



Liberty Tree

Vol. 19, No. 12 — December 2017



I left off last month with the scenario of United Flight 93 being shot out of the sky by Air Force fighter jets, despite the best efforts of the hub conspirators¹ to keep the military otherwise occupied and ineffective. The most immediate effect of this turn of events is that it left World Trade Center Building 7 without a plane to crash into it. Apparently not wanting to waste all the preparations already taken to demolish the building after the planned crash, Larry Silverstein — who in July 2001 entered into a 99-year lease of the World Trade Center complex with the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey — admitted in a news interview that it was decided to “pull it” anyway.² In the final tally, four planes were hijacked, and four buildings were destroyed — three of which were totally demolished, with the Pentagon being only partially destroyed. In this respect then, the most observable portion of the hub conspiracy was a huge success. But that isn’t the end of the whole conspiracy, not by a long shot.

In the big picture, there is more to be considered. Since an integral part of the hub conspiracy is to pin the blame for the whole tragedy on the hijacking spoke, other spokes must be activated to ensure that official investigations as well as public attention are directed along the pre-planned paths. And of course it’s a huge advantage in the planning process when you already know what’s going to happen. This simply can’t be overstated; because in the public mind, extreme emergencies such as the 9/11 attacks require quick reactions to deal with the disaster. And in such quick reactions, mistakes in judgment are often made, but are more

readily excused and forgiven. After all, who could have been prepared for such an unexpected event as hijacked planes being flown into skyscrapers? Why, the hub conspirators, of course!

In the same manner that foreknowledge allows them to interfere with air traffic controllers through mock hijack scenarios, and to minimize military response through war game exercises in other parts of the country, it also allows the hub to pre-position assets of their own choosing into positions of authority that will be called into action on the fateful day. And this can be done in the weeks and months leading up the event, so it goes completely unnoticed. You don’t need to push somebody in after the fact to run the show, you just promote or transfer them to the necessary post sometime prior. Conversely, people who the hub wants removed from the mix can likewise be transferred out of the way before they become involved,³ without raising suspicions of foul play.

Insuring and ensuring losses

When it comes to pre-positioning assets, let’s consider the presence of Larry Silverstein in this light. As mentioned above, Mr. Silverstein signed a 99-year lease just six weeks or so before the buildings were hit. Now, a month and a half isn’t much time to plan and prepare for the demolition of three huge skyscrapers, so it seems unlikely that he conceived this plan himself. And yet the buildings were under his control for those last critical weeks of preparation time. And to many people, this fact alone makes him the virtual poster boy of the conspiracy. One way to look

Tying
Up
Loose
Ends

Don't
Call **911**
Part III

(Continued on page 2)

1. My theory of the 9/11 attacks is that it was a wheel conspiracy, defined as: “A conspiracy in which a single member or group (the ‘hub’) separately agrees with two or more other members or groups (the ‘spokes’).” *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 8th Edition (2004).
2. It’s often noted that this terminology has connotations of controlled demolitions, and indeed seems to make little sense in the context of a building that purportedly fell down of its own accord.
3. On a more sinister note, they might also be purposely put directly in the path of the disaster, as will be discussed a little later.

By Dick Greb

at the whole affair is that it was just an unfortunate coincidence that almost before the ink had time to dry on a century-long lease, approximately 10 million square feet of premium office space covered by that lease was destroyed. Such a catastrophic loss may have been the death-knell for many an investor, but fortunately for Silverstein, he was able to collect more than \$4.5 billion from a passel of insurance companies (and the airlines involved) to compensate him for his losses. According to an article in the *New York Times*:

Mr. Silverstein and the Port Authority together had spent more than \$1.5 billion of the insurance money already, including more than \$500 million for Mr. Silverstein's rent to the Port Authority; about \$190 million for the Port Authority to buy out Westfield America's retail rights; and more than \$700 million to repay Mr. Silverstein's lender, GMAC, and to repay Mr. Silverstein and his partners most of their equity.⁴

So after spending one third of the insurance money paying off various expenses and recouping their investment, about \$3 billion was left to begin redeveloping the area destroyed in the attacks. Several of the buildings have now been completed and are open for business, including the Freedom Tower, now the tallest building in the United States. To sum up this scenario, Silverstein was able to slingshot a terrible catastrophe into a means to transform 16 acres in Lower Manhattan into a bigger and better World Trade Center complex.

A convergence of objectives

On the other hand, another way to look at the situation is that billionaire *real estate developer* Larry Silverstein was specifically chosen as the beneficiary of a lucrative lease arrangement just so that he would be at the helm at the time



Larry Silverstein, chairman of Silverstein Properties, which held the lease to the WTC buildings in 2001, speaking at the opening ceremony of Four World Trade Center on 11/13/13. The building has 2.5 million square feet of rentable space.

of the attacks, and thereby be in the necessary position to bring about the redevelopment of the site. And yet, even if this was so, that doesn't necessarily mean that Silverstein was a willing and witting participant in the conspiracy. He may have been chosen for the part because the hub conspiracists saw in him those traits that they considered necessary to wrangle the billions out of the insurance companies and get the rebuilding done.⁵ He would not necessarily inspect the internal structural framework of the buildings, so explosives could have already been placed before he took over control of the complex.

Another consideration is the possibility that the grand redevelopment plan for Lower Manhattan entered into the selection process for the target buildings. After all, if your plan is to knock some buildings down by flying planes into them, you need to pick the buildings, right? And if you get to choose anyway, why not knock down ones that will jump-start a huge remodeling project you had in mind? That makes it a win-win situation all around — except for the poor losers in the buildings and planes who were directly murdered in the conspiracy, and the untold number of other losers who were exposed to toxic conditions as a result of the destruction on that day. You see, this is just another way you can keep a crisis from being wasted.

It cost upward of \$10 billion to rebuild the complex as it now is, starting out from mostly piles of rubble. Imagine how much more time and money would have been required if not for the fast-tracking of the demolitions. In addition, the financial burden would have significantly shifted, since no billions would have been forthcoming from the insurance companies.

Of course, it's crazy to think that anyone would go to all the trouble involved in this grand conspiracy just to save a few bucks on safe and proper demolitions, and indeed, it would be crazy if that's all there was to it. But there are other objectives to consider as well. Front and center of these is setting up the pretext for a never-ending *War against Terrorism*. Coupled with that are all of the freedom-eradicating 'precautions' that now must be complied with to keep us 'safe.' And we must continually cement in our collective minds that radical Muslims were responsible for these attacks, and so we must hate them and kill them wherever in the world they may be. Never mind that the purported radical Muslims involved in the hijackings were already killed in the crashes, or that our Central Intelligence Agency has historically created, funded and trained the very same groups of radicals that we must later fight against elsewhere.

E pluribus unum

This possibility of widely divergent objectives can obviously make intricate hub conspiracies tough to figure out. Making it worse is that the separate spoke conspiracies may have objectives totally unrelated or even in opposition to those of other spokes, or of the hub itself. But whatever the situation, that diversity can be useful to the hub. Naturally, when goals are complementary, they enhance each other. However, a direct opposition of goals could also be used to isolate a spoke. After all, common sense would seem to dictate that if two groups have mutually exclusive goals, they wouldn't work together.

4. From "A Hole in the City's heart," *NY Times*, Sept. 11, 2006.

5. Of course, he may also have been selected for such reasons, and told of the plan too.

So, this kind of opposition could be an effective screen between the hub and the scapegoat spoke.

Since the spokes are just the means to the ends desired by the hub, their objectives are subordinate to it, if they are relevant to it at all. The overall job of the hub is to orchestrate this vast array of diverse interests and goals into one ultimate climax — the accomplishment of its goals without revealing its existence. *E pluribus unum* — out of many, one.

Before moving on from this subject of goals, I want to touch on one last aspect. Any of the people involved in any part of the overall conspiracy may decide to also branch out on their own, so to speak. They may become a small hub themselves, and set up a spoke or two to accomplish personal goals of their own, probably without the knowledge of the main hub conspirators. For example, a man who knows a specific flight will crash on a specific day, might decide that would be a good flight to book his wife onto, after having bought plenty of life insurance on her well in advance of course. Or knowing how disasters affect stock prices, someone might arrange very profitable trades for stock in companies he knows will be

thus affected. Of course, the main hub might also delve into such profiteering too.

Who would do such a thing?

In all this talk of hubs and spokes one could lose sight of the fact that where the rubber meets the road, *actual people* are the ones doing the dirty work. Whatever their reasons, it was human beings who imagined, plotted, prepared and executed this monstrous conspiracy to directly murder thousands of other human beings (as well as untold thousands more indirectly through the ongoing military actions that ensued). Normal people may ask themselves, “Who would do such a thing?” And the answer is, people who *aren't* normal. Psychopaths, in other words.

Psychopathy. Mental disorder, especially as apart from disease of the brain, and typified by emotional immaturity and instability, moral deficiency, and perversions.⁶



Listen to LWRN anywhere and any time!

**Download the APP
Smartphones
Iphones**

Visit **www.LWRN.net** and Click on the links on the left side of the home page!!

Ask everyone you know to download the app! And Listen!

But don't let the reference to brain disease fool you. These people are not crazy in the classical sense, like a lunatic. Rather they are morally and spiritually damaged, having seared consciences which enable them to trifle with the lives and deaths of others without remorse. The kind of people who send other people's children off to kill and be killed in foreign lands under false pretenses. The kind who buy and sell children for pedophilic purposes, send innocent people to prison by planting evidence, kill a stranger as a gang initiation, or sell pharmaceutical drugs to millions knowing them to be lethal.

The truth is, there's no real shortage of psychopaths in the world today. In fact, there's enough of them running around that it's rather amazing we're not all dead yet. But thankfully, your garden variety psychopath doesn't have access to the reins of power, and so isn't likely to be able to impact

(Continued on page 4)



A hearing of the 9/11 Commission on April 14, 2004, showing the swearing in of CIA Director Tenet and Deputy Director McLaughlin. Sitting directly behind the Commission's Chair, Tom Kean, is Philip Zelikow, a long-time "intelligence advisor" of some capacity in the Bush and Obama administrations. Zelikow served as executive director of the Commission, in a position to supervise and influence the entire direction of the public inquiry. Zelikow has also written about the formation of "public myths." Was he an asset of the hub conspirators for the post-9/11 management of public perception?

6. Funk & Wagnalls *New Comprehensive International Dictionary of the English Language*, Encyclopedic edition (1978).

more than a handful of people at a time. He also lacks the ability to control (or even prevent) investigations of his crime, making him more likely to be caught. But the psychopaths who manage to get themselves into positions of real power are the ones who can most literally bring us hell on earth.

The general ridicule of conspiracy theories by government officials and their media minions helps perpetuate a bias against them in the minds of many. The odd thing is that while so many people have no trouble believing that a score of radical Islamic psychopaths executed the attacks of September 11, 2001, they still can't seem to wrap their heads around the idea that they had help, and that without that help, the attacks would not have succeeded. More to the point, they can't bring themselves to believe that there are psychopaths within the highest levels of our own government (and in the shadow government behind it), and that because of the power they wield, they are far more dangerous to all of us than a handful of hijackers could ever be.

Why would they do it?

When it comes to why, many possibilities come to mind. At the highest level, I think the overall answer is simply because they can. In the rarified air of global elitists, the lives of mere mortals just don't matter all that much. Any opportunity to eliminate lots of people — through war (an all-time favorite), tainted vaccines, genetically altering food supplies, etc. — is worth the trouble. These elitists are the type who ascribe to the ideology engraved into the Georgia Guidestones: "Maintain humanity under 500,000,000 in perpetual balance with nature." For those without a calculator handy, that's about a 92% reduction in the population of the world.

Just below that level, personal gain is a big draw. Some people make tons of money selling imple-

ments of war and destruction, and so its no surprise those people want to see more of both. For this type then, the possibility of never-ending war is a huge motivator. Others of this type might be enticed by the promise of lucrative contracts, or concessions, or other forms of bribery.

From that point down to the level of the foot soldiers, other factors start to come into play. The people at these levels won't have as great an opportunity to enrich themselves from the plot. Part of the reason for that is the compartmentalization that takes place in a serious conspiracy. The hub has an interest in nobody knowing any more than absolutely necessary for it do its part. So the spokes, knowing less, have less chance to profit. In the lower levels, threats of death (of both self and family), and exposure of previously unrevealed crimes (such as the types identified above that are earmarks of psychopaths) are undoubtedly used to get people involved and keep them quiet. Once again, total surveillance is a useful tool in discovering one's complicity in such criminal activity.

As each *intermediate* goal of the hub is accomplished, there is an obvious incentive to eliminate the participants of the spoke whose *final* goal it was. As Benjamin Franklin noted, "Three may keep a Secret, if two of them are dead."⁷ Thanks to the diversity of the spokes and the compartmentalization of the components, a lot of this might be accomplished with hardly a ripple of notice. Co-conspirators who didn't notice would be inclined to continue with the plan under the impression that they would be safe as promised. And those who did notice, seeing all the more clearly the gravity of their situation, would also be likewise inclined.

The bottom line is that there is no one-size-fits-all reason why



LIBERTY WORKS RADIO NETWORK

NEEDS YOU TO DONATE!!!

The simple truth is that if we do not receive financial help the Fellowship may not be able to continue the work we have begun with **Liberty Works Radio Network**. It does not take much, just \$5 or \$10 a month — SO PLEASE PRAY ABOUT IT, AND CONTACT THE FELLOWSHIP!!

someone would participate in a conspiracy of this sort. Different actors require different motivations. And it is a primary function of the hub to make sure that each gets what they require, or at least the illusion of getting it, until such time as they are no longer needed.

Just another Inside-Job conspiracy theory

The most important thing to take away from this series is the concept of the *wheel conspiracy*. With that idea in mind, you can start to see how various spokes might be worked into the overall plan. The nature of the wheel conspiracy is that the spokes radiate from the hub. So, the more of the spokes you can piece together, the closer you can get to identifying the hub. You just have to follow them back to it. And with spokes like military war game exercises, air traffic control hijack simulations and explosives planted in skyscrapers, it's impossible for me to believe that some part of the government (shadow or otherwise) wasn't at the hub. So I join my voice to those who say, "9/11 was an inside job!"

And with that, folks, we come to the end of my little tale. As I said from the beginning, I can't prove that any part of my theory is true,⁸ so you would be well advised to take it all with a grain of salt. If it does nothing more than provoke a little thinking on your part, then it was worth the effort to me.



7. *Poor Richard's Almanack* (1735).

8. Although I know what I said about radar simulations is true, I have no means to prove even that.