

Fabricating an Enemy. “The Threat of Al Qaeda” as a Justification to Wage War

It is the Bush Administration, rather than Baghdad, which is supporting Al Qaeda

By [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)

Global Research, May 27, 2015

[Global Research](#) 28 January 2003

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Terrorism](#)

This article was first published in January 2003, two months prior to the launching of the war on Iraq. It was subsequently included in my book entitled America’s “War on Terrorism”, Global Research, Montreal, 2005.

Since the publication of this article, the instruments of propaganda have gained in impetus and sophistication. The global campaign against Muslims has continued unabated with a view to creating an atmosphere of fear and intimidation.

Suspected terrorists are arrested on trumped up charges. These arrests of individuals of Middle Eastern origin are not motivated by security considerations. Their main function is to provide legitimacy to the “Global War on Terrorism” and the Homeland Security State.

The ultimate objective is to justify a war of conquest.

Terrorist attacks by Muslims against the Homeland are said to be imminent. Counter-terrorism is intended to protect the Western World.

Much of the justification for waging this war without borders rests on the legitimacy of the US administration’s anti-terrorist agenda. The latter forms part of the propaganda campaign, which in turn is used to sway the US population into an unconditional acceptance of the war agenda.

Both the Bush and Obama administrations have covertly supported and financed international terrorism. They have used Al Qaeda as well as ISIS as their foot-soldiers, while also using the atrocities committed by the “Islamic terrorists” as a justification for intervening on humanitarian ground.

In Iraq, the Obama administration is supporting ISIS while at the same time waging a fake “war on terrorism” against ISIS. Without the support of media propaganda, the legitimacy of the “war on terrorism” would collapse like a deck of cards.

The ISIS brigades are integrated by US-NATO sponsored special forces, often recruited by private mercenary companies on contract to the Pentagon. These special forces which integrate the terror brigades are in permanent liaison with their US-NATO counterparts.

Michel Chossudovsky, May 27 2015

* * *

One of the main objectives of war propaganda is to «fabricate an enemy» . As anti-war sentiment grows and the political legitimacy the Bush Administration falters, doubts regarding the existence of this “outside enemy” must be dispelled.

As the date of the planned invasion of Iraq approaches, the Bush Administration and its indefectible British ally have multiplied the “warnings” of future Al Qaeda terrorist attacks. The enemy has to appear genuine: thousands of news stories and editorials linking Al Qaeda to the Baghdad government are planted in the news chain. Colin Powell underscored this relationship in his presentation to the Davos World Economic Forum in January. Iraq is casually presented in official statements and in the media as “a haven for and supplier of the terror network”:

“Evidence that is still tightly held is accumulating within the administration that it is not a matter of chance that terror groups in the al Qaeda universe have made their weapons of choice the poisons, gases and chemical devices that are signature arms of the Iraqi regime.”¹



In this context, propaganda purports to drown the truth, and kill the evidence on how Osama bin Laden’s Al Qaeda was fabricated and transformed into “Enemy Number One”.

Meanwhile, “anti-terrorist operations” directed against Muslims, including arbitrary mass arrests have been stepped up. In the US, emergency measures are contemplated in the case of war. The corporate media is busy preparing public opinion. A «national emergency» is said to be justified because «America is under attack»:

« the U.S. and Western interests in the Western world have to be prepared for retaliatory attacks from sleeper cells the second we launch an attack in Iraq.»

2

Defence of the Homeland

Emergency procedures are already in place. The Secretary of Homeland Defence -whose mandate is to «safeguard the nation from terrorist attacks»- has already been granted the authority « to take control of a national emergency», implying the establishment of de facto military rule. In turn, the Northern Command would be put in charge of military operations in the US «war on terrorism » theatre.

The Smallpox Vaccination Program

In the context of these emergency measures, preparations for compulsory smallpox vaccination are already under way in response to a presumed threat of a biological weapons attack on US soil. The vaccination program -which has been the object of intense media propaganda- would be launched with the sole purpose of creating an atmosphere of panic among the population:

«A few infected individuals with a stack of plane tickets-or bus tickets, for that matter-could spread smallpox infection across the country, touching off a plague of large proportions It is not inconceivable that a North Korea or an Iraq could retain smallpox in a hidden lab and pass the deadly agent on to terrorists.»³

The hidden agenda is crystal clear. How best to discredit the anti-war movement and maintain the legitimacy of the State? Create conditions, which instill fear and hatred, present the rulers as “guardians of the peace”, committed to weeding out terrorism and preserving democracy. In the words of British Prime Minister Tony Blair, echoing almost verbatim the US propaganda dispatches:

“I believe it is inevitable that they will try in some form or other,... ‘I think we can see evidence from the recent arrests that the terrorist network is here as it is around the rest of Europe, around the rest of the world... The most frightening thing about these people is the possible coming together of fanaticism and the technology capable of delivering mass destruction.”⁴

Mass Arrests

The mass arrests of individuals of Middle Eastern origin since September 11 2001 on trumped up charges is not motivated by security considerations. Their main function is to provide “credibility” to the fear and propaganda campaign. Each arrest, amply publicised by the corporate media, repeated day after day “gives a face” to this invisible enemy. It also serves to drown the fact that Al Qaeda is a creature of the CIA. “Enemy Number One” is not an enemy but an instrument.)

In other words, the Propaganda campaign performs two important functions.

First it must ensure that the enemy is considered a real threat.

Second, it must distort the truth, -i.e. it must conceal “the relationship” between this “fabricated enemy” and its creators within the military-intelligence apparatus.

In other words, the nature and history of Osama bin Laden’s Al Qaeda and the Islamic brigades since the Soviet-Afghan war must be suppressed because if it trickles down to the broader public, the legitimacy of the so-called “war on terrorism” collapses like a deck of cards. And in the process, the legitimacy of the main political and military actors is threatened.

The “9/11 Foreknowledge” Scandal

On 16 May 2002, the New York tabloids revealed that “President Bush had been warned of possible high jacking before the terror attacks” and had failed to act.⁵

The disinformation campaign was visibly stalling in the face of mounting evidence of CIA-Osama links. For the first time since 9/11, the mainstream press had hinted to the possibility of a cover-up at the highest echelons of the US State apparatus.

FBI Agent Coleen Rowley, who blew the whistle on the FBI, played a key role in unleashing the crisis. Her controversial Memo to FBI Director Robert Mueller pointed to the existence of “deliberate roadblocks” on the investigation of the September 11 attacks:

“Minutes after the 9/11 attacks the SSA [David Frasca, Director of the Radical Fundamentalist unit in the FBI] said ‘this was probably all just a coincidence’ and we were to do nothing until we got their permission, because we might screw up something else going on elsewhere in the country”⁶

In response to an impending political crisis, the fear and disinformation campaign went into overdrive. The news chain was all of a sudden inundated with reports and warnings of “future terrorist attacks”. A carefully worded statement (visibly intended to instill fear) by Vice President Dick Cheney contributed to setting the stage:

“I think that the prospects of a future attack on the U.S. are almost a certainty... It could happen tomorrow, it could happen next week, it could happen next year, but they will keep trying. And we have to be prepared.”⁷

What Cheney is really telling us is that our “intelligence asset”, which we created, is going to strike again. Now, if this “CIA creature” were planning new terrorist attacks, you would expect that the CIA would be first to know about it. In all likelihood, the CIA also controls the so-called ‘warnings’ emanating from CIA sources on “future terrorist attacks” in the US and around the World.

Propaganda’s Consistent Pattern

Upon careful examination of news reports on actual, “possible” or “future” terrorist attacks, the propaganda campaign exhibits a consistent pattern. Similar concepts appear simultaneously in hundreds of media reports:

- they refer to “*reliable sources*”, a *growing body of evidence* —e.g. government or intelligence or FBI.

- They invariably indicate that the terrorist groups involved *have “ties to bin Laden”* or Al Qaeda, or are “sympathetic to bin Laden”,
- The reports often points to the possibility of terrorist attacks, “sooner or later” or “*in the next two months*”.
- The reports often raise the issue of so-called “soft targets”, pointing to the likelihood of civilian casualties.
- They indicate that future terrorist attacks could take *place in a number of allied countries* (including Britain, France, Germany) in which public opinion is strongly opposed to the US-led war on terrorism.
- They confirm the need by the US and its allies to initiate “*pre-emptive*” actions directed against these various terrorist organizations and/or the *foreign governments which harbour the terrorists*.
- They often point to the likelihood that these terrorist groups possess *WMD including biological and chemical weapons (as well as nuclear weapons)*. The links to *Iraq and “rogue states”*(discussed in Part I) is also mentioned.
- The warnings also include warnings regarding “*attacks on US soil*”, *attacks against civilians in Western cities*.
- They point to efforts undertaken by the police authorities to apprehend the alleged terrorists.
- The arrested individuals are in virtually all cases Muslims and/or of Middle Eastern origin.
- The reports are also used to justify the Homeland Security legislation as well as the “ethnic profiling” and mass arrests of presumed terrorists.

This pattern of disinformation in the Western media applies the usual catch phrases and buzz words. (See press excerpts below. The relevant catch phrases are indicated in bold):

“Published reports, along with new information *obtained from U.S. intelligence and military sources*, point to a *growing body of evidence* that terrorists associated with and/or sympathetic to Osama bin Laden are planning a significant attack on U.S. soil.

Also *targeted are allied countries* that have joined the worldwide hunt for the radical Muslim cells hell-bent on unleashing new waves of terrorist strikes. ... The U.S. government’s activation of antiterrorist forces comes as the FBI issued a warning Nov. 14 that a “spectacular” new terrorist attack *may be forthcoming – sooner rather than later*. ...

Elsewhere, the Australian government issued an unprecedented warning to its citizens that al-Qaeda terrorists there might launch *attacks within the next two months*. 8

Although CIA Director George Tenet said in recent congressional testimony that “an attempt to conduct *another attack on U.S. soil is certain*,” a trio of former senior CIA officials doubted the chance of any “spectacular” terror *attacks on U.S. soil*.⁹

“Germans have been skittish since the terrorist attacks in the United States, *fearing that their country is a ripe target for terrorism*. Several of the hijackers in the Sept. 11 attacks plotted their moves in Hamburg.¹⁰

“On Dec. 18, a senior government official, speaking on condition of anonymity, briefed journalists about *the ‘high probability’ of a terrorist attack happening ‘sooner or later.’*...”

he named hotels and shopping centres as potential 'soft targets'... The official also specifically mentioned: a *possible chemical attack* in the London subway, the unleashing of smallpox, the poisoning of the water supply and strikes against "postcard targets" such as Big Ben and Canary Warf.

The "sooner or later" alert followed a Home Office warning at the end of November that said Islamic radicals might use *dirty bombs or poison gas* to inflict huge casualties on British cities. This also made big headlines but the warning was quickly retracted in fear that it would cause public panic. 11

The message yesterday was that these terrorists, however obscure, are trying - and, *sooner or later*, may break through London's defences. It is a city where tens of thousands of souls,... Experts have repeatedly said that the UK, with its bullish support for the US and its war on terror, is a genuine and realistic target for terror groups, including the al- Qaeda network led by 11 September mastermind Osama bin Laden.¹²

Quoting Margaret Thatcher: "Only America has the reach and *means to deal with Osama bin Laden or Saddam Hussein* or the other wicked psychopaths who will sooner or later step into their shoes."¹³

According to a recent US State Department alert: "Increased security at official US facilities *has led terrorists to seek softer targets such as residential areas, clubs, restaurants, places of worship, hotels, schools, outdoor recreation events, resorts, beaches and planes.*"¹⁴

Actual Terrorist Attacks

To be "effective" the fear and disinformation campaign cannot solely rely on unsubstantiated "warnings" of future attacks, it also requires "real" terrorist occurrences or "incidents", which provide credibility to the Administration's war plans. Propaganda endorses the need to implement "emergency measures" as well as implement retaliatory military actions.

The triggering of "war pretext incidents" is part of the Pentagon's assumptions. In fact it is an integral part of US military history.¹⁵ In fact in 1962, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had envisaged a secret plan entitled "Operation Northwoods, to deliberately trigger civilian casualties to justify the invasion of Cuba:

"We could blow up a U.S. ship in Guantanamo Bay and blame Cuba,"

"We could develop a Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area, in other Florida cities and even in Washington" "casualty lists in U.S. newspapers would cause a helpful wave of national indignation."

(See the declassified Top Secret 1962 document titled "Justification for U.S. Military Intervention in Cuba"¹⁶ (See Operation Northwoods at <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/NOR111A.html>).

There is no evidence that the Pentagon or the CIA played a direct role in recent terrorist attacks. The latter were undertaken by organisations (or cells of these organisations), which operate quite independently, with a certain degree of autonomy. This independence is in the very nature of a covert intelligence operation. The «intelligence asset» is not in direct

contact with its covert sponsors. It is not necessarily cognizant of the role it plays on behalf of its intelligence sponsors.

The fundamental question is who is behind them? Through what sources are they being financed? What is the underlying network of ties?

A recent (2002) classified outbrief drafted to guide the Pentagon «calls for the creation of a so-called « Proactive, Pre-emptive Operations Group » (P2OG), to launch secret operations aimed at “stimulating reactions” among terrorists and states possessing weapons of mass destruction — that is, for instance, prodding terrorist cells into action and exposing themselves to “quick-response” attacks by U.S. forces.» 17

The P2OG initiative is nothing new. It essentially extends an existing apparatus of covert operations. Amply documented, the CIA has supported terrorist groups since the Cold War era. This « prodding of terrorist cells » under covert intelligence operations often requires the infiltration and training of the radical groups linked to Al Qaeda.

Covert support by the US military and intelligence apparatus has been channelled to various Islamic terrorist organisations through a complex network of intermediaries and intelligence proxies. Moreover, numerous official statements, intelligence reports confirm *recent links* (in the post Cold War era) between US military-intelligence units and Al Qaeda operatives, as occurred in Bosnia (mid 1990s), Kosovo (1998-99) and Macedonia (2001).18

The Republican Party Committee of the US Congress in a 1997 report points to open collaboration between the US military and Al Qaeda operatives in the civil war in Bosnia.19 (See US Congress, 16 January 1997, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/DCH109A.html>)

Ties to Al Qaeda and Pakistan’s Military Intelligence (ISI)

It is indeed revealing that in virtually all post 9/11 terrorist occurrences, the terrorist organization is said to have “ties to Osama bin Laden’s Al Qaeda”. This in itself is a crucial piece of information. Of course, the fact that Al Qaeda is a creature of the CIA is neither mentioned in the press reports nor is considered relevant.

The ties of these terrorist organizations (particularly those in Asia) to Pakistan’s military intelligence (ISI) is acknowledged in a few cases by official sources and press dispatches. Confirmed by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), some of these groups are said to have links to Pakistan’s ISI, without identifying the nature of these links. Needless to say, this information is crucial in identifying the sponsors of these terrorist attacks. In other words, the ISI is said to support these terrorist organizations, while at same time maintaining close ties to the CIA.

The Bali Bomb Attack (October 2002)

The Bali attack in the Kuta seaside resort resulted in close to 200 deaths, mainly Australian tourists. The bomb attack was allegedly perpetrated by Jemaah Islamiah, a group, which operates in several countries in South East Asia. Press reports and official statements point to close ties between Jemaah Islamiah (JI) and Al Qaeda. The JI’s “operational leader” is Riduan Isamuddin, alias Hambali, a veteran of the Soviet-Afghan war, who was trained in Afghanistan and Pakistan. According to a report by UPI:

“The [Soviet-Afghan] war provided opportunities for key figures of these groups, who went to Afghanistan, to experience firsthand the glory of jihad. Many of the radicals detained in Singapore and Malaysia derived their ideological inspiration from the activities of the Mujahideen in Afghanistan and Pakistan” 20

What the report fails to mention is that the training of the Mujahideen in Afghanistan and Pakistan was a CIA sponsored initiative launched under President Jimmy Carter in 1979, using Pakistan’s ISI as a go-between.

Jl’s links to Indonesia’s Military Intelligence

There are indications, that in addition to its alleged links to Al Qaeda, Jemaah Islamiah also has links to Indonesia’s military intelligence, which in turn has links to the CIA and Australian intelligence.

The links between Jl and Indonesia’s Intelligence Agency (BIN) are acknowledged by the International Crisis Group (ICG):

“This link [of Jl to the BIN] needs to be explored more fully: it does not necessarily mean that military intelligence was working with Jl, but it does raise a question about the extent to which it knew or could have found out more about Jl than it has acknowledged.” 21

(International Crisis Group, <http://www.crisisweb.org/projects/showreport.cfm?reportid=845> , 2003)

The ICG, however, fails to mention that Indonesia’s intelligence apparatus has for more than 30 years been controlled by the CIA.

In the wake of the October 2002 Bali bombing, a contradictory report emanating from Indonesia’s top brass, pointed to the involvement of both the head of Indonesian intelligence General A. M. Hendropriyono as well as the CIA:

“The agency and its director, Gen. A. M. Hendropriyono, are well regarded by the United States and other governments. But there are still senior intelligence officers here who believe that the C.I.A. was behind the bombing.”22

In response to these statements, the Bush Administration demanded that President Megawati Sukarnoputri, publicly refute the involvement of the U.S in the attacks. No official retraction was issued. Not only did President. Megawati remained silent on this matter, she also accused the US of being:

“a superpower that forced the rest of the world to go along with it... We see how ambition to conquer other nations has led to a situation where there is no more peace unless the whole world is complying with the will of the one with the power and strength.” 23

Meanwhile, the Bush Administration, had used the Bali attacks to prop up its fear campaign:

“President Bush said Monday that he assumes al-Qaeda was responsible for

the deadly bombing in Indonesia and that he is worried about fresh attacks on the United States.” 24

The news [regarding the Bali attack] came as US intelligence officials warned that more attacks like the Indonesian bombing can be expected in the next few months, in Europe, the Far East or the US.”25

Cover-up

The links of JI to the Indonesian intelligence agency were never raised in the official Indonesian government investigation –which was guided behind the scenes by Australian intelligence and the CIA.

Moreover, shortly after the bombing, Australian Prime Minister John Howard “admitted that Australian authorities were warned about possible attacks in Bali but chose not to issue a warning.”26 Also In the wake of the bombings, the Australian government chose to work with Indonesia’s Special Forces the Kopassus, in the so-called “war on terrorism”.

Australia: “Useful Wave of Indignation”

Reminiscent of Operation Northwoods, the Bali attack served to trigger “a useful wave of indignation.”27 They contributed to swaying Australian public opinion in favour of the US invasion of Iraq, while weakening the anti-war protest movement. In the wake of the Bali attack, the Australian government “officially” joined the US-led “war on terrorism.” It has not only used the Bali bombings as a pretext to fully integrate the US-UK military axis, it has also adopted drastic police measures including “ethnic profiling” directed against its own citizens:

Prime Minister John Howard made the extraordinary declaration recently that he is prepared to make *pre-emptive military strikes* against terrorists in neighbouring Asian countries planning to attack Australia. Australian intelligence agencies also are very worried about *the likelihood of an al-Qaeda attack using nuclear weapons*.28

The Attacks on the Indian Parliament (December 2001)

The December 2001 terrorist attacks on the Indian Parliament –which contributed to pushing India and Pakistan to the brink of war– were allegedly conducted by two Pakistan-based rebel groups, Lashkar-e-Taiba (“Army of the Pure”) and Jaish-e-Muhammad (“Army of Mohammed”). The press reports acknowledged the ties of both groups to Al Qaeda, without however mentioning that they were directly supported by Pakistan’s ISI. The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) confirms in this regard that:

“through its Interservices Intelligence agency (ISI), Pakistan has provided funding, arms, training facilities, and aid in crossing borders to Lashkar and Jaish...Many were given ideological training in the same madrasas, or Muslim seminaries, that taught the Taliban and foreign fighters in Afghanistan. They received military training at camps in Afghanistan or in villages in Pakistan-controlled Kashmir. Extremist groups [supported by the ISI] have recently opened several new madrasas in Azad Kashmir.”29

(Council on Foreign Relations at <http://www.terrorismsanswers.com/groups/harakat2.html> , Washington 2002)

What the CFR fails to mention is the crucial relationship between the ISI and the CIA and the fact that the ISI continues to support Lashkar, Jaish and the militant Jammu and Kashmir Hizbul Mujahideen (JKHM), while also collaborating with the CIA. Ironically, confirmed by the writings of Zbigniew Brzezinski (who happens to be a member of the CFR), the training of these “foreign fighters” was an initiative of US foreign policy, launched during the Carter Administration in 1979 at the outset of the Soviet-Afghan war. Coinciding with the 1989 Geneva Peace Agreement and the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, the ISI was instrumental in the creation of the militant Jammu and Kashmir Hizbul Mujahideen (JKHM).³⁰ The timely attack on the Indian Parliament, followed by the ethnic riots in Gujarat in early 2002, were the culmination of a process initiated in the 1980s, financed by drug money and abetted by Pakistan’s military intelligence.

Dismantling the Propaganda Campaign, Building an Anti-War Consensus

We are at the juncture of the most serious crisis in modern history, requiring an unprecedented degree of solidarity, courage and commitment. America’s war, which includes the “first strike” use of nuclear weapons, threatens the future of humanity.

Much of the justification for waging this war without borders rests on the legitimacy of the Bush administration’s anti-terrorist programme. The latter forms part of the propaganda campaign, which in turn is used to sway the US population into an unconditional acceptance of the war agenda.

In the US, and around the world, the anti-war movement has gained in impetus. While millions of people have joined hands in opposing the war, the Bush Administration’s fear and disinformation campaign, relayed by the corporate media, has served to uphold the shaky legitimacy of the Bush administration.

At this critical crossroads, the anti-war/pro-democracy movement must necessarily move to a higher plane, which addresses the main functions of the Administration’s propaganda machine. The main purpose of propaganda is to sustain the legitimacy of the rulers and ensure that the rulers remain in power.

Undermining the Bush Administration’s « Right to Rule»

In other words, the mobilization of antiwar sentiment in itself will not reverse the tide of war.

What is needed is to consistently challenge the legitimacy of the main political and military actors, reveal the true face of the American Empire and the underlying criminalisation of foreign policy. Ultimately what is required is to question and eventually undermine the Bush Administration’s «right to rule».

Revealing the lies behind the Bush Administration is the basis for destroying the legitimacy of the main political and military actors.

Even if a majority of the population is against the war, this in itself will not prevent the war from occurring. The propaganda campaign’s objective is to sustain the lies which support the legitimacy of the main political and military actors, including Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Ashcroft, Tenet, Armitage, Rice, et al. As long as the Bush Cabinet is considered a «legitimate government» in the eyes of the people and World public opinion, it will carry out the Iraqi invasion plan, whether it has public support or not.

In other words, this legitimacy must be challenged. Similarly in Britain, where a majority of the population is against the US-led war, actions must be launched which ultimately result in the downfall of the Blair Cabinet and the withdrawal of Britain from the US-led military coalition.

A necessary condition for bringing down the rulers is to weaken and eventually dismantle their propaganda campaign. How best to achieve this objective? By fully uncovering the lies behind the « war on terrorism» and revealing the complicity of the Bush administration in the events of 9/11.

This is a big hoax, it's the biggest lie in US history. The war pretext does not stick and the rulers should be removed.

Moreover, it is important to show that « Enemy Number One » is fabricated. The terrorist attacks are indeed real, but who is behind them? The covert operations in support of terrorist organisations, including the history of Al Qaeda's links to the CIA since the Soviet Afghan war, must be fully revealed because they relate directly to the wave of terrorist attacks which have occurred since September 11, all of which are said to have links to Al Qaeda.

To reverse the tide, the spreading of information at all levels, which counteracts the propaganda campaign is required.

The truth undermines and overshadows the lie.

And the truth is that the Bush administration is in fact supporting international terrorism as a pretext to wage war on Iraq.

Once this truth becomes fully understood, the legitimacy of the rulers will collapse like a deck of cards. This is what has to be achieved. But we can only achieve it, by effectively counteracting the official propaganda campaign.

The momentum and success of the large anti-war rallies in the US, the European Union and around the world, should lay the foundations of a permanent network composed of tens of thousands of local level anti-war committees in neighbourhoods, work places, parishes, schools, universities, etc. It is ultimately through this network that the legitimacy of those who "rule in our name will be challenged.

To shunt the Bush Administration's war plans and disable its propaganda machine, we must, in the months ahead reach out to our fellow citizens across the land, in the US, Canada and around the world, to the millions of ordinary people who have been misled on the causes and consequences of this war, not to mention the implications of the Bush Administration's Homeland Security legislation, which essentially sets in place the building blocks of a police state.

This initiative requires the spreading of information in an extensive grassroots network, with a view to weakening and ultimately disabling the Bush Administration's propaganda machine.

When the lies - including those concerning September 11 - are fully revealed and understood by everybody, the legitimacy of the Bush Administration will be broken - Big Brother will have no leg to stand on, that is, no more wars to feed on. While this will not

necessarily result in a fundamental and significant “regime change” in the US, a new “anti-war consensus” will have emerged, which will eventually pave the way for a broader struggle against the New World Order and the American Empire’s quest for global domination.

NOTES

1. *Washington Post*, 25 January 2003.

2. Ibid

3 *Chicago Sun*, 31 December 2002.

4 Reuters, 21 February 2003

5. See Ian Woods, Conspiracy of Silence, McKinney Vindicated, *Global Outlook*, No. 2, 2002.

6. Coleen Rowley, Memo To FBI Director Robert Mueller, quoted in *Global Outlook*, No. 3, 2003, p. 28.

7. *The Boston Globe*, 5 June 2002.

8. *Insight on the News*, 3 February 2003.

9. UPI, 19 December 2002.

10. *New York Times*, 6 January 2003.

11. *Toronto Star*, 5 January 2003.

12. *The Scotsman*, 8 January 2003.

13. UPI, 10 December 2002.

14. AFP, 3 January 2003.

15. See Richard Sanders, War Pretext Incidents, How to Start a War, *Global Outlook*, published in two parts, Issues 2 and 3, 2002-2003.

16. Operation Northwoods, declassified top secret document sent by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to Secretary of Defence Robert McNamara on March 13, 1962, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/NOR111A.html> .

17. William Arkin, The Secret War, *The Los Angeles Times*, 27 October 2002.

18. See Michel Chossudovsky, *War and Globalisation, The Truth behind September 11*, *Global Outlook*, 2003, Chapter 3, <http://globalresearch.ca/globaloutlook/truth911.html>

19. See Clinton-Approved Iranian Arms Transfers Help Turn Bosnia into Militant Islamic Base, Congressional Press Release, US Congress, 16 January 1997, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/DCH109A.html>

20. UPI, 6 January 2002.

21. International Crisis Group, *Indonesia Backgrounder: How The Jemaah Islamiyah Terrorist Network Operates*, <http://www.crisisweb.org/projects/showreport.cfm?reportid=845> , 2003
 22. Raymond Bonner and Jane Perlez, More Attacks on Westerners Are Expected in Indonesia, *New York Times*, 25 November 2002
 23. Quoted in Raymond Bonner and Jane Perlez, *op cit*.
 24. *USA Today*, 15 October 2002.
 25. *Business AM*, 15 October 2002.
 26. *Christchurch Press*, 22 November 2002), (Similar warnings were made by the CIA).
 27. Operation Northwoods, *op cit*.
 28. *Insight on the News*, 3 February 2003.
 29. Council on Foreign Relations at:
<http://www.terrorismanswers.com/groups/harakat2.html>, Washington 2002.
 30. See K. Subrahmanyam, Pakistan is Pursuing Asian Goals, *India Abroad*, 3 November 1995.
-

ANNEX

Supporting evidence that successive US administrations have supported Al Qaeda is summarized below (references are provided to a selected bibliography):

- The “Islamic Brigades” are a creation of US foreign policy. In the post-Cold War era, the CIA continues to support and use Osama bin Laden’s Al Qaeda in its covert operations. In standard CIA jargon, Al Qaeda is categorized as an “intelligence asset”.
- The U.S. Congress has documented in detail, the links of Al Qaeda to agencies of the U.S. government during the civil war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, as well as in Kosovo and Macedonia.
- The evidence confirms that Al Qaeda is supported by Pakistan’s military intelligence, the Inter-services Intelligence (ISI). Amply documented, the ISI, allegedly played an undercover role in financing the 9/11 attacks. The ISI has a close working relationship with the CIA.
- Pakistan’s ISI has consistently supported various Islamic terrorist organizations, while also collaborating with the CIA.
- These various terrorist groups supported by Pakistan’s ISI operate with some degree of autonomy in relation to their covert sponsors, but ultimately they act in the way which serves US interests.
- The CIA keeps track of its “intelligence assets”. Amply documented, Osama bin Laden’s whereabouts are known. Al Qaeda is infiltrated by the CIA. In other words, there were no “intelligence failures”! The 9-11 terrorists did not act on their own volition. The suicide hijackers were instruments in a carefully planned intelligence operation.

Centre for Research on Globalization, Foreknowledge of 9/11 A Compilation of CRG articles and documents in support of a 9-11 Investigation, <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CRG204A.html>

The original source of this article is [Global Research](#)
Copyright © [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#), [Global Research](#), 2015

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)

About the author:

Michel Chossudovsky is an award-winning author, Professor of Economics (emeritus) at the University of Ottawa, Founder and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), Montreal, Editor of Global Research. He has taught as visiting professor in Western Europe, Southeast Asia, the Pacific and Latin America. He has served as economic adviser to governments of developing countries and has acted as a consultant for several international organizations. He is the author of 13 books. He is a contributor to the Encyclopaedia Britannica. His writings have been published in more than twenty languages. In 2014, he was awarded the Gold Medal for Merit of the Republic of Serbia for his writings on NATO's war of aggression against Yugoslavia. He can be reached at crgeditor@yahoo.com

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca