

A Dangerous Ideology

★★★★ "Fearless"

Iain Davis
**A Dangerous
Ideology**



**Why No One Believes
The State Anymore**

A Dangerous Ideology

A Dangerous Ideology.

Why No One Believes the State Any More.

by Iain Davis

*Copyright © 2019 by Iain Davis
All rights reserved. This book or any portion thereof
may not be reproduced or used in any manner
whatsoever
without the express written permission of the publisher
except for the use of brief quotations in a book review.*

Printed in the United Kingdom

First Printing, 2019

ISBN: 9781793871718

www.in-this-together.com

Contents:

Preface: - [p.5]

Part 1: The Dissonant Battle

Chapter 1: Surely It's All Just Conspiracy Theory? - [p.15]

Chapter 2: Who Are The Conspiracy Theorists? - [p.25]

Chapter 3: Are Conspiracy Theorists Extremists? - [p.41]

Chapter 4: Set Yourself Free. - [p.61]

Part 2: Twin Pillars of Deceit

Chapter 5: 9/11 – Disrespect or True Respect? - [p.89]

Chapter 6: Where Did All The Money Go? - [p.109]

Chapter 7: Where Did All The Security Go? - [p.121]

Chapter 8: The Collapsing Hypothesis. - [p.142]

Chapter 9: No One Could Have Believed. - [p.169]

Chapter 10: The Able Danger of Intelligence. - [p.191]

Part 3: London Laid Low

Chapter 11: The Lacking London Narrative. - [p.218]

Chapter 12: No Witnesses to a Forensic Mess. - [p.236]

Chapter 13: The Success of Failure. - [p.254]

Chapter 14: Oops! Looks Like We did It again. - [p.272]

Authors Note

Thanks so much for reading my book. I hope you find it both challenging and rewarding. I wrote it because I care about the core message and hope you give it your consideration.

We are living in a time of 'fake news' and disinformation. Society has become less certain of the narratives that weave their way through, and bond, our shared values and perspectives. This isn't necessarily unwelcome. We shouldn't blindly accept everything we are told. We need to be free to ask questions.

What concerns me more is the way in which this uncertainty is being exploited. It is fertile ground for those who want to push us towards the political extremes. When accepted 'truths' are eroded, many are tempted to seek out new explanations to fill the void. The vacuum also provides justification for the clamp down on our freedom to openly debate and share information. However, outlawing opinion fomenting discontent and stirs resentment. The increasing polarisation of society is evident.

The foundation of our entire way of life is free discourse based upon reasoned argument, empirical evidence and logical inquiry. We are all capable of critical thinking and already have the tools to withstand any nonsensical stories or claims which lack supporting evidence. We don't need to be told what to think. We just need an opportunity to apply our natural inquisitiveness to the information we are given.

If this book interests you, please consider writing a review. I need them to promote the book. Please be honest, I need to learn how to become a better writer and your feedback, good or bad, will be welcome. If you can't write a review any comments or shares you care to make would be appreciated.

Many thanks.

Preface:

Following the election of President Donald Trump, his Press Secretary, Sean Spicer, appeared to hugely inflate the attendance figures for the presidential inauguration. Justifiably criticised for talking nonsense, Counsellor Kellyanne Conway later defended Spicer by suggesting that he was simply providing “*alternative facts.*”

The suggestion that facts could be malleable, and didn't necessarily require any substantiating evidence, was actually debated as if it were 'a thing.' This was perplexing. Facts are not subjective. They are either accurate or they aren't facts.

The 'alternative fact' is not a concept at all welcome within this book. I consider 'alternative facts' to be rather like 'alternative cheese' in that they are neither cheese nor facts. Admittedly there has been no suggestion they are cheese, but nor is there any evidence they are facts. 'Alternative facts' just don't cut the mustard. Ironic, given that cheese does cut mustard quite nicely.

For similar reasons so called 'fake news' is equally unwelcome. It appears the concept was introduced in an effort to highlight the problem of 'news' that is neither based upon evidence, nor facts. Hitherto this has been referred to as 'fiction' or 'propaganda' and no one, prior to the announced existence of 'fake news,' has ever felt the need to define stories based upon myth, unsubstantiated opinion, ramblings of the imagination or statements that lack any evidential basis, as anything other than fiction or propaganda. Such fictions have never, to my knowledge, been considered 'news.'

For example, when, in the spring of 1917, the Times of London and the Daily Mail reported the Germans were boiling human corpses in factories to extract glycerine, this was not 'news.' It was reported as if it were 'news' and millions of British people believed it, but the total absence of any supporting evidence meant it was, in fact, propaganda. It was the story's estrangement from any 'facts' that rendered it fictitious, regardless of how many people were

A Dangerous Ideology

daft enough to swallow it.

Traditionally we have all differentiated between news and fiction by virtue of the 'fact' the news attempts to objectively report an event based upon observation and available evidence. Whereas, fiction is 'made up' and blissfully free from these tiresome constraints. This is why reading fiction makes train journeys more tolerable while reading 'the news' often makes them seem utterly pointless.

Consequently, all this 'fake news' stuff seems a bit odd. Thus far, the term appears to have been exclusively linked to those who are reporting the news, rather than its evidential basis, or lack thereof. As far as I can tell, anything written or broadcast by the mainstream media is extolled as 'fact based journalism,' whereas anything which challenges the mainstream narrative is labelled 'fake news.'

The origin of the term 'fake news' has largely been attributed to Donald Trump. A Twitter addicted orange man, with a terrifying comb-over, who has been elected to the office of President of the United States by mistake.

Given the 2016 U.S. presidential election offered the American people a choice between a vacuous, serial bankrupt, TV personality and a woman widely accused of war crimes and child trafficking, you can't really blame the people any more than you can blame a cow for being milked.

The only people with any legitimate right to complain are those who were wise enough to stay at home and not vote for any one. Realising that whoever you vote for you always get the government', only those who refuse to support the system have any right to criticise it. The rest of us, who keep falling for the same ruse time and time again, in the forlorn hope that it will change something, which it never does, just have to suck it up.

Though give him his due, President Donald Trump has achieved something of note. He has invented a form of language which is apparently based upon the arbitrary use of words, loosely flung together, to form something he claims are sentences but lack the required 'meaning.' Remarkably he has surpassed the not inconsiderable achievements of his

A Dangerous Ideology

predecessor in this regard.

Language is not a haphazard construct. It is a precise tool we use both to understand one another and to form our own thoughts. Not only the conveyor but also the recipient of language must agree upon the meaning. Otherwise we are babbling incoherently to the clueless, even in our own minds, unable to express anything other than basic emotion. Objectivity requires far more clarity.

For example, it is difficult to know what Trump meant when he tweeted, "*guys are total losers—they had their story stolen right from under their bad complexions—other media capitalized.*" Similarly, while "*Bett Middler (his spelling, not mine) is an extremely unattractive woman, I refuse to say that because I always insist on being politically correct,*" doesn't necessarily fail the grammatical construct requirement, it does fall into the presumably Lewis Carroll inspired 'nonsense' category.

Admittedly 140 characters or fewer (Twitter's former limit) isn't the ideal linguistic form for conveying complex, or even very simple ideas. Which is why you would have thought someone in his inner circle would have stopped him from doing it. Who knows? Maybe they tried.

So to 'understand' what Trump meant when he popularised the term 'fake news' we should perhaps look at the etymologies of 'fake' and 'news' in an attempt to decipher his intention.

Linguist Anatoly Liberman, writing in the Oxford University Press's publication 'Academic Insights for the Thinking World,' traced 'fake' back to the colloquial language of the 18th century London underworld called 'Cant.' The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) defines the word as meaning 'to do' in Cant. They also offer further Cant based interpretation including to 'kill, wound or plunder.'

Liberman traced the first written use of the word to Charles Dickens 1819 novel 'Oliver Twist' which included the term 'cly-faker.' 'Cly' was a Cant word for pocket, indicating that a 'cly-faker' was a plunderer of pockets. A 'pick pocket' in more modern vernacular. Liberman then sought to

A Dangerous Ideology

determine how 'fake' was originally adopted by Cant speakers. He identified the Cant adoption of Germanic words like 'fik', 'fak' and 'fuk', meaning "to move back and forth" or "to cheat". He wrote:

"They probably meant 'go ahead, move; act, do,' with all kinds of specialization, from 'darn (a stocking),' to 'cheat,' to 'copulate.' Once they were appropriated by thieves, 'go ahead, do,' naturally, became 'deceive; steal, etc.'"

These words, once used by English Cant speakers, then apparently morphed with 16th century English words like 'fukkit' and disused verbs, such as 'feague,' to produce arguably the most useful, and certainly the most adaptable, word in the English language. 'Fuck'.

So for 'fake' it is not unreasonable to associate it with the word 'fuck' meaning, in this case, to cheat, steal, plunder or deceive. Therefore, perhaps when Trump coined the term 'fake news', he possibly meant 'fuck news.' This is very close to the popular expression 'fuck knows,' which is a reasonable response to anyone who asks what Trump is talking about.

My point here is, before assessing if something is believable or not, we need to be clear, not only about the intended meaning (what is implied) but also about our own comprehension. What do we understand? The only way we can understand anything is by examining the evidence, while being mindful of our own confirmation bias.

Lieberman also pointed out, in his estimation, at least 10% of words currently defined by the OED lack a clear etymology. 'Fake' being an example. This leads to the calculated probability that we have absolutely no idea what we are talking about at least 10% of the time. This is a conservative estimate in my view. Personally I am fairly certain that I don't know what I'm talking about 50% of the time at best. Of course, because I don't, I could well be wrong about that.

We are going to explore the evidence, offered by people called 'conspiracy theorists,' that the official narratives of both 9/11 and 7/7 are questionable. The concept of the state

A Dangerous Ideology

using false flag terrorism to manipulate public opinion is one of the most pervasive beliefs among the conspiracy theorist diaspora. It is also one of their most absurd allegations as far as the rest of us are concerned.

So if we are going to understand these seemingly ludicrous beliefs, which politicians suggest threaten the widespread destabilisation of society, seeking to understand why they adhere to this apparent nonsense would be a good start.

The September 2001 attacks in the U.S led to the launch of the 'war on terror;' the London transport bombings, four years later, coinciding with the G8 summit in Scotland, refocused the Anglo-American electorate on the threat of international terrorism.

Following the launch of the war in Afghanistan, in response to 9/11, and the subsequent 2003 invasion of Iraq, which plunged the country into social and political chaos, bogging western troops down in increasingly costly conflicts, support for the U.S and UK lead coalition's 'war' on Islamist extremists was rapidly waning.

The 7/7 attacks reinvigorated public support for continued military intervention. It also diverted attention away from the growing realisation that the proffered reason for the Iraq war, Saddam Hussein's alleged ability to attack the west with weapons of mass destruction, was 'made up.'

A lot of people already knew this, and millions of them took the time to march through the streets to point this out. However, unlike U.N weapons inspectors like Hans Blix and David Kelly, who urged caution and further investigation, the politicians were eager to crack on with the 'war on terror.'

Millions of people also 'know' that both 9/11 and 7/7 were effectively 'false flag' operations. They are certain they were either carried out or guided by agents of the so called 'deep state' (the military industrial & intelligence complex) or were 'allowed' to take place by the same.

Many claim these catalysing events cannot be seen in isolation. They form part of an ongoing program, to deceive the tax paying public into funding a global war machine,

A Dangerous Ideology

which generates trillions in profits for multinational corporations.

In order to facilitate this continual wealth transfer, we must all be convinced that a clear and present danger exists. When the situation dictates, the 'deep state' is fully prepared to effectively attack its own populations to achieve the necessary political and social conditions it requires to maintain its profits and reinforce its social control.

The use of false flags by governments to start wars and manipulate public opinion isn't particularly contentious. There are numerous, proven examples throughout history. So the possibility that both 9/11 and 7/7 were false flags isn't unreasonable, especially given the massive holes in the official narratives.

Or so the sceptics claim.

The vast majority of us reject this notion as ridiculous. We are reliably informed, by government, academia and the mainstream media, that the people who suggest this possibility are stupid and probably delusional. We are able to identify these intellectual pariahs by collectively referring to them as 'conspiracy theorists.'

Yet before we simply dismiss their claims shouldn't we at least consider the evidence they say they can demonstrate? This doesn't mean we will agree either with their record of events or the conclusions they draw but, if we don't even consider their evidence, how can we be certain they are wrong?

Indeed, how can any of us be certain we know anything at all?

The classical Greek philosopher Socrates, often credited as the founder of Western philosophy, said "*The only true wisdom is in knowing you know nothing.*" It serves as a warning we should heed. We need to be very wary of those who claim they 'know' the facts.

History is strewn with individuals who knew the truth. More to the point, it is littered with the bones of millions who accepted that they didn't know much, but believed and

A Dangerous Ideology

followed those who claimed they did.

Given the wisdom of an immense intellect like Socrates, it seems likely that those who are certain they 'know' how 9/11 and 7/7 occurred, and who was responsible, are not reliable sources of information upon which to base any response. Especially if that response means killing more people.

While both conspiracy theorists and government claim this certainty, at least the conspiracists suggest you exercise due diligence, research the evidence yourself and make up your own mind. However, in keeping with the government's approach, if you don't agree with their conclusions, you're wrong.

Herein lies one of the problems many of us have with conspiracy theorists who apparently claim possession of 'da troof.' Despite all the commonly held opinions, that most reasonable people consider plausible, the conspiracy theorists claim we are deluded 'sheeple' who need to 'awaken.' In this, some differ little from our idiot leaders who also state they know what is best for us.

For example President Trump appears to be a buffoon offering us his own version of 'truth.' One truism being the hitherto unknown existence of 'fake news.' While we may assume he means 'fiction', it appears he means something else. The accuracy of the reporting is an irrelevance as far as he is concerned. 'Fake news' doesn't mean 'fiction' in the mind of Trump. Regardless of how much evidence is offered to substantiate the reporting, as far as 'the Donald' is concerned, 'fake news' is news that makes him look bad.

In part this is fair enough as 'who' reports the news matters. Equally, so do the preconceptions of the reader. However, rejecting all evidence, simply because it is produced by people you don't usually agree with, is not objectively tenable.

If we aspire to objectivity, when assessing the validity of the news, political claims and social commentary, it is we, as recipients, who must be vigilant. We should reflect upon, not only the vested interests of those providing information and, perhaps more importantly, paying for its distribution, but

A Dangerous Ideology

equally our own confirmation bias.

The social psychologist Scott Plous defined confirmation bias as:

“...the tendency to search for, interpret, favor, and recall information in a way that confirms one's preexisting beliefs or hypotheses.”

People who consider themselves to have some kind of objective grasp of reality frequently get all uppity if you suggest they have a confirmation bias. Yet it is only those who recognise their own confirmation bias who have any chance at all of achieving any measure of objectivity. For our purposes here, we don't care 'who' reports the news. All sources are valuable until they are proven worthless.

Most of the sources quoted herein are found on the Internet. Some reading this will reject these as not being credible, claiming that only publications owned and distributed by billionaires are capable of providing 'trustworthy sources.' To which my response is twofold. Firstly, whilst being mindful of influence and agendas, the source's credibility should be assessed only in terms of the strength of evidence it offers in corroboration. Secondly, it's 2019.

In the time it has taken to write this book some of the sources cited will have been removed. However, any links I have provided can be found through the useful Internet archive called 'Wayback Machine.' Simply paste the link into Wayback Machine's search box and it will find the last indexed version of the given URL. The site address is:

(<https://archive.org/web/web.php>)

If we wish to understand the dangerous ideology of the 'conspiracy theorists,' we must try to evaluate the evidence they offer. It is important to acknowledge the social, political and cultural bias of the sources they provide and strive for objectivity. However, it is illogical to reject their evidence simply because we disagree with the political agenda of the source.

For example, if a news item from Russia Today is cited as a

A Dangerous Ideology

source, we can be fairly certain it will promote the policies of Vladimir Putin. However, if that same news item contains a first-hand witness account of a bombing, we shouldn't discount the testimony simply because RT have reported it. It is perfectly reasonable to ask why RT have chosen to report the testimony, but that does not mean it is false. We must apply evidential standards.

If you watch, read and/or listen to 'the news' with an open mind; if you value verifiable evidence, as crucial to establishing facts, and if you prefer to think for yourself, I hope you will find some value here.

This book is written for those not easily offended who value 'free speech.' I suggest, if you are quick to take offence, this probably isn't for you.

Part 1:

The Dissonant Battle

Chapter 1

Surely It's All Just Conspiracy Theory?

The whole world agrees, in 2001, 19 Islamist terrorists, predominantly Saudis, attacked the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon with jet airliners. They hijacked four planes and three hit their targets. Less than four years later, four British men chose to become suicide bombers. They were also Islamist terrorists who blew up three London underground trains and a public service bus. The attacks in the U.S provided the 'casus belli' to legitimise the 'war on terror' and the London atrocity, the political momentum to maintain and expand it.

Yet a significant minority of people across the world believe that both 9/11 and 7/7 were staged events. They claim they were 'false flag' attacks designed to propel the world into perpetual conflict with an intangible, and therefore, undefeatable enemy.

They say this conflict is primarily run for the continual profit of global corporations but also provides government with the justification it needs to roll out draconian legislation, designed to erode our freedoms, and censor any dissent

A Dangerous Ideology

against the rule of the political and financial elite. They claim everything we are told by our news media is propaganda, and our political leaders are merely the corrupt stooges of the hidden, corporate dictatorship that rules all of us.

This book is partly for those of us who suspect the so called 'conspiracy theorists' have a kangaroo loose in the top paddock and should probably have a little lie down.

World events, the reporting and interpretation of those events, undoubtedly shape both our own views and those of the policymakers who dictate many aspects of our lives. Often we don't agree with the decisions made in our name but, at least in Western democracies, we do get an opportunity to influence them.

Not so, say the conspiracy theorists. It is a complete charade. We have all been fooled into 'believing the lie.' It makes no difference who you vote for because the people who really run things aren't elected.

We are going to attempt to understand why, despite all the common beliefs most of us find reasonable, there are a growing number of people who suggest that nothing is as it seems.

Certainly conspiracy theory, as we understand the term today, is nothing new. Nearly every single significant world event has at least one conspiracy theory attached to it. These alternative interpretations are found throughout history.

In 117 CE, the Roman Emperor Trajan died only two days after adopting his successor Hadrian. All his symptoms indicated a stroke brought on by cardio vascular disease. The adoption made sense as Trajan was childless and Hadrian was his preferred successor. This seemed to be the final political act of a man who knew his time was up.

Yet by the 4th century, in the questionable historical text 'Historia Augusta,' a number of 'conspiracy theories' surrounding Trajan's death had emerged. The 'alternative' history, claimed in the Historia Augusta, was that Trajan had been poisoned by Hadrian with Attianus, Trajan's praetorian prefect and Trajan's wife, Plotina, the co-

A Dangerous Ideology

conspirators.

The text was a self-proclaimed biography of Roman leaders which opined on a range of Roman political events. Many of these accounts have subsequently been proven unsubstantiated conspiracy theories. It is now known the text was written for political reasons and was a deliberate attempt to falsify history. However, for centuries, the conspiracy theories were believed.

Conspiracy theorists say our mistrust of anything labelled as 'conspiracy' stops us recognising 'the truth.' Whereas most of us see the hand of error prone idiots, crooks, power hungry careerists and tyrannical despots behind the chaos we call politics, they see dark forces, purposefully manipulating world events, controlling our media driven misconceptions, propelling us towards a eugenic inspired, war-torn, dystopia. Unless we accept conspiracies are a reality, we will never be free from their grasp, claim the deluded 'conspiracy theorists.'

By seemingly rejecting the possibility that world events are usually the result of monumental cock-ups, rather than the furtive conspiracies they prefer, most of us feel they are too eager to offer nonsensical conclusions that rely upon unproven assumptions. We suggest they add, embellish and distort information to justify their own opinions; look for connections that aren't there; offer facts that lack supporting evidence and would rather believe their own myths than accept objective reality.

Take the conspiracy favourite the Illuminati, for example.

In 1776 Adam Weishaupt, professor of law at the University of Ingolstadt, with the support of other academics and leading business men, formed a secret order called the Illuminati. Weishaupt himself stated the purpose of his organisation was:

'..illumination, enlightening the understanding by the sun of reason, which will dispel the clouds of superstition and of prejudice'

From the outset this fraternity upset pretty much everyone.

A Dangerous Ideology

In 1777 Weishaupt and his fledgling organisation were incorporated into the local Masonic Lodge 'Theodor zum guten Rath' in Bavaria, modern day Germany. They assumed a masonic reforming agenda of 'pure masonry' and immediately incurred the wrath of many of their fellow Masons. The Illuminati were inspired by the radical rationalism that underpinned the French Revolution and promoted many of its principle arguments, upsetting the royalists. They also heavily prescribed every belief their members were required to unquestioningly accept, thereby winding up the sceptical, and rationalist followers of the Enlightenment.

Public relations does not appear to have been their strong point.

So it really doesn't come as much surprise that, having made a concerted effort to infiltrate and undermine local and even national government, in 1784 the Illuminati was banned by the Bavarian authorities. Weishaupt was kicked out of his university position and fled Bavaria, having been accused of sedition.

So the Illuminati project, on the face of it, appears to have been an ignominious, largely ineffective, failure. That is not how the 'conspiracy theorists' saw it then and is opposed to their modern historical interpretation.

By 1797 conspiracy theories about the Illuminati had spread as far as the United States of America. These were initially based upon the writings of the Scottish scientist John Robison. Robison claimed the Illuminati was created "*for the express purpose of rooting out all religious establishments, and overturning all the existing governments of Europe.*"

Amongst the New England federalists, who were strongly opposed to what they saw as rising religious infidelity and Jeffersonian democracy, this all seemed like fairly alarming stuff. Consequently, the pulpits soon began to ring out warnings of the Illuminati's evil intent.

The malevolent role of the Illuminati is only one of the hundreds, if not thousands, of conspiracy theories that have been further fuelled by the advent of the Internet. Our ability

A Dangerous Ideology

to share information, to communicate and collectively foment ideas, has never been greater. Conspiracy theories have remained extremely popular as a result.

These theories range from the existence of a shadowy secret government (the 'Deep State', 'the powers that shouldn't be', 'the New World Order' and so on) to the existence of aliens, secret basis on Mars, pan dimensional lizard people, fake moon landings, flat Earth and a holographic universe.

Within conspiracy theory circles there is often hot debate about these topics. Disagreements are frequent and many suspect infiltration by agents of the 'Deep State' to misdirect and misinform the 'truth movement.' In reality conspiracy theory is not a belief system. It is a term used to describe a huge range of opinions that present some form of challenge to orthodox views.

For example, people who don't agree that carbon dioxide causes global warming, those who question the efficacy of some vaccines, individuals who explore evidence of suppressed history and technology and some who suggest the monetary system is actually a fraudulent, criminal racket, are all castigated as conspiracy theorists. However, interest in one field doesn't necessarily mean the person is intrigued by another. People called conspiracy theorists don't all believe the same thing.

However, whatever the individual perspectives, there is an overarching theory the majority accept to some degree. Namely, that governments are lying through their teeth in order to control us. In this regard, they may have found some common ground with the rest of us.

Where we diverge is that most of us accept that the worst politicians are basically a bunch of lying, self-serving careerists, best ignored. However, we still recognise the value of our democratic system. Conspiracy theorists think they are PR agents for a malevolent kakistocracy, who we ignore at our peril. Further, the democratic system is now so hopelessly corrupt it no longer serves the people, only the feudal, corporate dictatorship that owns it. The question is why?

A Dangerous Ideology

Why do these people keep railing against what most of us consider to be patently obvious? What is it that drives them? Is there anything we can learn from them? Does anything they say make sense? Are we the hapless 'boiling frogs' they seem to think we are, or are they the irretrievable cranks we suspect?

Given their claims about state sponsored terrorism, it is certainly worth considering the question. If there is even the remotest chance these allegations have any legitimacy, we can't afford to simply dismiss them. Not without considering the evidence they say they can point us towards.

This is far from the first attempt to try to figure out why conspiracy theorists are so eager to convince the rest of us they know something we don't.

Talking about his book 'Voodoo Histories: the role of Conspiracy Theory in Modern History (2009),' the broadcaster and Times columnist David Aaranovitch wrote:

“.....belief in the conspiracy makes you part of a genuinely heroic elite group who can see past the official version duplicated for the benefit of the lazy or inert mass of people by the powers that be. There will usually be an emphasis on the special quality of thought required to appreciate the existence of the conspiracy. The conspiracists have cracked the code, not least because of their possession of an unusual and perceptive way of looking at things. Those who cannot or will not see the truth are variously described as robots or, latterly, as sheeple — citizens who shuffle half-awake through their conventional lives.”

Is Aaranovitch right? Are the conspiracists driven by a sense of intellectual superiority? Does this explain their rejection of our concept of reality?

In the course of researching this book, I have met with many conspiracy theorists. There is no single personality 'type' that I could identify. These people seem to encompass all ages, ethnicities, sexual orientations, disabilities and genders.

A Dangerous Ideology

They appear to represent a wide cross section of the political, social, economic and academic spectrum.

Some presented as arrogant, but no more so than you might expect from any other social group. Many vehemently reject the term 'conspiracy theorist.' Claiming it is used purely to marginalise them and silence any debate of the ideas they expound. Others seem less concerned.

I fully concede my opinion here isn't based upon anything like a controlled scientific study. It is simply a result of my wholly unscientific experience. However, I could not identify the unified sense of superiority that Aaranovitch suggests.

Academia has also had a stab at figuring out why people believe conspiracy theories. Jan-Willem van Prooijen, associate professor in social and organizational psychology at VU University Amsterdam, published his finding following a 6yr study into the subject. Prooijen claimed to identify two primary motivators that drive their beliefs. *'Fear and uncertainty'* and *'a sense of control.'*

He noted that conspiracy theories tend to proliferate during times of 'uncertainty and fear.' He cited examples of terrorist attacks, financial crisis, natural disasters and so on. Prooijen considered the fear and sense of helplessness, engendered by such events, makes people more likely to seek any explanation to account for their feelings. He wrote:

“The sense-making leads them to connect dots that aren't necessarily connected in reality,”

Whilst that may be the case, it doesn't really explain why many of these beliefs both precede and persist beyond the aftermath of traumatic world events. One might also consider, for many conspiracy theorists, traumatic world events are the core foundation of their beliefs. So it is perhaps not surprising their voices are heard more loudly when they occur.

Again Prooijen, like Aaranovitch, identifies a degree of possible arrogance as a potential contributory factor. His team split a sample group into two, giving one half an exercise to undermine self-confidence, the other a confidence

A Dangerous Ideology

building task. They then asked both groups to consider a particular Dutch conspiracy theory about the possible deliberate destruction of people's homes for corporate profit. Their evidence showed the more confident group were more likely to believe theory.

Conspiracy theorists say that science is no less corruptible than any other human endeavour. Indeed, one of their oft stated gripes about the rest of us is that, as a society, we either cherry pick evidence to support our existing beliefs, completely disregard it, or refuse to look at evidence we don't agree with. This is almost exactly the same accusation the rest of us level against them. We can't both be right. Can we?

So we are going to explore the basis for their 'wacky' theories in relation to the 9/11 and 7/7 terrorist attacks. If examining the proof they claim to back up their position confirms our suspicions that they are deluded, at least it will enable us to better refute their arguments. If we can't even be bothered to consider their evidence, we don't really have a leg to stand on.

Before we do, I just want to clarify some common ground that I share with many of the conspiracy theorists I spoke with.

Firstly the scientific method, the basis for empirical science, is not disputed. I agree that an observation can prompt a question. This question can be researched and a hypothesis, tentatively accounting for the observation, can be made. Ideally this hypothesis will then be tested through experimentation to see if it is valid. If any evidence emerges that disproves the hypothesis then, logically, the hypothesis cannot be considered to be substantive, because there is evidence it isn't. If it is not possible to disprove the hypothesis, then it may well be considered a theory.

Before any idea can be accepted as a theory it must pass rigorous checks. If the experiments are repeatable, if the evidence is corroborated, no matter who undertakes the study or conducts the experiment, regardless of where and when; if the results or findings consistently support the proposition then, in the absence of any contradictory evidence, we may accept the hypothesis has become a

A Dangerous Ideology

theory. Simply put, a theory only exists if the evidence supports it. If it doesn't, it remains little more than an unsubstantiated belief.

The process of checking the evidence that supports or undermines a hypothesis, the cross-referencing of data and analysis of experimentation by suitably qualified people, is vital. This is ostensibly the 'peer review process.'

I agree that a published paper, having undergone the peer review process, carries more weight than one that hasn't. However, refusals to publish papers for peer review should also be noted. If there is resistance to test, or even consider evidence, we must ask why. If the hypothesis is simply dismissed without any attempt to logically disprove it or scrutinise the evidence offered, then it stands unchallenged. It isn't proven but nor is it invalidated. I accept that exclusion from the peer review process indicates nothing other than an illogical veto on further inquiry.

If experimentation isn't feasible, such as in the case of most historical analysis, it is still possible to move a hypothesis to a theory through the systematic cross-referencing of evidence, the use of verifiable sources and the peer review process.

Primary evidence comes in two forms. Firstly we have 'material evidence' such as physical remains, soil samples, objects etc. Then there's 'written evidence' such as first-hand witness statements, contemporaneous documents, official reports and so forth. When we are considering relatively recent events, unedited footage showing what happened could be considered 'material evidence,' whilst a filmed interview with a survivor could be seen as 'written evidence.'

Secondary evidence is corroboration of the existence of primary evidence. For example, a peer reviewed paper on the use of biological weapons during the Vietnam War is strong secondary evidence of biological warfare. An article in the Washington Post, on the same subject, is less convincing. It may be considered secondary evidence but its objectivity is more questionable.

When assessing the value of any evidence it is important to

A Dangerous Ideology

consider the possible agenda of the individual or group who may have produced it. Especially when considering if a source is 'reliable.' A peer reviewed scientific paper into the effects of smoking could be considered evidence from a reliable source. However, if you subsequently discover the research team behind it were funded by a tobacco company, its credibility becomes doubtful. Establishing independence is important.

Conspiracy types frequently offer theories about world events which they ask the rest of us to believe. When we don't, because it makes no sense, they often accuse us of ignoring the facts.

The definition of a fact is:

“A thing that is known or proved to be true.”

So before we accept their 'facts,' we need to see some 'proof.' If that proof meets the evidential standards we've discussed, we can accept it as a 'fact.'

This does not mean that facts remain unchallenged. As new evidence emerges, the evidential basis changes. So facts are not considered immutable. They are logical conclusions drawn from current evidence.

While that evidence endures, so do the facts. Facts can only change when hitherto unknown evidence disproves them. Without supporting proof, there can be no subsequent fact.

Chapter 2

Who Are The Conspiracy Theorists?

Working diligently in his office, in the late 1980s, Tim Berners Lee was trying to solve a puzzle. He had all the pieces. The transmission control protocol and domain name system for identifying computer networks (TCP/IP); the 'Internet' of connected computer networks like the NPL network, ARPANET and CYCLADES and hypertext, such as Aspen Movie Map. He even had his own hypertext system called ENQUIRE, which he'd developed earlier in his career.

His problem was, as a contractor for CERN (the 'Conseil Européen pour la Recherche Nucléaire' or 'European Organization for Nuclear Research'), he needed to be able to openly share his own and his colleagues work with other researchers, across the globe, quickly and effectively.

What Berners Lee did next literally changed the world, though he didn't know it at the time. He brought all the strands together, produced his hypertext markup language (HTML,) and proposed a browser based, interconnected, computer communication system. Today we call this the 'World Wide Web' and the Internet wouldn't exist without it.

A Dangerous Ideology

Lee's brilliance shouldn't be underestimated but, essentially, he 'joined the dots' and came up with a single, cohesive answer to a question.

Without the Internet, as we know it today, it is unlikely that conspiracy theories would have risen to their current prominence. Of all the amazing advances brought about by our ability to communicate and share information instantaneously across the planet, increased awareness of 'conspiracy theories' isn't generally considered one of them.

Most of us think it unlikely that a bunch of sci-fi addicted, pot smoking, heavy breathers, randomly mixing Vedic mythology with amateurish political analysis and a persecution complex, will produce a meaningful paradigm. This is not a description, I hasten to add, the conspiracists accept, as they eagerly await the forthcoming 'paradigm shift.'

So is this image of the troglodyte geek, sitting in the red eyed glow of their computer screen, making up connections and evidence to suit their own predetermined world view, accurate? For us to make such claims we have to demonstrate good reason.

If we rely upon assumption and poorly evidenced opinion for our own rebuttal of conspiracy theorists ideas, they would be justified in claiming that it is us, not them, who have fallen into the trap of intellectual laziness. If we value objectivity, we need to look beyond the stereotypes and take a hard look at the reality.

Writing in the UK broadsheet newspaper The Guardian, political theorist and historian Dr Hugo Drochon[1] has offered his opinion on the matter[2]. He states:

You can find conspiracy theorists across all walks of life – and yet certain stereotypes remain, and refuse to be disproved: white middle-aged men who have lower educational qualifications and are unemployed are still most likely to be conspiracy theorists.'

A Dangerous Ideology

What is the data analysis Dr Drochon uses to support his conclusion about whom the conspiracy theorists are? He doesn't reveal this in the article, so we can only look at the demographic studies that do attempt to define the conspiracy theorist diaspora.

Political scientists Joseph Uscinski and Joseph Parent wrote a book on the subject.[3] Rather than simply ask people if they thought the Earth was flat, or if 9/11 was a Jewish plot to enslave humanity, Uscinski and Parent conducted a large scale survey seeking to identify 'conspiratorial thinking.'

They set a series of statements that required respondents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement. These included, for example, "*Much of our lives are being controlled by plots hatched in secret places,*" and "*The people who really 'run' the country are not known to the voters.*" The pair then analysed their results to identify those most likely to be conspiracy believers and to gain a measurable insight into who these people were.

Women were just as likely to be conspiracy theorists as men. Black and Hispanic people represented the ethnic groups most likely to believe the theories. Conspiracy theorists, in keeping with the general population, came predominantly from outside of academia but a notable 23% were University educated.

What surprised Uscinski and Parent the most was that conspiracists couldn't easily be categorized by ideology. Liberal and conservative, socialist and capitalist, Democrat and Republican were all equally likely to be conspiracy believers. They did find 'independents' had an increased propensity to believe but, whilst statistically notable (and perhaps not entirely unexpected,) it didn't amount to a clear ideological predisposition.

However, they did find a statistical link to age. Those borne in the late '60s to early '80s (Generation X) were statistically the most likely to be 'truthers.' When the scientists tried to account for this they recognised that this was the generation who had developed their political sensibilities during a period characterised by conspiracies that were subsequently proven to be true.

A Dangerous Ideology

“Every age sees scandals, but Gen X’ers grew up in a somewhat anomalous age of less innocence: in the wake of shocking assassinations, galling FBI and CIA revelations, Vietnam, Watergate, and Iran-Contra,”

So Dr Drochon's opinion offers an interesting hypothesis, but lacks supporting evidence. It appears to be little more than his own unsubstantiated personal view. This doesn't mean he's 'certainly' wrong, only that the evidence suggests he may be. If we are going to rise above the speculative drivel offered by our 'loony conspiracy theorists' friends, then we should avoid jumping to evidentially flawed conclusions ourselves.

For example, some studies have been undertaken to try to figure out how many conspiracy theorists there are. The two most notable were both conducted by the market research company YouGov, in collaboration with the University of Cambridge Conspiracy and Democracy project.[4] Their findings were quite revealing.

They claimed that 19% of Americans believe that 9/11 was an inside job, 11% of Brits thought the same and 18% of British people believed that man-made climate change was a lie, compared to 13% in the US. They also found that at least 50% of people (in both the U.S. and the UK) accepted one or more of the many conspiracy theories they defined. These included those who thought alien spaceships crashed at Roswell or the moon landings were faked; the people who thought JFK was assassinated by the government and others who thought international terrorism is often a project of the Western intelligence agencies.

Further research indicated even these figures may have been conservative estimates. A number of polls were conducted in the wake of the 9/11 attacks, as governments and institutions sought to gauge public reaction. These varied in size and methodology but still revealed some interesting figures.

According to Wikipedia, who claim to have collated these studies, only 46% of Americans believed Al Qaeda were

A Dangerous Ideology

behind the 9/11 attacks, with 29% of the opinion another group were responsible. 15% in total blamed the U.S. Government itself.

Nor, it seems, does the passage of time diminish these deeply held views. A 2003 Gallup poll found that three quarters of Americans believed the 1963 assassination of President Kennedy was a conspiracy of some sort. Just 19% believed the official explanation.[6]

So it seems that conspiracy theorists, far from being a lunatic fringe, existing in the twilight zone of social exclusion, are actually a sizeable minority, perhaps a majority by some measures. They are our neighbours, shop keepers, teachers and even police officers. They are our friends, family and colleagues. Just like the rest of us in other words.

So why on Earth do so many people believe these apparently incredible theories?

Having looked at many of the explanations offered thus far, it seems that nearly every researcher and commentator, who has attempted to answer this question, have, for whatever reason, avoided the most obvious explanation. As a result, while many offer extremely plausible rationales, their arguments are invariably unbalanced.

The well know experimental psychologist, and founder of The Septic Society, Michael Shermer, who advocates scientific scepticism, has offered some interesting observations. He suggests that people tend to believe conspiracy theories in response to powerful, underlying psychological influences.[7]

Shermer theorises they struggle to manage something called 'cognitive dissonance.' This is a known form of psychological distress which occurs when people are exposed to two or more plausible, but contradictory thoughts. It is an uncomfortable feeling we experience whenever we hold opposing beliefs, values or ideas.

Shermer suggests that cognitive dissonance will not allow people to easily accept that a great leader like President Kennedy can be murdered by a lone crank like Oswald. It

A Dangerous Ideology

'feels' unbelievable, so we seek alternative interpretations to account for this feeling. He wrote:

“Big effects need big causes — we want balance between the size of the cause and the size of the effect.

. JFK was the most powerful political person on the planet, yet he was killed by a lone nut, a nobody living on the margins of a free society. There’s no balance. To reduce this dissonance and balance the scales, people have concocted countless co-conspirators”

Furthermore, he contends that anxiety is a powerful influence. When events occur which expose our vulnerabilities and sense of helplessness, we are compelled to find reassuring narratives, no matter how absurd, that explain our experience.

“Psychological research also shows that when people are placed in environments or conditions in which they feel anxiety and a loss of control, they are more likely to see illusory patterns in random noise and to look to conspiracies as explanations for ordinary events.”

Shermer also identifies the psychological difficulty he thinks conspiracy theorists have in managing the concept of chaos or randomness.

“Another psychological factor at work is that the mind abhors randomness. We humans are terrible at understanding chance and probabilities. We find hidden patterns everywhere, even in purposefully random sequences and noise. And yet much of what goes on in life, in politics and in history at large is the product of chance and randomness. By this I do not mean to imply that JFK was killed by a random event, but that Oswald acting alone feels like a

random factor when compared to a vast conspiratorial cabal plotting to overthrow the United States government.”

So, whilst Shermer stops short of defining so called 'truthers' as crazy, he advocates that conspiracy theories emerge as a consequence of mental health problems. This is a view echoed by many other researchers, commentators and academics who have attempted to explain why so many people accept such apparently preposterous ideas.

Two years after the Kennedy assassination the American historian Richard Hofstadter suggested that conspiracy theorists refusal to accept official narratives was bordering upon delusional. He also noted the strain of unjustified elitism common to the 'truther:'

“As a member of the avant-garde who is capable of perceiving the conspiracy before it is fully obvious to an as yet unaroused public, the paranoid is a militant leader. He does not see social conflict as something to be mediated and compromised, in the manner of the working politician. Since what is at stake is always a conflict between absolute good and absolute evil, what is necessary is not compromise but the will to fight things out to a finish. Since the enemy is thought of as being totally evil and totally unappeasable, he must be totally eliminated—if not from the world, at least from theatre of operations to which the paranoid directs his attention. This demand for total triumph leads to the formulation of hopelessly unrealistic goals, and since these goals are not even remotely attainable, failure constantly heightens the paranoid’s sense of frustration. Even partial success leaves him with the same feeling of powerlessness with which he began, and this in turn only strengthens his awareness of the vast and terrifying quality of the enemy he opposes.”

A Dangerous Ideology

This theme of the confused, irrational victim, struggling to come to terms with overwhelming events and living in fear of the 'unseen,' is often cited as a reason for conspiratorial beliefs. Another is the sense of exclusion from the political mainstream.

The suggestion is conspiracy theorists feel ignored by the political establishment. They are 'unheard' and their concerns are not reflected by any political representatives who have realistic hopes of gaining power. Without representation, these people feel disenfranchised, shut out of the democratic process and, again, are driven to find alternative 'stories' that account for this.

This conspiracy theorist's experience of political exclusion, real or perceived, was described by the Rolf Fredheim (Research Fellow at Cambridge University.)[9]

“Conspiracy theories are a marginal phenomenon, a form of disreputable counter-knowledge, and therefore unlikely to bring down strong democratic governments. Nonetheless, a case might be made that they contribute to a sometimes misplaced trust in elites. By all accounts, such trust is at historic lows. Complacency and political cynicism may be at corresponding highs. As Hugo noted, the polling data we have seen tends to suggest a link between conspiracy theorising and political disengagement. Trust correlates with irrational suspicion.”

It is also something which Dr Drochon identifies:

“..it is a sense of exclusion that characterises conspiracy theorists: those who reject the political system as a whole, who have a complete distrust of all political institutions, and those who don't vote. Or if they do vote, they vote for extremes.”

Given that research shows the huge number of people who believe at least one of these conspiracy theories, if we believe the assertions of researchers like Fredheim, Drochon and

A Dangerous Ideology

Hofstadter, we have an immense social problem. Their findings suggest that a significant number of our fellow citizens are not only delusional, but lack any sense of participatory involvement in society. A pretty dangerous cocktail.

However, before we get tooled up, and start digging defensive positions in the local park to fend off gangs of marauding, befuddled, middle-aged fat blokes wearing provocative tee shirts, I suggest we have a rethink.

Whilst this image of the 'conspiracy nut' raises worrying fears of chaotic disorder, these attempts to define conspiracists miss an essential, rather crucial point. They are all based upon an assumption which, if it's incorrect, renders these conclusions practically meaningless. The assumption is that conspiracy theories themselves are all baseless.

What if there really is evidence to support the theories? That would change any assessment of the conspiracy theorists' motivations, wouldn't it?

Suddenly their reasoning, far from being driven by irrational paranoia, is potentially rooted in awareness of the facts. Rather than disenfranchised ne'er-do-wells, impotently scrabbling for a social and political foothold, they could just as easily be active citizens, fighting for our collective enlightenment. The 'idiot' becomes the 'critical thinker.'

How can any academic researcher claim objectivity if their own study is based upon an unsubstantiated presumption? Namely, that conspiracy theories are without foundation. Effectively, by excluding the possibility that the conspiracy theorists have good reason to hold their beliefs, any attempt to understand their motivation is flawed.

This doesn't mean it should be 'assumed' conspiracy theories are rational. Assumption has no place in objective inquiry. However, if the whole premise of your research is to understand why people hold supposedly delusional beliefs you do need to be reasonably certain their expressed opinions are, in fact, delusional in the first place.

A Dangerous Ideology

Consider undertaking research into why seagulls choose to live on precarious cliff edges, while excluding their ability to fly as a possible contributory factor. You will inevitably conclude that seagulls are either adrenalin junkies or have suicidal tendencies. Your conclusion is unavoidably awry.

This is understandable for most of us. We are free to simply dismiss conspiracy theorists as silly, but leading academics and paid researchers, who are funded to publish their results for our information, are required to maintain higher intellectual standards. Otherwise, what purpose do they serve? You may just as well ask your mates down the pub.

They should first consider 'truthers' arguments and look at the evidence they offer, before announcing their idiocy. This is indivisible from seeking an understanding of their motivations.

While eminently qualified individuals like Drochon, Shermer, Hofstadter and Fredheim are a lot smarter than I am, even I know that academic theories stem from empirical evidence. I am reasonably certain that disregarding, or deliberately avoiding, evidence that doesn't fit with your predetermined conclusion, is not a scientific principle.

I am not suggesting these men, or the other academics who have come to similar conclusions, have done so. I am saying I can find no evidence in their 'conspiracy theorist' research that addresses the veracity, or otherwise, of 'truthers' claims. The assumption is that they are all entirely without merit, but no evidence is offered to substantiate this claim.

What we most commonly see in this research is a blanket acceptance of the official account of events. No consideration is given to the possibility the accepted narrative is wrong. The basic facts, underpinning the study, are unknown.

Many government conspiracies have been proven and are common knowledge. Iran-Contra[10], The Gulf of Tonkin incident[11] and numerous others, actually happened. The reality that the public have frequently been misled to further policy objectives is a proven, historical fact.

Therefore, the assumption that anyone who claims

A Dangerous Ideology

conspiracies exist must be some sort of 'defective' is simply wrong. It is reasonable for people to identify conspiracy as a potential cause. The observations do not rule out the 'false flag' hypothesis.

The respected author and essayist Christopher Hitchens addressed this in his essay 'On the Imagining of Conspiracy.' He wrote:[8]

“.....you may have noticed that those who are too quick to shout ‘conspiracy theorist’ are equally swift, when consequences for authority and consensus impend, to look serious and say: ‘It’s more complicated than that.’ These have become standard damage-control reflexes.”

Writing about the use of the term 'conspiracy theorist' to discredit people he added:

“One has become used to this stolid, complacent return serve: so apparently grounded in reason and scepticism but so often naive and one-dimensional.”

Hitchens was referring to the pejorative use of the term. There is no doubt the modern usage is derogatory. When most of us use the phrase 'conspiracy theorist' we mean someone who has taken leave of their senses and will believe any old bunk. These people are fantasist who understand next to nothing about the 'real world.'

The Oxford English Dictionary, on the other hand, offers a fairly benign definition of conspiracy theory:

“A belief that some covert but influential organization is responsible for an unexplained event.”

I know many conspiracy theorists who broadly accept this. Though they are quick to point out they are interested in offering explanations for so called 'unexplained' events.

Generally it isn't their attempts to provide narratives that account for unexplained world events that annoy us. It is

their insistence that we consider counter narratives for events we have already satisfactorily explained which really wind us up. Wikipedia offers a definition that most of us would probably consider closer to the mark.

“A conspiracy theory is an explanation of an event or situation that invokes an unwarranted conspiracy, generally one involving an illegal or harmful act carried out by government or other powerful actors. Conspiracy theories often produce hypotheses that contradict the prevailing understanding of history or simple facts. The term is a derogatory one”

This is the definition adopted by many of the academic researchers. The suggested conspiracy is unwarranted, contradicts our understanding of history and does not account for simple facts. Yet the legal definition of 'conspiracy' makes no assumption that a suspicion of conspiracy is unwarranted:

“An agreement between two or more person's to engage jointly in an unlawful or criminal act, or an act that is innocent in itself but becomes unlawful when done by the combination of actors.”

Surely few of us can disagree with this? The planning of crimes by two or more individuals is something which happens all the time. This suggests that a 'conspiracy theory' is nothing more than a rationale alerting us to a possible crime planned or committed by a group.

So how come we now use the phrase 'conspiracy theorist' to mean someone who is making a deranged allegation? A person who thinks they are smarter than the rest of us but are unable to understand basic, logical principles.

The first written reference to this may have been offered in the 1870s in the Journal of Mental Science vol 16.[12]

“The theory of Dr Sankey as to the manner

A Dangerous Ideology

in which these injuries to the chest occurred in asylums deserved our careful attention. It was at least more plausible that the conspiracy theory of Mr Charles Beade”

This infers ‘conspiracy theory’ is synonymous with implausibility, though the connection is not explicit. In fact, the term was still being used in closer keeping with the legal definition throughout the first half of the 20th Century. After the Second World War, we find increasing pejorative use of ‘conspiracy theory’ to describe a form of ill-informed thinking.

The philosopher Karl Popper alluded to this in his 1945 political work 'The Open Society and Its Enemies'. Popper was essentially criticising historicism. He stated that historical events were vulnerable to misinterpretation by those who were too eager to see a conspiracy behind them. He argued this was because historians suffered from cognitive dissonance (which Shermer later expanded upon) and rejected the possibility of random, chaotic events influencing history, preferring conspiratorial explanations. Usually because they were better stories.

Even Poppers definition doesn't fully describe the modern use of 'conspiracy theory.' As previously mentioned, Richard Hofstadter outlined many of the arguments used to repudiate the ideas of modern conspiracy theorists in 1964, but he did not use the term himself.

In 1967 the CIA released a briefing paper to their staff advising them on a set of techniques they could employ to challenge, or side-line, anyone who questioned the Warren Commission's Report into the investigation of the Kennedy assassination. This document came to light following a 1976 Freedom of Information request from the New York Times. It was called CIA Document 1035-960 'Countering Criticism of the Warren Report.' [13]

This is arguably the first time we saw the combination of Hofstadter's view of the “*paranoid*” as “*a militant*” with Poppers “*conspiracy theory of society*” to produce our modern interpretation.

A Dangerous Ideology

The document states:

“Conspiracy theories have frequently thrown suspicion on our organization, for example by falsely alleging that Lee Harvey Oswald worked for us. The aim of this dispatch is to provide material countering and discrediting the claims of the conspiracy theorists, so as to inhibit the circulation of such claims in other countries.”

This document is like 'manna from heaven' for our conspiracy types. “Look! See, we told you so,” they declare, “this proves there's a global conspiracy to shut us up.”

This is the problem with many conspiracy theorists. They simply assert statements as if they are irrefutable, pouncing on any evidence that may support their arguments while failing to acknowledge alternative, equally plausible explanations.

This document does appear to be primary evidence that the derogatory use of the phrase was first, clearly outlined by, of all people, the CIA. However, it certainly is not proof of anything, other than the CIA's annoyance with the conspiracy theorists. Just because they first coined the modern connotation and common response, it doesn't mean the rest of society picked it up from them. Causation cannot be determined from this alone. Especially given that people were referencing conspiracy theory as far back as 1871.

Nonetheless, the document then goes on to recommend techniques to discredit conspiracy theories. These included employing “*propaganda assets to [negate] and refute the attacks of the critics*”, to avoid “*discussion of the assassination*,” the use of “*friendly elite contacts (especially politicians and editors)*” to publicly state “*the charges of the critics are without serious foundation*” and so on.

In this document the CIA advanced a number of specific tactics to undermine the conspiracy theorists. These included:

1. Refute any evidence offered and cite only official reports

A Dangerous Ideology

stating 'no new evidence has emerged.'

2. Dismiss contradictory eyewitness statements and focus upon the existing, primary, official evidence such as ballistics, autopsy, and photographic evidence.

3. Suggest that large scale conspiracies are impossible to cover up in a huge, open and free democracy.

4. Accuse the conspiracy theorists of having an intellectual superiority complex.

5. Suggest that theorists refuse to acknowledge their own errors.

6. Refute any suggestion of witness assassinations by pointing out they were all deaths by natural causes.

7. Question the quality of conspiracy research and point out that ours is better.

In part these seem reasonable, but do hint at the personal attacks conspiracy theorists say are used to illogically discredit their arguments. For them this is the 'smoking gun' that proves, beyond any reasonable doubt, the CIA reinterpreted the term 'conspiracy theorist' to undermine them. Regardless of what proof they offer.

They say it is simply a propaganda technique designed to promote the idea, among the wider population, that conspiracists are clueless idiots. Moreover, this was done to ensure the public dismissed any evidence they offered without ever looking at it. They frequently point to this document whenever they identify these techniques apparently being used against them today.

If we are going to approach this subject objectively we have to concede that 'Document 1035-960' does suggest this possibility. Similarly, if the conspiracy theorists are going to claim the same, they should acknowledge that it could equally be a sensible response by an establishment that was justified in believing nonsensical, JFK conspiracy theories presented a genuine threat to social stability. It is interesting evidence but it is far from the smoking gun claimed.

A Dangerous Ideology

The problem for anyone trying to understand the conspiracy theory phenomenon is that the debate has devolved into little more than an adversarial slanging match. Some conspiracy theorists have their own dogmatic beliefs, as do the rest of us. We stand looking at each other across the divide hurling insults and ad hominem attacks. To the majority they are 'conspiratards' and, for this significant minority, we are 'sheeple.' This is not going to lead to anything other than a failure to communicate and none of us are likely to learn anything from it.

If we were discussing football it wouldn't matter, but no one can deny the serious implications suggested by this debate. Especially as we consider the ongoing war on terror and potential global conflict with Russia, China and Iran. It potentially concerns each and every one of us.

Unless both sides look at the evidence, none of us have any chance of resolving this issue. If the academics and politicians are right, then the so called conspiracy theorists represent a huge number of people who feel completely excluded from society and are creating a potentially dangerous mythology as a result.

History teaches us this rarely ends well.

However, if there is any truth at all to the conspiracy theorists claims, particularly with regard to the war on terror and the events that supposedly compelled it, our children will not thank us for ignoring the people who were trying to alert us all to the danger while we did nothing. So perhaps we should tentatively consider the modern definition of 'conspiracy theorist' preferred by those who are labelled with it.

Conspiracy theorist: Nothing more than a derogatory title used to dismiss a critical thinker.

Chapter 3

Are Conspiracy Theorists Extremists?

The crimes suggested by 'conspiracy theorists,' that 9/11 and 7/7 were sponsored terrorist attacks; that hidden elements within the U.S administration and UK government colluded to facilitate these atrocities and these malevolent forces were willing to murder their own citizens to achieve their own political objectives, is so far beyond accepted social norms it appears to be nothing short of complete lunacy.

Most consider this an 'extreme' view, but does it therefore imply those who hold it are 'extremists?' What does it mean to be an extremist and how is extremism defined?

We have already discussed the empirical evidence which shows the people who maintain this opinion are not an insignificant minority. Nor are these deeply held, anti-establishment views anything new. What is new, is the potential to spread these ideas across wider society with relative ease.

Whether the perceived growth in conspiracy theory is

A Dangerous Ideology

actually happening is debatable. Some say the Internet, and social media in particular, has led to a proliferation of conspiratorial thinking. However, there is research which indicates this isn't necessarily the case. For example, by studying readers' letters, published by the New York times between 1897 and 2010, analysis suggests levels of disbelief in government narratives have remained fairly constant.[14]

Other studies suggest the social media effect, far from broadening peoples perspectives and introducing them to new ideas, has resulted in the creation of 'echo chambers.' Social media users tend to seek out those they already agree with. They form 'information silos' with likeminded individuals, who collectively resist counter narratives and reject any evidence which undermines the groups predetermined belief system.

The Internet has increased people's awareness of the existence of conspiracy theories. However, the evidence doesn't demonstrate this has resulted in them becoming more widely accepted.

If anything, social media appears to be making people less willing to entertain new concepts or explore previously unknown evidence. Perhaps the real concern should be that our online lives are deepening divisions in society and eroding our ability to reasonably debate one another.[15]

What can be said is governments are unwilling to take the risk. They are evidently determined to draw parallels between 'conspiracy theory', extremism and even terrorism. They are racing ahead with legislation designed to stop the possible spread of this dangerous ideology.

Germany have passed the 'Network Enforcement Law' which will instantly fine social media organisations up to €50M if they don't remove information the German government doesn't approve of; President Emmanuel Macron of France has announced new judicial powers to combat 'fake news' which will enable judges to block any content the French state doesn't like; in the U.S. amidst a raft of anti-extremism legislation, we see the Countering Foreign Propaganda Act and Foreign Entities Reform Act aimed at foreign media organisations, such as Russia Today, who aren't reporting

A Dangerous Ideology

the news the way the U.S. state want it to be reported; Australia and the European Union have introduced stringent copyright laws which will effectively block independent content creators from sharing mainstream media stories, heavily curtailing their ability to critique the news for their followers.

Similarly in Brazil, India, Poland, Italy, the Czech Republic and many other countries, the program to shut down the free exchange of information across the Internet is well underway.

We are told these new laws, which consequently create new crimes, are for our protection. Terrorist cells and dangerous hate preachers are using mass social media platforms to coordinate their activity, brainwash new recruits and undermine the fabric of our society with their toxic dogma.

Oppressive states, who hate our way of life, such as Russia, Iran and China, are abusing our Internet freedoms to cause uncertainty and chaos among the population. Using sock puppet accounts and state propaganda outlets, they spread fake news like a virus infecting our democratic systems.

The problem is, legislation supposedly designed to stop disaffected teenagers from becoming terrorists, appears to have other, much broader consequences. Compelled by governments to 'take down' extremist content, the social media giants are doing far more than just removing ISIS recruitment videos.

Huge numbers of so called 'alternative media' sites have seen their channels banned, feeds withheld from subscribers and pages closed. They've had their access to funding removed, advertising revenues withdrawn and can't share their content, even to their own followers.

Whether by design or not, the effect has been to stop people sharing book discussions online. Not people who advocate hate or promote violence, just people who ask questions. People who don't believe the government, as if that were something new. Shock jocks, amateur sleuths, retired professors, former politicians, bloggers, independent journalists and former intelligence analysts appear to be the

A Dangerous Ideology

'non-violent extremists' who are being censored.

It seems telling, that while the political class uses the questionable 'fake news' meme to protect the 'independence' of the media they are simultaneously suppressing all media that is truly independent. Clearly, when they say 'independent media,' what they mean is mainstream media. Media owned by billionaire oligarchs, with close ties to the state, who are all staunchly supportive of establishment narratives.

The genuine independent media, borne from the current citizen freedoms afforded by the Internet, is constantly under attack. Unlike the mainstream media, it has a strong anti-establishment vein running through it. While some purveyors of 'alternative media' offer fairly poor, inaccurate news commentary, it is certainly no worse than the trash journalism we often find in the lower quality mainstream media.

The best 'alternative media' outlets, such as the Corbett Report, Tragedy and Hope, 21st Century Wire, The UK Column, The OffGuardian and many others, offer a depth of analysis almost entirely absent from the MSM. Not only do they use investigative journalism, something the MSM no longer seem capable of, they provide links to their information sources. They encourage readers to consider the evidence themselves. They are also widely accused of being 'conspiracy theorists.'

This is in stark contrast to the mainstream media. They simply report their news and insist you believe it. Citation of primary evidence is rare, and the reporting always reflects the political standpoint of the editorial team and, usually, the owners.

Perhaps the state has legitimate reason for concern. There will undoubtedly be some 'extremists' among the millions who believe in one conspiracy theory or another. Just as there are in any political interest group. However, with regard to those who question 9/11 and 7/7, the view is overwhelmingly that we are being misled into supporting unnecessary wars of conquest. It is essentially an anti-war movement.

A Dangerous Ideology

It isn't beyond the realms of possibility that some deranged individuals may take it upon themselves to use violence, in a pointless attempt to 'overthrow the government.' Nonetheless, there is no evidence, or reason, to believe there are disproportionate numbers of such people among those who question official accounts of terrorist attacks, or any other event.

In November 2001 George W. Bush addressed the United Nations General Assembly with the following words:

“We must speak the truth about terror. Let us never tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories concerning the attacks of September the 11th; malicious lies that attempt to shift the blame away from the terrorists, themselves, away from the guilty. To inflame ethnic hatred is to advance the cause of terror.”[16]

Let's be clear about what Bush was saying here. He was firmly suggesting that anyone who questioned the official story of 9/11 was inflaming “*ethnic hatred*” and supporting terrorism. Given the numbers and demographic range of people who, research shows, question 9/11, the insinuation that all are violent extremists, who support mass murder, seems ludicrous. His assertion was not based upon any evidence.

In 2014, then British Prime Minister David Cameron, also delivered a speech to the U.N. He equally contended that ‘conspiracy theorist’ was analogous with ‘terrorist,’ though he chose to lump them in with fascists as well.

To defeat ISIL – and organisations like it - we must defeat this ideology in all its forms.....

.....it is clear that many of them were initially influenced by preachers who claim not to encourage violence, but whose world view can be used as a justification for it. We know this world view.

A Dangerous Ideology

The peddling of lies: that 9/11 was a Jewish plot or that the 7/7 London attacks were staged.....

We must be clear: to defeat the ideology of extremism we need to deal with all forms of extremism – not just violent extremism.

.....We must proscribe organisations that incite terrorism against people at home and abroad. We must work together to take down illegal online material.....we must stop the so called non-violent extremists from inciting hatred and intolerance in our schools, our universities and yes, even our prisons.

Of course there are some who will argue that this is not compatible with free speech and intellectual inquiry.

But I say: would we sit back and allow right-wing extremists, Nazis or Klu Klux Klansmen to recruit on our university campuses? No.

So we shouldn't stand by and just allow any form of non-violent extremism.we need the strongest possible international focus on tackling this ideology - which is why here at the United Nations, the United Kingdom is calling for a new Special Representative on extremism.[17]

Again there is a clear insinuation that millions of ordinary men and women, exercising their legitimate right to demand answers from their governments, are extremists and possibly terrorists. If you ask any questions, he claimed, you are just the same as the Islamist extremist Imam preaching violent jihad to potential terrorist recruits.

Cameron's diatribe was one of the first times we witnessed a leading political figure suggest that belief in a 'conspiracy theory' is symptomatic of "right-wing" extremism. Again,

A Dangerous Ideology

there is no evidence to support this assertion. Studies show people labelled 'conspiracy theorist' cannot be characterised by political ideology.

According to Cameron if you question any aspect of the official account of 7/7 you are a "*non-violent extremist*" committing the very real crime of "*inciting hatred*." Clearly, there are senior policy makers who are determined to define those labelled 'conspiracy theorist' as extremist, with the potential to become terrorists. Regardless of the fact there is no justification for such claims.

This enables legislatures to use the new anti-extremism and hate speech laws to silence its harshest critics. With imprisonment a strong possibility for those who hold the wrong opinion.

We should note, there is no '*type*' of person who ends up with the '*conspiracy theorist*' label stuck to them. The government and the mainstream media continually insist this is the case. If not extremists, they must at least be 'alt-right' or 'far right' with strong tendencies towards fascism and anti-Semitism thrown in for good measure.

If you are a regular consumer of mainstream media (MSM) how could you possibly think otherwise? This message is continually being repeated and reaffirmed. There is no deviation from this notion across the entire MSM. It is never challenged. Whether you favour conservative, liberal or more left leaning media, the message is clear and consistent. This uniformity suggests a coordinated campaign. Which shouldn't be possible if we have a free press.

In reality we don't. A recent study by the campaign group 'Reporters Without Borders' ranked the UK 40th and the U.S 45th, out of 180 countries surveyed, for press freedoms.[18]. However this hasn't deterred the current UK Foreign Secretary, Jeremy Hunt, from lecturing the world on the importance of freedom of speech, in which freedom of the press plays a pivotal role.[19]

Yet the public perception of press freedom in the West is that we are practically unique in the degree of open discourse we enjoy. While we anticipate social norms will predominate, the

A Dangerous Ideology

role of the press, in a free and open democracy, is to question authority without fear or favour. So somewhere, amidst the thousands of column inches and hundreds of hours of media broadcast every day, you could reasonably expect at least some opposition to the state doctrine.

Yet there is none. The message that any who question official accounts of terrorist attacks are extremists is absolutely maintained. In keeping with government policy.

We can see how this propaganda is intended works when we look at the words of the former UK Home Secretary, Amber Rudd.

Speaking in 2017 Rudd was presenting proposals, at the Conservative Party conference, to strengthen anti-terrorism legislation. She suggested imprisoning offenders for up to 15 years if they 'persistently' viewed or shared 'extremist material.' She said:

I want to make sure those who view despicable terrorist content online, including jihadi websites, far-right propaganda and bomb-making instructions, face the full force of the law.There is currently a gap in the law around material that is viewed or streamed from the Internet without being permanently downloaded.....This is an increasingly common means by which material is accessed online for criminal purposes and is a particularly prevalent means of viewing extremist material such as videos and web pages.

By continually forging the link between 'conspiracy theory' and the 'far-right,' the association legitimises government moves to take down 'conspiracy theory' content. Just as the Social Media giants are currently doing, at the behest of the state. Questioning 9/11 is tantamount to declaring your love for National Socialism. Or so we are told.

Everything we post online is monitored by the intelligence agencies. Every email, Facebook post, tweet, video comment and Instagram 'challenge' is gathered and analysed by the likes of the National Security Agency (NSA,) in the U.S. and Government Communication Headquarters (GCHQ,) in the UK.

A Dangerous Ideology

For example, the NSA operate PRISM. This goes to the source. It intercepts all traffic from the Internet Service Providers (ISP's) who connect us to the Internet.[57] Similarly GCHQ have operated ECHELON since the 1960's and their ability to hack the fibre optic cables which connect the global Internet has been well known for some time.[58]

Unless you use careful encryption and secure private networks, there is no such thing as Internet privacy. The MSM hype of alleged data breaches are a nonsense. Governments, and increasingly private contractors, have been spying on everybody, buying and selling their data, for years.

Many will say that people watching beheading videos and downloading bomb making instructions should be monitored. This is reasonable. The problem is the people who use high level data encryption include criminals and terrorists. The laws targeting what we all watch, read and listen to online won't affect them at all. Or do you believe hardened Islamist terrorist groups communicate and divulge their planned attacks on Facebook?

Nor, given the capabilities of the world's intelligence agencies, is there any need for this legislation to 'combat extremism.' If anyone watches an ISIS recruitment video on YouTube, the security services will almost certainly know who, when and where they watched it, in seconds. So it is legitimate to question why we need to restrict Internet freedoms at all.

If these laws are both unnecessary and useless what is their intention? If the 'extremism' isn't 'terrorism' what is it? This will depend entirely upon the government's definition of extremism.

Rudd was threatening people who watch these 'extremist' videos or read 'extremist' websites with incarceration. While this speech was delivered at a party conference for political effect, the Conservative government, Rudd represents, haven't hesitated to give it teeth.

In 2015, two years before Rudd's outburst, the UK Government released their Counter Extremism Strategy.[20]

A Dangerous Ideology

In the absence of any clear legal definition of extremism, for their purposes, the British government stated:

“Extremism is the vocal or active opposition to our fundamental values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and the mutual respect and tolerance of different faiths and beliefs.”

There are so many ambiguities strewn throughout this suggested ‘definition’ it’s difficult to know where to start. However, some deeply worrying questions arise.

Firstly, who determines what our ‘shared fundamental values’ are? Whose values? When was this decided? Where is this clarified in law? Are these values fixed, or can they be altered to suit?

If you question democracy it is, according to the British government, extremism. So how do we discuss electoral reform without being arrested? What about highlighting evidence of vote rigging or suspected gerrymandering? Is that extremism? If not today it soon could be.

Presumably it could also constitute ‘extremism’ if we challenge court decisions or criticise the judiciary. A crime to be punished with up to 15 years imprisonment, if the former Home Secretary gets her way?

What certainly does question ‘our democracy’ is to suggest it isn’t working. If you allege it is subverted via propagandist deception, is led by war criminals who frequently murder their own populace to achieve political power and social control, and is so intrinsically corrupt it can never be fixed through the ballot box, we are told you should be incarcerated.

No need to advocate violence or suggest criminal acts. Forget about all the perfectly reasonable alternative democratic and non-statist models you can suggest. Simply question ‘democracy’ and the British government intend to bang you up and throw away the key. They are far from the only ‘democratic governments,’ to hold this view.

Just as Bush, Blair, Cameron, Rudd and many others

A Dangerous Ideology

politicians have claimed, the UK government's Counter Extremism Strategy insists, without any supporting evidence, that questioning their perception of our '*fundamental values*' is extremism.

Any suggestion the state could be involved in acts of sponsored false flag terrorism could certainly be construed as questioning our shared '*values, including democracy.*'

The unchallenged myth that any who question official narratives 'must' be dangerous 'extremists,' dovetails precisely with the establishment's opinion. The effective 'de-platforming' of online writers, speakers and content creators, and the restriction of people's ability to share anti-establishment views, is entirely consistent with the government's strategy. It states:

"We must be careful to only give a platform to the right people. We will be absolutely clear about the people and groups we will not deal with because we find their views and behaviour to be so inconsistent with our own."

This Orwellian pronouncement is totally at odds with the values upon which our democracy is supposedly founded. However it also reveals the underlying contradiction at the heart of the state's, and the MSM's, handling of alleged 'conspiracy theory.'

While the speeches of Bush and Cameron are far from the only rants by political heavyweights attempting to associate conspiracy theories with extremism, they are notable for the location of their delivery. Even for national leaders, addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations is a big deal.

These occasions are used by nation states to deliver major thematic speeches. So for Bush in 2001 and Cameron, 13yrs later, their big themes included the character assassination of conspiracy theorists. Why was this of sufficient importance to warrant such a high profile?

On the one hand we are told that conspiracy theories are all

A Dangerous Ideology

nonsense and those who advocate them are basically idiots. Yet we have world leaders presenting them as some sort of major threat to international security on the world's biggest political stage.

If alleged conspiracy theories are all unsubstantiated crap, surely governments can easily nullify them? Simply discuss the evidence openly, maybe on major TV debates, and demonstrate to the voting public what a load of risible claptrap they really are. Why not allow conspiracy theorists to write a few MSM columns or host some national radio talk shows? People will soon determine for themselves that these people are insane. It couldn't be easier. What's the problem?

However, rather than do the seemingly obvious, nearly every government in the world has adopted a baffling alternative path. Censorship and suppression with potential imprisonment considered a reasonable deterrent to stop clueless fools talking drivel.

Whether you read MSM red tops or broadsheets, catch up with the latest MSM news online, watch or listen to mainstream broadcasts; if you read academic publications or even government white papers and official strategies, you will discover endless explorations of both the 'problem' presented by fake news inspired 'conspiracy loonies' and dissections of their maladjusted psychology.

However, try as you might, you will never find, anywhere, any discussion at all about the evidence they claim to inform their allegedly insane opinions.

This strategy is bewildering, not least of all for the fact that it's failing. Despite Bush and Cameron's rhetoric, conspiracy theories continue to abound. As far as the establishment are concerned, rather than deploying the advantages of the free speech our democracies supposedly afford, and simply ridiculing conspiracy theorist's evidence through open discourse, we are instead going down the fascistic, book burning route.

We have all been indoctrinated to think that freedom of speech is a protected right. Probably from the moment you were able to comprehend, and certainly from the moment

A Dangerous Ideology

you first walked through the school gates, you have been 'educated' about our way of life, our shared values and the individual liberty underpinning our belief system which, on regrettable occasions, we must fight to protect.

We live in a free and democratic society founded upon the principles of tolerance, fairness, liberty and freedom. Providing you don't commit the crimes of inciting violence, religious or racial hatred; as long as you don't defame, slander or libel others, no expression of ideas is forbidden. Anything and everything can be openly discussed and intellectual inquiry has no limits.

Of course we need to be responsible and refrain from deliberately inflicting harm upon our fellow citizens. It is right that we make every effort to avoid distressing others wherever possible. However, offending someone isn't always avoidable when we exercise our free speech.

Most of us believe it isn't a crime to cause offence. However, as we will discuss shortly, the state's apparent need to censor free speech has indeed made 'causing offence' a crime. Yet we still incorrectly assume freedom of expression remains a cornerstone of our 'democratic way of life.'

While actively taking steps to curtail our freedoms, the state is simultaneously trying to maintain the illusion that they still exist.

We are encouraged to take pride in our non-existent freedom to challenge authority. Freedom of speech and expression are fundamental to our right to protest. A right which must be protected. If it isn't, we don't live in a functioning democracy. Therefore, we stand against the censorship of ideas and will defend people's right to freedom of speech because, without it, what do we have to protect?

Right?

I mean, it's an over simplification but when people like the current British Prime Minister Theresa May talk about our 'shared values,' I think we can agree this is broadly what she is alluding too.

However, the right to freedom of speech is no longer

A Dangerous Ideology

extended to all. Conspiracy theories are now considered a form of 'right wing' extremism that shouldn't be tolerated. Legislators the world over are doing everything they can to silence anyone who openly discusses them.

In the UK, Section 4A of the Public Order Act was updated by The Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 to define so called 'hate speech.'^[21] This outlaws causing anyone 'alarm' or 'distress.' Both of which are entirely subjective and based upon nothing other than the opinion of the alleged victim. It states:

A person is guilty of an offence if, with intent to cause a person harassment, alarm or distress, he—

(a) uses threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour, or disorderly behaviour, or

(b) displays any writing, sign or other visible representation which is threatening, abusive or insulting,

.....thereby causing that or another person harassment, alarm or distress.

This is a significant threat to the principle of free speech and freedom of expression. Anyone can claim an offence has been committed because of their 'feelings' about anything they see, hear or read.

I'm no legal expert, so thankfully you don't have to take my word for it. The UK government states:^[22]

In the UK we use this definition of hate crime in general:

Hate crimes and incidents are taken to mean any crime or incident where the perpetrator's hostility or prejudice against an identifiable group of people is a factor in determining who is victimised.

The UK Government's overall policy is that it is up to the victim to determine whether a crime

A Dangerous Ideology

against them was motivated by any particular characteristics.

This definition doesn't only relate to physical attacks. Hate speech is also a 'hate crime.' This means you cannot say what you think in the UK because, if someone is alarmed or distressed by your words, which they feel are hostile, you could be arrested and potentially imprisoned for speaking your mind. You don't even need to direct your vitriol towards the person 'offended.'

Anyone who is offended by your 'hate speech' can claim to have been harmed by it. Perhaps they overhear your private conversation in a cafe. Offended by your opinion, they can report the crime. Modern technology allows them to easily provide the 'evidence' as well. Case closed. Off you go to the cells.

This system was really popular with the Stasi, the feared secret police in the former communist tyranny of East Germany. Combined with anti-extremism legislation and anti-terror laws, it is clear that the mechanisms are in place to lock people up for expressing the wrong opinion.

Thoughtcrime[23] has effectively been established in the UK and many other western democracies. Self-censorship is now a necessity and it is clear that many people literally don't know what they are 'allowed' to say or think. This appears to be destabilising society and pushing people towards the political extremes. Such policies always do. It seems a deliberate policy decision.

Hate speech legislation is antithetical to the notion of a free and open democracy. It is the kind of law we commonly associate with dictatorships. We must ask why these laws exist, as there appears to be absolutely no need for them whatsoever.

The United Nations General Assembly signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights[24] (ICCPR) in 1976. Article 20 defined as illegal any action related to discrimination based upon race, religion, or nationality which '*incites*' anyone to commit a crime. Every Western democracy, and most other countries around the

A Dangerous Ideology

world, have either formed ‘*incitement*’ laws, or already had similar in-place prior to the ICCPR declaration.

In the UK, it has long been against the law to encourage anyone to commit a crime, either verbally or in writing. Calling for all English people to be ‘wiped out’ or Russians to be ‘destroyed’ is illegal and has been for a long time. Therefore, regardless of so called ‘hate speech’ legislation, if some unhinged psychopath calls upon his fellow nutters to ‘kill the Jews,’ he has committed the crime of incitement.

In fact, ‘incitement’ in the UK (until the Serious Crime Act 2007) was a common law offence. The *Incitement to Disaffection Act 1934* and *Incitement to Mutiny Act 1797* are both examples of UK statutes based upon this common law principle. Freedom of speech in Parliament, and their duty to protect individual rights, were first enshrined in British law in the 1689 Bill of Rights.[25] The negative right (the obligation of the state not to infringe your rights) to individual freedom of speech, is another common law principle.

Given that ‘incitement’ carries far stiffer penalties and longer custodial sentences than ‘hate speech,’ it is amazing that people today seem so keen to call for the application of law which is far less punitive than the alternatives which predate it.

This may be because they have been widely misled by the MSM into believing there is no law to stop people inciting criminal acts, such as assault, online. However, if they checked their facts they would soon find out this is not, and never has been, the case. When you add in libel, anti-terrorism, sedition and defamation laws etc. our online protections are pretty strong.

Posing the question, why the mainstream media (MSM) are frantically trying to convince everyone they are not? Moreover, why aren’t governments pointing out this fallacy for what it is?

The MSM promoted, alarmist clamour, for stronger ‘hate speech’ legislation, is not compelled by any legal ambiguity. There is something else driving this agenda forward.

A Dangerous Ideology

Something which governments appear to be eager to promote.

The case that conspiracy theory represents a form of 'extremism,' potentially turning people towards terrorism, has not been made. Yet governments, courts and the MSM are proceeding on the false assumption that it has. Regardless of whether or not you find any merit in their arguments, conspiracy theorists are certainly not calling for violence or seeking to encourage anyone else to commit a crime. They are simply being censored for asking questions.

Conspiracy theorists are the first 'non-violent' group, who don't incite any unlawful acts, to have their freedom of speech effectively limited by the nexus of legislation, media and social media regulation. Can you be confident they will be the last?

You may think this doesn't affect you. You don't hold any anti-establishment views and so have no reason for concern. Yet you have no way of knowing what impact future policy decisions will have on your life. Perhaps you will want your voice to be heard one day. Only to discover your right to express your opinion no longer exists.

As the philosopher Ronald Dworkin wrote:

“Liberties protected only when the state finds it convenient or costless are not liberties at all.”

There are very good reasons to be highly sceptical about government claims that they are the sole custodians of the truth. We should think long and hard before we blindly acquiesce to laws limiting our freedom of speech or ability to question authority.

The philosopher John Stuart Mill^[26] effectively defined why free speech matters, most notably in his work *'On Liberty.'*

Mills considered that free speech was essential to push all arguments to their logical limit. This is vital for us, as a species, because the dialectic principle (human beings discussing opposing opinions to reach reasoned conclusions) is one of humankind's most powerful tools for developing

A Dangerous Ideology

new ideas. Without the ability to freely share what we think, because certain topics are 'off limits,' our intellectual evolution will be stifled. Mills stated we should have:

"...absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral or theological."

Mills added, suppression of freedom of speech would mean "a sort of intellectual pacification" that would ultimately erode "...the entire moral courage of the human mind." Today many rightly refer to this process as 'dumbing down.'

Most people haven't noticed. They are too preoccupied with the latest twists and turns in 'get me out of strictly icy celebrity X voice,' or overly burdened with concern about Raheem's ankle strain. This is all well and good, as far as our censors are concerned. As all Roman emperors knew, bread and circuses are essential to distract the people and stop them figuring out how much of their money you've stolen.

Mills did not suggest that freedom of speech meant freedom to say anything you like, regardless of the consequences. The notion of incitement, in common law, is consistent with Mills 'harm principle.' Mills defined this as the only reasonable limit upon 'free speech.' He stated:

"...the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others."

When Mills referred to 'harm' he did not mean causing 'offence' or 'emotional distress.' He was referring to real, physical harm and felt context was vital in determining the nature of that harm.

He used the example of an activist printing and distributing a written allegation that corn dealers starve the poor by setting unreasonable prices. The corn dealers may be offended, upset or distressed by the allegation. His business may even suffer as a result. But he is not immediately or directly harmed by it.

However, if that same activist started making those same allegations and inciting an angry mob, who were gathered in

A Dangerous Ideology

front of the corn dealers house, pitchforks in hand, he would be endangering the life of the corn dealer. Mills drew a distinction between 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' harm.

There is no reason at all that we cannot (or should not) apply this principle to online 'freedom of speech.' If someone expresses an opinion, which others dislike, providing they do not directly incite unlawful acts, then we have no right not to be offended. It is essential we understand this principle.

In the case of conspiracy theory, claiming that elements within establishment may have been complicit in the 9/11 and 7/7 attacks does nothing to encourage any violence or crime. You may be offended by the suggestion, but that doesn't make it invalid, nor legitimise its suppression.

Urging attacks upon bankers, to stop them doing it again, is an example of 'legitimate' harm. There is a difference, and that's why we've had incitement laws for such a long time.

It may be a bitter 'opportunity cost' to swallow, but the alternative is a society based upon 'hate speech' legislation, press regulation and censorship by state decree. Such a society will be unable to explore the full limit of logical debate. Something to be avoided as far as possible. As Mills wrote:[27]

"If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind"

If we continue to usurp the common law principle of incitement in favour of draconian 'hate speech' statutes, we will destroy 'free speech' and freedom of expression. This will bring an end to intellectual rigour and stultify the development of ideas. The impact upon press freedoms alone would inevitably lead to totalitarianism.

We must resist and protest attempts by government to capitalise on the 'fake news' meme by using it as claimed justification for increasing press regulation and Internet censorship.

Former Director of BBC news, James Harding, is certainly

A Dangerous Ideology

not the first to point out that one of the most pernicious forms of 'fake news' is propaganda. Propaganda frequently emanates from the state, not the independent or alternative media. Something Harding highlighted:

“For all the discussion of fake news, there is much more pervasive problem of state news, which is the problem of governments and politicians encroaching on the media.”

Providing we don't contravene Mill's harm principle, why shouldn't we be able to freely exchange ideas without interference from the state? How can simply asking questions ever be considered an extremist act?

Chapter 4

Set Yourself Free

The problem most of us have, in even beginning to examine the evidence surrounding 9/11 and 7/7, is that we rule out one possible explanation from the outset. We always look at these events with a predetermined narrative in mind. Namely, that terrorists were solely responsible.

Within the MSM there has been a considerable amount of debate about how and why 'the terrorists' carried out the attacks. Further discussion has centred upon the ramifications of the response. The question has been asked if the war on terror makes us safer or if it actually causes the hostility which drives further terrorist attacks against Western targets. So called 'blow back.'

The media has seemingly held the intelligence community to account on this. As it should. It appears, to most of us, to have done its job. Conspiracy theorists say it has done nothing of the sort. It has framed any questioning of the state's narratives within strict boundaries. The only legitimate concerns relate to potential failures to 'stop' the terrorists. Any further questions are eschewed.

A Dangerous Ideology

Governmental inquiries, also examining possible 'failures of intelligence,' have been convened. Were the secret service asleep on the job? On every occasion, these 'investigations' have reassured us this was not the case. Though some things could have been done better, the real problem consistently seems to have been a lack of resources in the face of the scale of the threat. Invariably requiring more tax payer funding, in order for the military industrial intelligence complex to 'keep us safe.'

Another common theme has been to consider what various communities could have done to alert the intelligence agencies to the threat. This has led to calls for the Muslim community, in particular, to 'do more.'

Salman Abedi, the 22 year old who allegedly killed 22 concert goers in the UK's Manchester Arena on the 22nd of May 2017 was repeatedly highlighted as a potential threat by members of his own community, and even his own family. Abedi supposedly hung Islamist extremist flags out of his bedroom window. His Imam, family and friends all reported his extremist views and worsening behaviour to the authorities.[59] Unfortunately, as ever, due to a lack of resources, the security services were unable to 'keep us safe.'

An unfortunate consequence of the 'us vs them' narrative, incessantly reported in the mainstream media, seems to have been the rise of purportedly influential 'far right' activists like Stephen Yaxley Lennon. Also known as Tommy Robinson.

Rarely out of the headlines, Robinson's finger pointing, blaming Muslims for pretty much everything, has undoubtedly contributed to increased division and tension between communities. Robinson is just one of many prominent, 'far right' talking heads.

On both sides of the Atlantic, these 'hated' extremists have no difficulty at all in regularly appearing in and on the media. It's almost as if there is some sort of concerted effort to use 'divide and rule' as a means of controlling public opinion. Just as with every exploration of mistakes, failings and unintended consequences, so the 'far right' Muslim

A Dangerous Ideology

'blame game' is based upon the assumption of Islamist extremist's unilateral crimes.

So it seems odd that the 'conspiracy theorists,' who fundamentally reject this view, should also be labelled 'far right.' Though many prominent 'conspiracists' would relish the opportunity to publicly challenge the far right's 'hate all Muslims' gibberish, unlike the neo-fascists, not a single one of them can get anywhere near the mainstream media.

While these conspiracists acknowledge the possible role of Islamist extremists in carrying out terrorist atrocities, they suggest the picture is far more complex than the simple black and white explanations promoted by the likes of Robinson and his mainstream media backers.

In regard to 9/11 and 7/7 they contend the evidence firmly indicates that any Islamist terrorist involvement was directed by Western deep state operatives. Further, the attacks could not have proceeded as we are told without assistance. Both the attacks themselves, and the subsequent accounts given to the public, were carefully orchestrated to ensure Islamist extremism was perceived as the sole cause. Thereby providing the excuse, and necessary public support, to wage an endless war with an unseen enemy. All for shareholder profits and political control.

If this is true then the intelligence services must have been deeply involved in the planning, preparation and execution of the operation. Furthermore, a select group of senior political figures and influential globalists would also have been required. Both to direct the operation, and manage the media response.

This is the potential explanation for 9/11 and 7/7 that can never be acknowledged. Any and all assessments of these events, that exclude this possibility, are fundamentally flawed, say the conspiracy theorists.

There are sound reasons to consider the likelihood that both 9/11 and 7/7 were 'false flag' operations. While most people simply cannot accept the suggestion that any part of the state apparatus would ever be involved in such heinous crimes against its own population, the proven historical

A Dangerous Ideology

examples of states doing exactly that are so numerous, it would be surprising if 9/11 and 7/7 weren't false flag attacks.

If the state itself was behind such vile mass murder of civilians, the implications are almost beyond imagination. Even entertaining the concept requires we contemplate the destruction of everything we believe about our own society. It questions every aspect of our history and potentially eviscerates our shared reality.

Our inability to confront the potential implications of this idea is the cognitive dissonance Shermer, and others, have ascribed to the psychology of conspiracy theorists. Yet he is among the millions who simply refuse to accept that large scale, state run, false flag operations are relatively common. Despite the extensive and unequivocal evidence which proves they are.

Familiarising yourself with some historical examples of these false flags is a useful step towards overcoming this psychological hurdle. It may be an uncomfortable experience but could set you free from some powerful illusions.

It is pointless for me to pretend this isn't disorientating. It opens the proverbial rabbit hole. We can choose to enter it or not. In the Hollywood movie, the Matrix, the character Neo is offered the choice between the red or blue pill. This has become a popular cultural meme for good reason. It is a poignant metaphor.

The red pill promises knowledge and freedom but also uncertainty and brutal, painful truths about reality. The blue pill offers certainty and security but perpetuates only blissful ignorance, ensuring continued slavery and exploitation.

To apply this analogy to the investigation of terrorist attacks we must tentatively accept the potential existence of evidence which questions the official narratives. If we don't, should it exist, we will simply be unable to recognise it. Our seemingly rational 'truths' will be nothing but fables.

Eyes are useless when the mind is blind, so which pill are

A Dangerous Ideology

you willing to take?

This is not some meaningless philosophical conundrum. It goes to the heart of who we are, who we want to be and what future we are capable of building for our children.

As a species we are plagued by war and violence. Yet very few of us would ever choose to harm, and certainly wouldn't kill, another human being. So how are millions killed in conflict every year? Where, on the continuum from loving family member to mass murderer, do we so frequently go wrong?

This question has perplexed society for millennia. Ultimately, the people we call conspiracy theorists offer a simple answer.

We are led to war by leaders who frequently use deception to promote conflict. If we don't even try to understand how, or why, the confidence trick works, we are condemned to fall for it every time. Until we eventually destroy ourselves.

So let's start by looking at some examples of false flags.

There can be confusion among those new to the concept of 'false flag attacks.' The term is frequently misused and wrongly attributed to relative trivialities. This is part of a comprehensive disinformation campaigns by the mainstream media (MSM). While they are happy to talk at length about highly questionable 'false flag claims,' often borne from the knee jerk reactions of the twitterati,[28] they never mention the more concrete, historical precedents.

Many conspiracy theorists consider this to be another example of MSM attempts to illegitimately destroy the credibility of their more substantial theories. The ultimate aim is to ensure the wider public never considers the evidence upon which they are based.

We live in a capitalist society. Inevitably a 'truther industrial complex' has emerged. Some have seized on the opportunity to make a few bucks out of the large swath of people who doubt the state's narratives. Having watched a few YouTube videos, jumping on the conspiracy bandwagon, these people offer themselves as 'analysts' exposing 'the truth.' Most, having done little or no independent research themselves,

A Dangerous Ideology

then garner support from 'followers' who are often willing to buy the products they offer.

Because these 'superstars' frequently don't know what they are talking about, either endlessly capitalising upon the one decent piece of research they did years ago, or piggy backing on the investigations of others, they often stray into the realms of the ridiculous. They commonly lack, or are willing to forgo, the scepticism which underpins conspiracy theory suspicions. Content to accept what they are 'told' and then repeat it, ad infinitum, to their acolytes. This primes them to spread disinformation.

In particular, those with strong party political views are liable to offer, as fact, any political 'conspiracy theory' which promotes their favoured dogma. This is antithetical to genuine conspiracy theory which is critical of all political doctrines and insists upon free thought, based upon scepticism and an exploration of evidence.

These spurious 'official' conspiracy theorists are the only ones widely acknowledged by the MSM. Easy to discredit, because their allegations are driven by commercial necessity rather than any desire to expose corruption, they are offered as definitive examples of conspiracy theorists. Their obvious falsehoods can then be exposed to suggest that all conspiracists 'must' be equally deluded.

This is a strategy called 'controlled opposition.' It's a slippery yet fairly common tactic, which organisations throughout history have deployed. The idea is that you present your own, controlled version of your enemy. A variation would be to infiltrate your opponent in the hope of getting your controlled asset into a high ranking position. Another could be merely to misrepresent your opponent's views, using 'straw-man arguments' for example.

As Lenin said:

"The best way to control the opposition is to lead it ourselves."

If genuine conspiracy researchers expose evidence, which the MSM are compelled to confront, they simply misquote

A Dangerous Ideology

them, edit their statements or place their words out of context. What they never do is direct you towards that research in order for you to evaluate it yourself. They will instead personally attack the researcher and forcefully label them a 'conspiracy theorist' who must therefore believe the Earth is flat and the Queen is a lizard.

By tarring all with the same brush, the MSM's hope is that you will associate any who question 9/11, 7/7, or any other significant geopolitical event, with people who believe Copernicus couldn't add up.

This a bit like claiming that all who believe in Christ unquestionably accept that Jesus drove demons from two possessed men's souls into a herd of pigs, who then, terribly upset by the whole experience, drowned themselves in a lake. The attempted, alleged, 'guilt by association' is asinine.

On rare occasion, and never when discussing recent 'terrorist attacks,' the MSM will acknowledge the known examples of 'false flag' operations.[56] Generally however, they are eager to give the impression that those who suspect an attack was manipulated are clearly insane. The fact that it is difficult to find a major conflict that didn't start with an act of provocation, usually some form of false flag, is studiously ignored. With this historical evidence safely obscured, they invariably insist that any who suspect a false flag are insinuating the event was a 'fake.' This is yet another MSM misdirection.

Suggesting an attack was a 'false flag' is not to equate it with a 'hoax.' A hoaxed attack is one where the event itself didn't happen. Hoaxes take different forms. The use of false intelligence to convince decision makers an event occurred, the creation of fake media reports to swing public opinion or the planting of evidence etc. Others are pure theatre. Sometimes the supposed victims are people faking injuries. So called 'crisis actors.'

There are numerous agencies who specialise in creating fake terrorist attacks and other mass casualty situations. They offer their skills to militaries, emergency services, law enforcement or anyone else who needs to add realism to their training exercises. It certainly is not beyond the wit of

A Dangerous Ideology

the intelligence agencies, media companies or private military contractors to employ their services for whatever purpose they choose.

For example, CrisisCast[29] are a UK based firm specialising in the simulation of large scale emergencies. With clients including the UK Home Office and the private security firm G4S, among others, their website states:

“We dramatise events for emerging security needs in the UK, Middle East and worldwide. Our specialist role play actors – many with security clearance – are trained by behavioural psychologists and rigorously rehearsed in criminal and victim behaviour to help police, the army and the emergency services, hospitals, schools, local authorities, government, private security firms, shopping centers, airports, big business, criminal justice departments, media and the military to simulate incident environments for life saving procedures.

We use state of the art British film industry techniques, props and special effects to help trainers deliver essential, hands-on, high octane crisis response and disaster management training. We also work with trainee doctors, psychologists and care professionals.”

This in no way suggests that CrisisCast have ever been involved in any suspected hoaxes in the Middle East or elsewhere. However, companies like CrisisCast exist. The rolling of the eyes whenever conspiracy theorists mention the possible use of 'crisis actors' only demonstrates ignorance of the fact.

Hoaxed events do happen. For example, in September 2013 The BBC aired a documentary called 'Saving Syria's Children.'[30] The evidence suggests that some, if not all, footage used in the documentary was fake. It was an apparent hoax. The same footage was used on the BBC news earlier in August, on the day the British Parliament were due

A Dangerous Ideology

to vote on UK government proposals to launch military action against Syria. The Government subsequently lost the vote.

The footage purported to show victims arriving at Atareb hospital in Aleppo. They had apparently been injured when a bomb was supposedly dropped by the Syrian Air force on a playground. When the relevant segment of footage was first aired, on the day of the important vote, the report speculated the injured were victims of 'maybe napalm.' However, in the later documentary, the same 'live commentary,' given by a doctor at the scene, had apparently changed to claim the victims were from a 'chemical attack'.

In the August news footage, run on the eve of the Commons' vote, the doctor is heard to say:

“It’s just absolute chaos and carnage here... umm... we’ve had a massive influx of what look like serious burns... Er... it seems like it must be some sort of...not really sure... maybe napalm, something like that...”

However, in the September documentary the identical 'on the scene' dialogue had seemingly become:

“It’s just absolute chaos and carnage here... umm... we’ve had a massive influx of what look like serious burns... Er... it seems like it must be some sort of chemical weapon, I’m not really sure...”

Posing the question, which was 'real' and why did the BBC need to alter any of it?

When the researcher, Robert Stuart,[31] asked the BBC these questions they replied to him saying the original was of the doctor claiming the use of a 'chemical weapon.' An editorial decision was made to remove this from the footage aired on the BBC news in August. The BBC stated:

“...The phrase “chemical weapon” was taken out of the news piece because by the time it was broadcast it was known that this was an incendiary bomb that had been

A Dangerous Ideology

used in the attack. Ian Pannell mentions this on two occasions in his script prior to the clip of Dr. Rola. To have included her speculation that this could have been a “chemical weapon” ran a considerable risk of being incredibly misleading and confusing to the audience, not least because the incident happened within days of an alleged chemical attack in Damascus....”

The BBC clearly acknowledged that claiming the attack came from a chemical weapon would have been “*incredibly misleading.*” Yet that is precisely what they broadcast in their later documentary. Misleading the public incredibly.

Furthermore, medical evidence shows the physical behaviour of the supposed victims was entirely inconsistent with those of genuine burn victims. They were seen writhing in apparent agony, on cue in some instances. Medical experts have attested that severe burn victims do not behave this way.

A commander in the Free Syrian Army (FSA,) who fought against the Assad government, stated that he was willing to testify in court and provide a signed statement to the BBC (on condition of protected anonymity) as follows:

“We the fighters of the Free Syrian Army in the North West areas of the City of Aleppo we declare that we were present in this region in August 2013 and we did not meet any air strike with the substance of Napalm on Urum al Kubra or on any other region in the North West Aleppo countryside and we deny the cheap fabrication of the BBC and of the stations that imitate her because it undermines the credibility of the Free Syrian Army. Saying this we do not hesitate to criminalize the criminal acts of the Assad regime and its murderous extermination of its people. And we have done a field investigation with the help of the delegate of the Free Syrian Red Crescent and this has conducted us to confirm what we are saying

A Dangerous Ideology

: no victims, no traces and no memory with anybody of the alleged air strikes with the substance of Napalm.”

The BBC have not taken him up on his offer.

The evidence that a significant proportion of the 'news' footage within the BBC's 'Saving Syria's Children' documentary was hoaxed, is overwhelming. There is no evidence the supposed attack upon Urum al Kubra ever occurred. Given they have themselves admitted to faking the dialogue, coupled with the other evidence, I am persuaded it was a hoax. It didn't happen but was reported to the British people as if it were a real attack.

Please don't take my word for it. It is just my opinion and I recommend you do your own research before formulating yours.

In this case, it appears the BBC were using a hoax for propaganda purposes, possibly in support of a government policy objective to launch a bombing campaign in Syria. The loss of the vote, by the Conservative Prime Minister David Cameron in 2013, seemingly contributed to the Conservative Prime Minister Theresa May's decision, in 2018, to bomb Syria without bothering to seek parliamentary approval.

Whilst the BBC's apparently deceitful warmongering was unsuccessful in 2013, hoaxes have been used with far more devastating effect in the past.

On August 2nd 1964 the U.S. destroyer, U.S.S. Maddox, engaged three North Vietnamese Navy (NVN) P4 motor torpedo boats in the Gulf of Tonkin, in the South China Sea. The Maddox fired warning shots as the three NVN P4's approached. Apparently the P4's fired their torpedoes without effect. Shots were exchanged and an air assault was launched against the three P4's, killing four NVN sailors and wounding more.

The Vietnamese torpedo boats were forced to limp back to port having sustained damage. No U.S. personnel were injured, though the Maddox and one of the attack aircraft were damaged slightly.[32] Amidst rising tensions in the

A Dangerous Ideology

region, two days later, on the 4th, The Maddox and her escort, the U.S.S. Turner Joy, were apparently attacked again. Instruments indicated they were being fired upon. Both ships returned fire and jets were again dispatched to respond.

Three days later, in response to these 'unprovoked attacks,' the U.S. Congress passed the 'Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.' This empowered President Lyndon Johnson to take all measures he deemed necessary to repel aggression. This allowed the Johnson administration to escalate military action, leading to Operation Thunder[33] and the start of a full scale war that killed more than three million people.

When asked how many NVN attackers he saw, the pilot of one of the Crusader Jets, who responded to the attack on the 4th, James. D. Stockdale, said:

“Not a one. No boats, no wakes, no ricochets off boats, no boat impacts, no torpedo wakes—nothing but black sea and American firepower.”

The second attack on the Maddox and Turner Joy didn't happen. Captain Herrick, of the Maddox, questioned the attack within 24hrs. He was not sure his instrument readings were correct.[34] He sent a cable stating:

“Review of action makes many reported contacts and torpedoes fired appear doubtful. Freak weather effects on radar and overeager sonarmen may have accounted for many reports. No actual visual sightings by Maddox. Suggest complete evaluation before any further action taken.”[35]

Captain Herrick made the mistake abundantly clear to his superiors straight away. There was no evidence the sonar readings were falsified, it seems the misinterpretation was simply the result of human error, under difficult circumstances, in very heavy seas.

However, from that point forward the entire story was pure

fabrication. What is known is that his communications were deliberately ignored and mythical 'intelligence' reports were created to falsely claim the attack had occurred. The Vietnam War started with a hoax.

The National Security Agency (NSA) released documents in 2005 which revealed the extent of the deception.[36] The signal intelligence (SIGINT) recording of intercepted Vietnamese communications was 'doctored' to substantiate the attack. Firstly, approximately 90% of the relevant SIGINT was withheld. Had it not, it would have been evident that the only activity the NVN were engaged in, on the evening of the 4th, was the recovery of their vessels, damaged two days earlier.

Unrelated SIGINT reports were next inserted into the NSA summary of 'the Tonkin incident' to support the assertion that an attack occurred. Vital communication intercepts were deliberately mistranslated and other NVN communications were taken out of context, then edited and spliced together, before being reinserted into the report to create the hoaxed 'evidence.'[37]

Nor was the attack on the 2nd unprovoked, as claimed by then U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. In 1954 the CIA had launched a series of covert operations (codenamed 'Nautilus') against the Vietnamese, which included illegal commando raids. Control of these operations was transferred from the CIA to the Department of Defense under the codename OPLAN 34A in early 1964.

Operations were run out of the Da Nang U.S. Navy base where numerous U.S. Special Forces units were stationed. The day before the first attack, OPLAN commandos raided an offshore North Vietnamese radio transmitter station. It appears the failed NVN attack on the 2nd was either a defensive or forlorn retaliatory action.[38]

'False flag' attacks, unlike hoaxed events, are absolutely real. People die and suffer life changing injuries. They are designed to cause devastation that can then be blamed upon a chosen enemy. The purpose is invariably to achieve a geopolitical, policy or military objectives. Commonly they are

A Dangerous Ideology

undertaken to illicit support for further military action against the 'aggressor' who supposedly committed the atrocity. 9/11 and 7/7 are alleged prime examples.

The origin of the term 'false flag' (or 'false colours') stems from the 18th century privateer naval warfare practice of flying 'friendly' flags in order to approach an unsuspecting target vessel. Once within range, the 'false flag' would be lowered and the unprepared enemy attacked under the aggressors 'true colours'. [39] Since then, the term has come to mean the strategic manipulation of an event to provide justification for further action.

During the 1780s King Gustav III of Sweden was looking for a way to unite his kingdom and thought war with Russia would be the way to do it. So he employed tailors from the Swedish Opera House to make some Russian uniforms, dressed his troops up and launched an attack against Sweden's own border post at Puumala. Thereby creating the political will to launch the Swedish-Russian War (1788-1790.)

The Mukden Incident [40] in 1931 occurred when Japanese soldier Lt. Suemori Kawamoto planted a bomb along Japan's South Manchurian Railway. The explosion was blamed upon Chinese dissidents and Japan used it as a pretext to invade the north-eastern Chinese province of Manchuria.

In 1939 Heinrich Himmler masterminded a plan that involved an attack upon the German radio station, Sender Gleiwitz. German operatives were dressed in Polish uniforms and the attack provided a justification for the German invasion of Poland, which supposedly led to the start of WWII. [41]

The Lavon Affair (Operation Shoshana), [42] in 1954, involved Israel's use of Egyptian Jewish 'operatives' to plant bombs in American and British cinemas, libraries and other civilian targets. The attacks were then blamed upon the 'Muslim Brotherhood' with the objective of convincing Western powers to retain their military presence, in defence of the Suez canal, and distance the West from Egypt's President Nasser.

A Dangerous Ideology

The tactical use of false flag attacks was discussed at some length in the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff's 1962 document relating to Operation Northwoods.[43] A variety of options were advocated. The objective was to launch a false flag attack against U.S. targets, placing the blame on Cuba, in order to provide a justification for its invasion.

For example, the Joint Chiefs of Staff made the following recommendations:

“We could blow up a U.S. ship in Guantanamo Bay and blame it on Cuba.”

“We could create a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area, in other Florida cities and even in Washington”

“We could sink a boatload of Cubans en-route to Florida (real or simulated)”

“It is possible to create an incident which will demonstrate convincingly that a Cuban aircraft has attacked and shot down a chartered civil airliner”

“Casualty lists in U.S. newspapers would cause a helpful wave of national indignation”

President Kennedy wasn't impressed and rejected the idea a year before his assassination.

However, the tactical use of false flag attacks aren't merely a matter of historical record. They continue to this day, as much more recent events show.

In 2014 the Turkish government banned access to YouTube in their country. A leaked audio recording of a conversation between the Head of Turkish Intelligence Hakan Fidan and the Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu was on the site. The men were heard to openly discuss a planned false flag attack. Four men were to be sent from Syria to commit an attack on Turkish soil to provide the justification for Turkey to launch a war against Syria. Turkish officials stated the leaked recording was 'partially manipulated' and called it

A Dangerous Ideology

“*an attack on Turkish security.*” Although it appeared to be a planned attack on the Turkish people.[44]

In 1999, 293 people were killed in a series of apartment block bombings in Russia. These were blamed upon Chechen terrorists. Following public reports of suspicious activity in a tower block in the city of Ryazan, a huge bomb made from the military explosive RDX (Hexogen) was discovered and disarmed.

When the suspected terrorists were apprehended, they turned out to be FSB agents. Subsequent investigations showed the bomb they planted was identical to those supposedly used by the Chechen terrorists in the other apartment bombings.

The bombings caused widespread fear and panic amongst Russian voters. Coincidentally, in the midst of the crisis, former FSB director Vladimir Putin came to power promising strong leadership in the fight against Chechen terrorists.[45]

One of the most extensive and long running false flag operations was NATO's Operation Gladio.

In 1990 Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti officially disclosed the existence of Gladio to the Italian parliament. By then Gladio had already been exposed in the courts and elsewhere, but Andreotti's 'official' revelations revealed the full extent of the unpalatable reality.

Italian investigations, into the 'Years of Lead',[46] revealed NATO's hand in a series of false flag terrorist atrocities that had taken place in Italy (and across Europe) throughout the 1950s to the 1980s. These included bombings, assassinations, kidnappings and mass shootings by terrorist organisations. Thousands of civilians were killed across the continent of Europe during almost 40 years of bloody carnage wrought by Gladio sponsored terrorist cells.

Often carried out by 'far right' extremists, the attacks were predominantly blamed upon far left or Middle Eastern groups. For example leftist Lebanese terrorists were initially blamed for the 1980 bombing of Bologna Railway Station, killing 85 people and wounding more than 200. In reality,

A Dangerous Ideology

under the command of Gladio operatives, the bombing was carried out by the far right group the NAR (Nuclei Armati Rivoluzionari.)

Wikipedia's entry on Gladio largely reveals the official record of the operation:[47]

“Operating in all of NATO and even in some neutral countries such as Spain before its 1982 admission to NATO, Gladio was first coordinated by the Clandestine Committee of the Western Union (CCWU), founded in 1948. After the creation of NATO in 1949, the CCWU was integrated into the 'Clandestine Planning Committee' (CPC), founded in 1951 and overseen by the S.H.A.P.E (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe), transferred to Belgium after France's official withdrawal from the NATO military organization – but not from NATO – which was not followed by the dissolution of the French stay-behind paramilitary movements.

The existence of these clandestine NATO units remained a closely guarded secret throughout the Cold War until 1990, when the first branch of the international network was discovered in Italy. It was code-named Gladio, the Italian word for a short double-edged sword [gladius]. While the press said that the NATO stay-behind units were 'the best-kept, and most damaging, political-military secret since World War II', the Italian government, amidst sharp public criticism, promised to close down the secret army. Italy insisted identical clandestine units had also existed in all other countries of Western Europe. This allegation proved correct and subsequent research found that in Belgium, the secret NATO unit was code-named SDRA8, in Denmark Absalon, in Germany TD BDJ, in Greece LOK, in

A Dangerous Ideology

Luxemburg Stay-Behind, in the Netherlands I&O, in Norway ROC, in Portugal Aginter Press, in Spain Red Quantum, in Switzerland P26, in Turkey Özel Harp Dairesi, In Sweden AGAG (Aktions Gruppen Arla Gryning), in France 'Plan Bleu', and in Austria OWSGV; however, the code name of the stay-behind unit in Finland remains unknown”

Consequently, in November 1990, the European Parliament published its 'Resolution on the Gladio Affair.' This single page document stated a number of known facts relating to the near 40-year-long covert Operation Gladio.[48] The European Parliament stated:

“.....in certain Member States military secret services (or uncontrolled branches thereof) were involved in serious cases of terrorism and crime as evidenced by, various judicial inquiries.”

“...these organizations operated and continue to operate completely outside the law since they are not subject to any parliamentary control and frequently those holding the highest government and constitutional posts are kept in the dark as to these matters.”

“...various 'Gladio' organizations have at their disposal independent arsenals and military resources which give them an unknown strike potential, thereby jeopardizing the democratic structures of the countries in which they are operating or have been operating.”

The resolution then recommended that European governments should:

“Protests vigorously at the assumption by certain US military personnel at SHAPE (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers

A Dangerous Ideology

Europe) and in NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation) of the right to encourage the establishment in Europe of a clandestine intelligence and operation network.”

“.....dismantle all clandestine military and paramilitary networks.”

The NATO, CIA and MI6 response was muted. They partly refused to talk about it on grounds of 'national security' or 'military secrecy,' but left the Italian and European parliamentary findings unchallenged. This is about as far as the 'official narrative' goes. The European Parliament charged its member states to root out the Gladio networks and directed NATO to shut the operation down. End of story.

However, the extent to which NATO, as an intergovernmental military alliance of independent states, was ever fully in control of Gladio is debatable.

Gladio's use of 'stay behind' units predated the formation of NATO in 1949. Its practical operation was eventually overseen by the CIA and MI6. Other national intelligence agencies were involved, notably the Italian's Servizio Informazioni Difesa (SID - reconfigured in 1977) but the ability of national security services, beyond the CIA or MI6, to authorise Gladio operations remains in question.

NATO's Clandestine Planning Committee (CPC), under the auspices of S.H.A.P.E (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe), was supposedly running things. However, by 1957 the operational control of Gladio had been brought under the Allied Clandestine Committee (ACC) who were overseen by the U.S. Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, reporting directly to the Pentagon. In 1963 that command was taken by General Lyman Lemnitzer. He remains unique as the only U.S. general to have served as Army Chief of Staff, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Supreme Allied Commander for NATO.[49]

It was Lemnitzer who approved Operation Northwoods proposal to use false flag attacks to provoke a U.S. military confrontation with Cuba. Whether he was a key figure in moving Gladio from a defensive to offensive operation, isn't

A Dangerous Ideology

entirely clear. NATO have repeatedly denied freedom of information requests on the subject. However, his belief in the value of 'false flag' terrorism, and the timing of his appointment, is notable.

The 'disconnect' between European states and the operational management of Gladio was highlighted by the French withdrawal from NATO in 1966[50]. This did not coincide with the end of the French Gladio operations, called 'Plan Bleu.' This suggested the distinct possibility that not all NATO governments were fully cognisant of what was going on.

Gladio was a 'deep state' project. Elected governments were not controlling it.

Another example of the lack of governmental oversight was apparent with the Portuguese Gladio operation. The CIA formed an ultra-nationalistic, right wing organisation called the Aginter Press. It was run by former Vichy government operative, and Nazi sympathiser, Jean-Robert de Guernadec, under the assumed name of Yves Guérin-Sérac.

Outwardly portrayed as a press agency, it was actually a front for the storage and shipment of arms and the training of extremist mercenaries, many of whom received instruction in covert military techniques in the School of the America's in Panama.[51] There is no evidence that the Portuguese intelligence agency (PIDE) knew anything about the hidden agenda of Aginter Press.

Gladio was initially created in response to a genuine belief that the Red Army would invade Western Europe. However this fear was soon eclipsed by concern that domestic leftist movements, supported by the Soviets, presented the greater danger. Not because they threatened violence or disorder, but rather for their potential to encourage political upheaval that could overturn the rule of the financial and political establishment.

Gladio operatives were deployed to kill the people of Europe, distracting the survivors from any thoughts of political or economic change. Convincing them to be thankful for the 'protection' of the state. This strategy, called 'the Strategy of

A Dangerous Ideology

Tension,' was described with chilling clarity by convicted Gladio terrorist, Vincent Vinciguera. Speaking about the use of false flag terrorism he said:

“You had to attack civilians, the people, women, children, innocent people, unknown people far removed from any political game. The reason was quite simple. They were supposed to force these people, the Italian public to turn to the State to ask for greater security. This was precisely the role of the right in Italy. It placed itself at the service of the State which created a strategy aptly called the 'Strategy of Tension' in so far as they had to get ordinary people to accept that at any moment over a period of 30 years, from 1960 to the mid eighties a State of emergency could be declared. So, people would willingly trade part of their freedom for the security of being able to walk the streets, go on trains or enter a bank. This is the political logic behind all the bombings. They remain unpunished because the state cannot condemn itself.”

False flag attacks can broadly be split into two types. LIHOP (let it happen on purpose) and MIHOP (make it happen on purpose.) However, the manipulation required to carry out these operations often comes through the use of infiltration.

During 'the troubles' in Northern Ireland, which saw decades of deadly terrorist attacks in Ireland, Northern Ireland, the British mainland and elsewhere, both Republican and Loyalist paramilitary groups were extensively infiltrated by British military intelligence and the security services. Following the terrorist murder of Patrick Finucane in 1989, it became clear that one of the men involved was a Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) special branch agent called William Stobie. Subsequent concerns about the extent to which British agents were complicit in acts of terrorism led to the Stevens Inquiry.

After a 14-year-long investigation, Sir John Stevens released his final recommendations report in 2003.[52] Stevens

stated:

I conclude there was collusion in both murders and the circumstances surrounding them. Collusion is evidenced in many ways. This ranges from the wilful failure to keep records, the absence of accountability, the withholding of intelligence and evidence, through to the extreme of agents being involved in murder.

The failure to keep records or the existence of contradictory accounts can often be perceived as evidence of concealment or malpractice. It limits the opportunity to rebut serious allegations. The absence of accountability allows the acts or omissions of individuals to go undetected. The withholding of information impedes the prevention of crime and the arrest of suspects. The unlawful involvement of agents in murder implies that the security forces sanction killings.

My inquiries have found all these elements of collusion. The coordination, dissemination and sharing of intelligence were poor. Informants and agents were allowed to operate without effective control and to participate in terrorist crimes.

British agents were acting as terrorists. In another example two British agents were found to have been involved in 'human bomb' attacks on three Army Border checkpoints in 1990. The plot involved taking people's families hostage before forcing them to be unwilling suicide bombers. No security service agents have ever been prosecuted in connection with the bombings.[53]

Less than 2 years after the Stevens Inquiry released its findings, the British government enacted the 2005 Inquiries Act.[54] This legislation gave them extensive control over public inquiries. They can deny the submission of evidence, withhold witness statements, and have the power to edit

A Dangerous Ideology

findings before they are released. The British 'independent public inquiry' has been a complete misnomer ever since.[55]

These are just a few examples of the many ways false flag attacks have been used. Far from rare, they appear to be fairly standard operating procedure. There is no evidence whatsoever to substantiate the view that the deep state have ever made a decision to stop using the strategy.

Does the evidence suggest that 9/11 and 7/7 could have been further examples of false flag terrorism? One thing is certain, none of us can possibly know unless we look at it.

“When deeds speak, words are nothing.”

[Pierre-Joseph Proudhon]

Sources:

- [1]:<http://www.crash.cam.ac.uk/people/profile/hugodrochon>
- [2]:<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/nov/01/conspiracy-theories-social-malaise-fake-news-exclusion>
- [3]: “American Conspiracy Theory” by Joseph Uscinski and Joseph Parent.
- [4]:<http://conspiracyanddemocracy.org/blog/category/conspiracy-and-democracy-project/>
- [5]:http://www.realclearscience.com/blog/2014/12/conspiracy_theorists_arent_who_you_think_they_are.html
- [6]:<http://news.gallup.com/poll/9751/americans-kennedy-assassination-conspiracy.aspx>
- [7]:<http://time.com/3422083/jfk-conspiracy-theories/>
- [8]:<http://www.conspiracyanddemocristopher-hitchens/on-the-imagining-of-conspiracy>
- [9]:<http://www.conspiracyanddemocracy.org/blog/are-conspiracy-theories-a-threat-to-democracy-2/>
- [10]:<https://web.archive.org/web/20181020155502/http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/PS157/assignment%20files%20public/congressional%20report%20key%20sections.htm>
- [11]:<https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu//NSAEBB/NSAEBB132/press20051201.htm>
- [12]:https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=VsRMAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA141&dq=%22conspiracy+theory%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=1g7IT8eEBKSi2gW2_ejmDQ&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=%22conspiracy%20theory%22&f=false
- [13]:<http://www.jfklancer.com/CIA.html>
- [14]:<https://theconversation.com/the-Internet-fuels-conspiracy-theories-but-not-in-the-way-you-might-imagine-98037>
- [15]:<http://www.journalism.org/2017/09/07/news-use->

A Dangerous Ideology

[across-social-media-platforms-2017/](#)

[16]:<http://www.un.org/webcast/ga/56/statements/011110usaE.htm>

[17]:<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-at-the-un-general-assembly-2014>

[18]:<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2018/apr/25/uk-among-the-worst-in-western-europe-for-press-freedom>

[19]:<https://www.standard.co.uk/comment/comment/britain-champions-free-speech-so-we-re-leading-the-war-on-fake-news-a3977771.html>

[20]:https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/470088/51859_Cm9148_Accessible.pdf

[21]:http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1994/33/content_s

[22]:<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/a-definition-of-antisemitism>

[23]:<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/thoughtcrime>

[24]:<https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/unts/volume%20999/volume-999-i-14668-english.pdf>

[25]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bill_of_Rights_1689

[26]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Stuart_Mill

[27]:http://communicationethics.net/sub-journals/free_article.php?id=00112

[28]:<https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Twitterati>

[29]:<http://crisiscast.com/>

[30]:<https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b03c7m8s>

[31]:<https://bbcpanoramasavingsyriaschildren.wordpress.com/>

A Dangerous Ideology

[32]:<https://www.usni.org/magazines/navalhistory/2008-02/truth-about-tonkin>

[33]:<https://www.history.com/topics/vietnam-war/operation-rolling-thunder>

[34]:<http://www.globalresearch.ca/an-ominous-non-event-the-gulf-of-tonkin-and-the-strait-of-hormuz/7760>

[35]:[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/USS_Maddox_\(DD-731\)#Gulf_of_Tonkin_Incident](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/USS_Maddox_(DD-731)#Gulf_of_Tonkin_Incident)

[36]:<https://fas.org/irp/nsa/spartans/index.html>

[37]:<https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu//NSAEPP/NSAEPP132/rellea00012.pdf>

[38]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_34A

[39]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/False_flag

[40]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mukden_Incident

[41]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gleiwitz_incident

[42]:http://cisac.fsISISanford.edu/publications/the_lavon_affair_how_a_falseflag_operation_led_to_war_and_the_israeli_bomb

[43]:<https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu//news/20010430/northwoods.pdf>

[44]:<https://www.ibtimes.co.uk/turkey-youtube-ban-full-transcript-leaked-syria-war-conversation-between-erdogan-officials-1442161>

[45]:<http://www.historycommons.org/context.jsp?item=a092299ryazanbomb#a092299ryazanbomb>

[46]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Years_of_Lead

[47]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Gladio

[48]:https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/European_Parliament_resolution_on_Gladio

[49]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lyman_Lemnitzer

A Dangerous Ideology

[50]:http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_2_No_24_Special_Issue_December_2012/24.pdf

[51]:<https://www.mintpressnews.com/the-school-of-the-america-is-still-exporting-death-squads/204655/>

[52]:<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/apr/18/uk.northernireland1>

[53]:<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2006/sep/10/uk.northernireland1>

[54]:<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/12/contents>

[55]:<https://www.amnesty.org.uk/press-releases/uk-amnesty-launches-appeal-calling-judges-boycott-sham-inquiries>

[56]:<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/sep/17/israelandthepalestinians>

[57]:[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PRISM_\(surveillance_program\)#Programs_sharing_the_name_PRISM](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PRISM_(surveillance_program)#Programs_sharing_the_name_PRISM)

[58]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2013/jun/21/gchq-cables-secret-world-communications-nsa>

[59]:<https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/salman-abedimanchester-attack-reported-family-imam-friends-did-nothing-a7757726.html>

Recommended Reading:

Sophie's World – By Jostein Gaarder

American Conspiracy Theories - by Joseph Uscinski & Joseph Parent

Why People Believe Weird Things – by Michael Shermer

The Open Society and Its Enemies – by Karl Popper

Crossfire – by Jim Marrs

Part 2:

Twin Pillars of Deceit

Chapter 5

9/11 – Disrespect or True Respect?

In the preface I warned those who take offence easily not to continue. Seeing as you have read this far, I assume you are not one of them. That's good, because many people are offended by even suggesting what we are about to discuss in some depth.

At the time of writing we appear to be perilously close to a global conflict. Most Western governments are blaming Russia, and, to a lesser extent, China and Iran for the world's ills. Russian plots are constantly reported by the mainstream media. There seems to be no aspect of our existence the Russians aren't intent upon corrupting.

From our elections to the use of social media, we are being encouraged to accept, without much evidence it has to be said, that Russia are obsessively meddling, hell bent upon destroying our 'way of life.'

As are the Islamist extremists apparently, though they favour a more direct and bloodier approach. While the

A Dangerous Ideology

Islamists in Syria appear to have largely been defeated, the Islamist threat continues unabated. The 'war on terror' shows no sign of ending. Our leaders and the mainstream media persistently warn of further attacks. Perhaps with good reason.

Those who insist this is all part of a managed agenda, suggest we can collectively come to understand how the mechanism of deception works by looking at the continuing use of 'false flag' terrorism.

They say the evidence offered by the state to support the official accounts of the 9/11 and 7/7 attacks is woefully inadequate. It raises far more issues than it resolves. Some relatively brief, independent research will enable anyone to start asking pertinent questions.

In light of the long, proven history of government use of false flag attacks to control public opinion, unless the state can account for the huge number of anomalies, or at least provide some credible evidence to back up their bizarre stories, why should any of us think 9/11 and 7/7 were not false flags?

9/11 and 7/7 appear to be the key components of a constructed falsehood. They were seminal events along the path to an international conflict with an array of amorphous groups. As soon as you defeat one, another springs up somewhere else. This is a war that can never be won. Even the name itself, the 'war on terror,' suggests a battle against an idea, a thought construct. Something intangible and eluding.

Just as 9/11 started the gravy train so 7/7 perpetuated and expanded the scope for further spending. The huge benefit of an ideological enemy, whose shock troops fight an international guerrilla war, is that they can strike anywhere, at any time. Whenever the tax payers become squeamish about underfunding health care in favour of defence spending, an attack can soon remind them of the importance of 'staying safe.'

Now, with alleged Russian and Chinese hacking providing opportunities for increased spending in cyber security, the

A Dangerous Ideology

opportunities for greater investment in our defence, based upon invisible, elusive threats, is practically limitless.

This, say the conspiracy theorists, was always the plan. It ensures never ending profits for the military industrial and intelligence complex. The multinational corporations keep making the weapons and rolling out staggeringly expensive cyber security 'solutions,' governments keep buying them, the debt continues to rise and the banks profit from all of it.

However if enough of us can remove one of truth's protective layers, overcome our cognitive dissonance and apply critical thinking to the official narratives of 9/11 and 7/7, the process of deception will become clear. Once the trick is exposed, the lies won't work and perhaps we can all look forward to a brighter future.

Most people readily scoff at this notion. For the vast majority there is no doubt about either event. We all saw what happened. The subsequent investigations and examinations of evidence have been extensive. The public debate has been thorough and hasn't shirked from asking 'the difficult questions.' The evidence which substantiates the mainstream accounts of both 9/11 and 7/7 is entirely consistent with independent acts of terrorism, perpetrated by gangs of Islamists extremists.

The problem with conspiracy theories is that the facts don't support them. So conspiracists either twist them or make them up to justify their silly theories. What's worse is their continual insistence we re-examine the horror, constantly reminds the victims' families of their loss. These loonies refuse to allow the people who suffered most the closure they need. This alone exposes the conspiracy theorists callous egotism. They think they know something the rest of us don't. In reality they understand nothing other than their own illogical, unfounded mythology.

Conspiracy theorists point out that the public perception of both 9/11 and 7/7 stems from one source. The state. Everything people think they know has been provided to them by governments on both sides of the Atlantic. The narratives that emerged in the first few days, even hours following the attacks, have never altered. We think

A Dangerous Ideology

academia, the judiciary and the mainstream media have all unwaveringly supported the 'official' accounts. In reality there are plenty of academics, journalists, investigators and even members of the judiciary, who have questioned the state's version of events. They are all universally dismissed as 'conspiracy theorists' and their objections rarely reported.

Perhaps all the evidence is entirely consistent with the stories we've been given, but how many of us can truly say we've examined it? How many of us have simply accepted what we've been told, without ever questioning anything?

George Santayana[180] famously said "*Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.*" Understanding our history isn't just some sterile, academic pursuit. It informs the present and shapes the future. Whether you dismiss so called conspiracy theories or not, there is no doubt about the geopolitical significance of 9/11 and 7/7. They have been used to justify further conflict, like it or not.

The conspiracy theorists ask, why not examine the evidence? If their opinions are nonsensical drivel, what harm does discussing them do? However, if there is any chance that we have been deceived, we have also been compelled into supporting war based upon a lie. If so, this wouldn't be unusual.

Perhaps less known is Santayana's aphorism "*Only the dead have seen the end of war.*" While we passively accept the reasons we are given for war, this will remain the case. It can only be by increasing scepticism of official narratives that we will ever improve our chances of resisting the next call for conflict. Even if that scepticism is misplaced, what possible reason can there be for not thoroughly examining the state's claimed justifications, before we commit to mass slaughter?

Let's be clear about our objective. We are seeking a brief analysis of the evidence people frequently labelled as 'conspiracy theorists' claim to support their contention. Namely, that the official stories of 9/11 and 7/7 cannot be true.

We are doing this because we recognise the fundamental

A Dangerous Ideology

importance of evaluating this claim. If it is true then it clearly indicates that we have some significant social and political problems to address. Problems which will potentially remain hidden unless we open our minds to the possibility. But fearing the implications of asking the question is no reason not to ask it.

Look at it this way. If you didn't know you had cancer would you want to find out?

Whenever the subject of so called '9/11 truth' is raised the predominant response is merely to dismiss this as delusional. Such criticisms may well be justified, but the only way we can assess this is by checking the evidence.

Another common, illogical response is to express offence. Some, for example, are offended if anyone ever states the 'fact' that the official story of 9/11 is a 'conspiracy theory.' The story of 19 hijackers plotting to kill thousands is the definition of a conspiracy and all explanations constitute theories, including the official one.

Many conspiracists cite 9/11 as the single incident which prompted them to first start questioning the official narratives of global events. Some express regret they ever did so. Once awakened, they say, you can't go back. Nothing is ever the same again.

Those who oppose their world view claim this demonstrates their misplaced intellectual elitism. They assume a baseless sense of enlightened martyrdom, seeing themselves as Hofstadter's 'militant leaders.' They deserve the label 'conspiracy theorist' and all its negative connotations.

For our purposes the term 'conspiracy theorist' signifies nothing other than a way of collectively referring to those who question official narratives.

If we are to gain any measure of understanding of the conspiracists' evidence, we cannot allow someone else to deny our right to examine it, simply because they have stuck the 'conspiracy theory' label on it. It is up to us as individuals to decide whether the evidence stacks up or not, and we have the right to do so.

A Dangerous Ideology

The tendency of some, who don't accept 9/11 conspiracy theories, to offer emotional objections is untenable. The suggestion that those who question the official narrative of 9/11, or any other reported terrorist attack, are disrespecting the lives lost or destroyed does not constitute anything like a reasoned argument.

Let's say you witness a murder. You are certain the guy wearing the red jacket stabbed the victim. Yet the guy wearing the blue jacket gets convicted. As far as you are concerned they've not only sent an innocent man to prison for a crime he didn't commit, but the real murderer has got away with it. Is it disrespectful to the memory of the victim to challenge the court's decision? Will staying silent show the victim greater respect? Or is the real act of betrayal allowing the injustice to go unchallenged?

From a moral perspective, the only thing that matters is that you honestly believe an injustice has occurred. It makes no difference whether you're right or wrong.

There is no doubt the 'truthers' genuinely believe 9/11 did not happen the way the rest of us accept. They are not showing disrespect to the victims. Indeed, from their perspective, not saying anything demonstrates a callous disregard for those who suffered.

The 'Jersey Girls' (Kristen Breitweiser, Patty Casazza, Lorie Van Auken and Mindy Kleinberg) were among many victims' family members who questioned the official story. Arguably it was the Jersey Girls who were instrumental in pushing for the formation of the 9/11 Commission.[5] Similarly they have been among the report's harshest critics.

No matter which account is nearer the truth, the appalling reality is that many innocent men, women and children lost their lives that day. The United States Centres For Disease Control (CDC) issued the following casualty report in 2002. [1]

As of August 16, 2002, a total of 2,726 death certificates related to the WTC attacks had been filed. All but 13 person' died on September 11;.....[This] data represent 97%

A Dangerous Ideology

of the estimated 2,819 WTC deaths; fewer death certificates have been issued than the estimated number of decedents because some families have not yet requested certificates, and investigations into several requests are still in progress.

Other sources subsequently set this figure higher at 2997 (including the 19 named terrorists). Sadly, these people were far from the last victims of the atrocity.

The people of New York, surviving first responders, attending officials and many others, were also exposed to toxic debris from the fall of the buildings. Following public outcry, in the wake of the death of police officer James Zadroga, the 'James Zadroga Health and Compensation Act' was passed in 2011 (reauthorised in 2015 to extend the compensation plan to 2075). The Act established a fund to pay the health care costs for all those suffering illness as a result of their WTC dust exposure.

In 2016 the UK broadsheet the Guardian reported that at least an additional 1000 deaths could be directly linked to 9/11 toxic exposure.[2] In 2011 a study into the Firefighters who were exposed, carried out by the U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health[3] found that they were at least 19% more likely to develop related cancers than the general population.

The problem assessing the scale of this catastrophe is that the associated illnesses (primarily respiratory diseases and cancers) can take many years to fully develop. Yet as early as 2016 the Victims Compensation Fund had already approved 16,942 claims.[4] The horrific reality is that the true death toll may never be fully known, but long term estimates into the tens of thousands are entirely feasible.

The visceral anger generated by 9/11 is understandable. It was an outrage of staggering proportions. This was no natural disaster, it was an act of obscene violence. This is something that both conspiracy theorists and those who accept the official account agree upon.

The 9/11 attacks obviously impacted on U.S. public opinion,

A Dangerous Ideology

strengthening calls for the military response which immediately followed. Conspiracy theorists argue that this was the intended purpose. Others maintain, it was simply the sensible reaction of an administration discharging their duty to protect its population.

Prior to 9/11 evidence shows[6] the American public felt safer, less stressed and were less tolerant of government surveillance and military spending. 9/11 changed this.

Interestingly, while patriotism measurably increased following the atrocity, the public's reaction to immigration and their perception of foreigners changed little. There was increased antipathy towards people from the Middle East but this was relatively short-lived.[7]

The number of U.S. citizens who viewed the terrorists as extremists, neither representative of their nationality nor religion, has remained relatively constant. So has anti-Islamic sentiment. This spiked significantly following the attack but quickly returned to pre 9/11 levels within the next 18 months.

Less than one month after 9/11, on the 7th October 2001, the U.S. led coalition (initially incorporating forces from Canada and the UK) invaded Afghanistan. This was precipitated, according to the U.S. government, by the Taliban's refusal to extradite the leader of al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden (OBL). For their part the Taliban requested evidence of OBL's involvement in the attacks prior to extradition. The U.S. Bush administration viewed this as little more than a stalling tactic and didn't provide any.

And so began the longest War in U.S. military history. As of 2019 more than 8000 troops are still engaged in Afghanistan. President Trump initially signalled these numbers would increase.[8] Latterly he's changed his mind and claimed they would be withdrawn. This decision drew huge criticisms from the Democrats, and Trump's opponents elsewhere.[181]

Apparently, they hate him so much, they would rather perpetuate a war than ever agree with him. However, (at the time of writing) as with many of Trumps alleged decisions, it

A Dangerous Ideology

seems his words have had little or no effect. Backtracking almost immediately, Trump tweeted (of course) there would be a “*slow & highly coordinated pull out of U.S. troops from the area,*” later adding “*I never said we’re doing it that quickly.*”

John Bolton, who terrifyingly is Trump's National Security Advisor, clarified what Trump is allowed to do when he stated “*the timetable flows from the policy decisions that we need to implement.*” Meaning it hasn't been implemented yet and the troops aren't going anywhere.

Time will tell, but if Bolton has anything to do with it, it seems likely that the never ending war will be precisely that. Bolton has strongly advocated for war against Syria, Iraq, North Korea, Iran and Russia to name but a few. In regard to North Korea Bolton favours nuclear Armageddon:

“The threat is imminent, and the case against pre-emption rests on the misinterpretation of a standard that derives from pre-nuclear, pre-ballistic-missile times. Given the gaps in US intelligence about North Korea, we should not wait until the very last minute. That would risk striking after the North has deliverable nuclear weapons, a much more dangerous situation. It is perfectly legitimate for the United States to respond to the current ‘necessity’ posed by North Korea’s nuclear weapons by striking first.”

Something China and Russia wouldn't be too keen on. Almost certainly insane, that Bolton is in charge of his own car is bad enough. His current influential position should send shivers down the spine of anyone who knows anything about him.[182]

Even former U.S. President George W. Bush thought Bolton extreme. In his address to the nation on the 20th September, 9 days after the 9/11 attack, Bush launched the 'war on terror' saying:

“Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until

A Dangerous Ideology

every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated.”

Bush clearly defined a global dichotomy that has shaped the foreign policy, not only of the United States, but of most nations in the aftermath of 9/11.

“Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.”

Adding to this, Bush soon suggested that any nation the U.S. considered to be failing in their implied duty to fight terrorism would also be considered a legitimate military target. Speaking at joint news conference with the French President in November 2001 he said:

‘Over time it’s going to be important for nations to know they will be held accountable for inactivity, you’re either with us or against us in the fight against terror.’

It is not only conspiracy theorists who have been critical of these statements. The threat that any nation on Earth can be attacked if the U.S. administration 'believes' they are not doing enough to combat international terrorism, has been widely perceived as dangerous rhetoric.

However, leaders often issue such harsh proclamations in the wake of shocking domestic events. These words, though seen as unnecessarily threatening by many, are also understandable given the administrations need to be seen as tough (or at least doing something) in the eyes of the American electorate.

If we are concerned with civilian deaths then we cannot overlook the casualties of the 'war on terror' either. Determining a precise figure for war deaths has always presented difficulty, not least of all for the tendency of combatants to down play civilian casualties, for which they may be responsible, while exaggerating those caused by their enemies.

Statistical approaches aren't consistent either. For example, should figures refer only to those killed by munitions or

A Dangerous Ideology

should they also account for those who have died as a result of other consequences of war, such as disease, famine and lack of medical resources?

The Iraq Body Count (IBC)[10], in 2015, estimated civilian deaths, as a direct consequence of conflict, in Iraq to be around 290,000. They based their figures on the collation of media reports into fatalities. Critics stated that these estimates were not reliable.

Writing in the 'Middle East Eye' respected investigative journalists Nafeez Ahmed highlighted the statistical anomalies found in the IBC methodology:

“For instance, although 40,000 corpses had been buried in Najaf since the launch of the war, IBC [Iraq Body Count] recorded only 1,354 deaths in Najaf for the same period. That example shows how wide the gap is between IBC’s Najaf figure and the actual death toll – in this case, by a factor of over 30.

Such gaps are replete throughout IBC’s database. In another instance, IBC recorded just three air strikes in a period in 2005, when the number of air attacks had in fact increased from 25 to 120 that year. Again, the gap here is by a factor of 40.”

Responding to concerns regarding the lack of reliable data, the 'Physicians For Social Responsibility' (PSR) attempted a more scientific approach stating: [11]

“An extensive review has been made of the major studies and data published on the numbers of victims in these countries. This paper draws on additional information such as reports and statistics on military offensives and examines their completeness and plausibility.”

Releasing their findings in 2017, the PSR's minimum suggested figure was 1.3 million with an upper estimate of

A Dangerous Ideology

approximately 2 million people killed.

It is the use of 9/11 to justify the launch of numerous military conflicts, which lies at the heart of conspiracists criticisms. In addition to the senseless murder of thousands of U.S based citizens the subsequent death toll is equally unjustified.

Most of us consider a military response to horrendous events like 9/11 to be warranted. We expect our governments to discharge their primary duty to keep us safe. If there are countries who harbour and protect terrorists intent on killing us, isn't it essential that we take steps to stop them? Seen in this light, the military response to the 9/11 seems entirely appropriate.

This does not mean, despite some 'truthers' accusations, that those who accept this are incapable of critical thought. Nor does it infer they blindly accept any military action 'carried out in our names.' People on both sides of the 9/11 debate have been equally scathing about some aspects of the subsequent war on terror.

A primary objection to the conspiracy theorists allegation, that 9/11 was a contrived event, is that it would be impossible to keep such a massive plot, presumably involving thousands, secret. Surely, at some point, some would speak out?

In fact, many have. Bill Jennings was the Deputy Director of Emergency Services for the New York City Housing Department based in World Trade Centre 7. On 9/11 he stated that he had experienced explosions and seen bodies. This completely contradicted the official account.

Colleen Rowley was a former FBI agent who raised concerns about the FBI's apparent unwillingness to act on intelligence; J. Michael. Springmann was head of the U.S visa section in Jeddah who reported suspected collusion between the U.S intelligence agencies and Islamist extremists prior to 9/11; Bill Bergmann, an economist working at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, highlighted possible foreknowledge of the attack seen in financial market data; several members of the 9/11 Commission claimed a

A Dangerous Ideology

cover up, as did Senators and intelligence officers.[182]

Hundreds of witnesses, including first responders, building employees, police officers and members of the public, stated they saw, heard or experienced explosions in the Twin Towers. Hundreds more, that the aircraft didn't look like commercial flights. Many law enforcement officers and crash scene investigators contradicted the official account. As have air traffic controllers, state officials and many others.

Indeed, so numerous are the people who have spoken out, the idea that the 9/11 cover up is a secret at all seems utterly ludicrous to many. The problem most people have in understanding this reality is that the witness testimonies, official accounts, reports and public statements have been almost completely ignored by the mainstream media.

Sadly, if you rely upon MSM journalists for your window on the world the chances of you ever knowing any of this are pretty slim. When acknowledgement has been unavoidable, for example during the 9/11 Commission hearings, the testimonies are simply determined to be 'incorrect'; when whistleblowers step forward they are either sacked, arrested, ridiculed or die in unusual circumstances. However most witnesses, who challenge the official narrative, are simply labelled 'conspiracy theorists' who can therefore be discounted because they 'must' be mad.

It should also be noted that there are numerous examples of huge plots which were successfully kept entirely secret. One example being the 1939 Manhattan Project that produced the first nuclear weapon. An estimated 130,000 people were involved yet, when President Truman took office in 1945, even he didn't know about it.

Truman had accidentally asked a searching question about suspicious activity in a Minneapolis factory during a 1943 senatorial investigations into war-production. Neither he, nor his fellow panel members, had any idea it was secretly connected with the Manhattan Project. He later received a phone call from President Roosevelt's secretary of war, Harry Stimson, warning him not to inquire further. Taking office two years later, he was still none the wiser.

A Dangerous Ideology

Another example, among many others, is the 'secret' financial collapse during the 1980s. To this day few Americans (or anyone else for that matter) are aware of the staggering cover up of bank insolvency that occurred.

Delivering a speech to the Center for Strategic & International Studies in 2008, Richard C. Too, former economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and doctoral fellow with the Feds Board of Governors, stated that 7 out of 8 of the money centre banks were insolvent during the 80s. The Federal Reserve knew nearly every American bank was insolvent yet managed to keep this fact hidden from everyone for decades. Thousands of financial sector workers, economists and journalists would also have known, yet secrecy was maintained absolutely.

The conspiracy theorists also point to the effective use of the well-established security protocol of 'compartmentalisation.' Wikipedia defines this as:

“In matters concerning information security, whether public or private sector, compartmentalization is the limiting of access to information to person's or other entities who need to know it in order to perform certain tasks.”

It is the process of ensuring, while hundreds of thousands of people may be involved in a project, they only possess sufficient information to enable them to complete their specific task. It is only the select few, with oversight of the entire project, who have a clear understanding of its ultimate objective.

The development of the Greek Fire, a nautical incendiary weapon employed with devastating effect by the Eastern Roman Byzantine Empire c.672, is another example of a large scale project successfully kept secret by using strict compartmentalisation. Few of those involved in its development or manufacture knew what it was.

Compartmentalisation is one rebuttal the conspiracy theorists offer. However, as we've just mentioned, the main point raised in objection to the 9/11 'impossible cover up'

A Dangerous Ideology

criticism is that it isn't one. Or, if it is, it's crap.

Much of the evidence we will discuss here is already in the public domain. It isn't hidden. Far from being protected behind layers of secrecy, the plot has already been exposed. The suggested 'cover up' is actually the misdirection of public attention away from evidence that freely and openly exists. Conspiracy theorists blame the mainstream media (MSM) for this, and pretty much everything else for that matter.

We have already discussed the false flag principles of LIHOP (let it happen on purpose) and MIHOP (make it happen on purpose.) The suggestion is that elements within the Bush administration either deliberately allowed the attack to go ahead (LIHOP) or actively facilitated the attack (MIHOP.)

Whatever the truth may be, rejecting a theory because we don't 'want' to believe it is not consistent with objective inquiry. If we maintain conspiracy theories are absurd, we must base this upon evidence. Simply waving a dismissive hand is childish.

So what do most of us accept happened that day?[19]

The first of the hijacked plane took off at 07.59. American Airlines Flight 11, a Boeing 767, flew out of Boston's Logan International Airport for Los Angeles with 92 people on board. Among the passengers were the 5 hijackers Mohamed Atta (Egyptian), Abdulaziz al Omari (Saudi Arabian), Waleed al Shehri (Saudi Arabian), Wail al Shehri (Saudi Arabian) and Satam al Suqami (Saudi Arabian).

At 08:14 am. United Airlines Flight 175, a Boeing 767 with 65 passengers on board, took off from Logan for Los Angeles. The hijackers were Fayeze Banihammad (United Arab Emirates), Marwan al Shehhi (United Arab Emirates), Mohand al Shehri (Saudi Arabian), Hamza al Ghamdi (Saudi Arabian) and Ahmed al Ghamdi (Saudi Arabian).

American Airlines Flight 77 left Washington Dulles International Airport at 08:20 am. The Boeing 757 headed for Los Angeles with 64 people on board. Hani Hanjour (Saudi Arabian), Khalid al Mihdhar (Saudi Arabian), Majed

A Dangerous Ideology

Moqed (Saudi Arabian), Nawaf al Hazmi (Saudi Arabian) and Salem al Hazmi (Saudi Arabian) were among them.

Finally, at 08:42 am, United Airlines Flight 93 departed from Newark International Airport. The Boeing 757, which carried 44 passengers, was bound for San Francisco. Ziad Jarrah (Lebanese), Ahmed al Haznawi (Saudi Arabian), Ahmed al Nami (Saudi Arabian) and Saeed al Ghamdi (Saudi Arabian) were on the flight.

AA flight 11, UA Flight 175 and AA Flight 77 were hijacked whilst in flight with each cockpit secured by the terrorists. The attempt to hijack UA flight 93 did not go to plan as passengers and crew resisted. The hijackers initially secured the cockpit but a struggle ensued that resulted in the plane crashing in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, before reaching its intended target.

At 08.46, 47 minutes after take-off, AA Flight 11 crashed into the North tower (WTC 1) of the World Trade Center. At 09.03 UA Flight 175 struck the South tower (WTC 2), 52 minutes after its departure.

President Bush was notified of both strikes on the WTC by Whitehouse Chief of Staff Andrew Card at 09.05 during an elementary school visit in Sarasota, Florida. At 09.31 Bush made a statement that the event is '*a national tragedy*' and '*an apparent terrorist attack on our country.*'

6 minutes later, at 09.37, AA flight 77 hit the Pentagon.

56 minutes after the plane strike on WTC 2, at 09.59 the South Tower completely collapsed. Its total destruction took approximately 10 seconds from the point of initial, visible structural failure.

At 10.03 UA flight 93 crashed in Shanksville. 25 minutes later at 10.28, having been hit by AA Flight 11 approximately 102 minutes earlier, WTC 1 (the North Tower) was also completely destroyed in the same manner as the South Tower.

Having sustained fire damage, ignited by burning debris from the destruction of WTC 1, WTC 7 (The Saloman Brothers Building) also fell at 17.20, some 7hrs after the fire

A Dangerous Ideology

started.

The event timings are just about the only aspect of the official record the conspiracy theorists partly accept. They question nearly every other element of the narrative. Many don't accept that all the terrorists named were even on the planes. Whether offering LIHOP or MIHOP as explanation, their argument can be broken down into three main objections. They claim they have evidence to back all of them up.

Firstly they suggest the hijacked flights could not have occurred the way we are told. They point to perceived weaknesses in the official evidence, a questionable lack of normal security procedures and an apparent hobbling of the military response.

Their second concern is that the buildings' destruction was not consistent with the official 'collapse' explanation. They reject the theory of "*progressive collapse*" offered by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) in their final 2005 report.[9] Once again they claim to offer evidence for us to consider.

Finally, they question the way in which the narrative of 'who' was responsible emerged. They doubt the subsequent investigation, its reporting by the 'mainstream' media (MSM,) and claim it promoted a 'pretext' for war without scrutiny of the evidence.

It is impossible within these pages to analyse every aspect of the evidence the conspiracy community has offered in the years since 9/11. Numerous books have been written on the subject and further reading is necessary if you want to understand the 9/11 debate in its entirety.

The seemingly endless arguments can generally be characterised as an extensive warren of 'rabbit holes.' The conspiracists find the entrance and race down them until 'debunkers' block them with counter evidence. What usually follows is an inconclusive to and fro as both sides throw evidence, and frequently abuse, at each other while they battle over the minutiae.

A Dangerous Ideology

For example conspiratorial protestations were thrown into apoplectic overdrive by the many reports that some named terrorists were still alive. These emerged in the first few weeks after the attack. The BBC[12] reported on an electrical engineer with the same name, date of birth and physical appearance as Abdulaziz al-Omari (AA Flight 11) who told the London based 'Asharq Al-Awsat' newspaper:

'The name [listed by the FBI] is my name and the birth date is the same as mine, but I am not the one who bombed the World Trade Center in New York.'

His plea prompted protests from the Saudi embassy in Washington who said he had reported his passport stolen to Denver police in 1996.

A Saudi airline pilot called Saeed al Ghamdi (UA Flight 93), speaking to reporters for the British Newspaper the Telegraph[13], expressed his dismay as he had the same name, address, date of birth and occupation as his namesake who the FBI identified as one of the terrorists. *'You cannot imagine what it is like to be described as a terrorist - and a dead man - when you are innocent and alive,'* he said.

Similarly, Salem al Hazmi (AA Flight 77) stated *"I have never been to the United States and have not been out of Saudi Arabia in the past two years."* Ahmed al Nami (UA Flight 93) was equally shocked and angrily said *"I'm still alive, as you can see. I was shocked to see my name mentioned by the American Justice Department. I had never even heard of Pennsylvania where the plane I was supposed to have hijacked [was]."*

While in Morocco, again according to the BBC, Saudi Pilot Waleed al Shehri (AA Flight 11) was so annoyed that he complained to both the Saudi and U.S. authorities.[14]

This kind of stuff prompts conspiracy lovers to practically pee themselves with excitement. The fact the investigating authorities have largely maintained the suspect list in the intervening years, without fully accounting for these apparent anomalies, is 'proof,' some say, of a cover up.

A Dangerous Ideology

It isn't.

First of all these supposed survivor stories are based predominantly upon MSM news reports, something which conspiracy theorists have no problem disregarding at other times. All they suggest is the possibility that investigators, the media or both may have got some things wrong. It possibly indicates the hijackers were using false or stolen identities. Equally, the people quoted could simply have shared some personal details with the hijackers. These stories prove nothing.

In the carnage of the aftermath, amid public demands for news and results, such potential errors are hardly surprising. Though it should be noted this is difficult to reconcile with the FBI's own official statement, "*Within a matter of days, the FBI identified the 19 hijackers using flight, credit card, banking, and other records.*" [18]

Nonetheless, then director of the FBI Robert Mueller alluded to this apparent difficulty. On September 21st 2001, he said the FBI had a '*a fairly high level of confidence*' about the identities of some alleged hijackers adding "*.....The investigation is ongoing, and I am not certain as to several of the others.*" [15]

Some conspiracy theorists leap upon any ambiguity to assert statements of fact which, in reality, remain highly questionable. Their 'debunker'opponents are just as quick to seize the opportunity to point this out, though they often stray into the realms of the ridiculous themselves. These combative exchanges leave the casual observer nonplussed. You need to be a true die hard to unravel the full complexities of this discourse. Most of us simply don't have the time and can't be bothered.

If you are interested I recommend you undertake your own research, objectively assess both sides of the argument and make up your own mind. Throughout I have suggested further reading and viewing. I suggest you make of it what you will. Our intention here is to understand the conspiracist's evidence which, they claim, proves the official 9/11 story is a lie. However, we might question why they want to do this.

A Dangerous Ideology

One of the leading conspiracy theory websites 911Truth.org[16] offers a mission statement that gives us an insight into the truthers intentions.

To expose the official lies and cover-up surrounding the events of September 11th, 2001 in a way that inspires the people to overcome denial and understand the truth; namely, that elements within the US government and covert policy apparatus must have orchestrated or participated in the execution of the attacks for these to have happened in the way that they did.

It is important to avoid getting hung up on semantics. Many are infuriated by the 'truthers' insistence that it is they who offer 'the truth.' By implication, if you don't accept their truth, what you believe is a 'lie.' It is only a small bunny hop to perceiving the intellectual superiority complex identified by some.

Yet this is based purely upon differing interpretations of the meaning of a single word. Seen in one light, the use of 'truth' is pertinent and reasonable, seen in another it is accusatory and hints at self-aggrandisement. Both readings are subjective to some degree. A matter of perspective. A perspective often informed by what we are told.

If we wish to be objective ourselves, we should not allow these suggested labels to colour our own pursuit of the evidence. Rather, we should perhaps accept we all hold certain beliefs. We think these are 'true,' otherwise we wouldn't give them credit. If we ascribe persecutory intent to 'words,' simply because they are used by those we disagree with, we will never move beyond inane confrontation.

Chapter 6

Where Did The All The Money Go?

The initial investigation into 'what happened' on 9/11 was seen by many as surprisingly brief, given the scale and complexity of the crime.

On October 9th the FBI were reportedly urged by then Attorney General John Ashcroft to switch their attention away from investigating the events themselves in favour of an increased determination to prevent future attacks.[17] The Justice Departments communication director Mindy Tucker objected to this notion stating the investigation had *“not been curtailed, it is ongoing.”*

Yet Ashcroft's press statements, made on the 8th, appears to confirm, regardless of the continuing investigation, the administration had already decided what happened and who was responsible.[18] The emphasis had clearly shifted from investigating 9/11 to prosecuting the 'war on terror.'

Ashcroft's stated:

A Dangerous Ideology

“Yesterday, the president ordered the United States military to begin strikes against Al Qaeda terrorist training camps and military installations of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. Consistent with this development, I have instructed federal law enforcement to be on the highest level of alert to strengthen America’s protections.”

Furthermore, the FBI investigation codenamed PENTTBOM (short for Pentagon, Twin Towers Bombing) was not deemed to be a priority by the FBI as early as 3rd October 2001. Speaking to the House Intelligence Subcommittee on Terrorism The FBI deputy assistant director of Counterterrorism, J.T.Caruso, said:[19]

“Director Mueller has forcefully and repeatedly articulated our number one priority: to do everything in our power to prevent the occurrence of any additional terrorist acts.”

It is certainly evident that by January 29th 2002, less than 5 months after the 9/11, the Bush administration wanted to limit the scope of the investigation. Senate majority leader Tom Daschle stated that he had received a call from Vice President Dick Cheney urging this restriction and this had been agreed:

“The vice president expressed the concern that a review of what happened on September 11 would take resources and personnel away from the effort in the war on terrorism.....I acknowledged that concern, and it is for that reason that the Intelligence Committee is going to begin this effort, trying to limit the scope and the overall review of what happened.”

However, Daschle was also open about his personal feelings on the matter, adding:

“But clearly, I think the American people are entitled to know what happened and why.”

A Dangerous Ideology

Whilst many feel a focus upon prevention is understandable, as it adheres to the primary duty of law enforcement to protect the public, is it reasonable to ask why the administration were apparently so eager to move away from the investigation itself?

For the conspiracy theorists the answer is obvious. Had the investigation been given a free hand it would have exposed the deception.

Mary Galligan, who headed the PENTTBOM investigation until early 2004, emphasized how much was still unknown about the plot. In 2004, she said, “*There is still information coming in, and we still have so many unanswered questions.*” Changing emphasis in 2001 certainly seems to have been premature.

In order to hold to the official 9/11 narrative, you do need to accept a startling number of unbelievable coincidences. Consequently the 'conspiracy theorists,' often refer to those who accept the official account as 'coincidence theorists.'

For example, the day before 9/11, the U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld announced the Pentagon could not account for \$2.3Trillion of expenditure (yes, you did read that correctly).[21] This was a known problem that had plagued him following the Department of Defense Inspector General report for Fiscal Year 1999 which identified the missing money.[22]

Rumsfeld was eager to push ahead with a military modernisation plan that would require congress to agree an additional annual defence expenditure of \$50 billion. Making his plea for the cash to the Defense Secretary Nomination Hearing, in January 2001, Rumsfeld was acutely aware of this problem. Senator Robert Byrd asked him:

“How can we seriously consider a \$50 billion increase in the Defense Department budget when DoD’s own auditors — when DoD’s own auditors say the department cannot account for \$2.3 trillion in transactions in one year alone.”

Eight months later Rumsfeld was no nearer to providing an account for this money. In a break from the well-used political practice of announcing bad news late on Friday, at the end of the weekly news cycle, Rumsfeld unusually chose to concede the 'accountancy error' and declare 'war' on Pentagon financial procedures on Monday 10th September.

By publicly dropping this bombshell on a Monday he would normally be setting himself at the centre of disastrous news agenda for the next week, at least.[23] Less than 24 hours later this admission had been completely forgotten by the world's media. Indeed, apart from the conspiracy theorists, it has remained a moot point for the wider public. Following 9/11 Rumsfeld's request for an annual budget hike of \$50 billion seems like small change.

As of 2017, according to an academic study by Brown University's Watson Institute for International Studies, the estimated cost of the war on terror to the U.S. taxpayer was likely to exceed \$4 trillion.[24] Furthermore, since the process of auditing the Pentagon accounts began in 1996, as of 2013, the total amount that was unaccounted for stood at an eye watering \$8.5 trillion.[25]

If you can barely believe that figure I suggest you hold on to your hat. Dr Mark Skidmore of Michigan State University, and former Investment Banker Catherine Austin Fitts, investigated the accounts of the US Department of Defense and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Between 1999 and 2015 they discovered \$21 trillion in unaccounted transactions on the books.[183]

Conspiracy theorists claim that Rumsfeld statement, made the day before 9/11, suggests foreknowledge. A deliberate attempt to bury an unacceptable reality. That reality is that the U.S economy has a hidden counterpart. The Black Budget economy. Its scale is virtually untold and no one, outside of its deep state controllers, really have any idea at all how much is spent or what this dirty money pays for.

It could have simply been pure coincidence. Yet it is not the only one that ties curious financial irregularities to 9/11.

When AA flight 77 hit the Pentagon, it struck a recently

A Dangerous Ideology

reinforced section of the building, called 'Wedge One,' on the west side of the building. It housed personnel from Resource Services of the Army. Most were civilian accountants, bookkeepers and, coincidentally, budget analysts. 34 died, their office and data analysis was destroyed.

The obvious 'truther' suggestion is that these people were investigating the missing money. However, others have pointed out that this isn't the case.[26]

Firstly, some have claimed the Department of Defense Audit Service (attached to the Inspector General's Office) wasn't situated in Wedge One of the Pentagon but rather in Texas. However Wikipedia, hardly definitive, lists it as being in Arlington, Virginia. You might wonder why Rumsfeld would bother making any announcement at all about the money if he knew 9/11 would effectively erase the issue from history. Furthermore, this was just an accounting error (admittedly on an unimaginable scale) not, as claimed by the conspiracy theorists, evidence of governmental fraud.

This seems plausible. However, in 2002 the Inspector General issued another report identifying a further \$1.1 trillion of unaccountable transactions. Some questioned why this report made no mention at all of the previously stated 'accounting error.' The head of the Department of the Army, Thomas White, said they didn't publish any further comment regarding the 2001 financial statement of the missing \$2.3 trillion due to:[27]

“...the loss of financial-management personnel sustained during the September 11 terrorist attack.”

Perhaps key investigators were, coincidentally, killed that day. Maybe the conspiracy theorists do have reason for suspicion. However, there is no question that suspicion is justified when we look at some of the other financial 'coincidences' surrounding 9/11.

In April 2001 the lease holder for the Twin Towers and the Salomon Brothers Building (WTC 7), Larry Silverstein, signed a 99 years lease with NYC Port Authority.[28] From the outset there were some unusual aspects to the deal.

A Dangerous Ideology

The towers were valued at \$1.2 billion and the Port Authority held \$1.5 billion insurance coverage on the properties. Yet Silverstein insisted on \$3.55 billion worth of coverage as part of the deal. His flabbergasted brokers struggled to cover this. They had to cobble together a consortium of 25 providers in order to meet Silverstein's insurance requirements and force the purchase through.

So complex was this arrangement, when the Towers were hit, much of the coverage was still on a temporary contractual footing. Silverstein also insisted on an exclusivity clause to 'rebuild' the structures, if they were destroyed, at an additional cost to the contract.

Immediately following the attacks Silverstein started legal enquiries to ascertain if both towers were 'individually' insured for the full \$3.55Bn.[29] What followed was a protracted claim for \$7.1Bn which the courts partially upheld in 2007, netting Silverstein a tidy \$4.55Bn pay-out. [30]

On 9/11, AA Flight 11 struck the North Tower between 93rd and 100th floors, immediately destroying them in the violent explosion that killed the occupants. These innocent people predominantly worked for a single financial firm, worth an estimated \$13Bn, called Marsh & McLennan.

Marsh & McLennan had commissioned a software company called Silver Stream to develop a unique, highly secure trading platform between themselves and the insurance giant AIG. Coincidentally, staff worked around the clock to have it ready for the firm's roll out deadline of September 10th 2001.[31]

Silver Stream were no lightweights either, having also built platforms for the likes of Deutsche Bank, Bankers Trust, Alex Brown and Morgan Stanley among others. Yet the system they built for Marsh and McLennan was so bespoke only Marsh' and AIG could use it. It was effectively a closed loop system for extremely secure transactions, accessible only to authorised personnel. Its Data centre was housed on the 95th Floor, the epicentre of the impact blast.

Shortly before 9/11 it became apparent there were some

A Dangerous Ideology

major financial irregularities within the system. Analysts employed by Marsh' initially noticed up to \$10M in possibly fraudulent purchase orders. Many of those tasked with investigating the potential irregularities were attending a conference call meeting to discuss the situation in the North Tower. All those attending this meeting were murdered that day.[32]

Despite the scale of the destruction, a specialist German data retrieval firm called Convar were able to reconstruct some information from hard disk fragments found at Ground Zero. Speaking in late 2001 Peter Herschel, Convar's director at the time, reported that they had identified evidence of insider trading linked to the attacks.

“The suspicion is that inside information about the attack was used to send financial transaction commands and authorizations in the belief that amid all the chaos the criminals would have, at the very least, a good head start. Of course it is also possible that there were perfectly legitimate reasons for the unusual rise in business volume. It could turn out that Americans went on an absolute shopping binge on that Tuesday morning. But at this point there are many transactions that cannot be accounted for. Not only the volume but the size of the transactions was far higher than usual for a day like that. There is a suspicion that these were possibly planned to take advantage of the chaos.”

One of Convar's data retrieval experts, Richard Wagner, added:

“There is a suspicion that some people had advance knowledge of the approximate time of the plane crashes in order to move out amounts exceeding \$100 million. They thought that the records of their transactions could not be traced after the main frames were destroyed.” [22]

9/11 researcher Michael Ruppert received information from whistle-blowers inside Deutsche Bank (one of Silver Streams other clients) who told him:[34]

“.....in the moments right before the attacks and during the attack — there was a 40 minute window between the time the first plane struck the World Trade Center and the second plane — that Deutsche Bank’s computers in New York City had been ‘taken over.’ Absolutely co-opted and run. There was a massive data purge, a massive data download, and all kinds of stuff was moving.”

If large scale financial fraud, centred on the World Trade Centre, was underway during the attacks, it obviously suggests some people, with considerable financial interests, knew what was going to happen. Furthermore, a potentially secret trading system would presumably have been quite useful in any such attempt.

Is this precisely the kind of speculative dross conspiracy theorists are prone too? Suspicion does not evidence anything other than a furtive imagination.

On 12th September 2001 the United States Security and Exchange Commission (SEC) launched an investigation into the possible insider trading linked to the attacks. There was a huge amount of peculiar activity in the markets as unnamed investors bought something called 'put options' on stocks that were subsequently affected by the attacks.

Ostensibly you agree to sell shares at a fixed price, within a fixed time frame. If the stock falls you make money because you have bought the 'option' to sell the shares for a fixed price which now exceeds the cost of buying them. Enabling you to trade them for profit. For example, following 9/11, American and United Airlines stock fell by 39% overnight, providing big gains for those who invested in the right 'puts' before the attacks.[34]

Whilst these are a standard financial instruments, traders normally expect a similar number of 'call option' (betting the

A Dangerous Ideology

stock will rise) to be exchanged on any normal day. Yet in the days leading up to the attacks they noticed an extremely high volume of 'puts.' These are usually very high risk investments as, under normal circumstances, you can't be certain the stock will fall and could end up losing your shirt in a long odds gamble.

They weren't just purchased on airline stock either. Puts were also bought on the stock of other companies impacted by 9/11. For example Marsh & McLennan and Morgan Stanley (the WTC's main tenants.) Other companies, such as Axa Group, similarly affected, also had extremely high level of 'puts' purchased on their stock in the days leading up to 9/11.

Not only were some investors able to predict falling stocks with incredible accuracy, they were also able to identify precisely where to invest the equally high risk 'call options', betting stock would rise. The defence contractor Raytheon, who make the Tomahawk missiles the U.S. military used in response to 9/11, saw a six fold increase in 'calls' purchased on its stock on September the 10th. The day before the attacks.

This prompted many traders to alert the SEC of their suspicions. The concern being the terrorist's financiers had possibly profited financially, as well as politically and psychologically, from their crime. Effectively by 'insider trading' shares, certain that some stock values would collapse while others would soar, as a result of 9/11.

However, it wasn't just the U.S. based SEC who were alerted to the possibility of mass financial fraud. A number of other European agencies were investigating the possibility. Following statements from Belgian and Italian officials, who announced their suspicions, it was the German Central Bank's president Ernst Welteke who made the most definitive statement:[175]

“[There is]....almost irrefutable proof of insider trading. What we found makes us sure that people connected to the terrorists must have been trying to profit from this

tragedy.”

The subsequent SEC investigation was the biggest in its history. It examined over nine million securities transactions involving more than one hundred different companies. It coordinated with over 20 of the world's largest trading firms and liaised with ten foreign financial regulatory authorities. A number of agencies including the FBI, the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Justice were also involved.

Following their exhaustive exploration of the 'truth,' in May 2002, the SEC Division of Enforcement produced its report which concluded:[176]

“We have not developed any evidence suggesting that those who had advanced knowledge of the September 11 attacks traded on the basis of that information.”

The eagle eyed may have noticed some considerable problems with this statement. Firstly it doesn't state that insider trading didn't take place. It only claims that “*those who had advanced knowledge of the September 11 attacks*” didn't metaphorically, as well as literally, make a killing. It also begs the question how, in May 2002, the SEC were able to identify who those with 'advanced knowledge' were. More to the point, did they hand this information over to investigators such as Mary Galligan (head of PENTTBOM) who, unlike the SEC, had yet to solve the 9/11 crime?

Thankfully, in 2005, the eventual 9/11 Commission Report, which remains the only official, and therefore definitive account of 9/11, was able to clarify this for everyone. Speaking about the abnormal volume of United Airlines 'put' options traded on September 6th, they stated that 95% of these options were purchased by:

“A single U.S. based institutional investor with no conceivable ties to al Qaeda.”

Ruling out complicity in 9/11 on the basis of '*no conceivable ties,*' to al Qaeda is the logical equivalent of discovering a banana plantation, stripped bare of its fruit, with a very fat,

A Dangerous Ideology

guilty looking elephant stood in the middle of it. With 'no conceivable ties' to monkeys, its complicity in the banana ravaging incident can be ruled out.

While this nonsensical conclusion from the 9/11 Commission is cited by the some as 'evidence' that no insider trading occurred, conspiracists have pointed out that it was the trading patterns themselves that suggest advanced knowledge, not the trader's potential links to al Qaeda, or monkeys. So the question was 'who' was profiting from these trades because, irrespective of any established links al Qaeda, whoever it was made a lot of money out of 9/11.

As a result of these concerns, researchers checked the Commission's SEC sources used to decide there was no 'advanced knowledge' and no suspicious trading. It therefore came as something of a surprise that the SEC apparently decided to destroy all the evidence related to the matter.

Following an FOIA request from David Callahan (editor of 'Smart CEO') he received the following response from the SEC.[36]

“This letter is in response to your request seeking access to and copies of the documentary evidence referred to in footnote 130 of Chapter 5 of the September 11 (9/11) Commission Report.

We have been advised that the potentially responsive records have been destroyed.”

This investigation could have potentially uncovered the financiers of the 9/11 attacks. Presumably, it was by far the most important inquiry the SEC had ever undertaken. It was certainly their largest. Unfortunately they destroyed all their own hard work.

All this stuff, say the conspiracy theorists, evidently suggests a cover up. It raises the stomach churning possibility of an institutional financial fraud predicated upon the murder of thousands of innocent people.

However, others have highlighted alternative explanations for the anomalous trading. For example the stock price had

A Dangerous Ideology

been falling for American Airlines since July and, on the 7th September, they released a string poor financial reports. So perhaps the 'puts' weren't so suspicious.[37]

The same cannot be said for all the other companies, such as Boeing, Merrill Lynch, J.P. Morgan Chase, Citigroup, Bank of America and dozens more who all saw significant spikes in 'put' option activity in the days prior to 9/11. All of which turned out to be very profitable. Nor does it explain the equally anomalous increase in 'call option' trading in the stocks of companies whose share price increased following 9/11, such as Raytheon and Stratesec. Again, with universal success.

To date, no one has offered a reasonable account for the SEC's remarkable destruction of the evidence that could have answered these important questions.

This apparent lack of curiosity about the money behind 9/11 was a view shared by the 9/11 Commission itself:

“To date, the U.S. government has not been able to determine the origin of the money used for the 9/11 attacks. Ultimately the question is of little practical significance.”

(9/11 Commission Report - Chapter 5)

All of this information, and a great deal more, is publicly available. Ultimately only you can decide what you consider to be 'significant.'

Chapter 7

Where Did All The Security Go?

Another major problem the official narrative is the apparent lack of military response. How four hijacked planes could lumber around, unmolested by any interceptors, in absolute contravention of all security procedures, in the most heavily protected airspace on Earth, for respective periods of between 47 to 102 minutes is difficult to understand.

There appear to be only two possible explanations. Either the largest, most advanced military the world has ever seen, with a budget greater than the rest of the world's militaries combined, is completely useless, unable to defend the nation it serves from even the most rudimentary of threats or, at a senior level, a strategic plan was in place to sabotage the military response. Thus enabling the planes to reach their targets.

Conspiracy theorists have pointed out it was only the bravery of the passengers on UA Flight 93 that allegedly

A Dangerous Ideology

stopped it from reaching its unknown destination. Ending its meandering journey 1 hour and 45 minutes after the first hijacking was discovered. Otherwise, the terrorists' mission success rate would have presumably been 100%.

The counter argument suggests a third possibility. We might call this the 'sods law probability.' Namely, whatever can go wrong invariably does. This is much more in keeping with the official narrative and far easier for most of us to accept.

The official account, blames everything from crowded radar screens, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) ineptitude, North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) cock-ups, a complete breakdown of everyone's comprehension of both the rules of engagement and proper response protocols, training amnesia, an absent (presumed missing) chain of command, war games that couldn't have been scheduled at a worse time and thousands of experienced highly trained idiots who did well to find their way work that morning.

I have yet to meet a single conspiracy theorist who doesn't consider this claim, of an incredible string of coincidental calamities, anything other than complete tosh.

To accept them, they say, you also have to believe that FAA air traffic controllers and officials, who undergo years of intensive professional training, can't read and were both wholly incapable and utterly oblivious of their responsibilities; that they were hopelessly unprepared for the chaos which they presumably never trained or planned for; that experienced military personnel, including fighter pilots, didn't have the foggiest idea what to do if they were attacked, despite being trained to fly the most advanced weaponry on the planet, and from the ground crews to the Commander in Chief himself, all lines of communication were simultaneously knackered.

In one regard the conspiracists, the world's media and officialdom are in complete agreement. The horror that unfolded represented one of the worst failings in U.S. military history. Where they furiously disagree is how and, more importantly, why it happened.

A Dangerous Ideology

So what should have occurred and what evidence is there to account for the tragic breakdown of defence protocol?

You will not be surprised that establishing even the agreed official planned response is a source for hot debate. Thankfully the 9/11 Commission Report Spells it out.[38]

“On 9/11, the defence of U.S. airspace depended on close interaction between two federal agencies: the FAA and the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD).....”

On 9/11, all the hijacked aircraft were in NORAD’s North-east Air Defense Sector (also known as NEADS), which is based in Rome, New York. That morning NEADS could call on two alert sites, each with one pair of ready fighters: Otis Air National Guard Base in Cape Cod, Massachusetts, and Langley Air Force Base in Hampton, Virginia.....”

The FAA and NORAD had developed protocols for working together in the event of a hijacking. As they existed on 9/11, the protocols for the FAA to obtain military assistance from NORAD required multiple levels of notification and approval at the highest levels of government.....”

FAA guidance on hijack procedures assumed the aircraft's crew would notify the controller via radio or by 'squawking' a transponder code of '7500.' The universal code for a hijack in progress. Controllers would notify their supervisors, who in turn would inform management, all the way up the chain of command to the FAA hijack coordinator in Washington. This was the director of the FAA Office of Civil Aviation Security. The 9/11 Commission stated:

“If a hijack was confirmed, procedures called for the hijack coordinator on duty to contact the Pentagon’s National Military Command Center (NMCC) and to ask for a military escort aircraft to follow the flight,

A Dangerous Ideology

report anything unusual, and aid search and rescue in the event of an emergency. The NMCC would then seek approval from the Office of the Secretary of Defense to provide military assistance. If approval was given, the orders would be transmitted down NORAD's chain of command.

The NMCC would keep the FAA hijack coordinator up to date and help the FAA centers coordinate directly with the military. NORAD would receive tracking information for the hijacked aircraft either from joint use radar or from the relevant FAA air traffic control facility. Every attempt would be made to have the hijacked aircraft squawk 7500 to help NORAD track it."

According to the Commission Report these guidelines were reliant upon an assumption that the pilots would be able to alert the FAA air traffic controllers (ATCs) by issuing the 'squawk.' Seeing as the hijackers were armed only with box cutters, it seems odd that none of the aircrew, on any of the four hijacked aircraft, apparently managed to punch in a single one of these 'squawks.' Even so, if this wasn't possible, other procedural safeguards were clearly in place and the Commissions over emphasis on the squawk is strange.

All U.S. commercial flights were required to file a flight path with a predetermined set of 'fix points' prior to being cleared for take-off. If any were missed, or the transponder signal was lost, the ATCs would attempt to contact the pilots. If unsuccessful, or if the pilots did not respond as required, they would instigate the alert procedure. No squawk required.

The impression given by the 9/11 Commission was, without the squawks, ATCs didn't know the planes were hijacked. Hence, the terrible confusion. However, conspiracy theorists are not alone in questioning why the Commission would consider this to be the case, when pilot issued 'squawks' were only one part of a multi-faceted emergency procedure if

A Dangerous Ideology

hijacking was a possibility.

According to the FAA/Department of Defense order 7610.4J for 'special military operations,' which was in place prior to 9/11, the response time for scrambled jets to intercept wayward flights should have been no more than 10 - 20 minutes from the time of the first FAA alert.[39]

AA Flight 11 disable it's IFF (Identify Friend or Foe) beacon and was noted to veer wildly off course at 08.20. It struck the North Tower 26 minutes later at 08.46. So identifying precisely when the FAA first raised the alert was key to understanding what went wrong, why and who was primarily responsible for the horrendous fiasco.

Once the FAA informed the Pentagon's National Military Command Center (NMCC), they would inform The Secretary of Defense office, who would authorise NORAD to start scrambling jets under 'special military operations' procedures.

The official narrative offered the following timeline:

08.37: - 16 minutes after AA flight 11 is firmly identified as suspicious, NORAD is notified of the hijacking.

08.43: - NORAD received notification of the possible Flight 175 hijacking.

08.46: - Two F-15s scrambled from Otis to intercept Flight 11 just as it crashed into the North Tower. While UA Flight 175 was also on route to the WTC buildings, these jets were placed in a holding pattern, in military airspace off Long Island, to await further orders.

09.09: - F-16s from the North Dakota Air National Guard (ANG) went to battle station at Langley, but were not scrambled.

09.13: - The two F-15s circling Long Island were ordered to set a course for Manhattan more than 10 minutes after the second WTC strike.

09.24: - Three ANG F-16s were airborne, having scrambled from North Dakota. They were ordered to fly north and

A Dangerous Ideology

assume a defensive position over Baltimore to protect the capital.

09.36: - NORAD were advised of AA Flight 77 flight path towards the Pentagon (potentially). They directed the ANG F-16's to intercept. However, rather than heading north to Baltimore as ordered, the jets had flown eastwards towards the Atlantic and were out of position.

09.37: - With the F-16's still 150 miles away, Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon. Following the explosion, the three planes were sent to Reagan National Airport to hold a position south of the Pentagon.

10.03: - UA Flight 93 crashed in Pennsylvania. NORAD didn't know it had been hijacked.

This appeared to present a number of damning conclusions. Contrary to all procedure, from the point of discovery, the FAA took more than 20 minutes to raise an alert for Flight 11 and more than 35 minutes to report Flight 77's errant flight.

The notification for Flight 175 took just 1 minute but NORAD weren't notified of flight 93's hijacking until after it crashed. Despite Flights 11 and 175 heading towards New York, interceptors were scrambled from Otis ANG base rather than the much closer La Guardia or Langley bases. Even after WTC 1 was hit, despite apparently knowing that Flight 175 had been hijacked, the jets from Otis were still held in an off shore stacking pattern. No aircraft were scrambled from Andrews Air Force base to protect the Pentagon until after it was hit. It was instead defended by the F-16's from ND ANG that had flown off in the wrong direction. Though capable of flying at over 1500mph, the average speed of all the interceptors was less than 450mph. Other fighters, that should have been available, were all engaged in 'war games' elsewhere.[40] - [41]

The official line, accepted without question by the world's mainstream media, supports the finding. A coincidental combination of systemic failure, confusion and human error led to the terrorists achieving a 75% mission success rate. Apparently, this is reasonable and is the shared perspective

A Dangerous Ideology

of the vast majority of us who accept the official story.

Conspiracy theorists say that you need to be either completely unobservant or a special kind of dip-shit if you swallow this babbling absurdity. If you simply accept everything the government tells you, despite the mountain of contradictory evidence, you have sacrificed all sense of curiosity in favour of a mindless, unquestioning conformity.

They claim the idea that the FAA, NORAD and military personnel hadn't trained, practised or rehearsed for precisely this kind of scenario, and were somehow unprepared, is evidently false. They add there is clear evidence of a concerted, high level effort, effectively ensuring the terrorists had the best possible chance of success. For example, it seems most senior commanders may have deliberately neglected their duty or issued orders which ultimately facilitating the attacks.

The 9/11 Commission expressed an opinion that all of these failings were unfortunate but no one was really responsible. The Commission's main finding, in regard to the lack of military response, was that NORAD (NEADS) had, at best, an average 9 minutes response time to intercept the flights. This, they said, was insufficient and largely exonerated the military command structure and senior commanders.

The Commission intimated that any possible 'blame' for 'failures' lay predominantly with the FAA and its ATC management structure. They also decided that much of the testimony given by military leaders and senior FAA officials, which didn't support this conclusion, or their event timeline, was *“incorrect.”*

The August 1998 edition of a periodical newsletter issued by Xavius Software, for its ATC users,[42] outlines NORADS planned response to suspicious flights, It states:

“...procedures are procedures, and they will likely find two F-18's on their tail within 10 or so minutes.”

While this anticipated response assumed the hijacking of overseas, not domestic flights, others have reinforced this

A Dangerous Ideology

perception. It is extremely unlikely that the FAA would have so completely abandoned their procedures. A rapid response was the default position.

Former Boston ATC Robin Hordon said, in 2006:

“On September 11th I’m one of the few people who really within quite a few hours of the whole event taking place just simply knew that it was an inside job...normal protocol is to get fighter jet aircraft up (to) assist.”

As an ATC with 11 years’ experience, Hordon had dealt with many emergencies including two suspected hijackings, for which he received commendation. Hordon was also a certified controller for the west-bound departures out of Boston and was intimately familiar with the control of the AA Flight 11 and UA Flight 175 flight paths.

“I know people who work there who confirmed to me that the FAA was not asleep and the controllers could do the job, they followed their own protocols....Military pilots would have their asses off the ground faster than you could imagine. I know how quickly our systems can respond. Why would you design a system that responds slowly to an emergency?”

Providing oral evidence to the 12th open hearing of the 9/11 Commission, the acting FAA Deputy Administrator on 9/11, Monte Belger, testified:

“Prior to 9/11, the procedures for managing a traditional hijacked aircraft, as I said, were in place and pretty well tested.... The most frustrating after-the-fact scenario for me to understand is to explain is the communication link on that morning between the FAA operations center and the NMCC (National Military Command Center).... The hijacking net is an open communication net run by the FAA hijack

coordinator, who is a senior person from the FAA security organization, for the purpose of getting the affected federal agencies together to hear information at the same time.... It was my assumption that morning, as it had been for my 30 years of experience with the FAA, that the NMCC was on that net and hearing everything real-time..... I can tell you I've lived through dozens of hijackings in my 30-year FAA career, as a very low entry-level inspector up through to the headquarters, and they (the military brass) were always there. They were always on the net, and were always listening in with everybody else..... from my perspective there is no doubt in my mind that the FAA security organization knew what to do. There is no doubt in my mind that the air traffic organization knew what to do. They are the two key players in that type of scenario.... this is very, very important, in response to your question.... the NMCC was called. They were added to this open communication net. In my 30 years of history, there was always somebody listening to that net..... I truly do not mean this to be defensive, but it is a fact -- there were military people on duty at the FAA Command Center on the morning of 9/11, as Mr. Sliney said. They were participating in what was going on. There were military people in the FAA's Air Traffic Organization in a situation room. They were participating in what was going on."

This was another testimony which the Commission felt was 'incorrect.' Some have been quick to suggest that Belger was defending himself and his own service with his testimony. 'Maybe so' say the conspiracists, but he is not alone in attesting to a clear readiness to respond that fateful morning.

The Commission reported that Boston ATCs were aware of

A Dangerous Ideology

the tell-tale signs of the possible hijacking of Flight 11 at 08.14. It tells us that the ATC “....reached out to the pilot on the emergency frequency. Though there was no response, he kept trying to contact the aircraft.”

At this point the ATC's would start instigating alert protocols. They wouldn't assume it was a hijacking but would definitely consider it a possibility. We also learn that AA Flight 11 turned its transponder off at 08.21 (though others placed this a minute earlier). This would have necessitated full implementation of security safeguards.

Lt. Col. Dawne Deskins of the Air National Guard confirmed the military had received hijacking information by 08:30. Even this was longer than procedure recommended. Yet the Commission insisted that NORAD weren't notified until 08.37. There is no evidence offered that accounts for this 23 minute delay between identification and alert. Two potentially key testimonies could have perhaps shed some light upon this otherwise inexplicable breakdown. However, they raise more concerns than they resolve.

Former corporate lawyer Benedict Sliney was the Command Center National Operations Manager (CCNOM) on 9/11. Sliney was reportedly offered the position a second time by Jack Kies (FAA Tactical Operations Manager,) having previously declined it 6 months earlier.[43]

Before retraining as a lawyer, Sliney had accrued extensive experience as an ATC, changing career direction in the 90s. While an attorney, Sliney had represented numerous financial investment firms, including Merrill Lynch in 2000. Shortly after his successful representation of M.L he gave up his lucrative legal career to return to Air Traffic Control, choosing, despite Kies offer of the Command Center post, to work at a less senior level for the first few months.

On 9/11 Sliney was outranked by others (notably Linda Schuessler and John White) but their Commission testimonies clearly placed the lead operational management responsibility on Sliney's shoulders. Surprising then, say the conspiracists, that Sliney barely warrants a mention in the official report. Especially given that 9/11 was, coincidentally, his very first day in the role of CCNOM.

A Dangerous Ideology

Perhaps, they contend, this was because Sliney said he was notified of a hijack in progress sometime between 08.15 and 08.20. He could only have received this via front desk ATCs. Therefore, they did discharge their responsibilities and followed alert procedures, without the need of a '7500 squawk.' Or maybe it was because Sliney didn't appear to know who the FAA Hijack Coordinator was, or where to find them. It was his first day on the job after all.

As it turned out, the FAA headquarters hijack coordinator was Lt. Gen. Michael A. Canavan. A former Special Forces soldier, Canavan had risen through the ranks to a senior command posts within JSOC (Joint Special Operations Command.) The Hijack Coordinator role was the key link between the FAA and the military. Canavan was appointed as Associate Administrator for Civil Aviation Security by FAA Administrator Jane Garvey, only 9 months before 9/11. Garvey was present in FAA headquarters on 9/11.

The 9/11 Commission made scant mention of the importance of the Hijack Coordinator. Neither did it reference the fact that Canavan held that vital position, acknowledging instead only his JSOC role. So when Canavan stated that he was in Puerto Rico and had missed "*everything that happened,*" it seems odd that the Commission didn't pursue him more vigorously. Nor try to identify who was supposed to be the Hijack Coordinator that morning.

Coincidentally, Canavan was not the only key senior figure absent that day. Hugh Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the highest ranking military official, was also absent from his office on the morning of 9/11. As was the acting Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff (in Shelton's absence) Richard Myers, who continued to attend his scheduled meeting even after being informed the second tower had been hit.[44]

The most significant, in a string of high ranking absentees, was Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. According to the stated procedure, he had the ultimate responsibility for authorising a military response. Unfortunately no one could get hold of him.[45]

A Dangerous Ideology

Seeing as the President was reading poems to school children in Florida at the time (remaining with the children for more than 30 minutes after it was known the U.S. was under an attack and that he could well have been a target himself,) Rumsfeld, rather than Vice President Cheney, was the effective military Commander in Chief.

The protocol for the Secretary of Defense to assume full command of any military response, if the U.S. was under attack, had been in place since 1997. This agreement was amended, with Rumsfeld's signed approval, in June 2001. Rumsfeld certainly knew what his responsibilities were. He began the day with an 08.00 meeting with members of Congress at the Pentagon. Coincidentally, as recounted by Rumsfeld himself, his comments at that meeting were spookily portentous:[45]

".....sometime in the next two, four, six, eight, ten, twelve months there would be an event that would occur in the world that would be sufficiently shocking that it would remind people again how important it is to have a strong healthy defence department that contributes to -- that underpins peace and stability in our world."

Rumsfeld stated that someone informed him of the 08.46 strike on the WTC by handing him a note. This was reportedly sent from his special assistant Larry Di Rita. Rather than consider any possible need to instigate emergency protocols, Rumsfeld simply adjourned the meeting and returned to his office prior to his normal, scheduled CIA briefing.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Torie Clarke, said that she and Larry Di Rita watched the second WTC strike live on TV at 09.03. They knew immediately that the U.S. was under attack and started the emergency procedures. Just down the hall from Rumsfeld's office, the Pentagon's Executive Support Center (ESC) kicked into gear and Clarke and Di Rita headed to Rumsfeld's office with haste.

Having informed Rumsfeld they expected him to immediately

head to either to the ESC or the next door National Military Command Center (NMCC) to coordinate the response. However, he apparently decided to “*make a few phone calls*” from his office and told them he planned to attend his scheduled CIA briefing instead.

According to his Pentagon police bodyguard, Aubrey Davis, Rumsfeld remained in his office until the Pentagon was hit by Flight 77. Rumsfeld's testimony given to the 9/11 Commission doesn't clarify why he remained isolated in his office, on the other side of the building, instead of assuming his duties. What Rumsfeld did next was also contrary to the procedure he had already been ignoring for more than an hour. Rather than head to the NMCC, in spite of protestations from Davis and others, Rumsfeld headed off to the crash scene, in silence, without telling anyone where he was going.

Here he was coincidentally filmed acting in the role of first responder. If ‘saving lives’ was his concern, getting in the way of professional first responders was just about the worst thing he could have done. However, it was something his public relations aid Tori Clarke was later keen to highlight:

“Secretary Rumsfeld was one of the first people out there after it happened.....There’s example after example of heroism, of people who helped at the crash site, trying to help victims and get people to ambulances.”

While Rumsfeld was being filmed acting heroically, seeing as no one knew what other attacks may be underway, his staff were frantically trying to get hold of him because they needed him to defend the nation. Assuming temporary command of the NMCC, Captain Charles Leidig was among them. He stressed Rumsfeld's crucial role.

“In an age when an enemy attack might allow only a few minutes for detection and reaction, control of American military power became vested in the National Command Authority.....the NCA is the ultimate source of military orders, uniquely

A Dangerous Ideology

empowered.....In time of war, therefore, Rumsfeld was effectively the president's partner, the direct link to the fighting forces, and all orders had to go through him."

The first time Rumsfeld appears to have done anything remotely useful was at 13:00 when he finally issued the rules of engagement. Although, by then, it was irrelevant.

Conspiracy theorists are by no means the only people who have emphasised that Rumsfeld failed miserably in his duty to protect the American public during the 9/11 attacks. They also point out that it is the globally distributed MSM images, showing his gallant first responder efforts, that have largely endured in the public's imagination.

On the morning of 9/11, the Commander in Chief (Bush), his acting replacement in the defence command structure (Rumsfeld), The Highest ranking military officer (Shelton), his acting stand in (Myers) and the key Hijack Coordinator (Canavan – who apparently had no acting stand in) were all either absent from their posts or otherwise engaged. An incredibly unfortunate string of coincidences, as it was the precise moment their obligation to act was at its most critical.

Another person, whose behaviour seemed unusual, claim the conspiracists, was the Vice President Dick Cheney. The 9/11 Commission accepted Cheney's 'off the record' account that he witnessed the second WTC strike on TV and was evacuated by the Secret Service to the Presidential Emergency Operations Center bunker (PEOC) at 09.37. This coincided with CNN press reports of his movement timeline printed in 2002, prior to the instigation of the investigatory 9/11 Commission.

However, among many of the testimonies which the Commission ignored, or felt were 'incorrect,' was that of Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta. Unlike Cheney, he did give his testimony under oath to the Commission. Mineta was also evacuated to the PEOC. However, his sworn testimony directly contradicted Cheney's account.

Mineta placed Cheney in the PEOC at least as early as

09.20. He then offered his recollection of a conversation Cheney had with one of his aids in the minutes leading up to the Pentagon strike:

“During the time that the airplane was coming into the Pentagon, there was a young man who would come in and say to the Vice President...the plane is 50 miles out...the plane is 30 miles out....and when it got down to the plane is 10 miles out, the young man also said to the vice president 'do the orders still stand?' And the Vice President turned and whipped his neck around and said 'Of course the orders still stand, have you heard anything to the contrary?’”

Mineta said he assumed this was an order to shoot the plane down. However, conspiracy theorists remind people, the destruction of the aircraft was already the default position. By the time of his testimony, Mineta knew full well it was not an order to shoot AA Flight 77 down.

It is very unusual for an aid to question orders, especially those issued by the Vice President of the United States. This may explain Cheney's reportedly angry reaction. If Mineta's testimony was accurate, why would the young man he mentioned risk his career by repeatedly haranguing the Vice President about the hijacked planes inexorable approach to the Pentagon? If the standing order was to shoot it down, which it was, this would have been unnecessary.

Obviously its destruction, whilst in flight, didn't happen. Yet Cheney apparently stated *“the orders still stand.”* So this was not a shoot down order. Therefore, if the suspicions are correct (& the logic seems OK) the order must have been 'not' to shoot it down. To let it hit the Pentagon. MIHOP or LIHOP? Take your pick, say conspiracists.

This could all be a result of the 'sods law probability.' Maybe Mineta felt like making accusations against Cheney, under oath, for a laugh. Who knows? Nearly every aspect of the conspiracy narrative has been debated, debunked, re-examined and fought over for nearly two decades.

A Dangerous Ideology

The conspiracists say all of this is corroborated, checkable evidence that suggests the possibility of foreknowledge and potentially deliberate planning. The ultimate aim of which was to continue the profitable expansion of the same 'military industrial intelligence complex' former President Eisenhower warned everyone about in 1961.

Those who accept the official account say it proves doodly-squat aside from unsubstantiated, politically motivated conspiracy theories, determined to create a finger pointing narrative for what was nothing more than disastrous 'clusterfuck' (to use military parlance.)

All I can report is the conspiracy theorists I have met honestly believe the events surrounding 9/11 are questionable. They claim there is further evidence which supports their suspicions of a hidden 'Deep State' agenda at the heart of the Bush administration.

Regardless of whether they are right, is their belief 'idiotic' simply because it questions the official account most of us accept? Or, given the evidence they claim, is their belief reasonable? The only way any of us can decide is to look at it ourselves and make up our own minds.

While the 9/11 debate is the verbal and intellectual equivalent of a playground spat, there is at least one other broad area of agreement. Both conspiracists and believers of the official account agree the ATC's screens were unusually cluttered and available interceptor numbers were below normal levels. Mainstream analysis claims these ATC complications were yet more unfortunate coincidences which the terrorists took advantage of. How far can the rest of us stretch 'coincidence' as a plausible explanation?

In the decade prior to 9/11, research shows, the FAA and NORAD had trained for the 'unthinkable' scenario of hijacked planes being used as weapons on a number of occasions.[46]

For example, on October 16th 2000, NORAD (NEADS) simulated a hijacked Fed-Ex plane being used to hit the UN Building. Only a few days later, the Pentagon ran its MASCAL exercise, preparing for the possibility of a

A Dangerous Ideology

commercial flight striking the Pentagon. Similarly, the FAA ran preparedness drills and exercises. In December 2000 they simulated a flight turning its transponder off. In a larger 2001 exercise, they ran scenarios surrounding the fictional hijacking of a Boeing 767 over Florida.

Other New York based agencies, such as the FBI, FEMA and the NYPD, were also prepared, having specifically trained for a variety of terrorist scenarios. Police Commissioner Bernard Kerik testified to the 9/11 Commission that preparedness was tested frequently to ensure an effective response to "building collapses" and "plane crashes."

NORAD stated, prior to 9/11, numerous training exercises modelled potential attacks using hijacked aircraft. Feasible targets included the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon. [183] In May 2001 the Arlington Tri-Service DiLorenzo Health Care Clinic and the Air Force Flight Medicine Clinic, trained for a scenario involving a hijacked 757 airliner being crashed into the Pentagon. Furthermore, longstanding director of the FBI Louis Freeh told the 9/11 Commission that training frequently considered the possible use of "*planes as weapons*." He confirmed:

"The use of airplanes, either packed with explosives or otherwise, in suicide missions [was] part of the planning"

So conspiracy theorists utterly reject the statement made by the Bush administration's National Security Advisor (and future Secretary of State) Condoleezza Rice, in May 2002, when she said:

"I don't think that anybody could have predicted that these people would take an airplane and slam it into the World Trade Center, take another one and slam it into the Pentagon, that they would try to use an airplane as a missile."

Clearly, not only did the administration and its agencies predict the possibility, they actively trained for the precise scenario.

A Dangerous Ideology

So, why was the air traffic and air defence picture unusually convoluted that morning? Firstly, counter terrorism resources and first responders (the joint FBI - CIA Anti-Terrorism Task Force), responsible for defending the North Eastern United States, were, coincidentally, on a training exercise in California. Also purely by chance, the National Reconnaissance Office in Chantilly, Virginia were running simulations of planes striking high rise buildings, causing confusion when identical events simultaneously occurred in reality.

Coincidentally, many of the planes that would normally be available to defend the Skies over New York, Boston and Washington were otherwise engaged.

Operation 'Southern Watch' placed the 174th Fighter Wing of the New York Air National Guard in a training exercise in Saudi Arabia; Operation 'Northern Watch' dispatched 6 interceptors from Langley to the Turkish skies; Operation 'Northern Guardian' had more Langley interceptors chasing fictitious Russian bombers around Iceland; F15's from Langley and the 121st Fighter Squadron from Andrews AFB were in Nevada participating in 'Red flag;' Operation 'Northern Vigilance' diverted more fighters and support crews to Alaska to monitor a scheduled Russian bombing drill.

Coincidentally, communication systems were also simulating cyber and infrastructure attacks as the terrorists struck. Operation 'Global Guardian' was busy simulating a computer network attack by hostile hackers. Coincidentally, just as the real world horror was unfolding, NORAD, NEADS (including ATCs and FAA personnel) were engaged in Operation 'Vigilant Guardian.' This training exercise simulated the multiple hijacking of aircraft in the NEADS sector.

Understandably this was a cause of considerable confusion for people who were trying to deal with a real world situation which precisely coincided with an identical, fictitious incident, occurring at exactly the same moment. A remarkable coincidence.[47]

A Dangerous Ideology

The official explanation for all this is that it was extremely unfortunate that these calamitous coincidences perfectly coalesced to leave the NEADS defences unusually unprepared. This, they add, was especially unfortunate as it was the exact moment when the multibillion dollar air defences (built from U.S. tax payers' enormous investment) were actually required to deploy their staggering capability.

The stupid conspiracy theorists don't agree that 'shit happens' rationally accounts for all these highly improbable coincidences. In fact, they claim the 9/11 Commission Report, other than providing a record of the official story, isn't worth the paper it's written on.

It took 441 days of public pressure and a Congressional mandate to get the Bush administration to agree to a public inquiry into the largest mass murder on American soil since 'the 500-Year War' (the American Indian Holocaust[184].) Thomas Kean and Lee Hamilton, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the 9/11 Commission, stated their opinion that the inquiry was "*set up to fail*" in their book 'Without Precedent – The Inside Story of the 9/11 Commission.'

Poorly funded and facing considerable establishment opposition, the Commission struggled from the outset. Initially the Bush administration chose Henry Kissinger and former Democratic Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell to head the National Commission. Both men soon resigned. Kissinger felt an inquiry into 9/11 represented a personal conflict of interest and stepped down in order to avoid any potential disclosure of his private consulting firm's client list. Mitchell cited his reluctance to abandon his law firm, DLA Piper, as his reason for resignation.[91]

Other problems included the withholding of security clearances for Commission members, unnecessary and unusual time limits set on the report stages and restricted access to information.[90]

In December 2003 former Senator Max Cleland also resigned from the Commission. Cleland had been critical of the Bush administrations seeming reluctance for disclosure. He alleged the government had prior knowledge about the attacks but weren't forthcoming with the intelligence. He left

A Dangerous Ideology

following the Bush administration's setting of tight restrictions upon the Commissions access to documentation. He said:

“I, as a member of the commission, cannot look any American in the eye, especially family members of victims, and say the commission had full access. This investigation is now compromised.”

In a later interview he added:

“One of these days we will have to get the full story because the 9-11 issue is so important to America. But this White House wants to cover it up.” [92]

Richard A. Clarke, counter terrorism chief, stated the Executive Director of the Commission, Philip Zelikow, had been briefed on a suspected al Qaeda attack plan, prior to 9/11, by the White House. Clarke questioned his impartiality and willingness to disclose information.

Zelikow was widely criticised by Commission members, victim's families and others when it was revealed that he had agreed a skeleton outline of the final report, with the Chair and vice chair, soon after it began. The trio decided to keep this concealed from other commission members and the public because they wanted to avoid accusations of a predetermined outcome. Although, they had written one.

According to the eventual Commissions chair, Thomas Kean, NORAD gave false testimony to the investigation. He and other commission members were so concerned they convened a secret panel in the summer of 2004. Many believed senior officials had broken the law when they gave misleading statements to both Congress and the Commission. Speaking in 2006 Kean said:

“We to this day don't know why NORAD told us what they told us. It was just so far from the truth. . . . It's one of those loose ends that never got tied.”

The Commission also relied upon CIA testimony, extracted

A Dangerous Ideology

under torture, from suspected terrorist detainees.[93] The Commission were refused access to the detainees or their interrogators, despite frequent requests to speak to them. Instead, they were forced to rely upon third hand testimony. The Commission also requested to see the video tapes of the interrogations but the CIA testified there weren't any. This was a lie. In 2007 the CIA admitted that they had destroyed the tapes, rather than hand them over to the Commission. [94]

Consequently, if we accept the 9/11 Commission Report represents the official narrative of events (and there isn't another one,) do you think there is any reason to question its findings?

Is it tenable to discount all of this because it's just a 'conspiracy theory?'

Chapter 8

The Collapsing Hypothesis.

Like most of us alive to see it, I distinctly remember watching the towers collapse on TV. A few days later, after the initial shock subsided, I had some questions.

I couldn't understand how aircraft strikes, and the ensuing fires, could possibly cause one, let alone three, gargantuan, steel constructed skyscrapers to completely crumble to little more than dust. Especially seeing as the third one didn't even get hit by a plane.

Almost from the point of impact the mainstream media (MSM) was reporting this as a terrorist attack. So I concluded, based upon little or no knowledge, that somehow the terrorists had also set charges inside the buildings. That flimsy, hollow aluminium planes and fires cannot completely destroy approximately 500,000 metric tons of steel and concrete[48] seemed obvious to me. I thought I had witnessed something which looked very similar to the numerous controlled demolitions I'd seen on TV before.

A Dangerous Ideology

However, according to the official 2005 report[49] offered by the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST,) my eyes and mind had deceived me. Like most people, I accepted this. I don't remember ever having studied structural engineering. Therefore, in keeping with the vast majority, my opinion was reliant upon information given to me by people who claimed they knew far more about it than I did.

Being 'told' was crucial for my understanding. With a job, family and bills to pay, I didn't have either the time or, frankly, sufficient intrigue to do any research myself. Like most people I watched the news, read the papers and listened to the broadcasts. I was interested to know more but also content to rely upon knowledgeable 'experts' to tell me why the buildings disappeared as they did. I believed the analysis I was given. Why wouldn't I?

Apparently my acceptance evidences the banal, brain-dead obsequiousness despised by the most arrogant conspiracy theorists. Some, I have spoken to, consider anyone who believes the buildings collapsed as a result of fire to be hopeless cretins. However, most don't see that way.

The common emotion expressed towards those who accept the official narrative is sadness. There is a notable sense of loss amongst the conspiracy theory community. Not only for those murdered and their loved ones, but also for the majorities lack of, what they consider to be, critical thinking.

We too easily allow ourselves to be 'told' what to think. So pervasive is our unconditional acceptance, we will believe any old claptrap, no matter how far removed from reality, as long as it comes from 'official sources.' This indoctrination runs so deep, they claim, we can even be convinced to reject the evidence of our own eyes. By degrees, we have been successfully brainwashed into unhesitating belief. Like those who couldn't see the emperor had no clothes. It's a faith.

Does this opinion evidence the supposed underlying sense of intellectual superiority? Maybe so, but it would be foolhardy of us to simply dismiss this concern. Perhaps we are too eager to have our thinking done for us. Perhaps conspiracy theorists' disquiet is warranted.

A Dangerous Ideology

In summary, NIST stated that WTC 2 (the South Tower) collapsed due to some limited structural damage and fires which burned for 56 minutes. For similar reasons WTC 1 (the North Tower) collapsed 102 minutes after being struck. [50] Initially NIST didn't comment on the collapse of WTC 7 but later reported that WTC 7 was ignited by debris from the earlier collapses. The resulting fires caused its total destruction approximately 7hrs after they began.[51]

In order for investigators to understand why a building collapsed it is standard procedure to catalogue and examine the debris. This is crucial to discover the tell-tale signs which could reveal structural failings or possible criminal culpability.

The WTC building were of steel constructions, so remaining girders, trusses and beams were particularly significant for investigators. Considering the awful loss of life it is truly unfathomable why, prior to any investigation, the vast bulk of WTC steel was seized by the New York Port Authority and rapidly dispatched to New Jersey salvage yards before being hastily cut up and shipped off to China and India, at way below market value, for 'recycling.' [185] Some 150 pieces of steel, out of hundreds of thousands, were preserved for 'examination.' No one knows who the investigating, qualified structural engineer was who deemed these few the most relevant. In the absence of physical evidence NIST were almost completely reliant upon computer models.

In the case of WTC 1 and 2 NIST found the building would have withstood both the plane impacts and the initial structural damage. This only contributed to the collapse once they had begun to fail due to fire. Both Towers were designed to withstand plane strikes from aircraft. Speaking in 1993 the lead structural engineer for the WTC twin towers (John Skilling) stated:[57]

"We looked at every possible thing we could think of that could happen to the buildings, even to the extent of an airplane hitting the side... Our analysis indicated the biggest problem would be the fact that all the fuel (from the airplane) would dump into the

A Dangerous Ideology

building. There would be a horrendous fire. A lot of people would be killed. [But] the building structure would still be there.”

Similarly, in 2001, the WTC site construction manager Frank A. Demartini said:

“The building was designed to have a fully loaded 707 crash into it. That was the largest plane at the time. I believe that the building probably could sustain multiple impacts of jet-liners because this structure is like the mosquito netting on your screen door—this intense grid—and the jet plane is just a pencil puncturing that screen netting. It really does nothing to the screen netting.”

Conspiracists often point out that the towers did not collapse because of structural damage caused by the plane impacts. If you believe NIST (and they don't) they collapsed predominantly due to fire.

NIST found the plane impacts removed the protective heat shielding foam (called Spray on Fire Resistant Material or SFRM) from vital columns, beams and trusses. This supposedly rendered the steel liable to warping under exposed heat. The plane impacts indirectly contributed to the collapse, but only as a result of the stripping of the SRFM.

NIST stated:

“The WTC towers likely would not have collapsed under the combined effects of aircraft impact damage and the extensive, multi-floor fires that were encountered on September 11, 2001, if thermal insulation had not been widely dislodged or had been only minimally dislodged by aircraft impact.”

What is agreed therefore, is that key to the collapse, according to NIST, was the loss of heat shielding from a tiny percentage of the structure. In WTC 2 the south-east corner of the building was damaged but the tensioning beams on

A Dangerous Ideology

the roof (the hat trusses) maintained the building's cohesion initially. However, fires on the east side of the building caused exposed steel beams to warp (thermally expand) and floor supports started to sag, overloading the neighbouring columns.

Both towers stood at 110 stories. The mass of the top 28 floors of WTC 2 overwhelmed the weakened support trusses and columns, and it started listing eastwards. This overloaded the entire structure and, according to NIST, the top section '*began its descent,*' totally destroying the 80 floors below through a mechanism they identified as '*progressive collapse.*'

WTC 1 suffered a similar fate. Sagging floor trusses pulled the exterior supporting structure inwards and the top 17 floors tilted southwards before completely overloading the entire building. The floors plummeted to earth, turning to dust as they fell.

NIST explanation for the total destruction of the Twin Towers (and WTC 7) is considered by most, reasonably well informed conspiracy theorists, to be scientifically illiterate fantasy. Newton's third law of motion[80] states that when two forces meet, both oppose each other equally. The top floors of the WTC buildings had always exerted downward force on the structure below them. The upward, opposing force, supporting their mass, was equal to this. Otherwise, the building would never have stood in the first place.

As the top sections of the towers began to tilt, they were exerting no more load upon the supporting structure than ever before. The mass of the planes, at less than 180 tons each, added only negligible additional load to the 500,000 ton buildings (well within design tolerances.) Uneven distribution of the load was the problem. According to the engineers, architect and scientists who disagree with NIST, the most likely outcome was the loss of the top sections or a partial collapse of the structure where the load distribution was most intense.

However, as we all saw, that is not what happened. A uniform, total collapse occurred (in all three cases.)

A Dangerous Ideology

In regard to WTC7 NIST referred to it as a 'global collapse':[52]

Once the upper building section began to move downwards, the weakened structure in the impact and fire zone was not able to absorb the tremendous energy of the falling building section and global collapse ensued.

Many conspiracists have pointed out the term 'global collapse' was made up by NIST. The process they outlined is more commonly known as 'total progressive collapse.' They suggest the reason NIST chose to invent this term unnecessarily was to deflect from the fact that 'total progressive collapse' has never occurred in a steel frame constructed skyscraper, other than on 9/11.

This has been strongly attacked people who accept NIST's explanation. They claim there are many examples of 'total progressive collapse.' However, the key examples cited don't appear to match the uniform, symmetrical collapses witnessed at the WTC complex.

For example a historical survey commissioned by NIST lists 3 other collapses which they claimed were comparable to WTC buildings.[55] These were the 50 story 'One New York Plaza' building, 'One Meridian Plaza' (38 stories in Philadelphia) and the 62 story 'First Interstate Bank' in Los Angeles.

Each of these buildings were steel constructed buildings which suffered major fires. The First Interstate bank burned for 3.5 hours and 4 floors were damaged; the 35th floor collapse onto the 34th of One New York Plaza (as a result of fire) and, after burning for 18 hours, 9 floors of One Meridian Plaza were severely damaged. None of them completely collapsed to dust.

Some have pointed to other buildings, such as the 32 story Windsor Tower in Madrid, which partially collapsed in 2005. It was totally engulfed by fire above the 10th floor for nearly a day. This caused a collapse of the South facing portion of the structure above the 21st floor. Again, no total progressive

collapse occurred.

The problem with the comparison argument is that it is impossible to resolve. Skyscrapers are uniquely designed. Therefore, comparing the partial collapse of a reinforced concrete structure, like the Windsor Tower, with the 'global' collapse of steel framed structures, like the WTC buildings, is challenging to the point of irrelevance. The designs are very different. The exception to this uniqueness was the Twin Towers, whose architecture and construction were practically identical (and very different from WTC 7's.) This may explain why WTC 1 and 2 collapsed in the same manner but it doesn't explain why WTC 7 also completely collapsed that day.

This debate has devolved into the typical 'tit for tat' exchange between conspiracists and their mainstream adversaries. Both sides claim their argument outweighs that of their opponents. My own research suggests the conspiracy theorists are probably right to say there has never been another example of fire induced 'global collapse' of a steel constructed skyscraper. The only three examples in the history of construction all occurred in the same place, on the same day. 9/11.

NIST's stated, once the top sections of WTC 1 and 2 became detached, the force of their sudden fall caused the floors below to give way as they instantly became overwhelmed. This initiated the process of 'total progressive collapse.' The problem many have with this pronouncement from NIST, apart from its apparent contradiction of the laws of physics, is that they didn't clarify anything at all about mechanism of the collapse. Instead, NIST stated, for some reason, the Towers were "*poised for collapse.*"[56]

Their report infers, that as soon as the collapse was initiated, total collapse was inevitable. Thousands of engineers and architects don't understand why that would have been the case. Therefore, speculation regarding the precise reason for the collapses has largely been left to public debate. The official account, generally accepted by government and the wider public, doesn't explain much.

The two most prevalent hypotheses in support of NIST are

A Dangerous Ideology

the 'pancake' and 'pile driver.' Essentially this suggested the dislodged mass above the fire suddenly jolted down upon the floor below it. This floor (offering no resistance at all) then added its own mass to the combined total. Consequently the more massive body achieved a greater impacting force on the next floor (which again offered no resistance,) and so on, with each floor progressively adding additional force to the collapse.

The problem with this notion is, at each progressive stage of the 'global collapse,' the force of the falling mass must have met resistance from the opposing force of the completely undamaged structure below it. Newtons 'Law of the Conservation of Momentum' dictates that, in an isolated system (such as the collapsing WTC's) the momentum (its mass times its velocity) of the falling body (the top floors) added to the momentum of the thing it hits (the floor below – which were supposedly static) is equal both before and after the collision.

In other words if you increase the mass, as suggested by NIST who claimed each progressive stage added more floors to the total mass of the falling body, the velocity within the system must reduce to maintain the total momentum. Therefore, the acceleration of the collapse, from the point of initial structural failure, should have progressively reduced. This does not correspond to observation.

Nonetheless, avoiding the Newtonian problem of momentum, people such as Dr. F. R. Greening (PhD,) have completed calculations demonstrating the kinetic energy of such a collapse. They claim it shows how a pancake - pile driver effect can occur.[58] In keeping with good science, this has been roundly rebutted by “conspiracists” like Gordon Ross (MEng.)[59]

Observational analysis shows that all three towers fell with near free fall acceleration.[53] In the case of WTC 7 NIST partially conceded this:[54]

“...the north face descended essentially in free fall, indicating negligible support from the structure below.”

A Dangerous Ideology

Many engineers and architects have pointed out that NIST's models of 'progressive collapse' makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. They claim NIST would have us believe that between 25%, in the case of WTC 2, and 17%, of WTC 1, smashed their way to ground level by overcoming the resistance of the respective 75% and 83% of the structures beneath them. At each stage, due to very near to free fall acceleration, this supporting structure apparently offered no opposing, resistant force at all. Logically (you would think) the supporting structure must have been absent for some reason.

A very basic analogy would be to imagine that you up ended a cargo container and placed a smaller one on top, supported by four concrete blocks, one at each corner. The smaller container having the same cross-sectional area and being no more than quarter of the mass of the larger one below it. According to NIST, if you then suddenly removed two blocks on one side of the smaller container it would fall straight down, at near free fall acceleration, and uniformly obliterate the larger container below it. Plummeting to earth, through the path of greatest resistance, as if the larger container (opposing, resistant force) wasn't there.

Conspiracy theorists add, currently, the only known way that a supporting structure can offer no resistance at all, is through some type of demolition process.

They also contend that thermal causes suggested by NIST are not borne out by the evidence. NIST stated the internal temperatures of the fires reached 1000 degrees Celsius (1800 degrees Fahrenheit). Conspiracists counter that the vast majority of the jet fuel was witnessed to have burned up in the large fireballs observed at the points of the impacts. Little fuel can have remained and the ensuing fires were essentially fed by burning office furniture. The palls of black smoke were evidence of these relatively low temperature fires.

In addition, Steel is an effective heat conductor. While parts of the beams, missing their SFRM coating, may have been exposed to direct heat, the heat would have dissipated as the thermal energy was conducted through the steel girders.

A Dangerous Ideology

They claim the localised effect would have been far less than suggested by NIST.

NIST's own heat map of the WTC 1 structure,[56] prior to collapse, show the core temperature was less than 600 degrees Celsius. Most of the temperatures shown by NIST, on the 96th - 99th floors, were below 150 degrees Celsius. Conspiracists point out this wouldn't even affect, let alone weaken steel.

Leading the conspiratorial accusations are an organisation called Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth. Their main aim is to encourage a more thorough, independent inquiry into 9/11 to include an investigation of possible demolition as a cause.[60]

NIST stated that they didn't investigate this possibility because there was no reason to do so. This predetermination of possible causes does not seem to be very scientific, claim the conspiracists. They highlight the hundreds of eye witness reports of explosions as being just one of the reasons why ruling out this possibility seems both illogical and contrary to the available evidence. NIST's claim, that there was no evidential reason to even investigate demolition as a potential cause of collapse, is provably false.

The conspiracy theorists managed to get a paper published in Europhysics News.[163] However, this wasn't peer reviewed (despite some fervent conspiracists claims that it was.) The paper was published by leading members of the 'Scientists For 9/11 Truth' organisation. Subsequently, it has been widely attacked for its lack of peer review. Conspiracy theorists point out that the official NIST report, which most people accept, isn't peer reviewed either.

Following publication, Europhysics News back tracked considerably stating:

“It is shocking that the published article is being used to support conspiracy theories related to the attacks on the WTC buildings. The Editors of EPN do not endorse or support these views.”

A Dangerous Ideology

Given the paper concluded the WTC buildings collapsed as a result of controlled demolition, unless Europhysics News' editors didn't read it, prior to publication, it is difficult to imagine how else they thought it would be interpreted.

The Scientist For 9/11 Truth suggest the journal buckled under official pressure.[164] Nonetheless, the paper does offer evidence that suggests the collapses could not have occurred as NIST described. It references the use of military grade explosives as the cause of the WTC Twin Tower collapse. The catalyst for this collapse is thought by many scientists to have been 'nano thermite.'

Samples of WTC dust contained microscopic red/grey chips consistent with the use of explosives. In a paper, which was peer reviewed, on 'Active Thermitic Material' the scientists concluded:[165]

“Based on [these] observations, we conclude that the red layer of the red/gray chips we have discovered in the WTC dust is active, unreacted thermitic material, incorporating nanotechnology, and is a highly energetic pyrotechnic or explosive material.”

Once again debate concerning this evidence has meandered off down so may rabbit holes it is difficult for most of us to unravel its complexity. A significant objection comes from those who ask how these 'explosives' got in the Towers without anyone noticing teams of demolition experts laying charges. Conspiracists respond with reports of strange activity in the building prior to 9/11. As ever, if we are willing to have a crack at it, our only recourse is to get stuck in and do our own research.

Perhaps it's worth mentioning that many conspiracy theorists have some doubts about the leadership of the Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth. Some believe that at least one of its leading scientific advisors, the physicist Steven Jones, has promoted one particular theory of explosive demolition (Military Grade Nano Thermite) as a definitive 'answer.' This is not, they say, the purpose of an organisation which merely seeks a more detailed investigation. Controlled opposition is widely suspected.

A Dangerous Ideology

Leading the charge against silly conspiracy theorists is the science and technology magazine 'Popular Mechanics.' [61] They claim NIST, who are a non-regulatory agency within the United States Department of Commerce, are independent, and see no basis for questioning their findings.

NIST based much of their research upon computer models. In the case of WTC 1 and 2 these models focused almost exclusively on the impact dynamics of the plane strikes and the claimed, resultant damage. As stated previously, they did not model the collapses of the Twin Towers. Apparently, they didn't think this important enough. However, in regard to WTC 7, NIST did offer a collapse simulation.

Conspiracy theorists have said this looks nothing at all like the collapse of WTC 7. [62] The NIST models show a twisting, buckling of the structure as internal columns and trusses collapse. This does not appear to be in keeping with the symmetrical 'global collapse' everyone witnessed. Consequently, they requested that NIST release the raw data upon which they based their models. NIST refused to do so saying it "*might jeopardise public safety.*" [63]

Conspiracy theorist engineers and architects have asked why they should accept a computer simulation based explanation, which looks nothing like the real world event it supposedly describes, for which the scientific data has been completely withheld. They also ask how releasing a report, which professedly explains why a massive public building collapsed, can possibly jeopardise public safety. Surely not informing the public presents the greater danger?

Another popular question is why Larry Silverstein, owner of the WTC complex, stated in an interview, with regard to WTC 7, that a decision was made to "*pull it.*" Silverstein said: [67]

"I remember getting a call from the fire department commander, telling me that they were not sure they were gonna be able to contain the fire, and I said, 'We've had such terrible loss of life, maybe the smartest thing to do is pull it.' And they made that decision to pull and we watched the building collapse."

A Dangerous Ideology

To 'pull' a building is a trade term commonly used by demolition experts in reference to controlled demolition. Silverstein's PR team, and mainstream supporters of the NIST version of events, have claimed Silverstein was talking about 'pulling' the firefighters from the building.

Yet FEMA, the commanding fire officer (Assistant Chief Frank Fellini) and even Popular Mechanics all reported there were no firefighters in the WTC 7 after 11.30 am. Conspiracy theorists consider it is risible nonsense to suggest Silverstein would use the very specific phrase "*pull it*" to refer to evacuating firefighters (who weren't in the building anyway.) They also point out, if the plan was to ensure no one died 'when' WTC 7 collapsed, this was a disastrous failure. Sadly Special Officer Craig Miller perished.

However, Silverstein's alleged foreknowledge of the collapse is nothing compared to the BBC's.

Twenty three minutes before WTC 7 collapsed, the British Broadcasting Corporation's reporter Jane Standley discussed the collapse of the Saloman Brothers Building (WTC 7) while it remained standing behind her.[138] In response to what seem to be reasonable questions about how the BBC knew WTC 7 would collapse, 23 minutes before it did, the BBC authorised a remarkable response on its blog.[139]

Written by Richard Porter (BBC World Service Controller of English) the blog claimed that Standley was mired in the confusion and chaos of the day and simply reporting on "*the best information we had.*" He then went on to say the BBC no longer had "*the original tapes of our 9/11 coverage (for reasons of cock-up, not conspiracy).*" Fortunately for the BBC, Standley's report had long since gone viral and was plastered all over the Internet.

Conspiracists ask where that '*best information*' had come from, as whoever provided it clearly knew, without any cause, that WTC 7 was going to collapse in about 20 minutes time. What is even more remarkable is the accuracy and completeness of the 'information.'

Prior to Standley giving her report, her London based anchor Phillip Hayton not only knew the building would collapse but

A Dangerous Ideology

also why it would collapse, a full 7 years before anyone else did. He introduced the report as follows:

“Now, more on the latest building collapse in New York. You might have heard a few moments ago that [we] were talking about the Saloman Brothers Building collapsing.....and indeed it has. Apparently that's only a few hundred yards away from where the World Trade Center Towers were. [and] It seems this was not as a result of a new attack, it was because the building had been weakened....er...during this morning's attacks. We'll probably find out now more about that from our correspondent Jane Standley.....Jane, what more can you tell us about the Saloman Brothers Building and its collapse?”

In keeping with the coincidences that run throughout the 9/11 narrative key services, including the IRS, the EEOC, the Defense Department, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the New York field office of the United States Secret Service, just happened to be situated in WTC 7. What impact the loss of these data and control centres had on the investigation into 9/11, and the possible fraud inquiry for which the SEC subsequently destroyed all the evidence, remains an open question.

In 2007 Dr Judy Wood submitted a case under the False Claims Act (FCA) against NIST to the U.S. District Court of New York.[65] Wood claimed that NIST (& Applied Research Associates inc) knowingly participated in scientific fraud.

Dr Wood (Ph.D.), a former professor of mechanical engineering, specialising in stress and material analysis, scientifically proved that the WTC buildings turned to dust, before they hit the ground, in her book “Where Did The Towers Go.”[64] The seismic data she cites clearly demonstrates that 500,000 tons of steel and masonry did not hit the Manhattan basin in which the Towers stood. The material fundamentally broke down into constituent particulates, before it landed. Dispersing in the dust cloud.

A Dangerous Ideology

She further demonstrated clear evidence of a well-known phenomena called the Hutchison-Effect[184] which indicated the possible use of a Directed Energy Weapon (DEW). Derision was heaped upon Wood, with many erroneously alleging she suggested the use of 'space rays.'

The existence of Directed Energy Weapons is an established fact.[179] For example, The Active Denial System, developed by Raytheon, fires microwaves at people, burning of the skin. Other examples include the Pulsed Energy Projectile (PEP), which fires an expanding bolt of plasma at its target. Dazzler, and Vigilant Eagle are among the wide range of Directed Energy Weapons known to exist. Perhaps her critics were unaware of this fact. To date, Dr Wood and her fellow plaintiffs remain the only 'conspiracy theorists' to have presented evidence to a court which directly accuses NIST of scientific misconduct.

Dr Wood's case formally alleged that NIST deliberately avoided any analysis of the Twin Tower collapses. She stated that it was untenable to suggest that fire alone could turn quarter mile high buildings to dust in approximately 10 seconds. NIST (and the other named defendants) must (or should) have known this fact. Therefore, she accused NIST of scientific fraud under the FCA. Dr Wood offered her own considerable scientific analysis to evidence her claim.

The New York District Court summarily dismissed Dr Wood's claim on a legal technicality. They did not address the evidence she and her team offered. Dr Wood appealed but the decision was upheld by the United States Court of Appeal, despite the fact that a previous revision of the law did allow Dr Wood's case to proceed.

The higher court acknowledged the revision, which should have invalidated the technical dismissal of the junior court. Had they acted upon their own conclusion, this would have permitted Dr Wood's case to be heard. Yet they chose to completely ignore it (and the law) and decided to uphold the NYDC judgement. They didn't go anywhere near the evidence offered by Dr Wood either.[65]

Regardless of her critics, Dr Wood is one voice amongst thousands of highly qualified scientists, architects, engineers

A Dangerous Ideology

and professionals who question the official 9/11 narrative. For example over 2,900 qualified architects and engineers have signed a petition calling for an independent inquiry into 9/11.[68]

The impression given in the mainstream media, by some academics and the political establishment, is that conspiracists are either gullible fools, mentally ill, political malcontents or dangerous ideologues. These traits are firmly attached to the modern, pejorative use of 'conspiracy theorist.' This appears to be the view shared by the public majority.

Those of us who maintain this opinion must therefore accept the hundreds of thousands of highly educated, eminently qualified people, who have been branded 'conspiracy theorists,' are also idiotic, unstable subversives.

Another notable group, who presumably suffer these delusions, are the Pilots For 9/11 Truth.[66] There are numerous aspects of the 4 flights involved in 9/11 they find difficult to accept. Like their Architects and Engineer counterparts they do not claim to have all the answers, but are requesting an independent inquiry to establish the facts. They state:

“We stand with the numerous other growing organizations of Firefighters, Medical Professionals, Lawyers, Scholars, Military Officers, Veterans, Religious and Political Leaders, alongside Survivors, family members of the victims -- family members of soldiers who have made the ultimate sacrifice -- including the many Ground Zero workers who are now ill or have passed away, when we ask for a true, new independent investigation into the events of 9/11.”

Firstly they question how the planes, that struck the twin towers and the Pentagon, could have reportedly been flying beyond their design parameters.

At high altitudes 767's can fly a lot faster than at 800ft. This

A Dangerous Ideology

is because the air is denser (due to air pressure) at sea level. Whilst the engines can power the planes to speeds in excess of 500 knots above 30,000ft, they lack the power to do so at lower altitudes. Furthermore, in denser air, the drag upon the airframe increases exponentially. Even if the engines were capable of propelling the planes at 500 knots at sea level, friction, due to air resistance, would rip them apart.

The problem is that video analysis[69] and the 'Radar Data Speed Impact Study' from the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB)[70] showed that AA Flight 11 was flying at 430 knots when it hit WTC 1 and UA Flight 175 was flying at 510 knots as it struck WTC 2. Both at near sea level.

There are many experienced pilots and aeronautical engineers and pilots who firmly believe these flight dynamics are impossible for standard, commercial 767's. They concede the unlikely possibility the planes could withstand the speed induced stresses of near horizontal flight at sea level, for a very limited period. However, they firmly reject the notion the engines were capable of propelling them at such velocities.

Consider how quickly you can run on a track at full sprint (not very fast at all in my case.) For a large commercial jet airliner 'the track' is its cruising altitude. Now imagine how much more power you would need to run at the same speed in a swimming pool. For a jumbo jet this is analogous to sea level flight, where the air is 3 times thicker than at its cruising altitude. This is the crux of the pilots' argument. The Pratt and Whitney engines on a standard Boeing 767 simply aren't powerful enough to achieve the speeds measured.

In 1999 an Egyptian 767 was recorded as entering a catastrophic dive at 22,000ft with an equivalent air speed (EAS) of 425 knots. EAS is calculated as the maximum speed an airframe can withstand at sea level. At higher altitudes the actual speed, relative to the ground, may be greater (due to the thinner atmosphere). Boeing rate the top EAS for a 767 at 360 knots. Therefore, prior to 9/11, the Egyptian flights EAS of 425 knots was the fastest ever recorded speed for a 767. This EAS was achieved because the plane was in a steep dive. Sadly, this apparently resulted in it breaking

A Dangerous Ideology

apart at around 17,000 feet.

According to the official 9/11 narrative, AA Flight 11 was flying almost horizontally at 800ft (sea level air pressure,) travelling 5 knots faster than the Egyptian plane and 70 knots faster than its maximum EAS. UA Flight 175, under almost identical flight conditions, achieved a staggering 150 knots above its maximum EAS. Bluntly, many conspiracy theorist pilots and qualified aeronautical engineers don't believe it.

Something else they don't believe is the reported flight path of AA Flight 77 that struck the Pentagon. Firstly they are somewhat perplexed by the NTSB's released flight data, recovered from Flight 77's 'black box.' [87] The recorded impact time was 09:37:45 and the last data entry was recorded a second earlier at 09:37:44. This placed AA Flight 77 at an altitude of 480ft above sea level. Some 300ft above the Pentagon.

Despite the fact the Pentagon was covered in CCTV cameras and advanced surveillance equipment, the only released footage of AA Flight 77 hitting it, came from an adjacent gas station. No plane can be seen in this footage. Therefore, the official narrative relies upon other material evidence to substantiate the plane's path. This included the destruction of light poles which, if the black box data recorder is to be believed, must have been over 300ft tall.

This raises the possibility that Flight 77 didn't hit the Pentagon at all. However, assuming the black box data is wrong, what was AA flight 77's officially stated approach to the Pentagon?

According to the 9/11 Commission Report the terrorist pilot, Hani Hanjour, took a commercial jet airliner through a 270 degree arcing dive at 400 knots, descending from 2200ft at maximum power, before levelling off just 30ft off the ground and flying the jet on full throttle, in perfect level flight, across the lawn and into the side of the Pentagon. Striking it at 460 knots without leaving even a scuff mark on the grass. This is an extremely difficult thing to do with Boeing 757 jet airliner.

Highly experienced pilots are not the only conspiracists who

A Dangerous Ideology

find this suggested manoeuvre an absurd proposition. While some feel they may have been able to do this eventually, given plenty of attempts, they state their own chances of pulling it off perfectly, first time, to be virtually nil. However, under no circumstances whatsoever, would the suggested speed be possible. Hanjour supposedly achieved this physics defying manoeuvre without any trouble at all. Yet, in common with all the other 9/11 suicide pilots who had never flown jets, he was very far from an experienced pilot.

In 1996 Hanjour spent 4 months at a flight school in Scottsdale, Arizona. He didn't even manage to obtain a licence to fly a single prop Cessna. In August 2001 he tried to hire a small Cessna 175. After taking him out for three test runs, flight instructors Sheri Baxter and Ben Conner refused to rent him the plane because he couldn't fly. Which seems fair enough.[88]

What conspiracists claim is less reasonable, is to suggest that someone who couldn't fly a crop duster could successfully execute an incredible technical feat of aviation, pushing a jumbo jet beyond its known parameters, perfectly, at his first attempt. Unless someone can provide some evidence to prove this incredible event ever actually happened (a single CCTV video for example,) they see no reason at all to swallow this blathering insanity.

Those who wholeheartedly accept the amazing number of aviation firsts, all achieved on a single day, despite previously being considered impossible, say, whether the dumb ass conspiracists believe it or not, we all saw what happened. Clearly the planes were, in fact, capable of achieving the speeds witnessed, if only temporarily. They add that the terrorist piloting the planes, like Hanjour, had no intention of saving the aircraft or the passengers. Pushing it beyond its limits wasn't their concern.

This argument misses the point entirely, claim the conspiracy infected pilots and aeronautical engineers. Regardless of the terrorists disregard for holding the airframe together, the fact is the planes weren't physically capable of the feat. They suggest we need to consider the possibility that the planes, which were seen to crash into the Twin

A Dangerous Ideology

Towers, were not the hijacked 767's. They draw attention to the fact there is only one piece of footage which clearly shows the impact of AA Flight 11.

This is called the Naudet Film, named after the two French documentary film makers who caught the plane hitting WTC 1 while filming firefighters in New York. The footage shows only very grainy, low resolution images of the plane. It is not possible to positively identify the aircraft from this. Members of the public and news crews started filming the Twin Towers after the North Tower had been hit.

Consequently, there are 53 unique pieces of video footage that show a plane striking WTC 2.[69] The quality of these videos vary greatly but, once again, allege the conspiracists, it is not possible to positively identify the plane as UA Flight 175 from any of the film clips.

They say the better quality videos appear to show a large grey aircraft rather than a commercial Boeing 767 airliner. Nor did witness statements initially identify the United Airlines distinctive livery. There are plenty who later attested to seeing UA175 strike WTC 2. However, they did so after they were informed of its identity. On the day itself, prior to the collapse, there were numerous eye witnesses recorded who claimed the flights were not commercial airliners. They invariably described large grey planes, no visible markings or passenger windows, with some claiming they were military aircraft or drones.[71]

Conspiracy theorist attempts to account for these anomalies range from the use of military drones to holographic projections. The majority readily scoff at these suggestions as the delusions of the irrational. They claim there is no question to answer. We have already identified the planes and everyone saw what happened.

Did we? Probably the best way for you to decide is to take a look at the video footage and make up your own mind.

Many conspiracy theorists find the 'we all saw what happened' argument extremely hypocritical. If 'seeing' the planes hit the Towers tells us everything we need to know about the physics of flight or crash dynamics, then 'seeing'

A Dangerous Ideology

the way the towers collapsed should tell us everything we need to know about structural failure and demolition.

According to NIST, in keeping with everything we saw, both plane's light weight, hollow aluminium fuselages, their hollow wings and flimsy tail sections smashed their way through the box section steel girders of the Twin Towers. Nothing fell off, they didn't decelerate or crumple, they just cut through the steel frames like a hot knives through butter. All as a result of nothing more than the force of impact.

Therefore, although it doesn't seem remotely credible, perhaps it is unsurprising there was virtually no wreckage at all in Shanksville.[72] UA flight 93 weighed approximately 130 tons when it crashed and was heavily laden with jet fuel. Yet no fuel contaminated soil or water samples were found at the crash site. Nor were there any large sections of wreckage or bodies recovered.

The first responders on the scene were led by Assistant Fire Chief Rick King. He reported what he saw upon arrival:

"...thousands of tiny pieces scattered around--bits of metal, insulation, wiring--but no fuselage, no wings, only a smoking crater and charred earth."

Similarly, Pennsylvania State Police Officer Frank Monaco said there was *"...nothing but tiny pieces of debris....It's just littered with small pieces....It didn't look like a plane crash."* Scott Spangler, one of the first photographers on the scene, said, *'I was looking for anything that said tail, wing, plane, metal.'* But, he recalled, *'There was nothing, just this pit. I didn't think I was in the right place.'*

Another first responder, Pennsylvania State Police Commander Patrick Madigan said:

"I was amazed because it did not, in any way, shape or form, look like a plane crash"

This was the common experience reported by most at the crash site. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) took soil and water samples to assess

A Dangerous Ideology

contamination from Flight 93 fuel load. The DEP reported that no contamination was found and spokeswoman Betsy Mallison said, *'whether it burned away or evaporated, much of [the plane's fuel] seems to have dissipated.'*

Another weird, though gruesome anomaly was the absence of body parts. Initially, no trace was found of the forty-four people on board the flight. Wallace Miller, the Somerset County coroner, speaking shortly after 9/11 said:

"I stopped being coroner after about 20 minutes, because there were no bodies there."

A year after 9/11, he added:

"This is the most eerie thing. I have not, to this day, seen a single drop of blood. Not a drop"

Miller, and many others, made numerous statements about the lack of physical evidence and remains.[82] However, he, like the majority of other people first on the scene, later distanced himself from the remarks.

The 40 passengers were eventually identified through fingerprints, dental records and DNA samples, and the remains were returned to their families.[84] While being attacked as disrespectful scumbags, conspiracists remained unfazed and asked how, if all initial eyewitnesses reported no evidence at the scene, limbs and larger skull fragments were subsequently located. Where were they found and who found them?

Speaking in an interview in 2009, Miller stated that he was given the evidence of remains. He maintained that he had not seen a drop of blood at the crash site but also that he was given severed hands and feet.[89] The search for remains was conducted by the Coroner's Office working closely with the FBI. The DNA analysis was completed by the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology DNA lab in Rockville, Maryland.

Just like Flights 175 and 11 that struck the World Trade Center buildings, Flight 93 seems to have been completely enveloped by the object it hit (the Earth, in its case.) Supporters of the official narrative have suggested the

A Dangerous Ideology

ground swallowed the fuselage, wings and tail section whole.

The field in Shanksville covered a former strip mine. It had essentially been backfilled once mining operations had ceased. This, some say, meant the soil was so loosely packed it allowed the 155ft long Boing 757 fuselage, its 125ft wingspan and 44ft tail section to be completely consumed by the field. Like driving a pin into jelly.

The head of the Pittsburgh FBI's evidence response team, Bob Craig, advocated the idea of the ground swallowing the plane whole, when he said:

“Turn the picture of the second plane hitting the World Trade Center on its side and, for all intents and purposes, the face of the building is the strip mine in Shanksville.”

Writing in the Washington Post in May 2012, reporter Peter Perl stated:[81]

“The fuselage burrowed straight into the earth so forcefully that one of the 'black boxes' was recovered at a depth of 25 feet under the ground.”

The respected British broadsheet the Independent reported the following FBI statement:[84]

“Nothing was found that was inconsistent with the plane going into the ground intact.”

This is the kind of farcical nonsense that gets conspiracy theorists quite vexed. Just like the Twin Towers, the idea that a relatively flimsy aircraft can penetrate and subsequently disappear, in its entirety, inside a much larger, stronger object, without any large sections falling off, is utter codswallop.

They draw attention to the fact that traditional bullet proof vests contain ¼ inch thick steel plate armour. When you fire a bullet at the plate, it is the bullet, not the plate, which gets squashed. The bullet does not pierce the steel and there are thousands of gunshot survivors who can attest to the fact.

A Dangerous Ideology

The perimeter columns of WTC 1 and 2 were made from ¼ inch thick box section steel. The leading edge of these box sections, directly facing the oncoming aircraft, were ¼ inch wide and 13 ½ inches deep.

Newton's Third Law of Motion (for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction) dictates that the plane hitting the steel columns, supposedly at 500 mph, produces exactly the same effect as hitting a stationary aircraft with solid steel girders propelled at 500 mph. According to the event we all 'witnessed,' the planes scythed through these girders leaving almost perfect plane shaped holes.

This is the same as suggesting that whacking the stationary plane with rocket propelled steel beams would result in the steel breaking to pieces when it hit the flimsy, paper thin, aluminium of the aircraft.

All of this, say the conspiracists, must have come as something of a surprise to the WTC design engineers who had wrongly assumed Newton knew what he was talking about. They should have checked with NIST first, because they apparently knew better, according to their statement: [74]

“The massive damage was caused by the large mass of the aircraft, their high speed and momentum, which severed the relatively light steel of the exterior columns on the impact floors. The results of the NIST impact analyses matched well with observations (from photos and videos and analysis of recovered WTC steel) of exterior damage and of the amount and location of debris exiting from the buildings. This agreement supports the premise that the structural damage to the towers was due to the aircraft impact and not to any alternative forces.”

So were NIST suggesting their 'models' were designed to match the videos of the plane strikes, regardless of their improbable contravention of the laws of physics, ask the conspiracists. Why do they refer to exterior columns as

A Dangerous Ideology

“*relatively light steel?*” Relative to what? Certainly not the insubstantial aircraft, which get severely damaged if they hit a bird.

Combined with the airspeed conundrum is it reasonable for conspiracists to doubt if UA Flight 175 or AA Flight 11 actually hit the towers at all?

Most accept something struck the Twin Towers. They just doubt they were the commercial flights that were hijacked and, if they were, that they could have possibly 'pierced' the steel frame of the building without assistance (presumably explosives.) Some people have responded to this with video footage of phantom jets being propelled into a reinforced concrete block at 480 mph.[75] Conducted by Sandia National Laboratories, this test showed the plane atomized upon impact. It looked just like the WTC impacts everyone witnessed, say the believers in the official story.

Indeed so, say the conspiracists, but it isn't consistent with NIST's claims. According to the official line, the planes didn't break apart upon impact but rather smashed their way 'through' the steel beams they hit. Precisely the opposite of the test outcomes.

The conspiracy theorists are so pissed off about all this claimed stupidity that one of their most deluded idiots filed an affidavit at the United States Southern District Court of New York.

John Lear, son of the inventor of the Lear Jet (Bill Lear), a former airline captain and CIA pilot with more than 19,000hrs of flying experience and holder of 17 world aviation records, presented the following in 2008:[85]

“No Boeing 767 airliners hit the Twin Towers as fraudulently alleged by the government, media, NIST and its contractors. Such crashes did not occur because they are physically impossible as depicted, for the following reasons:

In the case of UAL 175 going into the south tower, a real Boeing 767 would have begun

A Dangerous Ideology

'telescoping' when the nose hit the 14 inch steel columns which are 39 inches on center.

The vertical and horizontal tail would have instantaneously separated from the aircraft, hit the steel box columns and fallen to the ground. The engines when impacting the steel columns would have maintained their general shape and either fallen to the ground or been recovered in the debris of the collapsed building.

No Boeing 767 could attain a speed of 540 mph at 1000 feet above sea level 'parasite drag doubles with velocity' and 'parasite power' cubes with velocity. The fan portion of the engine is not designed to accept the volume of dense air at that altitude and speed.

The piece of alleged external fuselage containing 3 or 4 window cut-outs is inconsistent with an airplane that hit 14 inch steel box columns, placed at over 500 mph. It would have crumpled.

No significant part of the Boeing 767 or engine could have penetrated the 14 inch steel columns and 37 feet beyond the massive core of the tower without part of it falling to the ground.

The debris of the collapse should have contained massive sections of the Boeing 767, including 3 engine cores weighing approximately 9000 pounds apiece which could not have been hidden. Yet there is no evidence of any of these massive structural components from either 767 at the WTC.

Such complete disappearance of 767s is impossible."

Those who believe NIST have largely responded to this by

A Dangerous Ideology

personally attacking Lear, calling him a 'tin foil hat wearing conspiracy theorist.'

He may well be. However, an affidavit is a powerful legal instrument if it isn't rebutted, especially if offered by an undoubted expert in their field, like Lear. His possible failings as a human being, in the irreproachable eyes of those who don't agree with him, are irrelevant. In legal terms it is 'prima facie evidence.'

Unless evidence is offered which rebuts it, it stands as 'truth in law.'^[86] To date (2019) no one has rebutted Lear's affidavit. Legally speaking, it is the 'truth.' Of course, most conspiracy theorists would be the first to say that 'truth in law' rarely amounts to objective reality.

Chapter 9

No One Could Have Believed.

Earlier, we discussed some training exercises which may indicate government awareness and possible foreknowledge of a 9/11 style attack. However, the conspiracy theorists claim some, within the so called 'Deep State,' not only knew 9/11 was going to happen, they planned it to further their own interests.

In June 2001, one of the conspiracists own leading lights, William Cooper, seemingly predicted the scapegoating of Osama bin Laden in a 'false flag' terror attack. Speaking on his popular underground radio show, three months before 9/11, Cooper questioned how, despite the 1996 formation of a dedicated joint Justice Department, FBI & CIA 'Bin Laden' unit (the 'Bin Laden Issue Station' or 'Alec Unit'[76]), a CNN news team were able to interview him in his supposedly secret layer. Peter Arnett conducted the interview in March 1997, with further interviews undertaken by a number of journalists in the lead up to 9/11.[77]

A Dangerous Ideology

Cooper, a former Naval Intelligence Officer, posited that either the U.S. security services, in their entirety, were completely useless, or they weren't looking for him at all. Cooper felt it was the latter:[78]

"I'm telling you be prepared for a major attack. But it won't be Osama bin Laden.....whatever's gonna happen that they're gonna blame on Osama bin Laden don't you even believe it."

[William Cooper 1943 - 2001]

Security service ineptitude still remains a possibility. However, is it plausible that one of the most wanted terrorists on Earth could evade capture by the global intelligence and security community while, at the same time, conducting interviews with U.S. news crews and other media organisations? Conspiracy theorists don't think so.

In the immediate aftermath of 9/11 Cooper continued to voice his opinion, accusing elements within the Bush administration and the wider political establishment of mass murder and treason. Bill Cooper was shot dead by officers from the Apache County (Arizona) Sheriff's Department, less than two months after 9/11. Conspiracists question the circumstances surrounding his death.[79]

According to the truthers, one of the tell-tale signs of a 'false flag' attack is the speed with which the official narrative emerges. 'Who dunnit' often precedes 'what happened,' they say. They argue we shouldn't jump to conclusions. Moreover, investigators certainly shouldn't. When they do, it suggests at least some degree of prior knowledge and may well indicate a predetermined narrative. Before we accept any official explanation, we should check the evidence ourselves. Don't let anyone, especially state media, tell you what happened. Make up your own mind.

The mainstream media (MSM) were reporting Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda as the prime suspects within seconds of the plane hitting the South Tower. UA Flight 175 struck WTC 2 at 09:03.[101] Thirty seven seconds later Jon Scott, Fox news anchor, said:[100]

A Dangerous Ideology

“This has to be deliberate folks....we just saw on live television as a second plane flew into the second tower of the World Trade Center. Now, given what has been going on around the world, some of the key suspects come to mind, Osama bin Laden for one.”

What followed was a flurry of conjecture from all the major news networks claiming Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda were behind the attacks. By 09:17, 14 minutes after WTC 2 was hit, CBS news correspondent Jim Stewart reported the following:

“The intelligence community for some time has been warning in a steady drum beat [Ryan] that Osama bin Laden has not been heard from now, frankly, since the beginning of the year, the USS Cole incident rather, and they have been wondering when and if he will strike again, and they only believed it was a matter of time, and I believe that today that is going to be their first suspicion. [but] We have no confirmation of that. I must underline, there's no confirmation that this is a terrorist attack number one or, number two, that Osama bin Laden involvement, but I can tell you right now that is what they are thinking that is the working premise.”

At 09.29, President Bush made the following public statement:

“Today, we've had a national tragedy. Two airplanes... have crashed... into the World Trade Center... in an apparent terrorist attack on our country.”

At 10.05. NBC state department correspondent, Andrea Mitchell, reported that Osama bin Laden may have been involved in the attacks:

“This very interesting information.....from the

FBI.....They have been operating a massive exercise.....all of their top teams.....were in Monterey California for the last two days, scheduled to fly back today. All of those people are out of place. It's fair to say, according to sources we've talked to....., that FBI operations and rescue operations are really in chaos right now because they can't reach their officials in New York. All of their phone lines are down and now you've got all of their experts stuck in Monterey California.....there is a real breakdown of the FBI anti-terror coordination team which is of course the principle team that would lead any effort.....I think it is far too early.....even [for] the best experts in the government to figure this out.....Their immediate reaction, in a case like this, would be to look towards Osama bin Laden.....simply because he has proved, with the embassy bombings in Africa that he is the one terror leader who is capable of this kind of highly coordinated attack.”

Speaking on CNN, At 12.39, Republican Senator John McCain characterised the attacks as “*an act of war.*” Two minutes later Senator Orrin Hatch told CNN ‘*Both the FBI and our intelligence community believe that this is bin Laden's signature.*’

This was quickly followed at 13.04 by a President Bush's statement from Barksdale Air force Base:

“Freedom itself was attacked this morning by a faceless coward and freedom will be defended.....the United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these cowardly acts.”

In his later address to the American public, speaking at 20.30, President Bush said:

“The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts...we will make no

A Dangerous Ideology

distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbour them.”

At the same time, several members of Congress informed CNN they had been briefed that the administration was confident the attacks were carried out by Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda. Before the day was out, President Bush recorded in his journal “*The Pearl Harbour of the 21st century took place today...We think it's Osama bin Laden.*”[102] For reasons we will discuss shortly, using the Pearl Harbour analogy is particularly significant.

According to the conspiracy theorists, it is preposterous to believe the administration were not only able clarify what happened, when and how, but also who masterminded the extremely complex plot, within a matter of hours. However, they add, if you planned the whole thing yourself that would explain your apparently astounding deductive powers. In any event, as far as the public were concerned, by the end of the day the case was solved.

Despite years of investigation and debate, there has been little deviation from the narrative rolled out in the first few hours.

Oddly, the supposed terrorist mastermind denied any involvement. In a statement published shortly after the attacks Osama bin Laden (OBL) said:[103]

“The U.S. Government has consistently blamed me for being behind every occasion its enemies attack it. I would like to assure the world that I did not plan the recent attacks, which seems to have been planned by people for personal reasons. I have been living in the Islamic emirate of Afghanistan and following its leaders' rules. The current leader does not allow me to exercise such operations.”

Usually, terrorists are all too eager to claim responsibility for killing people, even if they haven't. Yet Osama bin Laden, far from gloating over his 'victory,' as you might expect, seeing

as he had never been shy of claiming responsibility before, distanced himself from 9/11. Former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Dr. Paul Craig Roberts, was among many crazy conspiracy theorists who found Osama bin Laden's denial rather perplexing. He wrote:[104]

“Obviously, if bin Laden had outwitted not only the National Security Agency, the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the FBI, but also all 16 US intelligence agencies, all intelligence agencies of Washington’s NATO puppet states, Israel’s Mossad, and in addition the National Security Council, NORAD, US air traffic control, and airport security four times on the same morning, it would be the greatest feat in world history, a movement building feat that would have made al Qaeda the most successful anti-imperialist organization in human history, an extraordinary victory over “the great Satan” that would have brought millions of new recruits into al Qaeda’s ranks. Yet the alleged “mastermind” denied all responsibility.”

While the U.S. and global mainstream media were enthusiastic to report Osama bin Laden 'did it,' scarcely a mention was made of the fact he refuted the allegation. According to some mainstream thinkers OBL wasn't the mastermind, just the money behind the attacks. This conflicts somewhat with the 9/11 Commissions opinion that the funding of the attacks was “..of little practical significance.” Others claim that Bin Laden was merely a figurehead for a loose coalition of Islamist extremists, we call 'al Qaeda.'

This chimes with loony conspiracy theorist views that al Qaeda never existed until Western intelligence agencies helped to create it. The concept of the centrally coordinated, international terrorist cell network was simply a 'bogey man' created to give children (and their parents) nightmares, and the 'military industrial intelligence complex' an ever elusive, perpetually profitable, enemy.

A Dangerous Ideology

Robin Cook, the British Foreign Secretary at the time of the attack, was one of the conspiracy scatterbrains who thought this was the case. He later refused to support his government's subsequent call for war in Iraq in 2003. Citing a lack of legal authority or supporting evidence to justify war, his resignation speech is considered by many to be one of the greatest oratories ever delivered in the post WWII British Parliament.

Cook, privy to intelligence assessments at the time of 9/11, remained a critical back bench MP and wrote an article in 2005 which cast doubt upon the official al Qaeda 'mythology.' In the immediate aftermath of the London 7/7 atrocity, He wrote: [119]

“.....Bin Laden was, though, a product of a monumental miscalculation by Western security agencies. Throughout the 80s he was armed by the CIA and funded by the Saudis to wage jihad against the Russian occupation of Afghanistan. Al-Qaida, literally 'the database', was originally the computer file of the thousands of Mujahideen who were recruited and trained with help from the CIA to defeat the Russians.”

Four weeks later, aged 59, Cook unexpectedly died while out walking with his wife in the Scottish Highlands. Despite being a physically fit man, he suffered a fatal heart attack and fell down a hillside where he was initially assisted by another hill walker. He was flown to hospital 30 minutes after his fall. His wife did not to accompany her husband to hospital. The third person at the scene of his death has never been identified.

Many conspiracy theorists point out that there isn't any evidence that OBL had much to do with the attacks. Certainly nothing that would stand up in court. Soon after 9/11 the Secretary of State Colin Powell, having also called the attack “*an act of war,*” publicly declared the evidence proving OBL's guilt would soon be released. The very next day he changed his mind and said, “*most of it [the evidence]*

is classified.”

In October 2001, then British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, issued a report which made a number of allegations that secret intelligence revealed how al Qaeda and bin Laden were behind 9/11. However, because this intelligence was 'secret,' it amounted to little more than an unsubstantiated claim. When pressed on the actual evidence, Blair said, “*This document does not purport to provide a prosecutable case against Osama bin Laden in a court of law.*”

Although Osama bin Laden remained on the top of the FBI's most wanted list, he wasn't wanted in connection with 9/11. In 2006 Rex Tomb, Chief of Investigative Publicity for the FBI said, “*The reason why 9/11 is not mentioned on Osama bin Laden's Most Wanted page is because the FBI has no hard evidence connecting bin Laden to 9/11.*” This single statement abandons the state's account entirely. However, those who accept the official story have pointed to the video 'evidence' in which Osama bin Laden does apparently claim responsibility.

In early November 2001, Tony Blair brought the West's attention to another video interview with OBL. This time undertaken by Al Jazeera's Kabul correspondent Tayseer Allouni in October. The hour long interview was transcribed, and excerpts used to 'prove' Osama bin Laden's guilt.

Writing in the UK broadsheet the Telegraph, journalist David Bamber used the transcripts to report that OBL had admitted culpability. However, his article, entitled 'Bin Laden: Yes I did it'[126] contains no evidence of any such admission.

Blair, never one to miss a band wagon, leapt on the media coverage a few days later to exclaim that OBL said he had '*instigated*' the attacks. Perhaps encouraged by his friend's certainty, this led President Bush to call it a “*confession of guilt.*” CNN later reported that bin Laden admitted orchestrating the attacks when he said:

“If inciting people to do that is terrorism and if killing those who kill our sons is terrorism, then let history be witness that we are

terrorists.”

Osama apparently felt the attacks were justified, he egotistically spoke about the inspiration his fatwas had on the hijackers. However, at no stage did he claim actual responsibility. Numerous further interpretations were issued by the White House and reported in the media, each providing more 'proof' of OBL's 'admission.' However, add the conspiracists, numerous Arabic language experts have pointed out the transcripts themselves were wrong.[127]

Prof Gernot Rotter, professor of Islamic and Arabic Studies at the Asia-Africa Institute at the University of Hamburg said:

'The American translators who listened to the tapes and transcribed them apparently wrote a lot of things in that they wanted to hear but that cannot be heard on the tape no matter how many times you listen to it.'

OBL did claim responsibility for the bombing in Khost, in a video made between mid-November and late December 2001, which was verified. He appeared gaunt and frail with a long white beard and had poor left side mobility. Following another discovery by U.S. Special Forces in a private home in Jalalabad, Afghanistan in late November 2001, a second video, dated November 9th, was also released as evidence of Osama bin Laden's confession. In it, OBL is heard to discuss the planning of the attacks with his close associate Sheikh Khaled al-Harbi. The video was reportedly made during a CIA sting operation carried out in late September 2001, about two weeks after 9/11. However, the CIA have been vague about its origins and no government official has ever verified how the video was filmed.

The conspiracy theorists ask, if the CIA could operate a sting operation on OBL two weeks after 9/11 why didn't they arrest him? Also, seeing as OBL was left-handed, why was he right-handed in the video? Why was his skin a different colour and his beard very much shorter than it was seen to be in a confirmed video shot by professional journalist just 6 weeks later? Why was he about 30 pounds heavier, with full

A Dangerous Ideology

mobility, a shorter, fatter nose and different shaped ears? Finally, if this video was shot a few weeks before the verified footage, why did he look about 10 years younger?

OBL allegedly suffered from kidney disease.[180] But even a rapid deterioration in his health, wouldn't appear to account for all the differences between the videos. If the claimed dates were accurate.

The official explanation for the anomalies states they use the PAL video format in Afghanistan, which distorts and compresses the image in comparison to the NTSC format favoured in the U.S. Though PAL is used in Europe. This allegedly accounts for the much shorter beard and different shaped facial features. Skin colour variations were simply a result of different video quality and lighting conditions.

Ultimately OBL wasn't held responsible for planning the attacks anyway. He was seen by the 9/11 Commission more as an inspiration for, and the director of, the operation. The mastermind who planned the attacks was named as Khalid Sheikh Mohammad

Following his 2003 arrest in the Pakistan city of Rawalpindi by the CIA and Pakistan's Inter Service Intelligence (ISI), Khalid Sheikh Mohammad (KSM) was identified as the ultimate architect of the 9/11 atrocity by the 9/11 Commission. KSM was taken to a number of secret military bases, called 'Black Sites,' in Afghanistan, Thailand then Poland, before ending his extraordinary rendition in the Guantánamo Bay detention centre.

After months of torture, he admitted to being the tactical mind behind a string of terrorist attacks, including 9/11. In fact, he admitted to pretty much anything and everything. [104]

He later withdrew his statements saying he simply told his CIA interrogators what he thought they wanted to hear to stop them torturing him. Some elements of his confessions were proven to be false. For example, he confessed to robbing the Plaza bank in Washington in 2003. However, the bank didn't exist until 2006.[105]

A Dangerous Ideology

KSM's disclosures, extracted through torture, were key to many of the 9/11 Commissions findings. For example, the commission credited the following statement to the 'interrogation of KSM:'

“Bin Ladin . . . finally decided to give the green light for the 9/11 operation sometime in late 1998 or early 1999. . . . Bin Ladin also soon selected four individuals to serve as suicide operatives. . . . Atta – whom Bin Ladin chose to lead the group – met with Bin Ladin several times to receive additional instructions, including a preliminary list of approved targets: the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and the U.S. Capitol”

Conspiracy theorists point out evidence extracted through torture is generally useless and inadmissible under international law, including Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Though they acknowledge that recent exceptions have been made, in order to admit 'war on terror' evidence.[140] They highlight, for reasons we shall discuss shortly, the Commission's opinion that OBL met with Atta and 'chose' him to 'lead' the hijackers.

Regardless, on the day itself, the finger was firmly pointed at OBL. According to the MSM, politicians and the rest of us who accept the official story, the near instant identification of bin Laden as the main culprit was an obvious conclusion.

Prior to 9/11, governments and the intelligence agencies had long warned of the danger he and his network presented. All the major news networks had run stories and features on Osama bin Laden and his support for terrorist operations. He was wanted in connection with several attacks. Therefore media speculation and intelligence suspicions would immediately lean towards OBL. The fact that many accurately identified the culprit, straight away, suggests nothing other than a well-informed media. Intelligence agencies surely possessed enough information to be 'confident' about the Saudi's guilt and, as it transpires, they were right. The evidence proves it. Presumably the FBI weren't aware of this evidence when they didn't list 9/11 as

A Dangerous Ideology

one of OBL's suspected crimes.

That Osama bin Laden was central to the 9/11 horror is not disputed by anyone, except conspiracy theorists. Every Western intelligence agency stated OBL was guilty. Every MSM media outlet, journalist and commentator agreed. Leading academics and 'think tanks' said he did it and the vast majority of politicians, across the globe, had no doubt.

Osama bin Laden was a follower of Wahhabism. It is a pious form of Islam, built upon Salafi traditions, which advocates a return to ancient Islamic practices and laws. The Wahhabi faith is most widely practised in Saudi Arabia and is taught in Saudi financed religious centres, called Madrassas, across the world. It stems loosely from Sunni Muslim beliefs, but differs from Sunni theology and is fiercely opposed to Shi'ah interpretation of Islam.

Most Muslims, including the vast majority of Sunnis, consider it extremist and, in return, many Wahhabists consider any Muslim, who doesn't practice the rigorous austerity and barbaric 'justice' they advocate, to be 'Kafirs' (unbelievers.) This may go some way to explaining why the vast majority of people killed by Islamist extremists are Muslims. Everyone else is a Kafir as far as they are concerned.[107] This fervent extremism's potential to inspire acts of despicable violence has long been recognised as a useful tool by the those who seek power.

In the 18th century the emir of Najd, Muhammad ibn Saud, head of the al Saud tribal family, formed an alliance with Muhammad ibn Abd al Wahhab, the founder of Wahhabism, and his ferocious fighters. The Wahhabi part of the deal was to fight and pay their taxes to bolster the al Saud coffers. In return they received land and title, pay and a commitment to fund the expansion of their faith.

In the 19th century, this partnership resulted in the Wahhabi 'Muslim brothers' of the Ikhwan capturing Riyadh to return the house of Saud to power. By 1925, with the fierce Wahhabi troops under his command, Abd Al-Aziz ibn Saud had seized both Mecca and Medina and was well on his way to establishing the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.[108]

A Dangerous Ideology

However, his mercenary warriors wanted to create a Wahhabi caliphate across the entire Middle East. Realising this would pit him against other regional potentates, and jeopardise his personal ambitions, Abd al-Aziz slaughtered the fighters who brought him to power.

In 1931 OBL's father Mohammad bin Laden emigrated to the fledgling Kingdom of Saudi Arabia from Yemen. An astute business man, he built strong relationships with the future Kings Abdul al Aziz and King Faisal.

In 1933 the young Kingdom granted the Rockefeller owned 'U.S. Standard Oil' exclusive oil exploration rights. Just over a decade later, in 1945, the dying U.S. President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, met with King Abdul al Aziz and they made a deal that would underpin U.S. Saudi relations for the rest of the century. The Saudis agreed to sell their oil to the U.S. and, reciprocally, the U.S. pledged its military might to protect the rule of al Saud.

King Abdul al Aziz stipulated another condition of the deal. In return for oil the U.S. would also protect the Saudi faith, Wahhabism.[109]

Osama bin Laden was born into wealth, in Riyadh, in 1957. One of 54 children, his family's construction empire and their shrewd political acumen placed them amongst the world's wealthiest. They had reached the upper echelons of the world power elite and their Saudi Binladin Group had investments across the globe.

In 1976, Salem bin Laden (Osama's half-brother) co-founded Arbusto Energy with George W Bush and his close associate James R. Bath.[110] The bin Laden's also had extensive business ties with the multinational, private equity firm, the Carlyle Group. George H.W. Bush was the company's senior advisor and a major shareholder.[111] On the morning of 9/11, another bin Laden brother, Shafiq, was a guest at a Washington meeting of the Carlyle Group. George H.W. Bush was also in attendance.

The Binladin Group supposedly disowned their wayward son, Osama, in a statement in 1994.[112] However, conspiracy theorists draw attention to Yeslam bin Laden's

A Dangerous Ideology

admission, in 2004, that the family shared a joint Swiss bank account with Osama until at least 1997.[113] Furthermore, the French intelligence agencies issued a report, two days after 9/11, stating their opinion that the family continued to fund OBL's terrorist activities.[114] This was something both Vincent Cannistraro, the former head of the CIA Counter Terrorism centre, and Michael Scheuer, the former head of the CIA 'Alec Unit,' also acknowledged.

Odd then, say the conspiracists, that in the first few days after 9/11 two dozen members of the bin Laden family were transported to assembly points in Texas and Washington before being quietly flown out of the country.[115] Even stranger that Abdullah and Omar bin Laden (who were suspected of funding terrorism) were 'allowed' to make their own way home by the FBI, only days after 9/11, without even being interviewed.[116]

The brothers had been under investigation since 1996 for their connections to a suspected terrorist recruitment organisation called the 'World Assembly of Muslim Youth.' The FBI later released documents which showed they were pressured by the Bush administration to cease the investigation. It was reopened a week after 9/11, once the brothers were safely returned to Saudi Arabia. They flew home while all U.S. commercial flights remained grounded. [117]

Furthermore, the conspiracists add, there is little doubt the U.S. were aware the family had profited from Osama's terrorism. Osama had taken credit for inspiring the 1996 bombing of a U.S. Air Force base in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. Nineteen U.S. service personnel died in the attack on the Khobar Towers. The Clinton administration awarded the contract to rebuild the base to the Saudi Binladin Group. [118]

The mainstream response is that this is all circumstantial and meaningless. Just because the bin Laden's were well-connected, that doesn't mean the black sheep Osama had any association with the Western powers.

During the 1980s the CIA ran 'Operation Cyclone' to arm, train and equip Afghan Mujahideen fighters in their war

A Dangerous Ideology

against the occupying forces of the USSR. The CIA superficially made efforts to distance themselves from the jihadis and liaised with Pakistan's ISI to funnel funds to the extremists.[120] A significant proportion of the estimated \$5Bn investment was administered by Maktab al Khidamat (MAK.) The CIA had grown tired of the tribal infighting that plagued the Afghan fighters and looked towards foreign extremists as a better option. MAK was run by Osama bin Laden, among others.

Its purpose was to coordinate the movement of money, arms and fighters from the outside world into the Afghan conflict. [121] OBL supplemented MAK funds through his close association with the Afghan warlord Gulbuddin Hekmatyar and his international drugs empire.

Following the 1985 publication of National Security Decision Directive 166 (NSDD 166,)[129] which 'stepped up covert military aid to the Mujahideen,' the U.S. Assistant Undersecretary of Defense, Michael Pillsbury, flew to the Afghan border to meet with Hekmatyar and reviewed his military training operations.

Pillsbury was the chair of an inter-agency White House policy group tasked with advising Operation Cyclone. At his meeting with Hekmatyar, Pillsbury asked if direct funding of OBL's Arab fighters would be helpful. However, the Afghan drug lord wanted the money to continue flowing into his own operations and warned against it. [122]

Unconvinced, CIA director William Casey made an agreement with the Pakistani ISI to increase funding to the Arab fighters. Following this agreement, in 1986, Osama bin Laden established his first training camp which he named Maasada (the Lion's Den.) The camp was precariously close to a Soviet military base and was opposed by other Islamists who felt its scale and expense were unnecessary. Nor did they want to divide their forces by nationality. A split emerged which later shaped events in Iraq and elsewhere.

MAK ran up to 30 fundraising and recruitment offices in the U.S. Though the first office opened in Tucson (Arizona) it was the New York office, the 'Al Kifah Refugee Center,' which became its most significant. It was the place where the so

called 'Arab-Afghan foreign legion' (the future al Qaeda), was initially conceived.[137]

Based in Brooklyn, the office served as a hub for Arab immigrant and American born Islamist recruits to be sent to Afghanistan. It was also a rallying point for Afghan fighters flying into the States. Their passage facilitated with CIA supplied passports.[123]

In 1989 Michael Springmann (head US consular official in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia) was fired after repeatedly complaining about being overruled by his superiors every time he refused to issue Islamist extremists with visas to enter the U.S. On one occasion, Springmann reported that he declined the applications of two individuals who said they were visiting a trade show in the U.S. The men didn't know what it was called or where it was. Having rejected them Springmann said he received "*an almost immediate call from a CIA case officer, hidden in the commercial section [of the consulate], that I should reverse myself and grant these guys a visa.*"[153]

The original founder of MAK was Sheikh Abdullah Azzam, OBL's mentor. Azzam made numerous visits to the U.S. during the 1980s and, while building financial support for MAK's U.S. based operations, ran into conflict with his pupil Osama. Azzam was against the expansionist ambitions of OBL and his Egyptian comrade (and one time physician) Dr Ayman al Zawahiri.

Al Zawahiri eventually co-founded al Qaeda with Osama. He was pivotal, according to official accounts, in convincing OBL to expand the jihad globally. Azzam strongly disagreed with the pair's idea to move operations beyond Afghan borders.

Following The Soviet Union's withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989, Osama and al Zawahiri formed a fighting force whose aim was to use terror to take jihad to these foreign 'enemies.' Abdullah Azzam continued his objections, resulting in Ayman al Zawahiri accusing him of spying for the CIA. Azzam died in a car bombing later that same year and an unrestrained Osama and al Zawahiri forged ahead with their plan. Al Qaeda began to form and Osama took leadership of MAK.[124]

A Dangerous Ideology

Conspiracy theorists say the idea that Western intelligence agencies didn't know what was going on, especially as they were funding most of it, is so silly you'd need the audacity of a paid CIA troll to say otherwise. This is an accusation they often level against the promoters of the official account, which makes precisely that claim. Some mainstream voices acknowledge that al Qaeda was partly the product of some myopic operational policy blunders.

Former Secretary of State Hilary Clinton, in her testimony to Congress in 2009, spoke of this. She was predominantly referring to the Taliban. Nonetheless, her words in reference to Saudi Wahhabi fighters are revealing, as they clearly reference al Qaeda:

“Let’s remember here the people we are fighting today, we funded them twenty years ago and we did it because we were locked in a struggle with the Soviet Union. They invaded Afghanistan and we did not want to see them control Central Asia.....and we went to work and it was President Reagan, in partnership with Congress, led by Democrats, who said “you know what it sounds like a pretty good idea, let’s deal with the ISI and the Pakistan military and let’s go recruit these Mujahideen.”

....And great, let’s get some to come from Saudi Arabia and other countries, importing their Wahhabi brand of Islam so that we can go beat the Soviet Union.

....And guess what? They (Soviets) retreated, they lost billions of dollars and it led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. So there is a very strong argument which is it wasn’t a bad investment, in terms of [the] Soviet Union, but let’s be careful with what we sow because we will harvest.

So then we left Pakistan, we said “OK! Fine. You deal with the Stingers we’ve left all over

your country. You deal with the mines we've left all along the border and, by the way, we don't want to have any more to do with you."

Despite Clinton's belief that this was all money well spent, given Osama bin Laden's crimes, 9/11, 7/7, Paris, numerous other attacks and the horror of a global war on terror, conspiracy theorists ask if it was really worth it. They also point out that, despite Clinton's suggestion that this was all in the past, the evidence is that Western intelligence agencies have continued to back Islamist extremists to this day.

In 1981 Egypt's President Anwar Sedat was assassinated by a terrorist group linked to the Muslim Brotherhood called 'Islamic Jihad.' The perpetrators were subsequently executed and the remaining group members were rounded up by the Egyptian authorities. As one among approximately 300 hundred co-conspirators, Dr Ayman al Zawahiri[132] emerged as their spokesperson during their collective show trial. He served 3 years and then another shorter sentence for gun running. The trial had been televised and was shared globally by the MSM. The assassination, and subsequent testimonies, were the basis for numerous international news headlines for a couple of months.

Ayman al Zawahiri was a world famous Islamist extremist terrorist by the mid-1980s and was well-known to intelligence agencies across the globe. He was a key part of Operation Cyclone in Afghanistan receiving MAK administered funds from the CIA, starting in 1985.[128] Following Russia's withdrawal in 1989, he travelled extensively around Europe and central Asia. He is known to have travelled to Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, Hong Kong, central Europe and numerous countries in central Eurasia. His globetrotting apparently included periods of political asylum in Denmark in 1991 and Switzerland in 1993.[133]

Some have pointed out these asylum reports were unconfirmed. Yet, when asked about Zawahiri's alleged Danish asylum approval, Teddy Koch of the Danish ministry of the interior, rather than simply deny it, said:

A Dangerous Ideology

'Normally, we don't give out information about individual cases.'

Sibel Edmonds, an FBI whistle-blower, stated that Ayman al Zawahiri's name was mentioned on innumerable occasions within FBI files. She claimed his connection to al Qaeda and Islamic Jihad was never referenced, he was only identified as a NATO operative working in Turkey and Bulgaria. He was recorded as attending meetings held between high ranking NATO and U.S. officials in Azerbaijan. Saudi embassy official were also present at one such meeting, held in Baku, which again, al Zawahiri attended.[136]

However, as with all intelligence 'whistle-blowers,' it shouldn't be overlooked that Edmonds was once employed by the state. It isn't unusual for them to deliberately seed disinformation using the apparently incredible disclosures of former employees. Whatever Edmonds' claimed, as ever, the facts can only be determined through corroborated evidence.

In 1996 al Zawahiri was arrested in Russia by the FSB (the successor of the KGB) having visited Chechnya to promote jihad.[134] The Russians held him in custody for 6 months. They confiscated his laptop, containing numerous documents, and sent it to Moscow for analysis. Unfortunately, according to the official Russian account, they couldn't find a single Arabic translator anywhere in Russia. No one could read the documents for the entire 6 months of his incarceration. Despite suspecting he may have been 'a big fish,' they just couldn't prove it. So, disregarding the fact he was an infamous terrorist, arrested for terrorist offences in their own territory, they released him.[135]

Conspiracy theorists believe the Russian 'story' is complete bilge. Disinformation exemplified. Does anyone really believe the Russian state is incapable of translating Arabic or undertaking even the most basic of investigations into known terrorists? However, the inexplicable Russian tale suddenly appears more rational if the Russians believed him to be a Western intelligence asset.

American backed Islamist extremists had inflicted terrible losses upon their forces in Afghanistan. Is it logical to assume the Russians could in fact translate Arabic? If so,

A Dangerous Ideology

they almost certainly knew who he was and who he worked for. If they discovered an American asset at the head of an international terrorist organisation, currently supporting jihad in their own region, releasing him and then tracking his movements made perfect sense in intelligence gathering terms.

His extensive travels, unusual refusals to deny allegations of his asylum in European states, and the bizarre Russian arrest story, appear to lend credibility to Edmonds' claims. Her protracted legal battle with the U.S. Authorities adds further weight.

A Department of Justice inspector general's report called Edmonds' allegations "*credible*," "*serious*," and "*warrant[ing] a thorough and careful review by the FBI*." [130] She received support from Senators Charles Grassley and Patrick Leahy, who pushed for declassification of the evidence surrounding her case. Yet the litigation continued unabated.

In a highly unusual move 'state secret privilege' was applied retrospectively to all aspects of her case, including her briefings with Senators. Edmonds was tied up in the courts for years, leading the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) to call her "*the most gagged person in the history of the United States of America*." In 2009 Edmonds gave a sworn deposition under oath. As she had been subpoenaed, the administration were required to reissue the gagging orders to stop her giving evidence. Following considerable legal argument, after 8 years of government censorship, Edmonds was finally able to reveal some of what she knew. [131]

According to conspiracists, there is evidence to suspect that Ayman al Zawahiri, now the leader of al Qaeda, the person who supposedly convinced Osama bin Laden to launch a global jihad, who is hunted by the world's intelligence community, regularly attended meetings with Western intelligence. The evidence suggests he is an asset of the intelligence services. This further raises the uncomfortable possibility that al Qaeda is ostensibly a proxy of the West's own military industrial intelligence complex.

As we mentioned earlier, some people partly accept aspects of this suggestion (many don't.) They see it as an unintended

A Dangerous Ideology

consequence of the unavoidably murky dealings of Western intelligence agencies, battling to protect our freedoms.

A war against global terrorism isn't going to be won without brave individuals infiltrating these organisations. We owe a great debt of gratitude to these courageous men and women, who wage a secret war that can never be acknowledged. An unfortunate consequence may be that intelligence agencies are actively involved with groups that commit horrendous crimes against civilians. The decision to allow an attack to go ahead, rather than expose a valuable asset who could potentially stop a much greater, future slaughter, must be a terrible dilemma to face.

Most conspiracy theorists recognise compartmentalisation means there are probably many honourable, committed people, working within the intelligence community, who expose themselves to incredible danger. However, they maintain, at a senior level, the intelligence agencies rarely appear to be serving the public's best interests.

They see the Deep State's influence, promoting the use of international terrorism to destabilise governments, build puppet regimes and provide an ethereal enemy that can never be cornered. This ensures continuous military and intelligence spending and corporate profits. 9/11 was a prime example of manipulated mass murder, at the hands of controlled terrorist assets. All to achieve globalist ambitions. According to them, there is evidence that a cabal within the Bush administration planned and facilitated 9/11.

The flights were allowed to hit their targets through the deliberate mismanagement of standard security procedures and the directed disorientation of the military response. It is impossible that they could have occurred in the way we were told without internal sabotage. It is equally impossible that plane strikes and fires could have caused the WTC 1 & 2 to collapse in the way they did, and even less likely in the case of WTC 7. This was done to conceal evidence, incapacitate the response and cause the maximum impact upon the population's psyche. The ultimate objective being to gain wide public support for a predetermined 'war on terror,' and to create passive public acceptance of legislation designed to

A Dangerous Ideology

limit individual freedoms and curtail freedom of speech.

Similarly, the attack on the Pentagon could not have occurred as we have been told to believe. The evidence to support the establishment claim is woefully lacking and that which does exist points towards an entirely different conclusion. The evidence offered in support of the official Flight 93 narrative is, in many ways, totally ridiculous.

The investigations, both into how the attacks occurred and the mechanics of the devastation, were deliberately stifled and corrupted. They offered unsupported conclusions based upon the cherry picking of evidence and the selective admission of testimony. The over reliance upon evidence, extracted through torture, brings the findings further into doubt and evidential standards fell way below anything admissible in a court. In order to believe the official investigations findings, one would need to both ignore the reams of contradictory evidence and concede the existence of previously unknown physical laws.

Moreover, they say they can prove senior White House officials lied; have evidence the supposed terrorists hijackers were well-known assets of the security services and can provide statements, made by the neoconservatives who controlled the Bush administration, that reveal the one remaining pre requisite for any criminal conspiracy.

Motive.

Chapter 10

The Able Danger of Intelligence.

The public statements, from senior members of the Bush administration, were consistent. They all claimed that no one could have possibly known about the attacks. None of them had any knowledge whatsoever about any of it.

For example, in 2009, Dick Cheney said, *“I wouldn’t have predicted 9/11, the global war on terror, the need to simultaneously run military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq.”* Donald Rumsfeld told the 9/11 Commission, *“I knew of no intelligence during the six-plus months leading up to September 11 to indicate terrorists would hijack commercial airlines, use them as missiles to fly into the Pentagon or the World Trade Center towers.”* President George W. Bush said, *“Nobody in our government at least, and I don’t think the prior government, could envision flying airplanes into buildings.”*

Conspiracists draw people’s attention to the Group Islamique Arm (GIA) plan to crash planes into the Eiffel Tower. In Algeria, in 1991, it seemed likely the Islamic Salvation Front

A Dangerous Ideology

(FIS) were set for electoral success. There was a military coup as a result and the FIS were banned. Consequently, the (GIA) splintered from the FIS and set about protesting the military administration by killing more people.

It's leader was Djamel Zitouni. He blamed French citizens for allowing themselves to be ruled by a government that supported the Algerian coup. He devised a plan to hijack a commercial airliner and crash it into the Eiffel Tower. Ultimately the plot failed after an informant alerted the Algerian Secret Service. This led to a 2-day stand-off at Marseille airport and the eventual storming of the aircraft by the GIGN French Special Forces.[177]

Another idea attributed to Khalid Sheikh Mohammad, Operation Bojinka[141] was an al Qaeda plot uncovered, during its planning stages, by Philippine police. Unlike the Russians, the Filipinos were able to decipher and translate the encoded Arabic documents found on the suspects' computers. These revealed a plot to hijack multiple commercial aircraft and simultaneously detonate explosives on each. Conversations between plotters, Abdul Hakim Murad and Ramsi Yousef, revealed in 1995 by FBI transcript of the reports from Philippine investigators,[178] show the men discussed crashing a plane into CIA headquarters.

Colonel Rodolfo Mendoza, who interrogated Murad, claimed there was a second phase of the uncovered plot which included an almost a precise blueprint of 9/11. Hijacked planes would be crashed into major U.S. targets including the WTC buildings and the Pentagon. This seems questionable as it wasn't mentioned in either the reports, or the transcripts. However, Rafael Garcia, chairman and CEO of the Philippine technology firm Mega Group, tasked with decoding the seized computers, corroborated Colonel Mendoza's claims. He also alleged information concerning the discovery of the plot was passed to U.S. authorities. He stated:[174]

".....we discovered a second, even more sinister plot: Project Bojinka... This was a plot to blow up 11 airlines over the Pacific Ocean, all in a 48-hour period... Then we

A Dangerous Ideology

found another document that discussed a second alternative to crash the 11 planes into selected targets in the United States instead of just blowing them up in the air. These included the CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia; the World Trade Center in New York; the Sears Tower in Chicago; the Transamerica Tower in San Francisco; and the White House in Washington, DC... I submitted my findings to NBI officials, who most certainly turned over the report (and the computer) either to then Senior Superintendent Avelino Razon of the [Philippine National Police] or to Bob Heafner of the FBI... I have since had meetings with certain US authorities and they have confirmed to me that indeed, many things were done in response to my report."

Sam Karmilowicz, a security official at the U.S. embassy in Manila said, just before Murad's extradition to the U.S, he picked up an envelope, containing the Philippine government's and Mega Group's evidence, and sent it to the U.S. Justice Department office in New York City.

So it seems clear, following the GIA hijacking and Bojinka investigation, by 1995, Western security services were aware of the potential for Islamists to use planes as missiles. Some Islamist terrorists had already attempted to do so, and others were apparently considering the idea.

In 1999, the British military intelligence' Secret Intelligence Service (MI6) handed a report to the U.S. alerting them to a potential plot. The reports stated that al Qaeda had plans to use "*commercial aircraft*" in '*unconventional ways.....possibly as flying bombs.*'[143] Again, in 2001, British intelligence sent a report to Prime Minister Tony Blair warning that al Qaeda was in "*the final stages*" of preparing a terrorist attack against the West. MI6 reported the warning was based upon intelligence gathered by GCHQ and from U.S. agencies, including the CIA and the NSA. They confirmed the sharing of intelligence with their U.S. partners, adding that the warning had been corroborated through surveillance of al

A Dangerous Ideology

Qaeda prisoner Khalid al Fawwaz.[144]

In July 2001, weeks before the attacks, the German intelligence agency the BND informed their U.S, UK and Israeli counterparts that terrorists were “*planning to hijack commercial aircraft to use as weapons to attack important symbols of American and Israeli culture.*” The BND uncovered this information through their communication eavesdropping system called 'Echelon.'[145]

In August 2001 President Bush was given an intelligence report entitled 'Bin Laden Determined To Attack The U.S.' The report was focused solely upon a suspected, imminent major attack by al Qaeda on the U.S. mainland.[146] In addition, prior to the 9/11, the U.S. intelligence agencies received warnings from the governments of Russia, Pakistan, Israel, France, Italy, Argentina, Jordan, Egypt, India, Morocco, Afghanistan and the Cayman Islands.[147]

After 9/11 the scope and accuracy of this intelligence was down played by White House officials. White House Press Secretary, Ari Fleischer, told a press conference:

“All appropriate action was taken based on the threat information we had. The president did not — not — receive information about the use of airplanes as missiles by suicide bombers.”

The conspiracists think the evidence strongly indicates otherwise. They suggest the proof of foreknowledge, based upon intelligence reports, is so overwhelming only two conclusions are plausible. Either, both the U.S. intelligence agencies and the administration were criminally negligent, or they were lying. Given the numerous training exercises conducted, which precisely mimicked the use of airliners to attack buildings (some on 9/11 itself[148]); that intelligence agencies the world over were warning of impending airborne attacks, the conspiracy theorists think 'lying' is the most likely explanation.

However, while this evidence may tentatively suggest culpability, one strand of inquiry, in particular, renders any resistance to a further investigation untenable. 'Operation

A Dangerous Ideology

Able Danger' clearly indicates 9/11 was an inside job.

Writing in 2005, FBI Director Louis Freeh questioned why the 9/11 Commission had apparently ignored vital intelligence.[149] Able Danger was a Pentagon run data mining operation which uncovered a number of terrorist cells operating both within the U.S. and overseas. This included identification of Mohammad Atta (the 9/11 lead hijacker) and three other 9/11 terrorists, operating in the U.S. in early 2000.

The Able Danger operatives claimed they tried, on three separate occasions, to alert the FBI about Atta and his cohorts, but were repeatedly blocked by the Clinton Administration. After the 9/11 Commission Report was published one of them, Lt. Col. Anthony Shaffer, blew the whistle and went public.

Shaffer received support from Congressman Curt Weldon (Vice Chairman of the House Armed Services and Homeland Security Committees,) who joined him and Freeh in calling for a new independent inquiry. Rallying support from both sides of the house, Weldon built Congressional pressure to try to force Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld to allow *“former participants in the intelligence program-known as Able Danger-to testify in an open hearing before the United States Congress.”*

This was opposed by some members of the 9/11 Commission. Slade Gorton stated there was nothing to the reports about Able Danger, and they weren't *“important enough”* to consider further action. Another Commission member Tim Roemer said Able Danger presented *“no helpful information for the 9/11 Commission to consider.”*

Former FBI Director Freeh reacted strongly to the 9/11 Commission's treatment of Able Danger intelligence and its total exclusion from the report. He accused them of ignoring *“the most critical evidence that could have prevented the horrible deaths of 3,000 of our fellow citizens.”* Freeh could not understand why the 9/11 Commission had been resistant to considering *“undoubtedly the most relevant fact of the entire post-9/11 inquiry.”*

A Dangerous Ideology

A less restrained Congressman Weldon added:[150]

“There’s a cover-up here. It’s clear and unequivocal”

What was revealed by Able Danger that nobody was allowed to know?

Aside from Osama bin Laden, Mohammad Atta was the evil face 9/11 horror. His photograph circulated the planet in the winter of 2001 and has remained one of the enduring images of 9/11. He was described by the 9/11 Commission as the “*tactical leader of the 9/11 plot.*” and the “*commander of the operation in the United States.*” Handpicked to slaughter thousands by Osama bin Laden himself (who they say he met,) Atta represented the 'fear' of Islamist extremism and was one of the leading poster boys that launched the global 'war on terror.' There was no doubt, according to all official sources, Atta was the operational leader of the worst terrorist atrocity ever committed.

The evidence, revealed by Able Danger, also suggests Mohammad Atta was connected to a top secret operation of the Pentagon’s Special Operations Command (SOCOM.) Shaffer alleged that it was SOCOM, the Pentagon in other words, who protected Atta in the lead up to 9/11.[151]

Of course, many will point out that allegations alone prove nothing. So let’s look at the evidence.

The Able Danger leadership team were:

- Navy Captain Scott Phillpott (the head of Able Danger)
- US Army Lt. Col. Anthony E. Shaffer (on loan from the Defense Intelligence Agency)
- Erik Kleinsmith (Army Major and the Chief of Intelligence of the Land Information Warfare Activity)
- James D. Smith (a civilian defence contractor from Orion Scientific Systems)
- Dr Eileen Preisser (Dual PhD, analytical lead, from the Land Information Warfare Activity)[152]

Able Danger members were called to testify at a Senate

A Dangerous Ideology

Judiciary Committee hearing on September 21st 2005 and also provided statements to the Armed Services Committee, US House of Representatives, on February 15th 2006. The day before the 2005 Senate Judiciary Committee hearing was due to convene, the key witnesses, Shaffer, Phillipott and Smith, were placed under a gagging order by the Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld.[154] This appeared to be a desperate measure as the trio had already submitted written statements.

Brian Whitman, a Department of Defense (DOD) spokesman, later said that open testimony “*would not be appropriate*” adding, “*We have expressed our security concerns and believe it is simply not possible to discuss Able Danger in any great detail in an open public forum.*”[155] Rumsfeld was not able to stop Kleinsmith giving testimony. He testified that he was ordered to erase all 2.5 terabytes of the Able Danger data, destroying all the vital intelligence (and evidence) that could potentially have averted the attack, three months before 9/11.[156]

According to the 9/11 Commission “*American intelligence agencies were unaware of Mr Atta until the day of the attacks.*” Yet Captain Scott Phillipott (the head of Able Danger) testified to the Commission in 2004. So why, just as they had with many other witnesses, did they ignore his testimony?

The Commission Chair, Thomas Kean, said Captain Phillipot's “*knowledge and credibility*” were not “*sufficiently reliable.*” They also concluded that Able Danger was not “*historically significant.*”

Captain Scott Phillipott had been the holder of four US Naval commands prior to being selected by the Pentagon to lead its top secret surveillance operation.[157] The Commission did apparently ask for documents relating to Able Danger but recorded “*none of the documents turned over to the Commission mention Mohamed Atta or any of the other future hijackers.*” Seeing as Kleinsmith had been ordered to destroy everything before 9/11, perhaps that's not surprising.

As far as the 9/11 Commission, the Department of Defense and senior Pentagon officials were concerned, Able Danger

A Dangerous Ideology

was a waste of money. It's highly qualified operatives were all useless, none of them had anything of value to say about the alleged hijackers or their infamous leader. Should we take this opinion at face value? Before we decide, perhaps we should consider what the Able Danger team had to say and examine any corroborating evidence.

By January 2000 they had identified a terrorist cell working out of Brooklyn, New York. Mohammad Atta among them. Schaffer recommended to Phillpott that they work with the FBI to take the cell out. However, Pentagon SOCOM lawyers stopped the team passing the vital information to the FBI. Following 9/11 the Able Danger team were horrified when they realised the men they were tracking, who SOCOM were apparently protecting, apparently committed murder on an unimaginable scale.

In 2003 Lt.Col. Schaffer was stationed in Afghanistan and, when 9/11 Commission Executive Director Philip Zelikow visited Bagram Air Force Base, he informed him that Able Danger had identified Atta as early as January 2000. In an hour long meeting Schaffer told Zelikow everything he knew. Only a few months later, Schaffer's Defense Intelligence Agency security clearance was revoked and he was unable to access any further documentation.

Following their identification of Atta, the Able Danger team drew up a wall chart of the terrorists and their suspected network.[158] In 2005, Congressman Weldon showed the chart to the House of Representatives. During his address he asked:

“Why is there no mention, Mr. Speaker, of a recommendation in September of 2000 to take out Mohammad Atta’s cell which would have detained three of the terrorists who struck us? We have to ask the question, why have these issues not been brought forth before this day?”

I had my Chief of Staff call the 9/11 Commission staff and ask the question: Why did you not mention Able Danger in your report? The Deputy Chief of Staff

A Dangerous Ideology

[Christopher Kojm] said, well, we looked at it, but we did not want to go down that direction.

So the question, Mr. Speaker, is why did they not want to go down that direction? Where will that lead us? Who made the decision to tell our military not to pursue Mohamed Atta?"

By 2005 the Able Danger senior operations team had gone public. Speaking to the Armed Services Committee in 2006, civilian defence contractor James D. Smith testified that he was absolutely positive that Atta was on the chart and that he had given a copy to Pentagon officials in 2000.[159]

Able Danger clearly placed Mohammad Atta, the 9/11 monster, in New York in early 2000. The Pentagon were aware of his presence but the Pentagon's Special Operations Command stopped the security services from detaining him. When the Able Danger team tried to tell the 9/11 Commission, the Bush administration attempted to silence them and the Commission simply dismissed their testimony. When asked why they had done so, Deputy Chief of Staff Christopher Kojm replied, *"It did not fit with the story we wanted to tell."* [160]

The Able Danger team's assertion that Atta was in the U.S., long before the official narrative claimed, was also corroborated by a number of independent witnesses.

In defiance of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's orders for her to stay silent, Johnelle Bryant, from the USDA, told ABC news that Atta had tried to secure a loan from her to buy a small aircraft. She said ATTA came to her office sometime between the end of April and the middle of May 2000. Bryant reported that when she wrote down his name she spelled it A-T-T-A-H, leading him to say: *"No, A-T-T-A, as in 'atta boy!'"*[161]

A library worker reported that Atta repeatedly used the computers in the Portland Maine Public Library In April 2000.[162] A federal investigator reported that Atta, and another hijacker, rented rooms in Brooklyn in the spring of

A Dangerous Ideology

2000 and a senior Justice Department official reported that Atta's trail in Brooklyn began with a parking ticket issued to a rental car he was driving in 2000. Yet despite the fact that numerous independent corroborative witnesses are usually good enough to substantiate testimony in a court of law, the Pentagon's Inspector General's 2006 summary report stated:

"We concluded that prior to September 11, 2001, Able Danger team members did not identify Mohammad [sic] Atta or any other 9/11 hijacker. While we interviewed four witnesses who claimed to have seen a chart depicting Mohammad Atta and possibly other terrorists or 'cells' involved in 9/11, we determined that their recollections were not accurate."

Is it reasonable for to ask what this determination was based upon?

Conspiracy theorists submit the evidence is persuasive. It is not irrational to hypothesise that elements within the U.S. government were behind the 9/11 attacks. The links between the intelligence agencies and senior al Qaeda figures were known. Al Qaeda itself was created as part of U.S. covert operations in Afghanistan; its co-founder Ayman al Zawahiri was possibly a NATO operative, working with Western intelligence; the lead hijacker Mohammad Atta appeared to have been protected by the Pentagon and the instant blaming of Osama bin Laden, and subsequent falsifying of evidence in an attempt to prove his guilt, seems to have been deliberate misdirection.

What's more, conspiracy theorists claim they can demonstrate that senior figures within the Bush administration openly discussed their need for 'a new Pearl Harbour.' This reveals the motivation for the 9/11 false flag.

Following the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, the U.S. found itself practically unopposed on the world's stage. Realising this, and wishing to capitalise on what they saw as an unprecedented opportunity for global dominance, a new breed of American power broker emerged.

A Dangerous Ideology

Called neoconservatives (neocons,) their declared world view placed the United States at the centre of a global empire. As the sole superpower, or “*unipower*,” their primary concern was that no rival should ever be allowed to rise to challenge U.S. hegemony. One of their chief strategist was the Pentagon Undersecretary Paul Wolfowitz.

In 1993, then Defense Secretary and fellow neocon Dick Cheney published Wolfowitz' strategy document 'Defense Strategy for the 1990s: The Regional Defense Strategy.' [170] Often referred to as the 'Wolfowitz Doctrine,' this document advocated the U.S. should make good use of their military supremacy:

“We must not stand back and allow a new global threat to emerge or leave a vacuum in a region critical to our interests.....

.....we should expect future coalitions to be ad hoc assemblies, often not lasting beyond the crisis being confronted, and in many cases carrying only general agreement over the objectives to be accomplished.....

.....Certain situations like the crisis leading to the Gulf War are likely to engender ad hoc coalitions. We should plan to maximize the value of such coalitions. This may include specialized roles for our forces as well as developing cooperative practices with others.....

.....we will retain the preeminent responsibility for addressing selectively those wrongs which threaten not only our interests, but those of our allies or friends.....

.....In the Middle East and Southwest Asia, our overall objective is to remain the predominant outside power in the region and preserve U.S. and Western access to the region's oil.....

A Dangerous Ideology

Following its publication, throughout the 1990s, the U.S. administrations continued the process of creating the “*ad hoc coalitions*” and perfected the use of “*specialized roles*” in conflicts in Bosnia, Kosovo, Somalia and elsewhere. Many U.S. backed Islamist extremists fought in these conflicts.

In 1998, inspired by the 'Wolfowitz Doctrine,' the neocons, including Wolfowitz, Cheney, Rumsfeld and Jeb Bush (the brother of George. W. Bush,) formed a think tank called 'The Project for the New American Century (PNAC.)'[171] Ten members of PNAC went on to form the backbone of the 2001 Bush administration, filling the majority of the top positions. They were responsible for managing the 9/11 crisis and were the driving force behind the decision to instigate the 'war on terror.'

Just before 9/11, in 2000, PNAC published a document called 'Rebuilding American Defences' (RAD.)[172] This document's influence upon the Bush administration, say the conspiracists, was obvious. Bush's concept of 'Homeland Defense,' the countries he named in his 'Axis of Evil' (Iran, Iraq and North Korea,) and even his defence budget commitments, were all lifted directly from RAD.

The Wolfowitz Doctrine proposed the idea of “*preemption*”. This broadly meant the use of military force as a preventative measure if the U.S. had intelligence that a military or terrorist threat was imminent. However, RAD took this further and advocated the use of force simply if U.S. interests were at risk, no imminent threat required.[173]

RAD was essentially a manifesto for U.S. imperial expansionism. It promoted sweeping changes to defence structures and operational practices, increased investment in technology, expanded use of civilian contractors, a restructuring and modernisation of all armed services and more.

It was the need to fund this policy initiative which led PNAC member, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, to request the additional \$50Bn annual tax payer investment. His difficulty in obtaining budget approval came as no surprise to Rumsfeld and his fellow neocons.

A Dangerous Ideology

PNAC members had already identified the funding problem they faced. In order to secure the money for their global military empire, they recognised the necessity of unwavering American tax payer support. PNAC required some form of justification to convince the public that huge increases in military spending were essential.

They addressed this issue in *Rebuilding American Defenses*. In doing so, say the conspiracy theorists, they exposed their motive for the crimes they committed on 9/11:

“...the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalysing event – like a new Pearl Harbor.”

President Bush' statement on the day of the attack itself, *“The Pearl Harbor of the 21st century took place today. . .”* was not another 'coincidence'. He was part of the neocon cabal who were actively seeking their casus belli. This was a triumphant nod to his fraternity, he may as well have said *“we've done it.”*

On September the 12th 2001, 12 months after the publication of RAD, for the first time in history, the United States of America invoked Article 5 of the NATO 'Washington Treaty.'

'An attack on one is an attack on all.'

NATO was at war with an enemy it couldn't find and the neocons had the all funds they would ever need to fight the never ending global war they craved. The bankers, venture capitalists, weapons manufacturers, intelligence and military contractors who had supported PNAC's objectives and persistently lobbied to advance their agenda, were all poised to profit handsomely. In this regard, the neocon 'hawks' and their investors, were in a unique position after 9/11.

They were the only people on Earth who benefited from it.

So what should we make of all this? Should we believe the conspiracy theorists?

A Dangerous Ideology

Oddly, a large number of them say not. Generally, they don't want people to simply 'believe' them. In fact, they don't really want people to believe anything at all.

They persistently advocate that people stop 'believing' what they are told and start researching and questioning the evidence themselves. Perhaps we may then start to erode the power of the deception our 'leaders' employ to convince us we need to kill each other.

Conversely, those who accept the official story of 9/11, the politicians, the academics, the media and probably most people you know, tell you not to believe the conspiracists.

The establishment tells you to reject every word they say. A message constantly reinforced with rigid uniformity across the entire Western mainstream media. No dissent or deviation from this unshakable conviction is ever mentioned, let alone discussed.

Stupid conspiracy theorists are clueless, impotent social outcasts, incapable of reason and riven by mental health problems. At the same time they are dangerous pedlars of a powerful ideology. Potentially strong enough to overturn our concept of reality and destroy the basis of our whole democratic way of life.

They are dangerous subversives and hopeless fools in equal measure. They are wrong. Don't look at the 'evidence.' Ignore it and never, under any circumstances, think about it.

There's nothing to see here, move along! Stay away!

Keep out!

“Our enemies are innovative and resourceful, and so are we. They never stop thinking about new ways to harm our country and our people, and neither do we.”

[George W. Bush 2004]

Sources:

- [1]:<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm51SPa6.htm>
- [2]:<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/sep/11/9-11-illnesses-death-toll>
- [3]:<http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736%2811%2960989-6/fulltext>
- [4]:<https://www.vcf.gov/pdf/VCFProgramStatistics07212017.pdf>
- [5]:<https://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf>
- [6]:<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.526.5976&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- [7]:<http://www.worldhistory.biz/sundries/27978-the-impact-of-9-11-on-u-s-public-opinion.html>
- [8]:<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/20/world/asia/trump-afghanistan-strategy-mattis.html>
- [9]:<https://www.nist.gov/engineering-laboratory/final-reports-nist-world-trade-center-disaster-investigation>
- [10]:<https://www.iraqbodycount.org/>
- [11]:<http://www.psr.org/assets/pdfs/body-count.pdf>
- [12]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/1567815.stm>
- [13]:http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/disinfo/deceptions/telegraph_stolenids.html
- [14]:http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/1559151.stm
- [15]:<http://articles.latimes.com/2001/sep/21/news/mn-48189>
- [16]:<http://911truth.org/mission/>
- [17]:<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/09/us/a-nation->

A Dangerous Ideology

[challenged-the-investigation-preventive-steps.html](#)

[18]:https://www.justice.gov/archive/ag/speeches/2001/ag_crisisremarks10_08.htm

[19]:<http://911myths.com/images/f/fd/FBI-Summary-PENTTBOMB.pdf>

[20]:<https://archives.fbi.gov/archives/news/testimony/penttbom>

[21]:<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-war-on-waste/>

[22]:<https://www.corbetteport.com/episode-308-911-trillions-follow-the-money/>

[23]:<https://www.c-span.org/video/?165947-1/defence-business-practices>

[24]:<https://news.brown.edu/articles/2011/06/warcosts>

[25]:<https://www.reuters.com/investigates/pentagon/#article/part2>

[26]:<https://www.metabunk.org/debunked-rumsfeld-says-2-3-trillion-missing-from-the-pentagon.t165/>

[27]:<http://www.rense.com/general24/spent.htm>

[28]:http://www.panynj.gov/press-room/press-item.cfm?headline_id=81

[29]:http://web.archive.org/web/20041217043635/http://theidealdeal.net/issues/January_2004/1073516221.php

[30]:http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/24/nyregion/24insure.html?_r=2&ref=nyregion&oref=slogin&

[31]:<https://www.scribd.com/document/39061668/911insider-Richard-Andrew-Grove-Project-Constellation-Transcript>

[32]:<http://www.baselinemag.com/c/a/Past-News/Ellen-Clarke-former-CIO-of-Marsh>

[34]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J3qyDQU7ic>

[35]:<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/profitng-from-disaster/>

A Dangerous Ideology

- [36]:<http://www.washingtonsblog.com/2010/06/sec-government-destroyed-documents-regarding-pre-911-put-options.html>
- [37]:http://www.911myths.com/html/selling_amr.html
- [38]:<https://9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf>
- [39]:<http://physics911.net/noradfaa-hijack-intercept-protocols/>
- [40]:<http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/planes/attack/presrelNORADTimelines.htm>
- [41]:<http://911research.wtc7.net/sept11/analysis/anomalies.html#military>
- [42]:<http://www.xavius.com/080198.htm>
- [43]:<https://digwithin.net/2011/04/27/wall-street-lawyer-and-the-special-ops-hijack-coordinator/>
- [44]:<http://911blogger.com/node/9017>
- [45]:“Secretary Rumsfeld Interview With Larry King”; Torie Clarke, Lipstick on a Pig, pp. 217-218
- [46]:http://tarpley.net/docs/drills_of_911.pdf
- [47]:<http://www.gangstalkingmindcontrolcults.com/inside-job-the-46-drills-operations-war-games-and-exercises-of-911-tarpley-interview/>
- [48]:<https://www.uwgb.edu/dutchs/PSEUDOSC/911NutPhysics1.HTM>
- [49]:<https://www.nist.gov/engineering-laboratory/final-reports-nist-world-trade-center-disaster-investigation>
- [50]:https://www.nist.gov/topics/disaster-failure-studies/world-trade-center-disaster-study/about-investigation#_ftn1
- [51]:<https://www.nist.gov/el/faqs-nist-wtc-7-investigation>
- [52]:<http://911review.com/coverup/fantasy/progressive.html>

A Dangerous Ideology

- [53]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xqqelDq4P48>
- [54]:<https://www.nist.gov/pba/questions-and-answers-about-nist-wtc-7-investigation>
- [55]:http://www.jensenhughes.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/White_Paper_Historical_Survey_Building_Collapse_NIST_JBeitel-NIwankiw_OCT-2006.pdf
- [56]:http://journalof911studies.com/articles/Article_6_Pancake_theory_false_by_NIST_WorldTradeCenter.pdf
- [57]:<http://www1.ae911truth.org/faqs/655-faq-9-were-the-twin-towers-designed-to-survive-the-impact-of-the-airplanes.html>
- [58]:<http://www.911myths.com/WTCREPORT.pdf>
- [59]:http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Journal_5_PTransferRoss.pdf
- [60]:<http://www.ae911truth.org/signatures/ae.html>
- [61]:<http://www.popularmechanics.com/military/a6384/debunking-911-myths-world-trade-center/>
- [62]:<https://www.prisonplanet.com/nists-wtc7-collapse-models-some-observations.html>
- [63]:<http://911blogger.com/news/2010-07-12/nist-denies-access-wtc-collapse-data>
- [64]:<http://wheredidthetowersgo.com/buy/>
- [65]:<https://www.prlog.org/10481408-911-qui-tam-case-filed-in-us-supreme-court.html>
- [66]:<http://pilotsfor911truth.org/>
- [67]:http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/WRHARTICLES/silverstein_pullit.html
- [68]:<http://www.ae911truth.org/signatures/ae.html>
- [69]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UW62q8XiVp4>
- [70]:http://pilotsfor911truth.org/p4t/Radar_Data_Impact_Speed_Study--AA11, UA175.pdf

A Dangerous Ideology

[71]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cHHghW4Pg5k>

[72]:<http://pilotsfor911truth.org/pentagon.html>

[73]:<http://shoestring911.blogspot.co.uk/2013/02/shanksville-pennsylvania-on-911.html>

[74]:<https://www.nist.gov/el/faqs-nist-wtc-towers-investigation>

[75]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rWdcVo6zIYI>

[76]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bin_Laden_Issue_Station

[77]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dqQwnqjA-6w>

[78]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ILHVQUTrgvM>

[79]:<http://humansarefree.com/2015/08/bill-cooper-was-killed-shortly-after.html>

[80]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophi_%C3%A6_Naturalis_Principia_Mathematica

[81]:https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/magazine/2002/05/12/hallowed-ground/0c7b4753-ecca-48bd-8267-f11d2fc43a4f/?utm_term=.363c954fc3a9

[82]:<http://humansarefree.com/2015/03/shanksville-coroner-no-bodies-found-at.html>

[83]:<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/flight-93-remains-returned/>

[84]:<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/unanswered-questions-the-mystery-of-flight-93-173206.html>

[85]:<https://vrijewereld.files.wordpress.com/2016/03/john-lear-911-affidavit.pdf>

[86]:<http://thematrixhasyou.org/Affidavit-IRS-complete/Summons-affidavit/attachment-p.html>

[87]:<http://pilotsfor911truth.org/pentagon.html>

[88]:<http://911truth.org/hani-hanjour-evidence-suppressed-fbi-commission/>

A Dangerous Ideology

- [89]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nVUfN7RlgoQ>
- [90]:<http://web.archive.org/web/20070108233707/http://www.cbc.ca/sunday/911hamilton.html>
- [91]:<http://www.history.com/topics/9-11-commission>
- [92]:https://www.democracynow.org/2004/3/23/the_white_house_has_played_cover
- [93]:https://9-11commission.gov/report/911Report_Ch5.htm
- [94]:https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Barry_Jennings#cite_note-jvdr-1
- [95]:<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1394268/>
- [96]:<http://www.mujaahidkamran.com/articles.php?id=45>
- [97]:<http://911truth.org/beverly-eckert/>
- [98]:<https://www.nts.gov/investigations/AccidentReports/Reports/AAR1001.pdf>
- [99]:<http://alphahistory.com/pastpeculiar/1738-vaucanson-mechanical-crapping-duck/>
- [100]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pA2luI2wUEk>
- [101]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_for_the_day_of_the_September_11_attacks
- [102]:http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/07/18/AR2006071801175_5.htm
- [103]:<http://edition.cnn.com/2001/US/09/16/inv.binladen.denial/>
- [104]:<https://www.paulcraigroberts.org/pages/about-paul-craig-roberts/>
- [105]:<https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/khalid-sheikh-Mohammad-cia>
- [106]:<http://www.globalresearch.ca/khalid-shaikh-Mohammad-confessed-to-attacking-bank-founded-after-his->

A Dangerous Ideology

[arrest/5112?print=1](#)

[107]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/03/29/what-is-wahhabism-the-reactionary-branch-of-islam-said-to-be-the/>

[108]:<https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/saud/cron/>

[109]:<http://www.jeansasson.com/books/princess-more-tears-to-cry/Chronology-of-Saudi-Arabia.pdf>

[110]:<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article3332.htm>

[111]:<http://hereinreality.com/carlyle.html#.Wk03VXnLjAU>

[112]:<https://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/sept11/2001/10/07/bin-family.htm>

[113]:<http://www.historycommons.org/context.jsp?item=a97familymoney#a97familymoney>

[114]:<http://www.historycommons.org/context.jsp?item=a091301frenchbinladenfamily#a091301frenchbinladenfamily>

[115]:<http://www.historycommons.org/context.jsp?item=a091301flight#a091301flight>

[116]:http://web.archive.org/web/20010927124917/www.boston.com/dailyglobe2/264/nation/Family_weighed_staying_in_US%2B.shtml

[117]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/events/newsnight/1645527.stm>

[118]:<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2001/11/12/the-house-of-bin-laden>

[119]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/08/july7.development>

[120]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Cyclone

[121]:http://www.historycommons.org/entity.jsp?entity=maktab_al-khidamar

A Dangerous Ideology

- [122]:<http://www.historycommons.org/context.jsp?item=aearylmid86salempentagon#aearylmid86salempentagon>
- [123]:<http://www.newsweek.com/war-terror-road-september-11-151771>
- [124]:http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1902809_1902810_1905173-2,00.html
- [125]:<https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/nsdd-166.pdf>
- [126]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/1362113/Bin-Laden-Yes-I-did-it.html>
- [127]:http://www.fpp.co.uk/online/02/01/Laden/tapes9_Monitor.html
- [128]:<https://web.archive.org/web/20050315062249/http://www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,3809021-103643,00.html>
- [129]:<http://nswbc.org/about%20us.htm>
- [130]:<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A25813-2004Jul29.html>
- [131]:https://www.huffingtonpost.com/brad-friedman/formerly-gagged-fbi-whist_b_269787.html
- [132]:<http://edition.cnn.com/2012/12/14/world/ayman-al-zawahiri---fast-facts/>
- [133]:<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/sep/24/afghanistan.terrorism11>
- [134]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ayman_al-Zawahiri#Activities_and_whereabouts_after_the_September_11_attacks
- [135]:<https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB1025558570331929960>
- [136]:<https://www.corbettreport.com/episode-258-know-your-terrorists-ayman-al-zawahiri/>
- [137]:<https://www.globalresearch.ca/the-us-al-Qaeda->

A Dangerous Ideology

[alliance-bosnia-kosovo-and-now-libya-washington-s-on-going-collusion-with-terrorists/25829](#)

[138]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ltP2t9nq9fl>

[139]:http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/theeditors/2007/02/part_of_the_conspiracy.html

[140]:<https://academic.oup.com/ejil/article/17/2/349/2756253>

[141]:http://www.historycommons.org/entity.jsp?entity=operation_bojinka

[142]:http://www.historycommons.org/entity.jsp?entity=rodolfo_mendoza

[143]:http://www.propagandamatrix.com/mi6_warned_us_of_al_qaeda_attacks.htm

[144]:<https://911timeline.s3.amazonaws.com/2002/londontimes061402.html>

[145]:<http://www.foxnews.com/story/2002/05/17/clues-alerted-white-house-to-potential-attacks.html>

[146]:<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/05/16/us/bush-was-warned-bin-laden-wanted-to-hijack-planes.html>

[147]:<https://911timeline.s3.amazonaws.com/main/foreignwarnings.html>

[148]:<https://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/2002-08-22-sept-11-plane-drill-x.htm>

[149]:<https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB113219243999699729>

[150]:<http://www.globalresearch.ca/able-danger-uncovering-the-9-11-cover-up/1323?print=1>

[151]:<http://www.globalresearch.ca/able-danger-adds-twist-to-9-11/867?print=1>

[152]:<https://www.globalresearch.ca/911-analysis-the-claim-that-able-danger-failed-to-identify-mohamed-attas-probable-presence-in-the-us-in-january-2000/5474994>

A Dangerous Ideology

- [153]:[http://www.historycommons.org/entity.jsp?entity=us consulate, Jedda, saudi arabia office](http://www.historycommons.org/entity.jsp?entity=us_consulate, Jedda, saudi arabia office)
- [154]:https://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2005/09/20/Pentagon-gags-Able-Danger-team/UPI-13621127271451/
- [155]:<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/09/21/politics/pentagon-bars-military-officers-and-analysts-from-testifying.html>
- [156]:https://fas.org/irp/congress/2005_hr/shrg109-311.html
- [157]:http://web.archive.org/web/20050819153451/http://www.9-11pdp.org/press/2005-08-12_pr.pdf
- [158]:<https://therearenosunglasses.wordpress.com/2010/11/05/able-danger-mohamed-atta-and-ali-Mohammad/>
- [159]:<http://web.archive.org/web/20090506125755/http://www.newsobserver.com/114/story/400682.html>
- [160]:<https://www.globalresearch.ca/911-analysis-the-claim-that-able-danger-failed-to-identify-mohamed-attas-probable-presence-in-the-us-in-january-2000/5474994>
- [161]:http://web.archive.org/web/20020725114958/http://abcnews.go.com/sections/wnt/DailyNews/ross_bryant020606.html
- [162]:<https://www.pressherald.com/2011/08/25/september-11-portland-maine-chronology-fbi-mohamed-atta-abdulaziz-alomari/>
- [163]:<https://www.europhysicsnews.org/articles/e pn/pdf/2016/04/e pn2016474p21.pdf>
- [164]:<http://www.scientistsfor911truth.org/index.html>
- [165]:<https://benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOCPJ/TOCPJ-2-7.pdf>
- [166]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbigniew_Brzezinski
- [167]:<https://www.amazon.com/The-Grand-Chessboard-Geostrategic-Imperatives/dp/0465027261/antiwarbookstore>

A Dangerous Ideology

[168]:https://gopeopleca.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/ca_map.jpg?w=3507&h=2480

[169]:<https://www.globalresearch.ca/afghan-history-the-central-asian-grand-chessboard/24410>

[170]:http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/pdf/naarpr_Defense.pdf

[171]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project_for_the_New_American_Century#Former_directors_and_staff

[172]:<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/pdf/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>

[173]:<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article3249.htm>

[174]:http://www.historycommons.org/timeline.jsp?timeline=complete_911_timeline&complete_911_timeline_alleged_al_qaeda_linked_attacks=bojinka#a0295thirdplot

[175]:https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Deutsche_Bundesbank

[176]:<http://www.paperlessarchives.com/FreeTitles/9-11SECRpt.pdf>

[177]:<https://special-ops.org/sof/mission/hijacking-air-france-flight-8969/>

[178]:<http://www.investigatingtheterror.com/documents/files/Bojinka%20Dossier.pdf>

[179]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Directed-energy_weapon#Microwave_weapons

[180]:<https://www.globalresearch.ca/osama-died-in-2001-msnbc-hit-piece-unwittingly-reveals-corroboration-for-dr-steve-r-piecznik-s-assertion/24753?print=1>

[181]:<https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2019/01/us-isnt-really-leaving-syria-and-afghanistan/579712/>

[182]:<https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-legal-case-for-striking-north-korea-first-1519862374>

[183]:<https://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/>

2004-04-18-norad_x.htm

[184]: <http://livingthenativelife.blogspot.com/2012/09/the-american-indian-holocaust-known-as.html>

[185]:<http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/groundzero/cleanup.html>

Recommended Reading:

1. 9/11 Commission Report – by National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States
2. WTC 7 Final Report – National Institute of Standards and Technology
3. Without Precedent: The Inside Story of the 9/11 Commission. - by T. Kean & L. Hamilton
4. The War on Freedom: How and Why America Was Attacked September 11, 2001 – by Nafeez Ahmed
5. A User's Guide to the Crisis of Civilization – by Nafeez Ahmed
6. The New Pearl Harbour – by David. Ray Griffin
7. 9/11: Synthetic Terror – by Webster Tarpley
8. 9/11: Finding the Truth. - by Andrew Johnson
9. Where Did The Towers Go: - by Dr. Judy Woods
10. Black 9/11 - by Mark H. Gaffney
11. The American Deep State – by Peter Dale Scott
12. The 2001 Anthrax Deception – by Graeme MacQueen
13. Terror Conspiracy Revisited – Jim Marrs

Part 3:

London Laid Low.

Chapter 11

The Lacking London Narrative.

In May 2006 the official report into the 7/7 London bombings was published.[17] The timeline of the attacks was reported as follows:

03:58 A light purple Nissan Micra (hired by Tanweer,) containing Shehzad Tanweer (22), Mohammad Sidique Khan (30) and Hasib Hussain (18) is seen in Leeds before joining the M1 motorway heading south.

04:54 Stopping at Woodall service station to refuel, Shehzad Tanweer is filmed on CCTV wearing a white t-shirt, dark jacket, white tracksuit bottoms and a baseball cap. He argues over change with the cashier before re-joining Khan and Hussein in the vehicle.

05:07 A red Fiat Brava driven by Jermaine Lindsay (19) parks in Luton train station car park. In the next 90 minutes Lindsay wanders in and out of the station, checks the timetable, and moves the car a couple of times.

A Dangerous Ideology

06:49 The Micra arrives in Luton, parks next to the Brava and the men are seen transferring items between the boots (trunks.) The four men each put on one large, full rucksack. The Nissan Micra contained smaller explosive devices and a larger bomb, similar to those later used. The intended purpose of the smaller devices or the additional bomb is unknown. Other items consistent with the use of explosives were also found in the Micra and a 9mm hand gun was left in the Fiat Brava.

07:15 Shehzad Tanweer, Mohammad Sidique Khan, Hasib Hussain and Jermaine Lindsay leave the vehicles and enter Luton station.

07:21 The four are seen on CCTV heading for the platform to catch the Kings Cross Train. Each are carrying between 2 - 5kg of high explosive. For unknown reasons Shehzad Tanweer has now changed his trousers from white to black jogging bottoms.

07:40 The men depart Luton on board the train to Kings Cross. They drew little attention, though some remember their casual dress and chatter stood out somewhat among the business commuters.

08:23 The train arrives in Kings Cross station, slightly delayed. About 7 minutes later, the four are apparently seen hugging and a witness reports they appeared to be 'euphoric.' They then split up. Mohammad Sidique Khan left to board a westbound Circle Line underground train, Shehzad Tanweer an eastbound train on the same line, and Jermaine Lindsay a southbound Piccadilly Line train. Hasib Hussain is assumed to have gone to the Piccadilly Line.

08:50 A bomb detonates in the second carriage from the front of the eastbound tube train as it approaches Liverpool Street underground station. Shehzad Tanweer is not seen, but forensic evidence indicates he must have been sitting at the back of the carriage, with the bomb at his feet. 8 people are killed and 171 injured.

08:50 The second bomb detonates at Edgware Road Station. Eye witness accounts report that Mohammad Sidique Khan, also in the second carriage, was fiddling with a small

A Dangerous Ideology

rucksack before detonation. Khan was probably seated with the bomb at his feet and was most likely near the standing area next to the first set of double doors. 7 died and 163 were injured.

08:50 The third bomb explodes. Jermaine Lindsay was in the first carriage when the bomb detonated on the Piccadilly Line between Kings Cross and Russell Square. The train was crowded, making his precise location difficult to ascertain. Forensic evidence places the bomb on or near the floor of the standing area, between the second and third rows of seats. 27 people were killed and more than 340 injured.

08:55 Hasib Hussain exits Kings Cross onto Euston Road. Phone records show he tried to call the other three on his mobile (cell phone) over the next few minutes.

09:00 Hussain goes back into Kings Cross and visits a shop where he apparently buys a 9v battery. It is speculated this may have been required to detonate his device.

09:06 Hussain visits MacDonald's on Euston Road.

09.19 Hussain is seen in Gray's Inn Road. A man fitting his description was observed on the No91 bus travelling between Kings Cross and Euston Station. It was almost certainly at Euston that Hussain switched to the No30 bus, travelling eastward towards Marble Arch. A man matching Hussain's description was seen fiddling with a rucksack on the lower deck.

09:47 The last bomb explodes on the top deck of the No30 bus outside the British Medical Association headquarters in Tavistock Square. Forensic analysis places the bomb towards the back of the upper deck on, or close to the floor. It is not known why Hussain didn't detonate his device at 08:50. Possibly his train was delayed, or he was unable to detonate for a technical reason. Hence the need for the battery. 14 people died and 110 were injured.

The report then went on to recount the key points leading to the discovery of the 'suicide bombers' identities.

- DNA from each was found at the respective attack sites. Their remains indicate they were closest

A Dangerous Ideology

to the blasts.

- A suspected bomb factory was found in a flat in Leeds on July 12th. 18 Alexandra Grove[23] had the bombers fingerprints and traces of their DNA in it.
- The Nissan Micra had explosive devices and bomb making material in it.
- The four were seen on CCTV, prior to the bombings, carrying large rucksacks consistent with those used in the attacks.
- Witness accounts attest that two of the men were fiddling with their rucksacks prior to the explosions.
- There is no evidence of a plan to detonate the bombs remotely.
- On September the 1st, al Jazeera released a video of Mohammad Sidique Khan, and a last will and testament, indicating that he intended to fight jihad.

This 'state narrative' was very different from the accounts given by the authorities in the immediate aftermath of the 7/7 attacks. Initially police were said to have used controlled detonations to destroy suspect devices, and the widespread disruption was a result of electrical power surges. This quickly morphed into a story about suicide bombings.

For the first two days the bombs were said to have detonated at different times. On July 7th 2005, Scotland Yard's Deputy Assistant Commissioner Brian Paddock made a public statement that the underground explosions occurred at 08:51, 08:56 and 09:17.

Metropolitan Police Commissioner Sir Ian Blair stated that he knew of "*six explosions*," listing the six affected areas as Edgware Road, King's Cross, Liverpool Street, Russell Square, Aldgate East and Moorgate, adding that it was "*still a confusing situation*".[93]

A Dangerous Ideology

Initial reports suggested victims were killed or injured while heading towards Kings Cross, from where the bombers allegedly caught the trains they attacked. Among them was Jenny Nicholson, who sadly died in the Edgware Road blast. She had called her boyfriend shortly before boarding her train at Paddington. This meant she was eastbound at Edgware Road.[100] Divinia Turrell, who suffered facial injuries at Edgware Road, was also reportedly heading eastbound towards Canary Wharf.[101]

Police initially stated, at 09.17, an explosion on a train approaching Edgware Road blew a hole through the side of the carriage and tunnel wall, impacting another train. They maintained this account for more than a week. However, the official story later attributed the Edgware Road blast to Khan, on a single westbound train. Why the initial police assessment of events lasted so long is perplexing.

Similarly, Manjit Dhanjal and Ana Castro were both on a westbound Circle Line train, between Aldgate East and Liverpool Street, when it was apparently bombed. They described a loud explosion, thick black smoke, seeing horrendous injuries and the bodies of the deceased.

This train was also heading towards Kings Cross, where Tanweer was said to have caught the eastbound Circle Line train he destroyed. Despite considerable evidence of a bomb at Aldgate East this was soon excluded from the official account.[99]

Transport for London (TfL) issued a press update on the 7th stating there had been an explosion on a northbound Piccadilly Line train, heading towards Kings Cross. This was corroborated by a Tube Lines' statement to the same effect. Initially this train was identified as the northbound 311. Gary Stevens, the duty manager of Russell Square Station confirmed 311 was bombed, as did the Piccadilly Line operations manager. A year later the 'official account' had Lindsay on the southbound train, leaving Kings Cross.

Investigators subsequently changed the times of the bombs having analysed 'technical data' from London Underground. [92] They also revised the number of reported explosions, down from as many as seven, to four. By the time the report

A Dangerous Ideology

was released in 2006, the account had changed to four suicide bombers on three trains and one bus.

Already suspicious of the official narrative, many were unhappy about the amount of conjecture within it. There was heavy reliance upon words like 'assumed', 'possibly', 'must' and 'suspected.' Certainly from 08.26 onwards, there was a notable lack of evidence to support the given timeline.

The police investigation took some 20,000 witness statements, it looked at 40,000 pieces of physical evidence and cost the British tax payer £100M. However, to date, no one has been convicted of any direct involvement in the 7/7 attacks.[26] Furthermore, the initial report, supposedly based upon this thorough investigation, got some basic key facts wrong.[17]

The four alleged bombers were said to have caught the 07:40 train from Luton. However, due to disruption caused by damaged overhead lines in the Mill Hill area, the 07:40 was cancelled that morning. The next available train was at 07:42 (the delayed 07:30) but that didn't arrive at Kings Cross until 08:39. This would have placed their arrival at Kings Cross about quarter of an hour after witnesses supposedly saw them. It would also have meant Tanweer would have missed the train he allegedly blew up. Nor could they have caught the 07:56 (the delayed 07.48) as this would have placed their arrival in Kings Cross at 08:42, too late for either Khan or Tanweer to catch their respective trains.

According to the official narrative, they were caught on CCTV entering Luton station at 07:15. However, the video was time stamped at 07:21:54. This would not appear to have given them enough time to catch the earlier 07:24 (delayed to 07:25.) This may explain why the Home Office thought they had caught the later train. Although the delayed 07:24 arrived at Kings Cross Thameslink platform just after the Home Offices stated time of 08:23 (time stamped CCTV footage gave this as 08:25,) if the Luton video timestamps were correct, it seems unlikely the terrorists ever intended to catch this train. Frankly, the timings stated in the Home Office's official account didn't make any logical sense and were impossible in some instances.[52]

A Dangerous Ideology

After 'conspiracy theorists' had pointed this out, then Home Secretary John Reid was forced to inform parliament the investigation had got the train times wrong. Reid informed MP's of the error stating the 'terrorists' actually caught the 07:24.[53] The police insisted they had informed the Home Office about the correct train times when they first noticed the error in the report. If so, it begged the question why the impossible times remained in it for more than a year, especially given that independent researches had been pointing out the mistake for many months.

The reason for this error was further confused when footage from Luton was released in 2008. This purportedly showed the men going through the ticket barriers and waiting on the Luton platform.

These clips should have resolved the timing issues, but the timestamps were largely blurred out for some reason. The Police had already suggested that some timestamps were wrong and maintained they had entered the station at 07:15. Unable to see many of the timestamps on the new footage, it was impossible to independently verify this at the time.

However, CCTV footage from Luton, later given to the inquest, clearly showed the previously blurred out timestamps, recording the men on the platform at 07:23. This would have given them time to catch the delayed 07:24. [97]

Therefore, the train timing fiasco was inexplicable. Why were either investigators or the Home Office ever muddled? After five years of disorientation, the Luton CCTV timestamps were all revealed to be perfectly clear and entirely consistent with the revised, now workable, account. The police claimed they hadn't initially told the Home Office what time the bombers caught the Luton train, only later correcting their mistake. Surely such information was crucial? Why would the Home Office ever issue a report without requesting this vital evidence? Perhaps they just guessed. Incorrectly, as it turned out.

At the time, the error strewn 2006 report was the only publicly available account of the worst terrorist attack in British history. The state's protestations, that they hadn't

A Dangerous Ideology

received all the relevant information, did not offer adequate explanation.

It certainly didn't explain how the police possibly spoke to witnesses who were recorded as being on the non-existent 07:40 train. These people were reported as stating the men's casual clothes stood out from those of the average business commuter. They interviewed other witnesses on the phantom 07:40 who recounted the four's noisy conversations.

Although The Home Secretary John Reid claimed, during his parliamentary apology, that the rest of the report was accurate, it was not without good reason many had their doubts. If the investigation couldn't get such basic information straight, what confidence could any have in the other 'facts' offered in the official account?

The calls for an independent inquiry increased but, for reasons we will soon discuss, it never happened. The only review of the state's narrative came with the inquests, more than 5 years later.

The 2011 inquests into the deaths of the 52 people killed by the supposed suicide bombers returned verdicts of unlawful killing for all.[18] The coroner, Lady Justice Hallett, ruled there would be no inquests into the deaths of the four accused terrorists.

There is no official record of how these men died and certainly no court verdict proving them suicide bombers. None of the four alleged terrorists were pronounced 'life extinct' at the scenes. It may seem a moot point to most but, given the many other anomalies surrounding the official account of 7/7, it is a notable addition to the list.

As the story of the four suicide bomber emerged, the official account stated the four suspects were unknown to the intelligence and security services. Then Home Secretary, Charles Clarke, said they were so called 'clean skins.' [19] Therefore, it seemed surprising to some that the police were able to identify the men so quickly. Fortunately, identification documents were found at the scenes, which helped the police immensely.[27]

A Dangerous Ideology

Mohammad Sidique Khan's Identification documents were found at Aldgate, Edgware Road and Tavistock Square.[95] Tanweer's were found in a wallet at Aldgate and Jermaine Lindsay's with his body at the scene of the Piccadilly Line explosion. Hasib Hussain's driving licence and bank card were found at Tavistock Square. It was noted at the inquests the documents weren't damaged to the extent one might expect if they were in close proximity to a bomb. The government's QC, Neil Flewitt, explained this to the inquest.

“Although they were damaged to some extent, they did not show the damage that would be expected if they were on the body of the bomber or in the rucksack, suggesting that in each case they had been deliberately separated by some distance from the actual explosion.”

Therefore, we are told the bombers scattered identification documents on the floors of the carriages and the bus, prior to manually detonating their bombs. Suggesting their intention to be identified. There were no witness testimonies to corroborate this theory. It was simply assumed.[96]

The inquest was controlled by Lady Justice Hallett, She determined what evidence could and could not be admitted. Ultimately she concluded the key points of the government's narrative were all entirely correct. However, whatever her ruling was based upon, it is difficult to see how it related to the evidence openly revealed at the inquest.

Firstly the concept of the suicide bombers initially arose, and was widely disseminated by the mainstream media (MSM), thanks largely to the statement of one man.

Richard Jones said he saw a man, fitting the description of Hasib Hussain, fiddling with his rucksack on the No30 bus to Tavistock Square. For some unknown reason, never explained at the inquest or in any official account, the No30 bus was diverted on 7/7. If, as suggested, Hussain changed from the No91 to the No30 bus he would ordinarily have been heading back in opposite direction. It was only the diversion which resulted in the No30 ending its Journey in Tavistock Square.

Jones' testimony placed Hussain on the lower deck. The forensic evidence indicated the detonation occurred on the upper deck, contradicting Jones' eyewitness statement. Jones' credibility, as a witness who could place Hussain on the bus, was dubious.

He described Hussain as smartly dressed, wearing "*hipster-style fawn checked trousers, with exposed designer underwear, and a matching jersey-style top.*" This was completely at odds with the casual blue jeans, light purple top and dark jacket Hussain was wearing in the released CCTV images. Contrary to the ubiquitous media reports asserting his reliability, Jones' description did not match that of Hussain. Something Jones later highlighted at the inquest when he stated:

".....at no stage have I ever said I saw the bomber. Right?"

Inquest testimony, from a severely injured survivor of the Edgware Road blast, Danny Biddle, also reported that Mohammad Sidique Khan had been fiddling with his rucksack as the bomb detonated.

Biddle was in a coma for more than 5 months. Upon his recovery he was interviewed by investigators. Initially he was unable to offer them any significant additional information to assist their inquiries. Then he saw Khan's alleged 'martyrdom video' on TV. Suddenly, Biddle remembered seeing Khan on the train. He testified that Khan had a small black camping rucksack on his lap. This is the rucksack he recalled Khan fidgeting with.[27]

Khan's martyrdom video was apparently released on an Islamist website, by person's unknown. It suggested that Khan was associated with al Qaeda. Footage of Ayman al Zawahiri's speeches were cut into the video. This implied connection was contrary to the official account. No official explanation clarified why Khan, or whoever made the video, would promote the idea of a wider terrorist plot.

Khan made no reference at all to either the London Bombings or his own martyrdom in the video. He didn't mention any of the other alleged bombers or name any future London targets. It wasn't clear who he was talking to

either. The video offered no evidence that Khan was involved in the 7/7 bombings. Rather, it suggested he may have been planning to fight jihad overseas.[51]

Biddle's testimony differed from the forensic evidence which placed the Edgware Road device on the floor of the carriage. The hand movements, seen by both Jones and Biddle, suggested manual detonation but there was a lack of supporting physical evidence. No manual trigger mechanisms were ever found at any of the bomb locations.

Jones didn't appear to positively identify Hussein at all, and Biddle's identification of Khan only came after he'd been shown a video informing him that Khan as one of the four alleged suicide bombers.

Officially the four terrorists were working entirely alone. The inquest judged there were no reasons to suspect a wider plot or consider any possible co-conspirator involvement. However, contrary to Lady Hallett's eventual findings, the evidence given at the inquests indicated otherwise.

According to the official story, Shehzad Tanweer, Mohammad Sidique Khan and Hasib Hussain collected the bombs from their bomb making factory in Alexandra Grove, Leeds, on the morning of the attacks. A local resident (Mrs Waugh) testified that she saw as many as six individuals going to and from the flat. This was supported by the discovery of at least 10 separate sets of finger prints found in the 'bomb factory.'

The same witness said that she had seen 'at least' 6 men loading rucksacks into the Micra on the morning of 7/7. Mrs Waugh remembered it because the early hour commotion woke her. She saw three men get into one lilac car and at least one more into a white car. She had assumed they were drug dealers.[28]

This repudiated the official account. Supposedly only the three named terrorists were present at the flat that morning. Neither the white vehicle nor its occupants were ever pursued or traced. Corroborating testimony from another two independent witnesses soon emerged, again suggesting more were involved.

A Dangerous Ideology

Susan Clarke was disgruntled because the men had parked in her usual parking bay at Luton train station. She gave a statement to the police on the 12th that she saw four men, not three, in the lilac Nissan Micra and two men in the red Fiat Brava, which supposedly Jermaine Lindsay was driving alone. She didn't positively identify any of the men, saying she saw them only as “*shadow figures.*”

By the time of the inquests her original statement had changed to testimony which matched the official story exactly. However, under questioning, she confirmed that her sighting was of six men, not four.[29] Her recollection had not changed. It isn't clear why she temporarily adapted her account to fit the state's narrative.

Joseph Martoccia was the witness who had seen the men hugging at Kings Cross. However, his statement to police was that he too had seen four to six men. He thought they could have been a cricket team. After being shown photographs of the suspects, he stated two were in the group he saw. However, he described Hasib Hussain with shaved hair and Tanweer as being noticeably shorter than the others. This didn't match with either men's appearance.

As is the way with these things, Martoccia's statement was leapt upon both by conspiracy theorists, in the 'alternative media,' and the MSM. For conspiracy theorists it was 'proof' of a wider plot and for the MSM, in the absence of any CCTV footage, it 'proved' the terrorists were suicidal maniacs.

In fact, the MSM got so carried away, Martoccia's eyewitness account was reported as a photograph. Renowned journalist and former newspaper editor, Sir Peregrine Worsthorne,[30] later wrote:

“...I cannot help recalling those pictures a year ago of the suicide bombers at King's Cross looking so serene and happy, without a care in the world.....For the expression on their faces was not in the least diabolical, but rather innocent and happy...”

In reality, no such image existed. However, this didn't stop the MSM from describing it as 'iconic.'[31] This prompted

A Dangerous Ideology

complaints to the UK's Press Complaints Commission who, in a bizarre decision, stated that it was perfectly acceptable to describe a photograph that didn't exist, never seen by anyone, as an 'iconic image.'

The press focussed upon Martoccia's recollection that the men he saw were 'euphoric.' Bolstering the perception of their fanatical delight at the prospect of martyrdom. The MSM were far more muted about his claim of seeing more than four men.[32]

For example, on the 11th of July 2006, the BBC reported that "*CCTV images at King's Cross station appear to show the four men hugging and in a happy mood.*" There were no such CCTV images. Today some might call this 'fake news.' [94]

Ultimately Martoccia's eyewitness testimony doesn't 'prove' anything. It was merely one piece of evidence among thousands. The men he saw may not have been the alleged terrorists. Perhaps his initial impression was correct.

Nonetheless, at least three, independent eyewitnesses saw more than four men, with each seeing this larger group at three different locations. Mrs Waugh saw 'six' men in Leeds, Sue Clarke saw 'six' men in Luton and Joseph Martoccia saw four to 'six' men at Kings Cross. You might think that finding these other men was a priority for the investigation but there is no record of any investigator making an attempt to track them down.

The CCTV footage of the car park in Luton, where the terrorists supposedly met, also suggested the possible involvement of others. Jermaine Lindsay parked his red Brava a little after 05:00 on Thursday the 7th July. At 06:50, for unknown reasons, he moved the Brava, swinging into a parking bay on the right, in the shown footage. At the moment he parked the car, the CCTV footage cut out for 88 seconds. Coincidentally, at that instant, a black Jaguar arrived and parked at the other end of car park. When the footage resumed the Jaguar was visible, its entry into the car park and interim movements hidden by the 88-second cut. [33]

Shortly afterwards, the light purple Micra arrived. As the

A Dangerous Ideology

Nissan entered the car park, the black Jaguar turned on its lights, did a U-turn, and drove back towards the incoming Micra and Lindsay's Red Brava. Rather than drive up the central lane of the car park, motioning to leave, it stayed to the left, as if allowing room to swing into parking bay on the right. It looked like a possible rendezvous. At the precise moment the vehicles converged, the footage, coincidentally, cut out again. This time for 76 seconds. When the CCTV restarted, the Jaguar appeared to have either exited the car park or was possibly parked a couple of spaces up from the Micra. The indistinct CCTV footage made this difficult to establish.

There was no proof that a meeting had occurred, only that the possibility existed. However, this wasn't the only time a black Jaguar was in the car park at the same time as the alleged suicide bombers.

Station and underground CCTV footage taken on Tuesday the 28th June, 9 days before the attack, showed three of the four terrorists undertaking, what was reported to be, a dry run. However, other than Kings Cross, none of them visited any of the attack sites. So it certainly didn't appear to be much of a rehearsal.

Coincidentally, an identical looking black Jaguar was again captured on CCTV, in the same spot, while the bombers were seen at Luton. This time on Tuesday the 28th June. Furthermore, in the 7/7 clip, due to the subsequent U-turn, the occupant (or occupants) appeared to be waiting in the vehicle, rather than parking.

On Thursday the 7th of July, the Jaguar may have left Luton station car park at approximately 06:54, during the cut in the CCTV recording. On the 28th June, it was still in the same spot at 08:05. On two different days, at two different times, the black Jaguar was in Luton station car park with the terror suspects. The 7/7 Luton CCTV suggested a possible meeting.

Despite this presumably important coincidence, there was no mention of the Jaguar during either the investigation or inquest. No records exist of it being ruled out of inquiries.

A Dangerous Ideology

What's more, the blatant cuts, which precisely coincided with the movements of the Jaguar, were not shown in the CCTV given to the inquest. Footage from another camera was inserted, obscuring both the Jaguar's movements and the edits.

There appears to have been two distinct attempts to hide this 'unimportant' vehicle from the inquest. Firstly, the edits and next the addition of footage to obscure those cuts. Independent researchers, and some in the alternative media, have repeatedly highlighted these anomalies. This is not something discussed in any of the extensive mainstream media's coverage of 7/7.

Another oddity is the dearth of CCTV footage. According to police reports, they seized thousands of video recordings. For three years, a total of three stills were the only released images of the alleged attackers. The MSM ran repeated clips of the footage taken on the 28th June, often while neglecting to mention it wasn't filmed on 7/7.

Unfortunately, on 7/7, for the vital 20 minutes (08.30 – 08.50 approximately,) while the alleged bombers were supposed to be moving through the underground network, the CCTV cameras, functioning perfectly on the 28th, were all broken. A temporary system had recently been installed, but this had malfunctioned, with one exception, during the crucial timeframe.

The train's internal CCTV would have potentially shown the movements of the bombers inside the carriages. However no footage or images have been released and no stills or clips from inside the trains were evidenced at the inquests. Perhaps they weren't working either?

No images, placing the alleged terrorist on any of the tube trains, or even in the underground network, have ever been produced. Only one camera, at the Kings Cross Thameslink tunnel entrance, was working. This recorded the four men at 08:26.[98] on 7/7. There was no photographic evidence of them getting on, or travelling in, the trains they allegedly blew up.

In another unfortunate coincidence, the cameras in the

A Dangerous Ideology

McDonald's restaurant, where Hasib Hussain spent about quarter of an hour, weren't working either. This is where he supposedly fitted the battery to his malfunctioning device. As an Islamist fundamentalist on a suicide mission, popping into McDonald's for breakfast seems unlikely. So it's regrettable that staff decided to switch off the CCTV at 09.06, just as he entered the restaurant.

Similarly, while there was footage of both the No91 and No30 buses he apparently used, there was none of him getting on either of them. Just like the Kings Cross CCTV and the McDonald's CCTV, the buses security systems weren't functioning at the most critical moment of their existence. All of which raises some interesting questions.

According to the Home Office, the suspects were first identified on the 12th from the only functioning Kings Cross CCTV camera. If the police only had a 20-minute segment of footage from a single working camera to review, why did it take them 5 days to analyse it?

Detective Inspector Kindness told the inquests that an ex-military investigator first drew attention to the four, after reviewing the Kings Cross CCTV, on the 11th. The investigator was suspicious because the men were seemingly moving in a '2 by 2' military formation. Consequently, they were formally identified as the main suspects on the 12th.

DI Kindness stated that Luton was of particular interest as a result of 'information received' on the 11th of July. After being shown the viewing log, which indicated the review had occurred on the 10th, D.I. Kindness corrected his testimony and confirmed CCTV from Luton had been checked on the 10th. This made no logical sense.

Why were the police reviewing the Luton CCTV at least a day before receiving any information that Luton was of interest? The inquest was told that investigators had traced the possible connections back to Luton. Why Luton? They were yet to identify the suspects, so how did they know they met there? No explanation was offered.

Nor was the inquest informed of the apparent fact that police

had amassed in Luton, and cordoned off the car park, on the afternoon of day of the attack. The inquest heard that Lindsay's red Fiat Brava was towed away on 7/7. The reason for this was not made entirely clear but it was suggested the Brava's parking ticket was invalid.

It was also revealed that Lindsay's car was suspected of being used in an aggravated burglary. Police had supposedly discovered this, after the car had been removed. It was not the suggested reason for the vehicle's recovery. DI Kindness, speaking about the car being towed away for a possible parking violation, said CCTV would be submitted to the inquest showing the removal of the car. It wasn't.

The inquest didn't know that the car park's Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) camera had apparently alerted Bedfordshire Police about the Brava on the 7th. Vehicle recovery worker, Derek Allison,[130] was sent to collect it, the same day, by the police. He was required to provide a statement about the recovery in May 2006. This was available to the inquest but wasn't offered into evidence. Nor was the apparent real reason for the Brava's removal clarified.

Mr Allison was accustomed to recovering 'Used In Crime' (UIC) vehicles. He was surprised by the number of police gathered in Luton on the 7th. The Road leading to the station had been closed, there were at least two police vans, and several police officers were securing the car park. He had not encountered such a large police presence for a UIC vehicle recovery before.

'Conspiracy theorists' ask if video of the Brava's recovery was withheld from the inquest because it showed a police response utterly incongruous with the suggested account. The vehicle wasn't towed away because it breached parking rules, it was recovered because it was potentially used in the commission of a crime. According to witness statement, that crime appeared to be far more significant than a common burglary. Did it record police in Luton guarding evidence relating to a major incident, on the day of a large scale terrorist attack, long before investigators supposedly had any idea who the suspects were, or where they came from?

A Dangerous Ideology

At the inquest, Lady Justice Hallett decided questions about when and why the investigation reviewed the Luton CCTV were all “*a fuss about nothing.*”

Chapter 12

No Witnesses to a Forensic Mess.

The picture which emerged from the inquests did not support the official account. There were grounds for further inquiry which both the investigation and the inquest ignored. Was this simple oversight, or could there be other reasons why the establishment apparently shied away from certain issues?

The inquests failed to provide any substantive evidence placing the four alleged suicide bombers at the scenes. The lack of CCTV footage, and contradictory witness statements, meant their connection to the bombings was primarily established through forensic evidence. This supposedly linked the four to the bomb factory in Alexandra Grove, the bomb making equipment in the Nissan and the detonations. Upon closer scrutiny, this proof appears to be extremely weak or non-existent.

Initially it was widely reported the explosive used had been military grade plastic explosives. Possibly RDX (Hexogen) or C4. Christophe Chabaud, head of the French Anti-

A Dangerous Ideology

Terrorism Coordination Unit, brought in to assist the investigation, stated the bombs were of 'military origin.' [35] Scotland Yard's Deputy Assistant Commissioner Brian Paddock offered corroboration: [37]

“All we are saying is that it is high explosives, that would tend to suggest that it is not home-made explosive. Whether it is military explosive, whether it is commercial explosive, whether it is plastic explosive we do not want to say at this stage.”

The statements were fairly unequivocal at the time. Traces of military explosive were apparently found at all four bomb sites. This was widely reported in the MSM. The international news agency United Press International (UPI) stated: [38]

“Traces of the explosive known as C4 were found at all four blast sites, and The Times of London said Scotland Yard considers it vital to determine if they were part of a terrorist stockpile. Forensic scientists told the newspaper the construction of the four devices detonated in London was very technically advanced, and unlike any instructions that can be found on the Internet.”

This was expanded upon by then French Interior Minister Nicolas Sarkozy who informed an emergency European summit the explosives may have come from illicit military stockpiles in the Balkans. [39] Then British Home Secretary Charles Clarke responded with 'bewilderment.' However, given that all reports were consistent with the use of military grade explosives and technologically advanced devices, it was Clarke's resistance to Sarkozy's assessment that was bewildering. [36]

The official narrative changed completely (though not for the last time) with the discovery of the supposed bomb factory on the 12th. The flat contained a large amount of suggested bomb making equipment. [34] This predominantly consisted

A Dangerous Ideology

of normal household items such as tape, wire, gloves, hand tools and so forth. These could have been innocuous.

There was also a number of plastic tubs, containing either a light or dark brown mixture. At first, this was said to be TATP (Triacetone triperoxide).[128]

So all the initial reports, from international forensic explosives experts and senior investigators, on the ground at the scenes of the bombings, stating the detection of military grade explosives technology at all four bomb sites, simply disappeared. TATP was next reported as the explosive used. This story stood for a couple of years or so. Then, like C4/RDX before it, it just vanished from the tale, to be replaced with a home-made explosive no chemist or explosives expert could identify.

At the inquest this 'brown sludge' mixture of Hydrogen Peroxide and Piperine was finally established to be the explosive used. Though, as we are about to discover, you might ask why.

Investigators claimed to have found DNA and fingerprints from the bombers all over the Leeds flat. Suggesting the suicide bombers had little interest in hiding their activities. If they intended to kill themselves, why would they? This physical evidence was only discovered on the normal, everyday, household items.

Unfortunately, despite finding hundreds of prints and samples, none of the alleged terrorist fingerprints or DNA were found on any of the explosive filled containers. Hasib Hussain's prints were said to have been found on a small container of the suspected initiator charge, HMDT, but not on any of the tubs. The evidence proves their use of cutlery, but not the alleged explosive mixture.

Other items, such as duct tape, several large batteries, an additional ruck sack, freezer blocks, tools, fuses and wiring, were found in the purple car. Officially this indicated the three men, their large explosive packed rucksacks, the additional bomb making equipment and spare explosive devices, were all rammed into the tiny Nissan Micra.

A Dangerous Ideology

Why they chose to hire one of the smallest cars in Britain to transport themselves, and all this kit, is puzzling. Presumably saving money wasn't high on their agenda, although Tanweer's argument over his change at Woodall Services possibly indicated otherwise. Why not hire a van, negating the need to fiddle with bombs, in broad view of commuters and CCTV cameras, in a public car park, on busy weekday morning?

While the 2006 government report stated that nothing was known about their tickets, it later emerged the 'suicide bombers' bought 'day returns.' So perhaps saving money wasn't important to them after all.[78]

The only man forensically linked to the car was Mohammad Sidique Khan. However, like the flat, no evidence was found that he touched any of the bomb making equipment found in the Nissan. Again, it only showed he had handled everyday items, such as sweet wrappers and a water bottle.

Another unresolved problem is that the nameless home-made explosive found in the car was a pure white powder. [129] The mysterious substance found in the flat was brown. No trace of the white material was found in the flat.

No DNA or fingerprints were found linking any of the suspects to either the tubs of explosives or the bomb related items found in the Nissan Micra. Given that they were keen to be identified, it remains unexplained why this would have been the case. All four must have been perfectly fastidious, using gloves 100% of the time, because they had no known reason to wipe them clean.

Tavistock Square revealed a 9v battery that showed 'superficial' signs of bomb damage. If it was used to initiate an explosion, it survived remarkably intact. Some wiring was found at two of the bomb sites. This was damaged by close proximity to an explosion but was also the same wiring commonly used in headphones.

A halogen bulb initiator, attached to a small charge of the explosive HMTD, was supposedly found at the Alexandra Grove address in Leeds. Explosives expert Dr Clifford Todd expressed his opinion that this was the firing mechanism

A Dangerous Ideology

used for all four bombs, and the bomb makers would have required “*guidance and instruction from elsewhere.*”[42]

He was involved with the investigation of the Piccadilly Line explosion. At the inquest he confirmed that he had found no trace of the alleged halogen bulb initiator, similar connecting wiring or HMDT at the site.

In fact, unlike the initial identification of military grade explosives at every single bomb scene, no trace of the suggested 'improvised explosive' was found at any of the bomb locations. The residue of the supposed initiating charge, HMTD, was found at 3 of the sites, but in such insignificant quantities its origins couldn't be determined.

In addition to the absence of any DNA or finger print evidence, linking the four to the handling of the home-made explosive, there was no chemical evidence which demonstrated the suggested explosive compound was even used in any of the bombings. Consequently, proof of the four's involvement in the crime was reliant upon forensic evidence which was consistent with their bodies being closest to the blasts.

Following 9/11, the British Government devised its 'Mass Fatality Plan' (MFP.) This envisaged rapidly constructing temporary medical facilities in response to incidents involving large scale loss of life.

On July 6th 2005, the day before the 7/7 terrorist attacks, Losberger De Boer[131] finalised their MFP construction contract with the UK government. By sheer coincidence, the very next day, they were tasked with erecting the 'Resilience Mortuary' in the grounds of the British Military's Honourable Artillery Company (HAC)[133] to receive the 7/7 victims. It is not known why this was considered necessary for 56 corpses. The MFP wasn't set to be triggered unless more than 500 bodies required storage and local mortuaries had sufficient capacity.

The main purpose, and a legal requirement of a coroner's inquest, is to ascertain who the deceased were, where and when they died, and the causes of their deaths. Remarkably, Lady Justice Hallett ruled out any consideration of the way

A Dangerous Ideology

death was determined at the scenes. She decided it was 'outside of the scope' of the proceedings. That only 15 victims were pronounced 'life extinct' at the scenes, was left unchallenged. Despite it being apparent that at least 18, who died, survived for some time after the explosions.

Identification was also hindered by the fact that none of the 56 deceased people underwent internal post-mortems at the newly constructed Resilience Mortuary. This is normally a vital step in the forensic analysis of such attacks, and a standard method for establishing cause of death. The mapping of the injuries can assist investigators in locating the epicentre of the blast. Furthermore, the explosive used could possibly have been identified by examining the remains. Yet, in each and every case, this essential investigatory procedure was overlooked.

Instead, at great expense, Colonel Mahoney, defence professor of anaesthesia and critical care at the Royal Centre for Defence Medicine in Birmingham, had to construct medical 'models' of the deceased who initially survived the blasts. This unfathomable Ministry of Defence process threw up some stark anomalies.

To reconstruct the potential blast force of the bombs, Colonel Mahoney had to assume the explosive used was TNT. This was because the explosive supposedly used in the attacks was unknown to science. No one had any idea what kind of energetic forces it could exert, or even if it would reliably explode. Having made several attempts to blow it up, investigators were only successful on one occasion. So the alleged terrorists 100% detonation success rate was surprising, even extraordinary.

Furthermore, not only were there no autopsies, no X-rays were provided for Colonel Mahoney to model bone damage. Nor did he know where the victims were, within the carriages, when the bombs detonated. This strongly indicated that he hadn't seen any footage from the trains' internal CCTV. If footage showing the suicide bombers in the trains existed, why wasn't it shown to the team tasked with 'modelling' the injuries? Or the inquest for that matter.

At the inquest, pathologist Dr Awani Choudhary was asked

A Dangerous Ideology

to testify about his recollection of the Tavistock Square bombing, where he tried to save the life of Gladys Wundowa. Dr Choudhary stated he would need to see the autopsy results in order to confirm his own assessment of her injuries at the scene.

He was then informed that there were no internal post-mortems. Clearly shocked Dr Choudhary said:

“I’m absolutely sure that she had internal injury as well as a spinal injury, and I’m absolutely surprised that a post-mortem has not been done through and through.”

In reply, Andrew O'Connor, junior council to the inquests, said:

“Well, Mr Choudhary, that isn't a matter to concern you.....I was simply informing you so that we didn't chase any red herrings, but we don't need to concern ourselves about that matter.”

Post-mortem examinations aren't normally considered 'red herrings' at coroner's inquests.

In the unexplained, dumbfounding absence of this basic procedure, the police were forced to rely upon a combination of survivor accounts and other physical evidence. This led to total confusion.

The evidence relating to the underground bomb damage was baffling. Many of the survivors were asked to draw sketches of their recollections of seating positions and the damage caused to the carriages. From these statements and sketches, combined with physical evidence, the police produced CGI diagrams of the carriages and the bus at the inquest. These diagrams raised a number of issues.

Let's consider just a few.

Tanweer was said to be standing by the rear doors of the carriage with the rucksack on the floor, at his feet, before detonating his bomb at Liverpool Street. The police diagram showed the bomb placed in a standing area. Eyewitness

A Dangerous Ideology

Bruce Lait gave a press statement which partly confirmed the police account but also raised further questions:

“The policeman said ‘mind that hole, that’s where the bomb was’. The metal was pushed upwards as if the bomb was underneath the train. They seem to think the bomb was left in a bag, but I don’t remember anybody being where the bomb was, or any bag.”

Lait was called to give evidence to the inquest but wasn’t asked if he saw Tanweer or his bomb, which he didn’t.

Another survivor Michael Henning was called to confirm his alleged sighting of Tanweer. In the CCTV footage taken at Luton and Kings Cross, Tanweer was wearing dark tracksuits bottoms, a white sports top and a dark Jacket, apparently having changed his trousers. Henning described Tanweer as follows:

“An Asian man wearing some sort of white or cream light coloured clothing.”

Adding:

“I couldn’t say with great detail his features etc. It’s more those soft focus of the people you normally see on the tube and haven’t paid attention to.”

This didn’t in any way constitute a positive identification of Tanweer.

An off duty police woman, Elizabeth Kenworthy was in the next carriage. Following the blast, in one of the many acts of incredible bravery that day, she crawled into the devastation to try to save people’s lives. The sketch she drew showed a large hole in the floor in front of Tanweer’s suggested position but it also showed a second hole, in keeping with Bruce Lait’s account. She also stated the damaged metal around the hole was “*twisted upwards*,” suggesting a bomb beneath the carriage. As a trained police officer, her eyewitness testimony can perhaps be considered among the most reliable.

A Dangerous Ideology

The official account stated that each and every bomber removed their rucksacks and placed them on the floor. The injuries inflicted, predominantly to lower limbs, were consistent with detonations at ground level. The injuries were also consistent with bombs placed underneath the carriages, or possibly on the tracks. As was the damage to the carriages, which also indicated the use of more than just the four identified devices.

Ray Whitehurst, the driver of the Edgware Road train, was among the many witnesses who stated he experienced the carriage being 'lifted' into the air. Again suggesting possible bombs beneath rather than inside the carriages. He told the inquest:

"I felt the front of the carriage raise and it was as if I had hit a brick wall,"

In order to maximise the carnage, suicide bombers usually keep the explosives on their bodies and stand when they detonate. Had the 7/7 'terrorists' done so the explosions would have undoubtedly killed many more than they did. No account was offered to explain why all four mass murderers apparently took steps to minimise the death count. No manual trigger mechanisms were found, so the necessity for them to place their bombs on the floor wasn't established.

On the Piccadilly Line, it was claimed that Jermaine Lindsay's was 'unlikely' to have been seated. He was in a packed carriage of 127 commuters. Yet he too removed his rucksack and placed it on the floor of the carriage in the standing area between the second and third set of seats. Russell Square's Station Supervisor described another hole in the floor, and the roof, towards the rear of the carriage. Inconsistent with a single, ground level bomb.

Probably compounded by the lack of internal autopsies, the police said it was 'difficult' to determine where everyone was situated when the blasts occurred. Though the main police diagram showed the location of the bomb as described, no locations for the deceased were initially given.

A separate police diagram did give these locations and recorded Lindsay's body as being at the back of the carriage,

A Dangerous Ideology

some distance away from the bomb. This was corroborated by D.I Brunnsden who stated he found Lindsay, and a number of identifying documents, in the spot near the rear of the carriage. This seems odd given where the bomb was supposedly detonated.

If the official account is correct, Jermaine Lindsay got on to the crowded train, scattered his document on the floor, fought his way through the packed carriage, while wearing a large rucksack, placed his rucksack on the floor then blew himself up, killing 26 other people. This single blast caused multiple craters both in the floor and the roof of the carriage in at least two different locations, some distance apart.

Despite the carriage being packed solid, his body was somehow blown through the crowd of survivors to the rear of the carriage. Coincidentally it landed in the same place he had previously scattered his documents (consisting of his driving licence, passport, and a certificate of phone insurance with his name on it.)

Unfortunately, not a single surviving witness remembered seeing any of this.

Lindsay's body reportedly underwent pathology tests on the 10th of July. He wasn't declared dead at the scene, and his body wasn't listed among those recovered from the carriage. His home was subsequently raided on the 13th of July. Despite having already removed his body, the documents found close to the location of his corpse weren't discovered until 17th of July, ten days after the attacks and four days after the raid on his house.[109]

The evidence related to Edgware Road was also bizarre. The highly speculative official account given was that Mohammad Sidique Khan was 'most likely' near the standing area by the first set of double doors and was 'probably' seated with the bomb next to him on the floor. However, while the police drawing showed the bomb exploding by the first double doors, Khan is said to have been sitting a few feet away from it. Suggesting he left his rucksack and then sat down, or pushed it away from him, before detonation. This implied that Khan's bomb wasn't detonated manually.

Repudiating all official accounts.

If survivor eyewitness statements are in any way to be believed, the location of the bomb was not clearly defined either. Both Ray Whitehurst, and a passenger Danny Belsden, described seeing a hole near the front of the carriage. John McDonald testified he had fallen down another hole, further towards the rear of the carriage, as he moved forward to assist survivors. He also sketched ripped metal and another hole in the door near the standing area. These were not where the police diagram indicated the bomb to have been. Clearly this inferred the single device caused multiple craters, in different locations.

A noted witness was Professor John Tulloch, who was interviewed by the BBC. Like McDonald, Tulloch stated that he saw a hole further towards the centre of the carriage, away from the area indicated by the police. At the inquest Tulloch was presented with a diagram where 'x' marked the spot of the explosion. Tulloch questioned this location. In reply the examining barrister said:

“Professor, don't worry about the 'x', because we have heard evidence from some witnesses which suggests that there's other disruption and potentially other holes in the floor as well as the bomb crater.....”

Needless to say, this wasn't consistent with a single home-made device detonating in one rucksack. Most of the identified craters prohibited the possibility of Khan manually triggering the bomb. The only reason the police speculated where Khan may have sat, contrary to even their own location for bomb, was due to the statement of Danny Biddle.

Biddle claimed he saw Khan fiddling with his 'main' rucksack on his lap whereas, according to the police account, he only had a single rucksack and it was on the floor. Khan couldn't have reached it from where Biddle alleged he was seated.

Lawyers were also forced to rely upon Biddle's testimony because he was the only witness who claimed to have

identified Khan in the carriage. In fact, after seeing Khan on TV following a 5 month long coma, Biddle was the only witness, out of hundreds of survivors, to claim to have positively identified any of the bombers on any of the trains.

Further disparities emerged in regard to Hasib Hussain's alleged bombing of the No30 bus. The official account records him sat at the rear of the upper deck with the bomb between his feet, or in the isle next to him. Richard Jones was one of the named witness who claimed to have seen Hussain on the No30. As we have discussed, there were considerable problems with his account.

Hussain supposedly caught the No91 bus before changing onto the No30 at Euston. Two witnesses described a 'lost and anxious' man, broadly fitting Hussain's description, acting oddly on the No91 bus.

Apart from Jones the only other witness who placed Hussain on the No30 bus was Lisa French. Yet her description of Hussain didn't correspond to the description of the man on the No91 bus. French stated the man was acting courteously and removed his bag to avoid hitting her with it. The witnesses on the No91 bus said the man was barging into people with his bag. Exhibiting different behaviour.

Lisa French said the man walked past her and sat in the centre of the back row of seats. This is not where the police placed Hussain. They put him two rows forward in the aisle seat. However, another man, Prevshan Vijendran, whose bore some physical similarities to Hussain, was recorded by police as sitting in the seat mentioned by French. This led to the possibility the person French saw was Vijendran, not Hussain, but this wasn't questioned at the inquest.

Ultimately French didn't positively identify Hussain either. She described a man with a big backpack but later said it was a laptop bag, carried on one shoulder. What's more, in a later interview with the BBC, French, who had suffered with post-traumatic stress disorder following the attacks said:

"I don't really have any recollection of the blast myself because I was knocked unconscious so....um....my recollection of

*events really start when I regained
consciousness on the wreck of the bus.”*

None of the witnesses who the police listed as sitting closest to Hussain had any recollection of him at all.

Consequently, with confusing or notably absent testimony, analysis of the remains of the four alleged terrorists was crucial to establishing their presence at the scenes of the explosions. However, once again, the story surrounding the pathologist's examination raised questions.

The inquest heard the bodies of Tanweer and Khan were practically obliterated. All that was found was some tissue and pieces of vertebrae. These underwent DNA analysis to prove they were the bombers' remains.

Shehzad Tanweer was not listed among the seven people killed at Liverpool Street. DNA, extracted from the fragments of his body parts, was cross matched with swabs previously taken during his arrest for a minor public order offence in 2004. Khan was also reportedly blown to pieces, apparently leaving just tissue samples to enable identification via DNA analysis.

The terrible reality is that six people were pronounced 'life extinct' at Edgware Road. Dr. Costello (who was a consultant psychiatrist) was tasked with making this decision, and identified five bodies inside and one outside the carriage. Khan was not among them.

There was no evidence the bombs all detonated with perfect radial blast patterns. However, in the case of Tanweer, the man immediately to his left (Lee Baisden) sadly died. Mr Baisden lost his legs below the knee and suffered facial and neck burns.[105] The man immediately to Tanweer's right (William Walshe) was mercifully spared any life threatening injuries. Though burned, he managed to climb out of a window after the explosion and cut his leg in the process.

In Khan's case four people were said to be closer to the blast than he was. Sadly three died (Laura Webb, Jonathan Downey & Michael Brewster) but one (Catherine Al-Wafai) escaped serious physical injury, returning home on the day

of the explosion.[106]

No remnants of Tanweer were discovered until Saturday 9th July when a section of spinal column was found embedded in the back of a seat by Detective Constable Meneely. When asked why he thought this was significant DC Meneely stated:[107]

“Because all of the bodies I’d seen so far had no real upper body trauma to that degree. Obviously there was a lot of injuries, but everybody was relatively intact in relation to the upper body.”

This was consistent with bombs placed either at ground level or beneath the carriages. Though the possibility of them being under the carriages was never broached at the inquest. The lack of upper body trauma enabled 'life extinct' determinations to be made for all the deceased at both Edgware Road and Liverpool Street, apart from Khan and Tanweer.

Mohammad Sidiq Khan was formerly identified from tissue DNA analysis completed on the 20th July. Having already identified Khan from CCTV, and the documents he provided at three of the bomb sites, his DNA was matched with that of his father Tika Khan and mother Mamida Begum.

No evidence was presented to explain how, given the spread pattern of injuries, Khan and Tanweer were totally disintegrated. All that can be said, with any certainty, is that their bodies were not initially identified at the scenes of the explosions. Rather they were later identified through laboratory testing. This was presumably necessary because no identifying features such as fingers (prints), teeth (dental records) or facial features were found for either men.

However, the inquest testimony of forensic anthropologist Dr. Julie Anne Roberts contradicted the notion that no larger body parts were found. She stated that she had received a larger section of Tanweer's front torso and his lower jaw and forearms above the wrists. She said the parts of the body that were entirely missing were the cranial vault and facial bones, both wrists and hands, the breast bone and the

bottom half of the pelvis on both sides.

In regard to Khan she stated that parts that were completely missing were the upper and lower dentition, the left forearm, wrist and hand, the lower half of the pelvis on the right and the left sides, and those parts that were almost entirely missing were the right and left upper jaw, the right-hand, except for one hand bone, the left knee, the lower half of the right and left lower leg, and the left foot, apart from one toe. [108]

Dr. Roberts expressed an opinion that these injuries were consistent with the bodies being in close proximity to a bomb. The Blast trajectory appeared to be from the ground upwards. She also informed the court that she was not qualified in blast analysis. Nor did she play any part in identifying the the deceased. Their names had been given to her with each set of remains, following their earlier DNA identification. Dr. Roberts stated:

“....this was a chance to perhaps try to provide some physical evidence to support various interpretations”

Yet her testimony completely undermined that of DC Meneely and the determinations of 'life extinct' at the scenes.

The inquest revealed all the deceased, except three, died at the scenes. All were killed at the sites of the Edgware Road and Liverpool Street bombings. It was also known, according to DC Meneely (among others,) that the victims were *“relatively intact in relation to the upper body.”* Hence, his explanation of the additional significance he gave to the spinal section found in the seat.

So why did the police not find the discovery of all the upper body parts they gave to Dr. Roberts 'significant?' surely Tanweer's vertebrae were amongst the least significant of his remains, given that they had found his jaw, most of his front torso and forearms.

The same can be said for the discovery of most of Khan's left leg, his entire right leg above the shins, his upper pelvis, his right foot, his torso, his right arm and the upper half of his

A Dangerous Ideology

skull. Why wasn't this sufficient for his body to be determined as 'life extinct' at the scene?

The bodies of Hussain and Lindsay were also allegedly found at the scenes.[41] Dr. Roberts examined these remains having been told they were those of the bombers. She found that they were far more complete than those of Khan and Tanweer so why weren't they declared 'life extinct' at the scenes either? Unfortunately we will never know because Lady Justice Hallett had already ruled this “*outside the scope*” of the coroner's inquests.

In summary, there was no CCTV evidence placing the alleged terrorists on any of the trains or the bus.

There was no DNA or fingerprint evidence linking any of them to the bomb making containers or the bomb paraphernalia found in the Micra. Nor was there any evidence that the alleged home-made explosives were used in any of the bombings.

There was no evidence the bombs had a manual trigger mechanism (no evidence of suicide.) The locations of the bombs on the trains was extremely vague, with evidence of bomb damage inconsistent with single, home-made rucksack bombs. The locations of the alleged bombers was equally obscure, and inconsistent with manual detonation of the devices.

Only one witness positively identified one of the alleged bombers at one of the scenes, and there were considerable evidential problems with his testimony as it contradicted forensic and physical evidence.

None of the alleged bombers were declared dead at the scenes, despite significant remains being found which entirely contradicted the claim they were 'vaporised.'

In addition, there was evidence that suggested the possibility of a wider plot. Three independent witnesses, in three different locations described a larger group. CCTV footage showed the presence of another vehicle which possibly met with the bombers in Luton on two separate occasions, on two different days at two different times. The footage

A Dangerous Ideology

appeared to have twice been edited to hide this vehicle's movements. This wasn't even mentioned at the inquest.

There were a number of consistent reports, both in the UK and internationally, some at the highest level, that military explosive's residue was found at the site of every bombing. There was physical and witness evidence suggesting devices were possibly placed underneath the carriages.

It is difficult to understand why Lady Justice Hallett judged the evidence as being supportive of the official account. Equally confusing, is why she effectively found the four alleged bombers 'guilty.' Establishing guilt is not a function of a coroner's inquest, yet she did.

The coroner felt the evidence presented at the inquests gave rise to concerns that there was a risk of possible future harm, or further deaths occurring. Seeing as the alleged bombers were the only possible remaining inquest subjects, were supposedly working alone and were obviously dead, it wasn't really clear what further threat they posed.

Notwithstanding, under Rule 43 of the 1984 Coroners Rules, Lady Justice Hallett decided she was able to speak about their guilt. In her Rule 43 report she said:[24]

“For the purposes of this report I can say without a shadow of a doubt that the four men who detonated the bombs and therefore murdered the fifty two innocent people were Mohammad Sidique Khan, Shehzad Tanweer, Jermaine Lindsay and Hasib Hussain.....”

.....It is not generally a proper function of an inquest to attribute blame or apportion guilt to individuals, nor is it a proper function of a Coroner to express opinions in the verdicts returned.....I cannot consider the issue of preventability, one of the most important of the issues I have set, without stating in positive terms that they were the bombers.....the evidence is utterly overwhelming..... To argue or find to the

A Dangerous Ideology

contrary [i.e. that Khan, Tanweer, Hussein and Lindsay were not the bombers] would be irrational.....

.....Had there been a conspiracy falsely to implicate any of the four in the murder plot, as some have suggested, it would have been of such massive proportions as to be simply unthinkable in a democratic country..... Just to state the proposition is to reveal its absurdity.”

Perhaps Lady Justice Hallett was privy to information not revealed at the inquest because the “*utterly overwhelming*” evidence, proving the four alleged bomber's guilt, was otherwise completely absent.

Based upon evidence that was actually presented at the inquest, her findings appear to be little more than an unsubstantiated 'conspiracy theory.' Lady Hallett was yet another senior establishment figure keen to employ the 'conspiracy' label to fend off any criticism of the risible, incoherent concoction that is the state's 'official' account of the 7/7 bombings. One we are required to accept without question.

Is it reasonable to ask for a further examination of the state's tale? Is there any justification to call for a review of the evidence regarding the mass murder of 52 innocent people? The biggest single terrorist atrocity ever to strike Britain.

Or, as David Cameron claimed, is anyone who asks these questions really a non-violent extremist whose ideology of hate shouldn't be tolerated, requiring the strongest possible international response?

“Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.”

[Martin Luther King, Jr.]

Chapter 13

The Success of Failure.

As with mainstream media coverage of 9/11, exploration of 'what happened' on 7/7 was relatively brief.

The concept of the four suicide bombers was firmly established in the public's imagination within the first week or so of the attack. Rather than questioning official statements or undertaking too much unnecessary investigative journalism, on the whole, the MSM simply parroted whatever the authorities told them.

Rather like his U.S. counterpart, on the day of the attacks, then Prime Minister Tony Blair had the whole thing wrapped up straight away. He made the following statement:[65]

“We know these people act in the name of Islam but we also know the vast and overwhelming majority of Muslims here and abroad are decent and law-abiding people who abhor this act of terrorism,”

A Dangerous Ideology

According to the official narrative, none of the terrorists were known until the 12th, when they were first identified from the CCTV footage from Kings Cross. How Tony Blair knew the bombers were acting in the name of Islam on the 7th is anyone's guess. A supposedly al Qaeda affiliated group had initially claimed responsibility, but there was no evidence they were behind it.[77]

Blair appeared to be repeating an earlier statement he made at the G8 summit, which he subsequently credited to Muslim Council of Great Britain.[66] Blair simply reissued this later, and the media then printed his statement as if it were fact.

Similarly, speaking on the day of the atrocity, then Foreign Secretary Jack Straw said:

“There's an assumption that this is an al-Qaida-based organisation. It has the hallmarks of an al-Qaida-based organisation and also its ruthlessness.”

Coincidentally, prior to 7/7, the 'hallmarks' phrase first appeared in a fictional context. In May 2004 the BBC televised a 'what if' scenario in a program they called 'London Under Attack.' In a mock report BBC presenter Kirsty Lang quotes the UK Home Secretary as saying the attack *“bears all the hallmarks of Al-Qaeda.”* This was far from the only spooky premonition contained in 'London Under Attack.'

The phrase 'all the hallmarks of al Qaeda' really caught on with the MSM. It initially appeared on 7/7 following an 11:32 BBC Radio London report.

Security correspondent Frank Gardener had received intelligence from 'Arab sources' that al Qaeda were 'almost certainly' behind the blasts. By 11.39 the BBC were reporting it 'bore all the hallmarks of an al Qaeda attack.' This phrase was later repeated by Jack Straw.

The use of the term wasn't based upon intelligence assessments, evidence, surveillance analysis, communication intercepts or data retrieval, it was from a

A Dangerous Ideology

BBC journalists 'unnamed' source. Within hours, it had been used by Metropolitan Police Commissioner Sir Ian Blair, the BBC evening news, Sky News, CNN, Ch4, NBC, Fox News, The British Foreign Secretary and nearly every other commentator, political spokesperson and Western MSM outlet.

It became another unassailable fact in the minds of the public. Four suicide bombers carried out a terrorist attack which bore 'all the hallmarks of al Qaeda.' What else did anyone need to know?

The problem was that the 7/7 bombings were not in keeping with al Qaeda's previous attacks. Without a verifiable claim of responsibility, there was no discernible al Qaeda signature. It was suggested that the coordination of the attacks was unique to al Qaeda but multiple, simultaneous attacks had been used by a number of different terrorist groups in the past.

Initially, al Qaeda attacks tended to be upon military or commercial targets. For example, they had struck the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, the U.S.S Cole and the Pentagon. Even the Twin Towers were commercial targets.

After 9/11, attacks upon civilian, or so called 'soft targets,' increased. These included truck bombs, rocket attacks, mass shootings, assassinations and suicide bombs. They had also fought in numerous conflicts, ostensibly as a conventional military force. It was difficult to see any distinct 'hallmark.' 7/7 was not a 'typical al Qaeda attack.' Not least of all for the fact that it was in Britain. However, it was the kind of attack frequently carried out by Operation Gladio operatives.

While it is perfectly understandable that a journalist would report upon information received from his sources, this was simply adopted, without any critical thought, by the world's media in a matter of hours. There was no fact checking or further explorations of the evidence to support the statement. What's worse is that it was also used by officials upon whom the public have to rely for factual information.

This sound bite, repeated incessantly, effectively prepared

A Dangerous Ideology

those who didn't look far beyond the headlines to accept the subsequent state narrative. When it was released, it confirmed what they already 'knew.' Therefore, anyone who challenged it clearly didn't understand the basic facts and was either a loony 'conspiracy theorist' or politically motivated 'extremist.'

Once again, as with 9/11, the narrative given to the public was served up without any scrutiny by our co called 'free press.' It was then repeated 'ad nauseam' by the MSM, more or less on an hourly basis in the 24 hour television news cycle.

Other similarities with 9/11, beyond the awful carnage, were evident. Prior to 7/7 the authorities ran a number of exercises which closely mirrored aspects of the subsequent attacks. For example, Operation Osiris II, in September 2003, envisaged a chemical attack on the London underground. It allowed emergency services to train for the mass evacuation of casualties from the London tube network.[54]

Exercise Atlantic Blue was part of a large scale anti-terror exercise run in April 2005 called 'TOPOFF 3.' [58] The joint UK, U.S. and Canadian exercise was the largest anti-terror exercise since 9/11.

The scenarios practised included responding to simultaneous, multiple bombings on the London underground and buses, just three months before 7/7. It also, coincidentally, foresaw the attacks occurring during a major summit. As they did in reality, on 7/7, while the G8 gathering was underway in Scotland.

The UK government can issue news editors with something called a Defence and Security Media Advisory or DSMA notice.[59] Commonly referred to as 'D-Notices.' These are supposedly advisory only, and alert media editors of the need to withhold information for reasons of national security. It is possible that a D-Notice was issued in regard to Exercise Atlantic Blue as there was next to no MSM coverage of this massive, international exercise. The reports that did emerge notably came from U.S. rather than UK sources.[58]

A Dangerous Ideology

Operation Hanover was a series of regular Metropolitan Police response training exercises run by the Security Co-ordinator's office in the Anti-Terrorist Branch. Five days before the 7/7 attack they ran a two-day drill based upon three simultaneous bomb attacks on three London Underground sites (Waterloo, Embankment and St James's Park.)

The justice campaign group J7[55] highlighted the startling similarities between the drill and the real event which occurred within days of each other. Their submission to the 7/7 inquest,[56] based upon information then available in the public domain, now remains one of the few available records of Operation Hanover on the 1-2 July 2005.[57]

Chief Superintendent Peter Clarke, the head of Counter Terrorism Command at Scotland Yard, recounted his involvement in the Hanover exercise:[67]

"I spent the weekend before the London bombings of July 7 2005 with my colleagues in the anti-terrorism branch, working through our response to the most difficult scenario we could think of. The one we came up with was multiple simultaneous attacks on the Tube. Four days later, our musings became a dreadful reality."

On the morning of 7/7 a company called Visor Consultants[60] were running an emergency drill, commissioned by Reed Elsevier (RELX)[61]. These also corresponded closely to the attacks. Speaking to the BBC later that day, in an interview that shaped many subsequent 'conspiracy theories,' the Managing Director of Visor, Peter Power, said:

"...at half-past nine this morning we were actually running an exercise for, er, over, a company of over a thousand people in London based on simultaneous bombs going off precisely at the railway stations where it happened this morning. So I still have the hairs on the back of my neck standing upright!"

A Dangerous Ideology

Initially it appeared the probability of this happening, by pure coincidence, was so miniscule it was practically zero. This prompted many overeager conspiracists to suspect Power was complicit in the attacks. However, assuming previous exercises were intelligence based, closer examination makes the likelihood of Visor running an exercise, which matched some aspects of the real events, far greater than originally calculated.

Firstly, Power's own statement was a little misleading. His mock exercise didn't "*precisely*" match real events. The three bombings in his exercise did not include Edgware Road nor any bus bombing.

Contrary to the speculation of many conspiracists, the emergency plan he was running was entirely office based. The terrorist scenarios were desk top presentations, and the coordination of the emergency response was purely administrative. Power had absolutely no influence over the real crisis management operation underway during 7/7.

Power's description of the scenario he ran that morning appeared to be similar to one he had previously taken part in on national television. He was a panel member of a crisis management team in a May 2004 episode of Panorama (a long running BBC current affairs program). This was the 'London Under Attack' scenario previously mentioned.[62]

The BBC's mock terror event assumed three simultaneous explosions on the London underground with bombs detonating between 08:20 and 08:40 at Hyde Park, Oxford Circus and Vauxhall, with a fourth explosion of a Chlorine Gas Tanker in Shoreditch High Street at 10:10. A narrative that closely resembled the one offered by the state, just a year later.[63]

Power was invited to contribute due to his specialism in crisis management and role as a government advisor. Visor Consultants had also participated in Exercise Atlantic Blue and were contracted to the British Government as part of that training operation, among others.[64]

In the years between 9/11 and 7/7, the message from the British government about the possibility of an al Qaeda

A Dangerous Ideology

inspired attack were consistently that it was a matter of 'when' not 'if.' Numerous TV and newspaper reports speculated about when and where they would 'strike next.' The vulnerability of the London Tube network was discussed, most notably in the BBC's 'London Under Attack,' and numerous exercises were run anticipating such an event.

Power's Visor Consultants were involved in some of these preparedness exercises. Far from an astronomical improbability, the chances of him running a scenario similar to the real world event were higher than originally thought. The coincidence that it took place the same day is notable, but Operation Hanover, which Peter Clarke participated in, only preceded 7/7 by five days, so even the timing of Power's drill wasn't particularly suggestive of any complicity.

He seems to have been following, rather than setting the trend. Furthermore, no evidence has ever come to light which suggests that either Visor, or their client RELX, had any involvement in the London bombings or the emergency response.

Power's exercise appears to have been an enticing 'rabbit hole' many independent researchers, or 'conspiracy theorists,' fell down. Given his startling revelation on national television, on the day of the attacks, misdirection, and 'controlled opposition,' remains a possibility.

Taken collectively, when we look at the predictions of the various security services, independent analysts and the media, they do appear to have been incredibly accurate. Like those who ran training exercises which closely corresponded to the 9/11 attacks, they seem to have foretold 7/7 with great clarity.

We are often told about how many terrorist attacks the security services protect us from,[68] and are frequently reminded that we have the best security and intelligence services in the world.[69] So it is extremely unfortunate they couldn't detect an unfolding plot they had already anticipated, and extensively and repeatedly prepared for.

Initially the government and the security services were

adamant that all four alleged bombers were “*clean skins*.”[70] People of whom the security services had no knowledge whatsoever. This may have explained why the four's alleged preparations, to make the well-known plan a reality, went unnoticed.

The bereaved families and many others were keen to know what happened and if anything could have been done to prevent it. Many called for an independent public inquiry. When the Conservative opposition leader Michael Howard requested an inquiry in Parliament on the 10th, Downing Street, and reportedly Tony Blair himself, considered examining the evidence to be a “*ludicrous diversion*.”[71]

Government opposition to an inquiry was consistent. In December 2005 the Home Secretary Charles Clarke told the BBC the Government planned to produce a 'narrative of events' instead.[72] The next day Tony Blair told Parliament: [73]

“I do accept that people, of course, want to know exactly what happened and we will make sure that they do.....We will bring together all the evidence that we have and we will publish it so that people, the victims and others, can see exactly what happened.....But I really believe that at the present time, if we ended up having a full scale public inquiry when actually we do essentially know what happened on July 7, we would end up diverting a massive amount of police and security service time and I don't think it would be sensible.”

Although Tony Blair thought a legal inquiry into the mass murder of 52 people was a waste of time, many were deeply unhappy with his incomprehensible suggestion. They expected to see some investigation of the evidence, but were rather asked to simply accept whatever the government 'told' them.

Saba Mozakka, whose mother Behnaz died in the attacks, said it was '*unacceptable*' not to hold a public inquiry:

“The families will be campaigning for there to be a full public inquiry. A narrative of events will not satisfy anybody. This is not something we will go away on.”

The eventual 'narrative' came in the form of the 2006 'Report of the Official Account of the Bombings in London on July 7th 2005'. [17] It was a travesty.

It made it clear the investigation was ongoing and offered a “snapshot of where the 7 July investigation has reached.” It revealed very little new information, with much of its content already reported by the mainstream media. Supporting evidence was scant, and it was published anonymously. No government representative or official were apparently willing to put their name to it.

Wholly unconvinced, it was the continued investigation of independent researchers like 'the July 7th Truth Campaign'[55] which highlighted the problem with the train times. Though the Police claimed they had alerted the government, they certainly didn't alert the public. Despite the fact that this error had been highlighted prior to publication, it was still included in the report. The UK Government denied the mistake for more than a year until the Home Secretary's eventual admission and correction.

Ultimately the calls for an independent inquiry were unsuccessful. The British government repeatedly batted the requests away, claiming that an inquiry would, for some unfathomable reason, hamper efforts to protect people against future attacks and the prosecution of the 'war on terror.'

It was hard to see how trying to fully understand what happened on 7/7 could harm the cause of public protection. Surely it was a crucial step towards increasing, rather than reducing, the chances of detecting the next terrorist plot?

Many truth campaigners were already aware of the futility of a public inquiry in any event. The 2005 Inquiries Act rendered them a blunt instrument, incapable of questioning authority or discovering intelligence 'failures.' The July 7th Truth Campaign stated:[74]

“The July 7th Truth Campaign is the only grass-roots organisation to echo the sentiments of the Law Society of England & Wales, Amnesty International and Geraldine Finucane in calling on the judiciary to boycott any inquiry proposed under the terms of the Inquiries Act 2005. If the Inquiries Act 2005 is not fit for the purpose of investigating the killing of a Human Rights lawyer almost 20 years ago, it is most certainly not an acceptable piece of legislation under which to conduct an inquiry into the deaths of 56 people.”

British law requires that a coroner's inquest takes place whenever a sudden or unexplained death occurs. Whilst able to avoid an inquiry, it was difficult for the government to deny the inquests forever, though they tried. Once again, they were reluctant for the evidence to be examined in any formal court proceeding. Successive Home and Justice Secretaries made repeated attempts to withhold evidence from public scrutiny.

The Labour Justice Secretary Jack Straw continued efforts, previously introduced in the Counter Terrorism Bill, to establish 'secret inquests' via a clause inserted into the 2009 Coroners and Justice Bill. He proposed to allow ministers to bar the jury, the public, bereaved relatives and all media coverage from inquests in the interests of 'national security.'^[75]

Straw's legislative attempts failed initially, and he withdrew the clause. However, he then tabled an amendment back into the Coroners and Justice Bill which enabled inquests to be replaced by 'secret inquiries.' In many respects this amendment was worse than the removed clause. It passed the house by one vote after some aggressive whipping and government strong arm tactics.^[88]

The inquests were delayed because another case was considering some of the same evidence, which was therefore 'sub judice.' Three men Waheed Ali, Sadeer Saleem and Mohammed Shakil were accused of conspiring with the

alleged 7/7 bombers. They are the only people ever to have been prosecuted in connection with the states 7/7 'narrative.' After considering the evidence, the Kingston Crown Court jury found all three not guilty. However, Waheed Ali and Mohammed Shakil were found guilty of the lesser charge of having attended terrorist training camps.

Once the trial was concluded, the inquests could feasibly go ahead. Yet, largely due to the ongoing political wrangling and a mysterious injunction stopping the release of the evidence from the trial, it still didn't convene for another year.

It appears the inquest was stymied until the government could get their plans for 'secret inquests' in place. While such limited inquests were illegal, the government blocked all progress. As soon as the possibility of a more tightly controlled process became lawful, plans for the 7/7 inquest were set in motion.[89]

Lady Justice Hallett subsequently excluded the public and the media from the inquests, for reasons of 'national security.' She only allowed access via video link to the proceedings. This was switched off when 'secret evidence' was heard. She permitted the bereaved family members to attend, but decided that a jury would not be necessary. The summary of her decisions stated:[80]

“Sensitive intelligence material will be more effectively examined without a jury.”

Hallett also ruled that inquests into the deaths of the alleged bombers would not form part of the hearings. She offered any who wanted an inquest into the deaths of the suspected terrorists an opportunity to make representation for her consideration. However, then Lord Chancellor Jack Straw had already denied legal aid to the families of the bombers who did wish to question how their family members died. They appealed the decision twice and were eventually informed that no further appeal would be heard. Therefore, they couldn't 'make representation,' irrespective of Lady Hallett's offer.[81]

As we have discussed, the evidence supporting Lady Hallett's opinion, that the four men were guilty, was doubtful.

A Dangerous Ideology

However, she wasn't the first to categorically pronounce their guilt absent any reason. Having wholeheartedly accepted the government's narrative without question, the MSM had already informed the public the four were responsible long before the inquests began.

For example, the British broadsheet newspaper, and bastion of independent journalism, The Telegraph wrote:[82]

“Suicide bombers Khan, Hussain, Shehzad Tanweer, 22, and Jermaine Lindsay, 19, met at Luton station on the morning of July 7 2005. They took a train to King's Cross in London, then hugged and separated to carry out their deadly missions. Within three minutes of 8.50am, Tanweer detonated his bomb at Aldgate, Khan set his device off at Edgware Road and Lindsay blew himself up between King's Cross and Russell Square. Hussain detonated his device on board the number 30 bus at Tavistock Square at 9.47am. As well as killing themselves and 52 others, the bombers injured over 700 people.”

Similarly, the independent journalists at the aptly named broadsheet The Independent stated:[83]

“Suicide bombers Khan, Hussain, Shehzad Tanweer, 22, and Jermaine Lindsay, 19, met at Luton station on the morning of July 7 2005. They took a train to King's Cross in London, then hugged and separated to carry out their deadly missions. Within three minutes of 8.50am, Tanweer detonated his bomb at Aldgate, Khan set his device off at Edgware Road and Lindsay blew himself up between King's Cross and Russell Square. Hussain detonated his device on board the number 30 bus at Tavistock Square at 9.47am. As well as killing themselves and 52 others, the bombers injured over 700 people.”

And intrepid reporters at The Guardian added:[84]

“Suicide bombers Khan, Hussain, Shehzad Tanweer, 22, and Jermaine Lindsay, 19, met at Luton station on the morning of July 7 2005. They took a train to King's Cross in London, then hugged and separated to carry out their deadly missions. Within three minutes of 8.50am, Tanweer detonated his bomb at Aldgate, Khan set his device off at Edgware Road and Lindsay blew himself up between King's Cross and Russell Square. Hussain detonated his device on board the number 30 bus at Tavistock Square at 9.47am. As well as killing themselves and 52 others, the bombers injured over 700 people.”

Regardless of these copied and pasted news agency statements, masquerading as journalism, it was not proven, beyond reasonable doubt, that they were guilty.

7/7 remains an unsolved crime to this day. The concept of 'innocent until proven guilty,' which supposedly underpins the entire British legal system, was abandoned completely.

Without the possibility of a trial, some felt it didn't matter. Yet without objectively examining evidence, what chance did the survivors and relatives have of finding the truth? How would lessons be learned that could prevent further attacks?

The concept of investigating the 'failure' of the security services, rather than examining the attacks themselves, had emerged in the immediate aftermath of the murders. When the Leader of Her Majesties Opposition, Michael Howard, asked Tony Blair about establishing an inquiry, on the 10th of July 2005, he said:[71]

“The inquiry we have asked for is an inquiry into what happened, what went wrong.....Clearly in an ideal world we would have been able to prevent this dreadful attack and we were not able to do that.....It is not to say that was anybody's

A Dangerous Ideology

fault. We cannot achieve a guarantee of total immunity from these attacks in today's world."

Calls for an examination of intelligence and security 'failures' increased after 7/7. It soon became clear the British Government's claim that none of the alleged terrorist were known to the security services, was false.

'Operation Crevice' exposed a plot by members of the banned Islamist group Al Muhajiroun, led by the well-known radical cleric Omar Bakri Mohammad. Five men, including their ringleader Omar Khyam, were subsequently convicted of preparing a bomb made from ammonium nitrate fertiliser. They hadn't built a bomb, planned any attacks or specified any targets, and had only got as far as buying fertiliser (which the authorities swapped for an inert substance anyway.)

The men were eventually sentenced in April 2007 for planning terrorist activities.[79] Both Mohammad Sidique Khan and Shehzad Tanweer had been investigated as part of 'Operation Crevice.' The case revealed information which the MSM couldn't avoid.

Initial media reports suggested that Khan had contacted one of the main suspects during the surveillance operation.[78] This prompted endless MSM speculation about 'what had gone wrong.' That the only possible concern was the apparent failure to stop the attacks was consistently reiterated.

Certainly, given all the preparation the state had made for the eventuality, it seemed plausible they could have been 'stopped.' This reported concern about 'failings' led the government to appoint two special Intelligence & Security Committees (ISC's).

The first ISC report in 2006[85] concluded that Mohammad Sidique Khan and Shehzad Tanweer had appeared on a list of hundreds of surveillance subjects. They were considered to be peripheral to the main investigations and their full identities remained unconfirmed until after 7/7. Essentially, everyone was told they had slipped through the net. This

A Dangerous Ideology

was blamed squarely upon a lack of resources, leading to demands for increased funding of the security and intelligence services.

During the 'fertiliser bomb plot' trial it emerged that both Khan and Tanweer were placed under surveillance as part of Operation Crevice, at least a year before 7/7. This included tailing them for more than 200 miles, establishing their address and recording their phone calls. The claim in the 2006 ISC report, that they were barely on the security services radar, wasn't correct.[86]

This further provoked demands for a full independent inquiry. In response, a second ISC report was commissioned in 2009.[40] This one offered the public a timeline of MI5 and Police intelligence gathering. However, police and security service testimony at the inquests, a year later, thoroughly repudiated most of it.

The inquest revealed that MI5 knew far more than they had told either the 2006 or 2009 ISC panels. They also had information about the alleged bombers well in advance of the dates they had given the commissions.

Lady Justice Hallett made a statement about her intention to focus upon 'preventability' shortly before the inquests began: [90]

“The scope of the inquest into the 52 deaths will include the alleged intelligence failings and the immediate aftermath of the bombings.”

Not only were the inquests based upon a presumption of the alleged bombers' guilt, they would also only look at 'failings' of the security services.

The 2003 Stevens Inquiry Report[20] demonstrated that intelligence agencies had used the tactic of infiltration to manipulate terrorist groups and were even complicit in some attacks. A string of wrongful convictions of alleged terrorists in British courts, such as those of the 'Birmingham Six'[121] and the 'Guildford Four',[122] revealed how often the police and security services were willing to fabricate evidence. Yet

A Dangerous Ideology

exploring such possibilities were further avenues of inquiry 'ruled out' by Hallett. Objectivity was discarded from the outset.

It wasn't just the bereaved families and survivors who felt it was premature to discount a wider investigation into the activities of the security services.

The Stevenson Inquiry had confirmed the Security Services had, on occasion, used covert methods to commission terrorist acts. These techniques included the use of 'secret informants.' They are members of a terrorist group who are either compromised, then exploited in some way, or freely volunteer to provide information on the group's activities.

'Infiltrators' are agents who build trust with a group and then act as anything from informants to plot ringleaders. 'Assets' are usually well-placed individuals within a group who the security services have access to. They may or may not know they are being used. Finally, 'patsies' are individuals who are set up by the security services to take the blame for an act they either haven't committed or whose culpability has been greatly exaggerated.

These are not concepts found only in spy novels and the furtive imaginations of conspiracy theorists. There are numerous, proven examples of intelligence agencies, the world over, using informants, infiltrators, assets and patsies.

Nor is there any reason such tactics shouldn't be used. It seems prudent for intelligence and security services to use all means at their disposal to apprehend terrorists, uncover prosecutable evidence and foil plots to kill.

However, these techniques have evidently crossed the line from intelligence gathering and prevention to active participation on many occasions. It is legitimate to ask at what point the security services may act as terrorists or facilitators of terrorist attacks. "*To state the proposition*" does not "*reveal its absurdity.*"

Few suggest the security services could have been complicit in 7/7 and there is no proof they were. However, by denying

A Dangerous Ideology

any consideration of the possibility, nor was there any chance of uncovering evidence that could have potentially exposed such activity. Recent history, which indicated this was entirely feasible, was ignored without justification.

Sharing concerns about the actions of the security services, nineteen survivors requested the opportunity to cross-examine the intelligence agencies. Lady Justice Hallett denied their application. The inquests represented the last opportunity for the survivors and victim's families to get answers to their questions.

One of the survivors of the Edgware Road blast Jacqui Putnam, said:

“Our role now will be one of answering questions, which we will do, but our questions are not going to be answered. Once again, we have been shunted aside by officialdom.”

During the inquests, Lady Hallett considered some evidence from the security services in closed session. This evidence was withheld from all but the victim's families, who were themselves placed under gagging orders. In her summation Lady Hallett stated:

“Security Service and the police put before me material that was relevant to the issues, but which they reasonably believed could not be disclosed in an unredacted form without threatening national security.”

Ultimately this led her to conclude:

“The evidence I have heard does not justify the conclusion that any failings on the part of any organisation or individual caused or contributed to any of the deaths”

By the end of 2011, the British Government had successfully fought off all calls for an independent inquiry and had concluded an inquest with a largely predetermined outcome. The inquest didn't fulfil the legal requirements of a coroner's inquiry and the government had gone to great legislative

A Dangerous Ideology

lengths to severely restrict its scope. The UK state also presented a number of intelligence reports that were evidently false or inaccurate and denied legal aid to those who questioned their 'narrative.'

It seemed that every time evidence came to light, the official account was forced into another retraction or alteration. This gradual unravelling of the state's story was exemplified by the inquests which laid bare numerous problems with the evidence supposedly substantiating it. In reality, the evidence presented appeared to bring the whole story into considerable doubt.

Lady Justice Hallett's closing remarks about the absurdity of conspiracy theories were both historically inaccurate and irrational. It was the state's determination to maintain their own questionable conspiracy theory, and refusal to disclose information or investigate potential leads, that aroused and perpetuated public suspicion.

Chapter 14

Oops! Looks Like We Did It Again.

Mohammad Junaid Babar was a key witness in both the fertiliser bomb plot trial, built upon evidence uncovered during Operation Crevice, and the trial of the three alleged 7/7 accomplices who, despite Babar's testimony, were found innocent of any involvement in the London bombings.

From the age of two, Pakistan born Babar grew up in Queens, New York. He initially achieved notoriety, shortly after 9/11, by appearing in a number of interviews where he openly declared his plan to kill Americans. These interviews were syndicated globally by the MSM, ramping up fear of the threat presented by al Qaeda.

For instance, speaking to a Canadian news team, without the customary face covering usually worn by Islamist terrorists, he said:[110]

"I am willing to kill the American Soldiers if they enter into Afghanistan with their ground troops. I am willing to kill the Americans and, if the Americans use

A Dangerous Ideology

Pakistan soil as their bases, we will kill the Americans here in Pakistan too.”

Over the next few years, Babar apparently became a reasonably influential terrorist, though he was also something of a self-publicist, so some scepticism is warranted.

He allegedly met with senior members of al Qaeda, such as its third in command Abdul Hadi. He was a logistician and al Qaeda fundraiser, providing them with money, weaponry and equipment. He smuggled arms and facilitated the passage of U.S, Canadian and UK extremists to al Qaeda training camps in Pakistan. His motivation for doing all this was questionable. Babar's mother had been working in the World Trade Center on 9/11. She escaped and thankfully survived. So Babar's rabid fanaticism, for the terrorist group who had nearly killed his mum, was surprising.

Between 2001 and 2004, despite having been on global television networks making threats to kill and pledging his allegiance to the al Qaeda cause, Babar flew between the U.S, UK and Pakistan, without any problem at all. In 2004 he flew back to the U.S. and moved back in with his parents. More than a month after his return, the FBI picked him up for 'questioning' while he was walking down the street in Queens, New York.

There was no 'door kicking' raid, no terrorist last stand or dangerous hostage situation, no need for the bomb squad or indeed any guns at all. The FBI didn't even handcuff him. They simply asked him to accompany them. Nor did they throw him in a cell, or start water boarding him in the Guantánamo Bay detention centre. They instead took him to a Manhattan Hotel. A comfortable arrangement he would become accustomed to, throughout his 'imprisonment.'

Over the next few weeks, Babar not only signed a document, enabling the FBI to question him without the presence of a lawyer, but also gave them incredible detail about the al Qaeda networks he embedded himself within and the large number of terrorists he had trained. In fact, he built some of these networks and ran the training camps.

A Dangerous Ideology

Babar struck a deal with U.S. prosecutors and the FBI. The Western MSM eagerly promoted his life story, dubbing him 'the al Qaeda super grass.'^[111] Between 2004 and 2010 Babar frequently testified in courts in the U.S, UK and Canada, resulting in the conviction of 12 suspected terrorist.

U.S. district judge Victor Marrero commented:

"Mr Babar worked with the FBI and foreign governments to assist in investigations of terrorism organisations, including al Qaeda, and of terrorist activities such as the London bomb plot ... As a result of Mr Babar's co-operation, multiple defendants were arrested, prosecuted, and eventually sentenced not just in the United States but in England and Canada as well."

Facing a possible seventy-year sentence for his terrorist activities, in December 2010 a New York court gave Babar a 'time served' sentence, amounting to four and a half years, and released him. The court thanked him for his 'exceptional cooperation.' For most of his time in custody Babar had been jetting around the world as the security services 'star witness,' staying in hotels rather than prison cells. For the last two years of his sentence he was on bail, living freely in the U.S. The leading international terrorist spent very little time behind bars.

Documents from his trial confirmed that Mr Babar had been cooperating with the security services 'before his arrest' in 2004. They didn't indicate when this cooperation began but, given the other unusual facets of his life as a terrorist, it seems fairly clear that Babar was at least an informant, and probable agent, infiltrating al Qaeda for the U.S. intelligence agencies.^[112]

During the Operation Crevice trial (the fertilizer bomb plot) it became apparent the police and the intelligence agencies had invested a considerable amount of time and manpower in the surveillance of Shehzad Tanweer and Mohammad Sidique Khan. Claims that they were 'clean skins' were abject nonsense.

A Dangerous Ideology

Junaid Babar testified he had met with both Khyam and Khan during his frequent trips to the UK from Pakistan.

Khan and Tanweer had been photographed, captured on video and tailed. Numerous vehicle checks had been run on the cars the men travelled in, and their meetings were often bugged.

For example, Khan and Tanweer had been with a group of men who had met with the fertilizer plot ringleader Omar Khyam. After Khyam left, MI5 tailed the remaining group containing Khan and Tanweer. They followed them to Toddington Services on the M1 and captured high quality, colour photographs of the men, including clear images of both Khan and Tanweer.

At the same time, Junaid Babar was with the FBI in the U.S. In April 2004, more than a year before 7/7, one of the photos taken at Toddington, which clearly showed Khan and Tanweer, was sent by MI5 to the FBI for the attention of Babar. There was a strong possibility that Babar would have recognised Khan. He claimed to have trained both Khan and Khyam, among others.

In 2003 Khan allegedly flew out to a terrorist training camp in Malakand, North West Pakistan, which had been set up by Babar. Khan's training, at Barbar's camp, almost certainly including how to handle explosives.

Unfortunately, the perfectly distinct image, taken at the services, had apparently been photocopied and sent to the U.S. by an idiot. Tanweer looked like a grainy, amorphous blob and the only part of Khan that hadn't been cropped out of the image was his nose. Even his own mother couldn't have recognised him, so perhaps Babar can be forgiven for not doing so himself.[113]

When this was revealed at the inquests it prompted John Taylor, the father of one of the 7/7 victims to say:

“I think they could have made a better effort. They could have stuck it on a Jumbo Jet and got it there overnight if they really wanted to. They could have sent it over with a

A Dangerous Ideology

member of the security services or the Metropolitan Police.”

However, in light of the Stevens Report, was it possible the security services had another reason to literally keep Khan out of the picture? Khan was also recorded in conversation with the Omar Khyam in Khyam's car. The men discussed financial 'scams' and Khan's plans to go overseas to fight jihad. At one point Khan asked Khyam if he was a terrorist. Khyam said *“I'm not a terrorist but they're working through us.”* Khan then asked *“who are, there's no one higher than you?”*[114]

This appeared to indicate there was someone Khyam was taking orders from. It isn't known who this was but, during his subsequent trial, Khyam testified that he had trained in Pakistan training camps set up by the Pakistani ISI. Later he refused to give any further testimony. The judge in the Crevice trial warned Khyam that his silence could be interpreted as a refusal cooperate and could go against him in court. Khyam acknowledged this but added the ISI had threatened his family in Pakistan and he had no choice.

Khan, Tanweer and Khyam were also tailed to a meeting in Wellingborough in the East Midlands where again they were heard to discuss financial fraud. MI5 believed they were trying to raise money to fund their training and operations overseas. This placed Khan and Tanweer's alleged 'martyrdom videos' in a different light. It appeared they were eulogising about going to fight jihad overseas, not discussing a planned domestic terror attack.

MI5 also recorded that Khan and Tanweer had attended a meeting in Khyam's flat in Slough. When Operation Crevice came to an end, following the 2004 raids that led to the arrest the fertilizer bomb plotters, MI5 again ran another vehicle check on Khan's car.

The idea that MI5 had no knowledge of Khan or Tanweer, prior to the bombings, simply wasn't true. Far from being on the periphery of their investigation, it seems Mohammad Sidique Khan, at least, was of notable interest to them. Their claim that Khan hadn't been considered a priority appeared false. Yet this had been enough to convince the 2009

A Dangerous Ideology

Intelligence Security Committee that they could not have done more to foil 7/7.

Why Lady Justice Hallett maintained this opinion is mystifying. In addition to the evidence demonstrating the security services awareness of Khan and Tanweer, other information revealed at the inquest plainly suggested the intelligence agencies possible involvement in their recruitment and training.

Martin McDaid was described at the inquest as a former Marine who had converted to Islam in the 1990s, changing his name to Abdullah McDaid. According to Hugo Keith QC, he had been known to West Yorkshire Police and the security services since at least 1998, and was suspected of involvement in extremism. Though, as a former soldier of the elite Special Boat Service (SBS)[115] and a counter-terrorism operative, he was probably known to the security services throughout his professional career, long before 1998.[116]

McDaid had worked at an Islamist book store in Beeston, Leeds, called the Iqra Learning Centre. Mohammad Sidique Khan and Shehzad Tanweer were both volunteers at the shop.

Martin Gilbertson was an IT consultant employed by the Iqra Learning Centre to copy Islamists leaflets and videos. In his inquest testimony he said:[117]

“Martin 'Abdullah' McDaid did most of the talking, most of the ranting and raving; and as an ex-Marine, he knew about matters military.”

Gilbertson, who was previously caught lying in a couple of media interviews, was absolutely savaged at the inquests. However, he wasn't the only person who thought McDaid was actively inciting hatred and advocating Islamist extremism.

Mark Hargreaves, a youth worker, testified how it had been McDaid who had shown him 'hateful, deeply offensive' Islamist extremist pictures and videos. McDaid and another man, Max Gillespie, known as 'Abdul Rahman,' told

A Dangerous Ideology

Hargreaves they were distributing the Islamist propaganda. When asked, Hargreaves confirmed it was McDaid who was 'whipping up hatred.'

In January 2001, 8 months before 9/11, West Yorkshire Police's Special Branch launched a surveillance operation called Operation Warlock.[118] They surveilled a group of young Muslim men on an outward bound trip to Dalehead in the Dudden Valley, Cumbria. They did so at the request of the security services. The trip was one of many organised and led by McDaid.

It was alleged that this was a terrorist training camp. Mohammad Sidique Khan was photographed at the camp.

Again in 2003, during another joint MI5 & Special Branch surveillance operation, called Operation Honeysuckle, Special Branch recorded McDaid getting a lift with Khan. They ran a vehicle check and confirmed ownership, but supposedly didn't pass this information on to MI5. At the inquests they stated that they hadn't thought the lift was significant and didn't think it was relevant to the purpose of the investigation.

Operation Honeysuckle had involved teams of officers trailing McDaid around Yorkshire for two days. Why they thought his apparent meeting with Khan was insignificant wasn't clear. It also raised the question about the purpose of the operation. If it wasn't for gathering intelligence on McDaid or the people he met, what was it for? Neither the Police nor MI5 were willing to disclose this at the inquests.

West Yorkshire Police continued to investigate the Iqra Learning Centre and, in December 2003, they discovered the shop was jointly run by Abdullah McDaid and was a registered charity. The list of the charity's trustees included Mohammad Sidique Khan and Shehzad Tanweer.

In June 2004 MI5 sent an information request to the West Yorkshire Police and the Special Branch North Eastern Intelligence Cell requesting further details about Khan. The reply they received identified Khan, giving his personal details including previous addresses and a police caution he'd received as a teenager. Yet it completely omitted Khan's

appearance in Operation Honeysuckle.

In light of the inquests narrow remit, focusing upon 'preventability,' MI5 were asked why they had missed this vital information. Astonishingly they claimed this was because their database didn't work. This was another temporary problem, it later functioned perfectly.

The Iqra Learning Centre was considered to be a centre for the radicalisation of young Muslim men. Khan and Tanweer were among them, but one of the chief architects of the radicalisation appeared to have been McDaid. He had been under surveillance at least twice. His clear links to both Mohammad Sidique Khan and Shehzad Tanweer were never 'followed up' by the police or the security services. Supposedly due to a crap database, if you can believe that?

Following 7/7, the book shop was raided but McDaid, the former UK Special Forces soldier and apparent hate preacher, wasn't charged with any offence. He later told reporters that he was against violence and that Khan and Tanweer had left the Iqra book shop prior to his involvement. He also informed them that he had met with Jermain Lindsay at least twice.[119]

Operation Warlock and Honeysuckle, along with the list of the charity's trustees, meant he was lying about his relationship with Khan and Tanweer. McDaid has never been arrested or questioned about his involvement with at least three of the alleged 7/7 bombers, including the suggested ringleader. Having barely featured in the inquests, he has now disappeared and is thought to be living overseas.

The original focus of Operation Crevice wasn't upon the fertiliser bomb plotters. Its initial target had been Mohammad Quayum Khan, an alleged al Qaeda operative with direct links to Ossama bin Laden.

Codenamed 'Q' he was said to have been an al Qaeda recruiter who had sent many young British Muslims to training camps. According to the 2009 ISC report, in 2003 MI5 had recorded phone conversations between 'Q' and Mohammad Sidique Khan. It was alleged that it was 'Q' who had sent Khan to train with Babar in Pakistan.[40]

A Dangerous Ideology

The inquest revealed that 'Q's phone number had been noted as part of Operation Honeysuckle. Again this raised the question of why the Police supposedly neglected to tell MI5 any of this. Broken database notwithstanding.

'Q' was soon dropped from Operation Crevice as the focus shifted to Khyam and his co-conspirators. Despite being an alleged terrorist facilitator, with direct links to both Khan and Khyam, 'Q' does not appear to have been arrested or interviewed. He wasn't called to testify at the Crevice trial. Nor was there any subsequent exploration of his links with Khan. This led to speculation that 'Q' was actually an informant or asset of the security services.

Peter Clarke was the Deputy Assistant Commissioner of Special Operations (Counter Terrorism Command) at Scotland Yard. He was a key member of Operation Hanover, running simulations of terrorist attacks which closely mirrored the 7/7 bombings, just five days before they transpired. He led the subsequent 7/7 investigation.

In an interview with the BBC, Clarke was asked about 'Q's alleged relationship with the security services. The conversation left this possibility wide open:

Q: Who was or is 'Q'?

A: There are a lot of people connected to this investigation. Some of them I know their identities, some of them I don't.....um.....

Q: But you know who 'Q' is?

A: I know who 'Q' is but I am not going to discuss who he is or what he is or what he does during this interview.

Q: Why was 'Q' never arrested?

A: Decisions are made during the course of an investigation based upon the evidence that's available and..er..the decision of who should be arrested is based entirely..er..upon what evidence is available at the time.

A Dangerous Ideology

Q: Was 'Q' not arrested possibly because he was working for you or MI5?

A: ..mm..I..I'm not prepared to comment on..on any speculation like that.

There seems little doubt the alleged 7/7 bombers were involved in Islamist extremism to some extent. In particular, the evidence suggests Mohammad Sidique Khan and Shehzad Tanweer were planning to fight jihad abroad. Both appeared to have voluntarily attended al Qaeda and other Islamist training camps.

For many this will provide all the explanation they need to maintain their belief the four men were solely responsible for the murder of 52 innocent men and women. However, for many others, the evidence surrounding 7/7 appears to indicate a far more complex narrative than the one we have been given.

For the bereaved family members and survivors, there are far too many questions left unanswered. Having fought long and hard to find something approaching the truth, most have now been forced to accept their concerns may never be addressed.

Graham Foulkes, who lost his 22 year old son David at Edgware Road, is a prominent spokesperson for the 7/7 victims' families. He summed up their frustrations after the conclusion of the inquests:

In 2005 the Home secretary stated quite clearly that he'd been told by the intelligence community that the four bombers were previously unknown to them. They were 'clean skins.' They couldn't prevent the attack because it had come out of the blue. Now, since 2005, we know that's completely untrue.

We know that the intelligence community had been...had a full surveillance team in place shadowing or following or whatever they do.....Mohammad Sidique Khan for over

A Dangerous Ideology

two years. They had tape recordings of him being in contact with people who are now serving sentences for plan...for planning bomb attacks. They..they'd followed him to his home address. So they had a full surveillance team.

So the first question is why did they lie to the Home Secretary? What are the consequences of that because there don't seem to have been any? But also it's really...really upsetting for me, and all of us, to know that the intelligence community had such detailed information about Sidique Khan and his intent and yet they did naught. The key question for me is why didn't they act? Why didn't they prevent this?

As with most people, the only conceivable possibility, even for the families of the victims, is the security services 'failure' to act. Yet the connections between the alleged ringleader of 7/7, Mohammad Sidique Khan, and individuals who may well have been state operatives raised other questions.[120]

If Babar was a U.S. intelligence asset inside al Qaeda, what role did he have in the training and preparation of the alleged 7/7 terrorists? Why did the British security services send obscured, unidentifiable images of Khan and Tanweer for Babar's attention if they had perfectly clear photographs available?

Who was Martin 'Abdullah' McDaid and who did he work for? Is his story of the ex-Special Forces counter-terrorism soldier who converted to Islamist extremism even remotely plausible? What role did he play in the radicalisation and training of the alleged 7/7 bombers?

Was 'Q' working for British intelligence and what role did he have in the recruitment and training of the alleged 7/7 bombers? Why weren't his connections with the 7/7 bombers investigated thoroughly?

Given the evidence we have, has it been proven beyond

A Dangerous Ideology

reasonable doubt the four men were, in fact, the 7/7 bombers. Or is just as likely that they were expendable patsies? If not them, then who was responsible? Why was there so much evidence of possible military grade devices placed underneath the carriages? How and why was this discounted?

Why were the British government so reluctant to hold an independent inquiry and why did they go to such lengths to limit the scope of the inquests? Why didn't they just follow the existing, standard legal procedures?

In light of the evidence, is it reasonable to consider the possibility that 7/7 didn't represent a 'failure' of the security services to act but, whether intentional or not, was rather a consequence of their deliberate actions?

These questions do not arise as the result of irretrievable lunacy. They don't infer any blame or attempt to offer an alternative explanation. They spring from the very obvious holes in the evidence given thus far. The evidence does not appear to support the account we are all supposed to unhesitatingly accept.

Without meaningful responses to these questions, why should we believe the 'narrative' we've been given?

Terrorist events like 7/7 and 9/11 have shaped the nature of our society in recent years. Like it or not, they have provided the justification for the wholesale bombing of other countries, a dangerous escalation in international tensions, the killing of millions of people, and the introduction of draconian legislation designed to limit our freedoms.

Speaking in Parliament in 2007, Tony Blair rejected demands for an independent public inquiry into the 7/7 attacks. He said:[123]

“I have ruled out having another proper and independent inquiry. The fact is the ISC went into all of these issues in immense detail.”

The duplicity in his statement was breath taking. The Intelligence and Security Committees were entirely

A Dangerous Ideology

government appointed. There was nothing independent about them. There had been no *“proper and independent inquiry.”*

However, Blair was by no means finished with his witter:

“The reason why people want another inquiry - and I totally understand both the grief of the victims of 7/7 and their anxiety to have another inquiry - is because they want another inquiry to reach a different conclusion.”

Regardless of his continuing deceit concerning a previous inquiry, why would the surviving victims of 7/7 want one to reach any kind of predetermined conclusion? What they most wanted was an independent review of the evidence to find out what happened, not the creation of another government approved 'account.'

They also wanted this process to take place in reality, rather than exclusively in the imagination of Mr Blair.

As 7/7 survivor Rachel North put it:

“What we want is an independent person - properly independent of the government and security services - who can trawl through all the information available and make recommendations. That is not happening.”

Undeterred but such piffling concerns, Tony Blair then proceeded to raise significant questions about what the state really knew about 7/7, when they knew it, and why they were so worried about a proper examination of the evidence:
[124]

“If we end up now saying that the Intelligence and Security Committee was not an adequate inquiry, we have another inquiry, we will simply cause great anxiety and difficulty within the service.

We won't get any more truth, because the truth is there in the intelligence and Security

A Dangerous Ideology

Committee, but what we will do is undermine support for our security services and I am simply not prepared to do it.”

Posing the question, what was it the Prime Minister of Britain thought would be revealed by an independent inquiry that would “*undermine support for the security services?*”

Before we simply accept what we are told, shouldn't we at least try to ascertain if the 'facts' we are given are plausible? The only way we can do this is by examining the evidence.

If the state can simply refuse to provide any proof to back up its narratives by claiming 'national security;' if our media don't question the official statements, but simply repeat whatever they are told; if the stories the state provides don't stand up to scrutiny, and then it decrees we are going to war based upon 'secret intelligence' we aren't even allowed to know, then what is this thing we call democracy?

There is no such thing as a dangerous ideology. There are only dangerous actions. The ideas of the individual don't threaten social stability. It's our willingness to unquestioningly follow ideas, to be led by others, which fosters the necessary conditions for war and chaos. For evil to prosper, good men must be organised.

Freedom of speech and expression are our best protection against tyranny. Where the right to openly challenge ideas is protected, when debate is encouraged and critical thinking venerated, hateful or violent ideologies rarely flourish.

Most of us understand, no matter our differences, we each want what's best for our families and loved ones. We have no individual desire to harm others. Of course there are a few exceptions, but when we are free think rationally, to question the doctrines of hate or division, they seldom spread beyond the fringes of society.

A Dangerous Ideology

Those who want to elevate themselves to positions of authority are a miniscule minority. They always have been. Few of us desire power over other people. It is advisable to suspect the motives of those who do.

We are many and they are few. Yet human history is characterised by conflict and mass violence.

Tribes are capable of staggering cruelty. However, before one tribe attacks another, it must be convinced the enemy wants its destruction. Tribesmen and women must genuinely believe their children and loved ones are threatened before they will kill the children and loved ones of other tribes. The collective acceptance of an existential threat is always required.

The miniscule minority know this. Power over the rest of us is all they crave and they will do anything to acquire and maintain it. Not always because they want to cause harm but always because they believe they know best. If the world is to benefit from their exclusive grasp of the truth, they must have the authority to enforce their ideas upon the rest of us.

We are in danger of self-inflicted annihilation, not because we widely accept 'dangerous ideologies' but because we have allowed the miniscule minority to persuade us to act in defence of their power.

For us to be willing to do as they command, we must first be fearful. As long as we accept the threat, we will band together to protect 'our way of life.' To defend the authority of our chosen leaders.

Our rulers understand, if the threat doesn't exist, it must be created. This is their primary control mechanism. It gives birth to the divisions they need to secure their authority. Only when we are scared of each other will we seek their protection and allow ourselves to be governed.

Throughout history there have been many individuals who have recognised this confidence trick. Some have tried to alert us to the danger, not through violence or coercion, but by asking uncomfortable questions, challenging orthodoxy

A Dangerous Ideology

and exposing lies.

The miniscule minority's rule is precarious. Should we ever stop being afraid, and realise we don't need their protection, their power will crumble. We don't need to rise up and seize it from them because, in reality, it's just an idea.

All they have is our faith in their authority. The illusion of their power will evaporate in a generation if we simply ignore it.

That's why the miniscule minority invest so much of their power ensuring we never figure this out. Whenever they identify dissenters, their first priority is to convince the rest of us these malcontents should be feared. It is a matter of survival for them, not us. So vital is it for them to crush any who question their legitimacy they will marshal all the power we give them, simply to silence a lone voice.

The only 'ideology' that power fears is rationality. The only 'ideology' we should fear is conformity.

“We are not afraid to entrust the American people with unpleasant facts, foreign ideas, alien philosophies, and competitive values. For a nation that is afraid to let its people judge the truth and falsehood in an open market is a nation that is afraid of its people.”

[John. F. Kennedy]

Sources:

- [1]:<http://www.apfn.org/APFN/tolerate.htm>
- [2]:<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-at-the-un-general-assembly-2014>
- [3]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ronald_Dworkin
- [4]:<http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b03c7m8s>
- [5]:<https://bbcpanoramasavingsyriaschildren.files.wordpress.com/2017/06/1570611.pdf>
- [6]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6qciaJ2v9Rk>
- [7]:<https://off-guardian.org/2015/09/22/in-the-age-of-media-manipulation-how-much-can-we-afford-to-take-on-trust/>
- [8]:<https://bbcpanoramasavingsyriaschildren.wordpress.com/>
- [9]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/False_flag
- [10]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mukden_Incident
- [11]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gleiwitz_incident
- [12]:http://cisac.fsISStanford.edu/publications/the_lavon_affair_how_a_falseflag_operation_led_to_war_and_the_israeli_bomb
- [13]:<https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu//news/20010430/northwods.pdf>
- [14]:<http://www.historycommons.org/context.jsp?item=a092299ryazanbomb#a092299ryazanbomb>
- [15]:<http://crisiscast.com/clients/>
- [16]:<https://bbcpanoramasavingsyriaschildren.wordpress.com/#plausibility>
- [17]:<https://fas.org/irp/world/uk/7-july-report.pdf>
- [18]:http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120216072447/http://7julyinquests.independent.gov.uk/hearing_tra

A Dangerous Ideology

[nscripts/06052011am.htm](https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/13/july7.uksecurity15)

[19]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/13/july7.uksecurity15>

[20]:<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/apr/18/uk.northernireland1>

[21]:<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2006/sep/10/uk.northernireland1>

[22]:http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/12/content_s

[23]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1557106/Weve-never-seen-a-bomb-like-217-devices.html>

[24]:https://wikispooks.com/w/images/1/19/7-7_Inquest_Report.pdf

[25]:<https://www.amnesty.org.uk/press-releases/uk-amnesty-launches-appeal-calling-judges-boycott-sham-inquiries>

[26]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2009/apr/29/july-7-london-bomb-trial>

[27]:<http://77inquests.blogspot.co.uk/2010/11/77-inquests-danny-biddle-rucksack-on.html>

[28]:<http://j7truth.blogspot.co.uk/2010/11/j7-77-inquest-blog-dont-mention-fifth.html>

[29]:<https://deeppoliticsforum.com/forums/showthread.php?4860-7-7-Inquest-shows-official-narrative-falling-apart-at-seams#.WlzztnnLjAU>

[30]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peregrine_Worsthorne

[31]:<https://www.theguardian.com/theobserver/2008/jan/20/features.magazine77>

[32]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2010/oct/13/7-7-bombers-celebrating-sports>

[33]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gn3Vj5BjteY>

- [34]:<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-12340228>
- [35]:<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/explosive-used-in-bombs-was-of-military-origin-498495.html>
- [36]:<http://www.irishexaminer.com/archives/2005/0714/ireland/explosives-used-in-london-bombings-originated-in-the-balkans-664838892.html>
- [37]:<http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/05/front2453563.0402777777.html>
- [38]:<https://www.upi.com/London-explosives-have-military-origin/22931121255608/> | <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/hunt-for-the-master-of-explosives-ggjsnlsvn9w>
- [39]:<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/17/world/bombings-in-london-intelligence-politics-intrudes-in-bombing-inquiry.html>
- [40]:<https://fas.org/irp/world/uk/july7review.pdf>
- [41]:<https://77inquests.blogspot.co.uk/2010/12/jermaine-lindsay-circuit-board-and.html>
- [42]:<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1352560/7-7-inquest-Inside-terrorists-flat-room-filled-explosives.html>
- [43]:http://www.investigatingtheterror.com/articles/7_7_Co_nspiracy_Theories_and_Connecting_the_Dots.htm
- [44]:<https://www.usni.org/magazines/navalhistory/2008-02/truth-about-tonkin>
- [45]:<https://www.history.com/topics/vietnam-war/operation-rolling-thunder>
- [46]:<http://www.globalresearch.ca/an-ominous-non-event-the-gulf-of-tonkin-and-the-strait-of-hormuz/7760>
- [47]:[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/USS_Maddox_\(DD-731\)#Gulf_of_Tonkin_Incident](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/USS_Maddox_(DD-731)#Gulf_of_Tonkin_Incident)
- [48]:<https://fas.org/irp/nsa/spartans/index.html>
- [49]:<https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu//NSAEBB/NSAEBB132/re>

A Dangerous Ideology

[lea00012.pdf](#)

[50]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_34A

[51]:<http://www.julyseventh.co.uk/7-7-cctv-evidence.html>

[52]:<http://www.julyseventh.co.uk/july-7-luton-kings-cross-train-times.html>

[53]:http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/5170708.stm

[54]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/3086116.stm>

[55]:<http://julyseventh.co.uk/index.html>

[56]:<http://www.julyseventh.co.uk/J7-Inquest-Submission/05.Explosions Immediate Aftermath.pdf>

[57]:<http://terroronthetube.co.uk/latest-77-articles-3/77-practice-makes-perfect/comment-page-1/>

[58]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/10/july7.uksecurity2>

[59]:<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DSMA-Notice>

[60]:<http://visorconsultants.com/>

[61]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RELX_Group

[62]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PXlfnhhrJEs>

[63]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/panorama/3686201.stm>

[64]:<https://www.globalresearch.ca/7-7-mock-terror-drill-what-relationship-to-the-real-time-terror-attacks/821>

[65]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/08/terrorism.july74>

[66]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4659953.stm>

[67]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/terrorism-in-the-uk/11719684/77-anniversary-Why-we-can-never-stop-tackling-extremism.html>

[68]:<https://www.thesun.co.uk/archives/politics/544188/may-40-uk-terror-plots-foiled-since-77-bombs/>

[69]:<https://www.standard.co.uk/comment/letters/es-views-more-armed-police-would-help-foil-such-awful-attacks-a3497771.html>

[70]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/20/religion.july7>

[71]:<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2005/jul/12/terrorism.immigrationpolicy>

[72]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4526604.stm>

[73]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/dec/14/politics.july7>

[74]:<http://julyseventh.co.uk/pdf/j7.flyer-v3.0.pdf>

[75]:<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2009/may/15/jack-straw-drops-secret-inquests>

[76]:<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1332073/7-7-inquests-MI5-loses-fight-evidence-secret.html>

[77]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4663931.stm>

[78]:<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/the-reconstruction-77-what-really-happened-299674.html>

[79]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/6153884.stm>

[80]:<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120216081134/http://7julyinquests.independent.gov.uk/docs/orders/dec-sum-april-2010.pdf>

[81]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/crime/7620935/Legal-aid-refused-for-77-bombers-requests.html>

[82]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/crime/7620935/Legal-aid-refused-for-77-bombers-requests.html>

[83]:<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/77-bombers-widow-loses-legal-aid-bid-2063853.html>

[84]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2010/apr/22/7july->

A Dangerous Ideology

[bombers-inquests-legal-aid-refused](#)

[85]:http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/11_05_06_isc_london_attacks_report.pdf

[86]:<https://www.globalresearch.ca/british-terror-trial-raises-question-of-what-mi5-knew-about-2005-london-bombings/5601>

[87]:https://b1cba9b3-a-5e6631fd-sites.googlegroups.com/a/independent.gov.uk/isc/files/20090519_ISC_7-7_Review.pdf?

[88]:<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/henryporter/2009/oct/21/secret-inquest-inquiry-coroner's>

[89]:<http://j7truth.blogspot.co.uk/2010/01/they-lie-to-you-jack-straw-and-public.html>

[90]:<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1280162/Inquests-7-7-bombings-scrutinise-failings-MI5-run-attacks.html>

[91]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/08/terrorism.july74>

[92]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/10/july7.uksecurity1>

[93]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4659331.stm>

[94]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/5032756.stm>

[95]:<http://www.julyseventh.co.uk/7-7-profile-mohammad-Sidique-khan.html>

[96]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1895690/July-7-bombers-left-clues-to-martyrdom.html>

[97]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sKP7svXoFOo>

[98]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gjuyFUT045Q>

[99]:<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/aldgate-east-smoke-poured-into-the-carriage-but-we-couldnt-break-the-windows-5346395.html>

[100]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2006/mar/07/religion.july7>

[101]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/jul/09/july7.uksecurity1>

[102]:<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/77-bombings-anniversary-london-live-met-police-officer-recalls-the-horrific-scene-after-the-edgware-10369935.html>

[103]:http://3.bp.blogspot.com/_SZkmUWT-tH4/TNcLtMA1THI/AAAAAAAAAFs/etARYwolyE0/s1600/j7aldgate_carriage-2_probable-passenger-positions-prior.png

[104]:http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/4383162.stm

[105]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/terrorism-in-the-uk/8060221/77-inquest-52-families-hear-how-their-loved-ones-died.html>

[106]:<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-11726358>

[107]:<https://77inquests.blogspot.co.uk/2010/11/77-inquests-disintegration-of-shehzad.html>

[108]:http://julyseventh.co.uk/j7-inquest-transcripts/2011-01-31-2011-02-04-week-15/7_july_inquests_2011-02-01_pm-session.pdf

[109]:<http://77inquests.blogspot.co.uk/2010/12/jermaine-lindsay-circuit-board-and.html>

[110]:<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/july-7-bombers-tied-to-al-Qaeda/>

[111]:<https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/feb/14/al-qaida-supergrass-77-questions>

[112]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/terrorism-in-the-uk/8322346/Terrorist-who-trained-77-bomber-released-after-five-years.html>

[113]:<https://web.archive.org/web/20150824191636/https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/feb/21/mi5-cropped-7-7-bombings>

A Dangerous Ideology

- [114]:<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/6611803.stm>
- [115]:https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Martin_McDaid
- [116]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/terrorism-in-the-uk/8497204/77-inquest-Mohammad-Sidique-Khan-on-MI5s-radar-before-911.html>
- [117]:<https://77inquests.blogspot.co.uk/2011/02/mcdaid-who.html>
- [118]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/terrorism-in-the-uk/8345627/MI5-had-no-realistic-prospect-of-uncovering-77-plot.html>
- [119]:<https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/exclusive-bombers-and-the-special-forces-soldier-550920>
- [120]:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Znho6ry3BVw>
<http://www.investigatingtheterror.com/documents/files/7-7%20linkchart%20version%201.5.pdf>
- [121]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birmingham_Six
- [122]:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Guildford_Four_and_Ma_guire_Seven#Aftermath
- [123]:<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2007/may/03/uk.terrorism>
- [124]:https://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/may2007/020507_b_failures.htm
- [125]:<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/easter-2017-theresa-mays-message>
- [126]:<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/06/06/theresa-may-will-not-let-human-rights-act-stop-bringing-new/>
- [127]:<https://www.ibtimes.co.uk/turkey-youtube-ban-full-transcript-leaked-syria-war-conversation-between-erdogan-officials-1442161>
- [128]:https://web.archive.org/web/20051026015807/http://www.janes.com/security/law_enforcement/news/jtic/jtic050722_1_n.shtml

[129]:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in_pictures/4722775.stm

[130]: <http://77inquests.blogspot.com/2012/02/luton-station-car-park-recovering-truth.html>

[131]: <https://www.deboer.com/en-uk/about-us>

[132]: <https://web.archive.org/web/20061207000052/http://www2.army.mod.uk/hac/index.html>

Recommended Reading:

1. Terror on the Tube – by Nick Kollerstrom
2. Secrets, Spies and 7/7 – Tom Secker
3. London Bombings: an Independent Inquiry – Nafeez Ahmed

Recommended Viewing:

1. 7/7: Seeds of Deconstruction – by Tom Secker
2. 7/7: Crime and Prejudice - by Tom Secker
3. 7/7 What Did They Know – by Keelan Balderson

Authors Additional Note

Thank you so much for taking the time to read '*A Dangerous Ideology*.'

What did you make of it then?

Did it interest you, was there anything within it that prompted questions for you? Did you discover anything interesting, or was it simply another conspiracy rant?

Did you enjoy the writing style, or was it verbose? Did I make my points effectively or just ramble on a bit?

Whatever you made of it, I would really welcome your comments.

Please be honest, I need to learn how to be a better writer and your feedback, good or bad, will be most welcome.

I also need reviews to promote the book, so any comment or shares you care to make would be appreciated.

If you could possibly write and post a review that would be fantastic.

If you thought it good enough why not buy a physical copy or support my work through my website.

Many thanks

Iain

<https://in-this-together.com>