

LIBERTY TREE

Vol. 13, No. 9 — September 2011



Revisiting 9/11

By Dick Greb

With only ten percent of the 21st century under our belts, it's still too early to give the appellation of 'Crime of the Century' to the hijacking and kamikaze crashing of airliners into the twin towers of the World Trade Center complex and into the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, but it most certainly was a crime of gigantic proportions. And despite the ridicule heaped upon any explanation — ignominiously called *conspiracy theories* — other than the official one, there can be no doubt that there was indeed a conspiracy at work on that day. Unless you believe that the separate hijackings were unrelated, the very fact that four different planes were hijacked is proof that a criminal conspiracy existed. The extent of that conspiracy is the real question, and unfortunately for those who want to see truth prevail, that question is just one of many for which we will likely never be given satisfactory answers.

It has now been ten years since the catastrophic and catalyzing events¹ of that modern *day of infamy*, and the government has given no indications that it plans to reinvestigate the crime. In fact, the actions of government throughout the entire episode evinces an intent to conceal, rather than reveal, the facts surrounding what it has referred to as the worst terrorist attack on American soil. Indeed, its continuing obfuscation of the truth — whether through error or willfulness, or both — is one of the factors that may ultimately assure that the attack will remain in the running for crime

of the century. Just like any case where investigation of a crime is conducted by those who have a vested interest in the outcome, if not actual participation in the crime itself, truth is always a victim.²

As I said, the extent of the criminal conspiracy involved in the 9-11 attack is a central question that needs to be answered, as so many other questions come back to that one. Besides the actual hijackers (whether they were properly identified or not), every person who knowingly aided or abetted the commission of this series of crimes, no matter how small a part they played in the whole scheme of things, is a co-conspirator, and as such, they should rightly share in the criminal responsibility for the result, which was the *murder of thousands of people*. This is where foreknowledge comes into play, and of course, why such foreknowledge is always vehemently denied. If government agents knew of the plan, and allowed it to go forward, that's bad enough;³ if they not only knew, but orchestrated circumstances to make it more likely to succeed, that makes them complicit in those murders.

This type of orchestration can occur so far behind the scenes that it may be virtually impossible to discover; but sometimes hints of it come through. One such hint, to my mind, in the 9-11 attack is the training exercises that were going on at the same time as the hijackings. Although they didn't get a whole lot of

(Continued on page 2)

1. Could it be that this was the sort of event envisioned by The Project for the New America Century? See page 51 of *Rebuilding Americas Defenses*: www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf

2. Police officers routinely cleared by internal police investigations of any wrong-doing in brutality or illegal use-of-force cases is an excellent example.

3. In the 1993 WTC bombing, the FBI, after being informed of the plot by one of the participants — who requested that they supply him with fake explosives — instead let the bomb be built as planned, resulting in the death of six people. A CBS news video about this can be viewed at http://whatreallyhappened.com/IMAGES/wtc_bombing3.wmv

(Continued from page 1)

press, *Vanity Fair* did a great job in reporting on them.⁴ Officials in our air defense establishment admitted that these exercises — which included simulated hijacking of airliners — were being conducted at the same time as the actual hijackings. General Ralph E. Eberhart, USAF Commander of NORAD, was quoted as claiming that the exercises actually enhanced the response to the real threat, because everybody was already in a more alert status.⁵ Given the near-total failure of any military response to the hijacked planes, this seems like a pretty serious indictment of our air defense readiness.

Aside from that, however, this simultaneous existence of actual hijackings and training exercises on hijackings comes down to one of two options: either it was mere coincidence that both the real and simulated hijackings occurred at the same time; or one of them must have been based on foreknowledge of the other. Now, I'm no statistician, but I have to think that the odds of the first option are pretty long. But suppose for a minute that it *was* just a coincidence. Then, according to General Eberhart, the hijackers picked the *worst* of all possible times for their crimes, because our federally-controlled air security apparatus was more ready than usual to thwart their evil plans. And yet, despite this heightened readiness, 75 percent of the hijackers' plot was accomplished without any interference from the feds whatsoever.⁶ Given that it was managed by groups of four and five men armed with nothing but box-cutters,⁷ that would probably put the chances at about 50/50 for a pair of hijackers armed with pea-shooters to do the same on a normal day.

Then, there's the second option — foreknowledge. Perhaps the reason why such a precarious plan succeeded so far as it did was because people who knew of the plot maneuvered circumstances in such a way as to make the chances of success greater. This could work in either direction. That is, if the hijackers knew of the



General Ralph E. Eberhart, USAF Commander of NORAD on September 11, 2001.

those who have an interest in exploiting disasters (tyrants, for example), then perhaps the exercises were scheduled for the same day, and for the same reason. In the former case, though, it seems unlikely that the hijackers would have access to enough details of the planned exercise scenarios to determine that it would enhance their chances of success, since even the participants would be mostly kept in the dark, in order to maximize the usefulness of any evaluation of their performance. On the other hand, with the government's known predilection for infiltration of dissident groups (think COINTELPRO), it's not much of a stretch to believe that there could have been an informant (or even an agent provocateur) involved in the plot, feeding suggestions to the conspirators, while simultaneously leaking the plans to their government handlers.

I realize that to many people, this sounds crazy (or at least, *I* sound crazy), but pushing unstable people to engage in criminal behavior is a common ploy of the FBI in its War on Terrorism, as revealed by the *New York Times* in an article from November 29, 2010.⁸ In the same way, exploiting crises is a universal ploy of tyrants to gain greater power and control. This makes for

a powerful incentive to exacerbate such crises, because the greater the crisis, the greater the demand for (or at least the acquiescence in) more power to prevent another in the future. Thus, foreknowledge is a powerful tool for power-grabbers.

And one of the beauties of high-level behind-the-scenes manipulation is that it can be done under the cover of legitimate preparedness. Sending fighter planes off to another part of the country to engage in training is not, in and of itself, a

4. www.vanityfair.com/politics/features/2006/08/norad200608

5. Eberhart, when asked by the 9-11 Commission whether the training exercises helped or hurt the response, testified:

"Sir, my belief is that it helped because of the manning, because of the focus, because the crews -- they have to be airborne in 15 minutes. And that morning, because of the exercise, they were airborne in six or eight minutes. And so I believe that focus helped. The situation that you're referring to, I think, at most cost us 30 seconds -- 30 seconds." http://www.9-11commission.gov/archive/hearing12/9-11Commission_Hearing_2004-06-17.htm

6. According to the official story, the other 25 percent was thwarted by unarmed passengers who, by an unsuccessful 5-minute assault to breach the cockpit door, convinced the hijackers to crash the plane in Shanksville, Penn., rather than continue the 20-minute flight to Washington, D.C. The report also documents that the cockpit crew had received a warning from United Airlines about cockpit intrusions at least 4 minutes before the hijackers attacked, which should have given them ample time to secure the door, but apparently didn't do so. *The 9/11 Commission Report*, p. 11.

7. Personally, I find it rather incredible that dozens of adult passengers would let a few guys with box-cutters (or even regular size knives, for that matter) order them around and take over the cockpit of their plane in the first place. A bus full of children, maybe, but grown men and women? But then again, the FBI did report that they "collected 14 knives or portions of knives at the Flight 93 crash site," (*Report*, p. 457, FN 82.) so maybe they were carrying 3 or 4 each, and the people just felt overwhelmed by all that weaponry.

8. "In U.S. Sting Operations, Questions of Entrapment," <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/30/us/politics/30fbi.html>

(Continued on page 3)

BANK HOLIDAY IS ORDERED WAR TIME POWERS INVOKED

Special Session of Congress Called to Convene Tomorrow.

A modified bank holiday extending through Thursday was ordered Sunday night by President Roosevelt in a proclamation interpreted by some financial authorities as a temporary suspension

To Solve National Problems—President Roosevelt Suspends All Banking Operations Until Friday—Action Viewed as Definite Upward Start.

Revisiting 9/11



(Continued from page 2)

criminal thing. Quite the contrary, it's generally a good thing to have well-trained pilots defending our land. So, what blame could possibly be laid on the person who instigated the training, or scheduled it; unless, of course, it was done to further a criminal conspiracy. But alas, how would you ever prove such a criminal intent by anyone evil enough to execute a plan like that?

Making it even tougher to ferret out, the influence exerted might be so light of touch that those being manipulated never even know it's been done. This is a central premise of the movie *Inception*, starring Leonardo DiCaprio, where an idea to be implanted in a target's subconscious mind must seem to originate from the target himself in order to take hold. I've heard it said that Colonel Edward Mandell House, advisor to President Woodrow Wilson, among others, had such a gift — that he could suggest ideas to someone in a way that made the recipient believe he had thought of it himself. Is this what happened with the various training exercises scheduled for September 11, 2001, or was it truly just a coincidence? We will likely never know the answer to that question. But as for anybody who played a part in furthering that murderous conspiracy of ten years ago, we can rest assured that Christ sees what's in their hearts, and come judgment day, there will be hell to pay.



Will the HOLY DAYS of Big Banks' Past *haunt us again?*

In early 1933, as a result of the great panic, *a.k.a.* the depression, the fractional reserve banking system was experiencing yet another episode of 'bank runs.' A bank run occurs when ordinary folk sense their particular bank is weak and about to fail. They know that if it fails, their savings will be lost, and so they make haste to remove their deposits from said bank. At that time, this involved demands for redemption of frns in gold and silver — lawful money. To the Federal Reserve, such demands constituted a banking 'crisis.' As with all such 'crises,' it turned to the government to solve the problems it had created itself.

On March 2, 1933, two days before President Roosevelt's inauguration, President Hoover corresponded with the Federal Reserve, saying that he understood the Board was considering recommending the use of "emergency powers" under Section 5 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, "for the purpose of limiting the use of coin and currency to necessary purposes. I should be glad to have the advice of the Board."

On March 3, Governor Eugene Meyer of the Fed responded that the situation in Chicago:

has reached the point of extreme tension, with prospects that by the end of banking hours tomorrow the gold reserves of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago will be dangerously depleted. [The bankers] have requested that a national holiday be proclaimed as the only method they know of for dealing with the immediate exigency with which they are confronted. ... Similar conditions are developing rapidly in other Federal Reserve Districts. ... The [Board] has considered two methods of dealing with this emergency, one by executive order and the

"Holyday," also written "Holiday," see Webster's 1828 dictionary, is a "day set apart for commemorating some important event in history; a festival intended to celebrate some event deemed auspicious to the welfare of a nation; particularly ...devoted to religious solemnities." It is also "a day of exemption from labor; a day of amusement."

other by joint resolution of Congress. ... A form of executive order is enclosed for your consideration.

Meyer warned that immediate action was necessary in order to prevent a "banking collapse."

Hoover was awakened at 1:30 a.m. March 4th to read Meyer's letter, the same day Roosevelt was inaugurated with the ominous words: "This is a day of consecration."¹ Consecrated to the banking system, perhaps, because just two days later, he issued Presidential Proclamation No. 2039, an executive order declaring a bank holyday ("holiday") from March 6th to 9th. The order largely followed the Federal Reserve's proposal. Here is a portion of it:

Whereas there have been heavy and unwarranted withdrawals of gold and currency from our banking institutions for the purpose of hoarding; and

Whereas continuous and increasingly extensive speculative activity abroad in foreign exchange has resulted in severe drains on the Nation's stocks of gold; and

Whereas those conditions have created a national emergency; and

Whereas it is in the best interests of all bank depositors that a period of respite be provided with a view to preventing further

(Continued on page 4)

1. See *FDR and fear itself: the first inaugural address*, by Davis W. Houck, p. 140.

(Continued from page 3)

hoarding of coin, bullion or currency or speculation in foreign exchange and permitting the application of appropriate measures to protect the interests of our people; and

Whereas it is provided in Section 5 (b) of the Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. L. 411), as amended, "That the President may investigate, regulate, or prohibit, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of licenses or otherwise, any transactions in foreign exchange and the export, hoarding, melting, or earmarkings of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency . . ."; ...

Now, Therefore I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, in view of such national emergency and by virtue of the authority vested in me by said Act and in order to prevent the export, hoarding, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency, do hereby proclaim, order, direct and declare ... a bank holiday, and that during said period all banking transactions shall be suspended. ... (emphases added)

Note that people taking deposits from the banks supposedly resulted in "severe drains" on "the Nation's stocks of gold." How could this be, unless the people's gold *in the banks* were considered to be one and the same as the "Nation's"? If it belongs to the "Nation," that is, We The People, then the "Nation" has the right to it. Clearly, to Roosevelt and the bankers, the (collective) "Nation" was *not* We The People, it was nothing more than *the bankers themselves*, since they were the ones being drained. As later actions showed, Roosevelt was already planning a *nationalized gold stock*, with the Federal Reserve Board as the "Nation's" true representatives, something they had lusted after from the beginning.²

Banking collapses are inherent in the very nature of fractional reserve banking. If bank notes are empty promises, *i.e.*, they are not actually backed by the gold and silver they claim to represent, then they are fraudulent, and the bank should indeed fail, and its principals be hauled off to prison. However, the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 authorizes such fraud, and since the government benefits thereby, it does all it can to keep the fraud going, including, as Presidential Proclamation No. 2039 threatened, sending people who 'hoard' gold to jail for ten years. Even if — and most especially if, it would seem — the people stand to lose their property (the Fifth Amendment be damned).

As constitutional expert Edwin Vieira³ points out, the national 'emergency' for the bankers was that Americans wanted their *own* money, to which they were entitled, and demanded that the bankers honor their contracts. The 'hoarding' the bankers found menacing was nothing more than people's preference to hold their own

cash rather than leave it in the care of demonstrably irresponsible third parties (banks). 'Hoarding' is simply saving. Couldn't people as readily be accused of 'hoarding' money by saving it in banks? Perhaps their funds could be confiscated for the rash act(s) of keeping funds safe on deposit and thereby draining the nation of needed money flow for job creation?⁴ Given the propaganda of the banking system/government during the depression, such an absurd rationale for confiscating people's money in the name of the "Nation" does not seem impossible today. As long as bank 'bailouts' continue, stealth confiscation via inflation may be good enough for the banking system. But the entire system is now built on irredeemable paper. If depositors demand federal reserve notes to hold themselves, many banks might lose their "reserves" and fail; indeed, many are failing anyway. So there is no guarantee such holydays will not be called for in the future.

Many newspapers in 1933 lauded the bank 'holiday,' claiming that it was just the thing needed at the time to ensure the Nation's economic recovery. One might suspect that they were in the bank's pockets as well — or caught up in the totalitarian and fascist tone of the times.

It was widely acknowledged, even trumpeted on headlines, that Roosevelt had declared the bankster holiday by invoking war-time powers. But *America was not at war*. The Federal Reserve had designed the proclamation based on the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917, amended in 1918. In *Stoehr v. Wallace*, 255 U.S. 239 (1921), the Supreme Court said of this Act:

[It] is strictly a war measure and finds its sanction in the constitutional provision, Art. I, § 8, cl. 11, ... [One section of the Act did confer] authority summarily to seize property upon ... determination that it was enemy owned ... But ... Congress did not attempt the confiscation of the property of citizens or alien friends.

Congress resolved on March 3, 1921, that that date should be taken as the termination of WWI, and that "any Act of Congress, or any provision [thereof], that by its terms is in force only during the existence of a state of war," should be administered as if such war had terminated. Thus, the war-time powers invoked by Roosevelt were not legally available to him, even if they could be considered Constitutional.⁵

Never mind the blatant illegality of his action, however — during the banksters' holy days, Congress met and post-ratified his proclamation, and any actions he might take "thereafter," via the Emergency Banking Act. The hyped 'urgency' surrounding that Act, introduced and passed on March 9, 1933, was such that it passed with just a single copy available — so most legislators voted for it without reading it. Sound familiar?

If and when illegal and unconstitutional holy days are never again proposed by the Fed, nor implemented by its government lackeys ... well, then, your money in the bank should be safe.

2. See *Pieces of Eight*, by Edwin Vieira, Jr., 2002, p. 884.

3. Most of the details in this article are drawn from *Pieces of Eight*, by Edwin Vieira, Jr., 2002.

4. As in the popular mantra today: Get out and consume! Consuming will save the economy!

5. Which they cannot be, in many respects, but elaboration on that score, and on the gold confiscation which followed the bank holiday, must be reserved for another time.

