

Remember The London July 2005 Bombings? London Plot thickens, as does Propaganda

By [Larry Chin](#)

Global Research, July 18, 2005

[Online Journal](#) 18 July 2005

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Terrorism](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [London 7/7](#)

As was the case following 9/11 and all post-9/11 “terror” events, an official new propaganda legend is being constructed to justify whatever Anglo-American-Israeli aggression that is sure to follow.

Meanwhile, the list of unanswered questions, irregularities, and inconsistencies continues to grow, along with dramatically zigzagging cover stories and anti-Muslim agitation. Another large-scale government and media deception is well underway.

Two recent observations by the astute (but anonymous) *Xymphora* at [“Birth of the London Bomb Official Story” \(July 13\)](#) and [“Yet more on the London Bombings” \(July 15\)](#) provide analysis on the mounting anomalies. William Bowles and Edward Teague ask, [“Were the London Bombings a set up?”](#) [“The 7/7 London Papers”](#) is another site that provides a timeline exposing problems with the official version. Independent researchers like these, not the mainstream media, are the only ones undertaking this important investigation.

It is already known that the UK authorities received [advance warning](#) of a terrorist attack—from Israel. So did [Benjamin Netanyahu](#). Stratfor confirms evidence of foreknowledge in this report: [“Israel warned UK about possible attacks” \(July 7\)](#). The analysis of [Bowles/Teague](#) casts doubt on many aspects of the emerging legend of the [four bombers](#)—today’s version of 9/11’s “19 hijackers.”

London is already playing out in a way all too similar to the byzantine 9/11 terror propaganda construct described by [Chaim Kupferberg](#). As Bowles and Teague wrote, “without the four men to tell their side of the story, it’s all too easy to make the facts fit the theory as it serves the larger ideological objective of the state to present them as ‘fanatics.’”

Other parallels with 9/11 (and Bali, Madrid, etc.) are too obvious to ignore. Researcher and activist Jeff Strahl notes:

“The media obediently follow the cues provided by the US and British governments, and read the handed-down script regarding the London bombings, even as crucial details are being changed daily; not even a pause in the face of mounting inconsistencies. And this includes the “progressive” media, be it *The Nation* or Pacifica Radio, eager to prove they are, of course, not supportive of ‘terrorists.’ Read or listen all you want, you will find virtually no reference to many questions being raised about the official accounts. This is quite similar to how the 9/11 events have been treated. If people don’t seriously press the media, the latest propaganda will become ‘fact,’ as has happened with 9/11,

whose crucial details remain unexamined, whose official story remains accepted across the political spectrum.

“Why and how did former Israeli prime minister [Benjamin Netanyahu](#) get a warning to stay away from a place where he was to speak, located above one of the blast sites?

How does ‘suicide bombers’ square with earlier police claims of timing devices?

Why did the ‘suspects’ leave a car full of explosives in a parking lot in Luton, 30 miles from London? (Did they expect someone to find the car and put the explosives to good use?)

What about the anti-terrorism exercises scheduled for the same hour in which the bombings took place? How did former head of the Mossad, Efraim Halevi, [writing in the Jerusalem Post](#) on July 7, the day of the attacks, know that the bombs went off simultaneously, (when the London police did not say so for days)? And how could he claim they were ‘nearly perfect’? Why did the ‘suspects’ take credit cards along on a suicide mission?

“Authorities now say the explosives used were not military grade after all, but home brews. Seems like they had a tough time explaining how the supposed culprits could get military grade stuff. The *Boston Herald* reported yesterday that one of the supposed culprits carried not only his own ID, but also documents of one of the others. How did such documents survive the blasts, which should have torn their bodies into small pieces? This is the same as the magic 9/11 passport that appeared in the rubble.

“The supposed mastermind has been arrested in Egypt today, but he denies any connection. Not content with a car full of explosives, he left behind a house full of explosives, for someone to find and put to good use. Shades of 9/11 again, i.e., the car left at an airport parking lot with a Koran and a flight manual for a 767 in Arabic.”

The London event also fits the post-9/11 pattern in other ways. There continues to be no mention of the fact that

- 1) “Islamic terror,” including Al-Qaeda, is a creation of Anglo-American military intelligence;
- 2) these groups remain key instruments of Anglo-American policy—directly and indirectly guided, and controlled, by CIA, MI6 and affiliated intelligence agencies, such as Pakistan’s ISI.

According to new reports, some of London’s [four bombers](#) were trained in Pakistan—but there has been nothing in the media reports about the nature of this training. Pakistan, and its ISI, remains one of biggest elephants in a stinking post-9/11 living room.

As Bush and Blair bluster for the cameras, as the *only beneficiaries* of the horror, backlash against Muslims has reignited. *Time Magazine*’s coverage (July 18) was typical. Across a number of articles on London, *Time* immediately attributed responsibility to “jihadists,” “jihadism,” “bin Ladenism,” “lumpen jihadists” and Al-Qaeda “terrorists,” quoting conspiracy theories from officials and “security experts” desperate to tie the bombings to “Al-Qaeda fanatics.” All before any factual evidence was available to support these conclusions.

Somewhat more revealing, but not in the way intended, is where Michael Elliot's *Time* headline article offered this:

"According to a confidential report produced the day after the bombing by a private London security firm, Aegis Defense Services, Ltd., which was seen and read by Pentagon officials, the team was probably four to six strong . . . The Aegis report says it is possible that the explosives were 'constructed by an experienced bomb maker, possibly coming to the U.K. for that very purpose.'"

[Aegis](#) and its chief Tim Spicer are intimately involved with [the Pentagon's Iraq operations](#). Spicer is also implicated for murders in Northern Ireland in the 1990s. Aegis is also tied to the sponsoring of an aborted [coup](#) in the West African nation of Equatorial Guinea, which resulted in the arrest of Sir Mark Thatcher, son of former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

How did Aegis conclude that the foreign origin for the bomb maker, when no such evidence was available? What role does this British security firm serve in helping drive Washington-London "war on terrorism" planning, and what was this confidential report "seen and read by Pentagon officials"?

Britain and "Terrorism"

British terrorism goes back to the days of the old British Empire, and since the 1970s, includes the creation and running of "Islamic terror" groups all over the world, right alongside US and US-backed intelligence counterparts playing the same game. These connections persist to this day.

It is a matter of documented fact, exposed by [Michel Chossudovsky](#) (*War and Globalisation*) and others, that mujahadeen mercenaries and "Islamic jihad" from the Middle East and Central Asia were recruited and trained by Britain's MI6 and British SAS Special Forces, to fight in the ranks of the KLA, supporting NATO's war effort.

In *Crossing The Rubicon*, Mike Ruppert noted:

"Great Britain—one of the major players supporting the KLA in Kosovo—also maintained secret relationships with bin Laden and al Qaeda that served its interests. In 1996, Britain's exterior intelligence, MI6, actually funded and worked with al Qaeda in a plot to assassinate and overthrow Libya's Muammar Qaddafi. Details of the relationship emerged after a British domestic intelligence (MI5) officer, David Shayler, went public with documents detailing the relationship between Britain and bin Laden.

"In November 2002—in the wake of 9/11—as Shayler's trial brought the case to public attention, the British government invoked measures of the State Security Act to hide embarrassing information. The government's efforts went so far as to the issuance of a "D" notice by Prime Minister Tony Blair requiring that previously published news stories on the case be withdrawn and removed from public websites . . .

"Britain's dealings with Osama bin Laden have extended to allowing him to visit their country while he was a wanted man. As noted in 1998, 'the French Internet publication *Indigo* reported that bin Laden had been a London guest of British Intelligence as recently as 1996, and his treasurer recently defected to the Saudis as different factions shifted alliances for new campaigns in the Middle East.'"

The Real Enemy

Nothing has changed since 9/11. As long as Bush-Blair-Sharon dictate the course of events, nothing will.

Where no connection to “Al-Qaeda” or “Islamic fanaticism” actually exists, in a way that justifies endless “war on terrorism,” it will be created. Factual truth in this post-9/11 milieu is, to borrow the corrupt Alberto Gonzales’ words, a “quaint notion,” in a time of open government criminality and rampant deception.

There is debate about the possibility that London had elements of “real” terrorism, “blowback” or “payback” (see [“The Global Battlefield: We Are Standing On It”](#)), or perhaps that it was some combination of “made to happen” and “allowed to happen.”

Five continuous years of a “war on terrorism” past the point of no return, have left the line between fabricated (intelligence agency-orchestrated) terrorism and “real” terrorism (a response to the provocations and policies) irrevocably blurred. In any case, this discussion is academic.

The “root cause” of modern terrorism is the criminal geostrategy of Washington, London and Tel Aviv. The New World Order welcomes chaos and disorder—regardless of the particulars of any particular event. That fact is all that matters, as this war continues to devastate humankind.

The original source of this article is [Online Journal](#)
Copyright © [Larry Chin](#), [Online Journal](#), 2005

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Larry Chin](#)

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