

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001

What do we know 10 years later? A historical investigation.

Lecture by Dr. Daniele Ganser held at Basel University on September 1, 2011

Source: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KEN2wbaYlik>



Transcription by José Miguel Fernández, June 2016

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Chapter 1: Three different 9/11 stories..... | 4 |
| Chapter 2: Who is telling the truth? The 9/11 debate in the USA..... | 10 |
| Chapter 3: Conspiracies..... | 13 |
| Chapter 4: WTC7..... | 15 |
| Chapter 5: Pentagon..... | 24 |
| Chapter 6: Put Options..... | 25 |
| Chapter 7: Able danger..... | 26 |
| Chapter 8: Osama Bin Laden and Kalid Sheik Mohammed..... | 27 |
| Chapter 9: Northwoods 1962..... | 30 |
| Chapter 10: Conclusion..... | 31 |
| Questions..... | 32 |

Introduction

So, I'd like to welcome everybody to this lecture here at the Basel University! It is today September 1. 2011, so we are almost exactly ten years after the terrorist attacks and this is the occasion why I have decided to do this lecture with the title: *The terrorist attacks of September 11. 2001. What do we know 10 years later? A historical investigation*. It is obviously a very large topic, a vast field of research and I'd therefore decided to look at ten different issues because we have sixty minutes. So I'm not going to talk endlessly, we'll just going to go through ten points and I'm fully aware of the fact that for the research is needed the most of these points and I'm fully aware of the fact that, you know, there are other points which would be interesting but which we can't discuss today.

What are the issues? The first chapter is really that I look at the different stories that are available today on the attacks of 9/11. I call them: Surprise, LIHOP and MIHOP. I will detail what they actually mean later. Then I look in the 2nd chapter on the 9/11 debate in United States. And in the 3rd Chapter I will address the term 'conspiracies' because that term has surfaced a lot during the last ten years. And I'll look at WTC7 which is one of the buildings which was involved. Then I'll look at the Pentagon, which is another rather big discussion. I'll look at the financial transactions that took place on 9/11 in the segment of 'Put Options'. I will look at 'Able Danger', which is another research topic where quite a few people working on. I will look at Osama Bin Laden of course. I will look at Northwood and then reach the conclusion.

It is very often the case that in Switzerland lectures are in German, ok? Most of the time lectures are in German. We have some lectures here at Basel University, which are in English. This lecture is in English because it is a lecture that we do together with the Indiana University in Bloomington, in the United States. They have a topic, which is called "Making war, Making peace", and it's a research group, which is now currently discussing these issues, war and peace. And they said why don't you come over to the United States and give the lecture on 9/11 and I said: "I'd much rather do this in Switzerland, make a video tape and send you the link". So that's what we decided upon, and that's what I'm actually doing. The people in the United States who organized the lecture are: Heather Reynolds professor for Biology, then Curt Lively and Byron Bangert, and from this moment I'd like to say Heather and everybody else "Hello!" in the United States and good that we can do this international research Project, as I like to call it, together. This is really a change that you need to be aware of, international research has been very strongly influenced by

the development of modern technology: the Internet, streaming videos, live conferences and all these things. I mean twenty years ago this would not have been possible. But today it is, so we take advantage of it.

My lecture we'll have exactly the same topic and it will be shown in US I think in October. So we are a little bit earlier here in Switzerland and so to give you the overview again of the international framework we're here Switzerland for everybody else in the United States that's where we are (pointing at a world map), we're in Basel. Basel is in the corner where Switzerland and Germany and France meet. It's in the German speaking part of Switzerland. Switzerland is a small country within seven million inhabitants. And United States is obviously over here and Indiana University is here in the state of Indiana.

Chapter 1: Three different 9/11 stories

Ok! Let's go to into the debate of 9/11.

On that day most people watched television. And they made up their mind what happened on that day, and they had a gut feeling about what was happening, and they got information from the American government, from the Bush Administration, and later they read in the newspaper information on 9/11, some then watched videos and other started to look at the issue at the internet and further bought maybe DVDs and whatever. So we have a lot of different stories circulating on the topic of 9/11. And I'm a historian and you must know that in the end history is written by historians. So is really our task at the end of the day to say what happened and that is really difficult. That's what I have to say. And therefore I try to first of all look what different stories we have, on the Internet in the books, also in the public debate. And basically we can say we have three stories.

The first story is called 'surprise story'. It really says that Bin Laden was responsible for the attack, nineteen Muslims carried it out and the administration of George Bush and Dick Cheney was surprised by the attacks. So that's the official version of the events. The second story says: 'no, that's not the correct narrative' and it's called 'LIHOP', 'let it happen on purpose', so LIHOP really stands for 'let it happen on purpose'. People who think that that is the correct story emphasize that "yes, it was Bin Laden who carried out the attacks, nineteen Muslims attacked the

United States, but, the Bush government and Cheney are corrupt and they knew that the attacks were coming and let them happen on purpose and sacrifice the life of 3000 people in order then to start international wars, resource wars, grab oil and gas, reduce civil liberties, etc.” And the third theory is called MIHOP, ‘Make it happen on purpose’. This story says that Bin Laden had nothing to do with the attacks. It says: ‘all these videos we've seen from Bin Laden are fake’ and that ‘criminal elements that within the US defence department and in the secret services were responsible for the attack’. An attack which then is called ‘inside job’, on the own population. And these three theories compete, okay? They cannot be true at the same time. That's the most important thing to realize. From a logical point of view you completely and easily recognize that not all three theories can be right at the same time. It's either the one, or the other, or the third; and I personally don't know which of the three is correct, okay? So what I will say at the end of the lecture is, really, that we need more research. But I can show you in this lecture where the debate really is, okay? Why they debate and how they debate.

First question is: ‘why is it so important to know which of the three is correct?’ Ten years after, you know, you could say: ‘who cares? Maybe was the one or the other.’ It is very important; I'm very strongly convinced, because peace research must tackle the issue of 9/11. What is peace research? Peace research is not an established doctrine at Basel University or many other universities. You can't go there and say: ‘I'd like to have a master or a bachelor or a doctorate degree in peace research.’ You can't do that. So you can have a doctorate in history like I have. But historians are very interested in in questions of war and peace, and generally if we look at 9/11 we obviously see that it has to do a lot with international peace and war events. So those people who are interested in the promotion of peace –and there's a lot of people on the globe, believe me–, they are interested to know what happened on 9/11. Furthermore 9/11 is important because right after 9/11, that's only three weeks after 9/11, we have the start of the war in Afghanistan. The war in Afghanistan started on October 7. 2001. Most people have forgotten that it was just a few weeks after 9/11 that this war started and if we debate the war in Afghanistan we can only debate it in the context of 9/11. We must try to understand what happened in 9/11. The official narrative, the surprise narrative, obviously says: ‘Bin Laden carried out the attacks. He is in Afghanistan, protected by the Taliban. Therefore it is necessary to wage war in Afghanistan.’ That is the official narrative.

What happened in Afghanistan in the meantime is that you have a new afghan President –it is Hamid Karzai– and that is well-known. And people obviously argue whether that was a good thing for Afghanistan to happen. Because if you look at the person of Hamid Karzai, some people say: ‘That's much better than the

Taliban', and other say: 'No, that's not much better.' Allegations are, and I'm not going to go into the details of the afghan war, that Hamid Karzai and other parts of the afghan government are involved in the drug trade. And people ask me: 'Why are they involved in the drug trade?', and I say: 'Well, Afghanistan is a huge producer of drugs.' And the warlords that control large parts of Afghanistan, they support the government only if the government protects them, okay? So if the afghan government tries to pick a fight with the warlords who run the drug trade, they're out of business. So Afghanistan is very complicated and I'm not going to talk about it at length.

I'm going to talk about another event that is linked with 9/11. It's the US war against Iraq. It started on March 20, 2003. Some of you might remember that right after 9/11 there were people who tried to link 9/11 to Iraq and that was wrong from the beginning. But later in 2003 you have this link, that were quotes [saying] that Al Qaida is operative in Iraq and therefore we have to go to Iraq –'we' means US government. So the Iraq war is another war linked with these terrorist attacks. And what happened in Iraq, really, is that you have a new prime minister. Now, you had Saddam Hussein, who was removed from power, that's the main event that happened there. You have the oil resources that were distributed in a new way, and you have Nouri al Maliki, who is now the prime minister. Obviously here again there are huge debates whether that is big progress or not. And then you know you need to go into the details of what Maliki is doing. Whether he is one of those who open Iraq for Democracy, or whether he is in that old gang of political leaders who oppress their population.

What we do know is that American Soldiers who fought in the Iraq war –and you know, the Iraq war is not over; there are still American troops there. It's just that they're not called 'combat troops' anymore. So the semantics has changed. But the American troops that fight there have always rationalized their presence in Iraq with reference to 9/11. There is evidence for that. We look at helmets, you know? –in history we've many different sources. And we look at the helmets of US soldiers fighting in Iraq and they make designs on their helmets and here you can see the Pentagon and the Twin Towers. And in 2006 there was a survey, which was made in Iraq among US troops. And 85% of American soldiers said that the main mission was to retaliate for Saddam's role in the 9/11 attacks. And that is really surprising! Because Saddam Hussein had no role in the 9/11 attacks! So that is war propaganda. That makes your mind twisted, and it can twist your mind to such an extent that you can end up in a war where you might get killed or lose a leg, just because you're not well informed. And that is really tragic, that's not a detail.

Now, how did this misinformation surfaced? It was first of all this claim of weapons of mass destruction. It was secretary of state, Colin Powell, who said [it] in the United Nation's security council in February 2003 –that's one month before the Iraq war started. He said: 'there are weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.' Now, that was a lie, okay? And that lie really started to increase the distrust globally towards the Bush Administration. When people found out that the Bush Administration had lied about Iraq, they went further and said: 'did they lied about 9/11 as well?' You know, these things are very, very closely linked. It's all about trust: 'do you trust the government? Do you trust the president? Do you trust the prime minister? Or do you categorically question what they say?' Collin Powel, in 2005, offered an excuse for his lies. He said he felt terrible and apologized for having falsely presented an Iraqi weapons program that turned out not to exist. "I'm the one who presented it on behalf of the US to the world... it will always be a part of my record. [That is] painful." So Powel is one of the very few who offered his excuses.

At the same time, before the Iraq war, you have President Bush insisting on the same story. He was saying that 'there are weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in Iraq; we must go into Iraq because, otherwise, Saddam Hussein will give the WMD to the terrorists and you will have a new 9/11 with biological or chemical weapons.' And that really scared people. So that most people then said: 'yes, okay. Then we should do this war.' Because if you ask people: 'do you want to go into war?' Most people say: 'No!' Then you ask them again: 'But there is a bad, bad man out there, do you want to go to war?,' and they say: 'No!' You tell them: 'He has weapons of mass destruction.' Then they say: 'No! I don't want to go there, I don't want to send my son!' Then you ask them again: 'He has weapons of mass destruction he's going to give them to the terrorists.' And somehow he was linked with 9/11 and everybody remembered that event. And people had a strong feeling of fear. That's politics of fear. Because then people say: 'I'm actually against war, but this war, I'm for it. The last one.' That's how it works. It's always been like that.

Now, the source, the direct statement that Bush made before the war is:

"Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapon ever devised."

That's just before the start of the war.

"The danger is clear: using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons, obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfil their stated ambitions and kill

thousands of innocent people in our country, or any other.”

So, if you do a historical interpretation of that quote, it clearly is a quote that instills fear, and it works.

When later people found out that it was not true what Bush had said on that day, they started to have a very, very strong distrust. They started to have a very, very strong distrust towards the whole Bush Administration. So, on the left [pointing at a picture] you have Colin Powell, who lied at the United Nations but later excused. There you have Dick Cheney, who wrote [in] public articles that one should use torture, which created even more distrust. Then you have George Bush the president himself, who lied about the weapons of mass destruction but never offered an apology, never. Then you have Condoleezza Rice. She said: ‘there are links between Al Qaida and Iraq.’ That’s nonsense! There were no such links. And then on the very right you have Rumsfeld, and seated you have the director of the CIA George Tenet, and Andrew Card in the back. And, you know, when I talk to people, it’s really this picture that matters. It’s the question: ‘Do you trust these people?’ And some people say: ‘Yes, I trust them. I think they told me the truth about 9/11.’ And other people say exactly the opposite, and say: ‘these people, that’s the Mafia, I don’t trust them at all. They lied to me, and they started wars.’ And as a historian, I’m in between, okay? I listen to people what they say, and I try to find facts about all the events that’s have been happening during the last ten years.

Powell, who has been in the US Military for a long time, was already active in the first Iraq war. Which happened after Iraq had invaded Kuwait in August 1990, you now remember that war. And then, he knew the situation very well and he said in 2005 that he had never seen evidence to suggest a connection between the attacks of 9/11 and the regime of Saddam Hussein. So Powell is one of the few soldiers who said: ‘I have a military honour. And this military honour tells me that I shouldn’t lie.’ And he made very clear. And he got a lot of problems. But he made it clear: there is no link between 9/11 and Iraq.

Now, what you see is that more and more Professors in the US start to look at the last ten years: Iraq, Afghanistan, 9/11, and ask: ‘What is the cost?’, ‘What have we done?’, ‘What happened?’ For instance, Catherine Lutz, she is an Anthropologist. Now you see this: people come from all different corners, some are Professors for Biology, others are Professors for Anthropology, others are historians like me. So, the scientists is not just one group, it’s from different branches. And she said: “After ten years of war it really is imperative to know how much we... paid for these wars, and the cost is staggering.” She is not questioning 9/11, she is more

looking at Iraq and Afghanistan. Her Colleague, Neta Crawford, she is in Political Science. She tried to find out how many people were killed and how much money was spent during the last ten years. Not only in 9/11, but if you take together Iraq and Afghanistan and everything. And she comes to 225000 killed at least. Probably more. And to more than 3 Trillion USD spent. So that shows you it really is an important issue, we're not talking about details. If you compare this: we just now have in Europe this terrible attack in Norway, where one person killed many. But he killed less than a hundred people. I'm not saying: 'it's not important to research the Oslo terrorist incident.' That's an important research field. But just if you look at the figures, you have to say that 100 dead on the one hand, and 225000 dead on the other hand, make it very imperative that we get some clarity on what happened during the last ten years.

And you have, you know, suffering on all sides. First of all you have American soldiers. This is a memorial ceremony (showing a picture) in 2010 in Afghanistan. It's just the soldiers who are there, and who are very sad. Because their brothers in arms get shot, they get mangled, they have their arms torn away. And they don't even know exactly why they are in Afghanistan. So that makes it very, very hard for their families to live in this complicated world that we all live in. And furthermore you have the victims, the civilian victims in Iraq and in Afghanistan. I have brought the picture from Samar Hassan. She is the most famous victim of the war in Iraq. There is a picture where Samar Hassan is 12 years old. And she is now in Mosul, in Iraq, and looks at a picture where she was 5 years old, okay? She looks at the picture in this computer, it happens to be a similar computer than [the one] I have. But the fact is that global communication, you know, runs all across this computers. I'm now going to show a picture, and if you don't want to see it, look away, because there is blood on it, okay? There is blood on it because is the picture taken when Samar Hassan was 5 years old and her parents had just been killed by US soldiers in Iraq. And this is the first time she's seen the picture. That was published in The New York Times in May 2011, so it's rather new. And this is the original picture, which is coming now, which just shows you the pain of war [silence for a few seconds while the picture is shown].

So if you think about all this ten years you realize: it's quite important that we do some research on this.

A further issue, which some people don't realize, is that NATO invoked Article 5 for the first time in history after 9/11. My students sometimes ask me: 'what is that, Article 5? I don't know what it is.' Now, NATO has been constructed during the cold war as an Alliance, where if one member is attacked, everybody is attacked,

okay? That was the system. And we all thought, as historians, that it might be the Soviet Union who attacks Germany, and then, everybody, also the US and Canada, would be involved in the war, and then you would have a war between Moscow and Washington. And then, as everybody said: 'Moscow is not going to do that,' it never happened, it never happened. NATO never invoked Article 5 during the whole cold war. And now, when 9/11 happened, the US said: 'we've been attacked. And the attack came from Afghanistan.' That's very important, the attack has to come from outside the NATO territory to invoke Article 5. And that meant, that at the same day, all NATO countries were at war. [Which] means: Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Norway, Canada, Spain, Portugal, Turkey, Greece. And most people have never understood that this was the case.

At the time, NATO secretary general, George Robertson, declared on October 2, 2001 –so that was very quickly after the attack – that since it has been determined, determined by NATO, that the 9/11 attacks have been directed by Osama Bin Laden from abroad, from Afghanistan, Article 5 of the NATO charter has to be invoked for the first time in the NATO's history. The Article says that the attack on any NATO member shall be considered to be an attack on all. I've worked on NATO during much of my research time –that was before 9/11. And I've published a book, which has now been translated in 10 languages, and it's on NATO's secret armies. It basically comes to the conclusion that NATO is not very transparent. It's the largest military organization of the world, and you know, if you are interested in that topic, you can read it up in that book, but that's only in the Cold War, and that's not our subject today. But I want to make it very clear that most researchers never expected 9/11 to lead to an activation of NATO, and that was the case.

Chapter 2: Who is telling the truth? The 9/11 debate in the USA

So, what we face here today with is a debate on what really happened on 9/11. It's this 'SURPRISE', 'LIHOP', 'MIHOP' debate, and we are, you know, as researchers torn to this side, torn to that side, and it's really difficult.

Who is the most prominent advocate of the 'surprise story'? The 'surprise story' is: it was Bin Laden who surprised the US. The most prominent advocate is George Bush:

[Video of President Bush in the Television making an official announcement]

“The US and our allies are authorized to use force in ridding Iraq of weapons of mass destruction... Saddam Hussein and his sons must leave Iraq within 48 hours. The refusal to do so will result in military conflict, commenced at a time of our choosing. For their own safety, all foreign nationals, including journalists and inspectors, should leave Iraq immediately” (George W. Bush on Television, March 17. 2003)

And you know, the problem is: when we look at sources, then we always check ‘is that source trustworthy?’ And the problem with George Bush is that he lied about the Iraq war. So his trustworthiness is reduced. He’s still an important source, because he is the president.

Then you have other people, the 9/11 Widows. These are the women who lost their children, their husbands, who lost people in these attacks on 9/11. And they are very active. They pushed for a 9/11 investigation. It’s only actually thanks to the 9/11 Widows, that they stood up and said: ‘we want to have more clarity on what happen,’ that we had the 9/11 commission which investigated the attacks.

The 9/11 Commission was presided by Thomas Kean and Lee Hamilton. And they presented their 9/11 Commission report in 2004 in the summer. So, for historians, that was the most important book because that was the official history. But the important thing to notice is that these two gentlemen were appointed by Bush. So it was not an independent investigation, it was not the congress that investigated 9/11, it was selected people, former governors, former members of the congress, that investigated the attacks.

And at the time when this investigation was carried out, one member of the 9/11 Commission said: ‘this is not a good investigation, it has no solid access to documents.’ And he resigned from the commission, he said: ‘this is not good, it’s no quality research.’ Who is that? It is Max Cleland. He is a Vietnam War veteran. He lost both legs and one arm in the Vietnam War. And he was later a Senator for Georgia and he was in that commission, and he said: “I cannot look any American in the eyes, especially family members of the victims, and say that the 9/11 commission had full access. The 9/11 commission is now compromised.” So he stepped down. He said: ‘we didn’t get the documents; we didn’t get Cheney and Bush to testify under oath in public. We didn’t get that.’ Cleland said: “The Bush

Administration stonewalled the commission in its request for documents and other evidence about 9/11.” That’s really bad, that’s bad news. Because we as historians need a good investigation. What we then had in 2004 is that the authors of that commission presented their report and confirm the ‘Surprise’ theory, okay? That’s the official theory and is now been confirmed by the 9/11 Commission. And Bush thanked them very much.

And really the question is whether you trust Thomas Kean and Lee Hamilton. It’s again a question of whether you trust them. That’s really the question. If as a historian you have to make up your mind you have to always find out whom do you trust. Furthermore, they didn’t write the report themselves, it was a Professor. His name is Philip Zelikow. He wrote the book. It’s a book of 560 pages, so it’s really thick book. I read it with my students, they had to read it. And most people never read the 9/11 Commission Report. But Philip Zelikow wrote the whole book and he says: ‘surprise is the correct description of what happened on 9/11’. Okay.

But, that’s not the only story that you have in the US. You have other people who completely disagree and say: ‘the 9/11 commission report is worth nothing.’ Now, who are these people? This is a Professor. David Ray Griffin. He’s a retired professor so he is no longer at the university. You know, that’s sometimes helpful because obviously there is a lot of pressure. If you research 9/11 at the university you could lose your job, it’s true. So retired US professor David Ray Griffin is a professor of philosophy of religion, okay? You know, that’s not the first thing you think of if you think of somebody who researches 9/11. And he says: ‘9/11 was not SURPRISE, it was MIHOP (‘make it happen in purpose’).’ So he argues that the American Government orchestrated the attacks. He is not saying ‘the American people’, that’s a huge difference. There’s 300 million people living in America. And he’s saying: ‘there is a corrupt elite and their were involved in the attacks.’ He was dismissed in the beginning as somebody who is just crazy. But then... he wrote ten books! He started to write books about 9/11 in 2004. Then he added another one in 2005, then in 2007, then in 2008, then in ‘09, in ‘09 he even wrote two. And then 2010 another one, and now the new one is coming out in September 2011. It’s quite impressive. So there is a whole series of books and he is an outstanding scholar on 9/11. So if today you try to research 9/11, you have to read the 9/11 Commission Report, obviously. That’s the version of Bush. But also, you have to read the books of David Ray Griffin. Not all [of them], but maybe a selection.

And he says, he believes that the US government orchestrated the attacks. “The goal would be to get control of the world oil and to establish a new doctrine of pre-emptive warfare. That was a difficult sell before 9/11.” So he really says: ‘before

9/11 it would not have been possible to start pre-emptive wars.’ A pre-emptive war is a war that you engage in without having been attacked. You say; ‘I bomb the other one because I think he’s going to bomb me.’ You understand the difference. There’s a huge difference. If you fight a war after having been attacked, then it’s a defensive war. If you attack a country, who’s not attacked you, then it’s either a war of aggression –that’s something very terrible since Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, historians are very, you know, sensitive about wars of aggressions – but now these wars are not called ‘wars of aggression’ –the Iraq war– they’re called ‘pre-emptive wars’. This other means: you do a war to stop a war, which would be coming if you don’t do your war.

Griffin says ‘there’s no change, there is no change, from Bush to Obama, there is no change.’ He says: ‘the White House has never, and to this very day, has never started a new investigation of the terrorist attacks of 9/11. There is no interest in the White House at all to have a new debate about 9/11. In the US Congress –so the Senate and the House of Representatives– there is no interest in such a debate either.’ But you do have former Senators, former American Senators, who say: ‘we must research 9/11 anew.’ One senator is Mike Gravel. He was a senator for Alaska. From ’69 to ’81. And he’s now saying: ‘we should have movements in the states.’ So, you know, US is made out of different states, and one state –for instance California– can decide: ‘we are going to have a new 9/11 investigation.’ And that would affect the whole discourse. He said: ‘don’t wait for White House, don’t wait for Congress. Go to the level of the states, and there we should have a new debate.’ He’s saying: “The government’s official account is inaccurate, incomplete, implausible, and in fact constitutes a flimsy conspiracy theory.” So he is making the argument that the SURPRISE theory is not convincing. He says there’s an “urgent need for a new, independent investigation with subpoena powers and other grand jury powers.” ‘Subpoena’ basically means that you can say: ‘we are investigating this, and everybody who was involved, who had an official function, has to come and testify under oath.’ That is really an important thing if you can do such an investigation.

Chapter 3: Conspiracies

Now, what I’ve shown you in this –[the last]– chapter about the 9/11 debate is that there is a very big debate in the US going on, there is no agreement on what happened. And I’ve seen that many people who ask questions on 9/11 are dismissed

as people who believe in conspiracies. And that is then put in a way that people suggest that conspiracies are nonsense. That's what you see. And as a historian I'm obviously aware that sometimes you have conspiracies. For instance, when Fidel Castro and Nikita Khrushchev decided to put nuclear missiles into Cuba, they didn't tell Kennedy before. That's the conspiracy. To agree silently. If two people agree in silence, that's a conspiracy. Or when the CIA overthrew Salvador Allende on September 11., but 1973, it was a conspiracy. They didn't call Salvador Allende first. Later you had Pinochet installed in Chile.

So, yes! There are conspiracies! Not everything is a conspiracy, but sometimes you have conspiracies. When the French secret service sank the *Rainbow Warrior* in 1985, they bombed the ship because Greenpeace was protesting against French atomic test in the Pacific. So Greenpeace was always going there with a ship, so the French couldn't have their atomic testing. So, you know, they... they just sank the ship with a bomb. That's terrorism! But it's state terrorism! It's the secret service who [sic] carries it out. And this is the photographer who died on the boat. He wasn't informed of it, okay? So, it's a conspiracy! Or the Iran contra fare in 1986. You have Oliver North, who was involved –and others –, who sent money to the contras, which they had earned from selling arms to Iran. And at the time Congress had said US cannot sell arms to Iran. And then the White House ran away and secretly did it. And used the money to fund the contras in Nicaragua. That's was a conspiracy! Or if you take the Watergate breaking, it's a very interesting conspiracy. Nixon, here to the left, and Haldeman, his Chief of Staff. Nixon, you know, ordered this break-in in the Watergate complex. And then later, a week after the break-in, Haldeman told Nixon in the Whitehouse (we now have the records. It always takes a long time until the historian have the records, but we have them): “the Democratic break-in thing, we're back to the –in the, the problem area because the FBI is not under control”, Haldeman said. And then Nixon instructs to use the CIA to obstruct the FBI. So, the Whitehouse uses the different services to obstruct each other. Nixon said: “Play it tough. That's the way they play it, and that's the way we're going to play.” So that was a conspiracy! Nixon later had to resign.

If you take Bernard Madoff, in 2008, that's a recent conspiracy, he told people: ‘you give me your money, and I'm going to give you a lot of money.’ Okay? That was the idea. And he always said ‘I'm a great investor’, but what he really did, he just, you know, faked everything, it was a Ponzi scheme. He took the money from the new investors and he paid the interests of the others. But he had no real investment. And the lady who did all the fake reports was Annette Bongiorno. Somebody said: ‘that's a hell of a secretary.’ Because she, you know, copied everything and mix it... [laughter in the audience]. But there you go! It was a

conspiracy between Madoff and Bongiorno! And it doesn't make sense to say that there are no conspiracies. The question is, on 9/11: how many people were involved? If it's just one person you can't have any conspiracy. But if you assume that it was just one person who with the first plane flew into the twin tower, and then walked down, and then took a second plane and flew into the second tower, it's not possible! One person cannot do it! So you have at least two persons involved! And that means, from a scientific perspective that *it is* a conspiracy. The question is: who are the conspirators? It can be the group of Muslims, then is the SURPRISE theory. Or it can be somebody else. And that's really what you have to look at.

Chapter 4: WTC7

In the detailed investigation of 9/11 the debate has always focused on the twin towers. These are the twin towers. And everybody's seen the plane flying in the building and this exploded, and the second plane flying in the building and then these buildings went down. So for most people 9/11 is: plane, plane, building, building. That's the essence. But there is a third building which collapsed on that day. When people saw the twin towers, they were in shock, okay? That's an important thing. Terror means fear, as you can see. They actually watched the twin towers been hit. There's a huge fear effect.

But if you look at whole World Trade Center Complex, you see that these are the twin towers: WTC1 and WTC2, they were hit by a plane, and they went down. But there is a third tower [WTC7], but it was not hit by a plane! But it went down on 9/11! In 7 seconds. So, obviously, people then asked: 'what does the 9/11 Commission Report say about WTC7?' Because that's a crucial question! How do they explain the collapse of a building, which has not been hit by a plane. They don't even mention the building! Okay? And that's really a very serious problem! I mean, if the 9/11 Commission Report doesn't get number of buildings right... Yeah, you are laughing but it's serious! You know? It's very serious! The activation of NATO is based on the 9/11 Commission Report. The SURPRISE theory is based on the 9/11 Commission Report. But the 9/11 Commission Report doesn't get the number of buildings right!

So, WTC7 before 9/11, and after 9/11. Flat. If you look at the different buildings, you see these are the twin towers, there are much higher, and that's

WTC7, it's smaller, it's not that high. And the New York Time, at the time, said: 'that's really a mystery. WTC7 is a mystery.' They said: "Until now, the collapse of 7 World Trade Center has stood as one of the outstanding mysteries of the Sept. 11. attack. And since before then, no modern, steel reinforced high rise in the United States had ever collapsed in a fire." And that's true for the entire world, you know? They don't go down in a fire. But the Bush Administration claimed that this fire brought the building down. Now, WTC7, to my personal understanding, is the most important question in the whole 9/11 debate. And it's been discussed across the globe. I'm not sure whether you surf the Internet a lot, but maybe if you do you've maybe been in this webpage recently. That's a Japanese parliamentarian his name is Yukihiisa Fujita. And he presented, in the Japanese parliament, the collapse of the WTC7. That was in 2008. He showed everybody in Japanese parliament that WTC7 collapsed. And people were surprised, because most parliamentarians in Japan didn't know it. But here we're back to the fact that 9/11 happens in a period where we have the Internet. Where everybody has YouTube, where everybody has laptops, where everybody has cameras and is filming, you know? This is a completely different framework. You have to be aware of this information revolution, which is taking place. And as we are here in Switzerland I want to bring you a building, which is very high, so you can compare it to the World Trade Center. Here in Switzerland we don't have high buildings, we all know that. But the highest building is now in Zurich they just finished it; it's called the Prime Tower. It's 135 meters high. Now realize that the WTC7 is 170 meters high. So it's higher than the Prime Tower. And for us in Switzerland that's quite a thing, okay? So, that's why we can never say, WTC7 is a minor issue, it would be the biggest building in Switzerland.

So, what I did is, I went –when I was working at the centre for security studies at the ETH in Zurich–, I went to other professors and asked: 'how does that building came down?' And then, one colleague said: "I think there's a high probability that the WTC7 has been brought down by controlled demolition." So we seat at the ETH and I say: 'No, no! There is no controlled demolition on 9/11! Because that would take weeks to prepare it, and nobody said Bin Laden blew up a building with controlled demolition.' And the other professor said: 'I don't know, maybe there is a plane that hit WTC7 and you haven't heard about it.' And I said: 'No! I know that! There is not...' Yeah! You're laughing, but, you know, this is the sort of level of debate that is going on behind the scenes, and then nobody really knows what happened!

What we now have is a new webpage in Switzerland it's just been online for a few weeks, it's called *911untersuchen.ch* (investigate 9/11). And a few people come forward, I've also signed it, and basically is a petition to say: 'we need more

data. We need more data. Too many things are unclear.'

In 2002 we had a report by the federal emergency management agency (FEMA), It was called *World Trade Center Building Performance Study*. And the FEMA said: "the specifics of the fires in WTC7 and how they caused the building to collapse remain unknown at this time." Okay? So they said: 'yes. There was a fire, but we don't know how the fire could bring the building down.' In the same report you have a list of the tenants who were in the WTC7, because people were interested: 'who was in that building?' And that list shows you: that you had on floor 25 the department of defence (DOD) and the central intelligence agency (CIA). So this was a high security building, it was part of the defence community. And those who distrust Bush Administration, and those who think it was MIHOP, 9/11 was MIHOP, you know, they come to me and say: 'it's very clear, it was all done from WTC7, that was the control room for 9/11, and they just blew it up!' And I say: 'do you really believe that?' And they say: 'yes.' And I say: 'Okay. I take a note and I'll look at it.' And then I go home, and I look at the data and I say: 'I don't know who was in that building on that day and what they did, but I know that the building collapsed.' So what I'm saying is that we need more investigation on why it collapsed.

The National Institute for Standards and Technologies (NIST) said, in a report published in 2008: "WTC7 collapsed because of fires. It did not collapse from explosives." He [sic] explicitly said: "it did not collapsed from explosives." Why did he [sic] say that? Because at the time, and still today, many people say: 'that was brought down by controlled demolition.' And that is now the argument: either fire, or either controlled demolition. And it is very, very difficult to argue what the truth is. Because we really need the iron beams, but we don't have them, the iron frame of the building, that would help, but, you know, it has been recycled. There is no access to this primary data.

Now, Richard Gage comes forward and say: "the NIST report on WTC7 is no valid science" –that's the NIST report, published in 2008. Now Richard Gage is an Architect, and he's founded the movement *Architects for 9/11 Truth and Engineers*. So there are 1500 Architects in the US who say: 'we don't believe the story.' And you have to understand: people sometime come to me and say: 'Well, we heard the Bush version, and then we heard nothing. If somebody has doubts, he would have raised their voice. We don't hear from Richard Gage in the Swiss Newspaper.' But if you don't hear it, then is a question of how good is your, you know, information structure: your newspaper, your television, whatever. And it's not the point that there's nobody saying anything. It just doesn't reach you.

So the interesting question is really: we should ask the man who owned the WTC. We should ask him what happened on that day. And the man is: Larry Silverstein. He leased the WTC on July 24, 2001. Just shortly before the attack. Then he signed insurance policies with 24 insurance companies for a total of \$3.55 billion. And then he received \$4.55 billion after WTC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, that's the whole thing, was [sic] destroyed. So he's really the man to ask, he's in the middle of all this. And he says (he said this on television): "I remember getting a call from the, err, 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." So, really here the argument is what did he mean with 'to pull it'? Did he mean to bring it down with controlled demolition, or did he mean something else? So later he said: 'No, no! I didn't mean controlled demolition! I meant to pull the firemen out of the building.' But then Semantics, Professors for Linguistics, came and said: "'It' never refers to people.'

So we have a huge debate. Yeah, you're now smiling but it's really complicated, if you're going to the details, you realize 9/11 investigation is complicated. We have now firemen who say that there were explosives.

[A video of an interview with injured firemen on that day is played]

Reporter: What happened?

Fireman: There was an explosion. We were in the lobby and heard a third explosion and the whole lobby collapsed on us.

Reporter 2: What was it like?

Fireman: Horrible. Horrible. The whole building just collapsed on us, inside the lobby.

Reporter: That was a secondary explosion?

Fireman: Yes! It was! Yeah, definitively a secondary explosion. We were inside waiting to go upstairs, and on our way upstairs the whole fuckin' thing blew. It just collapsed on everybody inside the lobby.

Reporter: [unintelligible]

Fireman: I don't know 'bout the first one, but 'bout the second one, it was terrible. [...] there was a third one after that one.

Reporter: Was there an explosion after that?

Fireman: Yes, that's right. Everybody was inside the building waiting to go upstairs, and it just let loose, everything just let loose inside the building.

Reporter: So, would you to tell me that there was a plane, or whatever hit the building, in the secondary explosion?

Fireman: There were like three explosions after that. We came in after the fire. We came when the fire was going on already. We were just in the staging area inside the building waiting to go upstairs. Then the explosion. Then, the whole lobby collapsed on the allotment inside.

Reporter: And there was mayhem after that?

Fireman: It just made everybody try to make their way out. Lot of people's trapped inside and everything.

Fireman 2: I was in Brooklyn. We watched the first explosion as we watched the buildings, I saw a black, very large airplane fly right into the second building. It came out of the south, right before of our eyes. It was so surreal like a movie set. We were in the building for the third one collapse. That was on the strive here for the other one.

Fireman 3: People don't understand! There may be more, anyone of these fuckin' buildings can blow up! This ain't done yet!

Fireman 1: This is in the top of the list. Nothing could be worse than this! You're in the building trying to help the people, and it's exploding on you inside the building, so...

[End of the video]

These people come forward and say: 'Yes! There were explosives! Bam, Bam! We didn't know what to do with it.'

We've professors, in the US, who come forward. This is Steven Jones, who says: "It's quite plausible that explosives were pre-planted in the three (WTC) buildings." But that's not the official story. Then we have professors in Denmark. This man is called Niels Harrit, and he says: 'We research the dust, okay? We research the dust that we found on WTC.' He says: "In the dust, what we have found, is a modern version of thermite, which we call nanothermite." So this is as if you look at criminal movies, right? It's always the case there is a dead body, and then the

special team comes and they dust on every detail, right? To find DNA, or to find details. And they take it in the lab, and they go into this micro, micro, microstructures, which is not my world. But the same thing happened here, and there're people who say: 'we found explosives.' And I thought: 'if they're saying this, we're going to have a huge new debate.' But that never happened. Most people never discussed this research! I want to know, where did they get the samples from, is it really explosives, or is it something else? It is important to know... No debate.

Another really bizarre thing is that on 9/11 you have this journalist called Jane Stanley. She said: 'A third building has collapsed.' Okay? She said this. And now remember: on the Internet –everybody is in the Internet– people analyse videos all the time. And they said: 'while she said it, the building is still standing.' So that's really bad. How can she say that WTC7 collapsed, while it was still standing? How did she know? Who was she working for? BBC World News. And here, the line says: "The 47 storey Salomon Brothers building –that's the WTC7– close to the World Trade Centre [sic] has also collapsed." That's the line they put in. And then there're people who say: 'this is incredible! The media is not telling us the truth on 9/11.' They said: 'Jane Stanley is somebody who lies to us.' So they attacked that journalist personally. And then BBC World News in 2008 offered a story and said: 'We're very sorry,' "we were working on an incorrect news agency report." "We had this statement from REUTERS." They handed it on and say: 'we had it from Reuters.' But Reuters is a huge media information system. "On September 11, 2001, REUTERS incorrectly reported that one of the buildings of the New York Trade Center –WTC7– had collapsed before it actually did." That's what Reuters said by E-mail. How did they come to this conclusion? No explanation. But, understand! A historian has to write History, how do we write History in this context? It's really complicated. The journalist herself, this person, Jane Stanley, she had a very hard time, okay? She quitted her job and took a time out, because she had a sort of a burnout. Because everybody was attacking her, for being a liar. And, you know, she in retrospect said, 'it was a mistake,' she knows that the building was still standing. But obviously, she is not the one to blame! She said: "I was thrown –not a question, but a statement of fact, I don't know where that came from." So, you have to imagine [that] the journalists on that day were standing in New York, a lot of thing were happening, it was a terrible day. And they just read it into the camera, okay? So she didn't do the research for this. So she really can't be blamed.

But what you now have is that mothers and brothers of people, who died in the attacks, also go and question WTC7: "I lost my son on 9/11. Most people don't know that a third tower fell on September 11." They put up movies on the Internet and say: 'we want that people remember building 7.' They put [them] on websites, to

have a debate on this.

[video – fragment of a documentary]

Fireman: You get down below and you see molten steel. Molten steel running down the channel rows. Like you're in a fountain. Like lava.

Erik Lawyer: Well the manual gets in to thermite and it says if you had melted steel or concrete, which we had on 9/11, we should test for it.

Bart Voorsanger (Architect & 9/11 Curator): This is fused element of steel, molten steel and concrete, and all of these things all fused by the heat into one single element.

Erik Lawyer: We're asking for an investigation that follows national standards. There's no excuse to not test for this. If terrorists used explosives in 93', why didn't we test for them? If all these witnesses heard explosions, why aren't we testing for them?

Steven Jones (Physics Professor Emeritus Brigham Young University): NIST (National Institutes for Standards and Technology) concedes that they found no evidence for explosives. So then we asked them: 'did you look?' And they said: 'No, we did not look for explosives or residues of explosives' (laughter).

Lynn Margulis (Scientist/Professor, University of Massachusetts): So the pre-conceived notion of NIST is that there is no evidence of explosives, and so there's no point in looking, ehh, that is the most unscientific thing that you can possibly think of, not to look because you don't expect to find evidence, and in fact the evidence is

overwhelming. They stated these conclusions for which there's virtually no evidence, and then they ignored conclusions that could be drawn from the evidence.

Richard Gage: The Freedom of Information Act requested to NIST was denied, but they claimed that releasing this data might jeopardize public safety. How could it possibly jeopardize public safety?

Ronald Brookman (Structural Engineer): The destruction of evidence was a criminal act in itself. It was already being carded away and destroyed when the FEMA investigators got there about a month after 9/11.

Lynn Margulis: You can't do science when you are deprived of the evidence and when your hypothesis is the least valid instead of the most likely. And the most likely hypothesis in the case of building 7 wasn't even mentioned. This is not science.

Richard Gage: The scientific forensic evidence ignored by NIST but carefully reviewed by teams of technical professionals corroborates the hypothesis of explosives controlled demolition. We travelled to 21 foreign countries and 32 American cities bringing this evidence to the attention of the public. And we were backed by 9/11 Family Members and other concerned citizens, who were calling for an independent, unbiased investigation.

Michele Little: I'm a family member trying to find the answers to the murder of 3000 plus people. The bottom-line is that it needs to be investigated. Properly.

Chapter 5: Pentagon

Okay, we come to chapter five. Chapter five basically says: 'the Pentagon is the other site, where we have to look at.' Now, the important thing for you to notice is that the Pentagon is flat. It has five corners –that's why it's a pentagon– but it's flat. It's not like the twin towers –high – but it's flat. So the official story is that it was hit by a plane like that (showing a digital image of a plane flying just a few inches above the floor into the Pentagon). This is not a picture; this is a computer simulation, to show how low the plane has to fly to hit the Pentagon. And then we have pictures of the Pentagon after it had been hit. And then people went and said: 'we can't see no plane here. If it hits the Pentagon it should be here' (pointing at one of those pictures). George Nelson, Colonel USAF (ret.), who worked for the US Air Force and his job was aircraft accidents investigator and airport port authority, he was 34 years in the Air Force, he said: "With all the evidence readily available at the Pentagon crash site, any unbiased rational investigator could only conclude that a Boeing 757 did not fly into the Pentagon as alleged." Now that's complicated! Is he right or is he wrong? You know, as a historian I have Bush who tells us that the Pentagon was hit by a Plane, then I have these peoples stepping out and saying: 'No, it was not hit by a plane.' So that's really complicated. We have to write history, remember! So we look at the pictures again, and that's (pointing at a picture) when the fire is extinguished. And the picture that was later shown is when part of the building collapsed, but that's half an hour later. You have to look at the data right after the Pentagon was hit, and not this picture, that's half an hour later.

And you had a French journalist who soon after the attacks, his name is Thierry Meyssan, said in 2003: 'the Pentagon was not hit by an airplane.' And there was a huge debate. "9/11. The big lie" (That's the name of his book) and everybody said: 'he's crazy.' And he said: 'No, it was a missile.' You know? The Pentagon [sic] fired a missile into the Pentagon and then said: 'we were attacked by Osama Bin Laden.' That's what he basically suggested, he couldn't prove it, but he said that could be [the case]. And he said: 'we certainly see a hole in the Pentagon (pointing at a picture), at the back of the wall. This is the entrance's side, and something penetrated this different rings, and it came out here, so it has to be something very solid.' And as historians we'd like to go back to the Pentagon and look at that hole. But obviously you can't do that!, because it has all been reconstructed! That is in March 2002 (a picture of the reconstruction). What we did get is, however, a video. Many people said: 'we want a video to see how the plane hits the Pentagon.' So after many years the Pentagon produced the video, and this is the video, it came out in 2006. [The video is played] You see something hits the Pentagon, something. But is not clear what.

We come to Dick Cheney. He's the Vice President on 9/11 and he is in the

White House when the Pentagon is allegedly hit by a plane. And now we have the former Minister for Transport, Norman Mineta, who was in the White House on that same day, and he says: 'In that moment, before the Pentagon was hit, Cheney had a strange communication with somebody I don't know.' Okay? And Norman Mineta went before the 9/11 Commission and said: 'this was the communication.' He said, in the White House on that morning "there was a young man who had come in and said 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 o the contrary?'" Now we do not know who that young man was and we do not know what the orders where. And the problem is: this statement was not included in the 9/11 Commission Report. Although it is and important statement to find out what Dick Cheney was doing on 9/11.

Chapter 6: Put Options

Let me come to the chapter six, the put options. Many people don't know that on 9/11 a lot of money was made, okay? It's also about money. On the one hand, through the insurance that had to pay for the destruction of the World Trade Center. On the other hand, you have people who speculated that the shares of United Airlines and American Airlines would go down. And you can speculate on shares that can go down with put options. Those of you who don't know much about international finance don't know put options; but 'put option' is basically a bet that a share will fall. It's nothing criminal, okay?, it's happening every day. On that specific day you have bets on United Airlines and American Airlines.

A researcher, he is a colleague of mine, he's Professor Marc Chesney, at the Institute of Banking, at the Zurich University, he researched whether you also have a lot of call options on that day. Call and Put, you know, 'Call' means that you speculate that the share will go up, and 'Put' is that they go down. And you need to find out whether there's significantly more put. And there's significantly more put. That's clear. And then you look; yeah maybe somebody was speculating that the whole airline industry will have problems. And they'd also speculated on Lufthansa and Singapore Airlines and whatever. But no! They only speculated on United and American. And those where the two airlines involved, so really this is insider trading,

clearly.

What does the 9/11 Commission Report say? It says: "Some unusual trading did in fact occur... The volume of put options... surged in the parent companies of United Airlines on September 6 and American Airlines on September 10... Yet further investigation revealed that the trading had no connection with 9/11. A single US based institutional investor with no conceivable ties to al Qaeda purchased 95 per cent of the UAL puts on September 6." So they didn't investigate any further. And that is incredible! You obviously have to investigate this further! But in the Report it is buried in page 49 in footnote 130. Who is going to find it? I found it, but most people don't even read the report. We have one congresswoman, she's Cynthia McKinney, she said in 2002 that this is not right. She said: "Those people who dealt in unusual put options shortly before 9/11 knew enough to make millions!" And you know that it's not right to make money out of terrorist attacks. It's not right. So, clearly we need to know more.

Chapter 7: Able danger

Let me come to Chapter Seven, Able Danger. Able Danger is an operation that was not known in the years after 9/11. It was a plan to look at Muslims terrorists who are in the US, to observe them and watch their every move. "The 9/11 Commission Report fails to mention that a year before the attacks a secret Pentagon project called 'Able Danger' had identified four 9/11 hijackers, including leader Mohamed Atta." (New York Times, August 11, 2005). That was revealed in 2005 by the New York Times. Most people at that time didn't, you know, read about 9/11. They just, you know, went on with their daily business. But it is very important if the leading hijackers had been watched by the Pentagon, okay? Mohammed Atta flew in the North Tower and Marwan al-Shehhi allegedly flew in the South Tower. And they'd all been on the watch list. So people who believed in the LIHOP theory (the 'Let it happen on purpose' theory), they say: 'Able Danger proves that those terrorists operated under the umbrella of the Pentagon.' Whether that is true or not: I don't know! But you have a congressman, Curt Weldon, who said: "Unbelievable... It's a cover-up of information on the largest attack in the history of the country. The 9/11 Commission did not do its job. It's time to get the facts out to the American people." He said: 'we need new investigation into Able Danger,' and he said: 'I cannot understand that it's not in the 9/11 Commission Report.' Thomas Kean and Lee

Hamilton, who had written the report, said that 'Able Danger' "did not turn out to be historically significant." I'm very surprised that they say that. They just say: 'this is not significant.' and they put it aside. Now I'm a historian with a PhD and I tell you: yes! It's historically significant. Of course it should be in the report. Of course you should have more investigation on that.

Who is the source? How do we know that 'Able Danger' took place? The source is Colonel Anthony Shaffer, he was 42-years old in 2005, he's from Kansas, and he had blown the story in August 2005. He said he had to risk his career by discussing Able Danger. Many people come forward and say: 'You know, if there were people who found out shady things about 9/11, if it's a conspiracy, then these people would step forward, and I would hear about it.' And I say: 'Well, yes, there are people who stepped forward but you don't hear about it.' That's the main question. Colonel Shaffer was part of a secret Pentagon operation. He said that his role in Able Danger was a liaison with the Defence Intelligence Agency (DIA) in Washington –that's one of them, there are many different secret services in the US, not only the CIA and the FBI, there is also the DEA and the NSA and a lot more. He was not involved in the details of the strategy used in Able Danger. But he said: "I do believe the 9/11 Commission should have done that job figuring out what went wrong with Able Danger." Because if they watched the terrorists, why didn't they stop them? "I'm proud of my operational record, he said, and I love what I do. But there comes a time –and I believe the time for me is now– to stand for something, to stand for what is right." So he stepped out and said: 'we need more information on what happened on 9/11.'

Chapter 8: Osama Bin Laden and Kalid Sheik Mohammed

Now, obviously we have to talk about Osama Bin Laden, okay? Because Osama Bin Laden is the biggest suspect of the terrorist attacks, he is the official terrorist. And we have to talk quickly about him. And we know that he is a militant Muslim. That is a fact. He was fighting the Russians in Afghanistan in the 1980's. Why? Because he was convinced that the Russians were atheists and off course they were, they were communists. And he said: 'there is no atheist that should be in Afghanistan, Afghanistan is a Muslim country. Let's get them out of the country.' That was his idea. At the time the CIA funded him and cooperated with him. You have to understand that the 9/11 reaches beyond the technical debate of WTC7, it reaches

into the debate of how Christians and Muslims and other religions can coexist peacefully. That's a very interreligious debate which is important, and you see that here (a picture of a religious leader in front and above of a crown gathered around the Kaaba is shown), you have Saudi Arabia, you have Mecca. That's the holy place for the Muslims. And some don't understand Osama Bin Laden when he says: 'the American soldiers who came to Saudi Arabia insulted Islam.' That is his conviction! And if we as Christians think about it, it would be very much as if the Muslims would occupy the Vatican. Now, I'm not sure how strongly you feel about the Vatican. But, it's just to give you an idea that a Catholic would not like to see Muslim troops in the Vatican. And in the same way, the Muslims don't like to see Christian soldiers in Saudi Arabia. You get what I'm saying?

But after[wards you have] the Gulf war with George Bush Senior. He obviously had American Troops there, and there's a lot of oil there. So they stayed. Globally we need –this is a super tanker (pointing at a picture)– we need 44 super tankers of oil every day. So the oil dependency of the world today is very high. And Bin Laden didn't like the idea that the Americans have soldiers in Saudi Arabia, so he said in 1996: "US soldiers must leave Saudi Arabia as the country had been turned into 'an American colony.'" "I gave advice to the Americans to withdraw their troops from Saudi Arabia," Bin Laden insisted. So I'm saying: yes! It is possible that Bin Laden was involved in the terrorists attacks, I'm saying that we need more research on that. But we do see that the Americans after 9/11 did not distanced themselves from the Saudi Government but continued to have close relationship due to the oil. This is a picture taken in 2005 and you see the King of Saudi Arabia hand in hand with the American president [Bush jr.] in Texas. Students always ask: 'But why do they do that? I mean according to the official story most of the terrorists came from Saudi Arabia. Why didn't they bomb Saudi Arabia?' That's the sort of the debate that you have in Seminars. I say: 'you know, you have to look at the oil.'

Where is the oil? If you look at the oil, this is the world oil reserves (pointing at a world map and graphic). It's here! That's the reserves. In Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Iran, that's the biggest field where the oil is. And if you look at world religions (pointing at another world map graphic), and you see, in these colours is Christians. So North and South America is Christian, Europe is Christian, except for Bosnia and Albania. Southern part of Africa is Christian, Australia is Christian, China is atheist. India is Hinduism [sic]. Russia... some sort of a transicion period if you want. And this green area is the Muslim world, okay? Now you don't need to be a brilliant analyst to see that the big oil is in the Muslim countries. You don't need to be brilliant to find this. And behind the scenes you obviously have very, very closed contact between these governments in the oil region and the Americans and the Chinese,

because the Americans and the Chinese want the oil, they really need it. There you've Rumsfeld in 2003 debating with the Saudis: 'What should be done next?' Well, they can increase the production when US will bomb Iraq, because otherwise they will have not enough oil production in Iraq and the oil's price will go through the roof, and that would be very expensive.

Now we have news that Osama Bin Laden is dead. How do we hear this? On video screens. May 2011 you have a video screen [stating]: 'Bin Laden is dead.' And who is the source to confirm whether that is true or not? It's the president. Now the question is the same old question: 'do you trust the president or don't you trust the president?' And that really divides people: some people trust the president and some people don't. What's the evidence? The president published pictures where they say: 'we are looking at a picture of how Osama Bin Laden is killed.' But we don't see the picture of how Bin Laden is killed. What we do get as historians is a picture of the house where he allegedly was. That's in Pakistan. And we get pictures of blood on the floor, and the footage is: 'this is exclusive news.'... Just think about the quality of information that you get that is sold as 'exclusive news.' It's very poor. Because we don't see Bin Laden, it could be anybody who lost blood there.

Then the story goes that Bin Laden was brought to the USS Carl Vinson, which is an aircraft carrier. And that then –he was already dead– they sank him in the Indian Ocean. So if anybody wants to try and test whether Bin Laden is dead or not, he has to search in this area. And that's impossible! You can't do it! We, as historians can't search there, it's impossible, we don't know. We can trust or not trust the president, but who told the president that Bin Laden was dead? Leon Panetta. He is the CIA director. So the question really is again: do you trust Leon Panetta? It burns down to that question and it's not funny, it's true! That's the question.

There is another person who was involved in the killing of Osama Bin Laden, and his name is William McRaven, he's an Admiral, so he is a high ranking officer, and he runs the Joint Special Operations Command. That's Special Forces. So in the end you have to trust the Special Forces and the secret service, and that makes it very difficult, because the Special Forces and the secret services are considered as the ones who were involved in the crime by those who think it was LIHOP and MIHOP. Do you understand? It really divides in two different groups.

So Bin Laden –probably– is dead. Do we have anybody else? Anybody else who can confirm what happened on 9/11? Yes! We have somebody. His name is Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. He was captured in 2003 in Pakistan. He's usually called KSM, because Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is a bit long. And then he was brought to

Guantanamo. And he claims that he was tortured in Guantanamo. And in 2007 KSM says that he was responsible for 9/11. And that Bin Laden was involved in 9/11. So he's now the prime witness for the SURPRISE story. The problem is: if he's been tortured, people say: 'you know? You'd say anything under torture. It's not a valid testimony.' So the US attorney general –that's a justice minister in the US–, Eric Holder, announced in November 2009 that he wants KSM to take him from Guantanamo and bring him to New York and have a fair trial, you know? Public, with a hearing, everything. But then in April 2011 –so that's new– he declared that KSM will not be brought to New York but face a military trial at the Guantanamo Bay detention facility. So, really you'll have in the end probably a military trial, if he's found guilty he will face a death penalty, and then that will be the end of the story.

Chapter 9: Northwoods 1962

When I discuss with students 9/11 some say: 'Well, it is really difficult to imagine SURPRISE, LIHOP and MIHOP, because MIHOP would mean that the government plans to attack its own population. And that just psychologically is just incredible', they say. Because, we pay taxes to the government, and the government is supposed to protect us. And I mean: paying taxes is already hard. But if then the government attacks its own population, is there any evidence that we have, documents, that this ever happened? I'm saying: yes! There's one case where we have documents that the government planned to attack the population. They planned, they didn't do it.

The context is back in the Cuban missile crisis. Remember! Eisenhower and Nixon didn't like Fidel Castro, they wanted to get rid of him. So we have the Bay of Pigs invasion. In April 1961. It failed, okay? Castro is still alive, still there. But at the time the president was very angry and he said: 'the CIA messed it up. The Pentagon should have a new plan of how to have a war against Cuba. Because, you know, we need to start a war.' And there is now an original document from 1962: *Justification for US military intervention in Cuba*. It was top secret for many, many years. And now it is declassified. It's a Pentagon document. And I'm just bringing this here to show you that as historians we are very slow –sorry for that– it usually take forty years until we get these documents, that's a bit late, I'm very sorry. And what the general suggest is: "We should have a 'Remember the Maine' incident [...] We could blow up a US ship in Guantanamo Bay and blame Cuba." So that is false-flag

terrorism: to blow up a ship and say that the other one did it. "We could develop a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami Area, in other Florida cities and even in Washington." Remember that's the cold war, that's why it reads 'communist', today it would read 'islamist'. It really is the idea to produce a terror campaign in your own country. And the third thing which they suggest is: "exploding a few plastic bombs in carefully chosen spots, the arrest of Cuban agents, and the release of prepared documents substantiating Cuban involvement would be helpful in projecting the idea of an irresponsible government", meaning, 'irresponsible Cuban government'. Because then the American people would be so angry, that right away you would have an invasion, a normal invasion. That would not be the toppling of the Castros, that would be the reason to have a war. Now, this was stopped, okay? But these are original documents. And now my students want to know: 'how do the people look [like]? How who they look [like] who write something like that? They got to be really, really, really evil! How do they look?' I say: 'It's not very spectacular.' That's the chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (showing a picture of four armed forces officials), that's the highest ranking military officers. And what do they want? They want victory. That's what they want. That somebody gets killed is normal in military business. They want victory, and, you know, camouflage and deceit are part of it. Lyman Lemnitzer here to the left is the one who signed the document. And why was it not carried out? Because Kennedy stopped it! Kennedy said: 'I don't want that this operation is been carried out.' And he said: 'Lemnitzer has to leave.' He was the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that's the highest-ranking military officer in the Pentagon. So he had to leave, he was transferred to Europe; he became the Supreme Allied Commander of NATO. So... send him over [laughter in the audience].

Chapter 10: Conclusion

I conclude! I conclude!

We went through all these ten [sic] points. I said: 'we have to investigate 9/11 again. We have to look at SURPRISE, LIHOP and MIHOP. We have to look at the 9/11 debate.' The term 'conspiracies' is used wrongly to discredit anybody who questions the official version. But as historians we are trained to question presidents and prime ministers. Always. Because we say: 'if there's a lot of power, there is a lot of abuse of power.' Okay? That's our training. So I feel very strange about this

Conspiracy Theory debate. It's not about conspiracies, it's about: do we find out what happened on 9/11? WTC7 is a very important issue. Either it was brought down by fire, or it was brought down by controlled demolition. That's the two possibilities. More research is needed. The Pentagon is a very important question. Either it was hit by a plane, or it was hit by a missile. That's a very important question. The Put Options are an important question. Either they can be trace back to Al-Qaeda, it doesn't seem to be the case, or it was insiders in the US who carried out the trade. Bin Laden is dead, probably, we are not able to check that. Because he is in the Indian Ocean, really. Northwoods is just a document, a historical document, which shows that sometimes, crazy things are been planned.

And the conclusion really is... that we should take a little distance, we should take a step back, that's my last slide (a picture of the earth taken from space), and we should reflect on the ten years, because we've all lived through the ten years, nobody's younger than ten years here, right? You know, recently I had a class and said: 'Well, everybody remembers where they were in September 11.' And one of the students raised her hand, and said: 'I don't remember.' And I said: 'You just got to be kidding. Why is she saying that?' And I said: 'Why you don't remember where you were on September 11.?' And she said: 'I was 11 years old!' Then I started to realize that my students are now 21 and some of them, you know, they don't know what happened then. They want to read the history books. But we have to read the history books! And I just explained to you how difficult it is to write these history books!

So when I take a step back, I'm just saying: 'My firm conviction is that we must stop killing each other based on a story that we have not even understood.' That's the whole thing. Thank you for your attention. Good luck.

Questions

Let's do the questions right away, right?

Question 1: I think that we should start thinking about the whole Anthrax attack. Because it's an important matter in all that 9/11 story. I think we could get some answers from you.

Answer: That's true. I mean the Anthrax attack in the beginning it was targeted at congressmen, who were about to investigate what happen really on 9/11. And then they received this Anthrax letters. And then people thought: 'well that's Bin Laden again, you know? He's everywhere.' And people were very scared. And then after a few years it was discovered that it was not Bin Laden. It was traced back into military facilities in the US, departments for biological and chemical warfare. And then the response was that people said: 'this was just a crazy man, who got out of control and did this.' That's at the moment the investigation, whether that is true or not, you are absolutely right, it's an important question. More research is needed on the Anthrax story. More questions.

Question 2: My question is: what is missing for the next investigation?

Answer: There is the political will, which is really missing. Because to do an investigation you need American politicians to say: 'We want the truth.' And then if they say that, they can set up a committee of independent scholars. There are a lot of very good scholars in the US. They don't need to come to Europe. They have enough excellent scholars in the US. They bring their best minds together, and put them in a room and send everybody in who was active on that day. And then they can be questioned. On the record, publicly. On all these issues. And that's really what has to happen. And the question is: whether in the next ten years we see something like that happen or not. Is not that Japan or Switzerland or Germany or South Africa or Brazil can do such an investigation. It's an American story. But you always have to think that Americans are very deep in this. Many lost people, many lost people in the wars. Many are scared to lose their jobs, now they are in this debt crisis. It's very difficult for them. That's something we have to keep in mind.

Question 3: For me the biggest question is the role of the press. Why not one of our used papers asks these questions?

Answer: It is an important question because what you have today is really a division. I can maybe give a concrete example. My students they are between eighteen years old and twenty-five years old. So they come to the seminar, I had a seminar at Basel

University on 9/11, for 12 weeks we were just dealing with 9/11. We were dealing with SURPRISE, LIHOP, MIHOP. And everybody had to have presentations and we went through all the details. And at the end of that seminar everybody was completely confused. They didn't know what to believe. And I say: 'That's pretty good.' Because that is the Socratic position. It's better if you say: 'I don't know what happened. I know that I don't know.' You know, that is the Socratic position. Whereas instead if you say: 'I know what happened! It was this or that man and therefore we should have this or that war!' Okay, that's much more dangerous. So, these students, most of them use the Internet. It's getting really bad, I mean, I'm saying, in another context: 'which books have you read on the introduction of women voting rights in Switzerland in 1971?', for instance. And they say: 'I didn't find anything.' And I say: 'Where did you look?' And they say: 'On Google.' They don't go to libraries anymore they just do everything on the computer. Now, if you do [sic] 9/11 on the computer only, you're likely to end up with a MIHOP or LIHOP version of the events. So my students come to the seminar and say: 'So, it's quite clear, Cheney did this, right?' And I'm like: 'Let's discuss it.' And then, three weeks later I meet their parents. And the parents, they read the *Neuer Zürcher Zeitung*, or they look at the *Tageschau*, and they tell me: 'It's quite clear that Bin Laden did it, right?' And I say: 'let's look at it.' And the problem is that I talk to both groups, the student who is 20 and the parent who is 50. And the student thinks of the parent: 'He's got to be really stupid. He's always watching the news, and has not realize that the good stories are not there anyway.' And the parent thinks of the next generation: 'I'm really scared. He's always on the Internet until 3 in the morning. And he believes everything. He believes that tomorrow the aliens will invade.' And, you know, both groups are sort of right, or wrong. And that really leaves me with that situation that now Universities have to take over. We have to offer the ground where everybody can come and bring his story, and then we debate. Because that's how we usually work. You know, if you think of cancer research, it's not that the press decides how cancer functions, but you have scientists who come together and everybody says: 'Oh, I found this story. Or I found that's story and this illness develops like that.' And then take the microscope and throw a few millions in that direction, and then we have scientific progress. And now we need the same in the field of 9/11, but still today many scholars are scared. I have colleagues who tell me: 'If you touch 9/11 you'll just ruin your academic career.' Why do that? And so that's the problem. We have the problem that the press is not very well informed. And we have the problems that academics, well, many don't dare to speak out. But I don't know! I actually don't know what we'll see in the next ten years. But I'm saying that the situation is not the same like in the 70's, it's not the same like in the 50's because we have the Internet! It's completely different!

Yeah! Sorry. It's hard to say how the press works, right? I mean, this story where Reuters reports the collapse of WTC7, how do they do it? I don't know. I really don't know. But it's important to realize when people say: 'I don't hear anything on people who speak out with questions and stuff so they don't exist.' And now what we say is: 'remember that between the event and you there's the press.' And it

doesn't get to you if it's not in your daily newspaper. So if it is not in your daily newspaper, you should change your newspaper! It's always a good idea to change your newspaper again and again. Because if you just read the same newspaper all the time, you end up hating people that you don't even know, and you advocate a war that you don't understand based on a terrorist attack that you don't have no clue about! That's scary.

If we have one more question, otherwise... That's the last question!

Question 4: Which importance do you give to the scientists and physicists in Scholars for Truth?

Answer: I think, generally, scientists across the globe are my hope for really bringing in some structure into the debate and bringing some good data into the discourse. I mean, it's probably because I'm a scientist. I've always believed in science I think if we research hard we find out a lot. And we research hard! If you think of historians, we've written such many books about the Second World War, all the details, we've researched Russian Communism, I mean I've researched Oil and Gas, and other have researched the development in voting rights in Switzerland, and others now look at, you know, tons of stories! There are so many stories! But we can also, if we want, shift our attention on 9/11, if we want. If we do that, we come [out] with a very good training. We question... traditionally, it's our job. And we check the data: who said what. Where did they say it. And then we have the physics, and the architects who join us. And then we all come together! We really have, I think, the power to make progress in this research. So I do believe in science, yes! Ten years down the road I have to see how far we got. But, yes, it's a global research and many people are linked through the Internet. I mean, you have global scientists linked. It's nobody individual anymore. People send me: 'do you know Able Danger?' And I'm: 'No, I've never heard of it.' They send me the data, and then: Zack! There it comes! We're much faster, so, don't underestimate science.

Thank you very much! I wish you good evening, safe return home and take care!