



# ***FROM THE WILDERNESS***

*A Nonpartisan Non-sectarian MAP from the Here That Is,  
Into the Tomorrow of 60Our Own Making*

Vol. VII, No. 1

April 30, 2004  
© Copyright 2004

## **Condoleezza Rice Testifies**

# LIES A SIXTH GRADER WOULD NOT ACCEPT

by  
Michael C. Ruppert

April 8, 2004, 2000 PDT (FTW) – **T**he critical interaction in any criminal investigation of a major crime is between the detective and the suspect. It is the detective's mission to get the suspect to trip up and make statements which can then be presented in court to discredit the suspect, break down his alibis, and prove the suspect's criminal knowledge and intent. Courts and the legal system don't care what non-involved parties speculate or argue about with each other. They weren't part of the crime. They weren't there and their thoughts become hearsay or irrelevant. The only thing that matters in court is what the detective can get the suspect to state on the record which can then be corroborated or disproved. That is called direct evidence.

For independent investigators challenging the government's position on the attacks of 9/11/01, from the start our best gambit has been to maneuver the government and key officials into tripping themselves up publicly in a way that can be understood by the American people as easily as watching an episode of *NYPD Blue*. No expert witnesses are need. No scientific evidence needs to be presented or debated. The suspect lied. And if the suspect lied then the suspect's story is not true. And if the suspect's story is not true then the suspect is, in all probability, guilty as hell or withholding material evidence of someone else's guilt.

The hardest work involved in this process is to expose the lie in a way that the suspect cannot ignore or escape. It is much easier then to go from an admitted lie to proof of guilt and confession.

Perhaps Andy Sipowicz should have been on the September 11<sup>th</sup> Commission as Condoleezza rice hung herself today. There certainly was no one there willing to do the job that he could have done without breaking a sweat.

On no less than seven different occasions in today's long-awaited testimony before the September 11<sup>th</sup> Commission, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice insisted that there was no specific advance knowledge as to the time, place and method of the attacks, and that there was no warning of a domestic internal threat from Al Qaeda throughout the spring and summer of 2001. With these sworn statements the biggest vulnerability of the Bush administration in its criminal complicity for those attacks lies exposed and fully on the record. Ladies and gentlemen, what you witnessed today, on every major network, was perjury – a felony. We will prove that here. But compared to the crimes of murder, conspiracy and treason it was perhaps maybe too small a crime for the major media to notice. It was not too big a crime, however, for the American people and the victim families of 9/11 to notice. The revolution may not be televised. But it may have begun as a result of what was televised today.

(Cont'd on page 21)

## ***From the Wilderness***

Michael C. Ruppert  
Publisher/Editor

Assistant Managing Editor.....Jamey Hecht, Ph.D.  
Contributing Editor.....Peter Dale Scott, Ph.D.  
Science Editor.....Dale Allen Pfeiffer  
Military /Veteran's Affairs Editor.....Stan Goff

*From The Wilderness* is published eleven times annually. Subscriptions are \$65 (US) for 11 issues.

### ***From The Wilderness***

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

[www.fromthewilderness.com](http://www.fromthewilderness.com)

editorial: [editor@copvcia.com](mailto:editor@copvcia.com)

subscriptions and customer service:

[service@copvcia.com](mailto:service@copvcia.com)

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

---

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Condoleezza Rice Testifies: Lies a Sixth Grader Would Not Accept** ..... page 1

**Time Line: Path to Pandemonium**..... page 3

**Peak Oil: Debate or Vendetta**..... page 12

**Richard Clarke's Orchestra**..... page 16

© Copyright 2004 Michael C. Ruppert and *From The Wilderness Publications*, [www.fromthewilderness.com](http://www.fromthewilderness.com). All rights reserved

### **REPRINT POLICY**

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

"Reprinted with permission, Michael C. Ruppert and *From The Wilderness Publications*, [www.copvcia.com](http://www.copvcia.com), P.O Box 6061 – 350, Sherman Oaks, CA 91413, (818) 788-8791. *FTW* is published monthly; annual subscriptions are \$65 per year."

THIS WAIVER DOES NOT APPLY TO PUBLICATION OF NEW BOOKS.

For reprint permission for "for profit" publication, please contact *FTW*. For Terms and conditions on subscriptions and the *From the Wilderness* website, please see our website at: [www.fromthewilderness.com](http://www.fromthewilderness.com) or send a self-addressed stamped envelope with the request to the above address.

---

---

## **BBC Cites *From The Wilderness* as Source on Peak Oil**

In an article on Peak Oil, published this past week (4/19/04), BBC's online news service cited *From the Wilderness* and its reporting from the recent Peak Oil workshop in Paris, France.

In the article titled: "When the Last Oil Well Runs Dry", written by Alex Kirby, BBC News Online environment correspondent, BBC wrote:

... "In May 2003 the Association for the Study of Peak Oil and Gas (Aspo), founded by Colin Campbell, held a workshop on oil depletion in Paris.

### ***Changed priorities***

*One of the speakers was an investment banker, Matthew Simmons, a former adviser to President Bush's administration.*

*From The Wilderness Publications reported him as saying: "Any serious analysis now shows solid evidence that the non-FSU [former Soviet Union], non-Opec [Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries] oil has certainly petered out and has probably peaked..."*

### ***No cheap oil, no cheap food***

*"I think basically that peaking of oil will never be accurately predicted until after the fact. But the event will occur, and my analysis is... that peaking is at hand, not years away.*

*"If I'm right, the unforeseen consequences are devastating... If the world's oil supply does peak, the world's issues start to look very different.*

*"There really aren't any good energy solutions for bridges, to buy some time, from oil and gas to the alternatives. The only alternative right now is to shrink our economies." ...*

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/3623549.stm>

---

---

The following article was sourced through readily available news and commentary on the internet, most of it archived by date at [www.bringthemhomenow.org](http://www.bringthemhomenow.org) in the news section.

# TIME LINE: PATH TO PANDEMONIUM

By  
Stan Goff

It is always important to ask why we start history when.

For example, most commentators start the history of Iraq with the 1990 invasion of Kuwait. There is also an occasional reference to the chemical attacks at Halabja, in Iraqi Kurdistan on March 16, 1988 (now condensed to "Saddam used weapons of mass destruction against his own people"). The latter has to be boiled down considerably, because the chemical attacks were part of a massive and pitched battle with Iranians, which becomes a mitigating factor, and more importantly because the US had actively and materially supported the development and deployment of these weapons just a couple of years earlier, when none other than Donald Rumsfeld was Ronald Reagan's Special Envoy to the Middle East.

See what happens when you go back and start history just a wee bit earlier? Things take on a brand new aspect.

In 1979, the Carter administration encouraged Iraq to attack Iran because they had just undergone the shock of the Iranian Islamist Revolution, and almost the whole US Embassy in Tehran was taken hostage for over a year.

The virtuous Kuwaitis who were so ruthlessly attacked by the demon hordes of Iraq, by the way, were acting as US/UK surrogates in the region ever since Kuwait was invented by Great Britain in 1961. The US, alarmed at the development of Iraq and its growing prestige among other Arab nations, used Kuwait to undermine Iraq economically beginning in the mid-1980s, even as the US was continuing to encourage the perpetuation of the Iran-Iraq War. Kuwaitis not only illegally annexed 900 square miles of prime Iraqi oil land, they hooked up with the Santa Fe Drilling Company, who specialized in "slant drilling," running drills across the Iraqi border to pump billions of dollars of Iraqi oil, as they dumped cheap oil onto the market – with encouragement from the CIA – to cut the Iraqis' development revenues.

The American public, however, had their history lesson start with the invasion of Kuwait, complete with taxpayer-financed fabrications about Iraqi soldiers dumping little Kuwaiti babies out of their incubators (for the record, this story was utter bullshit).<sup>1</sup> The United States had its vil-

lain and its passion play, and off went Bush the Elder to crush Arab nationalism in the guise of Ba'athist Iraq.

History is interesting, isn't it?

Now the United States is faced with a furious rebellion against the military occupation of Iraq, and Bush the Junior seems determined to make sure that this rebellion succeeds, even as he makes yet more manly noises from the White House about how "we remain tough" in Iraq.

We.

The Bush staff wants to start history now with the April 5-6 armed operations by Muqtadi Sadr's Mahdi militia, and with the ambush of four American mercenaries in Fallujah on March 31st.

But let's go back to 1991 and work our way forward.

## 22 January 1991

Defense Intelligence Agency document, entitled "Iraq Water Treatment Vulnerabilities," is published. It details how sanctions combined with destruction of potable water infrastructure can be used against the Iraqi people as a war measure, in violation of the Geneva Conventions and the Laws of Warfare.

Here is an excerpt:

*"Iraq depends on importing specialized equipment and some chemicals to purify its water supply, most of which is heavily mineralized and frequently brackish to saline... With no domestic sources of both water treatment replacement parts and some essential chemicals, Iraq will continue attempts to circumvent United Nations Sanctions to import these vital commodities. Failing to secure supplies will result in a shortage of pure drinking water for much of the population. This could lead to increased incidences, if not epidemics, of disease... The quality of untreated water generally is poor, [and drinking it] could result in diarrhea... [Iraq's rivers] contain biological materials, pollutants, and are laden with bacteria. Unless the water is purified with chlorine, epidemics of such diseases as cholera, hepatitis, and typhoid could occur. [Chlorine] has been embargoed [by sanctions]... Recent reports indicate the chlorine supply is critically low... Food processing, electronic, and, particularly, pharmaceutical*

*plants require extremely pure water that is free from biological contaminants... Iraq conceivably could truck water from the mountain reservoirs to urban areas. But the capability to gain significant quantities is extremely limited... The amount of pipe on hand and the lack of pumping stations would limit laying pipelines to these reservoirs. Moreover, without chlorine purification, the water still would contain biological pollutants. Some affluent Iraqis could obtain their own minimally adequate supply of good quality water from Northern Iraqi sources. If boiled, the water could be safely consumed. Poorer Iraqis and industries requiring large quantities of pure water would not be able to meet their needs... Precipitation occurs in Iraq during the winter and spring, but it falls primarily in the northern mountains... Sporadic rains, sometimes heavy, fall over the lower plains. But Iraq could not rely on rain to provide adequate pure water... Iraq could try convincing the United Nations or individual countries to exempt water treatment supplies from sanctions for humanitarian reasons... It probably also is attempting to purchase supplies by using some sympathetic countries as fronts. If such attempts fail, Iraqi alternatives are not adequate for their national requirements... Iraq will suffer increasing shortages of purified water because of the lack of required chemicals and desalination membranes. Incidences of disease, including possible epidemics, will become probable unless the population were careful to boil water... Iraq's overall water treatment capability will suffer a slow decline, rather than a precipitous halt... Although Iraq is already experiencing a loss of water treatment capability, it probably will take at least six months [to June 1991] before the system is fully degraded."*<sup>2</sup>

This was one among many attacks leveled at civilian essential infrastructure during the war and as a component of sanctions. These sanctions and regular bombing from 1991 until the 2003 destroyed much of Iraqi infrastructure, and with it Iraq's comparatively high living standards, as well as Iraq's renowned social services. That social disruption amplified crime and sectarian violence, triggering harsher measures from the government to contain the increasing social disorder. The official story now is that Saddam Hussein destroyed the Iraqi economy.

While no one is disputing that Saddam's rule was in many respects both harsh and venal, the fact is that Iraq as a whole was in many ways the most advanced, and even the most progressive (especially with regard to women's legal status) regime in the region. Honesty demands that we look at this whole picture.

Sanctions alone are believed to have been responsible for the premature deaths of almost 1.5 million Iraqis in a 12 year period – a third of them children – from malnutrition, medical neglect, and disease.

As we go forward with this time line, it is important to understand that kinship bonds in Iraq are multi-lateral

and extensive. The killing, maiming, abuse, or humiliation of any one Iraqi ripples over many relatives.

## **27 February 1991**

380 Iraqi soldiers who had surrendered to US forces were given food by one US Army unit that then left, whereupon another Army mechanized platoon appeared on the scene and machine-gunned the unarmed and clearly marked POWs to death.

Does anyone think that this incident was forgotten 12 years later, or that the kin of these murdered troops were looking forward to being likewise liberated?

## **2 March 1991**

The Army's 24th Mechanized Infantry Division, commanded by General Barry McCaffrey, who would later go on to become Bill Clinton's "drug tsar," violated a declared cease fire and moved his division forward of the cease fire line south of Basra.

400 Iraqi supply trucks and 187 Iraqi tanks – with guns locked to the rear and therefore not prepared to fire – were in the process of retreating north in accordance with the agreement that accompanied the cease fire. Many of the Iraqi soldiers in this retreating column had family members and other civilians accompanying them on this northward retreat. They thought they were protected by the Law of Land Warfare, which prohibits attacking a retreating column during a declared cease fire.

They were wrong.

McCaffrey ordered a full scale attack on the column that employed ground and air forces.

In what was later referred to by participants as a "turkey shoot," the Iraqis were annihilated. Among the thousands of Iraqis killed was a school bus full of children accompanying the column.

If 5,000 Iraqis (a conservative estimate) were killed at McCaffrey's "turkey shoot," how many relatives surviving them would welcome the 2003 "liberation"?

This is the pre-time line. Now let's look at what has happened in the more immediate past, where the massive expansion of Iraqi armed resistance has triggered a political crisis in the Bush administration, the extension of troop tours in Iraq, the anticipation of more troops being deployed to Iraq, the employment of yet more mercenaries to augment the 20,000 or so that are already in Iraq – making private armies the second largest occupying contingent there – and a certain return to Congress for additional funds.

## **28-30 April 2003**

I include here an excerpt from my book, Full Spectrum Disorder:

Soon, a new town would gain recognition in American popular discourse: Fallujah. In Afghanistan, the U.S. refused to send stabilization forces into the hinterlands. There is no oil there. In Fallujah (and every other key city), U.S. soldiers were sent there whether anyone wanted it or not.

Once Iraqi combatants displaced from Fallujah, local imams stepped in. They stopped the looting and vengeance attacks, re-opened public services, and established an interim constabulary. Normalcy was beginning to take hold there, then the Bradley fighting vehicles rolled into town in late April, and the Americans took over a recently re-opened school for their headquarters, arrested the imams, installed their own mayor, and road blocked the whole city. These actions were their orders, orders from people who knew nothing of Iraqi society, and this ignorance was delivered into the hands of the Iraqi resistance like a priceless gift.

Popular outrage was swift. The Americans – still tightly strung from recent combat – were besieged by angry demonstrators, whom they then began to shoot. Between April 28 and April 30, twenty Iraqis were killed and scores wounded. Lies about weapons in the crowds were concocted, and eyewitnesses were effectively excluded from the American media. CENTCOM could say anything, no matter the number of witnesses, and it would be given equal weight against all claims to the contrary.

But lies are only misrepresentations of reality. They do not erase reality. In Fallujah, the masses were now served a helping of occupation reality, and they were galvanized by it. Resistance is fertilized by blood, and the American guns in Fallujah nourished the greening fields of Iraqi opposition. The popular basis for a guerrilla struggle had been established by the American military's hand, and it wouldn't be long in coming. A whole population was now prepared to take a supportive role in an armed resistance. This was a signpost, but it was written in a foreign tongue for the Americans.

We'll come back to Fallujah.

Michael Schwartz wrote an excellent April 12 article entitled What Triggered the Shia Insurrection? It begins:

*"The insurrection in Shia areas of Iraq was not a sudden explosion, nor was it primarily inspired by the events in Falluja. It was, instead, the result of a long series of actions and reactions between the Coalition's armed forces and increasingly organized and anti-American Shia militias."*

### June 2003

While the news media had us focused on battlefield drama in Iraq, explains Schwartz, Bremer's CPA was angling as early as last June to retain control of the whole Iraqi government after the putative handover of

"sovereignty," when Grand Ayatollah Ali Sistani, the senior Shia Muslim cleric in the world, let the CPA know that the 60% Shia population of Iraq, of which he was a part, was not going to have its numerical power politically diminished in post-occupation Iraq. Sistani further advised the CPA that sovereignty was to mean something... which would include the right to ask the American military to leave.

The US goal has always been to establish permanent bases in Iraq, of which Sistani is certainly aware. Bremer is equally aware of it and was having none of this. The problem was that Sistani exercised tremendous influence in the Southern and most populous half of Iraq, and Sistani's directive to his followers not to take up arms (yet) against the occupiers allowed the US to more or less ignore the South militarily and concentrate forces against the more northern focus of anti-occupation guerrilla warfare.

Viceroy Bremer's response to Sistani was to send his lawyers on a mission to concoct a way around Sistani's implicit challenge, which they did. Bremer quietly announced last June that the CPA had "found a legal basis for American troops to continue their military control over the security situation in Iraq" whether the governing body of 'sovereign' Iraq voted to expel them or not.

Sistani did not respond by inciting a rebellion, which is not the cleric's style anyway. A BBC profile has described him as having a "quietist approach." That does not mean Bremer or anyone else should underestimate him. Sistani managed to stay put and retain his influence throughout the Ba'athist era, marking him as a very patient and canny political survivor. His patience, in fact, was what frustrated younger, poorer Shias who were eventually drawn into the orbit of Muqtada al-Sadr, a younger and less conservative Shia leader from Baghdad.

Sistani's devout followers orient more toward Persia, and have close relations with Iran. Sadr's faction has typically oriented more toward the Syrian-based Hezbollah, an organization that formed as a militia to fight the Israelis in Lebanon. These links further predispose them to Sistani's slow deliberation (like a government, i.e., Iran) and Sadr's preference for action seen as the propaganda-of-the-deed (like a guerrilla organization).

Sadr's criticisms had actually developed into armed confrontations between his militia and Sistani in April 2003.

The Bush administration and Bremer's CPA analytically reduced this conflict, and began to think about Sistani as "the moderate" and Sadr as "the radical." This simplistic thought process is partly responsible for the mess Bremer finds himself in now, as does George W. Bush for that matter.

### October 2003

Sistani, having sat on his response to the CPA's legal chicanery, released a typically elliptical criticism of US plans.

The US seems to have ignored it, having been preoccupied at this point with an increasingly sophisticated guerilla resistance and with growing public vexation in the United States about the failure to find the alleged weapons of mass destruction.

#### **November 2003:**

Sistani tells Bremer, "We want elections, not appointments."

#### **December 2003**

Bremer rejects elections until after the US election.

#### **22 March 2004**

Israel assassinates Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, the paraplegic leader of Hamas, in Gaza, sparking worldwide outrage. While virtually the entire world condemns the assassination, the United States refuses to condemn it, calling it merely "troubling."

The elephant in the living room in Iraq – and throughout the region – which never seems to get any coverage in the media, is Palestine.

This of course requires its own time line, but for that I refer readers to:

<http://www.globalissues.org/Geopolitics/MiddleEast/Palestine/Background.asp> .

In the Arab and Muslim world, the US is associated – correctly – with every Israeli policy, including the expulsion of almost 800,000 Palestinians from their land in conjunction with Israel's independence; the further expropriation and annexation of Palestinian, Lebanese, and Syrian land; the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza; and the establishment of a system of virtual Apartheid within Israel and the conversion of the West Bank and Gaza into poverty-stricken and frequently attacked Bantustans.

The almost completely uncritical support of Israel by the United States has been matched by only one other nation, Apartheid South Africa. The US props up Israel's perennial-war economy with massive infusions of aid (Israel is the single largest foreign recipient of US aid anywhere in the world), credits to buy state-of-the-art weapons to continue its war against the Palestinians, and the protection of the US Security Council veto.

The issue of Palestine is tremendously important to Arabs and Muslims, who regard this as oppression of both Arabs for their ethnicity and Muslims as co-religionists. When the US press does what passes for analysis of the situation in Iraq, its failure to mention Palestine is yet another sign of its journalistic emptiness.

Attacks on Palestinians and the assassination of Palestinian leaders like Yassin inflame the entire region, and that heat is directed at both Israel and the United States. It was felt very strongly in Iraq, where it is already well known that Israel has been training American troops for the Iraq occupation – passing along the tricks of the trade learned in the ruthless occupation of Palestine.

Vengeance strikes – called retaliatory strikes – that collectively punish whole populations are emblematic of Israeli occupation operations.

#### **23 March 2004**

Shia Basra, until now the poster-child city for 'pacification,' erupts in riots. British soldiers are attacked with stones and Molotov cocktails. Two Finnish businessmen in Baghdad are killed. A car bomb goes off north of Baghdad. A Marine local security patrol in Ramadi is attacked. Iraqi police south of Baghdad are added to a suddenly growing list of dead Iraqi police. An oil pipeline is bombed.

The Mahdi militias are mobilized in a region of the country where there is a very low concentration of US forces, precisely because the Shia leadership had called upon the populations to wait. The story of the closing of Al Hawza, however, and the killing of the demonstrators, spreads through the country like wildfire. Sistani, respected as the elder of Shi'ism, is now faced with growing rage and impatience, and Sadr's popularity begins to grow. His militancy is now a reflection of the mood of the masses.

#### **25 March 2004**

Paul Bremer brusquely and arrogantly announces that the US intends to maintain its 14 bases in Iraq for as long as it desires, regardless of what any 'sovereign' Iraqi government says.

Michael Schwartz, in his article, outlined Bremer's statement:

1. The U.S. occupation itself would be used as a club against any Iraqi activities of which the Bush administration disapproves. According to the *New York Times*, "Top aides to Mr. Bremer have said in recent days that the American troops will act as the most important guarantor of American influence."

2. The U.S. would control the newly formed Iraqi army. The *Times* wrote of Bremer's document: "The document was unequivocal on the ultimate control of the Iraqi forces. 'All trained elements of the Iraqi armed forces shall at all times be under the operational control of the commander of Coalition forces for the purpose of conducting combined operations,' it said."

3. The U.S. would have permanent bases in Iraq. The 14 planned bases would be capable of housing over 100,000 troops, and are expected to be a part of the permanent American presence in the Middle East.

4. The \$18.4 billion in congressionally mandated reconstruction aid would be used as a guarantor of U.S. influence. According to the Times it would "give Americans a decisive voice" in the short run because it would be virtually the only cash available to establish and maintain public services. But more significantly, since it would be used over the next few years to modernize Iraq's electricity, communications and transportation systems, it would give the U.S. Embassy -- projected to be the largest in the world, with over 3000 employees -- policy control over the Iraqi infrastructure for the foreseeable future.

Muqtada al-Sadr's newspaper, Al Hawza, along with all Shia leadership, excoriated the statement. But Bremer had -- in brain-dead neo-con fashion -- already divided Sistani and Sadr into "moderate" and "militant," and he ordered Al Hawza closed by American forces.

In response to Bremer's statement that he would remain the Viceroy of Iraq for as long as the US desired, Sadr's Mahdi militia had already dusted off their weapons.

During a demonstration against the closing of Al Hawza, American troops open fire and kill an estimated 20 people, wounding dozens of others.

The fuse is now lit.

#### 26 March 2004

In response to a sharp increase in the frequency of attacks, US troops mount "aggressive" operations, and in one of them west of Baghdad a family is killed, including a two-year-old child. This story has traveled across all of Iraq in mere hours, and the sullenness of many turns to murderous rage.

As if coordinated by a combined general staff, the new combatants in the south and the northern guerrillas from Mosul to Fallujah conduct intensified and simultaneous attacks across both regions, suddenly and overwhelming disorienting the US military's operational planners.

Obliged now to respond to multiple crisis points, the US military begins to shift forces around on short notice, and the logistical activities that support them also have their routines disrupted. Supplies are being shipped to different points. Routes are changing. The need to decisively and flexibly respond is combined with disorientation, and US forces, as well as contract soldiers, are temporarily blinded and exposed.

#### 31 March 2004

Americans at home have forgotten the Fallujah of less than a year before, when for three days, US troops fired on unarmed demonstrators. But the people of Fallujah remember, and the city has become a center of gravity for the resistance.

Four mercenaries who are escorting supply convoys see a detour sign on the bypass route for Fallujah. For days now, everything has been in a flux, so this is no different. They take the detour. In moments they encounter a lethal ambush. One vehicle escapes only to hit a secondary ambush.

Journalists publish the pictures of Fallujans celebrating their victory by desecrating the bodies of the "contract employees."

A recently returned troop, who wishes to remain anonymous, says, "When I read about the mutilated charred bodies of the Blackwater mercenaries in the news, all I thought was that we did the same thing to them. They would see us debase their dead all the time. We would be messing around with charred bodies, kicking them out of the vehicles and sticking cigarettes in their mouths."

Another returned troop, also anonymous, says, "We would defecate on and run over dead Iraqi bodies."

But the story of the Blackwater mercs hits the American public without this context, and chauvinism combines with machismo all the way through Washington and to the CENTCOM G-3. Planning for an Israeli-like vengeance attack on Fallujah begins immediately.

Within hours, the north-south resistance increases the frequency of attacks yet again, and March closes as the month with the second-highest US troop death toll since the war began. April, however, would surpass it before our taxes were due.

#### 5 April 2004

The Mahdi militias open up attacks in Baghdad, Najaf, Nasiriya, and Kut. Eight GI's are killed in one day, and police stations are abandoned to the Mahdi. Two Marines are killed by resistance fighters near Fallujah, where the US is ringing the city with combat units

in preparation to "pacify" the city.

For the first time since the occupation of Baghdad was completed in 2003, Apache helicopters begin pouring chain-gun ammunition into Baghdad neighborhoods, in an Israeli-style counter-offensive.



Sadr' popularity soars, not only in Iraq, but throughout the Arab and Muslim world. Within days, knowledgeable observers will report that he enjoys the support of more than 30% of Iraq's Shias.

The Sunnis and Ba'athists of the north are also caught up in this admiration, and old rivalries begin to melt in the face of a common enemy. The success of these operations adds an element of Arab pride.

George W. Bush's military conquest of Iraq is beginning to undo 50 years of imperial effort to destroy pan-Arab nationalism and, in a spectacular historical paradox, is resurrecting it.

Attacks in Mosul and Kirkuk are added to the equation.

#### 6 April 2004

The US opens a lethal assault on Fallujah, killing scores of civilians.

#### 7 April 2004

As if in coordination with the defense of Fallujah, Sadr's militias intensify combat in Baghdad and Nasiriya. Northern guerrillas mount a stunning attack on Ramadi, killing 12 Marines and wounding dozens.

An anonymous Special Forces soldier says, "Things are getting very bad and they're going to get worse, but no one is saying that – either because they don't know or because they don't want you to know."

Military experts in the United States – not the drones dutifully trotted out by CNN, but a panel assembled for the Lehrer News Hour – warn that the situation is dire. The US will now have to act even more aggressively, not because they want to – this is already a political and strategic disaster – but to prevent being overwhelmed by "a swarm."

In Baghdad, hospitals are again swimming in blood from resistance and civilian casualties. New recruits flock to Sadr's militia.

#### 8 April 2004

US forces receive heavy fire from the vicinity of a mosque in Fallujah. Though there are trained snipers in abundance, the ground commander elects to call in an air strike on the mosque itself. The Israeli mentality has firmly established itself. Fallujah is in for collective punishment. The mosque is hit with a 500-pound bomb and multiple

shoulder fired rocket missiles. Over 40 people are killed inside, as the death toll in Fallujah, especially the civilian death toll, rises steeply into three figures.

If the military and political cul-de-sac of the occupier has wakened the long-slumbering volcano of pan-Arabism in Iraq, further north the prospect of a Sunni-Shia-Ba'athist tactical alliance is heating up the suspicious malevolence of the Kurdish Peshmerga militias.

The story of the mosque bombing spreads and the uprising is joined by thousands more – as combatants, as demonstrators and rioters, and as supporters. Fallujah becomes a symbol and Sadr becomes an icon.

Donald Rumsfeld tells reporters that the attacks are the work of a small number of people and that there is no popular uprising. The Ukrainian troops in Kut surrender to the insurgents. Through all the spin, America begins to wake up that something qualitatively different is afoot in Iraq.

#### 9 April 2004

The US assault on Fallujah, met with increasingly sophisticated tactics, fearless resistance, and a home court advantage, stalls.

A Marine tells the story about receiving fire from a building. Mechanized and light infantry respond with a withering river of lead. The guerrilla fires again. The Marine expresses a kind of respect.

The cover story for the stalled offensive is that the US is halting for humanitarian reasons.

It will get more complicated. Bremer, Rumsfeld, and Bush have repeatedly said they don't negotiate with terrorists. They have characterized both the resistance in Fallujah and Sadr along with his militia as terrorists. Now they find themselves tip-toeing around the fact that they are trying to set up negotiations with the Fallujah resistance.

I'm remembering some old military wisdom: Don't let an alligator mouth overload your tweety-bird ass. But then neither Bremer nor Rumsfeld nor Bush is actually fighting anyone; though they assure the public that they will "remain tough." Of course they will.

The same day, a photograph taken by a Marine gets published and circulates throughout the Arab and Muslim world. A cocky, smiling Marine has two Iraqi boys pose with him for the photograph, holding a sign they can't read that says, "Lcpl Boudreaux killed my dad + he knocked up my sister!"





then he knocked up my sister." The photograph had the effect of pumping pure oxygen into a blazing fire.

From the *New York Times*:

*Brent Bourgeois, a 20-year-old lance corporal from Kenner, La., said he saw an American helicopter fire a missile at a man with a sling shot.*

*"Crazy, huh?" Corporal Bourgeois asked.*

*Falluja is now a strange replay of the war. Even with the ceasefire, the action here represents the heaviest fighting since Mr. Hussein's government fell a year ago.*

*"It's the fight that never came last year," Major Petrucci said. "I guess these guys didn't really want to die for Saddam. But all this anti-American feeling is now uniting them."*

#### **10 April 2004**

US forces have begun to regroup and recover partial control over cities in the south, where it appears the Madhi militia – numbering around 10,000 – is withdrawing in order to close in around its leader, Muqtada Sadr, in the holy city of Najaf where a massive religious pilgrimage is underway.

The resistance – incapable of confronting the US conventionally and therefore obliged to adopt 'asymmetric' methods – has a tactical imperative and a strategic one. The tactical imperative is to blind the occupying forces to its intents and actions. The strategic imperative is to deny the purpose of the occupation – a colonial reconstruction.

The primary US source of tactical information in this alien cultural milieu is the collaborator. Attack and/or intimidate the collaborator, and a curtain drops between US military intelligence and the resistance.

To stop the reconstruction, the country must be depopulated of re-constructors. Kidnapping is added to the resistance's tactical repertoire.

And on this day, politics kicks into high gear in response to the attack on Fallujah and the preparations to attack Najaf. At least 16 major cities are now embroiled in the uprising. Bremer's Iraqi Quislings of the Interim Governing Council begin to appeal to Bremer to seek a political solution. They do not want to shred their last hope of exercising power in a 'new' Iraq, and they certainly don't want to be left behind like the Vietnamese Quislings of 1975.

#### **11 April 2004**

In addition to Shia resistance in Sadr City, Baghdad, Sunni neighborhoods join the fighting, attacking US troops with Kalashnikovs and RPGs. Tony Blair considers beefing up British forces by 700 troops to prevent a

"swarm" in Basra. Two thirds of Americans polled now think Iraq may become another Vietnam.

George W. Bush – who does not read any of his briefings, instead depending on short, simplified summaries from his closest advisors – dismisses the uprising as "a small faction."

Karl Rove, deep in the background, pours over the poll numbers and thinks about November.

At a press conference, the ferret-like Brigadier General Mark Kimmitt of CENTCOM verbally abuses Arab journalists who have the temerity to suggest that US troops have killed any civilians. This is a thinly-veiled threat, because the US has shown the willingness in the past to bomb news offices that printed unwelcome information. In response to one of those Arab journalists' question about the images of dead and maimed women and children, Kimmitt says in an oddly-strident tone, "Change the channel, change the channel!"

This was the face of military comportment for the occupier, who ritualistically defines anyone who dies under the American gun to have been combatants.

#### **12 April 2004**

On C-Span, the Chair of the Brandeis University Middle Eastern Studies Department, hosted by the Woodrow Wilson International Studies Center, spends over an hour stating what will likely become the more sophisticated, academic version of the Democratic Party's stance on Iraq.

Yitzhak Nakash begins by giving a very clear and pointed account of the situation in Iraq.

Nakash states in no uncertain terms that the current course of US military and political policy is leading the US into a situation where the occupation of Iraq will become "untenable."

Untenable.

He is counseling that Sadr and his followers be brought back into the fold with a seat at the political table. His assessment is very realistic, and he provides a wealth of evidence to support his dark prognostications. His reasoning is that the US cannot afford to fail in Iraq – without saying why, but we can probably figure that one out – and that to succeed, it must establish a political system where the US does not direct the outcome, but where pluralism creates a check-and-balance default. Nakash explains that this would check the influence of Sadr and others by the same means that Hezbollah has been checked in Lebanon: precisely by putting them in the Parliament. This is a very clever way of saying that technical "democracy," as such, is a more effective means of population control than direct occupation, and that it involves providing various incentives and disincentives to ensure that everyone is given enough power in a legitimized political process to disincline them to step outside that process – a circumscribed divide-and-conquer strategy.

This may prove too subtle for the neo-cons.

The most interesting part of this refreshingly frank account of the degree of disorder confronting the US occupation is what he sees as the absolute precondition for all this political maneuvering: “security,” meaning massive expansion of troop numbers there, with a commitment to stay for a decade or more.

The ruling class is trying to correct here for a political establishment that has, in some regards, gone out of control.

The political significance of religion in Iraq, in Southwest Asia, and in the United States, where Christian Zionists constitute a significant fraction of the ruling party’s base, cannot be overstated. Nor can the Bush Doctrine politics of macho-narcissism.

As a favored writer of mine – Alf Hornborg – says, we must “reconsider both the potency of consciousness and the permeability of the material.” The history, social bases, and development of various strains of Islam must be understood, as must the balance of forces in the US between evangelical, ecclesiastical, and prophetic religions – in order to grasp their political significance.

What Nakash points out is that this religious Balkanization in the region can be worked to advantage, and his greatest fear –stated explicitly – is that the current Bush military policy in Iraq is re-creating a form of Arab nationalism that threatens to displace the religious divisions upon which he and his fellow liberals would like to establish a (US) manageable pluralism in Iraq.

As this liberal position becomes clearer, people will again revisit the question of elections. Not the outcome this time, because some progressives are actually saying that there is something to be said for a continuation of the Bush leadership, to allow the debacle to reach its bottom. They are also saying that instead of focusing on electoral outcomes, the people need to see the elections as a way to confront those in front of the cameras and in the hot seat with questions like Iraq, Palestine, and Haiti – which paradoxically puts the Democrats in hotter water than the Republicans.

John Kerry will not welcome a strong pro-Palestinian appeal directed at his potential base, nor will he welcome Black Democrats confronting him with the issue of the coup in Haiti. Both of these are easily connectible to the occupation of Iraq if they are put into the analytical frame of colonialism.

That evening, Bremer suggests to reporters that he might consider negotiations with Sadr.

### 13 April 2004

Bad news pours into the White House. Emblematic of the situation, an Apache helicopter is shot down in Fallujah. The casualty numbers are fearsome, with more than 70 US dead from hostile fire. The military is issuing behind-the-scenes appeals for more troops, fast.

Sistani warns Bremer that an attack on Najaf will inflame the resistance.

George W. Bush, at the behest of his edgy handlers, gives a rare evening press conference, the third of his whole term, to explain the situation to the American public. It is a pathetic and even bizarre performance.

For almost 17 minutes, before taking the first question, he gives a stump speech full of generalizations, misrepresentations, and hare-brained platitudes. The responses to the media questions, asking about Iraq and the 9/11 Commission, are incoherent. His most rehearsed line – repeated again and again, often with no context whatsoever – is that “Saddam was a threat.”

### 14 April 2004

Sadr publicly accepts the authority of Grand Ayatollah Ali Sistani, even as US forces tighten their encirclement of Najaf, where Sadr is surrounded by his militia. Sadr’s goal from the outset was to ensure that Shias, and poor Shias in particular, would be included – with him at their head – in any future apparatus of Iraqi governance. What had run him afoul of the US was his insistence on the same thing being demanded by Sistani... that sovereignty be meaningful, and include the right to call for the departure of the American military occupation.

George Bush publicly endorses Ariel Sharon’s categorical



rejection of a Palestinian right of return to Palestine.

## 15 April 2004

The Globe and Mail – U.S. warplanes and helicopters firing heavy machine-guns, rockets and cannons hammered insurgents Wednesday in the besieged city of Fallujah, and the commander of U.S. marines warned that a fragile truce was near collapse. In central Baghdad, a rocket hit the Sheraton Hotel, where foreign contractors and journalists are staying, breaking glass but causing no casualties. A second rocket failed to fire and remained lying in the street outside.

The rocket attack took place as UN envoy Lakhdar Brahimi was holding a press conference across the Tigris River in the U.S.-led coalition headquarters...

About 880 Iraqis and 87 U.S. soldiers have been killed this month. Among the Iraqi dead are more than 600 people — mostly civilians — in Fallujah, according to the city hospital's director.

Reuters – Faced with rising violence in Iraq, the U.S. military plans to keep more than 20,000 troops from the 1st Armored Division and 2nd Armored Cavalry Regiment there this summer beyond their promised yearlong tours, defense officials said on Wednesday.

## 15 April 2004

The shaky truce in Fallujah is breaking down. All signs are that the US plans to attack Najaf. Another US helicopter is

downed, and four Marines are killed.

Analysts suggest that the Bush administration will have to go to Congress well before the election in November to ask for a minimum of \$70 billion additional dollars for the war.

## 16 April 2004

Today... A captured American soldier is shown on an Al Jazeera videotape.

The uprising spreads to another city holy to Shi'ism – Kufa. Mahdi militias ambush an American convoy, then withdraw when the Americans strike back with mortars.

Tony Blair and George W. Bush appear, in very expensive suits, for a short joint press conference where each sticks to the same script. In that script is a vow to attack Muqtada al-Sadr.

As of today, April has claimed the lives of 92 US soldiers in combat in Iraq.



Today, at least 36 people were killed and 66 wounded in fighting.

George W. Bush, the president who does not read his memoranda, leaning back for instructions from his mad mandarins, issues commands to his careerist generals, and secures his place in history as the mediocrity who put a simian smirk on the destabilization of the American empire.

---

### Endnotes:

1. <http://www.prwatch.org/books/tsigyf10.html> ; <http://www.csmonitor.com/2002/0906/p25s02-cogn.htm>  
<http://www.antiwar.com/orig/cohen1.html> ;  
<http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=14685>;<http://www.gvnews.net/html/Shadow/alert3553.html>  
<http://mediafilter.org/caq/Hill&Knowlton.html> ; <http://www.hillandknowlton.com/>

2. [http://www.gulfink.osd.mil/declassdocs/dia/19950901/950901\\_511rept\\_91.html](http://www.gulfink.osd.mil/declassdocs/dia/19950901/950901_511rept_91.html)

# PEAK OIL: DEBATE OR VENDETTA?

By

Suzan Mazur

April 22, 2004 1800 PDT (FTW) -- I sometimes think peak oil has already hit Manhattan as subways become increasingly unpredictable (although surveillance cameras are state-of-the-art) and escalator shut-downs present stair master survival challenges, a kind of perverse underground amusement. Unfortunately, surfacing on Fifth Avenue does not end the scenario, for where once there was excellence and exquisite fashion, now there are bargain stores catering to New Yorkers who are poor, and yes – even starving.

So I was particularly fascinated by the opportunity to listen-in to the telephone conference call that JP Morgan held for its clients on April 7 and 8, "Peak Oil: Fact or Fiction", which *From The Wilderness* was given exclusive permission to monitor. Maybe there would be answers as to whether or not Manhattan is a harbinger of what's to come for the rest of the nation, and whether its fleeting opulence (not counting all the questionably-financed real estate extravaganzas rising up) is energy-related.

The main speakers faced-off on separate days. First Dr. Colin Campbell, Founder of the Association for the Study of Peak Oil, succinctly gave his position saying that peak oil is "such a geological matter." Campbell says we're now at the halfway mark and that "by 2010 volatility comes to an end and then terminal decline" sets in.

The pronouncement is chilling. What's more, Campbell says that "over the next few years everybody will become aware of this, and in some ways the perception of this growing situation is as serious as the event itself." Campbell's a retired geologist with decades of experience in the oil industry in both exploration and executive positions. He compares peak oil to old age – saying that a man knows when it has set-in.

Campbell was followed the next day by Michael Lynch, a computer oil and gas modeler for the past 25 years, President/Director of Global Petroleum Strategic Energy and Economic Research. Lynch came out slugging, informing conference callers that Campbell has refused to appear with him since 1997, saying "you'll understand why very shortly." He seems to view Campbell as old school and too tired to be optimistic about the future. Perhaps a bit like Cheney and Rumsfeld having their last hurrahs before retiring into the bed & breakfast business on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

Lynch believes the Hubbert model that Campbell's theory relies on – discoveries and production follow a bell curve – is not only "incorrectly modeled", but is "much closer to being junk science." He says further, that while Campbell and his colleague, Jean Laherrère, have now "stopped saying that" . . . they've "never admitted they were wrong."

Lynch takes the position that URR – Ultimately Recoverable Resources – is not a static amount and therefore cannot follow such creaming curves. "It grows over time," he says, "as a result of economic changes, development in an area, but also because of technology, and in some cases, better scientific knowledge."

Campbell says today's oil supply is finite, and that it all came into being during two periods of global warming 90 million and 150 million years ago when "excessive" algal blooms formed on the seas and lakes, became heavier and heavier, and sank to the bottom of the rifts where they were "preserved" and pressure-cooked. The resulting oil and gas then began leaching its way back up to the surface through the sandstone (in the pore spaces between the grains of sand) and rock.

Campbell is adamant about the peak oil issue not being an economic or political one, but simply a case where we've now so depleted our "endowment" that peak oil will occur by 2010, and that soon after there will be a rapid fall-off in oil resources, which will profoundly affect world civilization.

So the conference began with a bit of posturing and name calling – with Campbell announcing "no common ground" with the "flat Earth economists" (Lynch et al.), who he says believe there's an infinite supply of oil (no one believes this, including Saudi Aramco).

Lynch called Campbell, Laherrère (and investment banker Matt Simmons) Malthusian pessimists, and obliquely referred to Simmons's upcoming book on peak oil as "content free."

Fortunately, JP Morgan's clients pressed speakers for details, which made the conference truly worth listening to. Campbell advised that peak discovery of oil was in 1964 and that it's been falling for 30 years. He also said that by 1981 the world was using more than it produced – 1 barrel is now found for every 6 consumed – and that there's little spare capacity anywhere in the world.

As further proof of peak oil, Campbell adds that the major oil companies are getting out of the business – shedding staff, divesting marketing sectors, outsourcing jobs, cutting back on exploration and drilling fewer wells – the seven sisters are now four. He notes the majors are also buying back company shares (i.e., BP), and argues that "the value of their past is more important than their future." He quotes the late Robert Anderson of Arco: "This is a sunset industry and the sun is fairly low in the sky."

However, Campbell does spare the more "nimble" independent oil companies, who he says will press on producing what's left, subcontracting to state companies however they can, through initiative, enterprise and bribes. And that oil in the ground will become increasingly valuable.

Lynch argues the oil majors are alive and well, thinking about returns and making their money upstream, just not investing in things like refineries, etc. downstream. He says lack of spare capacity and any pullback from the oil business is not because there's not enough oil out there. It's due to economics and politics.

Campbell counters that the picture is far worse than anyone's thought because he's "pretty sure" we may have to remove over 200 billion barrels of oil from world estimates as a result of Saudi Arabia, the world's largest oil producer, and Kuwait misrepresenting their oil numbers. Says Campbell, "If you're limited to public information and you're watching reserves grow, you can believe it can go on forever."

John J. Hoey, who served as President of Atlantic Refining Company, as well as Hondo Oil (Robert Anderson was CEO), and is currently founder and director of Tethys Oil in Stockholm, says the "Peak Oil debate is just that -- a debate." Hoey believes the adverse remarks about lack of disclosure and transparency of sovereign entities like Saudi Arabia, Russia, etc. appear self serving and disparaging, that the oil producing countries are not public companies and have no duty or obligation to disclose any more than they deem appropriate. He advises: "Try to get some technical information from a major oil company on a specific 'tight' well being drilled or completed in a highly sensitive geological area."

Moreover, Hoey says he's listened to all the peak oil arguments (including the JP Morgan call-in) and "gravitates" towards Lynch rather than Campbell or Harvard Business School alumni and friend, Matt Simmons. He also lived in Saudi Arabia during the 70s and worked closely with Aramco and Petromin; Hoey says he has the "highest respect for the professionalism, integrity and future of their petroleum industry."

Nevertheless, Campbell presents a litany of pessimism on future oil as he deconstructs reserve reporting: He says Iran and Iraq may also have been manipulating

their numbers, though he's "less sure." That UK gas and oil will be "virtually exhausted" by 2020, as acknowledged by the UK government (BBC reports Wood Mackenzie oil consultants described UK North Sea exploration as "the industry's biggest waste of money over the past five years"). That North American oil and gas is hopelessly depleted – it took 40 years for the US to go from peak discovery to peak decline – and that "Canada is way into decline." Norway has the Ecofis "exceptional chalk reservoir," which has been kept going through technology, but that doesn't change the overall pattern of decline. Germany has "no hope" and is long past peak. Argentina's production is down. Colombia has peaked. Egypt, with a teeming population, has hit its peak and has no money for exploration – "where will it get its oil from?" Indonesia has "no reason to remain in OPEC."

The only upbeat pronouncements from Campbell were that Iran will have a "rapid rise" in oil production until 2015 (and then fall), even though a Power Bridge Associates caller told Lynch he's been studying reserves in southwest Iran's Khuzestan field and that Iran has about 200 billion barrels of oil and needs capital to develop. He says Iraq holds "north of 300 billion."

Campbell believes Russia will see a second peak in 2010 – the first was under Soviet rule and influenced by OPEC price cutting in the 1980s which made Soviet oil uncompetitive. The increase in OPEC production stemmed from revisions in reserve estimates which allowed OPEC to exceed reserve-connected quotas. Heavy oils of Canada and Venezuela he believes will grow, but so will the costs of getting oil out. Canadian oil sands may be a good investment with an expected price of about \$20 a barrel, but right now the project is stuck, and is consuming Alberta's natural gas meant for the MacKenzie pipeline and North America's gas needs. Polar oil has "uncertain possibilities." "Deep water booms and goes quickly." Kashagan field in the Kazakhstan sector of the Caspian will produce 10-15 billion barrels, Campbell says, "but not what was hoped for."

Moreover, Campbell's bleak scenario includes not only a challenge to home heating and the gas tank. He reminds that the growing of agricultural products (crop nutrients and farm machinery) and their transportation are heavily dependent on petroleum – meaning global food shortages.

Lynch's principal role seemed to be one of resuscitating the audience after Campbell's address. He backed up the Saudi Aramco claim that its definition of "oil initially in place" (according to Society of Petroleum Engineers, World Petroleum Congress and the American Association of Petroleum Geologists) is the "volume or the amount of oil that's presently in the subsurface." Lynch also disclosed during the talk that he has worked off and on for the Saudis and does work in the short sell market, saying "I'm sure there'll be questions about that." Curiously, there were none.

Campbell explained the origin of the oil numbers system saying it all began with SEC reporting practices. For financial reasons, US oil company owners were allowed to report both

proved producing reserves and proved undeveloped wells. The SEC model then became an international standard. He said "companies found it convenient to be very conservative about what they reported; they effectively reported as much as they needed to give a satisfactory financial result, which meant the build-up of stock of under-reported reserves."

The Saudi "oil initially in place" numbers, which Lynch refers to, were presented at a Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) meeting in Washington February 24 by Aramco's Manager of Reserves Management, Dr. Nansen Saleri, and Mahmoud Abdul Baqi, VP of Exploration. They both said that in the last 20 years Saudi Arabia's oil in the subsurface has grown by 100 billion barrels and it currently has "in the ground" 700 billion barrels.

Aramco also claims a 52% success rate with 64 exploratory wells drilled in the past 10 years and says that for the fourth year in a row the company reduced its water cut levels with the total company aggregate water cut for 2003 less than 27% (Russia's is 80%); water cuts pose a problem because while water flushes out some oil, it tends to further seal-in a lot of what remains. Aramco cites reserves at 261 billion barrels – reserves defined as "oil that can be recovered commercially with current technology." Aramco says they expect to produce 12 million barrels of oil a day through 2025.

Lynch also obliquely referenced Matt Simmons's CSIS presentation, calling him an investment banker who "sort of said I read some technical articles and they describe engineering problems in the field. He made a whole bunch of mistakes which the Saudis corrected. . . . And he admitted he wasn't an engineer." Simmons referred to Aramco's sophisticated "MRC (maximum reservoir contact) wells" with multiple branches and high resolution digital imaging – as "bottle brush" wells.

Lynch did not question the Aramco claim that by 2025 Saudi Arabia expects to have 900 billion barrels of oil in the ground; Saudi Aramco's position is that only 14% of their "tank" has been tapped and that the main field Ghawar (actually many fields in one) is only 48% tapped. Lynch did say Saudi Arabia was virtually unexplored when it comes to oil, backing up Aramco statements regarding plans to push forward to the promising Saudi-Iraqi border (Campbell says you won't find much there) as well as into the previously inaccessible Rub'al-Khali – making use of "intelligent wells" and remote control digital imaging with a 10-million and soon 100-million cell resolution.

OPEC advises its figures also refer to member countries' remaining reserves and not total discovered, but says it does not ask member countries to verify reported numbers unless there is a major discrepancy. OPEC says its figures are in line with USGS and BP numbers, however this means that they are based on projected demand,

which leaves things a bit fuzzy. Matt Simmons has called the very concept of proven reserves "still an art form."

OPEC's current Director of Research, Dr. Adnan Shihab-Eldin, a Berkeley-trained nuclear physicist – perhaps the most dynamic personality to emerge at OPEC since Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani – is guiding the organization towards greater transparency in reporting its oil numbers by participating in JODI (Joint Oil Data Initiative) with APPEC (Asian and Pacific Petroleum Exporting Countries), IEA and UNSD. Shihab-Eldin previously served as a director of the International Atomic Energy Agency and as Director, Kuwait Institute for Scientific Research – where I first met him in the late 1970s when KISR was developing solar energy projects.

Shihab-Eldin, now OPEC's number two man, said the following regarding world oil supply:

*"In the current scenario of heightened political uncertainty in the Middle East, it is widely recognized that there is a premium on current crude prices, related to these events, of as high as \$4-\$5/b, rather than any basic lack of supply... Our projections, derived from the OPEC World Energy Model, show world oil demand growing from 76 million barrels per day in 2000 to 89 million barrels per day by 2010, and by over 106 million barrels per day by 2020. Two-thirds of the increase in demand over that 20-year period will come from China and developing countries. This highlights the relevance of such projects as the new multi-billion dollar pipeline which will stretch from Eastern Siberia in Russia to Northeast China – with construction due to start in 2003. . . . Non-OPEC production is expected to increase throughout the entire period, with the expected decline in North Sea output more than compensated by increases in developing countries, the CIS and the Caspian region [which he says will add an additional 4 million barrels a day to world supply by 2015 and believes that new discoveries will get a boost from newer technologies]." – Conference on Oil and Gas Transportation in the CIS and Caspian Region, Vienna, Austria, Oct. 2002*

Neither Campbell nor Lynch referred to the JODI figures, but there is little doubt that the time has come for the numbers to be counted. Even Lynch admits that OPEC's reserves numbers in the past were often referred to as "political reserves." Lynch says: "I was in Kuwait in 1987 and we were laughing about the reserves numbers. Everyone knew those numbers were not reliable."

And Lynch still believes "There are no good reserve numbers anywhere in the world – especially in the past 30 years." But he says he's referring to "proved reserves" not the ultimate amount available. And that proved reserves numbers are not really very important in long-term modeling.

He characterizes Colin Campbell's and Jean Laherrère's modeling as "curve fitting" – not geological research – "like people who look at stock market cycles and try to come up with waves." Lynch acknowledges that field size is determined by geology but says "the process of discovery is an economic one."

Lynch also accuses Laherrère of mixing up political and economic events with geological ones in terms of the pause in oil exploration in the Middle East after 1980, when Lynch says there was a world oil glut, and the Saudis and Kuwaitis stopped exploring because they have 100 years of oil left. And then the wars happened, Iran/Iraq and the Gulf War. What's more, Lynch says the creaming curves Campbell produces are not reliable estimates because field sizes are not stable – citing field growth according to the IHS database in Norway (where horizontal drilling is producing results which could never be realized otherwise, he says), in Britain and Canada.

Lynch says that Jean Laherrère told the Abu Dhabi their oil was scarce and he just wasn't believed and that OPEC doesn't even want to deal with this "nonsense" but people keep asking them about it. Says Lynch, "If you look at all their [Campbell, Laherrère] curves, what you find is they're not doing serious statistical analysis. They're just drawing curves and then eyeballing them. Just looking at them and saying, does this appear to follow a pattern?"

Lynch looks at slides regarding British North Sea production. He says we were told the big fields have been discovered and the small fields don't matter and new technology won't increase recovery. But he says Campbell was wrong about his 1991 predictions of 500,000 barrels a day, citing current production at 2 million b/p/d and that this suggests "you don't know that the estimate of total resources in the UK is reliable, that it is stable."

Lynch also claims Campbell is himself raising estimates of URR as well as extending the peak out – that Campbell first predicted peak oil for 1989. He says in 2002 Campbell updated a table from his 1997 book increasing the amount of URR by over 100 bb in 5 years, attributing it to countries discovering more oil "than they ever would have in 1997."

Lynch concludes that the danger in the Middle East is more political when it comes to the supply of oil, and not its running out. A Barron's 4/5/2004 editorial suggests the real scare is that "OPEC producers will stop pricing their oil in dollars and switch to a basket of currencies for both the pricing and settlement of crude-oil transactions." And Crown Prince Abdullah's historic visit to Moscow and talks with Vladimir Putin are further proof of politics as oil's ace card.

Says Lynch, "If you believe resources are scarce and companies should run up their debt levels, buy up reserves, sign a long-term contract for engineers, do everything they can – nobody's doing that. They're trying to hunker down against another price collapse because that's much more likely than prices staying up at \$35."

A caller from Arc Asset Management wanted to know why investments in US public oil companies weren't be-

ing realized in the past 2-3 years, although there had been substantial increases in exploration and development spending. The caller questioned why there was a lack of production response, was it because the decline rates have been getting much steeper? (The 1997 oil hype in Azerbaijan, which took me to Baku, came to mind; after the smoke screen came down there were dry holes, investors threatening to jump off the roof and the gobbling up of Amoco by BP plus the resignation of the US Energy Secretary.)

Lynch responded by saying give Capex time, you haven't seen the results yet, and that "it's partly delay because what you're seeing is companies putting money into big projects like deep water West Africa that take longer to come online than a shallow Gulf of Mexico field." He said the Chad pipeline took 2-3 years, and mentioned costs on such projects could go up as much as 30%-40%.

John Hoey of Tethys Oil agrees. "It would be folly," he says, "to solely rely on the old school theories of recoverable reserves, tertiary recovery methods and technologies, old maps and geological interpretations." Hoey says the technology is moving too fast; they are now drilling faster, smarter, deeper and more effectively, revisiting areas that were abandoned, looking for different plays -- all helped by the economics of \$30/bbl oil. He argues, "The worldwide deepwater drilling market expenditures have been estimated at \$40 billion between 2003 and 2007 versus a fraction of this amount 10 years earlier, and were virtually nonexistent 10 years prior to that."

Lynch's talk was followed by a presentation by Dr. William Fisher, Director of Geoscience at the University of Texas and an advisor to Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham. He held up a slide with some Shell figures (odd, considering Shell's in the hot seat for overstating its reserves by 20%), which looked at the range of conventional vs. unconventional oil in terms of a price scenario – ultimate at 3 trillion barrels and unconventional at another trillion barrels – and said cost probably will come down due to technology.

Fisher says he concurs with USGS "folks in Denver" who project peakings "at either a high demand of 3% a year out to 2025, and at 1% or less, it extends substantially." Fisher says future trajectory will be demand-defined, not constrained by physical shortage.

Fisher also says, fuel reserve growth "has been the biggest dynamic over the past 25 years." He notes that the USGS "roughly equates reserve growth potential with new field discovery – it's about 650 bb of each." Fisher says he feels it's necessary to address this because some "early peakers" think reserve growth is a myth or assume it's accounted for in "proved reserve base" numbers.

Fisher sees "multi-component seismic coming along" to deal with complex high density rock, carbonate rocks, and expects there will be a lot more computer imaging. He says 3D seismic works best in sandstone.

Surprisingly there is some common ground with Colin Campbell. Fisher suggests the oil age is pretty much over – though not because the world is running out of oil – but because oil will have outlived its usefulness (what will replace it is less clear). Fisher and Campbell both think coal-bed methane will be important. Fisher believes we're at the "threshold of the methane economy." And he says worldwide stranded pockets of gas will lead to cost-effective LNG (at a stable price of \$4.50 to \$5 a barrel).

Over the next 30-50 years, he believes natural gas will be the source for any development of the hydrogen fuel cell. Yet nowhere did he acknowledge well-documented

recent supply shortages or obstacles to overseas importation. He says further that some of the downward curves on crude oil demand "out here about 20 or 25 years are factoring in a substantial introduction of the hydrogen fuel cell in the transportation mode." (Now we're talking volatility!)

So as the peak oil caravan moves back to CSIS April 27, we await more answers. It will be the second US appearance by the Saudis on the issue – this time Saudi Arabia's oil minister Ali Naimi speaks – plus Secretary Abraham and Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan. The event will be a significant ratcheting up of the debate with the world's press in attendance – and standing room only.

---

---

## -- BOOK REVIEW

# Richard Clarke's Orchestra:

## Maestro Plays Simple Waltz; Shackled Media Manage to Dance Along

by

Jamey Hecht, PhD

*[There's a very troubling aspect of Clarke's testimonies that can and should be questioned. He maintains that he had repeatedly urged, both in the Clinton and Bush administrations, that direct action be taken to destroy Al Qaeda and the Taliban. But there is abundant evidence that Clarke's plans had been listened to and implemented. A great many publications, from the Indian magazine, "India Reacts" (June 26, 2001) to the BBC's George Arney (Sept. 18, 2001) to authors Jean Charles Brisard and Guillaume Dasquié "Bin Laden the Forbidden Truth" documented clearly that plans and staging for a US military invasion of Afghanistan in October of 2001 were in place and being pursued long before 9/11. It is absurd to think Clarke didn't know of this. It was, in fact, common knowledge in the region. US special operations troop deployments in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan through 2000 and early 2001 belie Clarke's assertions that nothing was being done.*

*It was the fact of these preparations that gave weight to Forbidden Truth's allegations that an ultimatum was delivered to the Taliban by a group called the 6+2 in the fall of 2001 (before the attacks), "Either you accept our offer of a carpet of gold, or we will bury you in a carpet of bombs." Their goal: to secure pipeline routes intended to bring Turkmeni natural gas to market and supply and Enron-owned power plant in India and to "monetize" what were then hoped for large oil reserves in the Caspian Sea basin. As FTW has repeatedly reported, drilling operations in Kazakhstan from 2000 through 2002 showed that the Caspian reserves just weren't there in the quantities hoped for.*

*Ultimately, we are left to answer a deeper question. How much truth does Richard Clarke actually wish to tell? Can we assume that his motives are entirely pure? Or is he, to one extent or another, still protecting some of the deepest secrets of a system which raised him and in which he still hopes to function? Either way, Clarke has left a lot of meat on the table to work with. -- MCR]*

---

APRIL 5, 2004 1800 PDT (FTW) – **A**t the end of a distinguished three-decade intelligence career in various offices of the U.S. government, Richard Clarke has just published a sharply critical account of the Bush administration's anti-terrorism record. Timed to appear on the

day of Mr. Clarke's public testimony in the 9-11 Commission hearings, the book has caused a wave of indignation among those it chides. It has also done much to redirect the country's attention back to 9-11, even as the Bush group tries to wield that day of mass murder as its own private political instrument.



Readers of FTW and other critics of the official 9-11 narrative will be right to condemn Clarke's book as too little, too late. But it's not too little to embarrass the administration, and it's not too late to influence the November election (assuming that there will be a 2004 election). Incisive readers and critics perceive that 9-11 was a false flag operation, perpetrated by a consortium that included elements of the Bush junta and the bin Laden organization with which it enjoys financial and personal ties. Readers of the mainstream Left-progressive press (like the Nation, which this writer has critiqued on these grounds in Media Monitors Network and From the Wilderness) regard 9-11 as an episode of colossal incompetence and "intelligence failure." Clarke espouses that view and attributes much of the failure to the President and his appointees, while distinguishing himself from them by taking on a measure of the blame with a heartfelt apology. But the rhetorical flavor of Clarke's book is very strange. It doesn't read like a progressive's complaint, nor like an insider's defense. Maybe we're projecting or reading wishfully, but we seem to hear Clarke speaking in two voices – an overt voice that tells the public about the Bush administration's incompetence and neglect, and a covert voice that whispers to those who can hear it: false flag.

En route to his explicit case for Bush's incompetent negligence, Clarke's narrative provides context by revisiting several other episodes of recent history, among them the crash of TWA 800 in July 1996, and the triggering of Desert Storm in 1990. My aim in discussing those incidents here is not to revisit them for their intrinsic interest, but to examine Clarke's weirdly self-defeating treatments of them in the light of his book's ostensible purpose. If I'm correct in concluding that Mr. Clarke knows full well that the official explanations are bogus – and that he's implying this knowledge in these very pages, for those who can see it – then his message regarding 9-11 is much more radical than it appears. He's in no position to say "Bush did it." If he were to say that, the media would disappear and he could accomplish much less. Clarke must be vividly aware of this, since in Chapter 5 he tells the story of Pierre Salinger, President Kennedy's White House Press Secretary who publicly claimed in the months following the TWA 800 crash that he had radar images and documentary evidence indicating a missile had destroyed the plane. Salinger is called by an NSC staffer "whacked; he's lost it. The real world is a planet he left long ago." Whatever the facts of Salinger's case, it's instructive that Clarke has chosen to invoke it here. The lesson of the Salinger anecdote is: say too much, and you won't be heard; say a little, and you might move some people.

The book that ate the month of March, 2004 has some very interesting merits. It's easy to overlook them if you're furious about the murder of three thousand people. But from a strategic point of view, this book is definitely a win for the political justice movement. On rare

occasions, a certain kind of limited hangout can do more than aid the cover-up; if it comes from deep enough inside the establishment, it can quietly destabilize the cover-up, sometimes more effectively than a direct attack. That position might seem like a sell-out compromise, but let's be clear: the effective thing about Clarke's particular attack is its source and its timing – not its completeness or its force (it has little of either). Finding something to applaud in Against All Enemies (and the corresponding Clarke performance in the sham hearings) does not imply that you, or I, or FTW, or the 9-11 political justice movement, should take Clarke's position. We absolutely shouldn't, because he denounces the tip of the criminal 9-11 iceberg and tacitly accepts the rest.

That much is pretty clear before you read the book. But as you make your way through it, something very interesting happens. Clarke seems to leave a trail of breadcrumbs for those who know about the dark side of September 11. It's as if he wants the better-informed among his readers to know that the book is really a politically pragmatic strike against a consortium of murderers, not the frank complaint against administration failure and incompetence that the media sees in it.

Watch the Frontline episode archived in Realvideo at the PBS website:

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/knew/view/>

And read the additional transcript interview of Clarke on the neighboring page:

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/knew/interviews/clarke.html>

I think you'll agree that one of the burning motivations behind Clarke's current activity is his bereavement and anger over the loss of his friend John O'Neill, the talented, maverick FBI agent who foiled the Millennium NYC plot, investigated the USS Cole bombing (until the US Yemeni ambassador stopped him) and nearly prevented 9-11. O'Neill left the FBI to become security director at the World Trade Center. He died in the attacks, and you can see his name among the thousands of others written on the makeshift paper wall-hanging which passersby created in the weeks following 9-11; it's preserved in the Union Square subway station in New York City. As certain exceptionally courageous individuals among the 9-11 victims' families can attest, when a person you really need is killed, you feel driven to find out who did it and expose them. I believe this may well be what Clarke is doing, albeit in a subtle and indirect way.

Before we turn to the text, let's suppose Richard Clarke does know that Bush, Rumsfeld, Rice, Wolfowitz, Perle, [FBI Supervisory Special Agent Dave] Frasca, and key players in the relevant agencies are guilty of criminal complicity in the September 11th murders. If he overtly says what he knows, he'll trigger one of the standard responses from media and government; they'll ignore him, slander him, ridicule him, and quickly move on. Instead, the wily Clarke is singing a moder-

ate war song against the Bush Administration, FAA, FBI, and CIA – a tune so finely adjusted to the media's tin ear that even Time and Newsweek and the national papers can hear it and dance along. Allegro, ma non troppo (fast, but not too much).

Here's what I'm seeing as a trail of breadcrumbs.

This is Clarke on Ramzi Yousef, pp. 94-5:

*"With almost every terrorist incident or similar event, an urban legend develops that challenges the official story. After the events of 9/11, one widespread legend had it that Israel had attacked the World Trade Center and had warned Jews not to go to work that day. After TWA 800 crashed, the legend was that the US Navy had shot down the civilian 747. With Ramzi Yousef, the legend was that there were actually two people: one was the man arrested by the FBI in Pakistan and the other was a mastermind of Iraqi intelligence, the Muhabarat. This legend was part of the theories of Laurie Mylroie."*

A bit later on, in the next paragraph:

*"Mylroie's thesis was that there was an elaborate plot by Saddam to attack the United States and that Yousef / Basit was his instrument, beginning with the first World Trade Center bombing. Her writing gathered a small cult following, including the recently relieved CIA Director Jim Woolsey and Wolfowitz."*

Next, Clarke quotes Jason Vest's November 27, 2001 article in the Village Voice:

*"According to intelligence and diplomatic sources, Powell – as well as George Tenet – was infuriated by a private intelligence endeavor arranged by Wolfowitz in September. Apparently obsessed with proving a convoluted theory put forth by American Enterprise Institute adjunct fellow Laurie Mylroie that tied Usama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein to the 1993 World Trade Center bombing, Wolfowitz, according to a veteran intelligence officer, dispatched former Director of Intelligence and cabalist James Woolsey to the United Kingdom, tasking him with gathering additional 'evidence' to make the case."*

Clarke has no immediate need to mention these "legends," but he does so. Why? The first one is false; Israel didn't perpetrate the attacks, and its intelligence agency repeatedly tried to warn the U.S. government about them.<sup>1</sup> This is not to ignore a serious body of evidence however, including DEA reports, showing that Israeli intelligence acted as an accomplice with US intelligence in facilitating the attacks before they happened. But the second is probably true. If TWA 800 wasn't shot down by a missile (Navy or not), then what are we to make of all the physical evidence suggesting that it was,<sup>2</sup> and why did the FBI threaten and harass witnesses, 116 of whom insisted they saw some kind of missile rise from near the

horizon and blow the plane to bits?<sup>3</sup> Both of these are called "urban legend."

But Clarke's third example is the Yousef story, which he treats as if it were the work of some independent researcher, the sort of conspiracy critic who might have come up with the aforementioned pair of "legends." He calls the Yousef story a "theory" by "author Laurie Mylroie." How did this particular theory get so influential? "Her writing gathered a small cult following, including Woolsey and Wolfowitz." Everybody knows that the American Enterprise Institute is one among many right-wing Washington think tanks that produce useful position papers more or less on command. It's housed in the same building as PNAC (Project for a New American century). Richard Perle and Lynne Cheney are members.<sup>4</sup> You don't have to be Mike Ruppert to read between the lines here. Clarke is being understated to the point of sarcasm: of course the story of a connection between Ramzi Yousef and Saddam Hussein is not an "urban legend"; of course Laurie Mylroie is not some neutral, disinterested "author"; and of course, one has to surmise, Wolfowitz directed her to produce this absurdity from her post at AEI in the first place. I'm trying to call attention to Clarke's tone. It implies that he knows this is all a limited hangout.

In the same chapter, Clarke mentions a striking detail of the personnel situation on 9-11: in a conversation with FAA administrator Jane Garvey, Clarke asks how long it will take to clear the skies:

*'The air traffic manager,' Jane went on, 'says there are 4,400 birds up now. We can cancel all takeoffs quickly, but grounding them all that are already up... Nobody's ever done this before. Don't know how long it will take. By the way, it's Ben's first day on the job.' Garvey was referring to Ben Sliney, the very new National Operations Manager at FAA. (p.5)*

Very new indeed! If Clarke had no suspicion that 9-11 was an inside job, wouldn't he be a bit less understated here? Wouldn't he comment on the appalling coincidence that the man at the controls of the FAA's National Operations on the morning of September 11th had logged no hours whatsoever in that position? Sure, piquant irony is just a writing style – but in Clarke's pages it certainly sounds loaded.<sup>5</sup>

His discussion of the origins of the first Gulf War is strange; it's as if he were trying to give two opposite accounts at once. Changes in Iraqi troop readiness (i.e., a switch to the radio silence called "Emcon") suggest the possibility that Iraq may be about to move against Kuwait. This triggers a meeting within which only a few people are concerned, but everyone is surprised:

*Only [Bob] Kimmit, NSC's Richard Haasm and I seemed concerned. CIA Deputy Director Dick Kerr said there was no chance of an Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Admiral Dave Jeremiah agreed and refused my suggestion to retain U.S. forces that were leaving the area after an exercise. State's own Middle East bureau had a report from our Ambassador, April Glaspie, noting Saddam's reassurances to her [my empha-*

sis]. *The meeting broke up without a sense of urgency. I went home.*" (p.56)

But for the educated audience, the very name "April Glaspie" means the-person-who-gave-Saddam-a-green-light-to-invade-Kuwait. Let me remind the reader, as Mr. Clarke does not, that on July 25, 1990 Saddam didn't give reassurances to Ambassador Glaspie; she gave reassurances to Saddam:

Saddam Hussein: "If we could keep the whole of the Shatt al Arab [waterway between Iraq and Iran] - our strategic goal in our war with Iran - we will make concessions (to the Kuwaitis). But, if we are forced to choose between keeping half of the Shatt and the whole of Iraq (which, in Saddam's view, includes Kuwait) then we will give up all of the Shatt to defend our claims on Kuwait to keep the whole of Iraq in the shape we wish it to be. (pause) What is the United States' opinion on this?"

(Pause, then Ambassador Glaspie speaks carefully)

U.S. Ambassador Glaspie: "We have no opinion on your Arab-Arab conflicts, such as your dispute with Kuwait. Secretary Baker has directed me to emphasize the instruction, first given to Iraq in the 1960's that the Kuwait issue is not associated with America."<sup>6</sup>

Yet on page 69, Clarke claims that "[Secretary of State] Baker would never have gone to war in the Gulf and made that clear at several points in the months after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait." Mr. Baker was Ms. Glaspie's boss. If he didn't want a U.S. war in the Gulf, why would he have "directed" Glaspie (or State Department spokesperson Margaret Tutweiler, or John Kelly, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs) to indicate that an Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was not going to bother the U.S., when he knew that G.H.W.B. hoped to retaliate with a major attack on Iraq? When Clarke says that Baker claimed to be against the Gulf War, I'm not sure I'm supposed to believe him.

Now, Clarke has just referred to the TWA 800 shoot-down hypothesis as an example of "legend." On pages 121-126 his discussion of TWA 800 rejects that hypothesis and offers the official alternative. But the way he goes about it is, again, a little weird. Here he is talking to his friend the late John O'Neill:

I tried to dissuade him from the Stinger theory. 'It was at 15,000 feet. No Stinger or any missile like it can go that high. The distance and angle are too far from the beach, and even from a boat right under the flight path, you can't get that high.' John wanted proof from the Pentagon. I agreed to get it. (p.124)

But what follows is a description of Clarke's visit to the FBI lab, and there is no further mention of Pentagon input regarding TWA 800. It's a bright red herring anyway, since the "Stinger theory" is no longer (if it ever was) the

major hypothesis of the critics at the time of Clarke's writing (2004). The Stinger was initially interesting because it didn't require a vehicle; somebody standing on the beach could have shot one from his shoulder. But it turned out there were several ships nearby that night, and in the air, a Navy P-3 Orion. Regarding the latter, says the Flight 800 Independent Researchers Organization, "The McArthur/Islip Airport radar (ISP radar) was the FAA's closest radar site to Flight 800 when it exploded. For approximately 28 minutes up until Flight 800 lost electrical power, only a Navy P-3 Orion aircraft was tracked by the ISP radar in the airspace near where Flight 800 exploded and fell to the sea (see Figure 1)."<sup>7</sup>

So, off Clarke goes to the FBI lab where the wreckage is being assembled.<sup>8</sup> An anonymous technician shows him what to look for on the metal wreckage: "See the pitting pattern and the tear. It was a slow, gaseous eruption from the inside." But later on the same page, Clarke explains that he's convinced of the FBI's official explanation, summing up this way: "There was no pitting or tear [!], no indication of an inbound explosion from a Stinger-like missile..." If that's not tipping your hand, I don't know what is. That Clarke does not mention that traces of solid rocket fuel were recovered from seat cushions inside TWA 800 is a sign that he's limiting his discussion to avoid going too far.

Now for the big elephant in the room. On pages 126-127, just after the TWA 800 discussion, are the paragraphs that drove me to write this article. I have to quote them in full:

*"Unfortunately, the public debate over the [TWA 800] incident was clouded by conspiracy theory. Conspiracy theories are a constant in counterterrorism. Conspiracy theorists simultaneously hold two contrary beliefs: a) that the U.S. government is so incompetent that it can miss explanations that the theorists can uncover, and b) that the U.S. government can keep a big and juicy secret. The first belief has some validity. The second idea is pure fantasy. Dismissing conspiracy theorists out of hand, however, is dangerous."* (p.126)

Let's take this a sentence at a time:

1. "Unfortunately, the public debate over the [TWA 800] incident was clouded by conspiracy theory." Yes, it's unfortunate when a perfectly good debate is ruined – clouded – by the presence of more than one point of view.
2. "Conspiracy theories are a constant in counterterrorism." Except for the part that counters terrorism by lone nuts.
3. "Conspiracy theorists simultaneously hold two contrary beliefs: a) that the U.S. government is so incompetent that it can miss explanations that the theorists can uncover..." This takes the cake. It's the cover-up that alleges government incompetence and intelligence failure; the critics allege government complicity and guilt. The central claim of Clarke's book is that the Bush administration accidentally permitted 9-11 because it was incompetent, in that it focused on missile defense and Iraq instead of on Al Qaeda; in Clarke's words, the government missed the explanation whereas he uncov-

ered it. By his own definition, then, Clarke is a conspiracy theorist. Yet everybody knows that the phrase is a derogatory term for anybody who argues that the U.S. government includes murderers with the power to cover up their own crimes. By definition, nobody in the mainstream makes that argument; not Al Franken's new Air America radio show, not the Nation magazine, not NPR, not PBS, and certainly not the 9-11 Warren Commission. Those are the voices crying "incompetence," and Clarke's is the loudest.

4. "Conspiracy theorists... hold ...b) that the U.S. government can keep a big and juicy secret." No, we hold that the huge quantities of information (e.g., documents, recordings, transcripts, testimony, diaries and logbooks, photographs, interviews and physical evidence) which the government emits (some of it deliberately, some accidentally, some through FOIA and litigation) might be worth looking at. For instance, Mike Ruppert pointed out long ago that Dave Frasca, Special Agent In Charge at the FBI's Radical Fundamentalist Unit, was the choke point high up in the Bureau, the man who quashed important investigations of Moussaoui and his cohorts prior to 9-11, including those by Colleen Rowley, Kenneth Williams and others. The lesson in the Frasca story is that you don't need the secrecy of thousands, just the obstructionism of a few people in the right places. But the other lesson is that stuff gets out – stuff like the Rowley memo, the Phoenix memo, and the data with which FTW established the identity of the man so bitterly described in those memos.

And things have always gotten out. Already in 1964, pioneer researchers like Sylvia Meagher and Mark Lane uncovered scores of facts indicating the conspiracy to murder President Kennedy. Clarke's assertion that critics overestimate the government's capacity for secrecy is itself "pure fantasy." If there were no evidence discovered or leaked, there would be nothing to discuss. How could a critical discussion of the evidence include the belief that the government keeps its secrets perfectly and therefore there is no evidence to discuss?

So Clarke's dismissal of "conspiracy theory" does not sound sincere, but it doesn't exactly sound like confident disinformation, either. It sounds transparent. And what makes it more transparent is the last passage I want to discuss:

Another conspiracy theory intrigued me because I could never disprove it. The theory seemed unlikely on its face: Ramzi Yousef or Khalid Sheik Mohammad had taught Terry Nichols how to blow up the Oklahoma Federal Building. The problem was that, upon investigation, we established that both Ramzi Yousef and Nichols had been in the city of Cebu on the same days. I had been to Cebu years earlier; it is on an island in the central Philippines. It was a town in which word could have spread that a local girl was bringing her American boyfriend home and that the American hated the U.S. government.

Yousef and Khalid Sheik Muhammad had gone there to help create an al Qaeda spinoff, a Philippine affiliate chapter, named after a hero of the Afghan war against the Soviets, Abu Sayaff. Could the al Qaeda explosives expert have been introduced to the angry American who proclaimed his hatred for the U.S. government? We do not know, despite some FBI investigation. We do know that Nichols's bombs did not work before his Philippine stay and were deadly when he returned. We also know that Nichols continued to call Cebu long after his wife returned to the United States. The final coincidence is that several al Qaeda operatives had attended a radical Islamic conference a few years earlier in, in all places, Oklahoma City. (p.127)

A disinformationist who wanted to succeed wouldn't round out his list of misguided "conspiracy theories" with a story that he "could never disprove," while continuing to call it a "conspiracy theory." Peter Dale Scott once remarked, with his characteristic brilliance, "Disinformation, in order to be successful, must be 95% accurate." He meant that if you want to deceive the public, tell a story that's mostly the truth and then slip in something that's your very own lie. But Clarke is doing the opposite. He's telling what serious critics will read as barely disguised lies, then adding something he "could never disprove." Might he be trying to tell us something which others won't hear?

The phrase AGAINST ALL ENEMIES comes from the Oath of Office, in which officials like the President solemnly swear to "defend the Constitution Against All Enemies, foreign and domestic." And who is the main target of Clarke's book, the enemy against whom it levels its charges? The Bush administration. Are they foreign? No, they are domestic. Now for what reason would anybody call the Bush administration domestic enemies? It's hard to miss, if you know the facts of 9-11. The explicit meaning of the book's title is that Bush did not defend the country against foreign enemies; the implicit meaning is that by attacking Bush, Clarke is now defending it against domestic enemies.

---

#### ENDNOTES

1 See item 64 of FTW's 9-11 timeline: Sept. 11, 2001 - Employees of Odigo, Inc. in Israel, one of the world's largest instant messaging companies with offices in New York, receive threat warnings of an imminent attack on the WTC less than two hours before the first plane hits. Law enforcement authorities have gone silent about any investigation of this. The Odigo research and development offices in Israel are located in the city of Herzliyya, a ritzy suburb of Tel Aviv that is the same location as the Institute for Counter Terrorism, which eight days later reports details of insider trading on 9-11. [Source: CNN's Daniel Sieberg, Sept. 28, 2001; MSNBC Newsbytes, Brian McWilliams, Sept. 27, 2001; Ha'aretz, Sept. 26, 2001]

2 [http://www.flight800.org/petition/pet\\_contents.htm](http://www.flight800.org/petition/pet_contents.htm)

3 <http://www.flight800.org/witness-review.htm> ;  
[http://www.flight800.org/petition/pet\\_sect9.htm](http://www.flight800.org/petition/pet_sect9.htm)

4 For a profile of AEI, see <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/groupwatch/aei.php>

5 "I thought I was missing something here," writes Clarke in his recounting of a meeting on the afternoon of September 12th, 2001 inside the White House. "Having been attacked by al Qaeda, for us now to go bombing Iraq in response would be like our invading Mexico after the Japanese attacked us at Pearl Harbor" (pp. 30-31). I doubt this is a conscious covert reference to America's actual invasion of Mexico, triggered in 1898 by a U.S. false flag operation against one of its own ships, the USS Maine. But there sure is a reference to Pearl Harbor here, the most famous false flag operation in history, which triggered U.S. entry into WWII as American authorities knowingly permitted the Japanese attack. Is Clarke trying to tell us something?

6 As the sources found on the following web page demonstrate, this was no mistranslation; Glaspie knew exactly what she was doing, as did her colleagues: [http://www.mideastfacts.com/saddam\\_glaspie.html](http://www.mideastfacts.com/saddam_glaspie.html)  
A longer transcript of the Glaspie-Hussein meeting is here:  
<http://www.chss.montclair.edu/english/furr/glaspie.html>

7 [http://www.flight800.org/petition/pet\\_sect4.htm](http://www.flight800.org/petition/pet_sect4.htm). FIRO also points out the presence of ships near the scene and the FBI's failure to identify them: "When Flight 800

crashed, boats and ships up and down Long Island's coast converged on the crash site. But the four closest didn't react at all. Two of these four were due west and within six miles of Flight 800 when it exploded. They were on parallel, east-southeast headings, as Flight 800 became a cascade of flames just off the port side of their bows. But strangely, neither changed course or speed during or after the crash." FIRO is currently suing the FBI.

Perhaps it's worth mentioning that although the presence of these ships and the Navy aircraft are enough to provide for a non-Stinger explanation, it's also quite possible to shoot down a commercial jet at 15,000 feet (and TWA800 was actually only 13,800 feet up) with a ground based HAWK missile from the beach. Easily transportable on a 5-ton flatbed truck, the HAWK system's ceiling is 30,000 feet, and you can watch a film of a HAWK launch – on a beach, firing into the sky over the water – at the website of the Federation of American Scientists page:  
<http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/program/hawk.htm>.

8 Reed Irvine and Cliff Kincaid write in Media Monitor, a publication of Accuracy In Media: "The penchant of the FBI and NTSB for hiding, altering and finally destroying TWA Flight 800 evidence is very revealing. Last summer the NTSB, headed by a Bush appointee, secretly sold all the TWA 800 wreckage that had been kept at the Calverton hangar as scrap metal to be recycled. The buyer had to promise to keep it secret to get the contract."  
[http://www.aim.org/publications/media\\_monitor/2002/06/10.html](http://www.aim.org/publications/media_monitor/2002/06/10.html)

---

---

### ***(Rice Testifies – Cont'd from pg. 1)***

Another crime was revealed when Democratic commission member Richard Ben Veniste said, "We agree", as Rice asserted that there were no specific threats inside the United States before 9/11. The so-called independent commission has no intention of fulfilling its mandate. Ben Veniste's use of the word "we" was the only time where any commissioner spoke for the entire panel and Ben Veniste is neither the chair nor the Vice Chair of the commission. What prompted him to speak for the entire panel? As *FTW* has said from the commission's inception, everything that we have witnessed thus far has been stage-managed drama intended to convince the American people that substantive answers to 9-11 have been obtained as a result of a difficult process.

This is an insulting load of bull.

One (of many) Presidential Daily (Intelligence) Briefs (PDBs) dated August 6<sup>th</sup> 2001 and a frequent theme in Rice's Q&A was titled "Bin Laden Determined to Strike Inside US" is only the barest tip of a criminal iceberg. Rice's position that it was a speculative paper was beneath disingenuous and belied by the title itself. The Commission's intense focus on that PDB alone, to the

exclusion of many other more damning unclassified and available records, is an indication of its deliberate unwillingness to confront Rice or the administration on the simplest points that reveal the administration's guilt. Rice's impish smile when asked several times if the PDB would be declassified betrayed the convenient roadblock, now accepted by panel and witness, as something that will never come to light, as if it were the only piece of evidence remaining to be explored. The big "What if?"

It is not. Forget the PDB. Let's just start with the open and unclassified public record.

### **IS CBS NEWS CLASSIFIED MATERIAL?**

Consider one CBS news story from July 26, 2001 in which it was reported:

*In response to inquiries from CBS News over why Ashcroft was traveling exclusively by leased jet aircraft instead of commercial airlines, the Justice Department cited what it called a "threat assessment" by the FBI, and said Ashcroft has been advised to travel only by private jet for the remainder of his term.*

*"There was a threat assessment and there are guidelines. He is acting under the guidelines,"...*

The CBS news story is not classified and it was referring to trips made inside the Continental U.S. by the Attorney General. Therefore, Rice's statement is false on its face and while the Americans who died on 9-11 were left exposed and unprotected, the Attorney General reacted to an Al Qaeda threat in complete contradiction to Rice's sworn testimony. That question wasn't even asked to day.

The totality of available and non-classified information is both infinitely more incriminating and more disturbing and we will look at some of it below.

### **RICE REVEALS MORE THAN SHE SUSPECTS**

In her opening remarks, Condoleezza Rice stated, "During this period, the Vice President, DCI Tenet, and the NSC's Counterterrorism staff called senior foreign officials requesting that they increase their intelligence assistance and report to us any relevant threat information."

In the wake of 9/11, as *FTW* began documenting a number of direct and very specific warnings received by the United States government, a number of press stories and TV commentaries reported that these warnings had never "trickled up" to the White House or senior management level because they had been received at lower levels. Rice's statement bypasses and nullifies that excuse in much the same way that it was impossible for Rice, Cheney and the senior White House staff to assert that they were not aware of the 2002 report from former Ambassador Joseph Wilson indicating that documents purporting to show that Iraq was attempting to purchase yellowcake uranium Niger were forgeries. It was Cheney's office which had dispatched Wilson in the first place.

It is beyond ludicrous; beyond "systemic" failure; beyond "connecting the dots"; to assume that a high priority request from the White House would have been ignored by lower levels of the national security apparatus, or that a mechanism did not exist for foreign intelligence services to get their information before the right eyes.

In repeating, ad nauseum, her assertion that "If we had had specific information as to the time and place of the attacks, we would have moved heaven and earth to prevent them", Rice played the administration's poker hand, bluffing to end with not even a pair of deuces to back her up.

### **WE DON'T NEED NO STINKING PDBs!**

In this section *FTW* will review some of its reporting on documented foreign warnings received by the admini-

stration before 9/11. And this writer will also disclose portions of his new book, *The Truth and Lies of 9/11 – America's Descent into Fascism at the End of the Age of Oil*, (scheduled for release this summer) for the first time publicly.

Although our first reports of specific warnings of an Al Qaeda threat inside the US were published within two weeks of the attacks, our best compendium of those warnings was published on April 22, 2002. That story *Briefing Paper: The Case for Bush Administration Advance Knowledge of 9/11 Attacks* is located at: [http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/042202\\_bushknows.html](http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/042202_bushknows.html).

In that article we wrote:

*As reported in the respected German daily Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ) on Sept. 13, the German intelligence service, the BND, warned both the CIA and Israel in June of 2001 that Middle Eastern terrorists were planning to hijack commercial aircraft to use as weapons to attack important symbols of American and Israeli culture. The story specifically referred to an electronic eavesdropping system known as Echelon, wherein a number of countries tap cell phone and electronic communications in partner countries and then pool the information. The BND warnings were also passed to the United Kingdom.*

*No known denial by the BND of the accuracy of this story exists, and the FAZ story indicates that the information was received directly from BND sources.*

*According to a Sept. 14 report in the Internet newswire online.ie, German police, monitoring the phone calls of a jailed Iranian man, learned the man was telephoning USG intelligence agencies last summer to warn of an imminent attack on the WTC in the week of Sept. 9. German officials confirmed the calls to the USG for the story but refused to discuss additional details.*

*In August 2000 French intelligence sources confirmed a man recently arrested in Boston by the FBI was an Islamic militant and a key member of Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda network. The FBI knew the man had been taking flying lessons at the time of his arrest and was in possession of technical information on Boeing aircraft and flight manuals, as reported by Reuters on Sept. 13.*

*According to a story in [Izvestia on Sept. 12](#), Russian intelligence warned the USG that as many as 25 pilots were training for missions involving the crashing of airliners into important targets.*

*In an MSNBC interview on Sept. 15, Russian President Vladimir Putin stated he had ordered Russian intelligence to warn the USG "in the strongest possible terms" of imminent assaults*

on airports and government buildings before the attacks on Sept. 11.

*Conclusion: From just these five press stories, then, the USG had received credible advance warnings, some from heads of state, that commercial aircraft would be hijacked by as many as 25 hijackers at airports, with Boston a strong candidate, during the week of Sept. 9...*

*No known preventive measures were taken.*

### **INSIDER TRADING**

*The documented pre-Sept. 11 insider trading that occurred before the attacks involved only companies hit hard by the attacks. They include United Airlines, American Airlines, Morgan Stanley, Merrill-Lynch, Axa Reinsurance, Marsh & McLennan, Munich Reinsurance, Swiss Reinsurance, and Citigroup.*

*In order to argue that the massive and well-documented insider trading that occurred in at least seven countries immediately before the attacks of Sept. 11 did not serve as a warning to intelligence agencies, then it is necessary to argue that no one was aware of the trades as they were occurring, and that intelligence and law enforcement agencies of most industrialized nations do not monitor stock trades in real time to warn of impending attacks. Both assertions are false. Both assertions would also ignore the fact that the current executive vice president of the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) for enforcement is David Doherty, a retired CIA general counsel. And also ignored is the fact that the trading in United Airlines stock -- one of the most glaring clues -- was placed through the firm Deutschebank/Alex Brown, which was headed until 1998 by the man who is now the executive director of the CIA, A.B. "Buzzy" Krongard.*

*One wonders if it was a coincidence then, that Mayo Shattuck III, the head of the Alex Brown unit of Deutschebank -- which had its offices in the WTC -- suddenly resigned from a \$30 million, three-year contract on Sept. 12, as reported by the New York Times and other papers.*

*The American exchanges that handle these trades, primarily the Chicago Board of Options Exchange (CBOE) and the NYSE, know on a daily basis what levels of put options are purchased. "Put options" are highly leveraged bets, tying up blocks of stock, that a given stock's share price will fall dramati-*

*cally. To quote 60 Minutes from Sept. 19, "Sources tell CBS News that the afternoon before the attack, alarm bells were sounding over unusual trading in the U.S. stock options market."*

*It is hard to believe that they missed:*

*- A jump in UAL put options 90 times (not 90 percent) above normal between Sept. 6 and Sept.10, and 285 times higher than average on the Thursday before the attack. [CBS News, Sept. 26]*

*- A jump in American Airlines put options 60 times (not 60 percent) above normal on the day before the attacks. [CBS News, Sept. 26]*

*- No similar trading occurred on any other airlines. [Bloomberg Business Report, the Institute for Counterterrorism (ICT), Herzliyya, Israel citing data from the CBOE]*

*- Morgan Stanley saw, between Sept. 7 and Sept.10, an increase of 27 times (not 27 percent) in the purchase of put options on its shares. [ICT Report, "Mechanics of Possible Bin-Laden Insider Trading Scam," Sept. 21, citing data from the CBOE].*

*- Merrill-Lynch saw a jump of more than 12 times the normal level of put options in the four trading days before the attacks. [Ibid]*

*These trades were certainly noticed after the attacks.*

*"This could very well be insider trading at the worst, most horrific, most evil use you've ever seen in your entire life... This would be one of the most extraordinary coincidences in the history of mankind if it was a coincidence," said Dylan Ratigan of Bloomberg Business News, interviewed on Good Morning Texas on Sept. 20.*

*"I saw put-call numbers higher than I've ever seen in 10 years of following the markets, particularly the options markets," said John Kinnucan, principal of Broadband Research, as quoted in the San Francisco Chronicle," reported the Montreal Gazette on Sept. 19. The paper also wrote, "Agence France Presse, on Sept. 22, reported, 'And Germany's Bundesbank chief, Ernst Weltke, said on the sidelines of the meeting that a report of the investigation showed "bizarre" fiscal transactions prior to the attacks that could not have been chalked up to coincidence.*

*"Weltke said the transactions, 'could not have been planned and carried out without a certain*

knowledge,' particularly heavy trading in oil and gold futures."

ABC World News reported on Sept. 20, "Jonathan Winer, an ABC News consultant said, 'it's absolutely unprecedented to see cases of insider trading covering the entire world from Japan, to the U.S., to North America, to Europe."

How much money was involved? Andreas von Bülow, a former member of the German Parliament responsible for oversight of Germany's intelligence services estimated the worldwide amount at \$15 billion, according to Tagesspiegel on Jan. 13. Other experts have estimated the amount at \$12 billion. CBS News gave a conservative estimate of \$100 million.

Not a single U.S. or foreign investigative agency has announced any arrests or developments in the investigation of these trades, the most telling evidence of foreknowledge of the attacks. This, in spite of the fact that former Security and Exchange Commission enforcement chief William McLucas told Bloomberg News that regulators would "certainly be able to track down every trade."

What is striking is that a National Public Radio report on Oct. 16 reported Britain's Financial Services Authority had cleared bin Laden and his henchmen of insider trading. If not bin Laden, then who else had advance knowledge?

It has been standard and established USG policy to be alert and responsive to anything even remotely resembling an attack on U.S. companies and/or the economy. The word "remote" does not apply here. The possible claim by the Bush Administration that, 'Gee, we just happened to miss this,' becomes even more implausible when considering the lengths intelligence agencies go to in order to track stock trades.

Note that the Israeli Institute for Counter-Terrorism was the first entity to release a detailed report on the insider trading. That alone is prima facie evidence of a direct relationship between the financial markets and terrorist investigations.

## **CIA AND THE MARKETS**

We can thank Fox News on Oct. 16 for breaking post 9-11 stories disclosing the use

of sophisticated PROMIS software by the FBI and the Justice Department. A multitude of court records and investigative reports have established not only the reality, but the versatility of a program initially designed to incorporate data from a variety of data bases in different languages into one readable format. PROMIS has since been refined to include artificial intelligence and "back doors" inserted by intelligence agencies to allow for surreptitious retrieval and/or removal and alteration of data.

The Fox stories clearly confirmed, especially when added to stories from last summer by the Washington Times which were based on interviews with Justice Department officials, that PROMIS was used to monitor banking and financial transactions in a virtual real-time environment.

This writer has written extensively on the software. More information can be found on the Web site at <http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/index.html>.

However, one point is critical to this report. In fall 2000 I was visited in Los Angeles by two members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) national security staff. They were conducting a major investigation inside the U.S. to determine whether or not the RCMP's version of the software had been compromised. During discussions with the Mounties, I confirmed several times that the software was used to monitor stock trades in real time. A subsequent investigation led me to contact several people in Canada who had been interviewed in the same investigation. They were stockbrokers.

In a taped panel discussion, which aired March 14 on Canada's Vision-TV, I faced a panel of three Canadian experts on the issue of U.S. foreknowledge of, and possible complicity in, the 9-11 attacks. Among them was Ron Atkey, former Canadian immigration minister and the former parliamentary head of the committee charged with oversight of Canada's military and intelligence operations. Over the course of the program I made specific statements, relying not only on the RCMP interactions but also on previous investigations that it was documented that intelligence services track stock trades in real time. On camera, I produced the business cards of the two RCMP agents. Atkey, who had not hesitated to challenge me on other points during the show, went silent.



## INTELLIGENCE SUCCESSES

Four basic intelligence successes need to be acknowledged here. These admitted successes, while not addressing any other still secret penetrations of the Al Qaeda network, further diminish any Bush Administration assertion that it did not know of the attacks.

On Feb. 13 [2001] United Press International terrorism correspondent Richard Sale, while covering a Manhattan trial of one of Osama bin Laden's followers, reported the National Security Agency had broken bin Laden's encrypted communications. Even if that prompted an immediate change in bin Laden's methods of communication, just six months before the attacks, the administration has consistently maintained -- and military and covert experience dictates -- that the attacks were planned for at least several years.

The FAZ story indicates that the secret eavesdropping program Echelon had been successful in securing details of the pending attacks. Echelon employs highly sophisticated computer programs capable of both voice and word recognition to filter billions of telephone conversations and locate specific targets. Assuming, as some sources indicate, Al Qaeda stopped using encrypted communications after it was known that their system was compromised, why was the NSA not able to pick up any cell phone calls or e-mails? Mohammed Atta and other alleged hijackers were known to have used cell phones. The FAZ story establishes that as late as June, Al Qaeda operatives were being tracked in this manner.

In the trial of a former Deutschebank executive Kevin Ingram, who pled guilty to laundering drug money to finance terrorist operations linked to Al Qaeda just two weeks before the 9-11 attacks, indications surfaced that the Justice Department had penetrated the terrorists' financial network. A Nov. 16 [2001] Associated Press story by Catherine Wilson stated, "Numerous promised wire transfers never arrived, but there were discussions of foreign bankers taking payoffs to move the money to purchase weapons into the United States, said prosecutor Rolando Garcia."

Two questions are begged but unanswered. How were the wire transfers blocked and how was the Justice Department able to

monitor the money flows without alerting either the bankers or the suspects?

Finally, as reported by the German paper Die Welt on Dec. 6 [2001] and by Agence France Presse on Dec. 7, Western intelligence services, including the CIA, learned after arrests in the Philippines, that Al Qaeda operatives had planned to crash commercial airliners into the WTC. Details of the plan, as reported by a number of American press outlets, were found on a computer seized during the arrests. The plan was called "operation Bojinka."

Details of the plot were disclosed publicly in 1997 in the New York trial of Ramsi Youssef for his involvement in the 1993 WTC bombing.

## IZVESTIA, PUTIN AND THE CIA = RICE PUDDING

Even more damaging to Rice and the Bush administration is a story published in Russia's *Izvestia* which came into this writer's possession thanks to former CIA counter-terror case officer, Leutrell Osborne (see above). The story had been brought to his attention by his Russian-speaking son and had fortunately been saved in its original form before it was sanitized of several key sentences.

FTW has posted a translation and copy of the original Russian story online at:

[http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/izvestia\\_story\\_pi.c.html](http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/izvestia_story_pi.c.html).

Portions of the story in bold indicate sentences that were removed from the *Izvestia* web site by late September 2001. We posted the full story in May of 2002 after commissioning a professional translation.

Here is the unedited story:

September 12, 2001 (14:15) Yesterday at the headquarters of Central Intelligence Service in Langley a confidential meeting between one of the Deputy Directors of CIA and a special messenger of Russian Intelligence Service took place. **According to NewsRu sources he delivered to his American colleagues some documents including audio tapes with telephone conversations directly relating to terrorist attacks on Washington and New York last Tuesday. According to these sources, Russian Intelligence agents know the organizers and executors of these terrorist attacks. More than that, Moscow warned Washington about preparation to these actions a couple of weeks before they happened.**

Russian Intelligent Service states that behind the terrorist attacks on Washington and New York stand the organization of Usama ben Laden, Islamic movement of Uzbekistan and Taliban government. According to our intelligence agents

among terrorists there were at least two Uzbeks, natives of Fergana who arrived in the USA on forged documents about ten months ago. A terrorist group which realized actions against the USA consisted of at least 25 people. All of them had a special training on the territories of Afghanistan and Pakistan including piloting of an aircraft.

Besides, Russian Intelligence Service warns White House that present terrorist attacks are only the beginning of the wide-scale action. Ben Laden has the plans to attack nuclear units on the territory of the USA. Among Islamic targets are space objects and large financial centers of the USA.

The organization of the International Terrorist, according to Russian Intelligence Service agents had been planning an operation against the USA more than a year and a half. Russian Intelligence Service insists that Usama ben Laden has about 400 fanatics who are ready any minute to realize attacks against the USA all around the world.

[NOTE: The scan of the Izvestia story presented... is of the story that was originally presented by Izvestia. The story that they currently have on their website has omitted the first paragraph completely. We wonder why...]

## KNOWN PENETRATIONS OF AL QAEDA

Following are excerpts from *The Truth and Lies of 9/11 – America's Descent into Fascism at the End of the Age of Oil*.

**SIGINT:** NSA Director Michael Hayden testified before Congress in October 2002 that the NSA had no indications that al Qaeda was planning attacks on US soil, let alone against New York or Washington.<sup>10</sup> This directly contradicts the fact that in the summer of 2001 the NSA had intercepted communications between the reported tactical mastermind of the attacks, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, and Mohammed Atta. The NSA did not share the information with any other agencies even at a time when Mohammed was on the FBI's most-wanted terror list. The NSA also failed to translate some messages and later offered the nonsensical excuse that they had no way to separate these calls from millions of others.<sup>11</sup> [What do you suppose they were talking about? The best bars in South Florida?]

**SIGINT:** For more than eighteen months Italian authorities wiretapped an al Qaeda cell in Milan.<sup>20</sup> Starting in October 2000, FBI agents assisted Italian authorities in analyzing the tapes, and this resulted in a direct warning to the US from Italy that planes might be used as weapons against US targets.<sup>21</sup>

**SIGINT/ELINT/HUMINT:** Italian authorities obtained information from wiretaps of al Qaeda cells that a possible attack was planned to kill President Bush at the G8 Summit in Genoa scheduled for July. Additional information suggested that Egyptian intelligence had achieved HUMINT penetrations of al Qaeda cells that confirmed information from the wiretaps and surveillance. Some conversations were recorded as a result of the bugging of a Citroen automobile used by Egyptian terrorists in Italy who are close to bin Laden. As a result the airspace around Genoa was closed and the conference was ringed with anti-aircraft weapons.<sup>23</sup>

**SIGINT:** In September 2001 the NSA intercepted multiple phone calls into the United States from Abu Zubaida, the man who is reported to be bin Laden's operations chief. No details of what was intercepted have been released, but it is obvious that the parties receiving the calls would have been identified.<sup>24</sup>

**SIGINT:** British sources disclosed that telephone conversations between Osama bin Laden and associates in Pakistan and Afghanistan in the weeks prior to 9/11 were monitored and that the attacks were generally discussed in those conversations.<sup>25</sup>

**HUMINT/SIGINT:** Jordanian intelligence had for years done a masterful job of infiltrating al Qaeda. A May 2002 story from *The International Herald Tribune* reported, "Since the early 1990s, the kingdom's well-organized and efficient intelligence service, the General Intelligence Division (GID), has carefully tracked the CIA-trained or Pakistan-trained guerillas or terrorists, or freedom fighters, or whatever you choose to call them—who survived their victorious 1979–89 war to expel the Soviet invaders from Afghanistan. . . . Jordan's GID hunted the returned fighters, capturing and bringing to justice several who became active terrorists. The GID aided the U.S. government in countless ways, even helping U.S. law enforcement officers to apprehend Al Qaeda and other operatives who had formed cells in the United States or Canada."<sup>39</sup>

The author, John K. Cooley, a veteran of ABC News and widely respected on terrorism issues, described how in the summer of 2001 the GID made an intercept deemed so important that it was relayed to the US government not only officially, most likely through the CIA station in Amman, but also personally through an Iranian-born German intelligence agent. From my experience this was a form of insurance for the Jordanian government in case the US ever denied that Jordan had delivered the message or asserted that the Jordanian government had been less than a staunch ally. Such is the fear of the Empire's wrath around the world. The message clearly indicated that a major attack had been planned inside the continental United States and that aircraft would be used. The code name for the operation was "Al Ourush," or "The Big Wedding." When this information subsequently became embarrassing to the Bush administration, Jordanian officials backed away from their earlier confirmations.<sup>40</sup> The administration had been insisting since the day of the attacks that it had received no forewarnings.

Cooley's story also told of how both a French magazine (name not given) and a Moroccan newspaper simultaneously reported that a Moroccan agent named Hassan Dabou had penetrated al Qaeda to the point of getting close to bin Laden, who was "very disappointed" that the 1993 bombing had not toppled the World Trade Center. The agent remained in place until weeks before the attacks. He successfully delivered a message to Moroccan intelligence that al Qaeda was planning "large-scale operations in New York in the summer or autumn of 2001."

### **Somebody knew**

Throughout the world the independent media organizations have done an outstanding job of picking up and reporting on independently published stories which the major media overlooked. One of the most outstanding examples of this was a July 16, 2002 piece posted at the web site of Portland Indymedia ([www.portland.indymedia.org](http://www.portland.indymedia.org)) that reproduced the following short article originally found at The Memory Hole.<sup>44</sup>

*"NPR interview on 9-11 confirmed attack was 'not entirely unexpected.'*

*"It's certainly one of the most disturbing and important indications that the government knew the attacks of September 11, 2001, were coming. On that morning, National Public Radio (NPR) was presenting live coverage of the attacks on its show Morning Edition. Host Bob Edwards went to a reporter in the field—David Welna, NPR's Congressional correspondent—who was in the Capitol building as it was being evacuated. Here is the crucial portion of Welna's report:*

*"I spoke with Congressman Ike Skelton—a Democrat from Missouri and a member of the Armed Services Committee—who said that just recently the Director of the CIA warned that there could be an attack—an imminent attack—on the United States of this nature. So this is not entirely unexpected."*

(Audio links for this interview are located at Thememoryhole and NPR websites)

[www.thememoryhole.org/tenet-911.htm](http://www.thememoryhole.org/tenet-911.htm)

### **THE 9/11 MOVEMENT MUST UNITE**

Within the narrow window between now and the November election, it is on the point of foreknowledge, and on this point only, that the entire government position – regardless of party or administration – can be completely and instantly deconstructed in a manner that is easily

understood by the majority of the American people. We must become Andy Sipowicz with one voice and we must make that voice be heard. Condi Rice has handed us the pivotal moment on a silver platter. We must break the suspect while she is still on the public stage (in the interrogation room). After that, the millions of other inconsistencies, lies and falsehoods of the attacks, including the physical evidence issues, can be pursued in a systematic way, hopefully with serious legal clout to eliminate wiggle room.

But for the moment, the suspect is in effect saying, look, you have a short period of time in which to book me or let me go. If we let her go, then all other discussions become academic.

---

### **EXCERPTED ENDNOTES**

10. "Terror Intercepts on Eve of Sept 11th Too Vague—NSA," Reuters, October 17, 2002; *USA Today*, October 18, 2002.
11. Jonathan S. Landay, "NSA didn't share key pre-Sept 11 information, sources say," Knight Ridder Newspapers, January 6, 2002: <http://www.bayarea.com/mld/bayarea/3416632.htm>
20. Charles M. Sennott, "Exposing Al Qaeda's European Network," *The Boston Globe*, August 4, 2002. Archived at: <http://www.cooperativeresearch.org/completetimeline/2002/bostonglobe080402.html>
21. Sebastian Rotella and Josh Meyer, "Wiretaps May Have Foretold Terror Attacks Investigation: Suspected Al Qaeda operatives taped in Italy in 2000 discussed airplanes, airports and strikes 'that will never be forgotten,'" *The L. A. Times*, May 29, 2002. Archived at: <http://www.cooperativeresearch.org/completetimeline/2002/latimes052902.html>; "Bugs Recorded Chilling 9/11 Talk," CBSNews.com, May 29, 2002: <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/05/29/attack/main510400.shtml>; *The Guardian*, May 30, 2002.
23. "Italy Tells of Threat at Genoa Summit," *The L. A. Times*, September 27, 2001: <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-092701genoa.story>
24. "Early Warnings," *ABC News*, February 18, 2002: [http://abcnews.go.com/sections/wnt/DailyNews/wnt\\_missedsignals\\_1\\_020218.html](http://abcnews.go.com/sections/wnt/DailyNews/wnt_missedsignals_1_020218.html)
25. "The Proof They Did Not Reveal," *The Sunday Times*, October 7, 2001. Archived at: <http://www.unansweredquestions.net/timeline/2001/sundaytimes100701.html>
39. John K. Cooley, "The U.S. Ignored Foreign Warnings," *The International Herald Tribune*, May 21, 2002. Currently archiveat: <http://www.cooperativeresearch.org/completetimeline/2002/iht052102.html>
40. Ibid.
44. "CIA Director Warned Congress About 9/11 Attacks," *The Memory Hole*. <http://www.thememoryhole.org/tenet-911.htm>. As of this writing the Memory Hole Web site still had a link to the actual NPR story allowing the user to hear the actual report

## **Draft Extradition Update**

As regular *FTW* readers know, four months ago we began contacting the embassies and consulates of 75 countries and asking the following question: "Under existing treaties, is \_\_\_\_\_ obligated to extradite fugitives (back) to the United States for draft evasion?"

Replies have come slowly, but since this chart was first published in the Feb '04 issue of this newsletter, we have received additional replies from the following countries: *Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, and South Africa*). Last updated April 22, 2004, this chart will be continually updated until all 75 countries on our list have responded. Updates can be viewed online, in Mike Ruppert's article, "Nowhere to Run, Nowhere to hide."

	Extradite Yes/No?	FBI LEGAT	NORTHCOM	NATO	ANZUS	CONDITIONS
Argentina	No*	Yes				* "Requested State may refuse extradition for offenses under military law that are not offenses under ordinary criminal law (article 4, military offenses-paragraph 4"
Australia	Yes	Yes			Yes	
Brazil	Yes	Yes				
Canada	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Colombia	Yes	Yes				Case by case basis
Germany	Yes	Yes		Yes		
Italy	Yes	Yes		Yes		
Mexico	Yes	Yes	Yes			
New Guinea	No					Will not extradite
New Zealand	No				Yes	Will not extradite if violation of military law
Nigeria	No	Yes				"No treaty exists between US and Nigeria to mandate repatriation of draft dodgers"
Norway	No			Yes		Discretion of Foreign Ministry
Panama	Yes	Yes				
Peru	Yes					Case by case basis
Philippines	Yes	Yes				
Poland	No	Yes		Yes		"Extradition can also be denied if military offense does not constitute a felony under existing national penal code (Art 5, subsection 4)"
Portugal	No			Yes		
Russia	No	Yes				"No agreement for extradition exists"
South Africa	No*	Yes				"The Executive Authority of the Requested State shall refuse extradition for offenses under ordinary criminal law."
Spain	Yes	Yes		Yes		
Sweden	No					No, if only crime is against military law
Switzerland	No	Yes				No, if only crime is against military law
Thailand	Yes	Yes				