

---

# Pipeline Politics, an Afghanistan Primer

Posted by Choco - 2008/07/05 12:08

---

To gage how corrupt our MSM is, then consider how little we've heard on this subject. This is the big story nobody wants to touch. Instead, we are led to believe there are terrorists around every tree. We better let them tap our phones. Why don't we tap the phones of the big oil companies, the real terrorists?

I've posted about the CentGas pipeline and Unocal VP John. J. Maresca's presentation to Congress in 1998 about the urgent need to remove the Taliban from power so the pipeline could go through. Here is a pretty detailed synopsis. It's long, but since our democracy is being eviscerated based on the Afghan/Osama lie, then it is entirely worth the time to read.

I've highlighted some texts in order to draw special attention. Please take a good look. Note the role of Ken Lay of Enron and remember Cheney's secret energy task force that included Ken Lay.

By Rudo de Ruijter,  
Independent Researcher  
Netherlands  
August 2006

Our politicians have shaped the idea many people have of our world. They have divided our world into good and bad. Of course, they are the good guys and the ones they accuse are the bad guys. Simple, isn't it?

However, if we stick to the facts, and throw out all the information that comes from unverifiable sources, our world looks very different. This research article is intended to reveal the facts that lead to the US invasion of Afghanistan and to reveal the logical place of the 9/11 events in that context. It is not meant to offend anyone. Don't read it if you are pleased with the "official" version of our history.

Immediately after 9/11 president Bush declared war to Afghanistan.

This article shows the role of Afghanistan in pipeline projects which determine US' control over oil and gas in Afghanistan's neighbouring countries.

Bush said the attacks of 9/11 were the reason to invade Afghanistan. This article shows that preparations for this war took place well before.

In 2000 the neoconservatives said they needed some catastrophic and catalysing event.

They said so at the time of the developments of unmanned aerial vehicles striking with pinpoint accuracy.

## The 1993 attack

The attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 eclipse an earlier attack on the World Trade Centre in 1993. On January 20 1993, William (Bill) Clinton had become president. A month later, on February 26, an "immense blast happened at 12:18 local time in the Secret Service's section of the car park underneath and between what are New York's tallest buildings."

BBC published the words of an eyewitness: "It felt like an airplane hit the building." Apparently the explosion was intended to bring both WTC towers down. The New York Times found out that the FBI was involved in the attacks. The FBI would have infiltrated a group of terrorists, would have known about their intentions and for some unknown reason let it happen. Six people died and a hundred were injured.

## 1: Why Afghanistan?

Immediately after the attacks of September 11, 2001, US officials accused Osama bin Laden. Since the man would stay in Afghanistan, it provided a pretext for George W. Bush to attack and invade Afghanistan.

Let's have a closer look at the situation prior to 9/11. As promised by Soviet president Mikhail Gorbachev, the USSR had withdrawn its last soldiers from Afghanistan on February 15, 1989. It was the end of ten years of war. It was also the last war of the Soviet Union.

---

A few months later, on November 9, 1989, the Berlin wall fell. The Iron Curtain broke down. The people living on the other side of the curtain, of whom our leaders had always pretended they were dangerous and ferocious, turned out to be as friendly as us.

With the concept of the Cold War our leaders had divided our world and maintained fear in our minds for over forty years. This terror, fabricated by our own governments, was finally over.

#### Pipeline projects through Afghanistan

On December 25, 1991, the Soviet flag was lowered from the Kremlin for the last time. The former Soviet republics become independent. Among them were the countries around the Caspian Sea, all rich in oil and gas.

Before, the oil and gas went through pipelines to their soviet neighbours, or were exported via Russia to Europe. Now each country could sell its own oil and gas and explore new markets. Buyers showed up from everywhere.

In the beginning, the new leaders still had no experience with the world oil business. One of the first deals of Turkmenistan was to auction an oil well for as little as \$100,000. US companies showed up, too.

The biggest challenge was to get the Caspian oil and gas to the world markets. The problem? The region is land-locked. If you trust neither Russia on the North side of the Caspian Sea, nor Iran on the South side, you need to build new pipelines.

Today, from the West side of the Caspian Sea, oil is pumped through several pipelines towards the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea from where it can be shipped.

Big business on the East side of the Caspian Sea is still limited. To unlock oil and gas from this side, pipelines have to be built through Afghanistan. Here, since the early nineties, two pipelines - one for gas and one for oil - have been in project.

The oil pipe should go South to the Indian Ocean, ending at the port of Gwadar in Pakistan. The gas pipe would turn East to Multan in the middle of Pakistan. From Pakistan an extension is planned to Bombay (Mumbai, India), where a US company with close ties to father and son Bush, Enron, has built a power plant.

Contracts for pipelines are not just multi-billion dollar projects to build them. The main contractor generally also buys and sells the oil or gas going through them. With contracts he disposes of it, determines how much the supplier gets for it, and how much fee is paid to crossed countries. He determines who gets it, how much, when, to which price and in which currency it has to be paid.

In fact, he determines a lot in the economical developments of both the selling and the buying countries. With Turkmenistan eager to sell its gas, Pakistan eager to buy it and Enron in India hoping to see it arrive as soon as possible, the pipelines through Afghanistan are of high interest.

However, in 2001, work in Afghanistan had not started yet. Since the withdrawal of the Soviets in 1989 there was still unrest in the country.

#### The Taliban: From ally to terrorist

The unrest in Afghanistan that blocked the business is worth mentioning. In 1992, the pro-Russian president Mohammad Najibullah was ousted. In 1993, Burhanuddin Rabbani became president, supported by the Tajik minority of the population.

In 1994, the Pashtun, forming half of the population, challenged Rabbani. Because the pipelines have to cross mainly Pashtun territory, their movement, the Taliban, had support from the US and Pakistan.

In March 1995, two companies, BRIDAS from Argentina and UNOCAL from the US, both claimed to have obtained the contracts from the seller of the gas (Turkmenistan) and the buyer (Pakistan). At that moment no deal had yet been signed with the Afghan authorities.

---

In October 1995, President Niyazov of Turkmenistan signed an official agreement with UNOCAL, but in February 1996, president Rabbani of Afghanistan signed an agreement with BRIDAS for the main section of 875 miles through Afghanistan.

UNOCAL's chances seemed compromised. Fortunately for UNOCAL, the Taliban wanted to oust president Rabbani. In September 1996, they took Jalabad, Kandahar, and then Kabul. President Rabbani fled to join the Northern Alliance.

UNOCAL sighed with relief. It expressed support for the Taliban takeover, saying it makes the pipeline project easier. Unocal later said it was misquoted.

Would BRIDAS now have lost the game? No. In November 1996, BRIDAS signed an agreement with the Taliban and Gen. Dostum to build the pipeline. Unfortunately, except from Pakistan and Saudi-Arabia, the Taliban government didn't get international recognition.

In April 1997, as work on the pipeline had still not started, the Taliban announced it would award the contract to whomever starts first. UNOCAL claimed there must be peace first.

In July 1997, Turkmenistan and Pakistan accepted a new delay and signed a new contract with UNOCAL, saying it had to start the work within a year and a half.

In December 1997, UNOCAL tried to become good friends with the Taliban and invited a delegation to their head office in Sugarland, Texas, where they received a VIP treatment and stayed in the best hotels.

In Afghanistan, civil war went on. With no internationally recognized legal representative of Afghanistan, the pipeline project seemed to be deadlocked.

US-bombs on Afghanistan after US embassies are attacked in Africa

On February 4, 1998 and May 30, 1998, very heavy earthquakes shook the North East of Afghanistan. They attracted a lot of international attention and many groups of relief workers came into the North-East of Afghanistan to help. According to US accusations, this was the moment that somewhere in this same region of Afghanistan a certain Osama bin Laden would have been planning the bombings of two US embassies in Africa, one in Nairobi (Kenya), and one in Dar es Salaam (Tanzania).

The bombings had a high impact in the press. 258 people were killed and some 5,000 injured. The bombings occurred on August 7, 1998, apparently for no specific reason.

Apparently only president Clinton benefited from it. In the US, the Monica Lewinsky affair had come to a height. The press and the public were excited and angry. Clinton had stated on oath he had had no sexual relations with Monica Lewinsky and now proof had come out he had. Clinton was close to the point of being convicted of perjury.

The bombings of the embassies drew people's attention to the drama in Africa. Finally, on August 17, Clinton came away with the perjury by arguing that oral sex was not a sexual relation.

A few days later, August 21, 1998, the US military threw bombs on Kandahar and other targets in Afghanistan. Only afterwards Clinton explained to the journalists this was because of Osama bin Laden, supposed to be behind the bombings of the US' embassies in Africa.

Unlike George W. Bush in 2001, Clinton did not invade Afghanistan. An invasion would have given hope to UNOCAL to see the Afghan deadlock broken, but with the Lewinsky affair still being discussed, Clinton did not have enough credit for such a war.

On August 28, 1998, UNSC resolution 1193 blamed the Taliban for the problems in Afghanistan.

On November 5, 1998, a US Grand Jury indicted Osama Bin Laden. (Not for the bombings of the embassies in Africa, but essentially for considering the US as his enemy.) &

UNOCAL withdraws

In December 1998 UNOCAL withdrew from the pipeline consortium and, at least for the outside world, the pipeline project seemed halted.

However, in January, 1999, Turkmenistan's foreign minister visited Pakistan, saying the pipeline project was still alive. In February, BRIDAS had talks with leaders in Turkmenistan, Pakistan and Russia.

---

In March, Turkmenistan's Foreign Minister Sheikh Muradov met with Taliban leader Mullah Omar in Kandahar to discuss the pipeline. In April, Pakistan, Turkmenistan, and the Taliban signed an agreement to revive the pipeline project. In May, a Taliban delegation signed an agreement with Turkmenistan to buy gas and electricity. Terror warning

On June 25, 1999, the US State Department announced: "As some of our embassies in Africa have been under surveillance by suspicious individuals, we are taking the precaution of temporarily closing our embassies in Gambia, Togo, Madagascar, Liberia, Namibia and Senegal from June 24 through the 27th of June - that is Sunday."

The speaker seemed to have no idea where these countries are, considering the strange order of announcing them. Besides, the only African countries, where incidents like attacks and hostage taking had been reported that year, are Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Burundi and Ethiopia. None of these countries is on the list.

On July 4, 1999, President Clinton issued an executive order prohibiting commercial transactions with the Taliban.

Back to Cold War budgets

On September 23, 1999, presidential candidate George W. Bush exposed his views on the US military. He complained that since the end of the Cold War the Defence budget had fallen 40 percent and that the army had never been in such a bad shape since Pearl Harbor.

"As president, I will order an immediate review of our overseas deployments - in dozens of countries. ... My second goal is to build America's defences on the troubled frontiers of technology and terror."

Among his views of arms: "In the air, we must be able to strike from across the world with pinpoint accuracy - with long-range aircraft and perhaps with unmanned systems."

On October 15, 1999, things were getting more serious for the Taliban. UN resolution 1267 against the Taliban threatened an aircraft ban and funded freezing, if Osama Bin Laden was not handed over before 14 November 1999. &

On November 11, 1999, in a press conference, the Taliban minister of Foreign Affairs said Osama bin Laden and the Taliban were unable to organize attacks like those on the embassies in Africa. He condemned these actions.

In 2000 the US had presidential elections. It was time to postpone delicate decisions.

On April 2, 2000, Richard Clarke, who had been appointed counter-terrorist coordinator a few months before the attacks against the embassies in Africa (on May 22), predicted: "They will come after our weakness, our Achilles heel, which is largely here in the United States."

Curious No-Fly list

On April 21, 2000, something remarkable happened. As an antiterrorist measure, the US Congress announced a single unified terrorist watch list, the TID (or Terrorist Identities Database), into which all international terrorist related data available to the US government - mainly the TIPOFF no-fly list - would be stored in a single repository. In airports, this list is used to prevent suspected people from going on board and from entering the US.

However, the same day that Congress announces the unified TID list, the FAA created a new and separate domestic no-fly list and put only six names on it. Two weeks before 9/11, the list was expanded with six other names, making it a total list of 12 names.

Thanks to this separate list the hijackers of 9/11, using domestic flights, and not listed among the 12 names, could board the planes without difficulties. On August 23, 2001, two names, later published as being two of the hijackers, had been added to the official TID-list, which counted 60,000 suspects, but was discarded for domestic flights.

2: Frustrations and solutions

In September, 2000, the neoconservative think tank Project for a New American Century (PNAC) published their imperialistic views for the US. In the document, they warned that the process of transforming the US into "tomorrow's dominant force" would likely be a long one in the absence of "some catastrophic and catalysing event - like a new Pearl Harbor".

A few months later, many PNAC members would become members of the Bush administration. Those members include Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, and Richard Perle.

Three month after 9/11, to those who would not yet have understood the benefits of the catastrophic and catalysing

---

event of US military debacle in Pearl Harbor in 1941, Bush would explain: "The four years that followed transformed the American way of war" and "even more importantly, an American President and his successors shaped a world beyond a war."

And, linking 9/11 to Pearl Harbor, he said, "September 11th, 2001 - three months and a long time ago - set another dividing line in our lives and in the life of our nation."

On October 12, 2000, three weeks before the presidential elections, the US population was shortly reminded of the terrorist threat in the world. US Navy destroyer USS Cole in the Yemeni port of Aden was rammed with an inflatable raft with explosives and was damaged. Published detail: it looked as if the raft was coming to help the warship to moor to a buoy. Message: you can trust nobody.

On November 7, 2000 the elections took place. It would be George W. Bush or Al Gore. The counting gave an extremely close result. The results of Florida became decisive, but these results are far from clear.

The opponents fought in many different courts until December 13. It turned out that in Florida, 180,000 votes had been thrown out of the counting. Bush led by less than 600 votes. Partial recounts resulted in much lower estimates. Finally, all recounts could not be executed within the time limit set by the Supreme Court. This is how Bush won the elections.

Dictator

A few days later, on December 18, speaking at the Capitol, Bush joked about his starting relationship with the four congressional leaders: "If this were a dictatorship, it would be a heck of a lot easier....just so long as I'm the dictator."

Just a slip of the tongue? Not really. In July 1998, about governing Texas, he said already: "A dictatorship would be a lot easier." And on July 26, 2001, speaking once again about his struggles with Congress he repeated: "a dictatorship would be a heck of a lot easier."

Well, for the ambitious plans of the neoconservatives, the US Congress was a major hurdle to take. The budget of the military had shrunk by 40 percent after the Cold War and with the wars they had in mind they would need substantially more budget.

How would they get the budget they wanted? If the US would be attacked, there would be no problem. They would receive all the budget and support they needed. But, as written in their document, without a new Pearl Harbor things would go slowly.

When Bush started his presidency, many neoconservatives considered Iraq as the first target to hit. In their document of September 2000 they had named Iraq as a "potential rival" of the US.

First Target Iraq?

Iraq has the world's second largest oil reserves. The country was exhausted. It had tried to conquer Iran from 1980 to 1988, had invaded Kuwait in 1990, had been defeated by Operation Desert Storm in 1991, and since then a UN embargo had brought the Iraqi economy to a standstill and the population at the edge of starvation.

Since 1996, the Oil For Food program of the UN had brought some relief for the Iraqi people. The country had been disarmed. Extensive weapon inspections had concluded the country formed no threat anymore. Well, at least, not military. In 2000, Saddam had still found a trick to hit the main pillar of US hegemony, the dollar. He started to sell his oil in euros, instead of dollars. (<http://www.raisethehammer.org/index.asp?id=252> , see: Dollar Hegemony)

Afghanistan back on the agenda

However, not even a week after George W. Bush had been declared winner of the elections, Afghanistan was back on the international agenda. UN SC resolution 1333 of December 19, 2000, imposed the sanctions the UN had promised more than a year before, in October 1999, if the Taliban would not hand over Osama bin Laden before November 14, 1999 (aircraft ban and funds freezing).

Geopolitically, Afghanistan had become a more urgent target. Since 1996, the US had experienced severe setbacks in their ambition to control gas and oil on the East side of the Caspian Sea and was losing influence.

The problems had started in February 1996, when Afghan president Rabbani signed a contract with UNOCAL's competitor BRIDAS for the construction of the gas pipeline through Afghanistan, between Turkmenistan and Pakistan. In March, the US tried to block this deal, putting pressure on Pakistan and telling them they should grant exclusive rights to UNOCAL. This resulted in a diplomatic clash with the Pakistani government.

---

Still, in the same month, Pakistan officially agreed to allow a proposed Iranian pipeline to run over Pakistani territory on its way to India, thus enabling Iranian gas sale to India. The gas would come from Iran's giant South Pars Field in the Persian Gulf and cross the South of Iran from West to East through a pipeline still to be constructed.

Meanwhile, in February 1996, Turkmenistan had showed it did not want to depend exclusively on the delayed Afghan pipeline project and had signed a contract with Turkey to supply Turkmen gas via a pipeline to be constructed along the North coast of Iran. If necessary, Turkey would be able to absorb all the Turkmen gas.

#### Iranian-Libyan Sanctions act

With these two Iranian pipelines the Afghan pipelines would become more or less useless. To prevent the construction of the Iranian pipelines the US Congress passed the Iranian-Libyan Sanctions act, threatening anyone who would help Iran constructing them, and forbidding transactions with Iran of \$ 4 million or higher. That was on June 18, 1996. Nevertheless on August 30, 1996 Turkey signed a 20-year deal to buy gas from Iran. & The Turkish president would be punished for his Islamic solidarity by a military coup forcing him to resign. That was on June 18, 1997.

With the Iranian-Libyan Sanctions act was in place, another US company, Enron, expanded its activities in the region. In Uzbekistan, Enron had obtained a contract for 11 gas fields. In April 1997, George W. Bush himself had intervened to help Enron obtain Uzbeki contracts. Enron counted on a US controlled pipeline through Afghanistan to export a part of the Uzbek gas to its power plant in India.

The US threatened sanctions and blocked the completion of the Turkish pipeline connexion to Iran, so the gas deliveries from Iran to Turkey were delayed several years. In August 2000, Iran and Turkey agreed the gas deliveries would start on July 30, 2001, which would be a few days before the expiration date of the Iranian-Libyan Sanctions act.

Despite the Iranian-Libyan Sanctions act, the construction of the northern pipeline had started on the East side of Iran. Funded by Iran itself, Iran and Turkmenistan opened an international pipeline connexion of 200 km by the end of 1997.

To frustrate further development of the Iranian pipeline to Turkey, the US came up with an idea for an alternative route from Turkmenistan, crossing the Caspian Sea to Azerbaijan and from there to Turkey. Enron did the study for this project.

By that time it looked as if the Afghan pipeline project would be abandoned. In June 1998, Enron withdrew from its Uzbek gas projects and in December UNOCAL withdrew from its consortium for the Afghan pipeline.

The US threats did not prevent big companies like Shell and Total from signing deals with Iran for exploration of oil and gas. Nevertheless, Shell withdrew from its pipeline project in Northern Iran.

The undersea pipeline crossing the Caspian Sea now existed on the drawing table, but in the waters the five surrounding countries (Azerbaijan, Russia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and Iran) had not yet come to an agreement about each other's borders, and thus about the ownership of oil fields. As long as this would last, according to an existing agreement of 1940, Russia and Iran would have to agree with the pipeline under the sea. And they did not.

In 2000, the Turkmen president had blamed the US for the delay in the trans-Caspian pipeline and had resumed gas deliveries to Russia. That May, president Putin had even come to Turkmenistan to offer extended deals for several years. Meanwhile, in Kazakhstan, the oil from the Tengiz field (world's sixth largest oil field) was going to be pumped via Russia to the Black Sea.

#### George W. Bush sworn in

On January 20, 2001, George W. Bush was sworn in as president of the US. He is the son of ex-president George H.W. Bush. The family is from Texas and has close ties with the oil and energy related companies there. These companies have contributed a lot to Bush's election campaign.

Companies contributing to election campaigns is a common phenomenon in the US. The financial support for candidates' campaigns determines how much marketing they can afford and, ultimately, their chances to win the elections. Of course, when these companies invest a lot of money, they expect something in return when their candidate wins, like nominations in the administration, influence for big business orders or favourable laws and amendments.

#### Enron

Enron had been the biggest contributor of the Bush 2000 election campaign. In fact, the company had generously contributed to father and son's election campaigns since 1985. Enron's chairman, Kenneth Lay, had close personal contacts with the Bushes. He had even been a sleeping guest at the White House. During these years, Enron had

---

expanded from a regional energy supplier to a giant multinational and the seventh biggest company in the US.

Although loaded with debts caused by its giant investments abroad, Enron always showed splendid results. How? In 1997 the Securities and Exchange Commission had exempted Enron from the Investment Company Act of 1940 that prohibits US companies from leaving debt from overseas projects off the books. At the same time Andy Fastow, Enron's senior vice president of finance, had started his "creative" financing.

Since 1993, in India, Enron had invested \$ 2.9 billion for a power plant near Bombay. Originally it had counted on cheap supply of gas from Turkmenistan via the planned pipeline through Afghanistan. The power plant project had turned into a nightmare.

Enron had faced severe criticism over their contemptuous way of doing business. They had experienced severe opposition from the local population after hiring police officers to beat down protests of opponents. Charges had been filed against the company for human right violations.

Last but not least, the price of the produced electricity averaged more than double the price of power from other suppliers. Taking into account the real cost supported by the regional electricity company, Enron's price was even 700 percent higher. The regional electricity company could not pay Enron's bills anymore. As retaliation, in January 2001, Enron had cut the power for 200 million people in Northern India, demanding three times the normal price. (Around the same time, Enron provoked power cuts in California too, also in order to obtain higher prices. )

In 1997 Enron had started gas projects in Uzbekistan, for which George W. Bush had had personal contacts with the Uzbek ambassador.

As soon as the Bush administration was in place, vice president Cheney would reward Enron for their support during the elections. Enron's chairman, Kenneth Lay, had a wish list that was almost entirely included in Cheney's proposals for the new US energy policy. Cheney also intervened to help Enron collect a \$64 million debt for its power plant near Bombay, during a meeting with Indian opposition leader Sonia Ghandi in Washington on June 27 2001.

#### BinLaden Group

Enron had also connexions with the construction firm BinLadin from Saudi Arabia, with which it constructed a power plant in the Gaza strip. (The power plant would not be finished before Enron's bankruptcy in December 2001.)

The wealthy bin Laden family is well known to the Bush family. Salem bin Laden supplied part of the money for George W. Bush first oil company, Arbusto, in 1978. The father of George W. Bush, after being US' president, joined the Carlyle group and developed relations with the BinLadin company. He met the family in November 1998 and in January 2000.

Bin Laden also invested in the Carlyle group. H.W. Bush still met with Shafiq bin Laden, Osama's brother, on September 10, 2001 at the annual investor conference of the Carlyle Group. Like Enron, Carlyle had made a tremendous development. In the early 1990s son Bush had been member of the board of a catering service for airliners. Carlyle had bought the catering company.

Although the catering service crashed, Carlyle has grown into an important defence contractor in the US. A bunch of well-known former politicians, including George W. Bush father, former UK Prime Minister John Major and former president of the Philippines Mister Ramos, are making a lot of money from the "war on terror".

#### Osama

There is a terrible lot of information available about bin Laden's son, Osama. However, almost all of it comes from sources that cannot be verified, like comments by unknown people who would have known him or met him. Other stories are based on allegations by people who have big business interests in the "war on terrorism", like the Bush. One step further, you find the comments by officials "convinced" that everything that has been said about Osama is true.

On the other extremity, there is the image Osama draws of himself in an interview by CNN reporter Peter Arnett in 1997. According to this interview he is, first of all, a faithful, who understands people who fight against the US soldiers who came to steal the oil and who attacked the Islamic religion. He denies having organized any attacks against the US himself. (Many people will remember a videotape with "Osama's confession", that he knew about the attacks of 9/11 in advance, which turned out to be a fake. )

Osama would become Bush's key excuse to invade Afghanistan. On September 17, 2001 Bush would declare Osama bin Laden was wanted "dead or alive".

Why did Osama bin Laden stay in Afghanistan? Here too, different sources give different stories. He had already been in Afghanistan during the eighties, helping the mudjahedeen fight against the Soviet occupation (as did the US). Back in

---

Saudi Arabia in 1989, he had opposed the king's alliance with the US.

When his passport was confiscated, he at first fled back to Afghanistan, and then settled in Sudan in 1992, where all Muslims were welcome since a regime change the year before. In 1994, because of his support to fundamentalist Muslim movements, Saudi Arabia revoked his citizenship and froze his funds.

After the assassination attempt against Egyptian president Mubarak in Ethiopia on June 26, 1995, Sudan was accused of being behind it. The relations between Egypt and Sudan deteriorate in the current of 1995.

At this point, let us jump to Afghanistan. In February 1996 things went wrong for the US pipeline project in Afghanistan. President Rabbani of Afghanistan contracted the Argentinean BRIDAS instead of UNOCAL for the construction and exploitation of the gas pipeline. For the US, to get the pipeline project back in the hands of UNOCAL, Rabbani would have to disappear. But who could be accused if Rabbani were killed?

Back to Sudan. March 8, 1996, the US suddenly asked Sudan to extradite Osama. It did not specify to which country. Since the Saudis took his passport and nationality away, Osama had few options. On May 18, 1996, he left Sudan and returned to Afghanistan.

Years afterward, many people were still wondering why he had not been arrested at that occasion.

In Afghanistan, events would take a different turn. From March 20 to April 4, 1996, Taliban leaders had held a shura (meeting) and concluded with a jihad against Rabbani. Osama arrived on May 18, but would not get involved. On September 27, the Taliban conquered Kabul and president Rabbani fled and joined the Northern alliance. At that moment things must have looked hopeful for the UNOCAL pipeline project. Unfortunately for them, in November 1996 BRIDAS signed a new contract with the Taliban.

Ultimately this would lead to the eviction from power of the Taliban. Clinton would not attack Afghanistan after the US embassy bombings in Africa in 1998, maybe thanks to Monica Lewinsky. Bush did, after "the catastrophic and catalysing events" of 9/11.

After having used the presence of Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan as his key excuse to invade the country, Bush would state, on March 13, 2002, he wasn't truly that concerned about Osama bin Laden.

Karzai

After the US conquest of Afghanistan (or at least of its capital), UNOCAL's advisor Hamid Karzai would be appointed Chairman of the interim administration of Afghanistan. On June 16, 2002, still before there was an elected president, Karzai would sign an official agreement with Turkmenistan and Pakistan for a gas pipeline through Afghanistan.

But even if the gas pipeline would come too late to transport Turkmen gas to Pakistan, Afghanistan remains an interesting booty. It has its own gigantic gas field south of the Turkmen field, near Mazar e Sharif. It has also several oil fields and coal. Furthermore, in the 1970s British geologists had already found 1600 places with minerals.

### 3: Preparations for 9/11 and the invasion of Afghanistan

#### Timing of the attacks

As noticed above, the timing for the attacks on the US embassies in Africa helped Clinton, as it drew away the attention from his threatening conviction of perjury in the Monica Lewinsky affair, and focused on the common enemies: the terrorists.

The invasion of Afghanistan would have to wait for the next US president. Between 1998 and 2001 there was enough time to plan everything carefully. Below we will notice, that the attacks of 9/11 occurred at the very moment everything was in place. The only thing missing was a pretext to get support from Congress, from the US population and the rest of the world...

#### Military preparations

For the US to invade Afghanistan at the other side of the world was a delicate operation. Step by step the US had pushed its influence and control in the former soviet republics. US oil and gas related companies had started up activities in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan and US' military had gained influence in the region, challenging Russia and China in their backyards.

Already in 1997, north of Afghanistan, the US had considerably expanded its military "cooperation" with Kazakhstan, which forms the buffer with Russia. In 1999, closer to Afghanistan, the US expanded its presence in Kyrgyzstan, and in

---

Uzbekistan, one of Afghanistan's direct neighbours. April 14-15, 2000, Uzbek and US troops conducted joint military exercises.

East of Afghanistan the US administration has strong ties with the Pakistani intelligence service. Its director, Lieutenant-General Mahmoud Ahmad, was with US officials the week before and during the attacks of 9/11. On the west side F-15 were based in Saudi-Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey and the Fifth fleet was permanently based in the Persian Gulf.

For the war in Afghanistan, huge transports of troops and material had to be organized well before the invasion. On November 7, 2000, the day all US-citizens were occupied with the election of their president, the UK announced its biggest military exercise since the Gulf War, operation Swift Sword (Saif Sareea in Arabic), involving 24,000 troops and a lot of heavy material.

The exercise took place in Oman, a strategic location, since all oil tankers from the Persian Gulf region (Saudi-Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Kuwait, Iraq and Iran) have to cross the Gulf of Oman. Here the UK detains a War Material Storage. They exercised on the coast of Oman from September 15 until the end of October 2001, and started moving their material in August 2001. The UK participated in the invasion.

From October 8 until the end of October, 2001 another military operation was planned in Egypt: NATO Operation Bright Star. It was the world's largest exercise with more than 11 Nations, and over 70,000 troops (among which 23,000 from the US) participating.

Among several other "coincidental" military moves towards Afghanistan, we notice that on July 23 2001 aircraft carrier Carl Vinson was sent out from Bremerton (on US West coast) to the Arabian Sea. It arrived just in time to launch the first air strikes on Afghanistan on October 7, 2001.

#### Diplomatic preparations

On the diplomatic front, to lower the risk of upsetting China, on June 19 2001, Bush had proposed to attend the APEC summit in Shang Hai and was expected to meet president Zemin between October 15 and October 21 2001. & (Bush's meeting with presidents Zemin and Putin took place on October 20, 2001)

Besides, in 2001 China was completing its bilateral agreements with all 37 WTO members to become a full WTO-member. China wanted to become member since many years. China's bilateral agreement with Mexico would be the last and this would complete China's membership. In July 2001 Bush would polish his relations with Mexico, "lobbying" against US unfair import restrictions on Mexican trucks.

This was probably not only to get the Mexicans in the right mood to sign with China, but also because Mexico would be member of the UN Security Council in 2002 and 2003. China reached its bilateral agreement with Mexico and became WTO member on September 13, 2001.

#### Bush's unmanned systems

In the summer of 1999, a number of US embassies on the African continent were closed for the weekend because of suspicious people hanging around. A few days later Clinton had issued its order prohibiting commercial transactions with the Taliban. A few months later George W. Bush presented his ideas of defences "on the troubled frontiers of technology and terror."

He said, "In the air, we must be able to strike from across the world with pinpoint accuracy - with long-range aircraft and perhaps with unmanned systems."

In September 1999 Bush still said "perhaps". He was still considering. This was at a time the market for unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's) for both military as well as civil aviation was rapidly developing. By 2001 there were more than 60 types of UAV world wide, from small models to big planes.

At the time of Bush's speech in 1999, the US was developing Global Hawk , a military UAV with a wing span comparable to a Boeing 737, which had made its first flight from Edwards Air Force Base, CA on 28 February 1998. After Bush became president, on April 23, 2001 the Global Hawk made a historical first unmanned test flight to Australia.

#### 9/11

Not all material about 9/11 has been released to the public. Some of the reliable evidence has been confiscated by the CIA. Statements of officials often turned out to be contradictory. And, in particular about possible advanced knowledge, the White House has confiscated dozens of documents of the 9/11 Commission. It doesn't make truth finding easier.

---

The official version of the events on 9/11 involves a very high number of coincidences that facilitated the "success" of the attacks.

A nationwide military exercise, Global Guardian, originally planned for November 2001, is in full swing, creating confusion between exercises and real-world events.

A large-scale military exercise, Vigilant Guardian, is taking place and involves all of NORAD, the defence department, which normally sends fighter jets after civil airplanes several times a week, when flight control operators report incidences.

The Vigilant Guardian exercise simulates an air attack on the United States.

NORAD is also running a planned real-world operation named Operation Northern Vigilance, for which many NORAD fighters are located in Alaska and Canada.

Operation Northern Vigilance also creates false blips on radar screens at least until the second plane crashes into the World Trade Centre.

In Washington a planned National Reconnaissance Office exercise involves a scenario of an airplane as a flying weapon.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is flying across the Atlantic on the way to Europe.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency Director is at a conference in Montana.

FAA hijack coordinator, who has to contact the National Military Command Centre in case of hijacks, is in Puerto Rico and cannot be reached.

All of FBI's anti-terrorist and top special operations agents are, together with the members of the CIA's anti-terrorist task force, on a training exercise in Monterey, California.

For the day of 9/11, the commander of the National Military Command Centre had requested to be replaced by someone without experience.

For FAA's new National Operations Manager it is the first day on the job.

The hijackers can board without trouble, since the official no-fly list is only used for international flights and, curiously, not for domestic flights. &

Informed a few minutes after the start of the first hijack (Flight 11), American Airlines top management decide to "keep it quiet".

Boston flight controllers do not follow normal procedures and lose time by contacting various military bases, instead of NORAD.

After NORAD is finally informed, two F-15 will remain on the ground and only take off when flight 11 already crashes into the WTC.

For various reasons F-16 will only arrive on scene after the last plane has crashed. &

A decision is taken to ground not only civil airplanes, but also all military planes.

The presumed hijacker pilot of flight 77 was not able to fly a Cessna without difficulty in August, but succeeded to spiral down a Boeing 757 and hit the Pentagon a few meters above the ground on September 11.

The President doesn't give any orders responding to the attack until just before the last plane crashes.

Above I only mentioned those coincidences that facilitated the success of the attacks. If I were to build a story on such series of coincidences, nobody would believe me. Well, I would not either. Keeping the things in their context, it makes more sense to look at them as facts, and not as coincidences.

All released details show that the attacks of 9/11 were carried out with military precision. However, the hijackers on the planes would have been improvised pilots without the extraordinary skills needed to fly like has been reported. &

Besides, they would not have been intelligent enough to foresee the reactions triggered by their actions. Apparently they had so little political awareness, they had not heard about the neoconservatives waiting for such a "catastrophic and catalysing event" to speed up US' conquests.

The success of the plan relied on a lot of advanced knowledge of the situation that day, like the confusion offered by planned military exercises and the scenarios played by them, like the confusion offered by fake radar blips, like traffic controllers lacking of primary radar images in specific areas, like the absence of several experienced officers in the command chains responding to the hijacks, like the absence of armed jet fighters to frustrate their plans.

All this seems more the work of a more influential and well trained organization, an organization willing to provide the justification for the neoconservatives' conquest plans, with Afghanistan as first target.

It does not seem likely to me that such an organization would let the success of its operation depend on the improvised skills of the hijackers. It makes more sense to suppose the hijackers were not in control. (In spite of an overheard phrase in the cockpit of the fourth plane, having been translated as "Pull it down" and by officials interpreted as "Crash the plane" ) It seems more likely the operation was conducted on the troubled frontier of technology and terror, and that technology had taken over the controls.

The two types of planes used, Boeing 757 and 767, can be controlled remotely. Robert Ayling, a former boss of British Airways, suggested in the Financial Times a few days after 9/11 that aircraft could be commandeered from the ground and controlled remotely in the event of a hijack. On 9/11 the remote control would have been in the hands of the wrong

people.

If we look closer to the remote control scenario, we notice that if the published details about the transponders are right:

1. the transponder of the second 767 is turned off shortly after the first 767 crashes.
2. the transponder of the second 757 is turned off shortly after the first 757 crashes.

So, it looks as if one remote pilot handled the two 767 one after the other, and another remote pilot handled the two 757 one after the other. ( 9/11 Commission Report, P.32, 8:47 & 9:41)

It has also been reported that a C-130 military cargo plane was tailing flight 77 when it crashed into the Pentagon. The same C-130 was behind flight 93 when it crashed. Did the plane play a role? Or was it just a coincidental tourist, flying around while all other planes had been ordered to land? , ,

The hijackers hijacked?

Although the official story asks us to believe the hijackers wanted to fly into the WTC and the Pentagon, the released pieces of cockpit conversations offer no indications to support this theory. Although mountains of stories and counter-stories have been published about the hijackers, I did not find a single verifiable element.

If the hijackers were to support some Arabic or Islamic cause, they would probably be in a stronger position if they had returned to airports with four planes and hundreds of US citizens in their might. They could have negotiated the release of political prisoners. They could have demanded a retreat of US forces from Saudi Arabia. They could have pleaded any cause they were after.

Did the hijackers really have in mind to strike the WTC and the Pentagon or were they overruled by the organization that had "contracted" them? Will we find out? According to the official story, all radio contact and overhearing of cockpit conversations stopped before the planes made their final approach of the WTC and the Pentagon. If the hijackers were to create the biggest possible spectacle, wouldn't they have shouted a last accusation against the US or a last glorious prayer to Allah? Or were they surprised and in panic when they flew into the buildings?

Conclusion

The Afghan pipelines are only one step in US political moves to take over the influence in the oil and gas rich former Soviet republics. Consuming 25 percent of the world oil consumption, their imperialism is first of all about energy. Today the US already relies for over 60 percent on foreign oil, a percentage that is quickly increasing. The neoconservative ideas to transform the US into a "dominant force" do not come out of nowhere.

The thought that they needed a "catastrophic and catalysing event" was not just motivated by the personal financial benefits several of them get from the war industries. It was also a sign of panic of a nation facing drying up oil wells and preparing itself to conquer foreign oil wells until the last drip is gone.

=====

## Re:Pipeline Politics, an Afghanistan Primer

Posted by Choco - 2008/07/05 12:21

Here's some stuff from the Guardian about the convenient death of Ken Lay with some bloggers comments following.

[http://blogs.guardian.co.uk/news/2006/07/ken\\_lay.html](http://blogs.guardian.co.uk/news/2006/07/ken_lay.html)

And this guy also died before his time, proving health insurance is not necessary.

The Mysterious Death Of An Enron Exec

WASHINGTON, April 10, 2002

-----  
(CBS) It may be the biggest outstanding mystery in the Enron story: the death of Cliff Baxter, a former top Enron executive. He'd just agreed to testify to Congress in the Enron case. A congressional source tells CBS News that Baxter wasn't a target in the probe, he was to provide evidence against others.

---

But on the morning of January 25th he was found in his car - shot dead.

Police were criticized for calling it a suicide before investigating, so they kept the case open. The fact that it's still open more than two months later has made the Cliff Baxter case prime fodder for murder conspiracy theories, reports CBS News Correspondent Sharyl Attkisson.

Adding to the mystery is a letter - perhaps a suicide note - that Baxter's wife is fighting to keep private. Groups like the Texas Freedom of Information Foundation want at least part of it made public.

"I believe very strongly that Enron is mentioned in it," said Joel White, the group's attorney.

More questions are raised in police, autopsy and lab reports obtained by CBS News.

Police won't talk while the case is open, so CBS News asked two experts - independent coroner Cyril Wecht and former homicide detective Bill Wagner - to review the reports. While suicide appears likely, both experts say the documents make it impossible to discount foul play.

Asked why he couldn't rule out murder, Wagner said, "because murder can be made to look like a suicide. ... Someone who is knowledgeable about forensics can very well have the ability to stage a murder, commit a murder and stage it to look as if it was a suicide, understanding what the police are going to be looking for."

The experts found several things highly unusual. First the peculiar ammunition: not regular bullets but something called "rat-shot".

"This kind of ammunition cannot be easily or readily traced back to the gun from which it was fired," explained Wecht.

"It's not as frequently used by people for any reason. It's not the type of ammunition one finds in guns - it has a specific purpose: shooting at snakes and rodents in order to get a distribution pattern of the small pellets contained within the nose portion of the bullet. It's not something that a person is likely to have and to use if they intended to kill themselves," said Wecht.

Other unanswered questions include mysterious wounds on one hand and unexplained shards of glass in Baxter's shirt. All reasons to look deeper to rule out murder.

But Wagner says glaring police errors may make it harder to close the books on the Baxter case.

First, nobody wrapped the hands to preserve evidence.

"When the body did finally arrive for the autopsy, the hands hadn't even been bagged," said Wagner.

"I'm just amazed frankly that the hands were not bagged," Wecht said.

"From what I've seen looking at the vehicle, it doesn't appear they even fingerprinted it," continued Wagner.

"The police narrative is vague for this type of investigation. It's important to get a timeline of the events that took place through the course of investigation - that appears to be lacking in the original report from the crime scene. Without that, without being able to piece together what was done when, it's very difficult to understand the events that took place and how they unfolded from that report," said Wagner.

The gun and other evidence were moved before photos were taken. The body was moved as well. There's a puzzling mention of blood outside the car from someone laying Baxter on the ground.

Wagner says that only should have happened if rescuers pulled him out to revive him. But even that scenario doesn't add up - the body is back in the car when the funeral home arrives "and that's something that is not explained in the police reports," said Wagner.

"I think there were some very important things omitted from the original investigation report that should have been included in it. I would like to have known what were the first couple things the Fire Department did to treat the victim allegedly as he was sitting in the car and from that point how did they change the initial crime scene. What was moved? Did they remove the body from the vehicle? It's actually unclear how they treated the actual scene," Wagner said.

Incredibly, even though an autopsy is required by law, none was ordered. By the time that decision was reversed, Baxter's body was being processed at a funeral home.

The coroner says police still won't tell her exactly who handled and who saw the body before it finally reached her and

won't even give her routine information.

The official finding on Baxter's death may well end up being suicide, but for now his death certificate remains unsigned. And at least one provocative question is left permanently unanswered: what, exactly, Cliff Baxter would have told investigators about the biggest corporate scandal in history.

What did Baxter know about Cheney's secret energy task force and what did he know about the pretext to invading Afghanistan?

---

## Re:Pipeline Politics, an Afghanistan Primer

Posted by Choco - 2008/07/05 13:06

### TESTIMONY

BY

JOHN J. MARESCA

VICE PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

UNOCAL CORPORATION

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

FEBRUARY 12, 1998

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, I am John Maresca, Vice President, International Relations, of Unocal Corporation.

Unocal is one of the world's leading energy resource and project development companies. Our activities are focused on three major regions -- Asia, Latin America and the U.S. Gulf of Mexico. In Asia and the U.S. Gulf of Mexico, we are a major oil and gas producer. I appreciate your invitation to speak here today. I believe these hearings are important and timely, and I congratulate you for focusing on Central Asia oil and gas reserves and the role they play in shaping U.S. policy.

Today we would like to focus on three issues concerning this region, its resources and U.S. policy:

The need for multiple pipeline routes for Central Asian oil and gas.

The need for U.S. support for international and regional efforts to achieve balanced and lasting political settlements within Russia, other newly independent states and in Afghanistan.

The need for structured assistance to encourage economic reforms and the development of appropriate investment climates in the region. In this regard, we specifically support repeal or removal of Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act.

For more than 2,000 years, Central Asia has been a meeting ground between Europe and Asia, the site of ancient east-west trade routes collectively called the Silk Road and, at various points in history, a cradle of scholarship, culture and power. It is also a region of truly enormous natural resources, which are revitalizing cross-border trade, creating positive political interaction and stimulating regional cooperation. These resources have the potential to recharge the economies of neighboring countries and put entire regions on the road to prosperity.

About 100 years ago, the international oil industry was born in the Caspian/Central Asian region with the discovery of oil. In the intervening years, under Soviet rule, the existence of the region's oil and gas resources was generally known, but only partially or poorly developed.

As we near the end of the 20th century, history brings us full circle. With political barriers falling, Central Asia and the Caspian are once again attracting people from around the globe who are seeking ways to develop and deliver its bountiful energy resources to the markets of the world.

The Caspian region contains tremendous untapped hydrocarbon reserves, much of them located in the Caspian Sea basin itself. Proven natural gas reserves within Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan equal more than 236 trillion cubic feet. The region's total oil reserves may reach more than 60 billion barrels of oil -- enough to service Europe's oil needs for 11 years. Some estimates are as high as 200 billion barrels. In 1995, the region was producing only 870,000 barrels per day (44 million tons per year).

By 2010, Western companies could increase production to about 4.5 million barrels a day (Mb/d) -- an increase of more than 500 percent in only 15 years. If this occurs, the region would represent about five percent of the world's total oil production, and almost 20 percent of oil produced among non-OPEC countries.

One major problem has yet to be resolved: how to get the region's vast energy resources to the markets where they are needed. There are few, if any, other areas of the world where there can be such a dramatic increase in the supply of oil and gas to the world market. The solution seems simple: build a "new" Silk Road. Implementing this solution, however, is far from simple. The risks are high, but so are the rewards.

**Finding and Building Routes to World Markets**  
One of the main problems is that Central Asia is isolated. The region is bounded on the north by the Arctic Circle, on the east and west by vast land distances, and on the south by a series of natural obstacles -- mountains and seas -- as well as political obstacles, such as conflict zones or sanctioned countries.

This means that the area's natural resources are landlocked, both geographically and politically. Each of the countries in

the Caucasus and Central Asia faces difficult political challenges. Some have unsettled wars or latent conflicts. Others have evolving systems where the laws -- and even the courts -- are dynamic and changing. Business commitments can be rescinded without warning, or they can be displaced by new geopolitical realities.

In addition, a chief technical obstacle we face in transporting oil is the region's existing pipeline infrastructure. Because the region's pipelines were constructed during the Moscow-centered Soviet period, they tend to head north and west toward Russia. There are no connections to the south and east.

Depending wholly on this infrastructure to export Central Asia oil is not practical. Russia currently is unlikely to absorb large new quantities of "foreign" oil, is unlikely to be a significant market for energy in the next decade, and lacks the capacity to deliver it to other markets.

Certainly there is no easy way out of Central Asia. If there are to be other routes, in other directions, they must be built. Two major energy infrastructure projects are seeking to meet this challenge. One, under the aegis of the Caspian Pipeline Consortium, or CPC, plans to build a pipeline west from the Northern Caspian to the Russian Black Sea port of Novorossisk. From Novorossisk, oil from this line would be transported by tanker through the Bosphorus to the Mediterranean and world markets.

The other project is sponsored by the Azerbaijan International Operating Company (AIOC), a consortium of 11 foreign oil companies including four American companies -- Unocal, Amoco, Exxon and Pennzoil. It will follow one or both of two routes west from Baku. One line will angle north and cross the North Caucasus to Novorossisk. The other route would cross Georgia and extend to a shipping terminal on the Black Sea port of Supsa. This second route may be extended west and south across Turkey to the Mediterranean port of Ceyhan.

But even if both pipelines were built, they would not have enough total capacity to transport all the oil expected to flow from the region in the future; nor would they have the capability to move it to the right markets. Other export pipelines must be built.

Unocal believes that the central factor in planning these pipelines should be the location of the future energy markets that are most likely to need these new supplies. Just as Central Asia was the meeting ground between Europe and Asia in centuries past, it is again in a unique position to potentially service markets in both of these regions -- if export routes to these markets can be built. Let's take a look at some of the potential markets.

#### Western Europe

Western Europe is a tough market. It is characterized by high prices for oil products, an aging population, and increasing competition from natural gas. Between 1995 and 2010, we estimate that demand for oil will increase from 14.1 Mb/d (705 Mt/y) to 15.0 Mb/d (750 Mt/y), an average growth rate of only 0.5 percent annually. Furthermore, the region is already amply supplied from fields in the Middle East, North Sea, Scandinavia and Russia. Although there is perhaps room for some of Central Asia's oil, the Western European market is unlikely to be able to absorb all of the production from the Caspian region.

#### Central and Eastern Europe

Central and Eastern Europe markets do not look any better. Although there is increased demand for oil in the region's transport sector, natural gas is gaining strength as a competitor. Between 1995 and 2010, demand for oil is expected to increase by only half a million barrels per day, from 1.3 Mb/d (67 Mt/y) to 1.8 Mb/d (91.5 Mt/y). Like Western Europe, this market is also very competitive. In addition to supplies of oil from the North Sea, Africa and the Middle East, Russia supplies the majority of the oil to this region.

#### The Domestic NIS Market

The growth in demand for oil also will be weak in the Newly Independent States (NIS). We expect Russian and other NIS markets to increase demand by only 1.2 percent annually between 1997 and 2010.

#### Asia/Pacific

In stark contrast to the other three markets, the Asia/Pacific region has a rapidly increasing demand for oil and an expected significant increase in population. Prior to the recent turbulence in the various Asian/Pacific economies, we anticipated that this region's demand for oil would almost double by 2010. Although the short-term increase in demand will probably not meet these expectations, Unocal stands behind its long-term estimates.

Energy demand growth will remain strong for one key reason: the region's population is expected to grow by 700 million people by 2010.

(My comment: All the cost in lives and injuries and expense to the American people and they never even intended to ship the oil back to the States).

It is in everyone's interests that there be adequate supplies for Asia's increasing energy requirements. If Asia's energy needs are not satisfied, they will simply put pressure on all world markets, driving prices upwards everywhere. The key question is how the energy resources of Central Asia can be made available to satisfy the energy needs of nearby Asian markets. There are two possible solutions -- with several variations.

#### Export Routes

##### East to China: Prohibitively Long?

One option is to go east across China. But this would mean constructing a pipeline of more than 3,000 kilometers to central China -- as well as a 2,000-kilometer connection to reach the main population centers along the coast. Even with these formidable challenges, China National Petroleum Corporation is considering building a pipeline east from Kazakhstan to Chinese markets.

Unocal had a team in Beijing just last week for consultations with the Chinese. Given China's long-range outlook and its ability to concentrate resources to meet its own needs, China is almost certain to build such a line. The question is what

---

will the costs of transporting oil through this pipeline be and what netback will the producers receive.

South to the Indian Ocean: A Shorter Distance to Growing Markets. A second option is to build a pipeline south from Central Asia to the Indian Ocean.

One obvious potential route south would be across Iran. However, this option is foreclosed for American companies because of U.S. sanctions legislation.

(Here it is, here is why John J. Maresca should be standing trial for what he knows about this great incentive to invade Afghanistan).

The only other possible route option is across Afghanistan, which has its own unique challenges. The country has been involved in bitter warfare for almost two decades. The territory across which the pipeline would extend is controlled by the Taliban, an Islamic movement that is not recognized as a government by most other nations. From the outset, we have made it clear that construction of our proposed pipeline cannot begin until a recognized government is in place that has the confidence of governments, lenders and our company. In spite of this, a route through Afghanistan appears to be the best option with the fewest technical obstacles. It is the shortest route to the sea and has relatively favorable terrain for a pipeline. The route through Afghanistan is the one that would bring Central Asian oil closest to Asian markets and thus would be the cheapest in terms of transporting the oil.

Unocal envisions the creation of a Central Asian Oil Pipeline Consortium. The pipeline would become an integral part of a regional oil pipeline system that will utilize and gather oil from existing pipeline infrastructure in Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Russia.

The 1,040-mile-long oil pipeline would begin near the town of Chardzhou, in northern Turkmenistan, and extend southeasterly through Afghanistan to an export terminal that would be constructed on the Pakistan coast on the Arabian Sea. Only about 440 miles of the pipeline would be in Afghanistan.

This 42-inch-diameter pipeline will have a shipping capacity of one million barrels of oil per day. Estimated cost of the project -- which is similar in scope to the Trans Alaska Pipeline -- is about US\$2.5 billion.

There is considerable international and regional political interest in this pipeline. Asian crude oil importers, particularly from Japan, are looking to Central Asia and the Caspian as a new strategic source of supply to satisfy their desire for resource diversity. The pipeline benefits Central Asian countries because it would allow them to sell their oil in expanding and highly prospective hard currency markets. The pipeline would benefit Afghanistan, which would receive revenues from transport tariffs, and would promote stability and encourage trade and economic development. Although Unocal has not negotiated with any one group, and does not favor any group, we have had contacts with and briefings for all of them. We know that the different factions in Afghanistan understand the importance of the pipeline project for their country, and have expressed their support of it.

A recent study for the World Bank states that the proposed pipeline from Central Asia across Afghanistan and Pakistan to the Arabian Sea would provide more favorable netbacks to oil producers through access to higher value markets than those currently being accessed through the traditional Baltic and Black Sea export routes.

This is evidenced by the netback values producers will receive as determined by the World Bank study. For West Siberian crude, the netback value will increase by nearly \$2.00 per barrel by going south to Asia. For a producer in western Kazakhstan, the netback value will increase by more than \$1 per barrel by going south to Asia as compared to west to the Mediterranean via the Black Sea.

### Natural Gas Export

Given the plentiful natural gas supplies of Central Asia, our aim is to link a specific natural resource with the nearest viable market. This is basic for the commercial viability of any gas project. As with all projects being considered in this region, the following projects face geo-political challenges, as well as market issues.

Unocal and the Turkish company, Koc Holding A.S., are interested in bringing competitive gas supplies to the Turkey market. The proposed Eurasia Natural Gas Pipeline would transport gas from Turkmenistan directly across the Caspian Sea through Azerbaijan and Georgia to Turkey. Sixty percent of this proposed gas pipeline would follow the same route as the oil pipeline proposed to run from Baku to Ceyhan. Of course, the demarcation of the Caspian remains an issue. Last October, the Central Asia Pipeline, Ltd. (CentGas) consortium, in which Unocal holds an interest, was formed to develop a gas pipeline that will link Turkmenistan's vast natural gas reserves in the Dauletabad Field with markets in Pakistan and possibly India. An independent evaluation shows that the field's resources are adequate for the project's needs, assuming production rates rising over time to 2 billion cubic feet of gas per day for 30 years or more.

In production since 1983, the Dauletabad Field's natural gas has been delivered north via Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Russia to markets in the Caspian and Black Sea areas. The proposed 790-mile pipeline will open up new markets for this gas, travelling from Turkmenistan through Afghanistan to Multan, Pakistan. A proposed extension would link with the existing Sui pipeline system, moving gas to near New Delhi, where it would connect with the existing HBJ pipeline. By serving these additional volumes, the extension would enhance the economics of the project, leading to overall reductions in delivered natural gas costs for all users and better margins. As currently planned, the CentGas pipeline would cost approximately \$2 billion. A 400-mile extension into India could add \$600 million to the overall project cost.

---

As with the proposed Central Asia Oil Pipeline, CentGas cannot begin construction until an internationally recognized Afghanistan government is in place. For the project to advance, it must have international financing, government-to-government agreements and government-to-consortium agreements.

#### Conclusion

The Central Asia and Caspian region is blessed with abundant oil and gas that can enhance the lives of the region's residents and provide energy for growth for Europe and Asia.

The impact of these resources on U.S. commercial interests and U.S. foreign policy is also significant and intertwined. Without peaceful settlement of conflicts within the region, cross-border oil and gas pipelines are not likely to be built. We urge the Administration and the Congress to give strong support to the United Nations-led peace process in Afghanistan. U.S. assistance in developing these new economies will be crucial to business' success. We encourage strong technical assistance programs throughout the region. We also urge repeal or removal of Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. This section unfairly restricts U.S. government assistance to the government of Azerbaijan and limits U.S. influence in the region.

Developing cost-effective, profitable and efficient export routes for Central Asia resources is a formidable, but not impossible, task. It has been accomplished before. A commercial corridor, a "new" Silk Road, can link the Central Asia supply with the demand -- once again making Central Asia the crossroads between Europe and Asia.

Thank you.

Yes, and thank you JJ Maresca for making it clear that our oil CEOs put their people into power by stealing elections and orchestrating false flag attacks on their own people, all in the name of garnering world record corporate profits and all the while relying on our socialized military and our patriotic taxpayers shelling out \$12 billion per month so that your free market enterprise can work out well. All this and we get \$4.50 per gallon of gas as our reward. Thanks Bush voters, the real anti Americans.

=====

## Re:Pipeline Politics, an Afghanistan Primer

Posted by Choco - 2008/07/05 13:17

---

Just some more information to drive home the fact that we've been had, BIG TIME!

### Document Says Oil Chiefs Met With Cheney Task Force

By Dana Milbank and Justin Blum  
Washington Post Staff Writers  
Wednesday, November 16, 2005; A01

A White House document shows that executives from big oil companies met with Vice President Cheney's energy task force in 2001 -- something long suspected by environmentalists but denied as recently as last week by industry officials testifying before Congress.

The document, obtained this week by The Washington Post, shows that officials from Exxon Mobil Corp., Conoco (before its merger with Phillips), Shell Oil Co. and BP America Inc. met in the White House complex with the Cheney aides who were developing a national energy policy, parts of which became law and parts of which are still being debated.

In a joint hearing last week of the Senate Energy and Commerce committees, the chief executives of Exxon Mobil Corp., Chevron Corp. and ConocoPhillips said their firms did not participate in the 2001 task force. The president of Shell Oil said his company did not participate "to my knowledge," and the chief of BP America Inc. said he did not know.

Chevron was not named in the White House document, but the Government Accountability Office has found that Chevron was one of several companies that "gave detailed energy policy recommendations" to the task force. In addition, Cheney had a separate meeting with John Browne, BP's chief executive, according to a person familiar with the task force's work; that meeting is not noted in the document.

The task force's activities attracted complaints from environmentalists, who said they were shut out of the task force discussions while corporate interests were present. The meetings were held in secret and the White House refused to release a list of participants. The task force was made up primarily of Cabinet-level officials. Judicial Watch and the Sierra Club unsuccessfully sued to obtain the records.

Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-N.J.), who posed the question about the task force, said he will ask the Justice Department today to investigate. "The White House went to great lengths to keep these meetings secret, and now oil executives may be lying to Congress about their role in the Cheney task force," Lautenberg said.

---

Lea Anne McBride, a spokeswoman for Cheney, declined to comment on the document. She said that the courts have upheld "the constitutional right of the president and vice president to obtain information in confidentiality."

The executives were not under oath when they testified, so they are not vulnerable to charges of perjury; committee Democrats had protested the decision by Commerce Chairman Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) not to swear in the executives. But a person can be fined or imprisoned for up to five years for making "any materially false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or representation" to Congress.

Alan Huffman, who was a Conoco manager until the 2002 merger with Phillips, confirmed meeting with the task force staff. "We met in the Executive Office Building, if I remember correctly," he said.

A spokesman for ConocoPhillips said the chief executive, James J. Mulva, had been unaware that Conoco officials met with task force staff when he testified at the hearing. The spokesman said that Mulva was chief executive of Phillips in 2001 before the merger and that nobody from Phillips met with the task force.

Exxon spokesman Russ Roberts said the company stood by chief executive Lee R. Raymond's statement in the hearing. In a brief phone interview, former Exxon vice president James Rouse, the official named in the White House document, denied the meeting took place. "That must be inaccurate and I don't have any comment beyond that," said Rouse, now retired.

Ronnie Chappell, a spokesman for BP, declined to comment on the task force meetings. Darci Sinclair, a spokeswoman for Shell, said she did not know whether Shell officials met with the task force, but they often meet members of the administration. Chevron said its executives did not meet with the task force but confirmed that it sent President Bush recommendations in a letter.

The person familiar with the task force's work, who requested anonymity out of concern about retribution, said the document was based on records kept by the Secret Service of people admitted to the White House complex. This person said most meetings were with Andrew Lundquist, the task force's executive director, and Cheney aide Karen Y. Knutson.

According to the White House document, Rouse met with task force staff members on Feb. 14, 2001. On March 21, they met with Archie Dunham, who was chairman of Conoco. On April 12, according to the document, task force staff members met with Conoco official Huffman and two officials from the U.S. Oil and Gas Association, Wayne Gibbens and Alby Modiano.

On April 17, task force staff members met with Royal Dutch/Shell Group's chairman, Sir Mark Moody-Stuart, Shell Oil chairman Steven Miller and two others. On March 22, staff members met with BP regional president Bob Malone, chief economist Peter Davies and company employees Graham Barr and Deb Beaubien.

Toward the end of the hearing, Lautenberg asked the five executives: "Did your company or any representatives of your companies participate in Vice President Cheney's energy task force in 2001?" When there was no response, Lautenberg added: "The meeting . . ."

"No," said Raymond.

"No," said Chevron Chairman David J. O'Reilly.

"We did not, no," Mulva said.

"To be honest, I don't know," said BP America chief executive Ross Pillari, who came to the job in August 2001. "I wasn't here then."

"But your company was here," Lautenberg replied.

"Yes," Pillari said.

Shell Oil president John Hofmeister, who has held his job since earlier this year, answered last. "Not to my knowledge," he said.

Research editor Lucy Shackelford contributed to this report.

© 2005 The Washington Post Company

=====

---

## Re:Pipeline Politics, an Afghanistan Primer

Posted by SueN - 2008/07/08 18:32

---

Hi Choco,

To avoid getting the poor software confused and repeating itself, please avoid putting square brackets around urls. Ericka kindly fixed it as you requested by replacing yours with parentheses.

=====

## Re:Pipeline Politics, an Afghanistan Primer

Posted by Choco - 2008/07/08 22:01

---

SueN wrote:

Hi Choco,

To avoid getting the poor software confused and repeating itself, please avoid putting square brackets around urls. Ericka kindly fixed it as you requested by replacing yours with parentheses.

Thanks both of you. I don't recall doing that, at least not deliberately. I'll watch for it though. Looks better now.

=====

## Re:Pipeline Politics, an Afghanistan Primer

Posted by Kerosé - 2008/07/09 19:54

---

DAAAmn my eyes hurt, i only read the first post though, i can't handle anymore, here's a little extra that i thought i'd throw in:

How the SysCorp Corporation 'Flight Termination System' (FTS) works:

There are even newer technologies which have since been developed which offer far greater sophistication, with little, to no input from humans. One such technology was developed by Sysplan Corporation, a company which is apparently completely dedicated to defense items, as well as intelligence and Homeland Security, with advanced tech in those areas their specialty. Sysplan Corporation has developed one technology along these lines, which enables the controller to control not just one 'pilotless drone' but up to eight (8) 'pilot less drones' simultaneously. It is called the 'Flight Termination System' (FTS). Below is a quote from Sysplan Corporation on the FTS:

FTS also allows multiple missions to be run simultaneously with a single CTS unit. In this mode, multiple operator stations share control of the transmitter unit. The FTS control software ensures that the multitasking of the CTS unit is performed seamlessly and is completely transparent to the operators. Original Source File:

SysPlan Corporation FTS System

There has been much progress in these technologies over the last 60 years. While we have just done an overview of the last 25 years for remote controlled technologies, or 'Auto pilots', the technology is really much older than one might think, and was first developed, not surprisingly, for B-25's in and during WW II. From the crude 'Auto-Pilots' for the B-25's during WWII to now, it has advanced infinitely beyond what we perhaps thought possible just 30 years ago. Consider this, that as you read this, Nasa is 'flying' or remotely controlling the latest little robotic units they sent to Mars, using radio signals, and a very sophisticated and advanced offshoot of the technology that we are now learning about. So it shouldn't come as a surprise that we are able now, to control in entirety, up to eight aircraft, and fly them entirely without the intervention of humans, apart from programming the unit. That is correct, this FTS unit by Sysplan Corporation, is capable of flying, from start to finish, up to eight individual aircraft, regardless of size, from taxi and takeoff, the entire flight plan, as well as landing; And this in their own words "is completely transparent to the operators."

Enter Dov Zakheim

---

Below is a quote from the Pentagon Biography on Dov Zakheim:

Dov S. Zakheim was sworn in as the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and Chief Financial Officer for the Department of Defense on May 4, 2001. Dr. Zakheim has previously served in a number of key positions in government and private business. Most recently, he was corporate vice president of System Planning Corp., a technology, research and analysis firm based in Arlington, Va. He also served as chief executive officer of SPC International Corp., a subsidiary specializing in political, military and economic consulting. During the 2000 presidential campaign, he served as a senior foreign policy advisor to then-Governor Bush.

Original Source File:

[http://www.pentagon.gov/bios/zakheim\\_bio.html](http://www.pentagon.gov/bios/zakheim_bio.html)

And below are quotes regarding Dov Zakheim, and his public thoughts about PNAC, Project for a New American Century.

In a document called "Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century" published by The American Enterprise's "Project for a New American Century"(1), System Planning Corporation (SPC) International executive, Dov Zakheim, called for "some catastrophic and catalyzing event - like a new Pearl Harbor" being necessary to foster the frame of mind needed for the American public to support a war in the Middle East that would politically and culturally reshape the region. A respected and established voice in the intelligence community, his views were eagerly accepted, and Dov went from his position at Systems Planning Corporation to become the Comptroller of the Pentagon in May 2001. (2) Perhaps not so coincidentally, it was an SPC subsidiary, TRIDATA CORPORATION, that oversaw the investigation after the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center in 1993.

#### Summary

So we can see that remote control technology isn't something new or only in science fiction. Consider the fact that we can remotely fly vehicles to Mars and then back again. And as already pointed out, most of the flight of a 757 and 767 is done remotely, by computer. With Global positioning now in place, a plane can be flown remotely into just about any spot on earth. The probability that the Drones used on 9/11 were remote controlled vehicles is extremely high, as suicide missions are hard to find recruits for. They had this 17 long years before 9/11, and had much time and public monies to perfect their technology, along with 17 years to do it in. And we can also see the fruits of this NASA technology in today's remotely flown Drones, Global Hawk and Predator. Remote control technology for large commercial airliners is a fact and had matured into a proven and workable technology.

#### AND ALSO THIS REGARDING WAR GAMES AND SUCH

May 8, 2001.

Bush 43 directs Cheney to oversee the "Office of National Preparedness." This new entity is responsible for the nationwide training and preparation effort "to ensure that all facets of our response to the threat from weapons of mass destruction are coordinated and cohesive." This gives Cheney the power to coordinate and schedule training exercises among the civilian and military.

June 1, 2001.

Cheney alters the military's rules of engagement for hijacked aircraft (innocuously classified as "Derelict Airborne Objects"). The military must now ask the President/VP/SecDef for permission to shoot down DAOs.

July 2001.

Cheney coordinates planning/scheduling of five independent yet overlapping military operations or FTXs (Field Training Exercises) for 9/11/2001:

- 1) "Vigilant Warrior," FTX, purpose is classified
- 2) "Vigilant Guardian," FTX hijacking drill requiring participation of all of NORAD
- 3) "Northern Vigilance," mil-op redeploying aircraft from NY & DC area to Russian Arctic
- 4) "Northern Guardian," mil-op redeploys 2/3 of a Langley AFB fighter squadron to Iraq and Iceland (yes, Iceland!)
- 5) "Amalgam Warrior," NORAD mil-op, purpose is classified

September 11, 2001.

The five simultaneous operations/exercises simulating hijacked aircraft confuse NORAD, FAA and other military authorities when the real attacks begin. This confusion delays their response, allowing the attacks to progress unimpeded.

Through the Secret Service's capability to tap into all FAA and NORAD radar Cheney monitors the progress of the attacks. Bush 43 is preoccupied with a pet goat in Florida, leaving Cheney in charge of the "National Command Authority"

in the PEOC (Presidential Emergency Operations Center) at the White House.

As a "hijacked" aircraft approaches the Pentagon, Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta, sitting with Cheney in the PEOC, relates the events (this testimony to the 9/11 Commission was stricken from its final report):

"During the time that the airplane was coming into the Pentagon, there was a young man who would come in and say to the Vice President...the plane is 50 miles out...the plane is 30 miles out...and when it got down to the plane is 10 miles out, the young man also said to the vice president "do the orders still stand?" And the Vice President turned and whipped his neck around and said "Of course the orders still stand, have you heard anything to the contrary!?"

Norman Mineta made it clear to reporters— who verified his quotes in written text alongside him—that Mineta was indeed talking about a stand down order not to shoot down hijacked aircraft headed for the Pentagon.

The aircraft is NOT shot down but is allowed to hit the Pentagon. Obviously Cheney had not issued a shoot-down order but a stand-down order. (Because of the rule-change on 6/1/2001 the military was not allowed to shoot the aircraft down on their own authority.) This is not negligence, but, when you recall the foreknowledge Cheney had, treason.

Contrary to Mineta's sworn testimony, Cheney has denied being in the PEOC at the time this occurred. This is perjury.

As former LAPD police detective Michael Ruppert points out in Chapter 19 of his excellent and well-researched book "Crossing the Rubicon" Cheney had the means, motive, and opportunity sufficient to make a legal case against him for the crimes of 9/11.

July 8-August 4, 1990: Interesting Aside

This was not the first time Cheney had coordinated a military exercise that ended up mimicking real-life-attacks. In 1990, when he was Secretary of Defense under Bush 41, he set up a wargame called "Internal Look" to simulate an Iraqi invasion of Kuwait—before it actually happened.

General Norman Schwarzkopf was interviewed for the documentary "Hidden Wars of Desert Storm" where he said, "We went ahead and did an exercise, what's called a command post exercise, which is what Internal Look was to test our ability to deal with this particular scenario ... Just so happened we were in the middle of conducting the Internal Look command post exercise at the same time the crisis developed in the gulf."

Gosh, what a coincidence!

While the exercise was underway (July 9 through August 4, 1990) Saddam attacked Kuwait on August 2, 1990. As the exercise unfolded, the real-world movements of Iraq's air and ground forces eerily paralleled the scripted scenario of the war game. So closely did actual intelligence reports resemble the fictional exercise messages, the latter had to be prominently stamped "Exercise Only."

NOBODIES FREAKIN READING THIS STUFF ANYWAYS, AND THE SAME PEOPLE WHO ALWAYS WANT PROOF, NOT ALL PROOF BUT FOR SURE AN OVERWHELMING AMOUNT OF EVIDENCE THAT WOULD HAVE A JURY TURN IN A GUILTY VERDICT BEFORE THEY EVEN LEFT THE COURTROOM

=====

## Re:Pipeline Politics, an Afghanistan Primer

Posted by Choco - 2008/07/09 21:29

Kerose wrote:

NOBODIES FREAKIN READING THIS STUFF ANYWAYS, AND THE SAME PEOPLE WHO ALWAYS WANT PROOF, NOT ALL PROOF BUT FOR SURE AN OVERWHELMING AMOUNT OF EVIDENCE THAT WOULD HAVE A JURY TURN IN A GUILTY VERDICT BEFORE THEY EVEN LEFT THE COURTROOM

Nice contribution to this subject. Very informative and easy to read. People are reading, but not commenting. This subject is just too weird for most people. My advice for those people is to think about Einstein's theories, very complex when you start getting into his mathematical mechanics, but the results speak for themselves, so his theories were usually born out. Most people can't wrap their minds around an Einstein or Hawking, or Newton or Galileo, etc. The plotters were on that level only in a diabolical genius fashion. They knew that people were overly subject to hype and image over substance issues and thus all they needed to do was give people a good story to go along with the display. Since the event was

---

traumatizing in it's horror, there must be lingering mental/emotional vulnerability and confusion and many people are still not ready to call it for what it is.

What I don't understand is, how can you not look at all the evidence you can find since so many aspects of life have changed because of this one event?

=====

## Re:Pipeline Politics, an Afghanistan Primer

Posted by Choco - 2008/07/09 21:42

Kerose wrote:

AND ALSO THIS REGARDING WAR GAMES AND SUCH

May 8, 2001.

Bush 43 directs Cheney to oversee the "Office of National Preparedness." This new entity is responsible for the nationwide training and preparation effort "to ensure that all facets of our response to the threat from weapons of mass destruction are coordinated and cohesive." This gives Cheney the power to coordinate and schedule training exercises among the civilian and military.

June 1, 2001.

Cheney alters the military's rules of engagement for hijacked aircraft (innocuously classified as "Derelict Airborne Objects"). The military must now ask the President/VP/SecDef for permission to shoot down DAOs.

July 2001.

Cheney coordinates planning/scheduling of five independent yet overlapping military operations or FTXs (Field Training Exercises) for 9/11/2001:

- 1) "Vigilant Warrior," FTX, purpose is classified
- 2) "Vigilant Guardian," FTX hijacking drill requiring participation of all of NORAD
- 3) "Northern Vigilance," mil-op redeploying aircraft from NY & DC area to Russian Arctic
- 4) "Northern Guardian," mil-op redeploys 2/3 of a Langley AFB fighter squadron to Iraq and Iceland (yes, Iceland!)
- 5) "Amalgam Warrior," NORAD mil-op, purpose is classified

September 11, 2001.

The five simultaneous operations/exercises simulating hijacked aircraft confuse NORAD, FAA and other military authorities when the real attacks begin. This confusion delays their response, allowing the attacks to progress unimpeded.

Through the Secret Service's capability to tap into all FAA and NORAD radar Cheney monitors the progress of the attacks. Bush 43 is preoccupied with a pet goat in Florida, leaving Cheney in charge of the "National Command Authority" in the PEOC (Presidential Emergency Operations Center) at the White House.

As a "hijacked" aircraft approaches the Pentagon, Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta, sitting with Cheney in the PEOC, relates the events (this testimony to the 9/11 Commission was stricken from its final report):

"During the time that the airplane was coming into the Pentagon, there was a young man who would come in and say to the Vice President...the plane is 50 miles out...the plane is 30 miles out....and when it got down to the plane is 10 miles out, the young man also said to the vice president "do the orders still stand?" And the Vice President turned and whipped his neck around and said "Of course the orders still stand, have you heard anything to the contrary!?"

Norman Mineta made it clear to reporters— who verified his quotes in written text alongside him—that Mineta was indeed talking about a stand down order not to shoot down hijacked aircraft headed for the Pentagon.

The aircraft is NOT shot down but is allowed to hit the Pentagon. Obviously Cheney had not issued a shoot-down order but a stand-down order. (Because of the rule-change on 6/1/2001 the military was not allowed to shoot the aircraft down on their own authority.) This is not negligence, but, when you recall the foreknowledge Cheney had, treason.

Contrary to Mineta's sworn testimony, Cheney has denied being in the PEOC at the time this occurred. This is perjury.

As former LAPD police detective Michael Ruppert points out in Chapter 19 of his excellent and well-researched book "Crossing the Rubicon" Cheney had the means, motive, and opportunity sufficient to make a legal case against him for the

---

crimes of 9/11.

July 8-August 4, 1990: Interesting Aside

This was not the first time Cheney had coordinated a military exercise that ended up mimicking real-life-attacks. In 1990, when he was Secretary of Defense under Bush 41, he set up a wargame called "Internal Look" to simulate an Iraqi invasion of Kuwait—before it actually happened.

General Norman Schwarzkopf was interviewed for the documentary "Hidden Wars of Desert Storm" where he said, "We went ahead and did an exercise, what's called a command post exercise, which is what Internal Look was to test our ability to deal with this particular scenario ... Just so happened we were in the middle of conducting the Internal Look command post exercise at the same time the crisis developed in the gulf."

Gosh, what a coincidence!

All that and more. I know, lets just talk about tapping our phones so we can catch the dark skinned bad guys.

London Bombings: False-Flag Operation?  
Rudolph Giuliani Was in London  
During the Bombings

The Dutch in the original article has been translated into English by Roy McCoy.

Former Mayor of New York Rudolph Giuliani, the ultimate expert on exercises-that-coincidentally-become-reality, could assist London since he happened to be there at the moment of the explosions, even right by the place where the first bomb went off.

The exercises-that-coincidentally-became-reality\* in New York on September 11 produced an extremely valuable expert, namely Rudolph Giuliani, the city's mayor at the time. The man who then managed the crisis in his city was at the moment of the bombings in London present right by the subway station where the first bomb went off and thus, with his unique expertise, could be of immediate service to the Brits. Giuliani turned the emergency of September 11 into a feather in his cap and established 'Giuliani Partners , a security consultancy and investment bank,' following thereby the same path as former member of Scotland Yard's anti-terrorism unit Peter Powers, mentioned in the previous part of this article, who led the exercise-that-became-reality with his Visor Consultants on July 7 in London. Powers had to experience what Giuliani had already gone through, and luckily Giuliani was around.

\* Read in DaanSpeak more about the wargames that brought down U.S. defenses on September 11, 2001.

Exercise 2004 as Preparation for Exercise 2005

Giuliani in London to MSNBC: 'It seems to me that the emergency services here in London were prepared for this. I don't mean prepared for the exact day, but prepared for something like this happening. I think they expected this to happen. Unfortunately, they didn't know the day or the hour, but they expected this to happen.' The planners of the London exercise-that-coincidentally-became-reality were not totally unprepared. In April of this year a transatlantic exercise was held 'which included 'bombs' being placed on buses and explosives left on the London underground', wrote The Observer: 'The anti-terror drill, codenamed Exercise Atlantic Blue concentrated on testing security weaknesses in the transport system.'

London, July 2005: Giuliani and ex-CIA Agent Robert Kiley

Giuliani was 'just yards from Liverpool Street station, when the bombs went off', wrote Fox News. When asked how he felt Giuliani said in London: 'I'm not sure, Lester. I don't know. There is a certain question I have in my mind: Why was I so close both times? ... Obviously there was no connection, but only God can answer questions like that, I guess.' Fox News quotes Giuliani when he says about the bombings: "'They are a very eerie reminder of Sept. 11. I was right near Liverpool station when the first bombing took place, so I could hear the sirens and then kept hearing reports of different bombings, in different parts of the city," he told Sky News television. Mr. Giuliani was in the City as the Underground system was evacuated and roads were closed in a rush of emergency vehicles and evacuations.'

That things ran as smoothly as Giuliani said may be due in part to Bob Kiley, currently Commissioner of Transport for London, in earlier days a fairly high-ranking CIA agent. Giuliani is no stranger to Kiley, the savior of the London Underground; more than that, he really likes him: 'London Mayor Ken Livingstone today welcomed the intervention of his New York counterpart after he backed London's Transport Commissioner Bob Kiley. New York Mayor Rudolph Giuliani defended Transport Commissioner Robert Kiley after Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott's office released figures claiming the New York subway was far less safe than the Tube. Mayor Giuliani's press secretary said Mr Kiley was "an incredible asset to New York City"', according to this press release from the mayor of London. Speaking of the CIA and

---

the London Underground: the CIA and Bechtel have often collaborated; Bechtel is part of a trio of firms that the Underground is going to freshen up.

#### Giuliani's Right-Hand Man Associated with Peter Power

The statements of Peter Power -the man behind the exercise-that-coincidentally-became-reality in London- figured centrally in the last two parts of this article series. Rudolph Giuliani and Peter Power have a mutual friend, namely Richard Sheirer. Sheirer was Giuliani's right-hand man and on and around September 11, 2001 was the boss of OEM, 'the major's Office of Emergency Management', writes Mike Ruppert on page 406 of his book Crossing the Rubicon. 'He's the guy Giuliani calls "the man behind the curtain." He's the wizard of OEM', writes New York Metro. Sheirer and Power sat together on the advisory commission CCEP, the Canadian Centre for Emergency Preparedness. Giuliani is Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire. Sheirer is Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire. And: 'Mr. Sheirer is a Senior Vice President at Giuliani Partners'.

#### Suspected Roles of Giuliani and Sheirer on September 11

On September 11 Giuliani was operating out of the Emergency Command Center on the 23rd floor of World Trade Center Building 7. The command center had its own air supply, fuel tanks and bomb-proof windows. WTC 7 was a large building over forty storeys high, was not hit and yet fell in on itself, straight down in the manner of a controlled demolition . As if he had foreseen this drama, Giuliani and his team could simply continue functioning because by chance a large backup-operation center had been created in connection with the Tripod II exercise scheduled to take place the following day, also under the direction of Giuliani and Sheirer. Also earlier on 9/11 Giuliani must have enjoyed a sort of prophetic power, namely concerning the collapse of the WTC towers. Considering the solid structure of the towers, their collapse was unimaginable, and the collapse remains contested to this day because bombs would be what brought the WTC towers down. 'Before either of the twin towers collapsed, Mayor Rudolph Giuliani and his associates were told to leave the headquarters they had set up within Building 7. 'We were operating out of there when we were told that the World Trade Center was gonna collapse,' Rudolph Giuliani told Peter Jennings of ABC News that morning, "and it did collapse before we could get out of the building." Despite this, Giuliani fled WTC 7 at least eight hours before it collapsed. How did he know that the twin towers were going to collapse if it was such an unprecedented occurrence? Why didn't the firefighters on the ground get the same warning?', wrote Prison Planet.

#### Giuliani and Anthrax

Another Giuliani company participated in the cleanup of the anthrax sent to the tabloid Sunday; the attack on the paper was part of a series of attacks that for a time terrorized the U.S. CBS wrote: 'The cleanup is being led by BioONE, a company established by former New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani and Sabre Technical Services, which decontaminated other buildings hit by anthrax attacks.' Earlier we wrote that according to the Washington Post the anthrax spores were consistent with those from the Army base Fort Detrick. This correlation of attacks and Army may be read about also in a section of the previous part of our series on the bombings in London: Bombs Made with Military Explosives.

#### DaanSpeak

Meld je aan voor de gratis mailing list.

=====