

Sept. 11 'Who Knew What' Debate Misses the Point

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

Washington was caught up in a frenzy of wild speculations in the media on May 15, dutifully seized upon by members of the U.S. House and Senate, around the question: What did the White House know, or not know, about terrorist attacks, prior to Sept. 11? The question was provoked by a couple of well-placed leaks in the press, to the effect that the White House had been informed of threats that al-Qaeda networks might seek new methods of hijacking airplanes. It was also reported that the FBI had received information in July, that al-Qaeda might have sent men to U.S. flight schools for training.

Immediately, members of Congress pounced on the "revelations" and demanded clear explanations from the government. White House spokesman Ari Fleischer was bombarded with questions at his press briefing, regarding why the FBI or White House didn't "connect the dots." Leading administration representatives, such as National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice and Vice President Dick Cheney, issued public statements defending the White House for allegedly not making the intelligence reports public. Rice said in a press conference on May 16, that the information received by the White House in August referred to generic warnings, that al-Qaeda-type groups might try new methods to hijack planes, but "I don't think anybody could have predicted that these people would take an airplane and slam it into the World Trade Center, take another one and slam it into the Pentagon." She said counter-terror experts met regularly in August 2001 to evaluate the threats, and that airlines had been informed. She said that to make the threats public, could have closed down the airline industry. She denied any intelligence lapse, citing cases in which terrorist attacks had been successfully foiled in Rome, Turkey, and Paris.

Cheney, speaking in New York on May 16, claimed that another terror attack was on the agenda. He said, "An investigation must not interfere with the ongoing efforts to prevent the next attack, because without a doubt a very real threat of

another perhaps more devastating attack still exists. . . . The people and agencies responsible for helping us learn about and defeat such an attack are the very ones most likely to be distracted from their critical duties if Congress fails to carry out their obligations in a responsible fashion."

Cheney lashed out at critics who insinuated that something could have been done to prevent the Sept. 11 attacks, saying that these suggestions were "thoroughly irresponsible and totally unworthy of national leaders in a time of war." The Vice President said that what he wanted to "tell my Democratic friends in the Congress is that they need to be very cautious not to seek political advantage by making incendiary suggestions. . . . The President and I believe that one of our most important responsibilities is to do that we can to ensure that an attack like 9/11 never happens again."

There followed a spate of alerts to possible terror attacks, this time, very public: On May 19, FBI Director Robert Mueller announced that "walk-in suicide bombers like those who have attacked public places in Israel will hit the United States eventually"; Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld proclaimed that it was "inevitable" that terrorists would gain access to weapons of mass destruction and use them; and several warnings were issued, that a major attack was expected in New York City, possibly against the Statue of Liberty or the Brooklyn Bridge, over the Memorial Day weekend.

Connecting the Dots

The focus of Congressional and press criticism of the administration, was that the authorities, who allegedly had various bits of information, did not "connect the dots," to put together a picture that would show the imminence of the Sept. 11 attacks. But the real problem is not that no one connected the dots; the problem is, the dots are a fraud.

The single bits and pieces of information allegedly received by the FBI and CIA, are bits and pieces of the mosaic



Strange and chilling “promises of more terrorism” were given the American people on successive days by Vice President Cheney (right), FBI Director Mueller (left, with Bush), and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld. What is their purpose, beyond eclipsing economic debates with a renewed focus on war?

which was presented as the official cover story, shortly after the attacks. That cover story has it, that the perpetrators were al-Qaeda-linked terrorists, who included young Arabs who had sought and obtained instruction in flight schools in the United States. But, since Sept. 11, there has been no evidence offered by the U.S. authorities, to prove that the attacks were carried out by this alleged network, nor to prove that any of the individuals reportedly receiving instruction at flying schools, were at all involved. Nonetheless, that was the official cover story adopted by the Bush Administration sometime late in the day on Sept. 11.

Lyndon LaRouche has pointed out, that the known operations of Sept. 11 involved a high degree of sophistication, and perhaps a year or more of preparations. The risk of involving potentially unreliable elements in such an operation, is such that one must doubt that any group capable of organizing the attack would be amateurish enough to rely upon elements of the types these names imply. He says, more likely was there “sheep-dipping” of persons of Middle East credentials into the picture, to create a false trail. It must be recognized, that the choice to hit the Trade Center first, when an equal opportunity existed to hit the Pentagon and possibly the White House first, meant that the intended effect of those who made that choice was to point credulous commentators to the false trail of Osama bin Laden and thus an Afghanistan origin. After all, by sending the U.S. into Afghanistan, the authors of the Sept. 11 attacks gained their intended objective.

Thus, the actual significance of the “revelations” in the press, regarding presumed foreknowledge on the part of the Bush Administration of the planned attacks, is that they constitute a further attempt to sell the cover story.

The real point is that the cover story has been blown.

On the morning of Sept. 11, Lyndon LaRouche, who was being interviewed by Utah radio talk-show host Jack Stockwell as the dramatic events were unfolding, immediately identified the attacks as a “strategic assault” against the govern-

ment of the United States, an assault which could not have been undertaken without the active participation of rogue elements of the U.S. security and military apparatuses. In subsequent reports, LaRouche fine-tuned his analysis, specifying that the military coup d’état attempted through the attacks, especially that against the Pentagon—which would automatically trigger a nuclear alert in the United States as well as Russia—could not have been carried out without either the total deterioration/dismantling of U.S. security systems, which itself would constitute a national security danger of the highest order, or the deliberate neutralization of the same systems, by elements participating in the coup. LaRouche stated that the strategic aim of the attempted coup, was to force the Bush Administration to back Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon in his war against the Palestinians and the Arab/Islamic world more broadly, as the opening salvo of a more generalized, and longer-term “Clash of Civilizations,” the policy of Harvard’s Samuel Huntington et al., pitting the West against Islam.

Developments in the intervening period have proven that LaRouche was right; and authoritative circles in the Arab world have explicitly acknowledged this. Since Sept. 11, and increasingly, since Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon escalated his war against the Palestinian Authority during the Easter period, Arabic press outlets have been competing for interviews with LaRouche, and media groups such as Egyptian national television, Al-Jazeera, *Al-Ahram*, and many others, have run extensive interviews with the U.S. Presidential pre-candidate and his associates. Other agencies, in leading countries such as France and Germany, as well as in Russia, have questioned the official cover story. No one believes the “bin Laden did it” story, no matter how many videos asserting the contrary may be fabricated. Everyone who is anyone in the corridors of power in any Western European government, or in Russia, China, and many countries in Asia, knows that the Sept. 11 attacks must have been planned, organized, and

carried out by elements within the U.S. intelligence and military community. Some have dared to voice such views publicly, such as former German minister and Social Democratic parliamentarian Andreas von Bülow. In France, the online intelligence newsletter *Réseau Voltaire* has continued its campaign to dismantle the lies of the “official cover story,” and to raise pertinent questions regarding the actual events of that fateful day.

The Scientific Nature of Foreknowledge

The question which *should* be raised, is not what did the White House know or not know. The real question is: Who planned, organized, and carried out the unprecedented assault of Sept. 11? LaRouche, since that very day, has indicated where the investigations should commence.

LaRouche’s authority on the matter can be established even before the fact. The pathetic press whores should consider what LaRouche, as early as August, had to say about events. Considering the global strategic situation, in which the financial and monetary structures were threatened with rapid disintegration, LaRouche forecast that the forces of the international financial oligarchy, eager to protect and preserve their system, would go to all lengths, including emphatically war. He presented this warning in a statement quoted in *EIR* on July 27, 2001 (“A Post-Sharon Nuclear Armageddon Plot?”). He also warned of a major destabilization building up in Washington, D.C. for September, around the planned mass demonstrations of anarchist groups.

LaRouche’s forecast relied solely on his comprehension of the fact which the international financial and economic structures that have prevailed over the past 50 years, have now entered terminal collapse, due to their faulty economic policies. Thus, LaRouche reasoned, forces within the financial oligarchy, seeing their existence threatened, would move to war: not only against locally perceived enemies, but against communities of religious believers across the Eurasian continent, in order to ignite religious warfare. A crucial factor in the Clash of Civilizations scenario he identified, was the oligarchy’s aim to crush the emerging “strategic triangle” of India, China, and Russia, which is the pivot of broader economic and strategic cooperation coming into being across Eurasia.

Now, in light of the “debate” about Sept. 11, it is high time that someone raised the real issue: Who was behind the attacks? Who organized them? How and why?

President Bush said, after meeting with Senate Republicans, referring to the questions raised in Washington, “There is a sniff of politics in the air. Someone may be trying to use this as a political opportunity.” Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) had an apt reply: “Sniff of politics? We want a sniff of truth.”

This is the question placed before the institutions of U.S. government, emphatically including the Congress: Are they interested in gaining brownie points, or are they committed to seek the truth? If the latter case be true, they have only one route: through LaRouche’s conceptual leadership.

Northcom Raises Legal, Constitutional Questions

by Carl Osgood

Since Sept. 11, there has been increasing pressure from both within and without the Bush Administration to expand the role of the U.S. military in “homeland defense.” To this ostensible end, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld announced, on April 17, the formation of a new unified military command, the U.S. Northern Command, to—as Rumsfeld put it—“help the [Defense] Department better deal with natural disasters, attacks on U.S. soil, or other civil difficulties. It will provide for a more coordinated support to civil authorities such as the FBI, FEMA [Federal Emergency Management Agency], and state and local governments.”

Rumsfeld described the new command as “assigned to defend the American people where they live and work, and it will be functioning in a supporting role to civil authorities as occasions arise.” Northern Command’s geographic area of responsibility will include Mexico and Canada, as well as the United States and parts of the Caribbean, including Cuba.

EIR Founding Editor Lyndon LaRouche warned (*EIR*, May 17, 2002) that in the current context of strategic policy-making, the creation of Northern Command “is clearly a proposal to ‘cross the Rubicon,’ ” a reference to Julius Caesar’s 49 BC march into Rome that ultimately led to the establishment of the Roman Empire under Augustus Caesar in 31 BC. The danger, today, stems from the possibility that, under this new arrangement, the Pentagon might become a tool of Attorney General John Ashcroft. LaRouche pointed to the doctrine of law encompassed by the 1878 Posse Comitatus Act which “may be properly viewed as the U.S. government’s recognition of the danger of allowing the circumstances under which corrupt elements of the Federal government might act to establish a military dictatorship in the U.S.A.”

LaRouche is not alone in his concerns. Military experts and state legislators consulted by *EIR* have raised numerous questions as to the Constitutionality of the Northern Command. One expert argues that, if the intent of the Northern Command is to facilitate the use of Federal troops in emergency situations, the required legal authorities already exist under Title 10 and Title 32 of the U.S. Code. If, however, the intent is to deploy Federal troops to assist other Federal departments, such as Treasury or Justice, in the enforcement of civil law, then Constitutional and legal problems arise.

Erosion of Posse Comitatus

The deployment of Federal troops for civil law enforcement purposes is strictly prohibited by the Posse Comitatus