BLACK NOBILITY TERROR

From Venice to Bohemia to London. The Royal Houses of Europe That Ruthlessly Eliminate All That Dare to Stand In Their Way!

PROTECT BY ALL MEANS

(Part 4)
BLACK NOBILITY PART 4: PROTECT BY ALL MEANS

David Kelly was a husband, a father and one of the world's foremost experts on nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. He advised the British government on the matter, particularly in connection with Saddam Hussein's Iraq. He was also one of the main sources for a claim by Andrew Gilligan, then a BBC reporter, that Tony Blair's government had rewritten publicly-released intelligence to make it "sexier", in the hope of justifying the Anglo-American invasion of Iraq in March 2003. After Gilligan made his claim, Kelly was quickly identified as the source of the leak. A few days after a stressful appearance before a Parliamentary committee investigating Mr Gilligan's allegations, he was found dead in the woods near his Oxfordshire home on July 17th 2003. By then the war was already over with a massive presence of American and British forces in Iraq and Saddam Hussein on the run. Retribution for the ill fated September 11th, 2001 attack on the twin towers in New York resulting in an Anglo-American occupation of the nerve centre of the world's oil supply and protection of the interests of the global elite oligarchs.
1. THE 9/11 CONSPIRACY

If the shooting of JFK was the ‘mother of all conspiracy theories’, then 9/11 must be the son. The widespread doubt which has been expressed about the official story is very much the culmination of the many mass disillusionments from the last few decades. The often highly charged debates which have grown up around what at first seemed an irrefutable occurrence neatly distil most conspiracy theory staples under one umbrella. All the classic elements are present: the allegations of a state-sponsored false-flag attack to create a mandate for oppressive control and desired conflicts; problematic forensic evidence; contradictions and holes in the official version of events; clear evidence of obfuscation in official reports; and events which seem to contravene both common sense and the laws of physics – according to the theorists. A number of other thematically related events, such as the London 7/7 bombings, have attracted similar scrutiny.

The criteria listed in the paragraph above are only the very basics of the claims that the truth has not been told about the notorious attacks which took place on 11 September 2001. It stands to reason that they are savagely denied by those affronted at the very idea that there is even an alternative view on the official version of events. The orthodoxy, as indelibly enforced in the mainstream, holds that Osama bin Laden and the al-Qaeda network arranged for the hijacks of four jet liners, which, now piloted by terrorists, were flown into the World Trade Center (WTC), the Pentagon and woods in Pennsylvania respectively, killing around 3,000 people. This narrative has already passed into dark legend, and, as such, needs little reiteration here. Yet, deep in the collective gut, it is hard to deny that there is a disquiet about what really happened on 9/11.

The widespread doubt that has grown by the year was evidenced by the polls conducted for 9/11’s tenth anniversary in 2011, which exposed the remarkable reality that something approaching half the global population had doubts about the official story. In the UK, the ICM poll service ‘found that more people agree than disagree that the official account of what happened on 9/11 might turn out to be wrong in important respects’. Indeed, only 8 per cent of respondents ‘strongly agreed’ with what they had been told to believe. The conspiracy view has once again become mainstream without anyone quite realizing it, yet this striking lack of faith is repeatedly misrepresented or ignored by the media, and attacked by Western politicians. Questioning 9/11 is often blocked by the stance that doing so is ‘disrespectful’ to the victims and their
families. Truthseekers counter that it is more disrespectful not to re-examine every detail of the episode, in the hope that uncovering the real truth might help prevent future atrocities.

By 2005, the 9/11 ‘truth movement’ was in full swing, with campaigns being mounted, websites proliferating and polished documentaries being burned onto DVD in impressive numbers, distributed by an eager throng of well-meaning individuals, by now firmly convinced they had been lied to. The passion was predominantly fired by the fact that the events of 9/11 still mattered, even years on, because of the resulting ‘War on Terror’, with its associated withdrawal of fundamental freedoms that affected everyone. The demoralizing and seemingly ill-organized wars launched by the West against Afghanistan and Iraq were further reminders of the fateful day’s legacy. An oft-verbalized desire from various leaders to ‘move on’ from now ‘historical’ events still continues to be resisted by those who believe that the original attacks were staged not by Middle Eastern terrorists, but by covert forces within Western intelligence services and probably beyond.

The inside-job hypothesis is the central accusation of the 9/11 truth movement. If it could be demonstrated beyond doubt that the attacks were either wholly engineered, partially manipulated or even simply allowed, then the entire basis of many of today’s global power games, which threaten the peace of the world, would be crucially undermined. The fervour that shines in the eyes of those who fight for the ‘truth’ of 9/11 is undeniably impressive. But is it justified?

Again, the full basis for the wide conviction that 9/11 was a classic false-flag conspiracy can be explored elsewhere in countless sources that will keep readers occupied for months, but the essential aspects are broadly summed up here.
THE HIJACKINGS

The officially accepted scenario of 9/11 sounds simple enough: hijackers, under assumed names, boarded each of the relevant planes and then took control of the flights by attacking or threatening the cabin and cockpit crew with concealed ‘boxcutter’ blades. Thus under al-Qaeda control, the planes were flown into their targets.

Yet many unexplained facets present themselves here, from the seemingly illogical movements of the hijackers themselves on the way to the airports (Boston, Newark and Washington, DC) to the fact that the assumed names they apparently used have never been identified from the passenger lists, definitive versions of which have not been released either. It has to be taken on trust that the authorities know who they were. Additionally, the terrorists seen in the security footage purporting to show them passing through customs do not match the descriptions given by staff on the day, while the timecodes shown in the videos are contradictory and inconsistent, suggesting that judicious editing may have taken place.

Oddly, passenger numbers on the hijacked flights were uncommonly low that day, with one of the usually busy commuter planes (Flight 93) flown at just 19 per cent of its normal capacity. Some have speculated that numbers were deliberately kept low that day to make the hijacks easier, with potential passenger resistance minimized.

What we know of how the hijackings actually took place has come almost entirely from accounts given by frightened passengers or cabin crew who managed to call their loved ones using their cell phones (mobiles). Yet how some of these calls took place at all has been the subject of much controversy. For example, CNN anchorwoman Barbara Olson was on Flight 77 (which we are told hit the Pentagon), and great emphasis has been placed on information gleaned from two conversations between her and her husband Ted (US solicitor general at the time), whom she reportedly managed to reach before the fatal impact. However, when the FBI sequestered the relevant phone network records, they in fact showed that just a single cell call, not two, was attempted – and that it failed to connect. When presented with this conundrum, Ted Olson said the call must have been made from a different network.
have been made from a commercial ‘seatback’ phone. But American Airlines has confirmed that Flight 77 did not have such a facility. So how did the Olson conversation take place?

In fact, despite the legends that have been built up around the 9/11 phone calls, only a limited number of the recordings have ever been released to the public, and some of the transcripts that have been reported are more than a little peculiar (‘Mom, this is Mark Bingham,’ says a Flight 93 passenger, oddly giving his surname to his own mother at the start of a very stilted conversation). Given the abilities of modern technology to recreate synthesized voices, a large number of people believe that at least some of the famous calls may have been faked, duping friends and relatives.

If this sounds too bizarre, it should be noted that when the Canadian science writer A K Dewdney, puzzled by the 9/11 calls, decided to hire a plane to test the capability of cell phones at different altitudes, he found it impossible to get a signal at any height over 8,000 feet. Only in more recent times has technology been introduced to allow cell calls on some flights, but this was not the case in 2001. Messages from the hijacked planes may have been possible as they flew low over New York, but this does not explain how so many claimed connections were made from Flight 93, which was flying between 34,000 and 40,000 feet for most of its ill-fated journey (coming down in Pennsylvania without hitting its target). Hollywood films and TV movies have been based on the accounts apparently derived from those calls, yet Flight 93’s altitude brings their veracity into significant question. When confronted with Dewdney’s findings, the authorities changed their story, claiming that seatback handsets had been used instead, saying that perhaps only two of the calls had been made from cell phones – but even these should not have worked, and the availability of seatback facilities on Flight 93 has never been established.

Nevertheless, if the orthodox version of the hijackings is accepted, there are still many unexplained aspects. There are strict procedures in place to prevent easy entry to a cockpit, and crew are trained never to let assailants in, no matter what may be occurring elsewhere in the plane – so how were the terrorists allowed to pass through, so fast that no one had time to raise the alarm to air traffic control? Planes are fitted with emergency Mayday buttons that can be operated at a touch, yet not one pilot in the four planes managed to operate theirs. Interestingly, Flight 77’s ‘black box’ data recorder shows that the cockpit doors were never opened during its final voyage, creating yet another puzzle.

The fact that Flight 77’s data recorder was the only one allegedly recovered from the 9/11 crashes has raised suspicions too, as boxes are specifically designed to withstand almost anything and are nearly always found following disasters. Rescue workers have claimed that the others were retrieved, but the authorities continue to deny this. Likewise, reportedly only Flights 77 and 93 had their cockpit voice recorders recovered, as if to ensure rather conveniently that some kind of evidence was available to confirm that the planes which have had the most doubt cast on their presence or trajectory (see below) were actually there.

It has been suggested that, whether hijackers were onboard or not, the planes might have been forcibly taken over using remote control systems, perhaps negating the need for the cockpits to be accessed. This might make sense of some of the remarkably accurate flying skills seen on 9/11, when even staff from the flight schools that inadvertently trained some of the alleged terrorists have expressed the view that their pupils were barely able to fly light aircraft (a point particularly pertinent to the Pentagon impact. Defenders of the official story scoff at the idea of remote control, but given that the US now mounts many of its air assaults using ‘drone’ technology operated from far away, it is hard to see why this should not be considered. Curiously, just a few months before 9/11, the short-lived X-Files spin-off TV series The Lone Gunmen
featured an astoundingly prescient episode whereby a jet airliner is hijacked using remote control – and sent to plough into the World Trade Center. Thus the idea of commandeering an aeroplane by such means, and the fact that the WTC might be a target for jet liners being used as missiles (something US National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice claimed ‘no one could have imagined’) was already firmly lodged in the collective at the time, albeit expressed in fiction.

9/11 FOREKNOWLEDGE

Even outside the world of fiction, it is now widely acknowledged that strident warnings had in fact been given by intelligence services that such attacks were in the offing. Quiet awareness of this had plainly been disseminated among certain members of the business community, given that there was an astonishing 1,200 per cent increase in trading activities in the week before 9/11, with particular focus on American Airlines and United Airlines – the companies which would be most affected when their planes were violated just days later. Traders were essentially betting that their stocks would ‘go short’ when there seemed no open reason at the time for anyone to think this. Trading in other companies which would be affected seemed equally prophetic. Meanwhile, San Francisco’s mayor, Willie Brown, was sent mysterious warnings to ‘be cautious’ about flying to New York on 11 September; civil rights campaigner Dick Gregory was told by a ‘friend’ not to be in New York that day and new World Trade Center owner Larry Silverstein took out a major destruction insurance policy just weeks before the attacks.

Something in the ether was unmistakably making itself known, but all of this was somehow ignored by the incumbent George W Bush administration, leading many to wonder if 9/11 was ‘allowed’ to happen, as opposed to being directly organized by an inside cabal. However, claims by ex-CIA and FBI operatives of a consistent refusal to apprehend known extremists who were suspected of planning such attacks speak as much of an overt setting-up. A truck bomb that caused deaths and injuries at the WTC in 1993 may have been an earlier attempt at the same strategy – an event that ex-FBI whistleblower Emad Salem says was supposedly set up by the FBI as a sting operation against a jihadist terror group, but ended up inexplicably going ahead using real explosives instead of dummies. So, if the core arrangement of 9/11 did originate from covert Western intelligence services, or even if remote control was somehow applied to the doomed planes, it does not necessarily follow that al-Qaeda patsies were not also actively involved somewhere down the line. Perhaps they believed that they were acting alone, but were unwittingly played by distant forces, generating enough evidence to allow them to take the whole blame, in the same way that the Gunpowder Plot conspirators may have been set up in 1605.

ENGINEERED CONFUSION?

Whatever or whoever was piloting the planes, conspiracy believers point to the consistent failure of the authorities to track the rogue flights as another contentious area. For the first time in hijacking history, someone in each plane managed to switch off the transponders (automatic beacon signals), which we are told made the flights untraceable. Yet NORAD (North American Aerospace Defense Command) and other agencies entrusted with the vital task of protecting US airspace often boast of their ability to track any flying object, however small, using radar and other equipment. So why were transponders necessary to find the planes? In its defence, NORAD uses the bizarre ‘coincidence’ that a number of high-level security exercises were taking place that day (Operation Vigilant Guardian, among others) – ones that posited precisely the same scenario of hijacked planes hitting important buildings. The fact that this did actually occur the very same day undoubtedly caused enormous confusion (‘Is this real world, or exercise?’ says one hapless air
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traffic controller when informed of the hijackings, heard in released recordings). Such an unlikely coincidence has left many convinced that the exercises were an intentional part of the plot, the planners knowing how useful such operations would be in sowing uncertainty and offering good excuses for inaction. Even under the hypothesis that al-Qaeda was directly responsible for the attacks, their operatives should have been unaware of these arrangements, given their top secret status – unless they were tipped off by insiders.

Until 9/11, planes even suspected of being hijacked were routinely intercepted within minutes of abnormal behaviour or radio silence, but on this day no fighters were scrambled until far too late, and then inexplicably flew at speeds too slow to make any difference. The main defence for the relative inaction is that no one had time to find and intercept the planes before the damage could be done, but glaring inconsistencies in the testimony of high-level staff strongly indicate that this was not the case. The officially published air traffic control transcripts, for instance, have been verifiably re-edited in recent years, seemingly to obscure who knew what and when, while Vice-President Dick Cheney, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and General Richard Myers – key decision-makers in such crises – all say they were either not present or informed enough in time to act decisively. This is notably contradicted by testimony from White House Security Chief Richard Clarke and Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta, amongst other staff, who have firmly stated that their colleagues were present at least 30 minutes before they claim – an important chronological difference in such a tight sequence of developments.

Mineta even reports being present during an episode that morning which suggests that Cheney was deliberately allowing a rogue plane to approach the Pentagon. When an operative seemed to question the wisdom of this, asking whether the (unspecified) ‘orders’ still stood, Cheney snapped at him: ‘Of course the orders still stand – have you heard anything to the contrary?’ The Pentagon was struck soon after. Defenders of the official version say this is open to misinterpretation, but those who believe that Cheney was a main player in the 9/11 conspiracy hold this episode to be an important piece of evidence, implicating him in a ‘stand down’ scenario. The omission of this conversation from the final 9/11 Commission report suggests that the authorities may also have recognized its damning connotations.

As for who was really flying the planes at these moments, there are many unsolved issues surrounding the hijackers, with some of those named having issued statements to claim they are still alive today. Aside from the almost too obvious evidence supposedly left in cars (copies of the Koran, incriminating documents, plans, etc.), one of the criteria used to identify the terrorists was the miraculous survival of some of their passports, which somehow survived huge fireballs to flutter down to the ground almost intact, when everything else was pulverized to dust. Indeed, it is the nature of the destruction following the hijacks that has been the greatest point of focus in the conspiracy world.

THE PENTAGON

Before looking at the mysteries surrounding the destruction of the three towers which fell at the WTC, which generally receive the most scrutiny, it should be noted that one of the first anomalies to be identified by truthseekers was the markedly limited damage at the Pentagon. We are told that a 228-passenger Boeing 757 ploughed into one side of the US military’s headquarters, yet the visible hole in the early images of the impact site (before the roof collapsed) appears to be little more than 20 feet in diameter, with some cursory damage either side. With a total wingspan of around 125 feet, and a tail 44 feet high, how had a craft of that size entered such a small space without causing wider devastation? The photos show no debris around the entry point, and workmen’s cable spools, present when the plane came in, stand seemingly unaffected.
Windows on the floor just above the hole are unbroken. The questions arising from this remarkably clean strike from such a large object loaded with fuel have never been satisfactorily answered.

The authorities contend that the plane entered the building at such a speed (around 500mph) that most of the debris ended up inside the structure and was therefore not readily visible, adding that the wings either folded back as they struck, or somehow vaporized with the force. Putting aside the problematic physics of vaporizing wings, the fact is that several witnesses inside the Pentagon have remarked at how little of the plane seemed to have survived – few seats, bodies or suitcases were immediately apparent. The rare shots of debris that do purport to be from Flight 77 display objects such as engine foils which are too small to be from a large jet liner; some have identified them instead as being from an A3 Sky Warrior, an obscure US fighter plane. This and the oddly penetrative clean strike qualities of some of the restrained damage (as compared with the huge explosions seen at the twin towers) lead some to wonder what really did hit the Pentagon on 9/11.

A number of eyewitnesses on the day described seeing a much slighter projectile enter the building; a missile or a small plane rather than a 757. A large plane would appear to have come down low over the building just before the explosion, perhaps leading people to assume this was responsible, but many believe it was a decoy for the real perpetrator, which may have flown in beneath it. It might be assumed that CCTV would clear up any confusion, but the very few frames ever released from what must be a multiplicity of available images fail to show anything other than a vague blur that leaves the questions hanging. If it was Flight 77 that hit the Pentagon, even more puzzles arise. How, for instance, did the hijacker Hani Hanjour manage to execute what has been described by pilots as one of the greatest feats in aviation history, when his own flight trainers claim he could barely handle a tiny Cessna? If the official claim is correct, the Boeing 757 dropped several thousand feet in less than two minutes without stalling or breaking up in mid-air, performed a perfect last-minute tight turn, skimmed roadside light poles without being diverted sideways, and handily struck the one part of the Pentagon that was under renovation at the time and comparatively unstaffed. This can be seen as oddly serendipitous when heading straight into the natural bullseye of the structure would appear to have been so much easier and potentially more destructive.
A THEORY FOR FLIGHT 93

A question thrown up by the conspiracy view is that if it were not Flight 77 that hit the Pentagon on 9/11, then what happened to that plane and its passengers? There have been a number of ideas proposed to account for this. There are a number of plane-switching theories in circulation (some of which incorporate more extravagant claims that what looked like planes were, in fact, projected holograms) which posit the notion that the actual hijacked flights – if they ever were really hijacked and didn’t just quietly divert somewhere – may have secretly landed and disembarked, their occupants perhaps never knowing what was really going on. Some say the abnormally low passenger numbers on all the flights (enabled their collective occupants to be packed onto Flight 93, which was then sent off to be discreetly shot down over Pennsylvania. There are certainly many reports of aerial explosions just before the plane came down, and the miles-wide debris field and anomalous sooty smudge we are told was Flight 93’s main impact site (with almost no plane parts found) suggest that much of it may well have been destroyed in the air.

The US military deny shooting down Flight 93, even as a protective measure, and adhere to the heroic tale of the passengers storming the cockpit and bringing the plane down before it could reach its target (‘Let’s roll’), but, as we have seen, the cell phone calls that are supposed to have given us much of this version of events may not be wholly reliable.

THE WORLD TRADE CENTER

Of all the memories seared into people’s minds, the images of the World Trade Center’s famous twin towers exploding with aeroplane impacts or crumbling down into dust are without doubt the most powerful of 9/11. The psychological shock generated by these globally televised nightmares is held by most conspiracy theorists to have been one of the key tools in the conditioning of the human race to submit to the mandate of the New World Order. Yet the same images are also held to contain some of the most important pieces of evidence to show that 9/11 was deliberately – and literally – engineered.

The bottom line of the official post-mortem on the WTC is that crucial fireproofing is said to have been removed from the steel girders by the impacts of the aeroplanes, allowing the heat of the subsequent infernos to weaken the structures to the point of eventual collapse, falling floor by floor within seconds. On immediate inspection, this would seem to be a reasonable hypothesis from what we see in the footage. However, an unusually large number of professional architects, engineers and physicists, far outside the usual conspiracy boundaries, have challenged this verdict.

This is not the place for a prolonged scientific analysis (many other sources provide the evidence in detail), but the main assertion of the truth movement is that the fire and damage could not by themselves have been enough to bring the buildings down so quickly or so totally. Until 9/11, no steel-framed modern building had ever collapsed due to fire, yet on this one day it occurred an incredible three times.

The photos and videos of Flights 11 and 175 hitting their respective towers in orange balls of flame show clearly that much of the aviation fuel, held to be one of the biggest contributors to the ‘infernos’, in fact ignited into the air on impact, burning out very quickly to leave a thick black smouldering suggestive of relatively low temperature fires. Steel is generally accepted to lose its strength at a heat of around 2,800°F, but even the official reports suggest that the highest temperatures which could have been reached in the towers could not have exceeded 1,800°F. The removal of the fireproofing is usually cited as the problem here, but this is only
a theory, with no available evidence to prove it beyond a few inconclusive tests which crudely involved firing bullets at metal plates on plywood boxes. Even allowing for the fireproofing arguments, critics believe that the towers should never have come down in the way we see, at virtually freefall speed without unevenness or hesitation, if a process of natural collapse was at work.

How else, then, might the WTC have come down? Most challengers assert that explosives of some kind must have been used, pre-planted in the buildings in the weeks before 9/11 to ensure that the towers fell with maximum spectacle. If so, this would suggest the activity of agents with greater access to the buildings than Middle Eastern terrorists would have been able to achieve. It goes without saying that defenders of the official version robustly attack this stance, but the evidence is hard to dismiss completely when closely examined.

Several observable aspects are usually proffered as proof of explosives. In the footage of each tower falling, filmed from multiple angles, small ‘squib’-like blasts can be seen pushing out in places up and down the height of the structures, sometimes far below the violent collapses occurring at the top. Often rejected as being merely the result of air-pressure waves passing through the buildings and pushing out office debris, it has been convincingly countered that such waves would not reach as far down as the levels at which these squibs are seen, given that the top floors are freefalling as fast as anything can travel for much of their descent; the speed of the falls is one of the main reasons why a process of natural collapse is so widely challenged. Demolition experts have remarked on the near-identical resemblance of the 9/11 squibs to those created by demolition charges used to bring down old structures.

Other evidence that explosives may have been placed in the towers is provided by firemen, rescue workers and WTC staff, many of whom described unexplained blasts going off inside even while the structures were still standing. The first of these appears to have taken place in the basement 30 seconds or so before the first plane hit, according to janitorial staff in the North Tower. Testimonies supporting internal explosions are numerous and convincing, yet the official 9/11 Commission report managed to conclude that no significant accounts were recorded. Firemen have claimed since that they have been ordered to keep quiet or risk redundancy, while interviews with them specifically reporting explosions in the towers, widely televised at the time, have been almost universally edited out of later programmes or repeats. Luckily, the internet preserves many of the original accounts. One telling description, backed up by many other reports, was given by WTC office worker Teresa Veliz, recounting her experiences while being evacuated from the North Tower:

There were explosions going off everywhere. I was convinced that there were bombs planted all over the place and someone was sitting at a control panel pushing detonator buttons … There was another explosion. And another. I didn’t know where to run.

Perhaps the most obvious explosions of all can be seen in the footage of the main ‘collapses’; many people have observed that the tops of the towers, rather than simply falling down, in truth effectively explode outwards, spreading debris so far that rubble and human remains were being found several blocks away even years later. The fact that one tower is seen to topple ominously towards the street at one point, before mysteriously correcting itself, suggests that material below it is simply dissolving into the air, rather than collapsing as such. Architect Richard Gage has demonstrated that one of the key principles of the official story – that the descending tops of the towers acted as ‘piledrivers’ crushing the floors below them – cannot be correct, as the videos clearly show that everything at the top effectively disintegrates as it falls, with nothing left to provide such a downward force.
Some of those who claim the presence of explosives point to the discovery of what would appear to be micro-particles of ‘nanothermate’ in dust sampled from the WTC remains, as researched by physicists such as Dr Neils Harrit and Professor Steven Jones. Critics have said the particles are nothing but paint, but this was examined and ruled out in the early stages of analysis. Nano-thermate, on the other hand, can be used to generate rapid explosions and high-temperature fires, and is commonly deployed in the demolition industry. One tell-tale sign for it might be melted steel – precisely what can be seen in footage taken shortly before the fall of one of the towers, running down in sparkling torrents from a corner of the building. Arguing about damaged fireproofing and temperatures which might or might not have weakened steel slightly is one thing; accepting that those temperatures went on to reach extreme heights which actually melted it is a far greater stretch. But molten steel was verifiably found by clearance workers in large amounts even weeks after the attacks, and aerial thermoimaging revealed tremendous temperatures that could not possibly have resulted from a simple collapse.

Some theorists reject even the nano-thermate arguments, with researchers such as Dr Judy Wood believing that some kind of experimental high-energy technology may have been used, while others point to micro-nuclear devices as a possibility. Certainly, not much was left from a supposed structural failure. Recovery workers remarked on the almost inexplicable absence of telephones, filing cabinets or any other solid objects which might reasonably have been expected to be found in the debris. Instead, all of it seemed to have turned to a fine white toxic dust (which many New Yorkers breathed in, to their long-term detriment), powerfully suggesting something at work capable of generating incredibly high temperatures.

Whichever way it is looked at, the evidence that there was more to the fall of the twin towers than met the eye is hard to ignore. Office workers in the WTC buildings reported unexplained mini-vans off-loading equipment, and nameless maintenance staff being ushered into the towers in the weeks before 9/11. The weekend before the main event, there were reports of an unusual security ‘power-down’, which saw cameras being switched off and electricity cuts instigated across parts of the buildings while some kind of unspecified ‘cabling upgrade’ was performed. Was this a mask for a more sinister kind of upgrade? If so, who was carrying it out? Presuming that al-Qaeda was not so organized as to be laying demolition charges in one of the most important complexes in the world without raising suspicion, the conspiracy view has it that paid operatives of whoever was really behind 9/11 were more probably at work – and had all the security clearances they needed. Some have pointed to the fact that the firm Securicom, which was in charge of the WTC’s security, was co-owned by Marvin Bush – brother of President George W Bush – making for another less-than-reassuring coincidence.

As for what the President himself knew, although some truthseekers have accused him of being one of the perpetrators of 9/11, others believe he was not a major player and may not have been told what was really going on until later that day. One theory has it that Bush was forced to go along with an inside-job plot by shadow authorities, with an implicit threat to his safety if he didn’t. As the President had fled into the skies aboard the aeroplane Air Force One shortly after the attacks, he would have been particularly vulnerable to a staged accident or another ‘terrorist’ strike, as a message using code words that al-Qaeda shouldn’t have known (‘Ángel is next’ – Angel being Air Force One, we now know), allegedly received by the US authorities that day, would suggest.

Bush has certainly not been straight about his own experiences on 9/11, and seems to have tried to cover some tracks. This is evidenced by his later claims that he had actually watched TV footage of the first plane crash before he famously went into a schoolroom to read a story to children in the face of a national crisis.
But footage of that first impact was not available for broadcast on 11 September itself (the video still trapped in a camera owned by the French documentary-makers Jules and Gédéon Naudet, who were filming NYC firemen that day), so how it was that Bush saw it, or why he simply said that he saw it, is yet another of the many mysteries of 9/11.

WTC 7

Of all the enigmas, conspiracy theorists usually point to the fall of Building Seven (WTC 7) at the World Trade Center complex as being the smoking gun which exposes what they see as the obvious contrivance of all the events. WTC 7 was set back some way from the twin towers, with Buildings Five and Six in between. At around 5.20pm, after several hours of mayhem following the loss of the twin towers, it hardly registered with the public when WTC 7 gracefully collapsed into its own footprint to become just another casualty of the day. As everyone had already been successfully evacuated, what did it matter? Yet the peculiarity of the fall of WTC 7 is that it was never struck by an aeroplane, and exhibited only a few relatively modest fires throughout the day.

The impacts and more extensive blazes at the twin towers could be seen as reasonable justification for their demise if not thought about too much, but with no such caveats available for WTC 7, as time went by, people began to ponder its sudden collapse. Soon intense speculation grew that this building had also been demolished using explosives – particularly suggested by its swift (again, in freefall for at least two seconds) and regimented descent, as remarked on by several demolition experts. If the twin towers were designed to go with maximum spectacle, this block was seemingly wired to descend without calling attention to itself. But if so, why go to the trouble of bringing it down at all?

It has been considered that the events of 9/11 may have been coordinated from WTC 7 (some have suggested it as the source of the remote control transmissions), and that the offices within it might have contained incriminating evidence that demanded removal lest restoration workers make awkward discoveries later. Others may also have exploited the opportunities the day provided (which would still imply detailed foreknowledge of the attacks), as it was of great convenience to the accused that a large number of important documents concerning the unfolding Enron company corruption scandal were being stored in the building at the time – all of them lost. A number of other crucial files and precious commodities were reportedly removed from WTC 7 by happy chance in the days before 9/11, but not these ones.

The authorities decry all this, stating that far more fire, spread by falling debris from the neighbouring towers, was present in the building than was visible, and that this contributed to a ‘new phenomenon’ whereby ‘global collapse’ was initiated by heat expanding the steel beams. Yet it took seven years for the official report of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to come up with this supposedly scientific explanation, and its details are disturbingly flawed. Without plane impacts, no fire-proofing could have been removed, thus taking away much of the rationale which could at least be put forward for the twin towers’ collapse. The report also fails to take into account the vital observation that concrete expands at much the same rate as steel, thus flawing its own theory that the heated expansion of the beams caused them to break away from the concrete, snapping the shear studs holding the building together. Perhaps most damningly, assessments of the fires which the NIST says caused the high temperatures in WTC 7 were based not on the unexceptional blazes visible in images or reported by eyewitnesses, but on presumed fires of much greater intensity factored into computer models. In other words, the models were programmed to create virtual fires which might, in the most extreme conditions, have brought such a structure down, but these did not reflect the ones
that were there in reality. Researchers of 9/11 such as David Ray Griffin have severely challenged the NIST’s findings, effectively accusing it of committing scientific fraud.5

If simple fire did bring down a 47-storey steel-frame building – one that contained a number of important offices for the CIA, the US Secret Service, the mayor’s Emergency Command Center, the US Department of Defense and the Internal Revenue Service – then it is a mystery how such a poor design could ever have been accepted, and even more of a mystery as to why many other similarly constructed buildings have not been abandoned in cities across the world as a result. Oddly, no fire in a modern tower block since – and there have been several, often burning far longer – has ever resulted in a total collapse.

The accusations that WTC 7 was demolished are supported by the fact that there seemed to be a wide expectation of its fall even several hours before it came down – at a time when no one should have considered that such a thing was possible. If it supposedly took the NIST seven years to work out why such an unprecedented event happened at all, why would anyone have remotely anticipated it on the day? Yet officials were giving out warnings about WTC 7’s dangerous state even by lunchtime, and fire crews were making very specific statements that ‘this building is coming down’ shortly before it did. BBC News even managed to report that the block had come down 23 minutes before its actual fall, making it likely that a prepared media statement had already been issued – but a little too early. These clues point strikingly to a scheduled taking-down of WTC 7.

WTC owner Larry Silverstein’s infamous remark about Building Seven in a subsequent TV interview, that the authorities had decided to ‘pull it’, appeared to speak of a direct demolition (‘pull it’ being a recognized demolition term), but this was later somewhat unconvincingly rescinded to explain that he was just referring to ‘pulling’ the firemen out. Perhaps there had been a brief consideration of admitting to demolishing WTC 7, albeit on safety grounds, before someone realized that this would have thrown an interesting light on the explosives claims concerning the twin towers.

Once again, reports of blasts taking place within WTC 7 in the hours before its collapse are rife, with especially strong testimony coming from city housing authority worker Barry Jennings, who claimed that he and another colleague were present in the building early in the day when a huge explosion took out the stairs below them. Official channels have tried to imply this was due to the fall of one of the twin towers nearby, but Jennings stated it happened well before this; the timing of TV news interviews with him, filmed shortly after he escaped from the building, support his chronology. Indeed, Jennings said that when they arrived for duty at the Emergency Management Command Center in WTC 7, at around 9.03am, it was already deserted – yet official records say the office was not abandoned until 9.30am, providing yet more contradictory oddness.

Barry Jennings might have had more to say, and was beginning to become vocal with his claims that bombs were present within WTC 7, but he died from unknown causes in 2008 aged only 53 – just as the NIST report negating his claims was issued. As ever, there have been a number of other mysterious deaths associated with important 9/11 eyewitnesses, taking us back into familiar conspiracy territory.6
WHO WERE THE PERPETRATORS?

It can be seen even from this very brief précis of the issues surrounding 9/11 that there are many important questions still to be answered by official channels. Of all the most widely subscribed-to conspiracy theories, 9/11 as an inside job is incontestably the one supported by the most observable anomalies. This does not mean that every proposed alternative permutation is true, but then most of the points promoted to support the official story are equally uncertain. What is clear is that the full picture of what really happened on 11 September 2001 has not yet been told. The ‘omissions and distortions’ (as Griffin accurately describes them) present in the final 9/11 Commission report published in 2004 make it, in most truthseekers’ eyes, about as reliable as the much-derided Warren Commission verdict on JFK. The fact that the 9/11 Commission was headed by people with close ties to the Bush administration, and that it avoided even mentioning glaring issues such as the fall of WTC 7 in its final analysis, virtually guaranteed conspiracy speculation from the start.

But if al-Qaeda did not act alone – or acted at all – then who did help stage 9/11 so successfully? We have already seen that, rightly or wrongly, many fingers have been pointed at Vice-President Dick Cheney. He and several other prominent ‘neoconservatives’ on the US political right, including Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz, were all names associated with the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), a think tank that produced a telling document almost exactly one year before 9/11. Entitled ‘Rebuilding America’s Defenses’, it was a blueprint for a more powerful and imperialistic USA, setting out the conditions that would need to be created to enable the country to maintain its status as a leading world power. Its now most famous line stands out:

The process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalysing event – like a new Pearl Harbor.

Just a year later, many of those who compiled the PNAC document were running the country, following the controversial election which saw George W Bush only just winning after bitter rows over voting irregularities, and the US had its ‘new Pearl Harbor’, a term specifically referred to by the President in the wake of 9/11. Given many of the conspiracy accusations directed towards the 1941 Pearl Harbor incident, maybe this was not such a wise allusion to make. But it might have been an accurate one.

From the enormous focus often placed on the PNAC document, observers might presume that most challengers of the official story hold neoconservatives to have been entirely responsible for 9/11, but some think this may in itself may be a sideshow. Perhaps inevitably, one pool of doubters implicates Israel as being another major player, accused of aiding the plot to help generate the very backlash against the Muslim world that followed. Dealing with supposedly unbiased claims of ‘dancing Israelis’ seen celebrating the burning towers, and assertions that Mossad agents were operating in and around the events of 9/11, is a difficult balancing act for conspiracy theorists, risking giving fuel to the knee-jerk reactionism of anti-Zionist camps. The fact that some have strayed into this territory at all has allowed journalists such as David Aaronovitch to slam the entire truth movement as being an anti-Semitic exercise, but this is both untrue and unfair. In the absence of definitive answers, all possibilities are bound to be considered. Overall, however, no matter which faction may have played a part in what, 9/11 is primarily seen as the keystone in the New World Order plans for global domination.
Regardless of whoever did instigate the attacks, or at the very least allow them, what is beyond question is that 9/11 brought with it many useful tools for those who believe in rule by force, and without a doubt the neocons got their ‘catalysing event’ to bring about the desired transformation of America. The ‘War on Terror’, launched in response to the attacks, snatched away many essential freedoms previously taken for granted in the West, and hugely accelerated the rise of the surveillance society, all in the name of our protection. The introduction of worryingly flexible anti-terror legislation across the world, including the US Bill of Rights-violating ‘Patriot Act’, opened dangerous windows for those who might develop totalitarian tendencies. The hunt for Osama bin Laden, meanwhile, named as the primary culprit even before any loosely assembled evidence was presented, provided the mandate to invade Afghanistan and carry out all that followed, while that same mandate was extended far beyond its brief to encompass action in Iraq and other nations, as we have seen.

The captured Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and the other claimed ‘masterminds’ behind 9/11 may have been involved, but there is a pervading feeling that copious waterboarding, combined with plea-bargaining and a desire for martyrdom, might have led them to say anything. As for bin Laden, whether the man finally shot down in his underwear in a Pakistani residential compound in 2011 was really him is almost irrelevant. Many doubt it. Numerous reports suggest he had actually died some years before, either from natural causes or quiet assassination, and much cynicism has been expressed over the very poor-quality video and audio recordings purporting to come from him in the decade after 9/11. In a 2007 television interview, Benazir Bhutto, leader of the Pakistani People’s Party, appeared to allude directly to the fact that bin Laden was already dead. Sceptics claim that she simply ‘misspoke’ and was referring to someone else, but just weeks later she was dead herself, killed by a suicide bomber. 7

Any useful information that interrogating bin Laden might have gleaned for the world was thrown away by his apparently senseless killing, and conclusive proof that the man executed in Pakistan was bin Laden was apparently dispensed with when the US Navy compassionately threw his body into the sea on the way home. Curiously, some 22 Navy SEALs from the same unit that assassinated the al-Qaeda leader never made it home themselves, dying when their helicopter was shot down less than three months later.

The over riding opinion is that the global elite were simply looking for a sufficient opportunity to return back to the Middle East and finish of Saddam Hussein who had survived the first Gulf War in 1991. Control and influence of the Middle East is a key aspect of the global elite agenda. As mentioned in part 1 the venetian black nobility were significantly involved in helping to support the Christian Crusaders in the Middle East and the republic of Venice at that time was a strategic position for the commerce flow between the West and the East.

The cycle of the rise of oppressive regimes in the Middle East that were previously supported and funded by the West is an all too familiar story and we know that the Global elite will go to any measures to ensure that their balance and control games of boom and bust in regards to the global economy are not interfered with by Arab leaders who begin operating out of the zone that they were originally given.
2. THE DAVID KELLY CONSPIRACY

Those implicated in the 2003 demise of Dr David Kelly include the Iraqi secret service, the French secret service, and not least, Kelly himself. Whatever the truth about his death, he was as much a victim of the war in Iraq as any soldier or civilian killed on the battlefield.

The confusion, briefings and counter-briefings that surrounded the days running up to the invasion of Iraq in 2002 and early 2003 created a nervousness and state of tension which caused all parties involved to act in unpredictable ways. During this time the UK government released two dossiers which set out evidence for its belief that Saddam Hussein’s regime posed a real threat to world security: the September 2002 document which stated that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) and that, crucially, these weapons could be deployed within 45 minutes; and a second, in February 2003, which detailed secret arms networks. A month later the UK had deployed troops in Iraq to secure Hussein’s downfall in spite of vocal protests from the government’s own MPs and many other groups.

On 20 May 2003, BBC Radio’s flagship current affairs programme Today featured a report from its defence correspondent, Andrew Gilligan, in which he revealed that a senior source at the Ministry of Defence accused a member of the Downing Street press office (later identified as Alastair Campbell) of having “sexed up” the September dossier by inserting the information about the 45-minute claim. The BBC’s Newsnight correspondent Susan Watts also reported that a “senior official” believed the intelligence services came under heavy political pressure to include the 45-minute claim in its dossier.

The government, enraged by the leak, demanded that Gilligan reveal his source, and weeks of accusation and counter-accusation began, with the BBC defending Gilligan and the anonymity of his source and the government’s press machine attempting to discredit the story. Richard Sambrook, the BBC’s director of news, described the attacks as “an unprecedented level of pressure from Downing Street”. Both Gilligan and Campbell were asked to appear before the Foreign Affairs Select Committee (FAC) to explain their actions.

The media frenzy must have worried Dr Kelly, who wrote to his line manager at the ministry admitting he had met Gilligan on May 22 and could have been one of the sources for his story. After another ten days of increasing pressure to reveal the identity of the source, the MoD then identified Kelly indirectly by pointedly refusing to deny he was involved when a list of possible sources was read out at a press conference, although Kelly himself was not informed his name was being released to the press.

On 15 and 16 July Dr Kelly sat in front of the FAC facing allegations that it was he who had been the source of the Gilligan story. He appeared deeply uncomfortable at being the centre of so much public attention, and
spoke so softly that air-conditioning fans had to be turned off so the committee members could hear what he was saying. Despite much probing, Kelly maintained that, although he had spoken to Gilligan, he had not been his primary source. Kelly said the controversial point about the 45-minute deployment claim being added by Alastair Campbell could not have come from him as he had no part in the actual compilation of the dossier, but had merely presented information for possible inclusion, and thus had not been not party to the decisions by the Joint Intelligence Committee, who had produced the document.

At the end of the two days the FAC had concluded that Kelly was “most unlikely” to be the source of the “sexed-up” claim. Kelly, too, had relaxed, and was laughing and joking with the committee members.

The following day, 17 July, he left his home at 3 p.m., telling his wife he was going for his usual afternoon walk. He did not return. At 11.45 p.m. his family contacted the police and reported him missing. He was found at 9.20 the next morning by two search volunteers in woods on Harrowdown Hill, about a mile and a half (2.5km) from his home. The police did not confirm the body as his until 19 July, and then stated that they believed he had committed suicide by taking the powerful painkiller co-proxamol and then cutting his left wrist. A day later, after talking to his family, the BBC issued a statement naming Dr Kelly as the source of both Gilligan’s and Watts’s reports.

In the light of the previous train of events and unusual vigour with which the government had pursued Andrew Gilligan and his source, it seems understandable that an independent inquiry into the whole affair was announced as the best way of uncovering the truth surrounding Kelly’s death and the lingering accusation that Downing Street had tampered with intelligence reports. Lord Hutton was appointed to head the inquiry, and his inquiry heard several months’ worth of evidence from experts, Kelly’s friends and family, and members of the Cabinet, including Tony Blair. Five months later, after much hype and speculation, Hutton concluded that the government had behaved properly, that the BBC should be heavily criticized for its actions, and that Kelly’s death had been by his own hand.

There, it was presumably hoped, is where the whole unfortunate episode would end, but there were some who pointed to inconsistencies in the official version of events. Many people who had been close to Kelly, professionally and personally, did not believe the suicide story, and others believed his death bore all the hallmarks of a planned assassination.

The first to speak publicly of their misgivings were the two paramedics who had attended the scene of Dr Kelly’s death, Paul Bartlett and Vanessa Hunt. Interviewed by Anthony Barnett in the Observer in December 2004, they said they found little or no evidence of the major bleeding that would have taken place if the severed wrist artery had been the cause of death, as stated by the pathologist. “When somebody cuts an artery, whether accidentally or intentionally, the blood pumps everywhere. I just think it is incredibly unlikely that he died from the wrist wound we saw,” said Hunt.

The paramedics’ views were soon supported by a group of doctors who wrote to the Guardian newspaper, saying they too were deeply unhappy with the official cause of death. The severed ulnar artery, they argued, was too thin to have allowed a major haemorrhage, especially as, out in the open, the blood vessel would have been closed off by surrounding muscle long before Kelly bled to death. David Halpin, a trauma surgeon and one of the authors of the letter, maintains that even the deepest cut in the region of the ulnar artery would not have caused death: “. . . a completely transected artery retracts immediately and thus stops bleeding, even at a relatively high blood pressure”. The artery itself lies deep in the wrist on the little finger
side of the hand, under other nerves and tendons, and cannot be accidentally slashed like the more superficial radial artery. Following the suicide theory would mean believing Kelly had managed to cut down deep into his own wrist to locate and cut the ulnar artery... with a blunt pruning knife.

The physicians also questioned the toxicology results, pointing out that the concentration of the drug co-proxamol in Kelly’s blood was not high enough to have killed him, being only a third of a fatal dose. Kelly’s stomach was virtually empty on examination, containing the equivalent of a fifth of one tablet, suggesting that, if he did swallow the cited 29 tablets, he had regurgitated most of them before the drug could be absorbed.

As suicides go, this was a pretty amateur affair, considering Kelly must have had an intimate knowledge of human biology in his work as a microbiologist and authority on biological weapons. He was the only person to die using these methods in the whole of 2003. Co-proxamol is often used in suicide attempts but most commonly in conjunction with alcohol. Severing the ulnar artery does not automatically lead to a fatal loss of blood. Kelly is known to have had an aversion to swallowing tablets. If his suicide was premeditated, why bring a small blunt concave-edged knife to do a tricky slicing job, along with the tablets? And if it was a spontaneous act, why did he bring 30 painkilling tablets with him on his daily constitutional?

As if there were not enough mystery surrounding the suicide, it became apparent during the Hutton Inquiry that there were other major discrepancies. The volunteers who found Dr Kelly’s body said he was sitting or slumped against a tree when they discovered him, but in his evidence DC Coe of the Thames Valley Police stated Kelly was flat on his back and away from the tree. The volunteers swore that the knife, an open bottle of Evian and a watch were not present when they were there, but these items had appeared next to the body by the time DC Coe left the scene.

As any viewer of TV crime will know, most solved cases are so because of the work of the forensics people, but in this case there was surprisingly little forensic evidence forthcoming. For instance, whose fingerprints were on the knife? Was any foreign DNA detected in the blood samples? Was the watch found beside Dr Kelly broken or intact, and, if broken, what time did it show? What were the last calls made to him on his mobile phone? None of these questions was asked during the inquiry, and no answers were volunteered.

In March 2005, Lib Dem MP Norman Baker resigned his front bench job expressly to investigate the circumstances surrounding Kelly’s death. A year later he published his findings on his own website and contributed to a BBC TV programme, Conspiracy Files, which focused on Kelly. Baker voiced his serious doubts over the conclusion of the inquiry, not only on the basis of the medical evidence and the suicide verdict but also concerning the “irregularities in the actions of the coroner”, the choice of pathologist, the
actions of the police at the beginning of the investigation, and why Lord Hutton, in particular, was picked to head the inquiry.

Baker questions why the Lord Chancellor, Lord Falconer, decided the inquiry should not be held under the usual rules, so that witnesses could not be subpoenaed, nor did they have to give evidence under oath, making the whole procedure less rigorous than a standard coroner inquest. Even more bizarrely, the Oxfordshire coroner, Nicholas Gardiner, pre-empted the findings of the inquiry by issuing a full death certificate on 18 August, while Hutton’s investigation was still in its early stages, in spite of rules stating that at most only an interim certificate should be issued while an inquest is in adjournment. Baker doesn’t think much of the appointed pathologist either, describing the medical evidence presented by him to the inquiry as “incomplete, inconsistent and inadequate”.

As for the conduct of the police force, the most puzzling fact that has come to light has been that Operation Mason, as it was named, began at 2.30 p.m. on 17 July, about nine hours before Dr Kelly’s family reported him missing and half an hour before he left his home to go for his walk. Quite how the police knew what was going to happen, they are not willing to divulge. Nor are they willing to say why they felt it necessary to erect a 45-foot-high (15.7m) antenna in the Kellys’ garden, or turn Mrs Kelly out of her home in the middle of the night for some considerable time while a search dog was put through the house. According to Baker, one of the most senior police officers in the country, on being consulted, was at a loss as to why either action would have been required.

Norman Baker reserves particular scepticism for the choice of Lord Hutton to head the inquiry and the part Tony Blair played in the decision. In spite of being on a jet somewhere between Washington and Tokyo when formally advised of Dr Kelly’s death, Blair decided on an inquiry and appointed Lord Brian Hutton as its head even before the journey was over. Parliament, perhaps rather conveniently, had adjourned for the summer, and the appointment was made on the advice of Lord Falconer and, Baker suspects, Peter Mandelson. The man they chose had no experience of chairing any other public inquiry but, during his distinguished career, plenty of history of upholding the views of the government of the day.

It was highly unlikely, therefore, that the Hutton Inquiry was going to answer such sticky questions as why a highly respected scientist chose to take his life in quite such an unconventional way, days after being embroiled in a political scandal that was potentially deeply damaging to the government. Kelly had been deeply upset by being thrust into the media spotlight and, no doubt, bewildered by the the MoD’s decision to leak his name to the press. However, he was also cheerful and joky with members of the Foreign Affairs Select Committee the day before his death, and had made plans to fly to Iraq the following week; one of his daughters was looking forward to her impending wedding day. Most importantly, perhaps, he was a practising member of the Baha’i faith, which forbids the act of suicide.

An email to a New York journalist, Judith Miller, on the morning of 17 July suggests that Dr Kelly realized that there was something worrying going on behind the sound bites and political posturing:

David, I heard from another member of your fan club that things went well for you today. Hope it’s true.

(Original message sent by Judith Miller, 16 July 00.30)

I will wait until the end of the week before judging – many dark actors playing games. Thanks for your support. I appreciate your friendship at this time.
Conspiracy theorists believe Kelly had been labelled a loose cannon and as such a threat to the stability of the government. If Britain lost Blair, Europe lost an important ally in its struggle for greater political and economic union. Michael Shrimpton, a barrister and intelligence services expert who also acted for the Kelly Investigation Group, claimed he was told Kelly had been assassinated. Speaking in an interview with Canadian broadcaster Alex Jones in 2004 he said: “Within 48 hours of the murder I was contacted by a British Intelligence officer who told me [Kelly had] been murdered... now that source told me he’d done some digging and discovered that, he didn’t name names, but he discovered that it had been known in Whitehall prior to 17 July that David Kelly was going to be taken down.”

Shrimpton went on to explain that clever governments get the secret services of their allies to do their dirty work for them, and that Kelly’s death bore all the hallmarks of a job by the DGSE (Direction Generale de la Securite Exterieure), the French equivalent of MI6. The tablets found in Kelly’s pocket would have been a cover; he would actually have been killed by a lethal injection of dextropropoxythene, the active ingredient of co-proxamol, and the muscle relaxant succinylcholine, “a favourite method” of murder by intelligence services, with his wrist clumsily cut to disguise the needle’s puncture mark. Shrimpton said the assassination team would most likely have been recruited from Iraqis living in Damascus, to disguise French involvement, and then its members killed after the event to ensure absolute secrecy.

There are others, such as UN weapons inspector Richard Spertzel, who claim it was the Iraqis themselves who killed Dr Kelly in revenge for all the trouble he’d brought upon Saddam Hussein’s regime through his work. This seems far-fetched. Although Kelly had said he supported the invasion of Iraq, he had not been the
author of the 45-minute claim which had precipitated military action. And he had only recently inspected trailers, claimed to be bio-weapons laboratories, and declared them to be no such thing. More hard-line conspiracy theorists maintain Dr Kelly’s death was yet another in a suspicious pattern of untimely deaths among the world’s leading microbiologists, who are being systematically bumped off for reasons that remain unclear.

It is clear that Kelly’s death was not properly investigated. The glaring omissions and conflicts of evidence; the choice of an inquiry, headed by a judge rather than a coroner, with terms drawn up at the outset by the government; the continuing unease of expert doctors and political figures, willing to risk their own reputations to publicize their misgivings – all this suggests there is far more to this event than the government is willing to be open about. Given that the government then would have much to lose should it be revealed that Kelly’s death was unlawful, it is likely to be a long time before all the factors surrounding this case reach the light of day.

It would seem that there was a non-reversible quest for the global elites plan to result in the occupation of the Middle East by the West both in Afghanistan and Iraq and serve their own agenda as they have been doing since the time of the Crusades.