



FROM THE WILDERNESS

*A Nonpartisan, Non-sectarian, MAP from the Here That Is,
Into the Tomorrow of Our Own Making*

Vol. VI, No. 6

Sept 30, 2003

© Copyright 2003

NOT ONE NIGHT'S SLEEP

**9/11 Second-Anniversary Events in Germany and New York City
Reveal Growing Strength, Credibility of Movement**

Many Government Critics Take Center Stage

Is McKinney Running Again?

Sept 17 , 2003 1400 PDT (FTW), BERLIN, NEW YORK CITY -- Events marking the second anniversary of the World Trade Center attacks held in Berlin, Germany and Manhattan featuring former Georgia Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney, this writer, and more than a dozen experts highlighted an estimated fifty conferences, screenings and protests around the US and the world, revealing growing popular support for the position that the US government was complicit in those attacks. In a few short words I will try to describe some of the biggest recent developments in a climate that has changed dramatically since disclosure that the US and British governments falsified and misrepresented intelligence to justify a now-failing occupation of Iraq. Those frauds, constituting impeachable offenses offered as a justification for war, have solidly returned 9/11 to the table for debate. Unresolved questions about the attacks are now also drawing attention from the major media and they will most certainly become an issue in the 2004 presidential race. As this opportunity presented itself, a great many courageous people--active for two, long years--were there to seize the moment and they did so powerfully, with an effectiveness made possible by two years of sometimes bitter experience and struggle.

(continued on page 11)

FTW Ad Campaign Saturates Northern California

Sept 29, 2003, 1200 Hrs (FTW) -- Following the Sept 3 running of FTW's full-page ad in The *Sacramento Bee*, the revolutionary ad campaign, which has evoked obvious concern from major media outlets, has bypassed a boycott by major California papers from San Francisco to Los Angeles by saturating the Northern California area as the state's bizarre gubernatorial race intensifies.

On Sept. 19th the ad ran in The *Tri-Valley Herald* - circ. 68,591 readership of approximately 100,000.

Sept. 24th the ad ran on page 8 of the front section of The *Marin Independent Journal*, or as the locals call it, the *Marin IJ*. The paper has a circulation of 64,420 and a readership of approximately 100,000.

On Sept. 25th the ad hit the front section of The *Vallejo Times Herald* with a circulation of 38,820 and an estimated readership of 60,000.

The same day, Sept. 25th, The *Oakland Tribune* ran the ad in their front section. The *Tribune's* circulation is 119,079 readership of over 150,000.

On Sept. 26th The *Argus*, with a circulation of 33,575 and an estimated readership of 65,000, featured the ad.

Still pending as part of the same package purchased by our L.A. ad agency are runs in The *San Mateo County Times*, The *Daily Review*, and The *Vacaville Reporter*.

The ads have had an impact. According to Bay-area news sources contacted by our advertising broker (himself a former news director at a major LA-based TV station), two bay area media outlets, one AM Talk station and one AM morning television news/talk show have had spirited and detailed discussions of the ad's content according to a source at KPIX channel 5 in San Francisco.

FTW has had to adjust its strategy since the publication of an article in The *Boston Globe* last July disclosed proprietary information on how the ads were being placed at low rates. As a result of that disclosure, major papers in some cases as much as tripled or quadrupled quoted ad rates and erected serious and unfair obstacles to its publication.

Since that time the task has been to stay within budget and still reach the same markets as laid out in our original plan. That is not to say that some major papers still aren't on tap and that we won't have some big surprises. The current Northern California strategy appears to be having a synergistic effect, however, as overlapping readerships see the ad on a number of successive days. Counting The *Sacramento Bee* the northern California campaign has reached an estimated readership of almost 750,000 and is not over yet.

Stay tuned.



— From The Wilderness —

Michael C. Ruppert
Publisher/Editor

Contributing Editor----- Peter Dale Scott, Ph.D.
Contributing Editor – Energy ----- Dale Allen Pfeiffer
Office of Public Affairs----- Michael Leon

From The Wilderness is published eleven times annually.
Subscriptions are \$50 (US) for 12 issues.

From The Wilderness

P.O. Box 6061- 350, Sherman Oaks, CA 91413

www.copvcia.com

editorial: editor@copvcia.com

subscriptions and customer service:

service@copvcia.com

(818) 788-8791 * (818) 981-2847 fax

TABLE of CONTENTS

Not One Night's Sleep	1
FTW Ad Campaign Saturates Northern California	2
Imminent Peril - Part II	3
Gulf War II Syndrome?	6
Kucinich, Maloney, and Sanders Go After Cheney.....	8

© Copyright 2003, Michael C. Ruppert and *From The Wilderness Publications*, www.copvcia.com. All Rights Reserved.

REPRINT POLICY

Any story, originally published in *From The Wilderness*, more than thirty days old may be reprinted in its entirety, non-commercially, if, and only if, the author's name remains attached and the following statement appears:

"Reprinted with permission, Michael C. Ruppert and From The Wilderness Publications, www.copvcia.com, P.O. Box 6061-350, Sherman Oaks, CA, 91413. 818-788-8791. **FTW** is published monthly, annual subscriptions are \$50 per year."

THIS WAIVER DOES NOT APPLY TO PUBLICATION OF NEW BOOKS.

For reprint permission for "for profit" publication, please contact Michael Leon. For Terms and Conditions on subscriptions and the *From The Wilderness* website, please see our website at: www.fromthewilderness.com or send a self-addressed stamped envelope with the request to the above address.

Imminent Peril (Part II)

Scientists are warning that we have only one or two generations to avoid global catastrophe.

Why aren't we heeding their warnings, and what can be done?

by Dale Allen Pfeiffer, FTW Contributing Editor for Energy

[Having detailed a large body of scientific research over the course of decades that demonstrates the threat level posed by Peak Oil/Gas and diminishing energy resources, in the wake of an environment in near full revolt against Homo Sapiens, Dale Allen Pfeiffer looks at the ideological and economic barriers to implementing effective solutions. The chief culprits are a mindset locked in a belief that infinite economic growth is possible, and a sect of radical Christianity that is actively trying to bring about the "end of the world" - a sect to which George W. Bush belongs.

Beyond that, there are less offensive but no less dangerous belief systems widely accepted by liberals and progressives which do nothing to address the real problem or move toward the only solution: sustainability, reduction in consumption and some drastic changes in the way we live our lives. - MCR]

Sept 2, 2003, 1200 Hrs (FTW) -- In the first half of this article, we reviewed the unprecedented warnings issued during the past decade by the world scientific community. And we summarized the results of the first global assessment studies that were issued in just the last couple years. We learned that virtually all of the planet's major ecosystems have been stressed to the brink of collapse. And we were warned that we have only one generation, or at most two, in which to deal with these impending crises.

Why are these issues not foremost in the minds of every human being living right now? Why are we not engaged in a global dialogue to seek a solution to these problems? Next, we will turn our attention to the answer to these questions.

Mindset

The prevalent economic system is predicated on never-ending growth, where prosperity requires continuous growth in production and consumption. Under this system, this growth must take place on a planet with limited resources and carrying capacity.

Economists are completely blind to these limits. They illogically argue that as known reserves of vital resources grow short, the increasing value of the resource in question will spur the discovery of additional reserves and render previously uneconomical reserves economical. When cornered, economists point towards scientific and technological innovations that they are certain to come to our rescue. They ignore the scientists and engineers who warn that we cannot expect such breakthroughs alone to solve our problems, and argue that we need basic changes in our lifestyle. We need to wean ourselves from over-consumption, emphasizing sustainability instead.

Continuing overconsumption plays upon the intransigent nature of human behavior. Human beings are predisposed toward developing habits and comfortable patterns of behavior. That which is new is alien and suspect. Change is resisted until it becomes absolutely necessary, or until the benefits of change become obvious. Even when change is clearly beneficial or necessary, many resist, becoming obstinately and blindly reactionary instead.

The situation is further obfuscated by the media, which has tended to either ignore the scientific warnings or downplay the warnings and quickly divert the public awareness to more innocuous matters. There is a documented bias in the media towards positions favored by their owners and sponsors.¹ Whether this media bias is deliberate or systemic, the effect is a public that is uninformed or-worse-misinformed.

The problem of disinformation is largely intentional. There is a powerful disinformation industry, the purpose of which is to produce conflicting studies attacking the veracity of information that may prove harmful to moneyed interests.

Many scientists are employed for no other purpose than to contradict the work of other legitimate scientists. This tactic was pioneered by the tobacco industry², but has developed into a major industry of its own devoted to retaining the status quo in favor of major corporations. Yearly, corporations funnel millions of dollars into junk science, either directly or through conservative think tanks and foundations.^{3 4}

Practitioners of junk science are closely linked to the public relations and advertising industries. Modern advertising developed out of research into brainwashing and psychological manipulation. Edward L. Bernays, the father of the PR industry, applied the work of Freud and other psychoanalysts to the task of swaying public opinion⁵. In the last few decades, military researchers have developed computer programs that utilize artificial intelligence to mimic basic personality types. These programs can then be used to determine how to manipulate people into doing and thinking as desired.⁶ The PR industries, as

well as the major political parties and the military/intelligence establishment employ all of these techniques.⁷

The moneyed elite has a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. This is not because they are necessarily intrinsically evil people. Some actually believe they are acting for the good of all. Many believe that the less affluent classes are inferior. They believe that the masses are incapable of making their own informed decisions and must be told what to do. But most simply cannot face their own culpability. They are removed from the chain of causality between their actions and their inevitable effects. They are no more inclined to accept the responsibility for their actions than are meat eaters inclined to accept responsibility for the slaughter of the animals whose meat they purchase in the supermarket.

Returning to the reactionaries, perhaps the worst of this breed are the Christian Zionists. They are Christian fundamentalists who are actively seeking to bring about their own vision of Armageddon. According to these fanatics, once Israel reclaims all of its former territory, a massive religious war will be provoked with Jews and Christians on one side and Muslims and other unbelievers on the other side. At that point, the true believers will ascend into heaven while the antichrist and the four horsemen of the apocalypse ravage the earth. Finally, Christ will return to vanquish the antichrist and proclaim a new kingdom of God, all people will be converted to fundamentalist Christianity, and the true believers will return to govern over the kingdom of Christ.⁸

Christian Zionists are not a fringe group. They are numerous, well organized, and influential. During the Reagan years, Christian Zionists were invited to present their interpretation of the Book of Revelation at the Pentagon. Among the most notable Christian Zionists are Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson and George W. Bush. In spring of 2002, after Bush demanded that the Israelis pull back their tanks from West Bank refugee camps, Jerry Falwell led born-again Christians to flood the White House with phone calls, emails, and letters telling Bush to back off. Bush retracted his demand and the tanks rolled on.⁹

Christian reactionaries are a powerful group, and they stand opposed to the resolution of the environmental threats affecting the planet so obviously today.

There are many who view the Bush family as the ultimate cynics and argue that the Bushes may well have no God other than power. That would make Bush's "use" of these zealots even more distasteful. Yet Bush himself has demonstrated in his speeches, an outlook that he may well believe, he is "chosen". In a recent story published in Ha'aretz, Bush was quoted as telling Palestinian Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas that God had instructed him to strike at Al Q'aeda and Saddam Hussein.¹⁰

Coup and Empire

In 2000, the moneyed interests backing the George W. Bush presidential bid pulled out every stop in order to install their candidate. They outspent every other candidate from both parties. In Florida, George's brother Jeb rigged the voter lists in an effort to disenfranchise minorities and others who vote predominately democratic. As the election came down to only a few thousand votes, and Al Gore appeared likely to win in a recount, the U.S. Supreme Court-dominated by Reagan and Bush Sr. appointees-ordered that the recount cease, handing the presidency to George W. Bush. In their decision, the Supreme Court-which is supposed to set precedent in matters of constitutional law-stated that this was a one-time decision which could not be used as a precedent.¹¹

In the months following his inauguration, Bush made very clear that he had no interest in resolving environmental and social problems. His administration was packed with oil, pharmaceutical and defense industry executives. Practically the first action of his administration was to back out of the Kyoto Treaty on Global Warming. In the months ahead, he also backed out of a biological weapons treaty and sought to weaken or overturn a variety of environmental laws and legislation on everything from water and air quality to opening the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge to oil exploration.

He refused to do anything about the California energy crisis, even when it became apparent that corporations such as Enron had largely contrived the situation. Instead of launching an investigation, he and Vice-president Dick Cheney had Enron President Ken Lay and other industry insiders submit a wish list, which then served as the basis for the presidential Energy Plan.

I do not wish to imply that the situation would have been much better had Al Gore been sworn into office. Though Gore has gone to great lengths to present himself as an environmentalist, his record as Vice-president was full of compromise and watered down legislative efforts. Witness his performance at the first Kyoto conference, where he lobbied to weaken the resulting treaty on global warming. In context of the scientific warnings issued over the past decade, Al Gore appeared to be the spokesman for big business with a conscience, seeking a compromise that would not penalize the ability of corporations to generate profit by exploiting the earth's resources, nor hamper economic growth or the right of the affluent to over-consume. Cast in this same light, George W. Bush was the candidate of big business *without* a conscience.

By fall of 2001, the Bush administration had earned the animosity of most of the international community, and his popularity at home had plunged to record lows. The Democrat-controlled Congress was successfully fighting many of his proposals. His administration was dead in the water; it appeared unlikely that any of his goals would come to fruition. Had things gone on this way, in all likelihood George W. Bush would soon be facing impeachment.

There is a mountain of evidence suggesting that the Bush administration had complete foreknowledge of the attacks of 9/11. That aside, it is certain that the Bush administration, and business interests tied to it, were the big winners in that catastrophe and the subsequent anthrax attacks. Bush himself was heard to quip on the day of the attacks, "I hit the trifecta!"¹² As a result of 9/11, Bush's popularity surged to unheard-of heights. He and Dick Cheney declared a never ending "terror"

war and ramrodded legislation through Congress that negated civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution. Whatever their connection to the 9/11 attacks (and whatever the attackers might ultimately be shown to be), the Bush administration has obviously capitalized on them to push ahead a fascist and imperialist agenda both at home and abroad.

Within a month after the attacks, Bush launched a war against one of the poorest countries in the world, though a country in a commanding position with regard to the potentially energy-rich Central Asian region. This gave him command of a vital strategic position at the crossroads of Europe, Asia and the Middle East. Military units poured into the surrounding countries, as did exploration teams from the various oil majors. Yet, as the oil prospects were toned down, so was the military presence.¹³ The US had already turned its attention to the Middle East.

The US has not focused much attention on Saudi Arabia, the country of origin for Osama bin Laden and most of the attackers, and the country from which Al Qaeda receives much of its financial backing. Nor has the US turned its attention to Pakistan, which has very strong ties to both Al Qaeda and the Taliban. Instead, the US has turned its attention to the one Middle Eastern country without ties to Al Qaeda; a country which is, in fact, reviled by Al Qaeda for its secular government. It is, however, a country that holds 11% of the world's proven oil reserves: Iraq.¹⁴

Clearly, the United States is not fighting a war on terrorism. It is fighting a war of imperial conquest aimed at dominating the world through control of its energy resources. Witness the Bush administration's lack of interest in capturing Osama bin Laden. Witness the Bush administration's insistence on a war with Iraq on the basis of falsified and exaggerated "evidence". Witness that Bush has done nothing about North Korea, even though they admit that they are actively seeking nuclear weapons and will use them preemptively. Witness the Bush administration's efforts to destabilize Venezuela and support a coup in that country, though the only offense of democratically elected President Chavez is to use a portion of oil profits to help alleviate poverty within his country. Witness the Bush administration's inclination to label, as international terrorists, one faction of a long-standing civil war in Colombia, while sending military aid and military advisors to that country in an effort to beef up the policing of oil pipelines that the rebels have damaged.

What's To Come

The Bush administration is not interested in a war on terrorism. The elite interests behind the Bush administration seek to ensure their continued dominance in a world of shrinking energy resources and looming environmental catastrophes. Comparing US policy over the past decade to the four strategies analyzed in **CEO-3**¹⁵, it would appear that the US has been pursuing a Markets-First strategy, while giving a nod to the Policy-First strategy. However, since George W. Bush moved into the White House-and certainly since 9/11-the US has given up any pretense of a Policy-First strategy and is currently moving away from a Markets-First strategy to a Security-First strategy.

A Sustainability-First strategy has never received any serious consideration.

If the US continues to pursue its current strategy, then this country will become even more of a police state in every sense of the word. The privileged classes will complete their flight to guarded and gated communities, while the rest of the population will be left to contend with a collapsed economy, energy impoverishment and starvation. Civil liberties will be dismissed and the constitution retired. Anger and dissent will be met with overwhelming repression. A massive military organization will take command of the world's resources while forcing the world population to accept a harsh military justice.

As burgeoning personal debt comes crashing down on the citizens of the US, it is likely that new laws will force them into debt servitude. Indeed, as energy production diminishes some form of slavery will have to be instituted in order for the elite to retain their accustomed lifestyles. As rates of imprisonment skyrocket, prisons will be transformed to work camps where the remaining industries will have access to abundant free labor. As for the masses, both within the US and throughout the world, they will be faced with unparalleled levels of starvation and suffering.

Or, if some alliance is formed in opposition, the Christian Zionists might just get their conflagration. It is doubtful, however, that it will be the apocalypse they are seeking.

Other Options

It doesn't have to be this way. We still have the time and resources to build a better world for all of us. Compromise is not the answer, nor is a cosmetic change in the prevailing economic system. It is doubtful that regulation of market-based capitalism is viable over the long-term. Experience has shown that eventually capitalism will find some way of nullifying any imposed restrictions, and then the maximization of profit will regain preeminence over environmental and social considerations.

A sustainable society must be focused on the small scale, based on strong local communities, most likely functioning on principles of direct democracy. Local communities require localized and self-contained economies. Such economies would not be measured by growth and profit, but by sustainability and quality of life. Local transportation would return to the basics: foot, bicycles and horses. Intercommunity transport would likely consist of high-speed monorails. Intercontinental transportation would return to the high seas. Housing would be restructured for energy efficiency, possibly in conjunction with the recycling of industrial waste heat. Communities would be supported by a local agricultural base, utilizing organic and permaculture techniques. There are already working models for sustainable communities, and the movement toward sustainability is growing.

We cannot depend on our political leaders or our business leaders to walk us safely through this minefield. We need to educate ourselves and we need to organize. We must take back the reins into our own hands, and we need to move fast.

Endnotes

1. **Manufacturing Consent**, Herman, Edward & Chomsky, Noam. Pantheon Books, 1988.
2. **Tobacco Industry Efforts subverting International Agency for Research on Cancer's Second Hand Smoke Study**, Ong, Lisa & Glantz, Stanton. *Lancet*, 2000; 355: 125359. <http://www.electric-words.com/junk/glantz/glantz.html>
3. **Who Determines what is Junk Science? The Corporate Corruption of Science**, Fist, Stewart, editor. <http://www.electric-words.com/junk/junkindex.html>
4. **Trust Us, We're Experts: How Industry Manipulates Science and Gambles on Your Future**, Rampton, Sheldon & Stauber, John. Tarcher/Penguin.
5. **The Father of Spin,: Edward L. Bernays and the Birth of Public Relations**, Tye, Larry. Owl Books, 2002. See a detailed review of this book: <http://www.prwatch.org/prwissues/1999Q2/bernays.html>
6. **Profiling and Personality Simulation**, Livergood, Norman D. <http://www.hermes-press.com/program1.htm> & **Brainwashing America**, Livergood, Norman D. <http://www.hermes-press.com/brainwash1.htm>
7. **Toxic Sludge is Good for You!: Lies, Damn Lies, and the Public Relations Industry**, Stauber, John C & Rampton, Shelton. Common Courage Press, 1995.
8. **Armageddon Lobby**. <http://www.againstbombing.com/ArmageddonUpdates.htm>
9. Ibid.
10. "Roadmap is a Lifesaver for us". Ha'aretz, August 31, 2003.
11. **The Best Democracy Money Can Buy**, Palast, Greg. Plume, 2002, 2003.
12. **Remarks by the President in Texans for Rick Perry Reception**. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020614-8.html>
13. **Much Ado about Nothing-Wither the Caspian Riches**, Pfeiffer, Dale Allen. From the Wilderness, 2002. http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/120502_caspian.html
14. **US Intentions**, Pfeiffer, Dale Allen. From the Wilderness, 2003. http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/030703_us_intentions.html
15. **Global Environmental Outlook-3**. United Nations Environment Programme, May 22 2002. <http://www.grida.no/geo/geo3/>

Gulf War II Syndrome?

Military Equipment and "Pneumonia"

By Stan Goff

(This article originally appeared in Counterpunch, www.counterpunch.org - reprinted with permission, Stan Goff)

To understand the official military response to the mysterious "pneumonia" breaking out among American troops in Iraq, we have to understand that troops are equipment.

To the unremitting vexation of Donald Rumsfeld and his "network-centric" techno-groupies, troops are articles of equipment whose preparation and maintenance prove troublesome. They have to be coaxed into "service" with Army-of-One-style Madison Avenue pitches and educational bribes, enculturated to discipline and punctuality, taught how to perform their various functions, then kept in the job through a system of economic and psychological rewards. Troops are the only part of the "tables of organization and equipment" (TO&E is the military's term to describe its units, not mine) that have to be indoctrinated.

There are a couple of troublesome aspects to this for the politicians who control the military. First, troops are not equipment. Second, indoctrination narratives are perishable as circumstances change.

I tend to harp about this, having been military for so long and now being a very politically active leftist, but no member of the armed forces is ever transformed into the unthinking, unfeeling, lethal robot that thrills the right and haunts the left. These men and women start and end as human beings exactly like all of us. They experience the same range of emotions, desire the same outlets for their creativity, seek the same human companionship, and are driven by the same intellectual curiosity. They are not computers that can be programmed. They feel loneliness, awe, pain, lust, confusion, mirth, dread, appetites, and obsessions just like every last one of us, and they exist in the same uncontrollable mix of potentially subversive facts that we do. They are the same combination of goal-directed willfulness and unmanaged acting-out as the rest of us. They are part of the same system as you and me, in which Wal-Mart workers and soldiers are both necessary and expendable. Like the rest of us, they can also get mad when they find they've been had.

They have to be given a special status, reinforced by popular media, that equates their subservience to heroism. They are dressed up in crisp uniforms so they can be properly recognized and adored, and rewarded with colorful medals and badges

that hang like fetishes all over those uniforms, and convinced that they are serving some sacred purpose even when they are only slaking Wall Street and the Dollar with their blood and sweat.

Troops might be bewildered, as we all are, by ideologies of chauvinism, consumerism, gender, and so on, but they're still exposed to all that contradictory stuff that life presents them. In fact, troops are often exposed more directly to the charlatan character of official horseshit than the rest of us. As middle class white America comforts itself with the cake-and-ice-cream of 'liberation' in Iraq, for example, the troops who are the instruments of this wretched folly are confronted each day with the generalized hostility of an occupied people, and with the glaring fact that their senior officers--whom they've been told to trust as leaders--are now professional hucksters assisting with the sale of war to voters and taxpayers.

What troops often haven't had yet, and what many don't have until after their tours of duty, is the epiphany that they are equipment. Equipment with an expiration date.

The Department of Defense does not care if a soldier retires and dies three weeks later. In fact, the Veterans Administration bean counters would see that as positive. The Department of Defense does not care if a soldier who was getting out anyway, finishes his or her three or four year hitch, then comes down with mysterious and debilitating ailments, as long as that ailment can plausibly be denied as "service-connected." Note how many millions have been spent by the US government to deny that Gulf War Syndrome existed, and how hard they've fought liability for Agent Orange.

Now there is a "pneumonia" breaking out among the troops, which may very well be related to inhalation of microscopic particles of the highly toxic and radioactive depleted uranium, a heavy-metal slag used in another bit of expendable military equipment, US anti-tank ammunition.

The press, as per standing operating procedure, is collaborating with the Department of Defense in completely evading the possibility of DU as a causative agent for the respiratory malady that has already killed two perfectly healthy young men and has dozens of others hospitalized with some on ventilators. *CNN's* medical reporter, Dr. Sanjay Gupta, has made the claim that the morbidity rate is average for the population, a claim copied directly from the Defense Department playbook. This idiotic assertion, of course, accepts the premise that this is one of the communicable pneumonias we all know and love, in the face of clear evidence to the contrary. There are no disease clusters to indicate that an organism is responsible for the problem at all, but this doesn't stop the spin machine.

Two of the over 100 cases have shown strep, and this is boldly emphasized while the fact that ONLY two have shown strep (which could very well be coincidental or opportunistic infections) is underplayed. And the boilerplate pre-emptive argument against toxic exposure as the source of this outbreak is that there is "no evidence of toxic or chemical exposure." What is not stated is that when the most obvious etiology is deliberately overlooked, the "evidence" is unlikely to appear on its own. The military made its mind up some time ago that DU is not toxic or carcinogenic--flying directly in the face of scientific fact as effortlessly as the military's political bosses stated the bogus case of al Qaeda-Iraq connections and WMD's.

The target audience for this kind of chicanery is generally the US civilian population, but in this case it is also the troops themselves. They cannot be allowed to develop a preoccupation about the very dust they are relentlessly exposed to every day, because that might degrade their ability to perform their primary functions.

Whether or not this deadly inflammation is the result of DU or some other environmental hazard, the troops are being exposed to DU and a lot more nasty shit every day, just like the troops from Desert Storm and its aftermath, and they will likely eventually be disabled at more or less the same rates--that would be upwards of 40 percent. Troops have become a target audience for the pneumonia spin, because their expiration dates are any time after Uncle Sam can extricate himself from this tar baby he has encountered in Iraq. Until then, just to cope with this arrogant overreach, Bushfeld is offering bribes all over the world for spare troops and activating the Individual Ready Reserve--a measure normally associated with direct defense of the nation or general war.

In March the sandstorms dead-lined their helicopters. Now something is dead-lining the troops. But the troops are NOT equipment, in spite of what Donald Rumsfeld and his whole techno-fascist entourage might like. We can tell them--and I am telling them--you are being had.

Stan Goff is the author of "**Hideous Dream: A Soldier's Memoir of the US Invasion of Haiti**" (Soft Skull Press, 2000) and of the upcoming book "Full Spectrum Disorder" (Soft Skull Press, 2003). He is a member of the **BRING THEM HOME NOW!** coordinating committee, a retired Special Forces master sergeant, and the father of an active duty soldier. Email for BRING THEM HOME NOW! is bthn@mfsso.org.

Goff can be reached at: sherrynstan@igc.org



Kucinich, Maloney and Sanders Go After Cheney

[Sept 25 , 2003 1530 PDT (FTW) -- The heat is building to dump Cheney for the 2004 Presidential race. Under fire for continuing compensation from Halliburton and for a fistful of lies about Iraq , the evidence is building solidly and the heat being placed on the Vice President is building up. We hope this effort continues and grows stronger in the coming months. Special thanks to TRUTHOUT (www.truthout.org) for bringing this letter to light. And special praise to Dennis Kucinich who is running much stronger in the hearts and minds of the people than FOX, ABC, or any other media organ will acknowledge. Representatives Kucinich, Maloney and Sanders are members of the Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations. Kucinich is the ranking member. - MCR]

Wednesday 17 September 2003

The Honorable Dick Cheney
Vice President
Office of the Vice President of the United States
Eisenhower Executive Office Building
Washington , DC 20501

Dear Mr. Vice President:

On July 21, 2003 , we sent a letter to you inquiring about your role in the dissemination of the disinformation that Iraq purchased uranium from Niger. We asked you ten questions relating to your direct personal visits to CIA 's Iraq analysts; your request for an investigation of the Niger uranium claim that resulted in an investigation by a former U.S. ambassador, and your several high-profile public assertions about Iraq's alleged pursuit of nuclear weapons. To date, we have not received your response to our inquiries.

Since our last letter to you, you spoke at the American Enterprise Institute and once again made reference to the already proven false assertion that Iraq was reconstituting its nuclear weapons program. In order to legitimize the war, you cited findings listed in the National Intelligence Estimate (NIE), some of which had been refuted months before you cited them.

Most recently, on September 14, 2003 , after almost a year of repeating the claim, you finally admitted the inaccuracy of your previous assertions on Iraq 's nuclear capabilities when you appeared on *Meet the Press*. The chronology shows that you knew or should have known that the claim was false when you first made it on *Meet the Press* in March 2003. We would like to inquire as to why your admission took so long to be made publicly. We would also like answers to our previous questions about your role in the dissemination of the nuclear uranium claim.

I. Concerning "unusual" personal visits by the Vice President to CIA analysts.

According to The *Washington Post*, June 5, 2003 , you made "multiple" "unusual" visits to CIA to meet directly with Iraq analysts. The *Post* reported: "Vice President Cheney and his most senior aide made multiple trips to the CIA over the past year to question analysts studying Iraq's weapons programs."

These visits were unprecedented. Normally, Vice Presidents, yourself included, receive regular briefings from CIA in your office and have a CIA officer on permanent detail. In other words, there is no reason for the Vice President to make personal visits to CIA analysts. According to the *Post*, your unprecedented visits created "an environment in which some analysts felt they were being pressured to make their assessments fit with the Bush administration's policy objectives."

On '*Meet the Press*' on Sunday September 14, 2003, you dismissed The *Washington Post* article by suggesting that your frequent trips to the CIA were because of a longtime interest of yours in the field of intelligence. You also denied that your visits to the CIA had any impact on the changing of intelligence:

"In terms of asking questions, I plead guilty. I ask a hell of a lot of questions. That's my job. I've had an interest in the intelligence area since I worked for Gerry Ford 30 years ago, served on the Intel Committee in the House for years in the '80s, ran a big part of the intelligence community when I was secretary of Defense in the early '90s...Shouldn't be any pressure. I can't think of a single instance. Maybe somebody can produce one. I'm unaware of anywhere the community changed a judgment that they made because I asked questions."

Questions:

- 1) How many visits did you and your chief of staff make to CIA to meet directly with CIA analysts working on Iraq ?
- 2) What was the purpose of each of these visits?
- 3) Did you ever meet with CIA analysts working on other intelligence matters, such as Al Qaeda?
- 4) Did you or a member of your staff at any time request or demand rewriting of intelligence assessments concerning the existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq ?

II. Concerning a request by the Vice President to investigate intelligence of Niger uranium sale, revealing forgery one year ago.

This alleged sale of uranium to Iraq by Niger was critical to the administration's case that Iraq was reconstituting a nuclear weapons program. During the period of time you reportedly paid visits to CIA, you also requested that CIA investigate intelligence that purported to show Iraqi pursuit of uranium from Niger, and your office received a briefing on the investigation. According to *The New York Times* of May 6, 2003, "more than a year ago the vice president's office asked for an investigation of the uranium deal, so a former U.S. Ambassador to Africa was dispatched to Niger."

The ambassador "reported to the CIA and State Department that the information was unequivocally wrong and that the documents had been forged," according to the *Times*. Indeed, that former U.S. Ambassador, Joseph Wilson, wrote in *The New York Times*, July 6, 2003, "The vice president's office asked a serious question. We were asked to help formulate the answer. We did so, and we have every confidence that the answer we provided was circulated to the appropriate officials within our government."

Moreover, your chief of staff, Mr. Libby, told Time magazine this week that you did in fact express interest in the report to the CIA briefer. Our understanding is that Standard Operating Procedure is that if a principal asks about a report, he is given a specific answer.

On *Meet the Press* on Sunday September 14, 2003, contrary to Ambassador Wilson and Mr. Libby, you denied receiving Ambassador Wilson's findings in February, or March of 2002. You also denied sending Ambassador Wilson to look into the claim.

"I don't know Joe Wilson. I've never met Joe Wilson... I get a daily brief on my own each day before I meet with the president to go through the intel. And I ask lots of question. One of the questions I asked at that particular time about this, I said, "What do we know about this?" They take the question. He came back within a day or two and said, "This is all we know. There's a lot we don't know," end of statement... And Joe Wilson -- I don't who sent Joe Wilson."

Questions:

5) Who in the office of Vice President was informed of the contents of Ambassador Wilson's report?

6) When did you personally become informed of Ambassador Wilson's findings?

7) If the staff who took your question said, "This is all we know. There's a lot we don't know", why did you continue to use the shaky uranium claim in your public statements over the past year?

8) What efforts were made by your office to disseminate the findings of Ambassador Wilson's investigation to the President, National Security Adviser, and Secretary of Defense?

III. Speech by the Vice President to the American Enterprise Institute on July 25, 2003

In a speech to the American Enterprise Institute on July 25, 2003, you read from several sections of the October 2002 National Intelligence Estimate (NIE). You said that the Administration could not ignore the findings in the NIE because doing so would be irresponsible. You said:

Those charged with the security of this nation could not read such an assessment and pretend that it did not exist. Ignoring such information, or trying to wish it away, would be irresponsible in the extreme. And our President did not ignore that information -- he faced it... Against this background, to disregard the NIE's warnings would have been irresponsible in the extreme. And our President did not ignore that information -- he faced it, and acted to remove the danger.

You cited the following sections of NIE as findings the President could not ignore:

"Baghdad has chemical and biological weapons, as well as missiles with ranges in excess of U.N. restrictions. If left unchecked, it probably will have a nuclear weapon during this decade... Since inspections ended in 1998, Iraq has maintained its chemical weapons effort, energized its missile program, and invested more heavily in biological weapons; in the view of most agencies, Baghdad is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program... Iraq is continuing, and in some areas expanding, its chemical, biological, nuclear and missile programs contrary to U.N. Resolutions."

What is concerning about your speech is that in your attempt to legitimize the cause for war with Iraq, you cited intelligence listed in the National Intelligence Estimate that had already been refuted before you spoke. Even more disturbing is that it was your office, the Office of the Vice President, that learned of the false uranium story seven months before the NIE was written and issued in October 2002.

Furthermore, questions have been raised about the intent of the drafting of the NIE document. Former CIA -analyst Ray McGovern, in an article printed in *The Miami Herald* on August 8, 2003 wrote:

Start with the fact that there was no NIE before the decision for war last summer. Such decisions are supposed to be based on the conclusions of NIEs, not the other way around. This time the process was reversed... The marketing rollout for the war was keynoted by the vice president, who in a shrill speech on Aug. 26 charged, "Saddam has resumed his efforts to acquire nuclear weapons." ANIE was then ordered up, essentially to support the extreme judgments voiced by Cheney, and its various drafts were used effectively to frighten members of Congress into voting to authorize war.

Because it appears as if the NIE may have been drafted so as to support certain claims for the war in Iraq, using it as a supporting document for intelligence that the President "could not ignore" is misleading and irresponsible.

9) Since your address to the AEI was delivered several months after the nuclear uranium claim had been disputed, on what basis did you make the claim that the President "could not ignore" the false nuclear findings in the NIE?

IV. Assertions by the Vice President and other high-ranking members of the Administration claiming Iraqi nuclear

weapons program.

The President's erroneous reference to the faked Niger uranium sale in his State of the Union address was only one example of a pattern of similar assertions by high-ranking members of the administration, including you. The assertion was made repeatedly in the administration's campaign to win congressional approval of military action against Iraq .

For instance, you said to the 103rd National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on August 26, 2002, "they [the Iraqi regime] continue to pursue the nuclear program they began so many years ago... we now know that Saddam has resumed his efforts to acquire nuclear weapons... Should all his ambitions be realized... [he could] subject the United States or any other nation to nuclear blackmail."

In sworn testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, just weeks before the House of Representatives voted to authorize military action against Iraq , Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld testified on September 18, 2002 :

"He [Saddam]... is pursuing nuclear weapons. If he demonstrates the capability to deliver them to our shores, the world would be changed. Our people would be at great risk. Our willingness to be engaged in the world, our willingness to project power to stop aggression, our ability to forge coalitions for multilateral action, could all be under question. And many lives could be lost."

Questions:

10) Since your address to the VFW occurred nearly 7 months after Ambassador Wilson reported his findings to the CIA and State Department, what evidence did you have for the assertion that Iraq was continuing "to pursue the nuclear program" and that Saddam had "resumed his efforts to acquire nuclear weapons"?

11) Since the Secretary of Defense testified to Congress that Iraq was "pursuing nuclear weapons" nearly 8 months after Ambassador Wilson's briefing to CIA and the State Department, what effort did you make to determine what evidence the Secretary of Defense had for his assertion to Congress?

Further refutation of the authenticity of the forged Niger documents came from IAEA Director General ElBaradei, when he reported to the U.N. Security Council on March 7, 2003 : "These documents, which formed the basis for reports of recent uranium transactions between Iraq and Niger, are in fact not authentic. We have therefore concluded that these specific allegations are unfounded... we have found no evidence or plausible indication of the revival of a nuclear weapons programme in Iraq ." Yet on March 16 -- nine days afterwards -- you again repeated the unfounded assertion on national television (*Meet the Press*, Sunday, March 16, 2003). You said:

"We think Mr. ElBaradei frankly is wrong," and "We believe [Saddam] has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons."

On September 14, 2003 , after almost a year of repeating the nuclear claim, you finally retracted your position on Iraq's nuclear capabilities when you appeared on *Meet the Press*. When asked about your March 16, 2003 *Meet the Press* interview in which you accused Mohammed ElBaradei of being wrong about Iraq not having reconstituted its nuclear weapons program, you said:

"Yeah. I did misspeak. I said repeatedly during the show weapons capability. We never had any evidence that he had acquired a nuclear weapon."

Question:

12) What accounts for the length of time it took you to publicly retract the Niger uranium claim?

We hope you will take the opportunity to answer these questions about your role in the dissemination of false information about Iraq's nuclear program to justify the war in Iraq. We look forward to a response.

Sincerely,
Dennis J. Kucinich
Ranking Minority Member
Subcommittee on National Security,
Emerging Threats and International Relations

Carolyn B. Maloney
Member
Ranking Minority Member
Subcommittee on National Security,
Emerging Threats and International Relations

Bernie Sanders
Member
Ranking Minority Member
Subcommittee on National Security,
Emerging Threats and International Relations

(continued from page 1, Not One Night's Sleep)

It is difficult to sit and write a comprehensive story in the few hours I have since my return from New York before I board another plane for Seattle and the production of a new CD covering the extraordinary developments of the last year. But I have acquired a new and important perspective since leaving for Berlin on September 3.

If I leave out a few names or neglect to give credit where credit is due, it is not for any other reason than the fact that there are so many who deserve credit, in so many places, that neither my pen nor my tape recorder can capture them all. Yet it is critical to note that many of these events, especially the ones in Berlin, happened only as a result of the opened pockets of private individuals and the tireless labor of unpaid volunteers. One German, Mr. Ronald Thoden, was responsible for the airfare that brought McKinney, American journalist Daniel Hopsicker, British author Nafeez Ahmed and me to that historic city. He paid for our hotel rooms, the rental of the halls and equipment, and the forum that made Germany and the world listen. He stands as a shining representative of all the people who have, in virtual anonymity, voted with their money to keep freedom and dissent alive. In New York, the sponsorship of radio station WBAI was augmented by organization from Unanswered Questions and 911 Citizen'sWatch along with the efforts of dozens of volunteers to effectively demonstrate that a sizeable segment of the American population are, in spite of media claims to the contrary, willing to aggressively fight to make 9/11 an issue for as long as is necessary to prove and address the crime. For it is September 11, 2001 that has been the singular defining moment of the 21st century.

BERLIN

9/11 has a special significance in Germany for many reasons. Mohammed Atta and members of his cell were recruited and operated for some time in Hamburg. Dan Hopsicker (<http://www.madcowprod.com/>) has done a masterful job of investigating and deconstructing the official legend of Mohammed Atta and the members of his cell. They banked at German banking giant Deustchebank.



Sept. 7 - **FTW** Editor Mike Ruppert and British author Nafeez Ahmed review the watershed *Guardian* editorial by former British Cabinet Minister Michael Meacher stating that the Bush Administration facilitated the 9/11 attacks and that the overriding motive was Peak Oil.

Immediately after 9/11, Ernst Welteke the President of Germany's state bank, the Bundesbank, confirmed that massive insider trading across the world's financial markets had occurred right before 9/11, in stocks that were devastated by the attacks. Then German cabinet minister Andreas von Bulow declared shortly thereafter that the global value of insider trading had possibly exceeded \$100 billion and that the US government had deliberately allowed the attacks to happen as a pretext for conquest of the oil-rich territories of the Caspian basin and the Middle East. Von Bulow was qualified to speak on this issue. His portfolio had included supervision of the German intelligence service -- the BND -- which had issued a number of strong and very clear warnings to the CIA that hijacked airliners were going to be crashed into the World Trade Center in the week of September 9th.

Also in Germany, and visible from my hotel, was the German Reichstag, the 1933 burning of which had given Adolf Hitler grounds to seize unprecedented power. Not for one second did any German or foreign participant in these 9/11 events forget that this symbolism was close at hand.



Sept. 7 -Former GA Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney delivers keynote address at Berlin's Tempodrome for the German 9-11 event.

On September 5 th , Cynthia McKinney and I held a press conference in downtown Berlin that was attended by some of the largest media outlets in Germany including German national television, *Reuters*, major Berlin newspapers and radio stations. We were treated with respect and the questions posed were intelligent and showed that the reporters had done their homework. Though we did not see much air time or ink as a result, it was clear that posing questions about 9/11 was no longer in the same category as discussions of a flat earth or Elvis sightings. We were being taken seriously.

That night we spoke together at the Neurotitan gallery, a dark and unfinished place located behind a "radical alternative bookstore where floors of bare cement, littered with the debris of artwork intersected with unfinished plaster walls, glazed windows, dim lights, dark corners and the faint smell of revolutionary thought and passion." Many in the cramped audience of about 100 were pierced, tattooed and leathered while others were dressed in the upscale casual attire of middle class professionals. There, after opening remarks from McKinney remembering darker days of American history in which much greater figures like Martin Luther King struggled to bring a cause to life, I presented a 90 minute updated version of my lecture, *The Truth and Lies of 9/11*. As with all of my previous lectures, more than 30 in six countries, the reception was very enthusiastic and little different from the responses I had previously received in Canada, Australia, the Netherlands, Mexico, the Dominican Republic, the US, or in Paris where I discussed *FTW's* research with politicians and energy experts last May.

On the 6th, I collaborated with Nicholas Levis of Berlin and New York, the emcee and wrangler for our Berlin events, Dan



Sept. 7 -Mike Ruppert delivers opening remarks at Tempodrome. Later in the day Mike presented a 90 minute lecture in the main hall.



Sept. 11 - Morning. Before beginning the first of many TV and print interviews, Cynthia McKinney and Mike Ruppert examine the original *Guardian* editorial of Michael Meacher. Seated at right, Kyle Hence of Unanswered Questions.

Hopsicker, German author Mathias Bröcker and three German researchers. Together we prepared a list of witnesses and documents that needed to be thoroughly examined to resolve the glaring inconsistencies in the Bush administration's story. On September 11th -- as I was preparing to speak in New York -- the German 911 Truth Alliance and The German 9/11 Research Network (www.911truth.org) presented formal letters to the government asking for responses. This made news throughout the country and the letter's contents were published in detail.

Throughout our collaborations that day, and in the public events that followed in both Germany and New York, all the experts gave praise to professor Michel Chossudovsky of the University of Ottawa for his many contributions to our collective knowledge. Of particular significance was his detailed work on direct links between the Pakistani intelligence service, Mohammed Atta and key figures in the US like DCI George Tenet, Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage and the heads of both US congressional intelligence committees.

September 6th also brought an early Christmas present. Britain's *The Guardian* published an op-ed by former British Minister for the Environment Michael Meacher. Meacher had resigned months ago over the Blair government's fraudulent "sexed up" intelligence, and its obsequious backing of Bush, Rumsfeld, Cheney, Wolfowitz and Powell. Titled "The War on Terrorism is Bogus", Meacher's full-page missive stated that the US government had facilitated the 9/11 attacks, refused to respond to detailed, credible warnings, and went further by adding that the motive was to control diminishing world oil supplies. Had Mr. Meacher asked me to write an article for him I could not have written it better or said more. As McKinney and I read the essay, we realized that we had indeed come a long way.

On September 7th, a capacity crowd of approximately 700 people showed up for the main event at Berlin's Tempodrome amphitheater. Nafeez Ahmed, author of the book "The War on Freedom" flew in from London, and Italian prosecuting magistrate Guido Salvini, who had previously proven US intelligence connections to alleged terror attacks in Italy, joined us. Experts from four countries had come together over 9/11 and a second press conference was filled with reporters from all over Germany and included the German Bureau Chief of *The Wall Street Journal*.



Sept. 11 - Evening. The main main 9-11 event featured an all-star panel of presenters including former CIA analyst Ray McGovern (L), Ruppert (C), and McKinney (R).

Presentations in smaller conference rooms were filled to capacity. Panels in the main hall, where I again delivered a 90-minute slide presentation on 9/11, were also jammed and interest remained intense throughout the nine-hour event. In her keynote address, Cynthia McKinney again harkened back to the turbulent days of the 1960s as civil rights and the Vietnam War roused an activist spirit throughout America and the world. She told the German audience that it was of vital importance for everyone to ask questions and to not be satisfied with pat answers. Most importantly, she said, it was imperative that diverse groups come together to form alliances from all over the world because this was truly what made change possible.

New York would make her very happy indeed.

NEW YORK

I arrived in New York late in the afternoon of September 10th. There was time to eat, sleep a little at the home of volunteer Michael Kane and his family, and then prepare for the big day. The first stop was the Walker Stage near Ground Zero where McKinney and I taped an interview moderated by Kyle Hince of Unanswered Questions. Neither she nor I minced any words. McKinney's focus was what had happened to the country in terms of civil rights and the climate that had come to dominate American politics since the 2000 presidential election. She expressed strong concern for a new generation of wounded veterans; mistreated, misled, and abused as well as for the innocent non-combatants who were dying in Afghanistan, Iraq, and in lesser-acknowledged conflicts around the world. She repeated her public questions about 9/11 which had caused such a furor a year and a half ago. It was those questions that had mobilized a massive campaign by Republican Party operatives and pro-Israeli financial interests (as acknowledged by *The Washington Post*) to unseat her. I forcefully repeated all of the arguments we have so painstakingly documented at *FTW* showing that the Bush administration had been criminally complicit in facilitating the attacks two years ago and I emphasized the fact that Peak Oil and its effects were becoming harder and harder to hide as witnessed by the massive blackout that has recently crippled that great city.

There to film me at the Walker Stage was an A Team production crew from the *Canadian Broadcasting Company*, well into work on a major documentary about 9/11. I had spoken with the producer, Bruce Livesey, several times from California and had been surprised to hear him acknowledge the accuracy of my research. He had also found material that corroborated my controversial work in the case of Delmart "Mike" Vreeland. Vreeland, who had claimed to be a US Naval officer, while



Sept 11 - The turnout at The Riverside Church was estimated at between 900-1,100. 200 additional spectators filled an overflow room.

incarcerated in a Canadian jail, had written a note warning of the attacks a month before they took place. He had also provided startlingly accurate details about the murder of Canadian intelligence operative Mark Bastien even before the facts were known to the Canadian government. Bastien's murder occurred well after Vreeland had left Moscow in 2000.

I will be eager to see their finished product.

Another gratifying moment came when the *CBC* took me to Ground Zero to shoot footage of me looking at a place I had visited twice before. As I was leaning over a railing, looking down into the still-stark ruins with the *CBC* crew filming me, a New Yorker leaned over and asked me who I was. I told him and I told him what I thought had happened. Without hesitation, the man, who had been there on that fateful day, said that he absolutely believed my analysis and thanked me for being there.

Times have indeed changed.

We next went to the Radisson Hotel where the *CBC* crew filmed an hour and a half interview with me. After that, it was off to the Riverside Church where Dick Cheney had, just hours before, spoken at an event sponsored by the New York City Port Authority. The network vans were packing up to leave as we arrived. They had no interest in what was planned for later that night. It was their loss. As it turned out, press from several countries including Greece was there, along with the *CBC* and representatives from influential magazines like *Harper's*.

Estimates of the crowd size varied from 950 to over 1,200. Not a single seat was available in the main hall. An overflow room held another 200. Cameras were everywhere and a kind of energy, eager for expression, that I had not experienced before was thick in the crowd. Prayers were offered by Rabbi Michael Feinberg; Muslim Imam Dr. Faiz Khan who, as an Emergency Room physician in Brooklyn, had treated many victims on that deadly day; and the Pastor of the Riverside Church, Reverend James Fitzgerald.

It was a busy night. Again, the workhorse Kyle Hence, who has worked closely with victim families acted as moderator for films by (among others) veteran Canadian journalist and commentator Barrie Zwicker and multiple Emmy award winner Danny Schechter. The now-infamous *Guerilla News Network* production "Aftermath" aroused the crowd and prepped it for the panel discussion that all had come to see.

Showtime

The main event was a panel of experts including McKinney, retired veteran CIA analyst Ray McGovern, veteran activist and researcher John Judge, Schechter, and me. It was not important that each of us agreed totally with the analyses and work of the others. No one was asked, nor expected, to compromise their positions and the event made no attempt to forge a perfect consensus. To have done that would have been to destroy the perfection of the consensus that already existed. What had brought us there together was a shared belief and commitment that the government of the United States was totally out of control and that it had, in just three years, brought the nation and the planet itself to the brink of disintegration and chaos.

Many were surprised that I sat next to a veteran CIA official, I who have spent twenty-five years opposing the CIA. Even as I have written that I believe that the CIA is fighting back, for motives other than a complete rectification of the ills which now eat at the world like a bioweapon gone mad. It was not a surprise to me, however. I have always recognized and praised honorable behavior whether among criminals, soldiers, government officials, journalists or private citizens. Everyone has a constituency and none of us are ever divorced from our roots. McGovern's scathing, penetrating, and meticulous deflowering of the neocon modus operandi vis a vis Iraq was a wonderful start. And just recently, he has written in some detail about the pre-9/11 briefings given to George W. Bush that have been classified and censored.

McGovern went further than ever when he spoke about the administration's exploitation of 9/11. While not saying outright that the administration knew about the attacks and allowed them to happen, even facilitating them, he implied it. The administration has a lot to hide, he said. He went on to say that Dick Cheney had a lot of chutzpah to show up at the Riverside Church calling him a "Meister of cover up and pointing out that he had turned the FBI loose to intimidate and silence the congressional committees charged with FBI oversight. He labeled the explanation that incompetence within the government had allowed the attacks to succeed as "charitable."

John Judge elaborated of his lifetime of experience in and around the Pentagon; his first-hand knowledge of surface to air missiles installed within the building and spoke of his work in researching the million holes in the government's position. He brought belly laughs to the crowd when he observed, "We're spending a lot of money trying to develop a constitution for Iraq. Why don't we just send them ours? It's a good one and we aren't using it anymore."

When it was my turn to speak I made it clear that I would always be the "pit bull" on 9/11, and that I would never be satisfied with any explanation that fell short of complete government foreknowledge, criminal involvement and full participation as an accomplice and principal in those attacks. This brought one of the largest ovations of the night, but not the largest. I held up an original page from Britain's *The Guardian* containing the Meacher essay, and then dryly observed that in the case of Meacher, as it had been with Andreas von Bulow in Germany, the organs of government were quick to state that these cabinet ministers were unbalanced. Then I noted that we had all gathered that night because of some other cabinet ministers who were unbalanced, and that their names were Powell, Cheney and Ashcroft.

The biggest thunder came as I paid homage to and introduced Cynthia McKinney. Because it was she who had opened her mouth to ask questions, who had taken the best shots the government and the press could throw and yet not only was she still standing, she had become a recognized world leader of a protest movement. Before getting up to speak, I leaned over to



Sept 11 - Ruppert delivers his opening remarks before introducing McKinney as “the former and next” Representative of the 4th District of Georgia.



Sept 11 - The crowd at Riverside Church cheered enthusiastically and frequently interrupted remarks from McKinney. The only member of the US Congress to have openly questioned the official events of 9/11.

her and asked her permission to say something special. She said go ahead.

At the end of my remarks I said, "It is my great privilege and a very special pleasure to introduce someone who is not only a friend but a great leader who has inspired us all, the former, *and the next*, representative from the 4th district of Georgia, the honorable Cynthia McKinney."

The building vibrated with cheers as the sound meters on TV and radio recording equipment blasted into the red. A thousand people leapt to their feet and the cheering did not subside for several minutes.

McKinney was gracious and powerful in her remarks. She laughingly blamed me, and ***From The Wilderness***, for getting her into trouble. She thanked John Judge for his past assistance and support in her investigation of the assassination of Martin Luther King. She praised Ray McGovern and everyone who had worked so hard to force 9/11 into the public consciousness. She thanked WBAI for sponsoring the event and Kyle Hence for organizing it. She acknowledged the foreign press and the incredible support she felt whenever she was in New York. And even though she did not announce her candidacy, she subtly reminded all of us that it would take all of us to get her back into Congress. Then she left no doubt about what she would do when she got back there.

The significance of this unity between varying organizations and groups with sometimes differing positions and which had sometimes competed was important to her. She remembers well the COINTELPRO program of the 1960s and 1970s, which was run by the government to create divisiveness among groups that could challenge the elites if united. She knows that the number-one priority of the FBI then was to prevent any alliance between blacks and whites or any unity between various elements that are most-often labeled as progressive.

She concluded her remarks by saying, "The nightmare of the people who are in power is that we could come together like this. Let's not let them have one night's sleep, not one night's sleep until we have thrown them out, until we have gotten our answers and until we have won the victory."

There was a remarkable lesson in that. It is time for all of us who have worked on 9/11 to see that something powerful has changed. Events following the 9/11 anniversary featuring McKinney, Wayne Madsen, Greg Palast, and Catherine Austin Fitts continued for three days.

Probably fifty researchers, writers, and activists have published and spoken out about 9/11. We all started from the same starting line. On September 11, 2001, ***FTW*** had 900 subscribers. Today we have 10,000. What has happened is that each of these people made a number of choices about what evidence was most important; how to present it; what would resonate as effective issues in the mind of the general public; and what future events would bring. With varying degrees of accuracy, professionalism and skill; with differing measures of commitment, intelligence, endurance and fortitude they have, like primary contenders in a presidential election year, weeded themselves, honed their skills, toughened themselves, learned and improved. The cream has risen to the top.

I could take great pride in being labeled "The Godfather of the 9/11 movement" by *Guerilla News Network* but that would miss the most important point entirely. The question now is not about one point of view being co-opted or muted, or about the supremacy of any one individual or group. The real issue is whether the likes of Michel Chossudovsky, Nafeez Ahmed, Dan Hopsicker, John Judge, Mathias Bröcker, Ray McGovern, Kyle Hence, Wayne Madsen, Cynthia McKinney and I can continue the fight together in a way that guarantees that the Bush administration, and any administration that follows it, will not sleep soundly for one minute until they give the American people and the people of the world the truth and are held accountable for their actions.

