misuse of the term "terrorism."

There is a phenomenon which corresponds to some of that which the current policy calls "international terrorism." Unfortunately, the lack of precision in the definition of the terms creates a problem potentially as deadly as the terrorism itself.

The proper word for the problem is not "terrorism." The name of the problem is the utopian development of so-called "special warfare" during the recent fifty-odd years. The new doctrines and practice of "special warfare" were adapted to the new conditions defined by H.G. Wells' and Bertrand Russell's stated intent to use nuclear weapons as a threat so terrible that, as Wells and Russell stated, nations would give up their sovereignty to world government, to avoid war. States therefore relied increasingly on covert forms of "irregular warfare," as ways of conducting warfare against other nations, or even targetted large sections of their own population.

An example of this is the way in which the Italian fascist element which the U.S. and Britain incorporated into the secret post-war organization "Gladio" was used as an instrument of Anglo-American and Israeli terrorist operations against Italy during the 1970s. The assassination of Aldo Moro was a notable example of this; the earlier assassination of Italy's Enrico Mattei and attempted assassination of France's President Charles de Gaulle, were also examples of this same method for targetting France's President.

Under U.S. National Security Advisors Henry A. Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, increasingly large-scale use of irregular warfare using private armies financed largely by proceeds of weapons- and drug-trafficking, became the leading direction of development. "Iran-Contra" was a leading example of this. The shift to such forms of "special warfare," begun on a large scale by Brzezinski in Afghanistan, was correlated with an accelerating purging of the U.S. and other military institutions of their traditional capabilities and outlooks, and increasing emphasis on the soldier as a wild-eyed "Nintendo killer."

To defeat what is legitimately denounced as the effects of international terrorism, we must, first of all, clean out the money-laundering systems associated with the traffic in drugs, and related problems. This, relevant governments, so far, are unwilling to do. However, we must also do two other things.

We must uproot the capabilities for actions such as those of Sept. 11th, which exist only within the military institutions of the principal powers. We must outflank the utopian warriors, by using our weapon, economic growth, against their weapon, lunatic destruction. If we do not find the courage to defend economic growth against the demands that we dismantle essential elements of our economies, we, by our own negligence, would have surrendered already to the utopian reign of general destruction of humanity as a whole.

There is no price, a true patriot would not pay, to prevent such a dark age from descending upon humanity as a whole.

Conference Report

Egyptian Expert Raises Questions on Sept. 11

Dr. Mahmoud Khalaf gave this speech, entitled "Who Committed the Sept. 11 Attacks, and Why?" at a seminar at the Center for Asian Studies at the University of Cairo, on Dec. 5, 2002. The meeting was hosted by the center's director, Prof. Mohammed Selim. EIR *correspondent Muriel Mirak-Weissbach also spoke, presenting Lyndon LaRouche's analysis of Sept. 11 (see last week's* EIR*). Dr. Khalaf is a strategic analyst; a retired Major General; a fellow of the Nasr Higher Military Academy; a member of the Royal College of Defense Studies (RCDS), London; and honorary member of the Association of the United States Army, Fort Benning, Georgia. He participated in several training courses with the U.S. Army in the United States and Germany. His speech has been translated from the Arabic, and subheads have been added.*

The lecture I just listened to [by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach] was very exciting, because it gave me answers to many questions that had remained unanswered on this issue as a whole, from the beginning in Sept. 11 to this moment.

There is one important part, which I want to explain to you very quickly. And this is military-strategic analysis. Military-strategic analysis is an independent branch of science within the strategic sciences, and not mere predictions and speculations. But, it has complete rules that are identical to "*post mortem* tests," an autopsy process used to find out the causes of death. The truth is that those who analyzed this precise operation—and I, personally, worked in special operations for 20 years and acquired deep expertise in this subject. This subject, people say, is very complicated and difficult, when they look at it as a whole. But I will explain it to you very briefly. . . .

First, [regarding the Sept. 11 attacks], we are confronted with a technical operation of extremely great dimensions. We estimate that the planning organ for this operation must have consisted of at least 100 specialized technicians, who needed one year for planning. Each stage of this operation has many details, and every single technical detail needed measures, which are called "deception" and camouflaging, against around ten specialized organs in the United States of America, which are called the "intelligence community." We will not say the CIA, but we will say the DIA, which is the Defense Intelligence Agency. The DIA has a highly qualified technical capability that enables it to—I will not exaggerate and say it can audio-visually monitor every single square meter of the planet at any moment. There is an agency called the National

Security Agency. Our question is, how could the intelligence community, which has an Executive Order from President Clinton, and President Bush, an okay from Bush, that this group [al-Qaeda] should be put under direct monitoring by American intelligence, and then it slips under their nose and manages to plan for two years for this operation? I agree with Mrs. Mirak-Weissbach, the speaker, that there was a penetration operation. Actually, I had difficulty in saying this [before]. Yes, there was a penetration of the security system and the U.S. Armed Forces, and I will tell you how.

We will ask some questions and try to answer them very briefly.

The Pentagon after the Sept. 11 attack. Egyptian General Khalaf's careful analysis of the preparation and timing of the attacks puts the lie to the "Osama bin Laden did it" cover story.

Penetrating U.S. Air Defenses

The first question, the air defense system, the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD). This system is a very sophisticated system, and it is supposed to detect any airplane that takes off. Even when an airplane lifts its wheels above an airstrip in Russia, it knows about it. Now, the airplanes are flying. With all due respect to Dr. Selim, who said that the pilot [of the hijacked airplane] did not give the alarm signal—no, he did. One pilot did give warning. He contacted the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and indeed informed it that there was a hijacking, and the air defense command was informed. We have a surprising case here. Andrews Air Force Base—this airbase, by the way, has its own defense system around the base, which consists of two jet fighters (which can scramble); they would be in the air within two to three minutes. The squadron at Andrews received the alert at the same moment, but did not take off. This issue disappeared and nobody talked about it. This is noteworthy. This answers the question why President Bush was unable to enter Washington for ten hours. This, of course reveals, that there were security gaps at this time. Nobody in the White House was able to reach him before 7:00 p.m. There were extreme reservations.

We will now see the navigation system, so that you will know the difficulty. Every small country has a radar system, which sends a signal and the signal hits an airplane, and then returns to the radar and it appears on the screen. For the U.S., there are thousands of flights. This radar system is "outside." Inside the U.S., of course, [let me give] an example: It is not reasonable to light up the whole mountain, therefore you give every person a lamp to find his way in the night. So, each airplane has a device called a transponder, inside the airplane. It works automatically, and conducts others to its location. As soon as a plane begins its approach to an airport, you get the flight schedule. The pilot knows his place. He takes the instructions and enters.

Here we have a puzzle at this stage. This is the first airplane (Flight 11). This one aroused my interest; I will explain it later. All the airplanes took off from 7:58 to 8:10. Combined, they were in flight 132 minutes in all. The first airplane took off at 7:59 and hit the tower at 8:45. It took 46 minutes. It made a maneuver, it went all the way and made a U-turn and hit the tower in the 46th minute. We want to count in the 46 minutes. The group, which was reportedly on board Flight 11, whose list was published—their ages range between 22 and 32 years. If you add up their lifetimes, that would still not be enough time for such training; that he [the pilot or hijacker] shuts off [the transponder] while being on board a Boeing 767, and reaches his target, relying only on satellite navigation to do what he did in 46 minutes?! When did he hijack the plane? When did he get control over it? How could he shut down everything and continue his flight? Naturally, he turned off everything, and turned off the [transponder] transmission, because he expected that the air defense would pursue him. He turned off the transmission and made his maneuver. Those hijackers must have known a lot about the air defense system in detail, such as that the Air Force pilots and air flight controllers had never practiced procedures for confronting hijacked commercial airplanes.

The Evidence Doesn't Add Up

There is a second issue. The high level of the operation does not match the level of the evidence presented. When we come and try—as policemen usually do in a murder investigation, they look for traces and evidence. The criminal breaks the glass or steals something and so forth. But this high-level performance didn't match the level of evidence: for example, the "How To Fly an Airplane" instruction manual left in their cars.

Targetting: Here is a question. There is something scientific in choosing targets, called "targetting." This targetting science is very complicated. Naturally, we know that there are innumerable kinds of targets. The capability to hit targets may be limited to one time, or, we have to detect which had a first priority and which the second, etc. Whether they are in the air, sea, underground, or satellites in space, choosing the time to hit each target is subject to many factors (in military language), such as something called "target escalation." So, the task of choosing targets must also be carried out by somebody who is a high-level military expert. He would say: "What would I strike? With what? And when?"

Now, there is a very strange point in the timing of the

strikes. When we analyze the strikes, we find that Flight 11 and Flight 175 [did the following]: The first hit the tower in 46 minutes, after making the maneuver. The second hit the North Tower after 67 minutes, with a 20 minute difference. Why? Why did it wait 20 minutes? There is a scientific answer. The first thing is called escalation of strikes. This means that someone is observing, he sees and registers: where the first strike hit, and where the second should hit. Somebody who can see and report. The other thing is, when they delay, and take a target with a certain time interval, this means that they strike the first target and make a "time outside," [this is the time to] bring in the rescue equipment very quickly, and when all the rescue equipment and firefighters have completed their entry, the assailants move to make the second strike. And this is what actually happened that day. All the fire and rescue vehicles got inside the tower, and then it collapsed and they lost their rescue capability, and increased their losses.

In target number 3 [the Pentagon], which is very interesting indeed, the flight took off from Dulles, Washington at 8:10 and hit the crash point at 9:43. Dulles is just 10 minutes or less from the Pentagon. Instead, they made a trip westward, and returned. Why did they choose the timing 9:43? Why the delay? And why wait around 45 minutes from strike number 2? Because a group of specialized [U.S.] commanders was to be summoned. Therefore, they hit the helicopter pad. They thought about this meeting as a [meeting to develop a] military concept, to face what had happened. They planned to hit the pad. Now, who would be at the meeting, is another question. This was a tactical measure that was carried out. It was planned that [Defense Secretary Donald] Rumsfeld and his group would convene in a hurry and there would be a helicopter arriving at the Pentagon, and [therefore] the Pentagon helicopter pad would be hit exactly at this time. They did not strike immediately. This target was very well studied. This was studied rigorously; indeed, the airplane crashed at the pad. This was synchronized. . . .

The other point which we want to say was planned, involves the fourth plane. It crashed in Pittsburgh at 10:10. It went all the way to Cleveland and returned. This kind of flying is not easy: They turned off all navigation equipment and continued only with satellite navigation. All this was done while they were flying, and returning. It was planned to hit the White House at 10:30. It took off at 8:01. Two hours and half. Why this delay? Because the President was not yet in the White House and they had to wait until the President and his assistant came inside the target area. What kind of hijacker would be thinking this way? And it was planned to hit at 10:30. From this perspective, when we go back and take a look at the state of things at the White House—.

Of course, the American leadership is very, very well aware of these things. They understood very well. The state of shock resulting from this performance, . . . —where was President Bush during that day? He left Florida, and headed to Barksdale [Air Force Base] in Louisiana, and put the U.S. military on high alert, worldwide, at (1:04 p.m.), and flew to Offutt [Air Force Base], in Nebraska. It was a long time before the President would be back in Washington, with three fighter jet escorts, and arrived at the White House (6:54 p.m.), and at 8:30 p.m., delivered his address. Why was the President away from Washington all this time?

There was, of course, a great deal of confusion in the system, and the jet fighters that took off, came from Langley Air Base, and this is located about 140 miles south of Washington. Of course, by the time these planes were prepared and in flight and had barely entered Washington, everything was finished and completed at this stage.

These are the detailed explanations, which I wanted to mention about the puzzling part.

Now, the puzzling question, is the preparation and training of these people who had the capability to follow up and execute: When were they selected? When did the training take place? When were the surveillance, intelligence gathering, and study operations conducted? From the intelligence organs . . . —I believe that the U.S. intelligence community, which now has around $150 billion in annual expenses, can gather information, and has "critical communications" and special satellites. Any "critical accident" that takes place in world, whether in Tokyo or Cairo, reaches the U.S. President within minutes, with all the details.

There is, actually, one question, which is posed here: That is, that there is no proportionality between the performance of the operation and the performance of bin Laden and his followers, as we have seen and heard later on in his speeches. Indeed, the question which we pose here again is. . . . It is known beforehand that if President Bush could say, "It was bin Laden," in his speech one hour after his arrival at the White House, at 8:30 p.m., and he ordered the U.S. Army to move to Afghanistan, that means he made bin Laden and his followers into huge enemies of the U.S.A., [although] they are worth nothing—and know nothing about Islam either. We are not saying this is a plan, because planning takes a long time. But what we are saying is that, what happened after Sept. 11 was planned before Sept. 11. Everything was prepared beforehand. The U.S. needed to work under the cover of fighting terrorism to achieve a lot of mysterious objectives.

As for the amount of ordnance which is now hitting Afghanistan: I would say that Afghanistan has been turned into a target practice field, because what one learns in the first years of military college is that aerial bombardment [in a mountain area] does not yield any results, especially if there is no military infrastructure on the ground. Afghanistan is a mountainous region. This bombardment is incomprehensible and not clear at all. Now, what is going on after three months, using the tremendous U.S. war machine in Afghanistan, against whom? But we have some answers, such as testing for new weapons like neutron bombs and ground-penetrating bombs and more. . . .

In the end we still have the question: Who planned and executed the Sept. 11 strategic operation against the U.S.?