

9/11 Foreknowledge and “Intelligence Failures”: “Revealing the Lies” on 9/11 Perpetuates the “Big Lie”

By [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)

Global Research, September 14, 2022
10 May 2004

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Terrorism](#)
In-depth Report: [AFGHANISTAN](#), [IRAQ](#)
[REPORT](#), [THE BALKANS](#)

Author's Note

The following article, first published in May 2004, was part of my keynote presentation at the opening plenary session to the International Citizens Inquiry into 9/11. Toronto, 25-30 March 2004.

The main thrust of this 2004 analysis was that the issue of “foreknowledge of the 9/11 attacks” was a “red herring” which has contributed to sustaining the “Big Lie”.

“Foreknowledge of the attacks” and “failure to act” uphold the notion that the terrorist attacks (“act of war”) “waged by Muslims against America” are “real”, when all the facts and findings ultimately point towards coverup and complicity at the highest levels of the US government.

Richard Clarke who at the time was in charge of counter-terrorism on the White House National Security Council “apologized” to the American people and the families of the victims.

Clarke hinted to “intelligence failures” in the months leading up to 9/11: Had the White House acted in a responsible fashion, had they taken the intelligence briefings seriously, 3000 lives could have been saved on September 11, 2001.

According to Richard Clarke, Bush and the White House intelligence team ignored these warnings.

In a recent statement on PBS (August 2011), Clarke accused former CIA Director George Tenet and two other CIA officials, Cofer Black and Richard Blee of “deliberately withholding critical intelligence” concerning the 9/11 attacks. The latter pertained to information regarding two of the alleged hijackers of American Airlines Flight 77, Al-Hazmi and Al-Mihdhar.

Compare Richard Clarke’s recent statements [2011] with regard to foreknowledge and “intelligence failures” to those of 2004. Déjà Vu? Red Herring?

What this August 2011 statement suggests is that the Bush administration was responsible for “intelligence failures” rather than coverup and treason.

Clarke's statements sustain the "Al Qaeda Legend", namely that Muslim hijackers were behind the attacks and that the information withheld by CIA Director George Tenet had not been made available to the White House and the US Congress.

Clarke hints that if this information had been made available, the attacks might have been prevented.

Clarke's statements both then and now are supportive of the "Global War on Terrorism" Consensus.

Bear in mind that Richard Clarke was part of an intelligence team which covertly supported Al Qaeda operatives in the Balkans throughout the 1990s. Moreover, amply documented, the Islamic brigades and Al Qaeda including the madrassahs and the CIA sponsored training camps in Afghanistan are a creation of the CIA. The Taliban were "graduates" of the madrassahs, which formed a US sponsored government in 1996.

Clarke's statements while challenging the role of the CIA, tends to sustain the Big Lie.

The official narrative remains intact. It assumes an Al Qaeda sponsored attack on America rather than a controlled demolition, as documented by Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth.

The debate launched by Clarke is a subtle form of propaganda. It blames the CIA, which had "foreknowledge" of the attacks.

It centers on whether the Bush administration and the CIA were responsible for an "intelligence failure", a "dereliction of duty" or sheer "incompetence."

In all three cases, the Al Qaeda Legend and "the threat of Islamic terrorists" remains unchallenged.

The Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) remains functionally intact.

The foreknowledge debate cum "intelligence failure" debate sustains the "Big Lie"....

Michel Chossudovsky, Global Research, September 11, 2011, September 14, 2022

"Revealing the Lies" on 9/11 Perpetuates the "Big Lie"

by Michel Chossudovsky

www.globalresearch.ca May 27, 2004

The original url of this article is: <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO404C.html>

The Bush administration had numerous intelligence warnings. "Revealing the lies" of Bush officials regarding these "intelligence warnings" has served to uphold Al Qaeda as the genuine threat, as an "outside enemy", which threatens the security of America, when in fact Al Qaeda is a creation of the US intelligence apparatus.

America's leaders in Washington and Wall Street firmly believe in the righteousness of war and authoritarian forms of government as a means to "safeguarding democratic values".

9/11 is the justification.

According to Homeland Security "the near-term attacks will either rival or exceed the 9/11 attacks".

An actual "terrorist attack" on American soil would lead to the suspension of civilian government and the establishment of martial law. In the words of Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge: "If we go to Red [code alert]... it basically shuts down the country,"

"You ask, 'Is it serious?' Yes, you bet your life. People don't do that unless it's a serious situation." (Donald Rumsfeld)

The "Criminalization of the State", is when war criminals legitimately occupy positions of authority, which enable them to decide "who are the criminals", when in fact they are the criminals.

Revealing a lie does not necessarily lead to establishing the truth.

In fact the experience of the 9/11 Commission, which has a mandate to investigate the September 11 attacks, has proved exactly the opposite.

We know that the Bush administration had numerous "intelligence warnings". We know they had "intelligence" which confirmed that terrorists had the capacity of hijacking aircrafts and using them to target buildings.

Attorney General John Ashcroft had apparently been warned in August 2001 by the FBI to avoid commercial airlines, but this information was not made public.

(See Eric Smith at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/SMI402A.html>)

The Pentagon had conducted a full fledged exercise on an airplane crashing into the Pentagon

(See <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/RYA404A.html>)

We also know that senior Bush officials including Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice lied under oath to the 9/11 commission, when they stated that they had no information or forewarning of impending terrorist attacks.

But we also know, from carefully documented research that:

There were stand-down orders on 9/11. The US Air force did not intervene.

(see <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/ELS305A.html> ,

Szamuely at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/SZA112A.html>)

There was a cover-up of the WTC and Pentagon investigation. The WTC rubble was confiscated.

(See Bill Manning at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/MAN309A.html>

The plane debris at the Pentagon disappeared.

(See Thierry Meyssan, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/MEY204C.html>)

Massive financial gains were made as a result of 9/11, from insider trading leading up to 9/11

(See Michael Ruppert, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/RUP110A.html> .)

There is an ongoing financial scam underlying the 7.1 billion dollar insurance claim by the WTC leaseholder, following the collapse of the twin towers

(See Michel Chossudovsky, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO403B.html>

Mystery surrounds WTC building 7, which collapsed (or was “pulled” down in the afternoon of 9/11 mysteriously

(For details see WTC-7: Scott Loughrey at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/LOU308A.html>).

The White House is being accused by the critics of “criminal negligence”, for having casually disregarded the intelligence presented to president Bush and his national security team, and for not having acted to prevent the 9/11 terrorist attack.

The unfolding consensus is: ***“They knew but failed to act”***.

This line of reasoning is appealing to many 9/11 critics and “Bush bashers” because it clearly places the blame on the Bush administration.

Yet in a bitter irony, the very process of revealing these lies and expressing public outrage has contributed to reinforcing the 9/11 cover-up.

“Revealing the lies” serves to present Al Qaeda as the genuine threat, as an “outside enemy”, which threatens the security of America, when in fact Al Qaeda is a creation of the US intelligence apparatus.

The presumption is that these forewarnings and intelligence briefs emanating from the intelligence establishment constitute a true and unbiased representation of the terrorist threat.

Meanwhile, the history of Al Qaeda and the CIA has been shoved to the background. The fact that successive US governments since the Soviet-Afghan war have supported and abetted the Islamic terror network is no longer mentioned, for obvious reasons. It would break the consensus regarding Al Qaeda as the outside enemy of America, which is a crucial building block of the entire National Security doctrine.

This central proposition that Islamic terrorists were responsible for 9/11 serves to justify everything else including the Patriot Act, the wars on Afghanistan and Iraq, the spiraling defense and homeland security budgets, the detention of thousands of people of Muslim faith on trumped up charges, the arrest and deportation to Guantanamo of alleged “enemy combatants”, etc.

The Central Role of Al Qaeda in Bush's National Security Doctrine

Spelled out in the National Security Strategy (NSS), the preemptive "defensive war" doctrine and the "war on terrorism" against Al Qaeda constitute the two essential building blocks of the Pentagon's propaganda campaign.

No Al Qaeda,

No war on terrorism

No rogue States which sponsor Al Qaeda

No pretext for waging war.

No justification for invading and occupying Afghanistan and Iraq

No justification for sending in US special forces into numerous countries around the World.

No justification for developing tactical nuclear weapons to be used in conventional war theaters against Islamic terrorists, who according to official statements constitute a nuclear threat.

(See <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO405A.html>).

The Administration's post 9/11 nuclear doctrine, points to Al Qaeda as some kind of nuclear power.

"The Pentagon must prepare for all possible contingencies, especially now, when dozens of countries, and some terrorist groups, are engaged in secret weapon development programs." (quoted in William Arkin, Secret Plan Outlines the Unthinkable, Los Angeles Times, 9 March 2002)

Central Role of Al Qaeda in US Military Doctrine

The very existence of Al Qaeda constitutes the justification for a pre-emptive war against rogue states and "terrorist organizations". It is part of the indoctrination of US troops fighting in the Middle East. It is also being used to justify the so-called "abuse" of POWs.

The objective is to present "preemptive military action" -meaning war as an act of "self-defense" against two categories of enemies, "rogue States" and "Islamic terrorists":

"The war against terrorists of global reach is a global enterprise of uncertain duration. ...America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed.

...Rogue states and terrorists do not seek to attack us using conventional means. They know such attacks would fail. Instead, they rely on acts of terror and, potentially, the use of weapons of mass destruction (...)

The targets of these attacks are our military forces and our civilian population, in direct violation of one of the principal norms of the law of warfare. **As was demonstrated by the losses on September 11, 2001, mass civilian casualties is the specific objective of terrorists and these losses would be exponentially more severe if terrorists acquired and used weapons of mass destruction.**

The United States has long maintained the option of preemptive actions to counter a sufficient threat to our national security. The greater the threat, the greater is the risk of inaction- and **the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves, (...). To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively."**

(National Security Strategy, White House, 2002, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>, emphasis added)

To justify pre-emptive military actions, including the use of nuclear weapons in conventional war theaters (approved by the Senate in late 2003), the National Security Doctrine requires the "fabrication" of a terrorist threat, -ie. "an outside enemy." It also needs to link these terrorist threats to "State sponsorship" by the so-called "rogue states."

But it also means that the various **"massive casualty-producing events"** allegedly by Al Qaeda (the fabricated enemy) are also part of the propaganda ploy which consists in upholding **the Legend of an outside enemy.**

9/11 and War Propaganda

In other words, the forewarnings sustain the Al Qaeda legend, which constitutes the cornerstone of the "war on terrorism". And the latter serves as a justification for America's "pre-emptive wars" with a view to "protecting the homeland".

One year before 9/11, the Project for a New American Century (PNAC) called for "some catastrophic and catalyzing event, like a new Pearl Harbor," which would serve to galvanize US public opinion in support of a war agenda.

(See <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/NAC304A.html>)

The PNAC architects seem to have anticipated with cynical accuracy, the use of the September 11 attacks as "a war pretext incident."

The PNAC's declared objective is **"Defend the Homeland"** and **"Fight and decisively win in multiple, simultaneous theater wars"**, perform global constabulary functions including punitive military actions around the World, and the so-called "revolution in military affairs", essentially meaning the development of a new range of sophisticated weaponry including the militarisation of outer space, the development of a new generation of nuclear weapons, etc.

(on nuclear weapons see <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO405A.html>,

(on the PNAC, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/NAC304A.html>)

The PNAC's reference to a **"catastrophic and catalyzing event"** echoes a similar

statement by David Rockefeller to the United Nations Business Council in 1994:

“We are on the verge of global transformation. All we need is the right major crisis and the nations will accept the New World Order.”

Similarly, in the words Zbigniew Brzezinski in his book, *The Grand Chessboard*:

“...it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus [in America] on foreign policy issues, except in the circumstances of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat.”

Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was National Security Adviser to President Jimmy Carter was one of the key architects of the Al Qaeda network, created by the CIA at the onslaught of the Soviet Afghan war (1979-1989).

(See Zbigniew Brzezinski at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/BRZ110A.print.html>)

The “catastrophic and catalyzing event” as stated by the PNAC is an integral part of US military-intelligence planning. General Franks, who led the military campaign into Iraq, pointed recently (October 2003) to the role of a “massive casualty-producing event” to muster support for the imposition of military rule in America.

(See General Tommy Franks calls for Repeal of US Constitution, November 2003, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/EDW311A.html>).

Franks identifies the precise scenario whereby military rule will be established:

“a terrorist, massive, casualty-producing event [will occur] somewhere in the Western world - it may be in the United States of America - that causes our population to question our own Constitution and to **begin to militarize our country** in order to avoid a repeat of another mass, casualty-producing event.” (Ibid, emphasis added)

This statement from an individual, who was actively involved in military and intelligence planning at the highest levels, suggests that the “militarisation of our country” is an ongoing operational assumption. It is part of the broader “Washington consensus”. It identifies the Bush administration’s “roadmap” of war and “Homeland Defense.” Needless to say, it is also an integral part of the neoliberal agenda.

The “terrorist massive casualty-producing event” is presented by General Franks as a crucial political turning point. The resulting crisis and social turmoil are intended to facilitate a major shift in US political, social and institutional structures.

General Franks’ statement reflects a consensus within the US Military as to how events ought to unfold. The “war on terrorism” is to provide a justification for repealing the Rule of Law, ultimately with a view to “preserving civil liberties.”

Franks’ interview suggests that an Al Qaeda sponsored terrorist attack will be used as a “trigger mechanism” for a military coup d’état in America. The PNAC’s “Pearl Harbor type event” would be used as a justification for declaring a State of emergency, leading to the

establishment of a military government.

In many regards, the militarisation of civilian State institutions in the US is already functional under the facade of a bogus democracy.

Actual Terrorist Attacks

To be “effective” the fear and disinformation campaign cannot solely rely on unsubstantiated “warnings” of future attacks, it also requires “real” terrorist occurrences or “incidents”, which provide credibility to Washington’s war plans. These terrorist events are used to justify the implementation of “emergency measures” as well as “retaliatory military actions”. They are required, in the present context, to create the illusion of “an outside enemy” that is threatening the American Homeland.

The triggering of “war pretext incidents” is part of the Pentagon’s assumptions. In fact it is an integral part of US military history. (See Richard Sanders, War Pretext Incidents, How to Start a War, Global Outlook, published in two parts, Issues 2 and 3, 2002-2003).

In 1962, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had envisaged a secret plan entitled “Operation Northwoods”, to deliberately trigger civilian casualties to justify the invasion of Cuba:

“We could blow up a U.S. ship in Guantanamo Bay and blame Cuba,” “We could develop a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area, in other Florida cities and even in Washington” “casualty lists in U.S. newspapers would cause a helpful wave of national indignation.”

(See the declassified Top Secret 1962 document titled “Justification for U.S. Military Intervention in Cuba”, Operation Northwoods at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/NOR111A.html>).

There is no evidence that the Pentagon or the CIA played a direct role in recent terrorist attacks, including those in Indonesia (2002), India (2001), Turkey (2003) and Saudi Arabia (2003).

According to the reports, the attacks were undertaken by organizations (or cells of these organizations), which operate quite independently, with a certain degree of autonomy. This independence is in the very nature of a covert intelligence operation. The «intelligence asset» is not in direct contact with its covert sponsors. It is not necessarily cognizant of the role it plays on behalf of its intelligence sponsors.

The fundamental question is who is behind them? Through what sources are they being financed? What is the underlying network of ties?

For instance, in the case of the 2002 Bali bomb attack, the alleged terrorist organization Jemaah Islamiah had links to Indonesia’s military intelligence (BIN), which in turn has links to the CIA and Australian intelligence.

The December 2001 terrorist attacks on the Indian Parliament –which contributed to pushing India and Pakistan to the brink of war– were allegedly conducted by two Pakistan-based rebel groups, Lashkar-e-Taiba (“Army of the Pure”) and Jaish-e-Muhammad (“Army of Mohammed”), both of which according to the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) are supported by Pakistan’s ISI.

(Council on Foreign Relations at <http://www.terrorismanswers.com/groups/harakat2.html> , Washington 2002).

What the CFR fails to acknowledge is the crucial relationship between the ISI and the CIA and the fact that the ISI continues to support Lashkar, Jaish and the militant Jammu and Kashmir Hizbul Mujahideen (JKHM), while also collaborating with the CIA.

(For further details see Michel Chossudovsky, Fabricating an Enemy, March 2003, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO301B.html>)

A 2002 classified outbrief drafted to guide the Pentagon “calls for the creation of a so-called ‘Proactive, Pre-emptive Operations Group’ (P2OG), to launch secret operations aimed at “stimulating reactions” among terrorists and states possessing weapons of mass destruction — that is, for instance, prodding terrorist cells into action and exposing themselves to ‘quick-response’ attacks by U.S. forces.” (William Arkin, The Secret War, The Los Angeles Times, 27 October 2002)

The P2OG initiative is nothing new. It essentially extends an existing apparatus of covert operations. Amply documented, the CIA has supported terrorist groups since the Cold War era. This “prodding of terrorist cells” under covert intelligence operations often requires the infiltration and training of the radical groups linked to Al Qaeda.

In this regard, covert support by the US military and intelligence apparatus has been channeled to various Islamic terrorist organizations through a complex network of intermediaries and intelligence proxies. (See below in relation to the Balkans)

Foreknowledge is a Red Herring

Foreknowledge implies and requires the existence of this “outside enemy”, who is attacking America. Amply documented, the Islamic brigades and Al Qaeda including the madrassas and the CIA sponsored training camps in Afghanistan are a creation of the CIA. The Taliban were “graduates” of the madrassas, which formed a US sponsored government in 1996.

During the Cold War, but also in its aftermath, **the CIA using Pakistan’s Military Intelligence apparatus as a go-between played a key role in training the Mujahideen. In turn, the CIA-sponsored guerrilla training was integrated with the teachings of Islam.**

Every single US administration since Jimmy Carter has consistently supported the so-called “Militant Islamic Base”, including Osama bin Laden’s Al Qaeda, as part of their foreign policy agenda.

And in this regard, the Democrats and the Republicans have worked hand in glove. In fact, it is the US military and intelligence establishment which has provided continuity in US foreign policy.

Media Reports on Al Qaeda and Pakistan’s Military Intelligence (ISI)

It is indeed revealing that in virtually all post 9/11 terrorist occurrences, the terrorist organization is reported (by the media and in official statements) as having “ties to Osama bin Laden’s Al Qaeda”. This in itself is a crucial piece of information. Of course, the fact that

Al Qaeda is a creation of the CIA is neither mentioned in the press reports nor is it considered relevant to an understanding of these terrorist occurrences.

The ties of these terrorist organizations (particularly those in Asia) to Pakistan's military intelligence (ISI) is acknowledged in a few cases by official sources and press dispatches. Confirmed by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), some of these groups are said to have links to Pakistan's ISI, without identifying the nature of these links. Needless to say, this information is crucial in identifying the sponsors of these terrorist attacks. In other words, the ISI is said to support these terrorist organizations, while at same time maintaining close ties to the CIA.

In other words, **the focus on foreknowledge has served to usefully distract attention from the US government's longstanding relationship to the terror network since the Soviet-Afghan war, which inevitably raises the broader issue of treason and war crimes.**

The foreknowledge issue in a sense erases the historical record because it denies a relationship between Al Qaeda and successive US administrations.

The administration is accused of not acting upon these terrorist warnings.

In the words of Richard Clarke:

"we must try to achieve a level of public discourse on these issues that is simultaneously energetic and mutually respectful... **We all want to defeat the jihadists.** [this is the consensus] To do that, we need to encourage an active, critical and analytical debate in America about how that will best be done. And if there is another major terrorist attack in this country, we must not panic or stifle debate as we did for too long after 9/11."(New York Times, 25 April 2004)

Bush and the White House intelligence team are said to have ignored these warnings. Richard Clarke who was in charge of counter terrorism on the National Security Council until February 2003 has "apologized" to the American people and the families of the victims. Had they acted in a responsible fashion, had they taken the intelligence briefings seriously, 3000 lives would have been saved on September 11, 2001. But bear in mind that Richard Clarke was part of an intelligence team which was at the time providing support to Al Qaeda in the Balkans. (See below)

This new anti-Bush consensus concerning the 9/11 attacks has engulfed part of the 9/11 truth movement. The outright lies in sworn testimony to the 9/11 Commission have been denounced in chorus; the families of the victims have expressed their indignation.

The debate centers on whether the administration is responsible for an "intelligence failure" or whether it was the result of "incompetence."

In both cases, the al Qaeda legend remains unchallenged. The fact that Al Qaeda hijackers were responsible for 9/11 remains unchallenged.

Source of Terrorist Warnings

Beneath the rhetoric, **nobody seems to have questioned the source of these warnings emanating from an intelligence apparatus, which is known to have supported Al Qaeda throughout the entire post cold War era.**

In other words, are the terrorist warnings emanating out of the CIA a “true” representation of the terrorist threat or are they part of the process of disinformation which seeks precisely to uphold Al Qaeda as an “Enemy of the Homeland”.

Meanwhile, the issues of “cover-up and complicity” at the highest levels of the Bush administration, which were raised in the immediate wake of the 9/11 attacks have been shoved out.

The role of Bush officials, their documented links to the terror network, the business ties between the Bushes and bin Laden families, the role of Pakistan’s Military Intelligence (ISI) which supported and abetted Al Qaeda while working hand in glove with their US counterparts (CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency), the fact that several Bush officials were the architects of Al Qaeda during the Reagan administration, as revealed by the Iran Contra investigation. (See Michel Chossudovsky, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO303D.html>)

“The Saudis Did It”

All of this, which is carefully documented, is no longer relevant. It is no longer an issue for debate and investigation. What the media, as well as some of the key 9/11 investigators are pushing is that “The Saudis did it”. **The outside enemy Al Qaeda is said to be supported by supported by the Saudis.**

This line of analysis, which characterizes the 1 trillion dollar law suit by the families of the victims led by Lawyer Ted Motley, is evidently flawed. While it highlights the business ties between the Bushes and the bin Ladens, it does not challenge the legend of the outside enemy.

“The Saudis did it” is also part of the US foreign policy agenda, to be eventually used to discredit the Saudi monarchy and destabilize the Saudi financiers, who oversee 25 percent of the World’s oil reserves, ten times those of the US. In fact, this process has already begun with the Saudi privatization program, which seeks to transfer Saudi wealth and assets into foreign (Anglo-American) hands.

The Saudi financiers were never prime movers. They were proxies. They played a subordinate role. They worked closely with US intelligence and their American financial counterparts. They were involved in the laundering of drug money working closely with the CIA. The Wahabbi sects from Saudi Arabia were sent to Afghanistan to set up the madrassas. The Saudis channeled covert financing to the various Islamic insurgencies on behalf of the CIA.

In other words, the “Saudis did It” consensus essentially contributes to whitewashing the Bush administration, while also providing pretext to destabilize Saudi Arabia.

“The Bush Lied” Consensus upholds “The Big Lie”

This emerging 9/11 consensus (“Outside enemy”, intelligence failures, criminal negligence, “the Saudis did it”, etc.) which is making its way into American history books, is “they knew, but failed to act”.

It was incompetence or criminal negligence but it was not treason. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq were “just wars”, they were undertaken in accordance with the National Security doctrine, which views Al Qaeda as the outside enemy. It is worth noting that at the outset of the war on Afghanistan, a number of prominent Western intellectuals, trade union and civil society leaders supported the “Just War” concept.

While the Bush administration takes the blame, the “war on terrorism” and its humanitarian mandate remain functionally intact.

Meanwhile, everybody has their eyes riveted on the fact that Bush officials lied under oath regarding the terrorist warnings.

Yet nobody seems to have begged the key question:

What is the significance of these warnings emanating from the intelligence apparatus, knowing that the CIA is the creator of Al Qaeda and that Al Qaeda is an “intelligence asset”.

In other words, the CIA is the sponsor of Al Qaeda and at the same time controls the warnings on impending terrorist attacks.

In other words, are Bush officials in sworn testimony to the 9/11 commission lying under oath on something which is true, or are they lying on something which is an even bigger lie?

The Legend of the “Outside Enemy”

The 1993 WTC bombing was heralded by the Bush Administration as one of the earlier Al Qaeda attacks on the Homeland. Since 9/11, the 1993 WTC bombing has become part of “the 9/11 legend” which describes Al Qaeda as “an outside enemy.”

In the words of National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice (April 2004) in sworn testimony at the 9/11 Commission:

“The terrorist threat to our Nation did not emerge on September 11th, 2001. Long before that day, radical, freedom-hating terrorists declared war on America and on the civilized world. The attack on the Marine barracks in Lebanon in 1983, the hijacking of the Achille Lauro in 1985, the rise of al-Qaida and the bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993, the attacks on American installations in Saudi Arabia in 1995 and 1996, the East Africa embassy bombings of 1998, the attack on the USS Cole in 2000, these and other atrocities were part of a sustained, systematic campaign to spread devastation and chaos and to murder innocent Americans.” (See complete transcript of her testimony at (<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/RIC404A.html>)

Below we provide evidence of US-Al Qaeda collaboration from official sources which confirms unequivocally that Al Qaeda was a US sponsored “intelligence asset” during the entire post Cold War era.

POST COLD WAR ERA: Time Line of Al Qaeda- US Collaboration

1993-1994 BOSNIAGATE Clinton Administration collaborates with Al Qaeda (1993-1994)

At the time of the 1993 WTC bombing, the Clinton Administration and al Qaeda were actively collaborating in joint military operations in Bosnia, as confirmed by an official congressional report emanating from the Republican Party.

The Clinton Administration’s “hands-on” involvement with the Islamic network’s arms pipeline included inspections of missiles from Iran by U.S. government officials.

The Militant Islamic Network (page 5): Along with the weapons, Iranian Revolutionary Guards and VEVAK intelligence operatives entered Bosnia in large numbers, along with thousands of mujahedin (“holy warriors”) from across the Muslim world. Also engaged in the effort were several other Muslim countries (including Brunei, Malaysia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, and Turkey) and a number of radical Muslim organizations. For example, the role of one Sudan-based “humanitarian organization,” called the Third World Relief Agency, has been well documented. **The Clinton Administration’s “hands-on” involvement with the Islamic network’s arms pipeline included inspections of missiles from Iran by U.S. government officials.**

(...)

In short, the Clinton Administration’s policy of facilitating the delivery of arms to the Bosnian Muslims made it the de facto partner of an ongoing international network of governments and organizations pursuing their own agenda in Bosnia...For example, one such group about which details have come to light is the Third World Relief Agency (TWRA), a Sudan-based, phoney humanitarian organization which has been a major link in the arms pipeline to Bosnia. [“How Bosnia’s Muslims Dodged Arms Embargo: Relief Agency Brokered Aid From Nations, Radical Groups,” Washington Post, 9/22/96; see also “Saudis Funded Weapons For Bosnia, Official Says: \$ 300 Million Program Had U.S. ‘Stealth Cooperation’,” Washington Post, 2/2/96] **TWA is believed to be connected with such fixtures of the Islamic terror network as Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman (the convicted mastermind behind the 1993 World Trade Center bombing) and Osama Binladen,** a wealthy Saudi emigre believed to bankroll numerous militant groups. [WP, 9/22/96]

bold added

Clinton Administration supported the “Militant Islamic Base”, Senate Press Release, US Congress, 16 January 1997,
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/DCH109A.html>

original Senate Document <http://www.senate.gov/~rpc/releases/1997/iran.htm>

The alleged terrorist Sheik Omar Abdul Rahman was sentenced as the mastermind behind the 1993 WTC bombings and subsequently convicted to life imprisonment.

From the Horse's Mouth

In a bitter irony, the same individual Omar Abdul Rahman was identified in the 1997 Report of the Republican Party Policy Committee of the US Senate (see above) as collaborating with Clinton officials in bringing in weapons and Mujahideen into Bosnia. **In other words, the Republican party confirms that Omar Abdul Rahman and Al Qaeda were US sponsored "intelligence assets".**

When Bill Clinton, appeared before the 9/11 Commission (April 2004), **was he questioned on his links to the terror network, including the mastermind of the 1993 WTC bombing? No!**

What can conclude: **A Clinton-Osama-Abdel Rahman Triangle. The Foreknowledge issue falls flat on its face. What we are dealing with is "Treason" and Cover-up" on the history of the Clinton Administration's links to the alleged "Outside Enemy". Treason is defined as: "consciously and purposely acting to aid its enemies."**

1995-1999. NATO AND THE US MILITARY COLLABORATED WITH AL QAEDA IN KOSOVO (1995-1999)

We provide below several statements from Congressional records which point to US support to the terror network in Kosovo (1995-1999) and which amply refute the existence of an "Outside Enemy"

- Frank Ciluffo of the Globalized Organized Crime Program in a testimony presented to the **House of Representatives Judicial Committee:**

What was largely hidden from public view was the fact that the KLA raise part of their funds from the sale of narcotics. Albania and Kosovo lie at the heart of the Balkan Route that links the "Golden Crescent" of Afghanistan and Pakistan to the drug markets of Europe. This route is worth an estimated \$400 billion a year and handles 80 per cent of heroin destined for Europe. (U.S. Congress, Testimony of Frank J. Cilluffo, Deputy Director of the Global Organized Crime Program, to the House Judiciary Committee, Washington DC, 13 December 2000)

- Ralf Mutschke of Interpol's Criminal Intelligence division, also in a testimony to the **House Judicial Committee:**

The U.S. State Department listed the KLA as a terrorist organization, indicating that it was financing its operations with money from the international heroin trade and loans from Islamic countries and individuals, among them allegedly Osama bin Laden. Another link to bin Laden is the fact that the brother of a leader in an Egyptian Jihad organization and also a military commander of Osama bin Laden, was leading an elite KLA unit during the Kosovo conflict.

(U.S. Congress, House Judiciary Committee, Washington DC, 13 December 2000)

- Rep. John Kasich of the **House Armed Services Committee:**

“We connected ourselves [in 1998-99] with the KLA, which was the staging point for bin Laden.” (U.S. Congress, Transcripts of the House Armed Services Committee, Washington, DC, 5 October 1999)

- In 1999, Senator Jo Lieberman stated authoritatively that

“Fighting for the KLA is fighting for human rights and American values.”

In making this statement he knew that the KLA was supported by Osama bin Laden.

What can we conclude from these and other statements? The transcripts from Congressional documents refute the existence of the “outside enemy”.

Al Qaeda (our “intelligence asset”) supported and continues to support the KLA. The Clinton administration supported the KLA. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright coveted KLA leaders Hashim Thaci.

Military Professional Resources (MPRI), a mercenary company on contract to the Pentagon was involved in the training the KLA. The KLA was also trained by US and British Special Forces. But the KLA was also trained by Al Qaeda. The US collaborated in training a terrorist organization which has with links to al Qaeda, the drug trade and organized crime.

The Bush Administration has followed in the footsteps of the Clinton administration. The KLA is supported by the US military, while also being backed by Al Qaeda.

2000-2001: 8/01: THE ISLAMIC MILITANT NETWORK, NATO AND THE US MILITARY JOIN HANDS IN MACEDONIA

Barely a few weeks before 9/11, in August 2001, senior U.S. military advisers from a private mercenary outfit on contract to the Pentagon (MPRI), were advising the self-proclaimed National Liberation Army (NLA) of Macedonia.

Mujahideen detached by Al Qaeda from the Middle East and Central Asia were fighting in a paramilitary army, which was also supported by the US military and NATO.

The NLA is a proxy of the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA). In turn, the KLA and the UN-sponsored Kosovo Protection Corps (KPC) are identical institutions with the same commanders and military personnel. *KPC Commanders on UN salaries are fighting in the NLA together with the Mujahideen.*

Ironically, while supported and financed by Osama bin Laden’s Al Qaeda, the KLA-NLA is also supported by NATO and the United Nations mission to Kosovo (UNMIK). In fact, the Islamic Militant Network also using Pakistan’s Inter Service Intelligence (ISI) as the CIA’s go-between still constitutes an integral part of Washington’s covert military-intelligence operations in Macedonia and Southern Serbia.

The KLA-NLA terrorists are funded from U.S. military aid, the United Nations peace-keeping budget, as well as by several Islamic organizations including Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda. Drug money is also being used to finance the terrorists with the complicity of the U.S. government. The recruitment of Mujahideen to fight in the ranks of the NLA in Macedonia is implemented through various Islamic groups.

U.S. military advisers mingle with the Mujahideen within the same paramilitary force; Western mercenaries from NATO countries fight alongside the Mujahideen recruited in the Middle East and Central Asia. And the U.S. media calls this a >blowback= where so-called "intelligence assets" have gone against their sponsors!

But this did not happen during the Cold War! It happened in Macedonia in the months leading up to 9/11. And it is confirmed by numerous press reports, eyewitness accounts, photographic evidence as well as official statements by the Macedonian Prime Minister, who has accused the Western military alliance of supporting the terrorists. Moreover, the official Macedonian News Agency (MIA) has pointed to the complicity between Washington's envoy Ambassador James Pardew and the NLA terrorists. In other words, the so-called "intelligence assets" were still serving the interests of their U.S. sponsors.

8/06 THE AUGUST 6, 2001 THE PRESIDENTIAL INTELLIGENCE BRIEFING (PDB)

The August 6 2001 intelligence briefing (PDB) prepared for President George W. Bush was entitled "Bin Ladin Determined To Strike in US".

PDBs are prepared at CIA headquarters at Langley and are presented to President Bush on a daily basis in the form of an oral briefing by CIA Director George Tenet. Below are selected excerpts from the PDB.

The complete text of the August 6, 2001 PDB can be consulted at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/WHI404A.html>

The presumption in media reports is that this August 6 PDB is based on an actual terror threat. In fact, what the PTB does is to fabricate a terror threat. Below are few selected excerpts.

"Clandestine, foreign government, and media reports indicate Bin Ladin since 1997 has wanted to conduct terrorist attacks in the US."

[This statement is disinformation. During that period the US was collaborating with Al Qaeda in the Balkans, see above]

"We have not been able to corroborate some of the more sensational threat reporting, such as that from a ... (redacted portion) ... service in 1998 saying that Bin Ladin wanted to hijack a US aircraft to gain the release of "Blind Shaykh" 'Umar 'Abd al-Rahman and other US-held extremists.

Nevertheless, FBI information since that time indicates patterns of suspicious activity in this country consistent with preparations for hijackings or other types of attacks, including recent surveillance of federal buildings in New York.

[Does the CIA Director inform the president that a proxy organization of Sheikh Abdu Rahman was actually collaborating with US military inspectors in Bosnia as confirmed by the 1997 Republican Party Committee report.]

The FBI is conducting approximately 70 full field investigations throughout the US that it considers Bin Ladin-related. CIA and the FBI are investigating a call to our Embassy in the UAE in May saying that a group of Bin Ladin supporters was in the US planning attacks with explosives.

[Does the CIA Director advise the president that Osama bin Laden was in the UAE in July of that year receiving treatment for a kidney condition at the American Hospital in Dubai and that the American hospital has close links to the US embassy (See the report published in Le Figaro, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/RIC111B.html>)]

8/27-8/30 2001 AUGUST 27-30: MISSION TO ISLAMABAD AND RAWALPINDI FOR INTELLIGENCE CONSULTATIONS

From the 27th to the 30th of August 2001, barely a couple of weeks before 9/11, the chairmen of the Senate and House intelligence committees, respectively Senator Bob Graham and Representative Porter Goss together with Senator Jon Kyl, were in Islamabad for “consultations”. Meetings were held with President Musharraf and with Pakistan’s military and intelligence brass including the head of Pakistan’s Inter Services Intelligence (ISI) General Mahmoud Ahmad.

(see <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO111A.html>)]

An AFP report confirms that the US Congressional delegation also met the Afghan ambassador to Pakistan, Abdul Salam Zaeef. At this meeting, which was barely mentioned by the US media, “Zaeef assured the US delegation [on behalf of the Afghan government] that the Taliban would never allow bin Laden to use Afghanistan to launch attacks on the US or any other country.” (Agence France Presse (AFP), 28 August 2001.)

The September FBI Report

An FBI report released to ABC news in late September 2001, which was subsequently confirmed by a Times of India report, suggests that Pakistan’s Military Intelligence (ISI), headed by General Mahmoud Ahmad, played a key role in transferring money to the 9/11 hijackers. General Mahmoud Ahmad had allegedly ordered the transfer of \$100,000 to the alleged 9/11 ring-leader Mohamed Atta. (See Michel Chossudovsky, War and Globalization, The Truth behind 9/11, <http://globalresearch.ca/globaloutlook/truth911.html>)

As to September 11th, federal authorities have told ABC News they have now tracked more than \$100,000 from banks in Pakistan, to two banks in Florida, to accounts held by suspected hijack ring leader Mohammed Atta. As well, this morning, Time magazine is reporting that some of that money came in the days just before the attack and can be traced directly to people connected to Osama bin Laden. It’s all part of what has been a successful FBI effort so far to close in on the hijacker=s high commander, the money men, the planners and the mastermind.²¹

Note the sequencing of these meetings. Bob Graham and Porter Goss were in Islamabad in late August 2001, meeting General Mahmoud Ahmad, the alleged “money man” behind 9/11. The meetings with President Musharraf and the Afghan Ambassador were on the 27th of August, the mission was still in Islamabad on the 30th of August.

9/ 4- 9/13: HEAD OF PAKISTAN MILITARY INTELLIGENCE (ISI) ARRIVES IN

WASHINGTON ON SEPTEMBER 4, DEPARTS ON SEPTEMBER 13

General Mahmoud Ahmad arrived in Washington on an official visit of consultations barely a few days later (September 4th). During his visit to Washington he met his counterpart CIA director George Tenet and high ranking officials of the Bush administration including Richard Armitage and Colin Powell. At the US congress, the General meets up with Senator Joseph Biden, Chairman of Foreign Relations Committee (13 Sept), Senator Bob Graham and Representative Porter Goss. Graham and Goss, the men who hosted the general will later be called upon to set up the Joint Senate-House Inquiry on 9/11.

9/9: THE ASSASSINATION OF THE LEADER OF THE NORTHERN ALLIANCE AHMAD SHAH MASOOD

The leader of the Northern Alliance Commander Ahmad Shah Masood was mortally wounded in a kamikaze assassination on September 9, 2001. It happened two days before the 9/11 attacks on the WTC and the Pentagon. Masood later died from wounds suffered in the suicide attack on the Saturday (9/15) following 9/11.

In the wake of the September 11 attacks, the killing of Ahmad Shah Masood was barely mentioned. The broad media consensus was that the two events (9/9 and 9/11) were totally unrelated. Yet the Northern Alliance had informed the Bush administration through an official communiqué that Pakistan's ISI was allegedly implicated in the assassination:

"A Pakistani ISI-Osama-Taliban axis [was responsible for] plotting the assassination by two Arab suicide bombers.. 'We believe that this is a triangle between Osama bin Laden, ISI, which is the intelligence section of the Pakistani army, and the Taliban'" (The Northern Alliance's statement was released on 14 September 2001, quoted in Reuters, 15 September 2001)

'Pakistan's ISI (Inter-Services Intelligence), the Taliban and Osama bin Laden appear to be behind this plot.'" (AFP, 10 September 2001)

In other words, there is reason to believe that the 9/9 and 9/11 are not isolated and unrelated events.

According to official statements and reports, the ISI was allegedly implicated in both events: the September 9, 2001 assassination of Shah Masood and the financing of the September 11, 2001 attacks. Both these events directly implicate senior officials in the Bush administration.

While the US media tacitly acknowledges the role of Pakistan's ISI in the assassination of Shah Masood, it fails to dwell upon the more substantive issue: How come the head of the ISI was in Washington, on an official visit, meeting Bush administration officials on the very same day Masood was assassinated?

Had Masood not been assassinated, the Bush administration would not have been able to install their political puppet Hamid Karzai in Kaboul.

Masood rather than Hamid Karzai (a former employee of UNOCAL oil company), would have become the head of the post-Taliban government formed in the wake of the U.S. bombings of Afghanistan.

9/10 OSAMA IN HOSPITAL ON 9/10, ONE DAY BEFORE THE ATTACKS ON THE WTC

Don Rumsfeld states that the whereabouts of Osama are unknown. Yet, according to Dan Rather, CBS, Bin Laden was back in Hospital, one day before the 9/11 attacks, on September 10, this time, courtesy of America's indefectible ally Pakistan. Pakistan's Military Intelligence (ISI) told CBS that bin Laden had received dialysis treatment in Rawalpindi, at Pak Army's headquarters:

[transcript of CBS report, see <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CBS203A.html> ,

see also <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/01/28/eveningnews/main325887.shtml>]

It should be noted, that the hospital is directly under the jurisdiction of the Pakistani Armed Forces, which has close links to the Pentagon. U.S. military advisers based in Rawalpindi. work closely with the Pakistani Armed Forces. Again, no attempt was made to arrest America's best known fugitive, but then maybe bin Laden was serving another "better purpose". Rumsfeld claimed at the time that he had no knowledge regarding Osama's health. (see CBS transcript above).

Needless to say, the CBS report is a crucial piece of information in the 9/11 jigsaw. It refutes the administration's claim that the whereabouts of bin Laden are unknown. It points to a Pakistan connection, it suggests a cover-up at the highest levels of the Bush administration.

Dan Rather and Barry Petersen fail to draw the implications of their January 2002 report. They fail to beg the question: where was Osama on 9/11? If they are to stand by their report, the conclusion is obvious: The administration is lying regarding the whereabouts of Osama.

If the CBS report is accurate and Osama had indeed been admitted to the Pakistani military hospital on September 10, courtesy of America's ally, he could still be in hospital in Rawalpindi on the 11th of September, when the attacks occurred.

In all probability, his whereabouts were known to US officials on the morning of September 12, when Secretary of State Colin Powell initiated negotiations with Pakistan, with a view to arresting and extraditing bin Laden.

These negotiations, led by General Mahmoud Ahmad, head of Pakistan's military intelligence, on behalf of the government of President Pervez Musharraf, took place on the 12th and 13th of September in Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage's office. The general also met Colin Powell in discussions at the State Department on the 13th.

9/11. THE FOLLOW-UP BREAKFAST MEETING ON CAPITOL HILL WITH GENERAL MAHMOUD AHMAD

On the morning of September 11, the three lawmakers Bob Graham, Porter Goss and Jon Kyl (who were part of the Congressional delegation to Pakistan) were having breakfast on Capitol Hill with General Ahmad, the alleged "money-man" behind the 9-11 hijackers. Also present at this meeting were Pakistan's ambassador to the U.S. Maleeha Lodhi and several members of the Senate and House Intelligence committees were also present. **This meeting was described by one press report as a "follow-up meeting" to that held in Pakistan in late August.** (see above) *"On 8/30, Senate Intelligence Committee chair Sen. Bob Graham (D-FL) 'was on a mission to learn more about terrorism.' (...) On 9/11,*

Graham was back in DC 'in a follow-up meeting with' Pakistan intelligence agency chief Mahmud Ahmed and House Intelligence Committee chair Porter Goss (R-FL)" 3 (The Hotline, 1 October 2002):

While trivializing the importance of the 9/11 breakfast meeting, *The Miami Herald* (16 September 2001) confirms that General Ahmad also met Secretary of State Colin Powell in the wake of the 9/11 attacks.

Again the political significance of the personal relationship between General Mahmoud (the alleged "money man" behind 9/11) and Secretary of State Colin Powell is casually dismissed. According to *The Miami Herald*, the high level meeting between the two men was not planned in advance. It took place on the spur of the moment because of the shut down of air traffic, which prevented General Mahmoud from flying back home to Islamabad on a commercial flight, when in all probability the General and his delegation were traveling on a chartered government plane. With the exception of the Florida press (and Salon.com, 14 September), not a word was mentioned in the US media's September coverage of 9-11 concerning this mysterious breakfast reunion.

Eight months later on the 18th of May, two days after the "BUSH KNEW" headline hit the tabloids, the *Washington Post* published an article on Porter Goss, entitled: "A Cloak But No Dagger; An Ex-Spy Says He Seeks Solutions, Not Scapegoats for 9/11". Focusing on his career as a CIA agent, the article largely served to underscore the integrity and commitment of Porter Goss to waging a "war on terrorism". Yet in an isolated paragraph, the article acknowledges the mysterious 9/11 breakfast meeting with ISI Chief Mahmoud Ahmad, while also confirming that "Ahmad :ran a spy agency notoriously close to Osama bin Laden and the Taliban":

While the *Washington Post* scores in on the "notoriously close" links between General Ahmad and Osama bin Laden, it fails to dwell on the more important question: what were Rep. Porter Goss and Senator Bob Graham and other members of the Senate and House intelligence committees doing together with the alleged 9/11 "money-man" at breakfast on the morning of 9/11. In other words, the *Washington Post* report does not go one inch further in begging the real question: Was this mysterious breakfast venue a "political lapse", an intelligence failure or something far more serious? How come the very same individuals (Goss and Graham) who had developed a personal rapport with General Ahmad, had been entrusted under the joint committee inquiry "to reveal the truth on 9-11."

The media trivialises the breakfast meeting, it presents it as a simple *fait divers* and fails to "put two and two together". Neither does it acknowledge the fact, amply documented, that "the money-man" behind the hijackers had been entrusted by the Pakistani government to discuss the precise terms of Pakistan's "collaboration" in the "war on terrorism" in meetings held behind closed doors at the State department on the 12th and 13th of September. 11 7(See Michel Chossudovsky, op cit)

9/12-9/13 THE AFTERMATH, THE ALLEGED MONEYMAN MEETS COLIN POWELL AND RICHARD ARMITAGE

Bear in mind that the purpose of his meeting at the State Department on the 13th was only made public after the September 11 terrorist attacks when the Bush administration took the decision to formally seek the cooperation of Pakistan in its "campaign against international terrorism." despite the links of Pakistan's ISI to Osama bin Laden and the Taliban and its

alleged role in the assassination of Commander Massoud. 2 days before 9/11.

Meanwhile, the Western media in the face of mounting evidence had remained silent on the insidious role of Pakistan's Military Intelligence agency (ISI). The assassination of Massoud was mentioned, but its political significance in relation to September 11 and the subsequent decision to go to war against Afghanistan was barely touched upon. Without discussion or debate, Pakistan was heralded as a friend and an ally of America. In an utterly twisted logic, the U.S. media concluded in chorus that:

U.S. officials had sought cooperation from Pakistan [precisely] because it is the original backer of the Taliban, the hard-line Islamic leadership of Afghanistan accused by Washington of harboring bin Laden. 9

The Bush Administration had not only provided red carpet treatment to the alleged "money man" behind the 9-11 attacks, it also had sought his 'cooperation' in the "war on terrorism". The precise terms of this 'cooperation' were agreed upon between General Mahmoud Ahmad, representing the Pakistani government and Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, in meetings at the State Department on September 12 and 13. In other words, the Administration decided in the immediate wake of 9-11, to seek the 'cooperation' of Pakistan's ISI in "going after Osama", despite the fact (documented by the FBI) that the ISI was financing and abetting the 9-11 terrorists. Contradictory? One might say that it's like "asking Al Capone to help in going after organized crime"

9/11 Timeline

1. AL QAEDA IS BORN, THE COLD WAR ERA

1979, LARGEST COVERT OPERATION IN THE HISTORY OF THE CIA LAUNCHED IN AFGHANISTAN, CREATING THE ISLAMIC BRIGADES TO FIGHT IN THE SOVIET AFGHAN-WAR. AL QAEDA IS BORN

1985, PRESIDENT REAGAN SIGNED NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION DIRECTIVE 166 AUTHORIZING STEPPED UP COVERT MILITARY AID TO THE MUJAHIDEEN

1989- END OF THE SOVIET-AFGHAN WAR, END OF THE COLD WAR, STEPPED UP COVERT OPERATIONS IN THE (FORMER) SOVIET UNION AND THE BALKANS

1996 THE TALIBAN FORM A GOVERNMENT WITH THE SUPPORT OF THE US

2. POST COLD WAR SUPPORT TO AL QAEDA IN THE BALKANS

1991 BEGINNING OF CIVIL WAR IN YUGOSLAVIA

1993-1994 CLINTON ADMINISTRATION COLLABORATES WITH AL QAEDA IN BOSNIA

1995-1999. NATO AND THE US MILITARY COLLABORATE WITH AL QAEDA IN KOSOVO

2000-2001. THE ISLAMIC MILITANT NETWORK, NATO, THE US MILITARY AND THE UNITED NATIONS MISSION IN KOSOVO JOIN HANDS IN MACEDONIA IN SUPPORTING THE NLA

3. SHORT TIMELINE (JULY- SEPTEMBER 2001

7/01 JULY 2001: OSAMA BIN LADEN IN THE AMERICAN HOSPITAL IN DUBAI, UAE

8/06 THE AUGUST 6, 2001 THE PRESIDENTIAL INTELLIGENCE BRIEFING (PDB)

8/27-8/30 2001 AUGUST 27-30 MISSION OF SENATOR BOB GRAHAM AND REP PORTER GOSS TO ISLAMABAD AND RAWALPINDI FOR INTELLIGENCE CONSULTATIONS WITH PRESIDENT MUSHARRAF AND ISI CHIEF GENERAL MAHMOUD AHMAD

9/ 4- 9/13: HEAD OF PAKISTAN MILITARY INTELLIGENCE (ISI) ARRIVES IN WASHINGTON ON AN OFFICIAL VISIT. ARRIVES ON SEPTEMBER 4, DEPARTS ON SEPTEMBER 13

9/9: THE ASSASSINATION OF THE LEADER OF THE NORTHERN ALLIANCE AHMAD SHAH MASSOOD

9/10 OSAMA IN HOSPITAL ON 9/10, ONE DAY BEFORE THE ATTACKS ON THE WTC

9/11. 11 SEPTEMBER: TERRORIST ATTACKS ON WTC AND PENTAGON. FOLLOW-UP BREAKFAST MEETING ON CAPITOL HILL WITH GENERAL MAHMOUD AHMAD HOSTED BY SENATOR BOB GRAHAM AND REP PORTER GOSS. THE "WAR ON TERRORISM" IS OFFICIALLY LAUNCHED

9/12-9/13 THE AFTERMATH, THE ALLEGED "MONEYMAN" GENERAL MAHMOUD AHMAD MEETS COLIN POWELL & RICHARD ARMITAGE AT THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO DISCUSS TERMS OF PAKISTAN'S COOPERATION IN THE WAR ON TERRORISM .

Who in the Bush Administration has Links to Al Qaeda?

The Bush administration accuses people of having links to al Qaeda. This is the doctrine behind the anti-terrorist legislation and Homeland Security.

This relationship of the Bush Administration to international terrorism, which is a matter of public record, indelibly points to the criminalization of the upper echelons of US State apparatus.

Colin Powell's Role: From Iran-Contra to September 11

Both Colin Powell and his Deputy Richard Armitage, who casually accused Baghdad and other foreign governments of "harboring" Al Qaeda, played a direct role, at different points in their careers, in supporting terrorist organizations.

Both men were implicated -operating behind the scenes- in the Irangate Contra scandal during the Reagan Administration, which involved the illegal sale of weapons to Iran to finance the Nicaraguan Contra paramilitary army.

[Coronel Oliver] North set up a team including [Richard] Secord; Noel Koch [Armitage's deputy] , then assistant secretary at the Pentagon responsible for special operations; George Cave, a former CIA station chief in Tehran, and Colin Powell, military assistant to U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger...(The Guardian, December 10, 1986)

Although Colin Powell was not directly involved in the arms' transfer negotiations, which had been entrusted to Oliver North, he was among "at least five men within the Pentagon who knew arms were being transferred to the CIA." (The Record, 29 December 1986). Lieutenant General Powell was directly instrumental in giving the "green light" to lower-level Irangate officials in blatant violation of Congressional procedures. According to the *New York Times*, Colin Powell took the decision (at the level of military procurement), to allow the delivery of weapons to Iran:

Hurriedly, one of the men closest to Secretary of Defense Weinberger, Maj. Gen. Colin Powell, bypassed the written "focal point system" procedures and ordered the [Defense Logistics Agency](#) [responsible for procurement] to turn over the first of 2,008 TOW missiles to the C.I.A., which acted as cutout for delivery to Iran" (New York Times, 16 February 1987)

Richard Armitage

Richard Armitage held the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense in the Reagan Administration. He was in charge of coordinating covert military operations including the Iran-Contra operation. He was in close liaison with Colonel Oliver North. His deputy and chief anti-terrorist official Noel Koch was part of the team set up by Oliver North. Following the delivery of the TOW anti-tank missiles to Iran, the proceeds of these sales were deposited in numbered bank accounts and the money was used to finance the Nicaraguan Contras. (UPI. 27 November 1987). A classified Israeli report provided to the Iran-contra panels of the Congressional enquiry confirms that Armitage "was in the picture on the Iranian issue." (New York Times, 26 May 1989):

"With a Pentagon position that placed him over the military's covert operations branch, Armitage was a party to the secret arms dealing from the outset. He also was associated with former national security aide Oliver L. North in a White House counterterrorism group, another area that would also have been a likely focus of congressional inquiry" (Washington Post, 26 May 1989)

[CIA Director William Casey with the collaboration of Richard Armitage in the Pentagon "ran the Mujahideen covert war against the Soviet Union..."](#) (quoted in [Domestic Terrorism: The Big Lie The "War"](#)) "Contragate was also an off-the-shelf drug-financed operation run by Casey." ([Ibid](#)).

Financing the Islamic Brigades

The Iran Contra procedure was similar to that used in Afghanistan, where secret aid was channeled to the militant Islamic brigade (*US News and World Report*, 15 December 1986). In fact part of the proceeds of the weapons sales to Iran had been channeled to finance the Mujahideen. :

"The Washington Post reported that profits from the Iran arms sales were deposited in one CIA-managed account into which the U.S. and Saudi Arabia had placed \$250 million apiece. That money was disbursed not only to the contras in Central America but to the rebels fighting Soviet troops in Afghanistan." (U.S. News & World Report, 15 December 1986)

The Irangate Cover-up

Reagan's National Security Adviser Rear Admiral John Pointdexter, who was later indicted on conspiracy charges and lying to Congress was replaced by Frank Carlucci as National Security Adviser. And Maj. General Colin Powell was appointed deputy to Frank Carlucci, namely "number two" on the National Security team.

"Both came to the White House after the Iran contra revelations and the NSC housecleaning [i.e. coverup] that followed [the Irangate scandal]" (The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour, 16 June 1987).

Needless to say, this housecleaning was a cover-up: Colin Powell was in on the Irangate affair

While several Irangate officials including John Pointdexter and Oliver North were accused of criminal wrongdoing, the main actors in the CIA and the Pentagon, namely Armitage and Casey, were never indicted, neither was Lieutenant General Colin Powell who authorized the procurement of TOW missiles from the [Defense Logistics Agency](#) .

Moreover, while weapons were being sold covertly to Iran, Washington was also supplying weapons through official channels to Baghdad. In other words, Washington was arming both sides in the Iran-Iraq war. [And who was in charge of negotiating those weapons sales to Baghdad? Donald Rumsfeld](#)

How to Reverse the Tide

September 11 has been used profusely by the Bush administration as a justification for waging a preemptive war without borders.

It is part of the Administration's doctrine of "self-defense". But that justification is based on a lie: that America is under attack by an outside enemy.

The so-called "War on Terrorism" is a lie.

Realities have been turned upside down.

Acts of war are heralded as "humanitarian interventions" geared towards restoring democracy.

Military occupation and the killing of civilians are presented as "peace-keeping operations."

The derogation of civil liberties by imposing the so-called anti-terrorist legislation is portrayed as a means to providing domestic security and upholding civil liberties.

This system relies on the manipulation of public opinion.

The fabricated realities of the Bush administration must become indelible truths, which form part of a broad political and media consensus. In this regard, the corporate media is an instrument of a de facto police state, which has carefully excluded, from the outset, any real understanding of the September 11 crisis.

Millions of people have been misled regarding the causes and consequences of September

11.

When people across the US and around the World find out that Al Qaeda is not an outside enemy but a creation of US foreign policy and the CIA, the legitimacy of the Bush Administration will tumble like a deck of cards.

In other words, when the lies emanating from the seat of political authority are fully revealed, the perceived enemy will no longer be Al Qaeda but Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Powell, et al.

Bear in mind that the Democrats are also complicit. Democratic administrations have also supported Al Qaeda.

This relationship of successive US Administrations to international terrorism, which is a matter of public record, indelibly points to the **criminalization of the upper echelons of US State apparatus.**

Let's use this information to dismantle the Bush Administration's war plans. Sensitize our fellow citizens. Expose the "dubious links."

Because when the truth trickles down, the leaders' war and homeland security plans will not have a shred of legitimacy in the eyes of millions of Americans who believe that Al Qaeda is "A Threat to America" and that their president is committed to their security.

At this crucial juncture in our history, we must understand that antiwar sentiment in itself does not undermine the war agenda.

The only way to reverse the tide is to unseat the rulers, who are war criminals.

And the way to unseat the rulers is to break their legitimacy in the eyes of the people.

In other words, it is necessary to fully reveal the lies concerning the so-called "war on terrorism" to our fellow citizens, which were used to justify the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan and impose the police State in the US

A precondition for breaking the legitimacy of the Bush Administration is to fully reveal its links to international terrorism and its complicity in the tragic event of 9/11.

This objective can only be achieved by effectively curbing its propaganda campaign and spreading the truth through a grassroots citizen's information campaign.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#), Global Research, 2022

[**Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page**](#)

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)

About the author:

Michel Chossudovsky is an award-winning author, Professor of Economics (emeritus) at the University of Ottawa, Founder and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), Montreal, Editor of Global Research. He has taught as visiting professor in Western Europe, Southeast Asia, the Pacific and Latin America. He has served as economic adviser to governments of developing countries and has acted as a consultant for several international organizations. He is the author of 13 books. He is a contributor to the Encyclopaedia Britannica. His writings have been published in more than twenty languages. In 2014, he was awarded the Gold Medal for Merit of the Republic of Serbia for his writings on NATO's war of aggression against Yugoslavia. He can be reached at crgeditor@yahoo.com

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca