
I wonder how the foreign policies of the United States would look if we wiped out the national boundaries of the world, at least in our minds, and thought of all children everywhere as our own.” Howard Zinn

“Of all the enemies to public liberty, war is, perhaps, the most to be dreaded, because it comprises and develops the germ of every other. War is the parent of armies; from these proceed debts and taxes. . . .” James Madison, “Political Observations,” April 20, 1795.

Number of private U.S. citizens killed in terrorist attacks in 2010: 15. Number killed by falling televisions: 16.” (“Harper’s Index,” August 2012, p. 9). Our warrior leaders and their war-monger supporters have produced two wars (or is that four?) to defend “America” and “freedom”
at the price of trillions of dollars and tens of thousands of innocent people.

INSTEAD OF A WAR ON TERRORISM LET’S DECLARE WAR ON IGNORANCE, WAR ON HATRED, WAR ON KILLING

Petition for Peace:

I just signed the petition "The US President and US Congress: End wars and the attack on our civil liberties here in the US" on Change.org.

It's important. Will you sign it too? Here's the link:


Thanks! Dick
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Sirota, “Terrorism” Is Retaliation for US Terrorism
WHY DO SO MANY PEOPLE AROUND THE WORLD HATE US AND BLOW UP OUR SOLDIERS AND BUILDINGS? US ARROGANCE AND VIOLENCE.

A Cronkite Moment for the Blowback Era by David Sirota. The Progressive Populist (June 1, 2013).

"The stuff we have done overseas is now brought back into our own front yards. America's chickens are coming home to roost." — Reverend Jeremiah Wright

In 2008, the hysterical backlash to the above comment by Barack Obama's minister became a high-profile example of one of the most insidious rules in American politics: You are not allowed to honestly discuss the Central Intelligence Agency's concept of "blowback" without putting yourself at risk of being deemed a traitor to country.

Now, five years later, with America having killed thousands of Muslim civilians in its drone strikes and wars, that rule is thankfully being challenged — and not by someone who is so easily smeared. Instead, the apostate is one of this epoch's most revered journalists — and because of that, we will see whether
this country is mature enough to face one of its biggest national security quandaries.

This is the news from Tom Brokaw's appearance on "Meet the Press" last Sunday. Discussing revelations that the bombing suspects may be connected to Muslim fundamentalism, he said:

"We have got to look at the roots of all of this because it exists across the whole (Asian) subcontinent and the Islamic world around the world. I think we also have to examine (America's) use of drones (because) there are a lot of civilians who are innocently killed in a drone attack in Pakistan, in Afghanistan and in Iraq. And I can tell you having spent a lot of time over there, young people will come up to me on the streets and say, 'We love America, but if you harm one hair on the head of my sister, I will fight you forever.' And there is this enormous rage against what they see in that part of the world as a presumptuousness of the United States."

As one of the establishment's most venerated voices, Brokaw is not prone to radical statements. But in a nation that often avoids acknowledging its own role in intensifying cycles of violence, it is unfortunately considered radical to do what the NBC News veteran did and mention that our violent attacks abroad increase the chance of retributive attacks at home.

Of course, Brokaw was merely stating the obvious: With America having killed thousands of civilians in its wars, we should be appalled by acts of terrorism — but we shouldn't be surprised by them. We should know that violence will inevitably come from those like the Boston bombing suspect who, according to the Washington Post, "told interrogators that the American wars in Iraq and Afghanistan motivated him and his brother to carry out the attack."

Noting this is not to argue that such attacks are justified or that we deserve them. It is only to reiterate what Brokaw alluded to: Namely, that blowback should be expected in this age of Permanent War and that one way to potentially avert such blowback in the future is to try to de-escalate the cycle of violence.

To be sure, from Reverend Wright to Republican presidential candidate Ron Paul, many have made these points before. But they have typically been ignored or lambasted for uttering the truth. Brokaw, though, can't be so readily dismissed. He is a Walter Cronkite of his age, and, indeed, his declaration recalls Cronkite's seminal moment 45 years ago.

Back in 1968, opponents of the Vietnam War were being marginalized in much the same way critics of today's wars now are. But when such a revered voice as Cronkite took to television to declare the conflict an unwinnable "stalemate," he helped create a tipping point whereby Americans began to reconsider their assumptions.

In similarly making such an assumption-challenging statement, Brokaw has followed in Cronkite's heroic footsteps. The only question is: Will America finally listen?

David Sirota is the best-selling author of the books "Hostile Takeover," "The Uprising" and "Back to Our Future." Email him at ds@davidsirota.com, follow him on Twitter @davidsirota or visit his website at www.davidsirota.com.
AFTER 9/11 unprecedented new levels and kinds of information control, surveillance, imprisonment, torture, and killing.

After 9/11, 2001, for counter-terrorism the CIA built an unprecedented international prison system entirely in secret. Leader: CIA’s Copher Black??

Pentagon’s Rumsfeld, competing for the power, created another unprecedented secret counter-terrorism organization, JSOC, inside the Pentagon without Presidential approval, to systematically “target” (murder) Al Qaeda and Taliban leaders, with less oversight than over the CIA.

2003 Invasion of Iraq. CIA had no evidence of Saddam/Al Q. linkage, so Rumsfeld claimed to have the evidence and created another secret Pentagon organization to back up the claim, the Office of Special Planning. The OSP began? the quickly universal official reference to WMD.

Bush claimed 9/11 an “attack on freedom and our way of life.” In addition to the CIA and the Pentagon he assigned the NSA to also provide counter-terrorism, the Terrorist Surveillance Program, for sweeping unconstitutional evesdropping, 1.7 billion unwarranted message intercepts by today.

One result of these new counterterrorism roles and the need for additional employees was the rush through Congress of secret, uncounted, unaccountable money. The money spent is still secret. Another result was the employ of hundreds of private companies, an enormous expansion of the military-corporate complex. Another was the secret construction of hundreds of new buildings throughout the Washington, DC, area. And don’t forget Homeland Security, which built a headquarters that rivals the Pentagon.

How do we know all of this? Two Washington Post reporters, Dana Priest and William Arkin dug up the information by among other methods locating all of the private contractors. Their series in the WP became a book and then a documentary in 2011 shown by PBS’s “Frontline,” and apparently shown again April 30, 2013. Priest and Arkin must rank among the highest of US investigative journalist heroes ever, and PBS deserves the highest award for the immensely public service program, which PBS was intended to do in 1966.

And Obama: In his first campaign 2008 he promised transparency, but almost immediately after inauguration he succumbed to the realities of the US Corporate-Pentagon-Congressional-Mainstream Media-Security Complex. (Bob Woodward makes it all painfully clear in Obama’s Wars.) He soon reauthorized Bush’s “Greystone” security system, keeping about everything of Bush’s “War on Terrorism.” Then, without examining the need of each new contractor, each new building, each new project—without examining Top Secret America and the War on Terrorism—he expanded it, for example ratcheting up JSOC raids, financing the continuing expansion of Homeland Security, and supporting the transformation of local police via “fusion centers” into extensions of the FBI (which was expanding too). For Bush had ordered all of his subordinates never to allow another 9/11, and, like Bush, Obama was afraid, if another attack came, he would be blamed, so we must attack, bomb, imprison, torture, murder..

Finally, yes bin Laden was captured, not by Top Secret America, but by basic police investigation, though his murder and disposal of his body in the ocean were state murder not lawful police methods.
And the billions spent for Top Secret America (and the billions not accounted for), what have they accomplished? Instead of the “freedom” drumbeat our leaders wrap themselves in (and they hope us and the “troops”) to delude our troops and send them to kill innocents around the world, our nation and the entire world is under Top Secret surveillance the Gestapo and NKVD would have envied.

THE WP SERIES
1. Top Secret America | washingtonpost.com
   projects.washingtonpost.com/top-secret-america

THE DOCUMENTARY
Dana Priest: Top Secret America Is “Here to Stay” | Top Secret ... - PBS
www.pbs.org › FRONTLINE › Iraq / War on Terror › Top Secret America
Sep 6, 2011 – A two-time Pulitzer Prize-winning investigative reporter for The Washington Post Priest is the author, along with William Arkin, of Top Secret ...

JOIN OMNI AND BE A PART OF THE PEACE AND JUSTICE MOVEMENT.

TWO BOSTON MURDERERS: Essays by Greenwald, Scheer, and Ackerman

Reader Supported News | 23 April 13 PM
It's Live on the HomePage Now:
Reader Supported News

Glenn Greenwald | Why Is Boston 'Terrorism' but Not Sandy Hook?
Glenn Greenwald, Guardian UK
Greenwald writes: "The overarching principle here should be that Dzhokhar Tsarnaev is entitled to a presumption of innocence until he is actually proven guilty. As so many cases have proven ... people who appear to be guilty based on government accusations and trials-by-media are often completely innocent.
Media-presented evidence is no substitute for due process and an adversarial trial."

**Reader Supported News | 25 April 13 PM**

It's Live on the HomePage Now:

[Reader Supported News](#)

---

**Glenn Greenwald | The Recurring Motive for Anti-US 'Terrorism'**

Glenn Greenwald, Guardian UK

Greenwald writes: "In the last several years, there have been four other serious attempted or successful attacks on US soil by Muslims, and in every case, they emphatically all say the same thing."

---

**GREENWALD VIA MOYERS  4-28**

**TWO BOSTON BOMBERS AND GLOBAL ENEMIES**


The overreaction of some politicians and much of mainstream media ("enemy combatants") moves Greenwald and Moyers to discuss why so many people around the world dislike US imperial behavior so intensely they are willing to risk their life in attacking the US. Greenwald cites the hundreds of thousands of injured and killed victims of US aggression as “America’s invisible victims.” A consequence of the retaliations is US self-wounding by becoming a closed society—destroying democratic
society (for example, increasing repressive laws, Patriot Act, reducing privacy, increasing government secrecy, persecuting whistleblowers under the Espionage Act). Kissinger said: The legal we can do immediately. The unconstitutional takes a little longer. Lies continue under Obama, who lied that drones targeted only top level Al Qaeda leaders, when mainly low level functionaries and civilians were killed. The media goes along: Tom Brokaw said we must accustom ourselves to deep government intrusion and authority. [From Dick’s notes. For the program go to: billmoyers.com/video/].

Robert Scheer | 277 Million Boston Bombings
Robert Scheer, Truthdig
Scheer writes: "Obama was right to blast the use of weapons that targeted civilians in Boston as inherent acts of terrorism, but by what standard do such weapons change their nature when they are deployed by governments against civilians?"
READ MORE

Here’s Why Tsarnaev Was Charged With Using a 'Weapon of Mass Destruction'
Spencer Ackerman, Wired
Ackerman writes: "Tsarnaev is innocent until proven guilty in a court of law. There appears to be no similar redress scheduled for the way in which the law contorts a common-sense meaning of an already vague term about some of the world’s deadliest weapons."
READ MORE

Prisoners Of The War On Terror
By Judy Bello  http://www.countercurrents.org/

Hundreds of prisoners of the US War of Terror languish in prisons around the world, in Guantanamo and on the US mainland. Some have been there as long as 12 years some have
sentences that extend beyond the span of their life. Many have never been charged with a crime and more than half the prisoners who remain in Guantanamo have had their original charges dropped or have served their full sentence, but are barred by US law from being repatriated to their homeland, therefore can not be released.
Jose Padilla short-shackled and wearing blackened goggles and earmuffs to block out all light and sound on his way to the dentist. Fifteen-year-old Omar Khadr crying out to an American soldier, "Kill me!" Hunger strikers at Guantánamo being restrained and force-fed through tubes up their nostrils. John Walker Lindh lying naked and blindfolded in a metal container, bound by his hands and feet, in the freezing Afghan winter night. This is the story of the Bush administration's response to the attacks of September 11, 2001—and of how we have been led down a path of executive abuses, human tragedies, abandonment of the Constitution, and the erosion of due process and liberty. In this vitally important book, Peter Jan Honigsberg chronicles the black hole of the American judicial system from 2001 to the present, providing an incisive analysis of exactly what we have lost over the past seven years and where we are now headed.

The Secret Trial 5 is a crowdfunded documentary in-progress that examines the human impact of Canada's “war on terror”; specifically the use of security certificates, a tool that allows for indefinite detention, with no charges, and secret evidence. Over the last decade, 5 men have been held under security certificates in Canada. They spent between 2 and 7 years in prison each. None of them have been charged with a crime. These men are The Secret Trial 5, and YOU can help us tell their story.

Recent blog posts:

**Our Doc Ignite Campaign Wraps - THANK YOU!**

Posted on Wednesday, February 20, 2013.

Well everyone,

After 36 days, and 148 contributions, I guess all that's left is to say thank you. Thank you for proving to a couple of young filmmakers that the last 3 years have been
worthwhile. Thanks for showing us, and the security certificate families that we are all ready to talk about these issues, and right these wrongs.

We raised just over $18k during this campaign, which may not be a lot in the life of the average documentary, but means everything in the life of THIS documentary. We wish to sincerely thank Hot Docs for this chance, and in particular, Elizabeth Radshaw, Stephanie McArthur, Chloe Sosa-Sims, and Patrycja Cieniewicz for their truly personal support, hard-work, and encouragement during the last few months.

We want to take this last opportunity to talk briefly about crowdfunding, and why it so important for emerging filmmakers. What we did this last month cannot be quantified. The money can, but the value of Doc Ignite vastly exceeds the money raised. We have no real idea how many people just learned about our project, and are now waiting to see the film. Sure, our FB and twitter accounts exploded, and we know we are reaching tens of thousands every week, but what exactly does that mean? The answer, is the aforementioned EVERYTHING. It means everything.

In a time when audiences are more fragmented than ever, and old models of funding and even distribution make less and less sense, crowdfunding just fits. It's a lot of work, but then filmmaking has always been so, and the results when it works are incredible. Right now, there are thousands of people waiting to see ST5. A film with little to no money, about a contentious issue, has a small but devoted audience behind it before it even enters post-production. This is an enviable position to be in for any film. . . .

Thank you all once again, we promise to make a good film. An honest film. Where we go from there (re: security certificates) will be up to Canadians.

Sincerely, Amar and Noah

Share: □□□□

The Secret Trial 5 on the Tarek Fatah Show

Posted on Tuesday, February 12, 2013.
We stopped by Newstalk 1010 yesterday to speak to host Tarek Fatah about our film. Tarek is known to be controversial. This is a great example of why we are making this film, blanket statements were being thrown around left, right and center. Warning, it gets pretty heated! **Take a listen!**

The Secret Trial 5 on Global's The Morning Show

Posted by [Noah Bingham](#) on Thursday, February 07, 2013.

We are hitting the mainstream! Here is a clip of producer/director Amar Wala on Global TV's The Morning Show discussing The Secret Trial 5 and our Hot Doc's Doc Ignite campaign.

We have until Feb 19 to continue to raise funds. The more we raise the MORE we can do to spread the word and raise awareness about these important stories! Please encourage others to become a part of this project.

A Few Words From Hassan Almrei

Posted by [Amar Wala](#) on Friday, January 25, 2013.
We’d like to introduce Hassan Almrei, one of the subjects of our film. We asked him to share a few words with you all.

1. **The Secret Trial 5**
   secrettrial5.com/-Canada
   The Secret Trial 5 is a crowdfunded documentary in-progress that examines the human impact of Canada's "war on terror"; specifically the use of security ...

2. **Hot Docs | Docignite : Project : Secret Trial 5**
   www.hotdocs.ca/docignite/project/secret_trial_5
   Many Canadians view the so-called War on Terror as something distant, something far away. ... The subjects of our film are known as The Secret Trial 5.

3. **The Secret Trial 5 on the Tarek Fatah Show - SoundCloud**
   soundcloud.com/the-secret-trial-5/the-secret-trial-5-on-the
   Feb 11, 2013 – Listen to The Secret Trial 5 on the Tarek Fatah Show by The Secret Trial ... It is a film about the human impact of the "War on Terror" in Canada ...

---

**The Terror Plot in Canada: What You Need to Know**

*Ishaan Tharoor, TIME Magazine*

Tharoor writes: "Canadian nationals have been known to venture abroad and join jihadist movements, ranging from Somalia to Afghanistan. But the country's history of dealing with terrorist activity on its soil does not begin with Islamist extremists." [READ MORE](http://freethoughtblogs.com/singham/2013/02/28/the-cleveland-bombers-and-other-terrorist-plots/)

---

**[GvlVetsForPeace] evil masterminds menace the Homeland!**

Mon Mar 4, 2013 1:09 pm (PST) . Posted by: "Bill Warrick" jedi.knight8
From: Pierce R Date: Fri, Mar 1, 2013 at 7:19 PM
Subject: [GvlVetsForPeace] evil masterminds menace the Homeland!

Feb 28 2013
*
**The Cleveland bombers and other terrorist plots**

*Politics [http://freethoughtblogs.com/singham/category/politics/>]*

One day in April last year, I opened the local newspaper to read a sensational story of the successful thwarting of a plot by five ‘terrorists’, people from the area, to blow up a bridge south of Cleveland. They accepted a plea deal in November that resulted in four of them receiving sentences ranging from 6 to 11 years with the remaining person still awaiting mental competency evaluation. The US attorney’s office had asked for sentences ranging from 19 to 30 years.

Who were these terrorist masterminds in our neck of the woods and why were they interested in blowing up a bridge in a fairly sparsely populated area of the state? Arun Gupta has looked closely into the case and finds that it is a familiar and sordid story that we have heard many times before, of the government using its agents, criminals, and paid informants to lure and encourage drifters and homeless and other people on the margins of society to engage in criminal actions by putting in their minds crazy plots that they would have no chance of implementing successfully if not aided by the government in procuring and using the materials.

The U.S. government described the five as hell-bent on sowing terror to fulfill their “violent anarchist ideology.” In reality, the FBI supplied ten pounds of inert plastic explosives to drifters, suicidal, drug addicts and emotionally troubled. Like hundreds of post-September 11 cases against Muslim-Americans, the FBI conjured up the terrorism it takes credit for preventing. [True, hundreds?—Dick]

The FBI’s most valuable asset was a paid informant and con artist, Shaquille Azir, who played father figure to the lost men, molding their childish bravado and drunken fantasies into a terrorist plot. Azir drove the five around—who lacked cars and drivers’ licenses according to friends—and provided them with jobs, housing, beer, pot and prescription drugs. Every time the scheme threatened to collapse into gutterpunk chaos, Azir kept it on track.

FBI tapes reveal Azir led the brainstorming of targets, showed them bridges to case out, pushed them to buy C-4 military-grade explosives, provided the contact for weapons, gave them money for the explosives and demanded they develop a plan because “We on the hook” for the weapons. At one point, Azir burst out in frustration at their ineptitude: “Every time we meet, we leave saying, we’re doing some research. And then get back together and go back to square one.”

This case is depressingly similar to those of the past where so-called terrorist plots that were supposedly foiled by the astute work of federal agents turn out under close examination to be those that involved luring
people who couldn’t plot their way out of a paper bag into getting involved in some grand scheme.*

*This article [http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/nov/16/fbi-entrapment-fake-terror-plots](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/nov/16/fbi-entrapment-fake-terror-plots) from The Guardian goes through a list of cases in which there would not have been a plot if the FBI had not been pushing the people eventually charged with terrorist acts. It describes one case of David Williams, a youth in New York with a criminal background involving drugs.*

*His aunt, Alicia McWilliams, was honest about the tough streets her nephew was dealing with. "Newburgh is a hard place," she said. So it was perhaps no surprise that in May, 2009, David Williams was arrested again and hit with a 25-year jail sentence. But it was not for drugs offences. Or any other common crime. Instead Williams and three other struggling local men beset by drug, criminal and mental health issues were convicted of an Islamic terrorist plot to blow up Jewish synagogues and shoot down military jets with missiles.*

*Even more shocking was that the organisation, money, weapons and motivation for this plot did not come from real Islamic terrorists. It came from the FBI, and an informant paid to pose as a terrorist mastermind paying big bucks for help in carrying out an attack. For McWilliams, her own government had actually cajoled and paid her beloved nephew into being a terrorist, created a fake plot and then jailed him for it. "I feel like I am in the Twilight Zone," she told the Guardian.*

*David Swanson argues [http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/02/23/290438/fbi-sponsoring-terrorism-across-the-us/](http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/02/23/290438/fbi-sponsoring-terrorism-across-the-us/) that if there is one agency that is behind almost all the terrorist plots in the US, it is the FBI*

*Between 911 and August, 2011, the U.S. government prosecuted 508 people for terrorism in the United States. 243 had been targeted using an FBI informant. 158 had been caught in an FBI terrorism sting. 49 (that we know of, FBI recording devices have completely unbelievable patterns of “malfunctioning”) had encountered an agent provocateur. Most of the rest charged with “terrorism” had little or nothing to do with terrorism at all, most of them charged with more minor offenses like immigration offenses or making false statements. Three or four people out of the whole list appear to be men whom one would reasonably call terrorists in the commonly accepted sense of the word. They intended to and had something at least approaching the capacity to engage in acts of terrorism.*

*So next time there is a news conference announcing the foiling of a spectacular plot by terrorists, I would suggest that people look a little skeptically at the evidence. And you can be sure that there will be a next time, and fairly soon, because the government does not want people to think that the terrorist threat has diminished because then we might demand that
all the laws that have undermined civil liberties because of the ‘war on terror’ be rescinded.

May The Force be with you,
Bill

**Glenn Greenwald | Andrew Sullivan, Terrorism and the Art of Distortion**
*Glenn Greenwald, Guardian UK*
Excerpt: "Challenging the conventional western narrative on terrorism produces unique amounts of rage and bile. It's worth examining why."
[READ MORE](https://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/mar/02/terrorism-california-campaign)  [I couldn’t enter this site. See if you can. –Dick]

POSTS TAGGED "TREVOR AARONSON"

Trevor Aaronson on Democracy Now!
Terror Factory author Trevor Aaronson appeared on Democracy Now! on Friday, talking about the FBI's use of terrorism stings and …  Continue reading →
Posted April 28, 2013 in News | Tags: Boston Marathon bombings, Democracy Now!, FBI, Terror Factory, terrorism stings, Trevor Aaronson

The Terror Factory on C-SPAN’s Book TV
Terror Factory author Trevor Aaronson recently appeared on Book TV to talk about his book with Monika Bauerlein of Mother …  Continue reading →
Posted March 15, 2013 in News | Tags: Book TV, CSPAN, Monika Bauerlein, Mother Jones, Terror Factory, Trevor Aaronson

Trevor Aaronson on Lopate and On the Media
Terror Factory author Trevor Aaronson appeared on The Leonard Lopate Show on Friday, February 1, talking about his new book. …  Continue reading →
Posted February 10, 2013 in News | Tags: Leonard Lopate, On the Media, Terror Factory, Trevor Aaronson, WNYC

Trevor Aaronson on CBS This Morning
Terror Factory author Trevor Aaronson appeared on CBS This Morning on Friday January 11 to discuss his new book.

Posted January 13, 2013 in News | Tags: CBS This Morning, Entrapment, FBI stings, Terror Factory, Terrorism, Trevor Aaronson

Great Reviews Make Us Happy
The Terror Factory received a starred review in the 10/15 issue of Publishers Weekly. “Compelling, shocking, and gritty with intrigue.” …  Continue reading →
Posted October 15, 2012 in News | Tags: Andrew Cotto, Booklist, Care and Feeding of Exotic Pets, Diana Wagman, Mystery Scene, Outerborough Blues, Publisher's Weekly, Terror Factory, Trevor Aaronson

Trevor Aaronson on RT America
Terror Factory author Trevor Aaronson appeared on RT America, talking about the FBI’s use of informants.

Posted August 21, 2012 in News | Tags: FBI, Informants, RT America, Terror Factory, Terrorism, Trevor Aaronson

The Terror Factory
“Compelling, shocking, and gritty with intrigue.” –Publishers Weekly (starred review) “A real eye-opener
that questions how well the country's security ... Continue reading →

1. **The Terror Factory: Inside the FBI's Manufactured War on Terrorism**
   
   www.amazon.com › Books › Law › Criminal Law › Forensic Science

   The **Terror Factory: Inside the FBI's Manufactured War on Terrorism** [Trevor Aaronson] on Amazon.com. *FREE* super saver shipping on qualifying offers.

2. **Trevor Aaronson | Author of The Terror Factory**
   
   trevoraaronson.com/

   Articles and contact information for an award-winning journalist specializing in investigations and narratives.

3. **Trevor Aaronson | Book**
   
   trevoraaronson.com/book/

   The **Terror Factory: Inside the FBI's Manufactured War on Terror** shows how the ... An outgrowth of Trevor **Aaronson's** work as an investigative reporting fellow at ...

4. **Inside the Terror Factory | Mother Jones**
   
   www.motherjones.com/.../terror-factory-fbi-trevor-aaronson-bo...

   by Trevor Aaronson - in 74 Google+ circles

   Jan 11, 2013 – Editor's note: This story is adapted from The **Terror Factory**, Trevor **Aaronson's** new book documenting how the Federal Bureau of Investigation ...

5. **Trevor Aaronson - Terror Factory - YouTube**
   
   www.youtube.com/watch?v=0xQS-aWQQvY

   Apr 13, 2013 - Uploaded by friendshumanrights

   Trevor Aaronson - **Terror Factory**. Trevor Aaronson speaks about his book "Terror Factory: Inside the FBI's ...
7. Law and Legal - "The Terror Factory: Inside the FBI's Manufactured ... www.booktv.org/.../The+Terror+Factory+Inside+the+FBI's+Manufacture...

   The book "The Terror Factory" started off as a Mother Jones magazine cover story that earned Mr. Aaronson several journalism awards. For more, visit: ... 


   Mar 15, 2013 – According to journalist Trevor Aaronson's The Terror Factory, this isn't the premise for a Kafka novel; it's reality in the post-9/11 United States.

9. The Terror Factory with Trevor Aaronson - Crooks and Liars crooksandliars.com › Blogs › Nicole Belle's blog

   Thu, May 16 - Left Bank Books

   Terror Factory author Trevor Aaronson appeared on Democracy Now! on Friday, talking about the FBI's use of terrorism stings and … Continue reading

---


In the wake of the September 11 attacks, the U.S. government adopted a series of counterterrorism policies that radically altered the prevailing balance between civil liberties and security. These changes allowed for warrantless domestic surveillance, military commissions at Guantanamo Bay and even extralegal assassinations. Now, more than a decade after 9/11, these sharply contested measures appear poised to become lasting features of American government. **What do Americans think about these policies?** Where do they draw the line on what the government is allowed to do in the name of fighting terrorism? Drawing from a wealth of survey and experimental data, **Whose Rights?** explores the underlying sources of public attitudes toward the war on terror in a more detailed and comprehensive manner than has ever been attempted.

In an analysis that deftly deploys the tools of political science and psychology, **Whose Rights?** addresses a vexing puzzle: Why does the counterterrorism agenda persist even as 9/11 recedes in time and the threat from Al Qaeda wanes? Authors Clem Brooks and Jeff Manza provocatively argue that
American opinion, despite traditionally showing strong support for civil liberties, exhibits a “dark side” that tolerates illiberal policies in the face of a threat. Surveillance of American citizens, heightened airport security, the Patriot Act and targeted assassinations enjoy broad support among Americans, and these preferences have remained largely stable over the past decade. There are, however, important variations: Waterboarding and torture receive notably low levels of support, and counterterrorism activities sanctioned by formal legislation, as opposed to covert operations, tend to draw more favor. To better evaluate these trends, Whose Rights? examines the concept of “threat-priming” and finds that getting people to think about the specter of terrorism bolsters anew their willingness to support coercive measures. A series of experimental surveys also yields fascinating insight into the impact of national identity cues. When respondents are primed to think that American citizens would be targeted by harsh counterterrorism policies, support declines significantly. On the other hand, groups such as Muslims, foreigners, and people of Middle Eastern background elicit particularly negative attitudes and increase support for counterterrorism measures. Under the right conditions, Brooks and Manza show, American support for counterterrorism activities can be propelled upward by simple reminders of past terrorism plots and communication about disliked external groups.

Whose Rights? convincingly argues that mass opinion plays a central role in the politics of contemporary counterterrorism policy. With their clarity and compelling evidence, Brooks and Manza offer much-needed insight into the policy responses to the defining conflict of our age and the psychological impact of terrorism.

CLEM BROOKS is professor of sociology at Indiana University, Bloomington. JEFF MANZA is professor of sociology at New York University.

SIBEL EDMONDS


FBI whistle-blower Sibel Edmonds was described as "the most gagged person in the history of the United States" by the American Civil Liberties Union. Was the Sunday Times pressured to drop its investigation into her revelations?

By Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed

A whistleblower has revealed extraordinary information on the U.S. government’s support for international terrorist networks and organised crime. The government has denied the
allegations yet gone to extraordinary lengths to silence her. Her critics have derided her as a fabulist and fabricator. But now comes word that some of her most serious allegations were confirmed by a major European newspaper only to be squashed at the request of the U.S. government.

In a recent book *Classified Woman, Sibel Edmonds*, a former translator for the FBI, describes how the Pentagon, CIA and State Department maintained intimate ties to al-Qaeda militants as late as 2001. Her memoir, *Classified Woman: The Sibel Edmonds Story*, published last year, charged senior government officials with negligence, corruption and collaboration with al Qaeda in illegal arms smuggling and drugs trafficking in Central Asia.

More: http://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/whistleblower-al-qaeda-chief-u-s-asset/

> David Sirota> The Military’s 40 Year Experiment

Few probably recall the name Dwight Elliott Stone. But even if that name has faded from the national memory, the man remains historically significant. That's because on June 30, 1973, the 24-year-old plumber's apprentice became the last American forced into the armed services before the military draft expired.

Though next month's 40-year anniversary of the end of conscription will likely be as forgotten as Stone, it shouldn't be. In operations across the globe, the all-volunteer military has been employed by policymakers to birth what Gen. George Casey recently called the "era of persistent conflict." Four decades later, we therefore have an obligation to ask: How much of the public's complicity in that epochal shift is a result of the end of the draft?

There is, of course, no definitive answer to such a complex question. However, a look back at some lost history shows that today's public acquiescence to militarism was exactly what the government wanted when it ended the draft.

That loaded term — "militarism" — was, in fact, a prominent part of the 1970 report by President Nixon's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force. In its findings, the panel worried about "a cycle of anti-militarism" in a nation then questioning America's increasingly martial posture.

Noting that "the draft is a major source of antagonism" toward the growing military-industrial complex, the report praised the fact that "an all-volunteer force offers an obvious opportunity to curb the growth of anti-militaristic sentiment."

Nixon's commission did devote some empty rhetoric to downplaying "the fear of increased military aggressiveness or reduced civilian concern" about military actions in the event of an all-volunteer force. But the report's political conclusions were clear: By disconnecting most Americans from the blood-and-guts consequences of war, the end of the draft would "decrease dissent stemming from conscription" and "close one of the channels" of anti-war organizing.
Today, such conclusions read like prophecy.

Though polls showed that many Americans opposed the Iraq War, that invasion and occupation was historically unprecedented in length and yet never generated the kind of mass protest that earlier shorter wars evoked. Same thing for the Afghanistan War. Same thing for all the forward deployments to far-flung bases and one-off missions.

The pattern suggests that in the absence of conscription, dissent — if it exists at all — becomes a low-grade affair (an email, a petition, etc.) but not the kind of serious movement required to compel military policy changes. Why? Because as former Defense Secretary Robert Gates put it, without a draft "wars remain an abstraction — a distant and unpleasant series of news items that does not affect (most people) personally."

The danger, says West Point's Lance Betros, is that Americans then "reflexively move towards a military solution before they will try all the other elements of national power."

That reality has prompted some lawmakers in recent years to propose reinstating the draft. They argue it is the only way to compel Americans to truly care about the foreign policy and national security decisions of their government.

Well-meaning people can certainly disagree about whether a modern-day draft is a good idea or not (and it may not be). But forty years into the all-volunteer experiment, it is clear that ending conscription was as much about giving citizens the liberty to abstain from as about quashing popular opposition to martial decisions. By design, it weakened our democratic connection to the armed forces — a connection that is the only proven safeguard against unbridled militarism.

David Sirota is the best-selling author of the books "Hostile Takeover," "The Uprising" and "Back to Our Future." Email him at ds@davidsirota.com, follow him on Twitter @davidsirota or visit his website at www.davidsirota.com.
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REVIEWING EVIDENCE OF 9/11

From: Global Research E-Newsletter <newsletter@globalresearch.ca>
Date: Tue, May 7, 2013 at 7:01 AM
Subject: Elizabeth Woodworth: 9/11 in Context The Importance of the Growing Contradictory Evidence

To: sam.noumoff@mcgill.ca [forwarded by Sonny San Juan.]
9/11 in Context: The Importance of the Growing Contradictory Evidence
Nearly 12 years after the event, the official account of 9/11 continues to be actively studied by academics around the world. The idea of 9/11 as a false-flag operation to build support for an aggressive foreign policy in the Middle East is steadily gaining ground, suggesting that a policy change is overdue.

This essay provides a brief overview of recent academic evidence, high-level conferences, and media documentaries that raise fresh questions regarding the official account of 9/11. It then describes the 9/11 Consensus Panel as an up-to-date source of evidence-based research for any investigation that may be undertaken to settle 9/11’s unanswered questions.

Finally, this essay argues that mortality from all terror events combined lags far behind annual mortality from preventable common causes such as obesity, smoking, and impaired driving. More importantly, all these causes together will be dwarfed by the mortality from predicted “business as usual” global warming events — which cry out for a unified emergency response.

Today is the second anniversary of the day the United States announced the destruction and disposal of Osama bin Laden during a special military operation.

In spite of this announcement, worldwide skepticism and research continue to dog the official account of 9/11.

Had the United States Government called an immediate investigation (it did not form the 9/11 Commission until late 2002) and provided consistent and transparent proof of its claims against Osama bin Laden and the 19 alleged hijackers, things might have been different.

In the wake of the officially failed evidence, NGO’s continue to dig into the disturbing and unanswered questions that haunt this world-changing event. Year by year, these research bodies have been delving ever more deeply into new photographic, FOIA, and witness
Recent high-level conferences in Kuala Lumpur,[1] Bremen, Germany,[2] and Toronto, Canada,[3] have raised public awareness of the urgent need to revisit the watershed event behind the global war on terror.

An issue of the international magazine Nexus, which sold on news-stands across France in March and April this year, devoted 12 pages to the work of the 9/11 Consensus Panel (www.consensus911.org) and its 28 peer-reviewed Consensus Points of evidence against elements of the official story.[4]

In late 2012, PBS aired one of its most-watched documentaries, “Experts Speak Out,” in which 40 architects and engineers demonstrate that the structural collapses of the Twin Towers and WTC 7 could only have been caused by controlled demolition.[5]

Indeed many serious investigations have been undertaken by the major media, including Canada’s flagship CBC program, The Fifth Estate.[6] These explorations were summarized in my 2010 essay reporting that “eight countries – Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and Russia – have allowed their publicly-owned broadcasting stations to air the full spectrum of evidence challenging the truth of the official account of 9/11.[7]

In February, 2010, the American Behavioral Scientist published six articles introducing the concept of “State Crimes Against Democracy” (SCADS), including “Beyond Conspiracy Theory: Patterns of High Crimes in American Government.”[8]

Why has all this effort to establish the truth about 9/11 persisted for nearly 12 years?

1. First, because many high officials have cast doubt on the official story. To name just one, a dismayed General Wesley Clark reported in a 2007 interview with Amy Goodman that on September 20, 2001, and again later in November, his former Pentagon staff told him that the US was going to “take out” seven Middle East countries in the next five years, beginning with Iraq; then Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Iran, Somalia, and Sudan.[9]

2. In carrying out these operations, the “global war on terror” spawned by 9/11 has
maintained an unprecedented degree of fear and divisiveness in the world;

3. This war has been justified by a pervasive, shadowy enemy that can only be countered by flawless surveillance, suspension of civil rights, and unlimited military spending;

4. This “forever war” has redefined world relationships (Muslim and Christian) and given the West a new kind of entitlement to occupy lands that might foster terror against it;

5. It has virtually bankrupted the West through trillions spent in Afghanistan and Iraq that are roughly equivalent to the bank bailouts;

6. September 11th and its offspring terror war have wrecked our confidence in the first principles of democracy. Ever-reminded that terror lurks all around, we must cower and surrender freedoms to contain it.

7. Worst of all, preoccupation with terror has taken our attention off the vital need to address global warming and planetary survival. War-on-terror hawks have done quite the opposite, having manufactured public consent to occupy the very lands that house the cheap oil that is cooking the planet as it approaches 400 ppm of atmospheric CO2.[10]

How do we get back to first principles and return to global, survival-oriented priorities?

The central question is: “Do we choose to act from what we want our world to be, or from what we fear it might become?”

Do we design a harmonious world fit for all humanity, or do we stifle our vision and hopes for peace behind fear, prisons, martial law, and infinite military spending?

All great periods of history – the golden ages of optimism, learning, culture and prosperity — have been inspired by the creative, expansive human imagination. This imagination is inspired by the belief that a civilized world is possible because we can make it so. It is inspired by a vision of human beings as a world family whose spirits embrace justice, order, and decency.

As President John F. Kennedy said in his famous speech of 1963:
“If we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. In the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children’s futures. And we are all mortal.”[11]

Because of 9/11, however, our new century has been dominated by an obsessive fear of Muslim peoples. This fear, fueled daily by the Western media, has persuaded America to compromise its fundamental democratic rights and principles in favor of a “security” that has not yet become evident.

Thus it is crucial to know whether 9/11 transpired as we have been told — and for this we need the means to identify the best evidence possible.

**The 9/11 Consensus Panel and its Approach to Evidence**

The 9/11 Consensus Panel was formed in May, 2011. Its purpose and procedures are briefly outlined below:

· The media has claimed for a decade that it is unable to evaluate the technical evidence being presented against the official story of 9/11.

· A parallel problem existed in medicine during the years when there were contradictory, unranked approaches to evaluating the 22 million articles in the biomedical literature databases.

· This problem was greatly reduced by the introduction of “evidence-based” medicine, which applied formal rules of evidence in evaluating the clinical literature.

· Using widely accepted tools such as the Delphi Method, medicine has now developed hundreds of standard Consensus Statements to guide physicians in diagnosis and treatment.

· Similarly, 20 expert members[12] of the new 9/11 Consensus Panel have now developed Consensus Points of “best evidence” opposing the official account of 9/11.
· The Panel Members, who remain blind to one another throughout the process, provide three rounds of review and feedback that are refined into 28 Points (thus far) of “best evidence”.

· This scientific process has yielded an unprecedented degree of credibility for points of evidence relating to 9/11 that can be trusted by the media and the public.

· The 9/11 Consensus Points provide a ready source of evidence-based research to any investigation that may be undertaken by the public, the media, academia, or any other investigative body or institution.

Conclusion:

We have seen that the evidence supporting the official story of 9/11 has become increasingly open to question. We have also seen that preoccupation with 9/11 has continued unabated through the ever-present war on terror.

But to keep things in perspective: lives lost to the sum total of terror events are far fewer than those lost annually to preventable deaths from obesity, smoking, and impaired driving. [13]

This should translate into the media giving more time to the prevention of obesity, traffic accidents, and smoking, and less time to preventing terror events.

That would be fine except that all these things taken together pale by comparison with the disease and mortality[14] that will ensue if we continue with “business as usual” in the face of recent evidence that “observed [fossil fuel] emissions continue to track the top end of all scenarios.”[15]

In order to steel ourselves to confront global warming — the most serious challenge ever faced by civilization — we need to reframe our priorities.

We need to wage war on our own behaviour, and it’s time to gear up, impose discipline, and win the planet back.

This means taking our declared “war on global warming” to the front page of every
newspaper, to the top of all social media discussions, and to the Number One item in every town hall meeting on Platform Earth.

Notes

[1] International Conference: “9/11 Revisited — Seeking the Truth,” sponsored by Dr Mahathir Mohamad, Fourth Prime Minister of Malaysia and President of Perdana Global Peace Foundation (http://www.perdana4peace.org/events/conferences/911_revisited/).

[2] “Quo Vadis NATO? — Challenges for Democracy and Law,” University of Bremen, April 26-28, 2013 (http://ialana.de/files/pdf/veranstaltungen/13-Veranstaltungen/IA%20Bremen%20Programm_englisch%2018_4-1.pdf). Presenters included: Dr. Hans-Christof Graf von Sponeck, former United Nations Assistant Secretary General; Prof. Dr. Christopher Weeramantry, former Vice President of the International Court of Justice; Dr. Dieter Deiseroth, Judge at the German Federal Administrative Court; Wolfgang Nescovic, former Judge at the German Federal High Court; Prof. Dr. Reinhard Merkel, Professor for criminal law and philosophy of law, University of Hamburg; Dr. Andreas von Bülow, former German Assistant Secretary of Defense; and Dr. Daniele Ganser, Swiss historian and peace researcher.


[5] “9/11 Explosive Evidence: Experts Speak Out,” produced by Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth (ae911truth.org) was the most watched and most shared PBS video nationwide for several weeks, with over a million viewers. (http://video.cpt12.org/video/2270078138/).

31 Geminis.


[8] These are listed at http://abs.sagepub.com/content/vol53/issue6. The print issue is available for $24 from Sage Journals at journals@sagepub.com, telephone 1-800-818-7243.


CDC Atlanta. “The adverse health effects from cigarette smoking account for an estimated 443,000 deaths, or nearly one of every five deaths, each year in the United States.” (http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/fact_sheets/health_effects/effects_cig_smoking/).

CDC Atlanta. “In 2010, 10,228 people were killed in alcohol-impaired driving crashes,
accounting for nearly one-third (31%) of all traffic-related deaths in the United States.” [http://www.cdc.gov/motorvehiclesafety/impaired_driving/impaired-dry_factsheet.html]
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PRESIDENT OBAMA REJECTS PERMANENT WAR?

The End of War

Dick,
Late last week, in a speech at the National Defense University here in Washington DC, the President called for the United States to end its current state of perpetual war and refocus its national security priorities. We here at The Peace Alliance could not agree more.

President Obama stated that with the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq ending, we are now at a crossroads, and that it is time for the United States to ask ourselves tough questions. While much of the President’s focus in that statement was on military and intelligence priorities, The Peace Alliance would go further. We believe that the United States needs to shift our priorities and resources into proactive peacebuilding, and we believe that is best accomplished through implementation of far more significant peacebuilding measures, like the establishment of a Cabinet level United States Department of Peacebuilding, greater funding for U.S. Institute of Peace, State Department operations and USAID, among others. We also want the existing agencies to sharpen their focus to core peacebuilding objectives.

In a little over a decade, war has cost us over a trillion dollars, nearly 7,000 American lives lost, hundreds of thousands of Iraqi and Afghani lives lost, and countless thousands more lives, Iraqi, Afghani, and American, forever altered from physical and emotional wounds. The costs are just too high; we cannot afford to repeat these same follies in the future. President Obama asks us to consider how we will confront threats in the future, but this is the wrong question. Instead we must ask how we can prevent these threats in the future. To do that, we must anticipate future problems and address these concerns before those situations turn violent. A US Department of Peacebuilding and other robust measures would allow us to address the root causes of terrorism, and instead of building hatred and mistrust, often through military efforts, we can build goodwill, stronger communities, stronger societies, and, springing from those, stronger democracies.

The costs, both morally and financially, are far too great for us to continue on our current course. We need to seek new solutions to the national security paradigm, and while discussions about how and when we use military and intelligence resources are useful and important, we believe that the United States faces much more fundamental questions. We must ask ourselves how we want to engage with the rest of the world. Do we want to engage in a positive way, building stronger, more prosperous, more peaceful, freer societies, or do we wish to choose a course of reckless and reactive destruction?

Sincerely,

Bob Baskin
President

Some excerpts from the speech:
Read full speech here

With a decade of experience to draw from, now is the time to ask ourselves hard questions – about the nature of today’s threats, and how we should confront them.
So America is at a crossroads. We must define the nature and scope of this struggle, or else it will define us, mindful of James Madison’s warning that “No nation could preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare.”

And yet as our fight enters a new phase, America’s legitimate claim of self-defense cannot be the end of the discussion. To say a military tactic is legal, or even effective, is not to say it is wise or moral in every instance.

Success on these fronts requires sustained engagement, but it will also require resources. I know that foreign aid is one of the least popular expenditures – even though it amounts to less than one percent of the federal budget. But foreign assistance cannot be viewed as charity. It is fundamental to our national security, and any sensible long-term strategy to battle extremism. Moreover, foreign assistance is a tiny fraction of what we spend fighting wars that our assistance might ultimately prevent. For what we spent in a month in Iraq at the height of the war, we could be training security forces in Libya, maintaining peace agreements between Israel and its neighbors, feeding the hungry in Yemen, building schools in Pakistan, and creating reservoirs of goodwill that marginalize extremists.
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