

September 11: The Highest Stage of Zionism

Presented at the 911 Vancouver Hearings,

Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

June 17, 2012

BY GREG FELTON

Over the course of five years, I wrote a detailed, scholarly work called *The Host and the Parasite*, in which I argue, among other things, that Sept. 11 was not an event that came out of the blue, but rather a means to an end that had been many years in the planning. One of the biggest mistakes people make when they talk about Sept. 11 is they start from there and look forward. It's as if on that day a cabal of eight or nine fascistic, anti-government rebels took over the government, controlled it, forced people to watch an event, interpreted it for them and turned America into a police state. That is only partially true.

You see, the people who did this, the Project for the New American Century, which has been cited by numerous people here, didn't come out of the blue. I mean, going back to around 1998 or so we see the first PNAC documents. But a republic like the United States, imperfect though it may be, it just doesn't commit suicide overnight. People like Richard Perle, Paul Wolfowitz, Douglas Feith, James Woolsey... all these people had to come from somewhere. So, it's my view that we need to take a longer historical perspective. We need to look at the last—oh, say—30 years of American history as the beginning of the end of the Republic.

It is my contention that Sept. 11 was designed solely for the purpose of passing the USA PATRIOT Act, which turned the United States into a police state and essentially eviscerated the *Constitution*. Now, I have a hard time believing that Americans would do this willingly to their own country; in fact, they didn't.

I argue that since 1980, with the rise of Ronald Reagan and the politics of "enlightened stupidity," we have essentially a descent into fascism, and it's with Ronald Reagan's presidency that we have the rise of Israeli influence within the United States.

In my book I cite six stages of the zionization of America. The first was Harry Truman in 1948 when he took a \$2 million bribe from the Israel lobby to accept Israel as a state. He's admitted this. The next stage was Lyndon Johnson, who in 1967 threw his weight behind Israel. Up until '67, Israel was a nonentity in the American sphere, a secondary afterthought at best. But '67 showed Israel to be a power in its own right, and it could be a useful ally in the Cold War. We'll talk a bit about that later.

THE VANCOUVER HEARINGS

The next stage happened with Jimmy Carter, who was a Baptist Christian. Ironically, I consider Carter to be the last president of the republic. You see, he was the last president elected by the American public. Every president since then has been put into power by a cabal of interest groups—Zionist Christians, Zionist Jews, and the combined forces in PNAC.

After Jimmy Carter we come to Ronald Reagan, whom I call the “headless horseman”—not too bright. Under his rule, Israelis and pro-Israel sympathizers, Jewish or not, managed to infiltrate many levels of American government to the point that by the end of the 1980s the American government, was almost thoroughly under the influence of pro-Israel thought. During the 1980s, we also saw a change in American policy from a pro-oil policy in the Middle East to one of abject subservience toward Israel’s growing occupation of Palestine.

From there, we go through to Bill Clinton, who was so compromised by the Israel Lobby that he agreed to give Israel its financial aid before he was sworn in. He was the U.S.’s first thoroughly Jewish president, in my view.

After Clinton, we come to George W. Bush, who was essentially...uh, well, we won’t talk about Bush just yet. I want to get back to why the events of Sept. 11 happened. And I do not believe that you can look at this rationally and come up with a rational answer.

If we assume the United States is a dominant player in the Israeli relationship, then what possible reason could the United States have for bombing itself?

Well, we’ve heard theories about global dominance and expanding the American empire, but you know—the American empire was pretty good already. America didn’t need to bomb anybody. It could pretty well get oil whenever it wanted. It dealt with people of dubious character. It dealt with the Shah of Iran, Suharto, Pinochet... Saddam Hussein was yes, a dictator, a tyrant, but he was no worse than anybody else. So I have to wonder why the Americans would do this.

And the answer we mostly come up with is oil. Well, America didn’t really need much in the way of oil from Iraq. In fact, going back to 1980 oil imports from Iraq were negligible. If you look at total oil imports at the time, they were something on the order of 7 million barrels a day annual consumption—from a low of 7.16 in 1990 to 11.24 million in 2003. Annual imports from Iraq were on the order of 3,000 barrels per day, 12,000, 441,000, 514,000 and that was the highest, in 1980. Then for five years there was nothing!¹

Now Iraq has some of the best oil in the world, some of the lowest sulfur content, which means it’s sweet oil, especially up around Kirkuk. So why does America not buy oil from Iraq?

1. Table 3.3a, Energy Information Administration/Monthly Energy Review, February 2004, www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/mer/pdf/pages/sec3_8.pdf; www.bts.gov/publications/national_transportation_statistics/html/table_04_01.html

I mean going back to the early '80s, we know that Saddam Hussein was a useful ally of the United States. There's that famous picture of Rummy, shaking his hand, and not caring about any alleged chemical weapons. The United States wanted to make use of Saddam Hussein.

Let's face it— he was not particularly smart, and he allowed himself to be goaded into attacking Iran. As you know, with the Shah's deposition, the U.S. cut off spare parts to the military of the new religious-based government, and the Americans thought "you know those guys can't get any spare parts—let's attack them while they're weak!"

Well, the Iraqis did okay for a while, then the counter attacks started and we had eight, nine years of almost static war, and throughout all of this Saddam Hussein was a friend of the United States. Well, "friend" is kind of a dubious word; America has no real friends just as Israel has no real allies. It has client states, sycophants and enemies.

At any rate, we come to 1990, and Desert Shield. For some reason the United States decides to send in troops to Saudi Arabia. And then it goes into Desert Storm in January 1991, and America bombs the hell out of Iraq. After that, Iraq becomes *persona non grata* in the world community and in the eyes of the United States. And yet Iraq has done nothing except what America wanted it to do. And what do you suppose happened on Sept. 11, 2001, at 2:40 in the afternoon?

Well, Donald Rumsfeld put a very important note in his notebook that got discussed on Tim Russert's *Meet the Press*. As a matter of fact, it's so important that when Russert brought it to Rumsfeld's attention, he put it up on the screen behind him, so Rumsfeld couldn't exactly deny it. The page from his notebook at 2:40 p.m. on Sept. 11, 2001, reads:

best info fast. Judge whether good enough hit S[addam].H[ussein]. at same time. Not only U[sama]B[in]L[aden].... Go massive. Sweep it all up. Things related and not.²

If I saw the World Trade Centers fall, the first thing that would cross my mind is "Let's not *blame* somebody; let's find out who *did* it." Why was Iraq already planted in Rumsfeld's mind? Iraq posed no threat to the United States, and Iraq didn't have the expertise to conduct an operation of that, well, ineptitude.

The answer comes, ironically, from a man named Phillip Zelikow, who you just saw described up here as the author of the *pre-9/11 Commission Report* report. What he said was:

2. Tim Russert interview with Donald Rumsfeld, *Meet the Press*, NBC, March 23, 2003; *Plans For Iraq Attack Began On 9/11*, CBS, September 5, 2002. Rumsfeld lied again On January 19 when he told a reporter that there was no way to know if force would have to be used. ("Media stakeout at Fox News" www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2003/t01212003_t019sdstakeoutfox.html).

THE VANCOUVER HEARINGS

Why would Iraq attack America or use nuclear weapons against us? I'll tell you what I think the real threat (is), and actually has been since 1990—it's the threat against Israel. And this is the threat that dare not speak its name because the Europeans don't care deeply about that threat, I will tell you frankly. And the American government doesn't want to lean too hard on it rhetorically because it is not a popular sell.³

Now, that is truly an amazing statement, because Zelikow is one of the bad guys. But I'll tell you something—sometimes bad guys have a very interesting habit of speaking candidly. They think they're above the law, and can get away with anything. They don't think they'll ever be held accountable for what they say. When Ariel Sharon said, “we Jews control America”, which he said in Hebrew on Israeli radio, his cabinet said to him, “Don't say that in public! It's a terrible PR disaster!” But he said it. Some of the best evidence we have comes from the Zionists, because they say the stupidest things, or the smartest things when they're being stupid.⁴

Now we come to why Iraq was planned to be the fall guy for Sept. 11. After the attack, Richard Clarke was having a chat with Rumsfeld, and Rumsfeld told him “Look why do we have to attack Afghanistan? There's nothing there, no targets.”⁵

I mean, Rumsfeld did not want to attack Afghanistan after Sept. 11. He had no reason to. So Clarke was saying, “Well, there's got to be some targets worth fighting, bombing.” And Rumsfeld said, “No, find something about Iraq.”

Very, very strange.

Well, anyway, in April 2003 the Luntz Research Company, a media communication organization run by the staunchly pro Israel Frank Luntz, wrote a report on media communication for the philanthropic Wexner Foundation called *Israeli Communications Priorities 2003*. It's a 17-page report and has 11 recommendations about what pro-Israel people can do to help Israel's cause in the United States.⁶ Now I'm going to just read a short paragraph from it.

This document is about language. So let me be blunt. “Saddam Hussein” are the two words that tie Israel to America and are most likely to deliver support in Congress. They also happen to be two of the most hated words in the English language right

3. Emad Mekay, “9/11 Commission Director: Iraq War Launched to Protect Israel,” *Antiwar.com*, March 30, 2004. See also M. Marshall, “Foreign Policy Experts Assess War on Terrorism, Saber Rattling Toward Iraq,” *Virginia Journal*, Fall 2002. www.law.virginia.edu/home2002/html/news/2002_fall/terrorismforum.htm

4. Sharon to Peres: ‘Don't worry about American pressure; we control America’, IAP news, October 3, 2001, www.wrmea.com/html/newsitem_s.htm.

5. Clarke's Take On Terror”, *60 Minutes*, CBS, March 21, 2004. www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/03/19/60minutes/main607356.shtml.

6. Wexner Analysis: Israeli Communication Priorities 2003, April 2003. www.adc.org/luntzwexleranalysis.pdf

now. A warning. There are some who would say that Saddam Hussein is already old news. They don't understand history. They don't understand communication. They don't understand how to integrate and leverage history and communication for the benefit of Israel. The day we allow Saddam to take his eventual place in the trash-heap of history is the day that Israel loses its best asset.

Now, each of those particular points managed to find its way into the American media, the White House, Congress, and every outlet of commentary about Sept. 11. It became standard boilerplate. When people talked about Saddam Hussein torturing innocent Iraqis or committing violence on women and children, we know this is exactly where the information came from. The United States is following a script written by Israelis.

Sometimes when I tell this to people they roll their eyes, and think “how could a little country like Israel beat a big, powerful nation like the United States.” After all, Israel is a small thumbnail piece of wasteland on the eastern Mediterranean. Look how big America is! Well, in matters of terrorism *size does not matter!* Israel is like a supra-national entity. It has agents; it has influence throughout the world, and its influence is not limited to national borders. Let me explain to you a little bit about how long Israel had been planning this.

I go back to Ronald Reagan as the beginning of the end of the American Republic because it was during his first term, February 1982, that Israeli journalist Oded Yinon wrote:

Iraq, rich in oil on the one hand yet internally torn on the other is guaranteed as a candidate for Israel's targets. Its dissolution is even more important for us than that of Syria. Iraq is stronger than Syria. In the short run it is Iraqi power which constitutes the greatest threat to Israel. An Iraqi Iranian war will tear Iraq apart and cause its downfall at home even before it is able to organize a struggle on a wide front against us.⁷

And so forth. So right there in '82 Iraq had been targeted by Israel for destruction. And with the -the problem of Israel, it doesn't have the will to do its own dirty work. It wants other countries to do its dirty work for it. And so, progressively throughout the 1980s and '90s America became more and more zionized and more and more amenable to Israel's interests in the Middle East.

Now, the motive for the Sept. 11 attack becomes clearer. Iraq posed no threat to America—Iraq was an *asset* to America—but Iraq posed a threat for Israel. In the late 1990s, as I mentioned earlier about Desert Storm, America needed an excuse to get rid of Saddam Hussein. At that time Dick Cheney, who was the Defense Secretary for the Senior Bush,

⁷ Oded Yinon, “A Strategy for Israel in the Nineteen Eighties,” *Kivunim (Directions)*, No. 14, February 1982, trans. Israel Shahak. www.informationclearinghouse.info/article1025.htm.

THE VANCOUVER HEARINGS

told King Fahd of Saudi Arabia, falsely, that there were 200,000 troops amassed on the border that Saddam Hussein was preparing to use to attack Saudi Arabia. Sounds pretty strange, yet Fahd and his advisors believed it to the point where they allowed the United States to establish forces on Saudi soil.⁸

That became Desert Shield. Later on, the U.S. needed an excuse to attack Saddam Hussein and then April Glaspie, the famous ambassador to Iraq, told Saddam Hussein that he had a green light to attack Kuwait. At the time, Kuwait was slant drilling into the Rumeila oil field on its border with Iraq, and helping to depress the world price of oil so Hussein couldn't raise enough funds to rebuild his economy. You see, Hussein had outlived his usefulness and he had to be, well, destroyed. The United States went to great lengths to ensure that this happened.

The U.S. would attack Iraq but not for the sake of U.S. interests. There are some interesting quotations from Dick Cheney, that go back to this time, to demonstrate that Saddam Hussein posed no threat at all to America. He says this after Desert Storm in on April 29, 1991:

Hussein's offense, his military ability, his ability to threaten his neighbors has been virtually eliminated. This is a very significant development. Israel, I think, from a military standpoint, is more secure today than she has ever been at any time in the recent past.⁹

That's pretty good from an American point of view, from Cheney's point of view. In fact, the same statement was repeated almost 10 years later on Feb. 24, 2001, by Secretary of State Colin Powell:

Hussein has not developed any significant capability with respect to weapons of mass destruction. He is unable to project conventional power against his neighbors so in effect our policies have strengthened the security of the neighbors of Iraq. And these are policies that we are going to keep in place.¹⁰

This comes less than nine months before the attack on Sept. 11. Then we have the state testimony from Colin Powell on May 15.

Even though we have no doubts in our minds that the Iraqi regime is pursuing programs to develop weapons of mass destruction, chemical, biological and nuclear,

8. "Interview with Richard Cheney," Frontline—The Gulf War, PBS, January 9, 1996.

9. Dick Cheney, The Gulf War: A First Assessment, Soref Symposium, Washington Institute for Middle East Policy, April 29, 1991.

10. Colin Powell, Press Remarks with Foreign Minister of Egypt Amre Moussa, U.S. Department of State, February. 24, 2001.

I think the best intelligence estimates suggest that they have not been terribly successful. There's no question that they have some stockpiles of some of these sorts of weapons under their control. But they've not been able to break out. They've not been able to come out with the capacity to deliver these kinds of weapons.¹¹

So this is May 15, 2001, and there are still no weapons of mass destruction. We're now within four months of the attack, so what could possibly have stirred the United States to want to attack Hussein?

Well, it was in *Israel's* interest that America attack Iraq. Israel is the only country for whom Iraq was, essentially, an enemy.

As I may have told you in a comment earlier, Israel had considerable warning of an attack, and it came thru Odigo which was an instant messaging service. And Odigo received an alert two hours before, and it was given to Micha Macover who was head of Odigo, and who passed it off as a joke. He didn't believe it. He didn't want to believe it. He didn't take it seriously.¹²

However, Odigo has great ties to the Israeli government and I'd like to tell you a little bit about what Odigo did soon after this. It got \$15.4 million for investment from a private banking syndicate, which included Israeli Comverse network systems. Odigo and Comverse together with Onset Technologies, an Israeli based company founded in 1997 and headed by Gabi Bazor, ex-head of research for an elite group in the Israeli army's intelligence corps. So we have Onset Technologies, headed by an ex-Israeli super spook, we have Odigo, and we have Comverse. Odigo also received \$3 million in funding from a company called Hollinger Digital, a subsidiary of Hollinger International Communications. The head of Hollinger Digital was a man named Richard Perle. So, Richard Perle is a connection here between PNAC, Odigo and the World Trade Center.¹³

We know that Israel had forewarning of the attack, because we know that the Federal Bureau of Investigation tried to trace the IP address of the person who tipped off Odigo. That address, I believe, came from the United States. I'm not sure. But the question has to be: "Why did that not lead to the placement of an alert to the United States. Why did Macover not simply tell the Americans this may be happening?" As Susan Lindauer stated earlier, "everybody knew this was happening."

11. Colin Powell, Testimony to the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, May 15, 2001 (excerpts). www.thememoryhole.org/war/powell-no-wmd.htm

12. Yuval Dror, "Odigo says workers were warned of attack," Ha'aretz, December 27, 2002. The only North American source to pick up the story was the Washington Post.

13. "Odigo, Inc., The Leading Instant Messaging Solutions Provider, Secures \$15.35 Million In Private Placement," Media Center, Comverse Inc, Jan, 9, 2001. Comverse bought Odigo outright for \$20 million in May 2002.

Even FOX News, Israel's main media outlet, conceded the Israeli role. Investigators told reporter Carl Cameron that "tie-ins" between the attack and Israel did exist, but refused to elaborate: "Evidence linking these Israelis to 9-11 is classified. I cannot tell you about evidence that has been gathered. It's classified information."¹⁴

So, the fact that Micha Macover did not say anything or didn't even react to the tip properly, tells me that he didn't want to react to it. Since Israel knew about the attack, why did it not at least order an evacuation of its people from the World Trade Center? Well, many people who worked for Jewish companies such as Zim Trading were not at work that day, and many companies had systematically been moved out of the centre to Virginia. Moreover, nobody sent out an alert to the general population. So we have to ask ourselves: "how is it possible that Israel knew about it and did nothing about it?"

This behaviour is not uncommon for Israel. Remember, in September 1983 there was an attack on the Marine barracks in Beirut. A Mercedes truck filled with extra heavy explosives headed towards the barracks in a terrorist attack. The Mossad chief in Beirut knew about this. He knew there was going to be a major attack that it was going to involve a Mercedes van, and that it was headed for an American target. He chose not to give the alert to the Americans. He said simply that an attack was going to come but should be on a general alert but he did not give any specific information. He allowed the attack to happen. And he did so because if the Americans want to get involved in the war, they would have to pay the price.¹⁵

Israelis do not care about America; they care only about themselves, which is why the horrible waste of life that took place on Sept. 11, sounds more consistent with an Israel-first motive than an American. Essentially, Americans don't want to kill themselves, but an occupation terrorist organization has no love for the people over whom it rules.

Now, there is something else that has to do with the relative strength of Israel versus the United States. There's a tendency to believe, for example, that Israel is the subordinate player, that America dominates it, but there is very little to support this. One day in the winter of 2002, Karen Kwiatkowski, who was a Pentagon officer, was in charge

14. Citations regarding all four parts of the Carl Cameron series can be found at www.informationclearinghouse.info/article5133.htm. The information is taken from the originals before they were pulled.

15. Claire Hoy and Victor Ostrovsky, *By Way of Deception—A Devastating Insider's Portrait of the Mossad*, (Toronto: Stoddard, 1990) pp. 321, 322, 323. To this day, the vast majority of Americans do not know that the attack on the marine barracks was carried out in retaliation for an offshore bombardment by the battleship *USS New Jersey* that destroyed Arab villages in Lebanon's Shouf mountains. One could argue that no attack would have taken place had the U.S. not sided with the Lebanese Army.

of escorting some Israeli generals to see Undersecretary Douglas Feith. What took place was quite telling. She came up to the officers, and these officers barged past her.

They didn't even wait for an escort. They knew exactly where they were going. Most people who go to the Pentagon, she said, don't know where to go—it's a hard place to navigate...lots of rings...but these Israelis just stormed ahead and she was left traipsing after them.

After they got up to Feith's office, Kwiatkowski tried to get them to sign in, but the secretary sitting in Feith's outer office looked at her with terror in her eyes. Kwiatkowski reported that the secretary said "D-d-don't do that!" as if she'd committed a social *faux pas*. "They don't have to sign in."¹⁶

Israelis don't have to sign in to the Pentagon as visitors.

One of the officers then said: "Who's in there with Feith?" as if he had a right to know. It's as if someone walked into a house and thought he owned it. Let's face it. Israel does own the place, to all intents and purposes.

Now, the Pentagon itself was a bit of a problematic entity. Regardless of what we think about it and its war-making capacity, there are some good people there who actually do good research. The Defense Intelligence Agency has professional analysts, and these people have a sense of pride in doing good civil service. But if you're an occupation force, you want to destroy the intellectual fabric of a culture and that means setting up your own little nucleus, your own little cancer nucleus, that is secret and cut off from everything else. This is the Office of Special Plans, run by a man named William Luti, who is a former naval officer and a former Dick Cheney staffer. Julian Borger in the *Guardian* said the OSP functioned like a shadow government, much of it off the official payroll and beyond Congressional oversight, but it proved powerful enough to prevail in a struggle with the State Department and the CIA by establishing a justification for war. Remember, the CIA, DIA, the FBI...nobody wanted to go to war. There was no justification for it, and these people knew it. The OSP was an open, largely unfiltered, conduit to the White House, not only for the Iraqi opposition.¹⁷ Of course we know the Iraqi opposition, don't we? —Ahmed Chalabi.

We're going to save the Iraqi people; give them democracy; we're going to get rid of the tyrant and replace him with an American tyrant. So it's the same sort of corrupt stooges in the opposition, just like we would have in Libya later on and we now have in Syria. As I'm sure you all know, some of the heads of the Syrian National Council are Israelis.

16. Karen Kwiatkowski "The New Pentagon Papers," *Salon.com*, March 10, 2004. p. 5.

17. Julian Borger, "The spies who pushed for war," *Guardian*, July 17, 2003.

You have to wonder how long they do they expect us to believe this story because they are preparing now an attack on Syria based upon the same lame excuse they used in Libya. And that of course reminds me of Oded Yinon, who in 1982 talked about eliminating Iraq in the same breath as Syria. This is consistent with Israeli policy because America had no need to wage war on the Muslim world. Never did. It had good relations with the Muslims and it wasn't until Israel came along that Muslims became an enemy of convenience. This is how Israel has sacrificed American integrity, lives and money for the sake of itself.

Anyway, let me get back to this one little point here. Not only did the OSP form an unfiltered conduit for Iraqi opposition, but it also forged close ties to a parallel *ad hoc* intelligence operation inside Ariel Sharon's office in Israel specifically, to bypass Mossad to provide the Bush administration with more alarmist reports on Saddam's Iraq than Mossad was prepared to authorize.

So Mossad was too conservative for Sharon. This is bizarre. Most people in Israel really **did not** believe that Iraq posed a problem. They scoffed at it. I mean, if you were Israel, **bristling** with the most sophisticated weaponry in the world, why would you be afraid of **Saddam Hussein**? Why would you be afraid of Iran? There is no need to be afraid. In fact, **Israelis** have gone on the record stating they have nothing to fear. So the question is: why was Israel trying to destroy Iraq?

Then we come to the question of things like water, the Tigris & Euphrates rivers, and oil to some degree, but not for the United States. The upshot is that if you want to look for a reason why Sept. 11 happened, there are many people you could blame. You could blame, well, PNAC, but anything that does not take into account Israel's role is deficient. It's like telling half a story. Like taking a two-sided coin and pretending it has only one side.

By the time the Bush administration took office, there was no America left. America had ceased to be. It had been consumed from within by a cancer that had been introduced by Ronald Reagan. It had eaten through the body politic of America. It had consumed the healthy parts and replaced it with a toxic, virulent self-replicating foreign entity. Today, every time Israel gets its knickers in a twist, all it has to do is send a phone call to Congress or Senate saying "we want a letter written" condemning president "whomever".

In May 2012, the Senate was mulling unprecedented aid to Israel. "There should not be one scintilla of light between the positions of Democrats and Republicans on the security of Israel," according to John Isakson.¹⁸

18. Yitzhak Benhorin, "U.S. Senate mulls unprecedented aid to Israel," *ynteneus.com*, May 23, 2012. <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L4233005,00.html>

September 2006: 88 senators chose to condemn Hezbollah as a terrorist organization but 10 Republicans did not, and for good reason: Hezbollah is not terrorist. One of those people was Richard Lugar, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, one of the longest serving senators, and one of the few Republicans with integrity. He recently lost his nomination to a tea bagger, which is what happens when you do the right thing. If you're an American and you serve America, you get punted out. If you *offend* America and serve *Israel* you have a long and healthy career.

So the question is why is it that Americans who support America are vilified as these Republicans were. The head of the New Jersey Democratic Committee said:

Democrats are out there trying to punish Israel's enemies and ensure that she has a right to defend herself, these ten Republican senators have no problem with the international community treating Hezbollah as a legitimate organization. These 10 Republicans have no problem with the international community treating Hezbollah as a legitimate organization.

The problem is you can't admit fair play if you're a terrorist, if you're a tyrant, because the essence of an unjust society is that you place yourself above the law, as Kevin Barrett said just before me with regard to Leo Strauss.

The tragedy we have to recognize is that when we defeated Hitler in WW2 we defeated Adolf Hitler but we did not defeat fascism; fascism migrated to Israel. Zionist Jews, like Joseph Weitz, Chaim Weizmann, David Ben Gurion, Moshe Shertok, Yitzhak Yizernitsky (later Yitzhak Shamir) and Menachem Begin, took that same fascism, and they applied it to Palestine. That same fascism germinated, strengthened, and effectively became transmuted to America. Slowly over time, not immediately, from 1948 onward, America became infected with a foreign body. They'd managed to find within American society, a certain clique, a certain cult of supporters called the Christian Zionists, which had long existed but had never had any real say in government. This toxic infection managed to grow and grow, and took advantage of the anti-war movement ultimately until 1973, which was the high-water mark of liberal America. In that year Paul Weyrich founded the Heritage Foundation, the first of many propaganda organs to spew the fascistic doctrine of neoconservatism.

From that point, this toxin infiltrated and polluted the American body politic and leads us to Sept. 11, and why it was done. America had no reason to do it. The whole idea of American doing it for the City of London, the Illuminati, or oil, or economic imperialism is patent rubbish. America was already on top of the world. Then it was plunged to the bottom.

THE VANCOUVER HEARINGS

You see, the problem with economics is that it doesn't like war. War is bad for business if you're an oil importer from the Middle East. If you're Lockheed Martin, of course, it's a different matter. So it makes no sense to formulate such a hysterical war economy in the name of promoting American economic interests. You have to ask yourself: "Why on earth would America do it to itself. It's good for some business but it's not good for the country.

The people who did this did not do it for America; the people who did this do not work for America. These are people who either openly or covertly support Israel. This PNAC clique that runs America, is not American. There is no American government. America is a dead country. It is a shell. It is a satrapy of the Israeli empire. The president is the governor on the Potomac for Israel. The capital of America is Washingtelaiviv.

Unless you take this position, I feel that you end up in an impossible scenario, where you try to explain Sept. 11 in the American national interest. There is no national interest in doing what it did. Look at the fallout from it. There are banking fiascos; there's a police state; and police states are unsupportable in the long term. There is no scenario conceivable, in my view, to explain Sept 11, that does not include an analysis of Israel and how it knew ahead of time what was going on, and who was privy to the most secret information of the American government. By this time, Israel *was* the American government.

Thank you.