel residue outside the Pentagon, nowhere near the degree of structural damage a Boeing 757-200 going hundreds of miles an hour would have caused, the hole in the exterior of the Pentagon was about half the width necessary to accommodate a Boeing airliner, and there was not the degree of fire damage that would have been caused by the explosion and burning of many thousands of gallons of jet fuel.



Pentagon surveillance camera photo taken less than 8/1000ths of a second prior to the Pentagon explosion. 91

The following photo was taken 8/1000ths of a second after the above photo. 92



A French website called – *Hunt the Boeing* - has many photographs of the Pentagon available for examination that were taken on September 11th and in the days that followed. 93 The website invites viewers to find *any* indication of a Boeing airliner in *any* photograph. It is irresponsible and intellectually dishonest not to question the official version of what occurred on September 11th considering the clear and unambiguous photographic evidence Flight 77 did not crash into the Pentagon. The photographs are neutral and would speak for themselves to everyone if not for the mind altering effect of the chorus of voices by those who profited from September 11th that the photos depict something that they don't, and the dissemination of that falsehood by the compliant national news media in the U.S. Mr. Meyssan and others are serving the essential function of simply pointing out the obvious, just like the little boy in *The Emperors New Clothes* did to everyone blinded by uncritically believing the Emperor was wearing clothes that in fact didn't exist except in their imagination.



Taken less than five minutes after the Pentagon explosion, this photo clearly shows the absence of debris, burning jet fuel, or other indications that a huge Boeing airliner had just crashed into the building. 94

Mr. Meyssan explains that a U.S. military winged missile resembling a small aircraft fits the description of eyewitnesses as to what crashed into the Pentagon. One eyewitness told CNN: “It was like a cruise missile with wings, went right there and slammed into the Pentagon.” 95 Another witness working at the Pentagon near the location of the explosion told the Washington Post, “We heard what sounded like a missile, then we heard a loud boom.” 96

Consistent with those reports was a hole in the wall of the Pentagon’s inner ring at the point of impact that is approximately the width of a defense department missile that resembles a small aircraft.



Tomahawk, a U.S. government missile with wings that resembles a small aircraft

Also supporting the crash of an object much smaller than an airliner into the Pentagon is that minutes after the explosion, Reuters as the first news agency reporting on the explosion, issued a news release that a helicopter had crashed into the Pentagon. 97 The AP confirmed in a news dispatch that the explosion was caused by a small craft. 98 In addition, the Defense Department issued a press release about 20 minutes after the explosion that made no mention the Pentagon was struck by an airplane, much less a huge 115 ton Boeing 757-200 full of fuel like American Airlines Flight 77. Furthermore, the press release made no mention of airline passengers casualties. The announcement, however, did refer to an “attack” that caused casualties to people in the building. 99

It wasn’t until *several hours* after the explosion that a government official publicly floated the idea for the first time that it was attributable to an airliner crash. 100 The absurdity of that claim was revealed during a press conference the next day (September 12, 2001) when the Arlington County, Virginia Fire Marshall acknowledged there was no debris of any kind at the explosion site identifiable as possibly coming from an airplane, except for something that looked like it might be a “nose cone.” It is highly unlikely what the Fire Marshall was referring to was in fact the nose cone of whatever struck the Pentagon, because that would be the part most likely to be destroyed. The Fire Marshall also acknowledged there was no evidence of any of Flight

77's 80,000+ pounds of jet fuel, except for a "small puddle" of some kind of liquid he couldn't readily identify. 101 Another extremely odd fact is that since a few days after the event at the Pentagon, there has been an eerie silence about it compared to the unending hoopla concerning the airliners that crashed into the World Trade Center towers. 102

Consistent with Meyssan's thesis that the official version of what caused the explosion at the Pentagon on September 11th is media disseminated government propaganda, are eyewitness accounts and professional opinions that the collapse of the World Trade Center buildings could not have been caused by the airliner that crashed into each one – and that their destruction was caused by pre-planned demolition.

Firemen and other eyewitnesses at the scene who heard explosions at the base of the buildings rejected the official story that the crashes caused the buildings to implode. Likewise, the professional review, *Fire Engineering*, rejected that the airliners caused the buildings to implode after analyzing all the factors related to the crash, including the buildings construction, and the heat and distribution of the fire caused by the airliner's fuel. 103 In addition, Van Romero, a world renowned expert from the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, expressed the opinion that only explosives could have caused the implosion of the buildings. 104 The witness testimonials and the analysis of the buildings construction are empirically supported by the fact the buildings were designed to withstand being crashed into by a modern jet airliner without simply falling down like a rickety house of cards. 105

The federal government's possible behind the scenes role in what transpired on September 11th is empirically supported by a plethora of inconsistencies, circumstantial suspicions and incriminating facts. 106 One of those is that video equipment located at strategic vantage points captured the crashes with crystal clarity from different angles. The supposition that occurred by mere happenstance is not only undermined by the astronomical odds against its happening, but by what might have been a Freudian slip by President Bush when he stated during a citizen meeting in Orlando, Florida on December 4, 2001, that he saw the *first* airliner crash into the *first* World Trade Center building *as it occurred*. 107 He only could have done so if there were pre-positioned television cameras broadcasting the crashes in real time to selective insiders. Additionally, in President Bush's first public announcement, *four hours* after the events on the morning of September 11th, he made no reference whatsoever attributing them to foreign terrorism or that they were caused by foreign terrorists. He merely referred to them one time in

five paragraphs as “attacks.” 108 Of course, the sheer magnitude of the negligence by the U.S. military and intelligence and highest levels of political authority points directly to complicity in what occurred on September 11th. 109

Information in Mr. Meyssan’s book is complemented to varying degrees by what is disclosed in other books, including, *The War On Freedom* (2002) by Nefeez Mosaddeq Ahmed, and, *Forbidden Truth: U.S.-Taliban Secret Oil Diplomacy, Saudi Arabia and the Failed Search for bin Laden* (2002) by Jean-Charles Brisard, Guillaume Dasquie and Lucy Rounds. The volatility of the information in these books is indicated by the manner in which they have been made available in the U.S. Mr. Meyssan’s book, printed in France, was not released in the U.S. as scheduled on September 11, 2002 because of difficulties clearing Customs, *The War On Freedom* was issued by a small specialty publisher in the U.S., and the U.S. edition of *Forbidden Truth* is 74 pages less than the edition published in France. 110

The extraordinary circumstances surrounding many issues related to the events of September 11th not only support the possibility that federal agencies and elected officials had prior knowledge, but lend credence to speculation it was a covert federal operation. There is a growing body of compelling empirical evidence that federal military, intelligence and political officials were behind the planning, execution and cover-up of the events that occurred on September 11th. A significant factor driving investigations by concerned individuals and independent organizations into this aspect of those events is federal agencies and operatives were the only ones possessing the inside knowledge, connections, and human and technological resources necessary to carry out an operation of that scale on U.S. soil. That is consistent with the maxim that all big crimes are inside jobs. The Washington Times, for example, reported that at least one Senator, Patrick J. Leahy (VT D), has referred to the attacks as avoidable. 111 Another strongly circumstantial factor indicating the federal government’s involvement is it is the world’s all-time greatest master of perpetrating mass destruction, and it has an unabashed willingness to engage in it under the flimsiest of pretexts. After all, if someone wants to cause serious physical damage and loss of life, the U.S. military and intelligence services supporting its activities are the “go to guys and gals.” 112

Compared to the U.S. military’s extraordinarily high level of expertise at causing mass destruction and ready access to resources able to do so like planes, ships, tanks, etc., Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida are rank novices. Especially if they tried to covertly do something in a

foreign land such as the U.S. where they would stand out due to their different appearance, native language, religion and customs.

If as it strongly appears, the federal government was actively involved in the financing, planning and execution of what occurred on September 11th, then those events meet both prongs of being definable as acts of terrorism. First, they were acts of “politically motivated violence.” Second, they were executed by “subnational groups or clandestine agents.” 113

It is responsible, and indeed a moral imperative for all conscientious Americans to be willing to face the distinct possibility the federal government was intimately involved in September 11th. Particularly considering it is known the U.S. military and intelligence services planned and had every intention of executing a major terrorist operation against Americans in the early 1960s, until President Kennedy vetoed it. Known as Operation Northwoods, it was designed to justify an invasion of Cuba for the purpose of overthrowing Fidel Castro’s government by blaming him for such things as shooting down civilian airliners with Americans on them, blowing up civilian ships near Cuba with Americans on board, and attacking the U.S. military base at Guantanamo Bay. The planes and ships would have been destroyed by the U.S. military, and the ground attacks would have been primarily carried out by U.S. paid mercenaries. As it was planned and ready to be executed, thousands of civilians and U.S. military personnel could have been killed if Operation Northwoods had been permitted to be carried out. Yet in a true Orwellian twist, those U.S. military caused deaths were intended to be portrayed as justifying the *defensive action* of a U.S. invasion of Cuba. It is also a matter of historical record that when President Kennedy vetoed Operation Northwoods, U.S. military leaders reacted angrily. 114 The documentation of that operation provides positive proof the U.S. military and intelligence services have no compunction about killing thousands of American citizens and U.S. military personnel in the pursuit of their objectives. 115 They are purely driven by an end justifies the means mentality.

So even though it is known there was no foreign terrorism related to the events of September 11th, there is substantial and circumstantial evidence that those events were domestic terrorist actions carried out by agencies of the U.S. government against the American people.

XII Final Words

The events of September 11, 2001 were not acts of foreign terrorism. That simple fact is apparent from understanding the common definitions of the word. Furthermore, no event of any kind has occurred in the U.S. since then that can be described as foreign terrorism. So there is no substantiation for the federal government to implement measures to counter non-existent foreign terrorist events.

On September 11, 2001 terrorism was defined *generally, legally, statutorily* and by *law enforcement* agencies as an action involving two prongs: 1) an action intended to affect political policies, 2) by people associated with a group. Neither the nineteen alleged hijackers, Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida, nor *any* known Islamic group or country meets the first prong – because none of them exerted any pressure or made any political demands on the U.S. government related to the events of September 11th. Consequently, the events of September 11th do not meet any of the four different types of definitions describing what could be considered an act of foreign terrorism. Which means that even if it were eventually proven that Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida, or any other foreign group or country was involved in September 11th, they could only be alleged to have committed crimes. There is simply no definitional basis to legitimately characterize those events as foreign terrorism, and the well orchestrated multi-pronged political and media campaign to do so is one of the greatest frauds ever attempted by a government in the history of the world.

Although the acts themselves weren't foreign terrorism, that doesn't mean there hasn't been terrorism related to September 11th. The Oxford English Dictionary clearly shows that *beginning minutes after the first event on September 11th*, the actions of innumerable federal and state politicians and agencies perfectly met the definition of people and groups engaging in terrorist activities in the promotion of terrorism against the American people. Those people and organizations associated with federal and state governments began working overtime to “spread a feeling of terror or alarm,” in order to influence the thinking of Americans, judges and reluctant public officials about proposed legislation, and the way that existing legislation should be executed.

The etymological roots of terrorism reveal the federal governments is engaging in terrorism by using the events of September 11th to encourage a feeling of terror and apprehension in Americans about their safety as a device to generate support for its political policies, legislative

agenda and further distance itself from the Americans under its control. It can even be said that the events sponsored by the federal government commemorating the first anniversary of those events were terrorism, since they were used as a platform to continue spreading “a feeling of terror or alarm.” The federal government’s systematic response to September 11th has been to maximize support for political policies that would otherwise have insufficient backing to be seriously considered, much less enacted, in the absence of those events. The most visible of those are the Patriot Act, and the Homeland Security Act, but they also include such things as the federalization of airport screeners, the federalization of insurance claims related to losses resulting from events labeled as terrorist, and creation of the Defense Departments Information Assurance Office. 116

Consequently, September 11th has been used to enact legislation that can not be characterized as having even a superficial relationship to combating foreign terrorism – which is consistent with the fact that is not what they were.

Thus at a minimum, the true terrorism attributable to September 11th has been the after the fact response by federal politicians and officials. That after the fact domestic terrorism is compounded by any involvement of the federal government in the events themselves. The manner in which the federal government has sought to maximize its benefits from the tragic events of September 11th would raise grave suspicions of its possible complicity in them in the absence of any other indications of its involvement.

Those events, regardless of whether the federal government was intimately involved with their financing, planning and/or execution, were criminal acts, and their perpetrators are prosecutable under existing laws. If for some reason a person chose not to call them what they were - criminal acts - then English imposes no impediment to the immediate creation of a new word if none of its estimated 500,000+ words is considered adequate at expressing what a person considers those actions to have been. The mischaracterization of what occurred on September 11th as foreign terrorism obscures that existing criminal laws provide as much justice for the survivors of those events, and as much protection for society, as can be expected from the prosecution, trial and punishment of any person that commits any horrible crime. Stated as plainly as possible, that means neither the UPACT nor the HSA, nor the federalization of airport security screeners, nor any other action by the federal government since September 11th has any relationship to preventing a reoccurrence of those events or finding its perpetrators. Given the degree of disinformation dispensed by the federal government about the Pentagon explosion, and the circumstances of the

planes that crashed into the twin WTC towers and their subsequent collapse, the disassociation between the concern for preventing a reoccurrence of those events and the UPACT and the HSA is predictable. The dissemination of disinformation about the events of September 11th by the media is predictable given the federal government's penchant for dispensing untruthful information to domestic and foreign media sources.¹¹⁷

Since September 11th the federal government has relied on the principle of political policy attributed to Adolf Hitler, "The great masses of the people... will more easily fall victims to a big lie than to a small one." Yet not even the Nazi's attempted to foist a lie on the German people as mammoth as the federal government's preposterous tale that a Boeing 757-200 crashed into the Pentagon at 9:38 am on September 11, 2001.

Convincing many tens of millions of people to accept the myth that the events of September 11, 2001 were foreign terrorism has depended on bastardization of the English language that George Orwell warned about in his 1945 essay, *Politics and the English Language*. As would be expected from employment of such tactics of gross deception, the perpetration of that fantasy has done nothing to improve the lives of Americans, while it has harmed them in a number of ways. Not the least of which is the incessant domestic terrorism innocent and decent Americans have been subjected to by federally employed and associated terrorists. They are getting away with doing so in broad daylight without any significant opposition by throwing the 'spectre of terrorism card' on the table at every opportunity as a way to both silence intelligent inquiry, and to justify imposition of draconian legislation and policies without meaningful debate. Those government terrorists, from the President on down, are taking advantage of September 11th to invade the privacy of Americans and enact legislation opening the floodgates to restrictions on their liberty and impairing application of their protections from the federal government under the Bill of Rights. The grave threat to the liberty of Americans is not from the menace of terrorists from without the country, but by the federal government and its cadre of terrorist within this country.

Consequently, the illusions foisted on Americans by the federal government concerning September 11th have neither increased their health, welfare or security, nor can they. What the myth of foreign terrorism has done is provide essential support for actions by the federal government that amount to nothing less than a de facto declaration of war by the United States government against America and the American people.

THE END

Footnotes

¹ *Politics and the English Language*, George Orwell, *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian George, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1968. This essay was written in May 1945, the month Germany surrendered ending the war in Europe.

² *Id.*

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *The Dictionary of the English Language* by Jack Lynch. Available at: <http://newark.rutgers.edu/~jlynch/Johnson/Guide/dict.html> . Samuel Johnson wrote the definitions of over 40,000 words, illustrating them with about 114,000 quotations drawn from every field of learning. See the biography of Samuel Johnson at: <http://www.kirjasto.sci.fi/samuelj.htm>.

⁶ *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 10th Edition, p. 1217.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Black's Law Dictionary*, 7th Edition, p. 1484.

⁹ From: *Patterns of Global Terrorism*. Washington: Dept. of State, 2001: vi, cited at:

<http://www.history.navy.mil/library/guides/terrorism.htm#general>. This definition is used by the U.S. government to determine whether it is appropriate to classify an act of violence as terrorism. The federal government explicitly recognizes that violence, per se, is not classifiable as terrorism in the absence of the caveat that it be "politically motivated violence."

¹⁰ "The FBI defines terrorism is the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives." *Terrorism in the United States: 1996*, Federal Bureau of Investigation, p. 3. This same definition is the FBI's report for 1999, although it is attributed to 28 C.F.R §0.85.

¹¹ A couple of the definitions don't exclude the theoretical possibility that an individual can engage in terrorism. For all practical purposes, however, logistical reasons exclude an individual from being able to do so with anything other than temporary or localized effectiveness. So acts by an individual that could be labeled as terrorism are more symbolic than real.

The Unabomber is an example of a lone person that some people might try to classify as engaging in terrorism. However he wasn't. The Unabomber's actions were so inconsequential in their impact on how people acted, that regardless of their motive they can't be considered as being intended to influence political policies anymore than one can consider the shooting of a pop-gun will be effective at stopping a charging bull.

So while acts of violence by an individual may be a symbolic "blow" for some personal or philosophical cause, they are rarely acts of terrorism: such acts by an individual are not even potentially politically influential – so they don't meet terrorism's first and most important prong of being intended to affect a nation's political policy.

¹² One example is *Bloody Friday*, July 21, 1972: An Irish Republican Army (IRA) bomb attack killed 11 people and injured 130 in Belfast, Northern Ireland. Ten days later, three IRA car bomb attacks in the village of Claudy left six dead. Source: Significant Terrorist Incidents, 1961-2001, U.S. Dept. of State, Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, October 31, 2001.

¹³ "Whoever did plot and plan the 9-11 terrorist attacks, there is no evidence they were working out of Afghanistan. The FBI admits that among thousands of documents discovered in Afghanistan produced by al-Qaida, "not a single sheet of paper--- not even one computer entry --- mentions any aspect of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks." [MSNBC, May 3, 2002] Even as early as September 23, 2001, the Washington Post reported that al-Qaida had no connection whatsoever to the 19 hijackers on the aircraft that hit the World Trade Center towers or the Pentagon. According to the story, the CIA and the FBI had been tracking al-Qaida "cells" inside the U.S. for over two years and characterized their activities as "benign." [Washington Post Sept. 23, 2001] Most of the hijackers were later identified as being Saudi Arabian." Source: <http://shadownews.org/archives/911.htm> . Fifteen of the nineteen men identified as being involved in the hijackings had Saudi Arabian roots.

¹⁴ Excerpts from Chapter 1 of Mr. Ellsberg's book, in which he talks about the events of August 1964, is at: <http://www.ellsberg.net/index.htm>

¹⁵ *Joint Resolution of Congress*, H.J. RES 1145 August 7, 1964. Reporters and journalists that uncritically parrot the official government version of events to their readers, viewers or listeners, are known as *functionaries* in France.

George Seldes wrote extensively on how the news media in the U.S. is beholden to its advertisers and sources of information, and the lengths it will go to in protecting them from adverse publicity. Mr. Seldes' observations are compellingly presented in the documentary about his life: *Tell the Truth and Run: George Seldes and the American Press* (1988), an Academy-Award nominated film by Rick Goldsmith.

¹⁶ *Guilt vs. Responsibility*, Sean Gonsalves, Cape Code Times, Oct. 1, 2002

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ These men and women service people were afflicted with Gulf War Syndrome, which the federal government may have deliberately made out to be mysterious so as to minimize its financial responsibility to the injuries they suffered.

¹⁹ The other is the Homeland Security Act of 2002 signed into law in November 25, 2002. See the entire text of the USA Patriot Act of 2001 on the Electronic Freedom Frontiers website at:

http://www.eff.org/Privacy/Surveillance/Terrorism_militias/20011025_hr3162_usa_patriot_bill.html

²⁰ It is impossible for this author to ascribe good intentions to elected officials that vote for any legislation they don't understand. Only a fool or a knave would abuse their position of trust and responsibility to do such a thing.

²¹ See the text of the USA Patriot Act of 2001 on the Electronic Freedom Frontiers website at:

http://www.eff.org/Privacy/Surveillance/Terrorism_militias/20011025_hr3162_usa_patriot_bill.html

²² See e.g., *Sensenbrenner wants answers on act: He threatens to subpoena Ashcroft to get details on antiterror measure*, Steve Schultze (staff), Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, August 19, 2002.

²³ On November 27th, 2002, almost 15 months after September 11th, 2001, Henry Kissinger was named to be the chairman of a Commission to investigate the events of that day. Of course, given the law enforcement maxim that the trail of a crimes perpetrator(s) grows colder each day that passes, then it is certainly likely that many crucial and important facts related to the events of that day are forever gone. Henry Kissinger abruptly resigned less than three weeks later on December 13, 2002.

²⁴ *9/11: The Big Lie*, Thierry Meyssan, Carnot Publishing, Paris, FR, 2002, p. 86. On November 27, 2002 Henry Kissinger was named as President Bush's hand-picked choice to head a commission to investigate the events of September 11th. President Bush only agreed to creation of the commission in exchange for the carte blanc support of the HSA by key Democratic leaders. President Bush demanded, and was given, the power to appoint the commission's leader. Henry Kissinger's many years in the inner sanctum of government made him the perfect person to oversee an investigation of September 11th that superficially is intended to appear thorough, but which is actually intended to gloss over or ignore the substance of what occurred both visibly and beneath the scenes on that day, and in the days, months, and years leading up to it. Since Henry Kissinger is wanted in several countries, such as Chile, for his crimes against humanity that include the ordering of "hits" on foreign citizens, he owes a significant debt to President Bush. On September 30, 2002 President Bush was able to bully the U.N. into approving an exemption of Americans from prosecution in the International Criminal Court (ICC). Without that exemption, the U.S. could possibly be put in the embarrassing position of having to block efforts by the ICC to investigate, and possibly issue an international arrest warrant so it could put Mr. Kissinger on trial for the international crimes he committed. Mr. Kissinger committed those acts while he was the United States Secretary of State under President Nixon, and they were committed in the furtherance of what were perceived as the U.S.'s interests at the time. Kissinger's duplicity between his public persona and his private actions was so complete that he won the Nobel Peace Prize during the time he was ordering "hits" on foreign citizens. Furthermore, as the U.S. Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger played a central role in the Chilean military coup on September 11, 1973 that deposed Constitutionally elected President Salvador Allende, during which at least 3,197 Chileans were killed and over 60,000 were tortured. Kissinger oversaw the funneling of millions of dollars to the military conspirators and the supplying of them with lists of dissidents who after being rounded up were executed or tortured during their imprisonment. See e.g., *President Names Kissinger To Lead 9/11 Commission*, Richard N. Stevenson, NY Times, 11-28-02, pp. A1, 20; *Terrorism in Chile, September 11, 1973*, Bill Vann, The Paper, Victoria, Australia, Edition 39, October 2002, available at: http://www.thepaper.org.au/issues/039/039terrorism_in_chile__september_11__1973.html; *The Trial of Henry Kissinger*, Christopher Hitchens, Verso, 2001; and, *Americans Spared War Crimes Court*, (Brussels, Belgium) The Guardian Unlimited, October 1, 2002. The agreement permits U.S. citizens, such as Henry Kissinger, avoid prosecution for genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes in the ICC that citizens of other countries, such as Slobodan Milosevic, are unable to avoid. The article states in part: "Defusing a trans-Atlantic spat, the European Union agreed Monday to spare U.S. citizens the fate of standing trial on war crimes charges in the newly created International Criminal Court."

The U.S. government has struggled to justify its massive annual military expenditures since the Soviet Union, AKA The Evil Empire, evaporated as the boogeyman Americans supposedly needed to be protected from. It can be surmised that Henry Kissinger's job as the head of the 9/11 commission is to produce a report about September 11th that sustains the illusion that the U.S. is vulnerable and likely to be the target of foreign terrorism, since that threat is required to justify waging a perpetual war against non-existent "terrorism" that is necessary for the U.S. military to maintain, and even increase its expenditures in a time of relative peace in the world. The perpetual war against non-existent terrorism, or which may artificially be generated as a response to the U.S.'s aggression, is reminiscent of the perpetual war in Orwell's 1984 that served the same purpose.

On December 13, 2002 Henry Kissinger abruptly quit as Chairman of the 9/11 Commission on the grounds that he couldn't compromise clients of his consulting company by publicly disclosing who they are, which is a requirement of service on the 9/11 Commission. See e.g., *Kissinger Pulls Out as Chief Of Inquiry Into 9/11 Attacks*, David Firestone (staff), NY Times, December 14, 2002, Sec. A, p. 1, col. 1.

²⁵ The data section of the Homeland Security Act is: *Title II – Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection*. For an explanation of everything entailed by Title II, see e.g., *You Are A Suspect*, William Safire, The New York Times, Nov. 14, 2002; and, *A Supersnoop's Dream*, Audrey Hudson, The Washington [D.C.] Times Nov. 15, 2002. The HSA can also be used to turn state drivers licenses into de facto national I.D. cards by linking them to Title II's database collection and analysis system.

²⁶ The Information Analysis provision of the Homeland Security Act and the Total Information Awareness program are inexorably linked in reality, whatever disconnection there may appear to be on the surface. When the Homeland Security Act was passed, the Total Information Awareness project was funded with \$120 million to carry out its surveillance of Americans. For an explanation of DARPA's role in driving the development of computer technology that is enabling the systematic obliteration of liberty in America, see this author's essay: *Rule By Punch Cards or: How Computers Are a Menace to Liberty* (October 2002), available at: www.forejustice.org/ms/rule_by_punch_cards.htm.

²⁷ Under Homeland Security Act Section 201(d)(1), it is the responsibility of those entrusted with executing the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection provision: "To access, receive, and analyze law enforcement information, intelligence information, and other information from agencies of the Federal Government, State and local government agencies (including law enforcement agencies), and private sector entities, and to integrate such information."

²⁸ TIA is envisioned to accomplish this by utilizing software from Syntek Technologies, that markets a commercial version of the software known as Genoa. Syntek Technologies was the previous employer of John Poindexter, the director of the TIA project. See e.g., *The U.S. Spymaster: John Poindexter's Information Awareness Office wants to read your email*, Eric Johnson, Coast Weekly, Monterey, CA, Dec. 5, 2002, at: <http://www.coastweekly.com/article.asp?section=results&ref=8489>.

²⁹ There is a significant body of evidence that intelligence gathering tools available to the FBI prior to September 11, 2001 enabled the agency to identify people that could be planning to commit violent criminal acts in the U.S. and other countries. Coleen Rowley, an FBI whistleblower disclosed that prior to September 11th her FBI superiors and DOJ officials interfered with her investigation of people possibly planning violent criminal activity in the U.S. See e.g., *Coleen Rowley's Memo to FBI Director Robert Mueller: An edited version of the agent's 13-page letter*, Time Magazine, May 21, 2002, at: <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,249997,00.html>. Time Magazine named Coleen Rowley and the women that blew the whistle on Enron and WorldCom as their People of The Year for 2002. The fact that Coleen Rowley and other FBI agents (two of those agents were interviewed on ABC's Primetime Live on December 19, 2002) were instructed by superiors in Washington DC to stand down in following suspicious leads prior to September 11th substantiates that elements within the federal government may have been intimately involved in the planning and execution of those events, since there is no conceivable reason for those agents to have been diverted from carrying out investigations, unless they would have led to the discovery of those internal elements prior to the execution of those events.

³⁰ See e.g., an analysis by this author of the direct relationship between the federal government and the development of the computer as an instrument information collection and surveillance in *Rule By Punch Cards or: How Computers Are a Menace to Liberty*, to be published in 2003 in an anthology about the danger national ID cards pose to the liberty of Americans, available at: www.forejustice.org/ms/rule_by_punch_cards.htm.

³¹ *I.B.M. Plans a Computer That Will Set Power Record*, John Markoff (staff), The New York Times, Technology Section, November 19, 2002. The publicly announced purpose of the computer is to do simulations related to nuclear war and nuclear waste.

³² *Id.*

³³ *Smallpox Provisions Hidden In Homeland Security Bill*, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, November 14, 2002, FreeRepublic.com at: <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/789101.posts> (emphasis added).

³⁴ See e.g., *Term Limits: the meaninglessness of "WMD,"* Gregg Easterbrook (Senior Editor), The New Republic, October 7, 2002, pp. 22-25, esp. 24-25. Mr. Easterbrook relates that when the Smallpox virus from a Soviet bioweapons lab in Aralsk, Kazakhstan got loose in 1971, only 3 people died in an area of Russia that had such poor public health that the life expectancy of men was only 40 years. The public health in the U.S. is significantly higher, and it is possible that if a comparable release occurred in this country no one would have died. However, it is known that at least 3% of everyone given the Smallpox vaccine suffers serious negative side-effects, including death.

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ *Smallpox Provisions Hidden In Homeland Security Bill* quoting AAPS spokeswoman Kathryn Serkes.

³⁷ *Oppose the New Homeland Security Bureaucracy!*, Rep. Ron Paul (TX), November 13, 2002, <http://lewrockwell.com/paul/paul61.html>

³⁸ Senator Byrd's comments are available from numerous locations, including: <http://www.rense.com/general31/abila.htm>

³⁹ Professor Livergood's website is at: http://www.hermes-press.com/nazification_step3.htm. The decree invoked Article 48 of the Weimer Constitution, which allowed for suspension in time of an emergency of the multitude of rights that constitutionally protected Germans from the arbitrarily exercise of power by the federal government.

⁴⁰ See e.g., *New World Coming: American Security In The 21st Century: Supporting Research and Analysis*, The U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, Phase I: , September 15, 1999, p. 125. Available at: http://www.nssg.gov/NWR_A.pdf

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² This report can be read at the Commission's official website: <http://www.nssg.gov/PhaseIIIFR.pdf>

⁴³ 18 U.S.C. 1385. See, Phase I Report of the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, dated September 15, 1999, p. 129.

⁴⁴ See the National Taxpayer's Union website at: <http://www.ntu.org/features/sotu/SOTU2002graph.php3>. Among the several dozen federal agencies coming under the control of the Department of Homeland Security are the Coast Guard, Customs, and the INS. The budgetary increase these agencies will receive is indicated by the fact that none of them objected to being brought under the Homeland Security umbrella.

⁴⁵ Nazi leader Hermann Goering, interviewed by Gustave Gilbert during the Easter recess of the Nuremberg trials, 18 April 1946, quoted in Gilbert's book *Nuremberg Diary*.

⁴⁶ *Bin Laden tape 'created by imposter,'* (staff and agencies), Guardian Unlimited, London, November 29, 2002.

⁴⁷ Based on his six years as a U.N. weapons inspector, Scott Ritter has pointed out that the secrecy of the Iraqi government about some its activities has nothing to do with concealing weapons development programs, manufacturing facilities, or stockpiled weapons. Rather, it is concealing Saddam Hussein's security process that keeps him safe from assassination by the CIA or other clandestine groups funded by the U.S. government. A 90 minute talk he gave on October 5, 2002 about these and other subjects related to Iraq can be listened to at: www.forejustice.org/audio/scott_ritter_10-05-02.mp3.

⁴⁸ See e.g., an analysis of the U.S. Constitution from this perspective in *The Constitution of No Authority* by Lysander Spooner in *The Lysander Spooner Reader*, Lysander Spooner with an Introduction by George H. Smith, Fox & Wilkes, 1992.

⁴⁹ The vehemence of the Founding Fathers opposition to a Bill of Rights might have been tempered if they had not overlooked that it serves one crucial function consistent with their aim to create a government of absolute power: it supports the illusion that the government's power is not de facto unlimited, when in its absence that illusion completely evaporates like a morning mist at the break of dawn.

⁵⁰ The one provision that some people may try and claim contradicts this is Article 1, Section 9 of the Constitution. That provision forbids the suspension of habeas corpus except, "when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public safety may require it." To make such a claim would be deceptive, however, because habeas corpus is a protection against *illegal* imprisonment, by providing for judicial review of a person's jailing when they contend there is no

legal authority for it. Consequently the Constitution's habeas corpus provision provides no protection against an imprisonment considered legal. This was confirmed less than 10 years after the adoption of the Constitution by the passage of the Alien and Sedition Act that resulted in the "legal" imprisonment of numerous political enemies of the Federalists that were in power. The habeas corpus provision provided no relief to them, just as it provides no support for a person jailed under a provision of the UPACT. On November 18, 2002, the constitutionality of the UPACT was upheld by the unanimous vote of a secretive appeals court panel of three federal appeals court judges that were hand-picked by US Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist. The three judges reversed a unanimous 7-0 vote by all the federal judges on the secret Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that the UPACT's wiretapping and information sharing provisions among federal agencies were unconstitutional. See e.g., *Judges uphold wider use of wiretaps: Expanded foreign surveillance allowed*, Lyle Denniston (The Boston Globe), Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Nov. 19, 2002, Nation Section. See also, *Secret Court OKs Broad Wiretap Powers*, Deborah Charles, Reuters/Washington, November 18, 2002, available on the Findlaw.com website. Justice Rehnquist, who hand-picked the three appeals court judges, was also one of the five Supreme Court judges that ruled in Bush's favor in *Bush v. Gore*, the decision that effectively amounted to the Supreme Court's appointment of George Bush as President. See e.g., *The Betrayal of America: How the Supreme Court Undermined the Constitution and Chose the President* by Vincent Bugliosi, forward by Gerry Spence, Thunder's Mouth Press / Nation Books ; ISBN: 156025355X, May 2001.

⁵¹ *Creating the Bill of Rights: The Documentary Record from the First Federal Congress*, edited by Helen E. Veit, Kenneth R. Bowling and Charlene Bangs Bickford, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London, 1991, ix. (emphasis added to original). It is pertinent to mention in the context of discussing the opposition of the Founding Fathers to a declaration of rights that there is some spiritual discontinuity between the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. That is indicated by the fact the former document was only signed by 3 of the 56 signers of the latter document. Contrary to a popular misconception, Thomas Jefferson had no role in drafting the Constitution, he was in France during that period of time, but he did write to James Madison that the Convention had no right to draft a Constitution that would profess to have a life of more than 20 years, since one generation had no right to even make a pretense of legally binding the one that would follow it. The three signers of both documents were Roger Sherman of Connecticut, and Robert Morris and Benjamin Franklin of Pennsylvania.

⁵² In stark contrast with the Constitution, the Articles of Confederation respected the national sovereignty of the thirteen colonial nation-states that it loosely tied together by assuring relatively free trade and non-aggression between them.

⁵³ For the take of the Constitution's opponents about this, see e.g., *The Antifederalists*, ed. by Cecelia M. Kenyon, Northeastern University Press, Boston, 1985 reprint of 1966 edition with a new forward by Gordon S. Wood). At p. xciii she wrote:

"That a Bill of Rights was needed not only to protect the people from their government but also to protect individuals and minorities from the will of the majority was stated explicitly by James Winthrop. In refuting the federalist argument that Bill of Rights were not necessary in republican governments, he replied: "that the sober and industrious part of the community should be defended from the rapacity and violence of the vicious and idle. A bill of rights, therefore, ought to set forth the purposes for which the compact is made, and serves to secure the minority against the usurpation and tyranny of the majority. ... The experience of mankind has proved the prevalence of a disposition to use power wantonly. It is therefore as necessary to defend an individual against the majority in a republic as against the "King in a monarchy." [fn. 133: #133 Agrippa Letters, Ford Essays, p. 117. See also Elliot, III, 499, for a similar statement from William Grayson], at p. xciii.

⁵⁴ Lord Acton made his similar, but better known phrasing of the same concept 117 years later in a letter to Bishop Mandell Creighton dated April 3, 1887: "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad man."

⁵⁵ Article I, Section 2, Clause 3. "Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, *three fifths of all other Persons.*" (italics added)

⁵⁶ It is worth noting that the most passionate of the Antifederalists were not among those that signed the Declaration of Independence. This is explained by a little known spiritual affinity between that document and the Constitution. In 1772 England's Lord Chief Justice Mansfield ruled that English law does not support slavery and ordered that all slavery in England was illegal. Since the colonies legal system was directly based on English law, the freeing of the hundreds of thousands of slaves in the American colonies was a foregone event waiting to happen. The only way to

prevent the freeing of the slaves was for the American colonies to break their direct political dependency on England. The movers and shakers behind the Independence of the American colonies from England exhibited mind-numbing hypocrisy by publicly proclaiming love for liberty while behind the scenes they worked to preserve the institution of slavery. The benefits of cheap slave labor infected the entire colonial economic structure. For example, while far removed geographically from the slave plantations of the South, the New England textile trade depended on their cheap cotton to produce economical finished products. The hypocrisy of the men behind the Declaration of Independence's bold proclamations of human liberty is shown by the personal history of its primary author, Thomas Jefferson. He was a life-long slave owner who didn't liberate the slaves that maintained his Monticello estate because he couldn't afford to maintain it without their "free" labor that only cost him the expense of their minimal upkeep. In other words, he failed to put his bold words of freedom into action in his own life because it would have reduced the style of living to which he had become accustomed.

It is historical fact that if the colonies had not revolted against England, the slaves in America would have been legally emancipated many decades before they were. It is also worth pondering that if the South had not entered into a war with the North that the institution of slavery would have continued on for an unknown number of decades, since the Supreme Court, Congress and Abraham Lincoln were all content to allow the institution to continue as it had for hundreds of years so long as the South was agreeable to paying exorbitant import tariffs on manufactured goods. In other words, the abolition of slavery in the U.S. had nothing to do with elevated moral principles, but pragmatic economic considerations.

The history of slavery in the U.S. and the support of it by a many decades long succession of economic and political leaders is important in the context of what is happening in the U.S. today. The same men that viciously fought to prevent the Constitution's constrictions by a declaration of rights incorporated slavery as a salient feature of that document. That same mindset is evident today by the proponents of the Patriot Act and the Homeland Security Act that can only be executed as they are intended if the American people are de facto presumed to have no rights or protections as human beings that are beyond the reach of the government. That is, the UFACT and the HSA depend on Americans to literally be viewed as, and treated like rightless slaves.

⁵⁷ See e.g., *The Anti-Federalist Papers and the Constitutional Convention Debates*, edited by Ralph Ketcham, Mentor, Penguin Group, New York, 1986, pp. 201, 208. Patrick Henry said in the speech: "Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect every one who approaches that jewel. ... Revolutions like this have happened in almost every country in Europe: Similar examples are to be found in ancient Greece and ancient Rome: Instances of the people losing their liberty by their own carelessness and the ambition of a few. ... Yet, there is another thing it will as effectually do: it will oppress and ruin the people." (201) ... "And yet who knows the dangers that this new system may produce; they are out of the sight of the common people: They cannot foresee latent consequences: I dread the operation of it on the middling and lower class of people: It is for them I fear the adoption of this system. ... I see great jeopardy in this new Government. I see none from our present one:" (208).

Under the Article of Confederation, the independent nation/states of Colonial America had more autonomy than do European countries that are signatories to the European Union of today. One example of their autonomy was that the Colonial nations of Massachusetts, New York, Virginia, et al did not have a mandated common currency.

⁵⁸ In a speech before the Virginia Ratifying Convention. *Id.* at 199.

⁵⁹ *Id.* at 201.

⁶⁰ The submergence of sovereignty by the American states under the Constitution into a super nation-state called The United States was similar to what occurred during the 1800s when small independent nation/states were absorbed into what because the super nation-state known as Germany.

⁶¹ *Id.* at 212.

⁶² *The Anti-Federalist Papers and the Constitutional Convention Debates*, at 201.

⁶³ Addressing the decadence, erosion of individual rights, and decline of public morality in the Roman Empire about 120 A.D., the satirist Juvenal asked pointedly in his Sixth Satire "quis custodiet ipsos custodies", or, "Who guards the guardians?"

⁶⁴ *Id.* at 208. Patrick's Henry's fears of the latent powers imbedded in the Constitution that could be used to destroy any pretense of liberty in the U.S., are perfectly realized in both the HSA and the UFACT that are discussed in later chapters. The overt subjugative state of Americans to the federal government is the given principle underlying those

legislative enactments that are abhorrent to the memory of those who fought in the American Revolution and all lovers of liberty since, up to the present day.

⁶⁵ See e.g., *George Mason*, Encyclopedia Britannica, at:

<http://search.eb.com/eb/article?eu=79743&tocid=0&query=mason%2C%20george>. Mason's Virginia Declaration of Rights is credited with "being the first authoritative formulation of the doctrine of inalienable rights."

⁶⁶ See e.g., Alexander Hamilton, *Encyclopedia Britannica* at:

<http://search.eb.com/eb/article?eu=39835&tocid=0&query=hamilton%2C%20alexander>

⁶⁷ *The Anti-Federalist Papers and the Constitutional Convention Debates*, edited by Ralph Ketcham, Mentor, published by the Penguin Group, New York, 1986; and, *The Anti-Federalists*, Herbert Storing, University of Chicago Press, 1985. Note: These books present, in the words of the men who lived at the time of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, the fierce opposition that existed in the thirteen colonies to adoption of the United States Constitution and the centralized federal government it created. Their worst fears about the federal government's inherent rapaciousness was evident for all to see only a few years later. In 1794 when George Washington led an army of 13,000 against Americans in Western Pennsylvania who refused to pay the federal excise tax on whiskey they produced and sold. Known as the Whiskey Rebellion – Washington's swift crushing of the dissidents cemented the power of the newly installed federal government. See e.g., *The Whiskey Rebellion*, Thomas P. Slaughter, Oxford University Press, 1986. There is a website devoted to The Whiskey Rebellion at: www.whiskeyrebellion.org

⁶⁸ The legal profession enthusiastically assisted the Nazi's with implementation of their political policies. On German Day in November 1933, for example, Adolf Hitler was told by Hans Franc at a rally of 20,000 lawyers in Leipzig, "you can rely on your German lawyers!" Source: http://hoffmannverlag.schiff.bei.t-online.de/irrtum_2.html

⁶⁹ "[T]he right to be let alone – the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men." is how Justice Brandeis summarized the intertwining relationship between privacy and liberty in his dissent in *Olmstead v. U.S.*, 277 U.S. 438, 479 (1928). That was the first case in which the Supreme Court gave its stamp of approval to the wire tapping of private telephone conversations by government agents. Justice Brandeis wrote: "The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, *the right to be let alone – the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.*" (emphasis added) Of course, what Justice Brandeis was referring to was the right to privacy embodied in the Bill of Rights, not the Constitution proper. See also, an analysis by this author of the relationship between privacy and liberty in *Rule By Punch Cards or: How Computers Are a Menace to Liberty*, to be published in 2003 in an anthology about the danger national ID cards pose to the liberty of Americans, available at: www.forejustice.org/ms/rule_by_punch_cards.htm.

⁷⁰ At the time Hitler was appointed Chancellor, the German Constitution guaranteed Germans more rights than Americans are under the Bill of Rights to the U.S. Constitution. Among the rights guaranteed Germans were the freedom of the press, free expression of opinion, individual property rights, right of assembly and association, right to privacy of postal and electronic communications, states' rights of self-government, and protection against unlawful searches and seizures. After the Reichstag fire, these rights were suspended on February 28, 1933 by President Paul Von Hindenberg's *Decree of the Reich President for the Protection of the People and State*. This provision is mimicked in the UPACT, that permits Americans to be confined indefinitely without access to a lawyer on the mere suspicion they are involved in terrorist activity or are an enemy combatant.

⁷¹ After the Reichstag Fire, on February 28, 1933 President Hindenberg suspended enforcement of the German Constitutions multitude of individual rights guarantees by invoking Article 48's National Emergency provision. That mimicked the effect on Americans labeled as enemy combatants or terrorists or terrorist sympathizers under the Patriot Act.

⁷² According to perhaps the most authoritative analysis of mass murder in the 20th Century, Professor Rummel estimated that 43 million people were killed during the reign of Stalin. That is more than double the 21 million that Professor Rummel estimates were killed during the 12 years the National Socialist Workers Party controlled the German government. See: *Death By Government*, R. J. Rummel, New Brunswick, N.J., Transaction Publishers, 1994. See Professor Rummel's website at: <http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/welcome.html>.

The following articles in Constitution of the USSR (Adopted December 1936) are presented to satisfy the doubts of anyone about the plethora of individual protections specifically enumerated in it. None of these symbolic

declarations of rights actually protected anyone from the Soviet Union's federal government when it wanted to exercise its effectively unlimited power, that was no more checked than that of the U.S.'s federal government of today. The protections afforded by each Article are italicized.

Chapter X

Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens

Article 118. Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the *right to work*, that is, are guaranteed the right to employment and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality. ...

Article 119. Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the *right to rest and leisure*. The right to rest and leisure is ensured by the reduction of the working day to seven hours for the overwhelming majority of the workers, the institution of annual vacations with full pay for workers and employees and the provision of a wide network of sanatoria, rest homes and clubs for the accommodation of the working people.

Article 120. Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the *right to maintenance in old age and also in case of sickness or loss of capacity to work*. This right is ensured by the extensive development of social insurance of workers and employees at state expense, free medical service for the working people and the provision of a wide network of health resorts for the use of the working people.

Article 121. Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the *right to education*. This right is ensured by universal, compulsory elementary education; by education, including higher education, being free of charge; by the system of state stipends for the overwhelming majority of students in the universities and colleges; by instruction in schools being conducted in the native language, and by the organization in the factories, state farms, machine and tractor stations and collective farms of free vocational, technical and agronomic training for the working people.

Article 122. *Women in the U.S.S.R. are accorded equal rights* with men in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life. The possibility of exercising these rights is ensured to women by granting them an equal right with men to work, payment for work, rest and leisure, social insurance and education, and by state protection of the interests of mother and child, prematernity and maternity leave with full pay, and the provision of a wide network of maternity homes, nurseries and kindergartens.

Article 123. *Equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race*, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life, is an indefeasible law. Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or, conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for, citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law.

Article 124. In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the U.S.S.R. is separated from the state, and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens.

Article 125. In conformity with the interests of the working people, and in order to strengthen the socialist system, the citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed by law:

freedom of speech;

freedom of the press;

freedom of assembly, including the holding of mass meetings;

freedom of street processions and demonstrations.

These civil rights are ensured by placing at the disposal of the working people and their organizations printing presses, stocks of paper, public buildings, the streets, communications facilities and other material requisites for the exercise of these rights.

Article 126. In conformity with the interests of the working people, and in order to develop the organizational initiative and political activity of the masses of the people, citizens of the U.S.S.R. are ensured the *right to unite in public organizations*--trade unions, cooperative associations, youth organizations, sport and defense organizations, cultural, technical and scientific societies; and the most active and politically most conscious citizens in the ranks of the working class and other sections of the working people unite in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), which is the vanguard of the working people in their struggle to strengthen and develop the socialist system and is the leading core of all organizations of the working people, both public and state.

Article 127. Citizens of the U.S.S.R. are *guaranteed inviolability of the person*. No person may be placed under arrest except by decision of a court or with the sanction of a procurator.

Article 128. *The inviolability of the homes of citizens and privacy of correspondence are protected by law.*

Article 129. The U.S.S.R. affords the *right of asylum to foreign citizens* persecuted for defending the interests of the working people, or for their scientific activities, or for their struggle for national liberation.

Article 130. It is *the duty of every citizen* of the U.S.S.R. to abide by the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, *to observe the laws*, to maintain labor discipline, honestly to perform public duties, and to respect the rules of socialist intercourse.

The Soviet Constitution of 1936 is available on the Bucknell University website at:
<http://www.departments.bucknell.edu/russian/const/36cons04.html#chap10>

⁷³ *Camps for Citizens: Ashcroft's Hellish Vision: Attorney general shows himself as a menace to liberty*, Jonathan Turley, LA Times, August 14, 2002, B11. The opening two paragraphs are:

“Atty. Gen. John Ashcroft's announced desire for camps for U.S. citizens he deems to be "enemy combatants" has moved him from merely being a political embarrassment to being a constitutional menace.

Ashcroft's plan, disclosed last week but little publicized would allow him to order the indefinite incarceration of U.S. citizens and summarily strip them of their constitutional rights and access to the courts by declaring them enemy combatants.”

⁷⁴ One of Henry Kissinger's functions as head of the Commission investigating September 11th is to create a report that will justify a perpetual war against illusory foreign terrorism. That will provide the cover necessary to justify the U.S. military's presence around the world. This harkens to Orwell's *1984* in which each of the three super-powers portrayed each other as the boogiemán – since a powerful enemy was necessary to solidify their domestic power, sustain support for draconian domestic laws, and justify a large standing military force.

⁷⁵ See e.g., *The Security Traders: As Washington prepares to spend tens of billions of dollars on homeland security, companies are gearing up for the biggest government bonanza since the Cold War*, by Brendan I. Koerner, Mother Jones, September/October 2002. Available at: http://www.motherjones.com/news/feature/2002/37/ma_106_01.html

⁷⁶ *Connecting the Energy Dots*, Sean Gonsalves, Cape Code Times, September 3, 2002. Available at:
http://www.alternet.org/mobile/story_mobile.html?StoryID=14047

⁷⁷ *Dictionary of Word Origins*, John Ayto, Arcade Publishing, NY, 1993 pb ed., p. 525.

⁷⁸ *The Oxford English Dictionary*, Vol. XI, T-V, p. 216, 1961 Reprint of 1933 ed. It is noteworthy that the etymology of the word terrorism and the way it is still defined in the OED has an important difference from its definitional tone in the U.S., and one that is *180 degrees* from its meaning in the U.S. The etymological root of terrorism is its linguistic representation of violence and intimidation by a government against the people under its control in the pursuit of promoting its political aims. In contrast, in the U.S. all four classes of definitions (general, legal, statutory and law enforcement as explained in the chapter *How Is Terrorism Defined*) relate to violence and intimidation by people against the government in the pursuit of promoting political aims.

⁷⁹ *Id.*

⁸⁰ It is important to keep in mind that when analyzed from the perspective of what is in fact a terrorist event (as explained in Chapters III and IV), the two most prominent events prior to September 11th that are typically referred to as caused by terrorists, the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center and the 1995 bombing of the Murrow Federal Building in Oklahoma City, were *not* terrorist events. It is known that the FBI and the CIA were heavily involved with the people that carried out the WTC bombing in 1993, and the federal agencies had prior knowledge of the planned bombing, including its exact time. Similarly, the BATF had at least two undercover agents within the group in Oklahoma that there is substantial reason to believe was intimately involved in the bombing of the Murrow Federal Building. One of the BATF's undercover agents, Carol Howe, was submitting regular reports to her superiors. Neither of those criminal events that the federal government was integrally involved in was a terrorist event, because neither of them meets the definition of terrorism explained in the Chapters, *How Is Terrorism Defined* and *What Are Acts of Terrorism*. The involvement of the federal government in the 1993 WTC bombing and 1995's Murrow Federal Building isn't surprising, as its apparent involvement with September 11th isn't surprising, given that under Operation Northwood, the U.S. Military was going to shoot down civilian airliners, destroy civilian ships, stage an attack on U.S. military personnel with mercenaries and engage in other activities that would be blamed on Fidel Castro, and thus used to justify an invasion of Cuba and the overthrow of his government. President Kennedy's veto of Operation Northwoods, subtitled, *Justification for U.S. Military Intervention in Cuba*, is the only reason it wasn't executed. See photocopies of Operation Northwoods at: *9/11: The Big Lie*, pp. 198-205.

⁸¹ The degree of that complicity is exposed in *Into The Buzzsaw: The Myth of a Free Press*, edited by Kristina Borjesson, Prometheus Books, February 2002. Publisher's Weekly wrote of the book: “Editor Borjesson succinctly explains the journalist's predicament: “The buzzsaw is what can rip through you when you try to investigate or expose anything this country's large institutions be they corporate or government want kept under wraps.””

⁸² *The New Oxford American Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, NY, 2001, p. 1752. The NOAD is Oxford University Press' dictionary of American English that is backed up by its 200 million word data bank of English and

the citation files of the OED. It is noteworthy that the NOAD's definitions of terrorism and terrorist bridge the meaning of those words when they came into use during the French Revolution and how they are presently defined in the U.S. The NOAD allows for terrorism and terrorists to be applicable to anyone using violence and intimidation in the promotion of political aims – whether it is used on behalf of the government or in opposition to it. The NOAD's entry for terror also makes that same definitional bridge, although it leans towards violence by the government: “1. extreme fear – the use of such fear to intimidate people, esp. for political reasons. ... (the Terror) the period of the French Revolution between mid 1793 and July 1794 when the ruling Jacobin faction, dominated by Robespierre, ruthlessly executed anyone considered a threat to their regime.”

⁸³ It is also noteworthy that fifteen of those men were Saudi Arabian – a military ally of the U.S. At a minimum the federal government is engaging in misdirection, which is an indicator that it may eventually come to light that government agent provocateurs were responsible for the events themselves.

⁸⁴ *9/11: The Big Lie*, Thierry Meyssan, Carnot Publishing, Paris, FR, Oct 2002, at 54-55. Meyssan's book was published in Europe under the title: *The Frightening Fraud*. In *9/11* Thierry Meyssan reports that five of those men are alive. *The War on Freedom* expands on that by reporting that at least *seven* of the alleged hijackers were known to be alive after September 11, 2001.

⁸⁵ *Id.* at 54.

⁸⁶ *Id.* at 56.

⁸⁷ One website that has a considerable amount of information about prior knowledge by federal officials and agencies of September 11th's events is Alex Jones' InfoWars, at: <http://www.infowars.com/resources.html>.

⁸⁸ Among the numerous books presenting various aspects of the involvement of the U.S. government in the events of September 11, 2001 are: *9/11: The Big Lie*, Thierry Meyssan, Carnot Publishing, Paris, FR, Oct 2002; *The War On Freedom*, Nefeez Mosaddeq Ahmed, Media Messenger Books, Joshua Tree, CA, July 2002; and, *Forbidden Truth: U.S.-Taliban Secret Oil Diplomacy, Saudi Arabia and the Failed Search for bin Laden*, Jean-Charles Brisard, Guillaume Dasquie and Lucy Rounds, Avalon Publishing Group, NY, August 2002.

⁸⁹ In contrast, a senior FBI official was reprimanded after the 1992 events at Ruby Ridge that resulted in the shooting deaths of Vicki Weaver and her son. Also, after the events at Waco, Texas related to the Branch Davidians in 1993, two BATF agents were reprimanded. Although people died during both of those events, they were significantly less in scale to the loss of life and property damage that occurred on September 11, 2001. Yet it has not been publicly reported that a single government employee, official or private contractor has been given even a verbal reprimand related to their performance, or lack thereof on September 11th.

⁹⁰ *Pentagate*, Thierry Meyssan, Carnot, Paris, FR, 2002. See e.g., *French Book, A Best-Seller, Denies Pentagon Crash*, London (CNSNews.com), at: <http://www.townhall.com/news/politics/200204/FOR20020405c.shtml>. See also: *Frightening Fraud Continues? Organizers of Sept. 11 Tragedy Named*, Pravda English Version, May 23, 2002, at: <http://english.pravda.ru/main/2002/05/23/29196.html>.

⁹¹ Source: <http://www.airdisaster.com/photos/aa77/photo.shtml>. This is the first in a series of five photos on the Air Disaster.Com website that were taken by a Pentagon Surveillance Camera in the space of 4/100s of a second.

⁹² Source: <http://www.airdisaster.com/photos/aa77/photo.shtml>.

⁹³ Hunt the Boeing is the French website with photographs of the Pentagon after the September 11, 2001 explosion at: http://www.asile.org/citoyens/numero13/pentagone/erreurs_en.htm. Another website with many photographs of the Pentagon is: <http://www.thepowerhour.com/pentgallery/FrameSet.htm>. This author spent some weeks looking at every available photograph on the Internet taken of the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 and in the days that followed. He has yet to find a single photograph that supports the government's claim that a Boeing 757-200 crashed into the Pentagon at 9:38am on September 11, 2001.

⁹⁴ Source: <http://216.239.53.100/search?q=cache:NUHZ11EicNIC:www.crc-internet.org/june2a.htm+pentagon+meysan+missile+photo&hl=en&ie=UTF-8>. The site states about this picture:

“Emmanuel Ratier published a document on the Internet on 18 October, one month after the attacks. On 21 March, it was in fact to him that *Le Monde* and *Actualité juive* gave first prize for this incredible news, illustrated with a series of photographs entitled: No plane crashed into the Pentagon. As surprises go, it was indeed a surprise! Incredible? One has only to examine the AFP photo, above, to understand that it is the pure and simple truth: it stares one in the face!

The photograph was taken in the first minutes of the fire. Fire trucks are on the scene, but as yet these vehicles have not gone into action. Moreover, the upper floors of the building are yet to collapse. Now, there is no trace of significant debris, no engine, no black box, no undercarriage. Nothing! And yet, according to the official version, a

Boeing 757-200, an air freighter with a wingspan of 38.05 m, a length of 47.30 m, a height of 13 m and a weight of 100 tons, struck the ground and first floors of the front of the building, hedge-hopping as it approached, flying just a few metres above the ground at a minimum speed of 400 km per hour, without knocking down a single streetlamp or even causing any damage to the magnificent lawn in the foreground, the car park, or the helipad.”

⁹⁵ ““It was like a cruise missile with wings, went right there and slammed into the Pentagon,” Mike Walter, an eyewitness, told CNN.” *Up To 800 Possibly Dead At Pentagon*, CNN News, September 12, 2001, at: <http://www.cnn.com/2001/US/09/11/pentagon.terrorism/> .

Complementing that eyewitness report that an airliner did not crash into the Pentagon is the following report of an eyewitness who saw the object that crashed into the Pentagon from a distance of little more than a football field was printed in the afternoon edition of *The Washington Post* on September 11, 2001:

“Steve Patterson, 43, said he was watching television reports of the World Trade Center being hit when he saw a silver commuter jet fly past the window of his 14th-floor apartment in Pentagon City. The plane was about 150 yards away, approaching from the west about 20 feet off the ground, Patterson said.

He said the plane, which sounded like the high-pitched squeal of a fighter jet, flew over Arlington cemetery so low that he thought it was going to land on I-395. He said it was flying so fast that he couldn't read any writing on the side.

The plane, which appeared to hold about eight to 12 people, headed straight for the Pentagon but was flying as if coming in for a landing on a nonexistent runway, Patterson said.

“At first I thought ‘Oh my God, there's a plane truly misrouted from National,’” Patterson said. “Then this thing just became part of the Pentagon I was watching the World Trade Center go and then this. It was like Oh my God, what's next?””

He said the plane, which approached the Pentagon below treetop level, seemed to be flying normally for a plane coming in for a landing other than going very fast for being so low. Then, he said, he saw the Pentagon “envelope” the plane and bright orange flames shoot out the back of the building.” *'Extensive Casualties' in Wake of Pentagon Attack*, Barbara Vobejda (staff), *Washington Post*, September 11, 2001.

⁹⁶ *'Extensive Casualties' in Wake of Pentagon Attack*, Barbara Vobejda (staff), *Washington Post*, September 11, 2001.

⁹⁷ *9/11: The Big Lie* at 14.

⁹⁸ *Id.* at 15. The AP later issued at least one report that the damage was caused by explosives detonated in a truck parked near the Pentagon.

⁹⁹ *Id.* at 13.

¹⁰⁰ *Id.* at 15. This announcement was by the newly appointed Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard Myers. The absurdity of the hours it took for government officials to settle on the story that Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon is emphasized by considering one idea. If a huge 115 ton airliner with a fuselage 155 feet long and a wingspan of 125 feet crashed into the largest and most populated building in any major city, is it reasonable to even suggest that minutes after the crash that international and national news agencies would report the object was a relatively small helicopter or some other small object, and then several hours later have those reports contradicted by a government spokesperson claiming the damage was actually caused by a huge commercial airliner crashing into the building? The government’s manufactured cover story that Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon is facially absurd. Of course, the great mystery of Flight 77 is where it crashed. It is reasonable to surmise it crashed into the Atlantic Ocean, since its wreckage would have otherwise been found by now if it had crashed on the mainland U.S..

¹⁰¹ *Id.* at 23.

¹⁰² The greatest mystery of the new century is what happened to American Airlines Flight 77 and the people that were on it.

¹⁰³ *9/11: The Big Lie*, at 35. Mr. Meyssan wrote: “This theory was vigorously rejected by the New York firemen’s associations and the professional review, *Fire Engineering*, which, backed up by calculations, claimed that the structures could have resisted the fire for a long period. The firemen affirm that they heard explosions at the base of the buildings and demanded the opening of an independent investigation.” The cited article is at fn. 23 in Mr. Meyssan’s book, and it can be found at: *Selling Out The Investigation*, by Bill Manning, *Fire Engineering*, January

2002. See also, *WTC Investigation? A Call for Action* (A petition published in the same issue of the review). *Id.* at 215.

¹⁰⁴ *Id.* at 35.

¹⁰⁵ The allegation the heat from the burning jet fuel was the trigger causing the implosion of both buildings has nothing to do with the type of airplane that struck the buildings, and it is contradictory with the fact the buildings were specifically designed to withstand a direct airliner crash – which both buildings did, and the resulting fire – which we have every reason to believe they also did. As noted in a previous footnote, “the professional review, *Fire Engineering*, which, backed up by calculations, claimed that the structures could have resisted the fire for a long period.” *Id.* at 35.

¹⁰⁶ One website that has a considerable amount of information about prior knowledge by federal officials and agencies is Alex Jones’ InfoWars, at: <http://www.infowars.com/resources.html>.

¹⁰⁷ For the text of President Bush’s statement see: *9/11: The Big Lie*, at 37-38. An audio recording of President Bush’s admission is at: www.forejustice.org/audio/george_bush_admitting_he_saw_wtc.mp3

¹⁰⁸ *Id.* at 46-47. This was released to the public at 1:04 pm East Coast time. In addition, during two press briefings by Presidential Spokesperson Ari Fleischer on September 11th, he did make any reference to the “attacks” as being foreign terrorism, or that foreign terrorists were believed to be involved. *Id.* at 47.

¹⁰⁹ In *The War On Freedom* by Nefeez Mosaddeq Ahmed, Media Messenger Books, Joshua Tree, CA, 2002, some of the negligence by these agencies and officials is explained in the section titled: *Myers and Bush on 9/11: Negligence Points to Complicity*, at pp. 159-166.

¹¹⁰ This author was told by a representative of Carnot Publishing that the release of *9/11: The Big Lie* was delayed for six weeks until late October 2002, due to difficulties with the book, that is printed in France, clearing U.S. Customs. This interference by U.S. Customs caused the publisher to lose the momentum generated by the nationwide buzz and publicity buildup about the book, including the following mention in the NY Times: “...challenges the entire official version of the September 11th attacks.” (cover of *9/11: The Big Lie*).

¹¹¹ *September 11 Attacks Called Avoidable*, Joyce Howard Price, The Washington Times, June 9, 2002. Senator Leahy was quoted as saying: “There was plenty of information available before September 11. I think historians are going to find, tragically, that, had it been acted upon, the hijackers could have been stopped,” Available at: <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20020609-22093908.htm>

¹¹² As the most militaristically adventurous country in the world since WWII, the U.S. is generally viewed by people of most, and perhaps all other countries as the savage and barbarous “Big Bad U.S.” In *Nuremberg and Vietnam*, for example, Telford Taylor, the Allies chief prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials after WWII, explains how the U.S. military’s normal tactics of warfare turned the Vietnamese people at the grassroots level against the U.S. In other words, the Vietnamese people viewed the United States as foreign invaders and not liberators. [Source: *Nuremberg and Vietnam: an American Tragedy*, Telford Taylor, Bantam, NY, 1970, Chapter 8 – War and Peace, pp. 183-207, esp. 195-207] On August 2, 1970 for example, The New York Times published reporter Gloria Emerson’s first hand report under the headline, *Americans in Vietnam Find Themselves Hated*. [Source: *Id.* at 195-196, fn. 16.] If foreign terrorism ever does come to the U.S., it will be the chickens coming home to roost and a self-fulfillment of the prophecy that it is bound to happen sooner or later, since the U.S. government has actively engaged in foreign terrorism for over 160 years. The U.S. is known to have invaded foreign countries over 200 times for the express purpose of influencing the internal politics of those countries.

¹¹³ 22 U.S.C. §2656f(d)(2). For a full explanation see the chapter, *How Is Terrorism Defined?*

¹¹⁴ See *9/11: The Big Lie* at 142-143. Comparisons beg to be made between the Northwoods project’s purpose to create a justification for an invasion of Cuba as a defensive measure, and the use of September 11th as a justification to invade Iraq as a defensive action to protect the U.S. from a hypothetical danger that country might pose to the U.S. at some indeterminate future time.

¹¹⁵ See *9/11: The Big Lie* at 198-205 for a photocopy of Operation Northwoods. The operation included many more nefarious activities than the few significant ones explained in the text of this essay.

¹¹⁶ For an analysis by the National Taxpayer’s Union of the federalization of insurance losses attributable to terrorist acts, see: http://www.ntu.org/features/ntu_on_capitolhill/T0110KeatingErrorInsuranc.php3.

¹¹⁷ An example of the federal government’s deliberate distribution of erroneous information is The New York Times report on February 19, 2002 that the Pentagon’s Office of Strategic Influence is “developing plans to provide news items, possibly even false ones, to foreign media organizations” in an effort “to influence public sentiment and policy makers in both friendly and unfriendly countries.” See: <http://www.fair.org/activism/osi-propaganda.html>.