

NO MORE ILLUSIONS

HOW ALEX JONES AND OTHERS IN THE
ALTERNATIVE MEDIA HAVE BETRAYED
THE PATRIOT MOVEMENT



BELL



RUPPERT



NOORY



GOODMAN



BLOOD



ALEX JONES



HENCE



RENSE



DUNNE



FLOCCO

VICTOR THORN & LISA GULIANI

Table of Contents

Introduction: Wake Up! You've Been Infiltrated

Alex Jones

- 1) Infowars = Infomercial
- 2) Alex Jones' America: Fear Sells
- 3) Overt Censorship
- 4) All Bark, No Bite
- 5) Cult of Fear
- 6) Ten Questions
- 7) Censorship Sneak
- 8) The Great Debate
- 9) Proof: Money Grubbing Greed
- 10) Censorship Reign of Terror
- 11) Proof: Alex Jones Sells-Out to ABC
- 12) Alex Jones Betrays Patriot Family
- 13) Alex Jones = Big Brother
- 14) Beware the Fearmongers
- 15) Advertisement for *Fear World*
- 16) Alex Jones & the Common Cause: United We Stand
- 17) "Alex Jones" Parody Interview

Mike Ruppert

- 18) Mike Ruppert Unmasked
- 19) Ten Questions
- 20) Mike Ruppert: 9-11 Saboteur
- 21) Hey Ruppert: 9-11 Is Not Dead
- 22) Panhandling Scam

Art Bell

- 23) 9-11 Outrage
- 24) Art Bell Burn in Hell
- 25) Art Bell Sells-Out
- 26) Ten Questions Art Bell Refuses to Answer
- 27) Me, Art Bell & 9-11

George Noory

- 28) Open Letter to George Noory
- 29) *Coast-to-Coast AM* 9-11 Roundtable
- 30) George Noory & the Shadow Rodents
- 31) Disinfo Specialist

Jeff Rense

- 32) Jeff Rense Dupes His Audience
- 33) Jeff Rense Shows His True Color: Yellow

9-11 Mafia

- 34) Kyle Hences False Front
- 35) Kyle Hence-George Soros Connection
- 36) 9-11 Mafia's Wild Goose Chase
- 37) 9-11 Mafia = War Criminals
- 38) 9-11 Truth.org: Fire Your Phony Leaders
- 39) Nicholas Levis: Tarred-and-Feathered
- 40) Does WING TV Advocate Murder?
- 41) Janice Matthews: Queen of Pettiness

Jack Blood

- 42) Jack Blood Sells Out
- 43) Cozying Up to Fox News
- 44) Give a Man Enough Rope ...
- 45) Exposed: WALE Radio Scam
- 46) The Worst Interview Ever: Jack Blood & Tom Flocco
- 47) Poseur Patriot

Tom Flocco

- 48) The Tom Flocco Debacle
- 49) Revealed: Tom Flocco's Next Ten Articles
- 50) Shoddy Journalism Run Rampant

Phil Jayhan

- 51) Jayhan Attacks Alex Jones
- 52) Laughing-Stock
- 53) The 9-11 Pods

Fintan Dunne

- 54) Phony Left/Right Paradigm
- 55) 9-11: The Truth Resonates

9-11 and the Oklahoma City Bombing

- 56) Cynthia McKinney's 9-11 Whitewash
- 57) Charles Key Sells-Out the OKBIC
- 58) Paul Isaac, Jr.: Nailed!

Left Gatekeepers

- 59) Amy Goodman: *Disinformation Now*
- 60) William Rivers "Money" Pitt
- 61) Pitt: A Good Old-Fashioned Debate

Peak Oil

- 62) The "Peak Oil" International Banking Scam
- 63) \$10/barrel
- 64) Peak Oil: U.N. Zionist Scam

Networks

- 65) GCN an ABC Affiliate
- 66) GCN Goes Mainstream
- 67) Analysis: RBN Yanks Peter Schaenk

Alternative Media = Mainstream Media?

- 68) Anatomy of a Betrayal (part one)
- 69) Anatomy of a Betrayal: The Crux Issue
- 70) Anatomy of a Betrayal: Who's Who
- 71) Breaking the Illusion: Does Alternative Media = Mainstream Media?
- 72) Truth Movement Voices of Conscience
- 73) Media Cowards: The Games Are Over
- 74) *Popular Mechanics* 9-11 Challenge
- 75) Company Media Puppets (Media Sleaze 101)
- 76) NYC Indy Media 9-11 Censorship
- 77) Are You a Conditioned Thinker?
- 78) *Outfoxed*: Alternative Media Mind Control Techniques

Fear & Money: The Televangelist-Apocalypse Syndrome

- 79) Activism vs. Fear-Mongering
- 80) OPM: Other People's Money
- 81) Jeffrey Bennett & John Stadtmiller: Strange Bedfellows

Closing Words: Truth - The Supreme Reality

INTRODUCTION: **WAKE UP!** **YOU'VE BEEN INFILTRATED**

By Victor Thorn

9-11 researcher Eric Hufschmid recently wrote an article (October 2005) entitled *To Get Away with Crimes, Pretend to Be a Crime Fighter* that is a virtual blueprint for how government moles and COINTELPRO agents operate. This 'guide' is so valuable to those in the patriot movement who want to determine who among them is a betrayer that I found it necessary to touch upon it as an introduction to our book, *No More Illusions: How Alex Jones and Others in the Alternative Media Have Betrayed the Patriot Movement*, which is the most comprehensive examination of the alternative media ever compiled.

The reason why we need to determine who is real (and who isn't) is obvious: after being deceived for decades by our government, corporate mainstream media, schools, and churches; the alternative media is our last grasp at any semblance of truth. What most boggles my mind is that after being lied to for so long by so many other entities, why do people in the patriot movement so readily accept more lies — without objection! It's incredible.

Luckily, truth-seekers like Eric Hufschmid are still around to expose how extensively we've been manipulated and infiltrated by those who want to prevent the truth from becoming known, rather than the opposite. And as I said earlier, his above-mentioned article serves as an invaluable overview of the techniques and tactics used by these betrayers.

But prior to delving into this list, Hufschmid reminds us of what this war against the globalist cabal is all about: "The people who did 9-11 have a lot to lose if they are exposed ... Do you really think these people are so foolish that they will sit idly by while people expose them?" This point is vital, and it shows how high the stakes really are. In other words, our enemy is comprised of cold-blooded murderers who desperately want to keep their crimes concealed. It is precisely for this reason that they need to infiltrate and corrupt the patriot movement. We're the only force left in the entire world that can destroy them.

With this notion in mind, here are some examples of Hufschmid's conclusions, and also examples of what patriots should be on the lookout for in regard to New World Order operatives:

*** The government pays hundreds, if not thousands, of people who pretend to be 'truth seekers'. Think very hard about the implications of this statement. To cover-up for their horrific deeds, fake patriots are put on the government payroll in vast numbers. Thus, certain people whose radio shows you listen to on a daily basis are actually operatives, as well as numerous people on Internet message boards. This concept should rock your world to the very core.

*** An array of different methods are used to deliberately deflect people's attention away from crux issues (i.e. pods vs. the 9-11 World Trade Center controlled demolition).

*** Fake patriots are paid to call into radio shows and post on message boards to spread disinformation. To determine who these individuals are, see which ones most vocally object to those who point-out censorship, money-grubbing, fear-mongering, sensationalism, and betrayal.

*** Be wary of those who are constantly seeking donations (and have a tin-cup out), or those who make rampant profiteering their main objective.

*** Keep an eye out for those who advocate ludicrous 'news' such as Barbara Olson's arrest, holograms, or un-sourced stories that never pan out. The reason why is evident — all of this insanity drowns out the honest information and gives the entire alternative media a bad name.

*** Useful idiots are employed to either spread false data, or to attack those who are trying to expose the truth (oftentimes anonymously or under fake Internet monikers i.e. Raven, the Queen of Hearts).

*** Cabals of false-front websites often link together to keep people in a maze of disinformation. A good rule of thumb isn't determining who these disinformation sites are linking to, but instead who they aren't linking to. Then ask them why? As Hufschmid notes, every one of these false sites is part of "the same criminal organization."

*** Be highly vigilant when a person or organization is proven to be engaging in treacherous activities (censorship, betrayal, excessive greed, etc), then accuses others of being COINTELPRO. The first thing that popped into my mind when reading these words was the completely baseless attacks waged by Alex Jones and Jeff Rense against WING TV - truly despicable, cowardly behavior that they should be ashamed of.

*** Hufschmid also addresses the World Trade Center controlled demolition issue by showing how groups like 9-11 Truth.org push the line that "no one really knows what happened":

"There is no consensus on this among 9/11 Truth.org staff or within the 9/11 truth movement."

*** He also had this to say about Gatekeeper Nicholas Levis: "In 2004 Jimmy Walter allowed Levis to help set up a 9-11 meeting in New York City. During the meeting it became so obvious that he was a trouble-maker that security guards had to drag Levis out of the meeting."

*** Don't accept excuses like, "Well, even though Mr. A spreads disinformation, he also puts out some good stuff." The reason why such a pronouncement is preposterous is because it contains the very definition of disinformation - the mixing of truth with a preponderance of lies.

*** Ask why prominent Left Gatekeepers such as MoveOn.org, Air America, and the Green Party aren't talking about real issues such as 9-11, the Oklahoma City bombing, or the sinking of the USS Liberty. Hint: I'll bet it has something to do with the big money New World Order luminaries who are financing them.

*** The following Eric Hufschmid quote immediately made me think of Alex Jones: "When you catch somebody lying to you or committing crimes, you should assume that you caught only a fraction of their total lies and crimes. Only a fool would think that he caught their one and only crime." Truer words couldn't be spoken.

There are many other pearls of wisdom in Hufschmid's article, but I'll only include one more - a passage about Mike Ruppert's false front operations where he wanted us to believe that, "Gary Webb committed suicide by shooting himself in the head twice. Mike Ruppert insists this is possible." He continued, "Other people suspect Ruppert is a wolf in sheep's clothing who is trying to deflect attention away from the Zionists and onto the CIA, vice president Cheney, and peak oil." Again, Hufschmid is right on the mark.

The above material is a perfect way to jump into *No More Illusions*, for as you'll see, it lays the foundation for what is undeniable proof that the alternative media and patriot movement have been massively infiltrated by government/NWO forces.

But as you'll see, there's even more to this story in regard to the disinformation campaign being waged against us. Y'see, the number one role of the media is to

be a watchdog against wrong-doing, corruption, and abuse. The primary reason why the patriot movement has become such a cesspool is precisely because the alternative media has failed miserably in fulfilling its watchdog role.

Thus, WING TV has - out of sheer necessity - taken on this role because virtually nobody else is serving this function. And before proceeding, I'd like to clue you in on quite possibly the greatest disinformation technique being used to manipulate you right now. The PAID operatives keep repeating one completely misleading mantra: WING TV is hurting the "movement" by attacking other patriots. But there's a tremendous difference between attacking someone and exposing their wrongful actions.

Here is an example: an attack would be if we said, "Mr. A is fat, bald, ugly, and his wife dresses him funny." That's an attack. But if we PROVE that Mr. A is a censor, fear-monger, and betrayer, then that's an expose. Being able to differentiate between the two is crucial, for if you're so brainwashed into being unable to see the distinction, then you're in very big trouble. The reason why the disinfo cabal wants to blur this line is simple: they want to shift blame away from their own misdeeds and instead shift it onto those who are exposing them. It's a pure, unadulterated bait-and-switch technique, and you need to discern between the two.

Anyway, people keep asking us: when are you going to stop exposing the charlatans, censors, sell-outs, money-grubbers, thieves, gatekeepers, and fear-mongers? Our answer is simple: when they quit engaging in this egregious behavior. It's that easy to understand. When Lisa Guliani and I entered the truth movement, it was for one reason - we wanted the truth to be exposed! But right now certain people like Alex Jones, Mike Ruppert, Amy Goodman, and others have so corrupted and deceived their followers that it's literally a crime. And we're not going to stay silent about it - ever!

What is most amazing is that supposed truth-seekers laugh at people who accept mainstream media news without investigating it, but then they aren't willing to look in the mirror and face their own bitter realities. If they give traitors within their own ranks carte blanche to act without consequence, what differentiates them from those who are glued to FOX, CBS, ABC, NBC, & CNN?

There can't be any more illusions!

But y'see, this book is more than simply an expose. Rather, it's a psychology handbook that allows everyone to see how those in the opposition - the government infiltrators - operate. Similar to how *The New World Order Exposed* is an encyclopedic look at how those atop the global control pyramid function, and

how *9-11 On Trial* deconstructs the World Trade Center controlled demolition, so too does *No More Illusions* unmask the operatives in our alternative media who are used to keep the patriot movement contained. Why do you think the government has been allowed to get away with 9-11 and the OKC Bombing? Likewise, why aren't patriots more active and organized as a movement? It's because the people and organizations mentioned in this book have been put in place to obliterate their progress.

Do you get it???

Too many among us have been corralled into a pen, filled with fear, bamboozled out of their money, and denied any hope for the future. The illusions being laid upon them become a vast unreality. To break these shackles, we need to shatter the illusions and free our minds.

Amazingly, there are so-called 'patriots' who are now calling for us to accept and band together with those who are con-men, censors, sensationalists, and even COINTELPRO agents! What such a bone-headed notion does is water-down the definition of 'patriot' to such an ineffective extent that it becomes blotted-out and meaningless. I mean: is this what we've become? It's somewhat understandable that people have become so desperate in our current day-and-age that they need to believe in somebody outside their 'self,' but how can they continue this idol-worshipping after the phonies in question have been exposed as not having their best interests in mind? It's like bowing down to Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker after they'd stolen twenty million dollars. It's pathetic. The end result is that all the NWO-handlers who have infiltrated our ranks are laughing their asses off at the *Animal Farm* lemmings that can't see through the ruse and are being led over a cliff.

To insure that the blind keep stumbling along behind their phony 'leaders,' they keep repeating a mantra about needing to "fight" the New World Order. Of course no one would argue with this sentiment, but the same alternative media figures who most talk about 'fighting the NWO' are the very same ones who do their damndest to prevent the fighters from becoming organized! Stated differently, they use the NWO as a quasi-Orwellian perpetual enemy akin to Goldstein in *1984* and Snowball in *Animal Farm*. Thus, the movement itself is used to deflect blame away from their horrific actions while at the same time keeping people in a state of perpetual fear. Can't you see? They don't give a damn about the 'movement' other than to use it as a shield to defray criticism away from themselves, while also keeping people ineffective. You know the mantra: "We can't criticize any 'patriots' because that will harm the movement." Well guess what: there is no Movement precisely because these same phonies are preventing it from happening.

Look at it this way:

Thesis: Use the "patriot movement" to deflect any criticism away from themselves (i.e. don't bad-mouth the government infiltrators posing as Patriots because it will hurt the "Movement")

Antithesis: Refuse to organize the patriots into an actual "Movement"

Synthesis: Keep well-intentioned patriots confused, stifled, ineffective, and contained within a box

So, what these hollow mouthpieces want all of us to do is accept the censors, infiltrators, shysters, profiteers, and betrayers because, after all, they call themselves PATRIOTS. But at what point do we continue to glide along with this "slippery slope" mentality? Just because somebody calls themselves a Patriot doesn't mean they're virtuous or on our side. Why can't more people see that fundamental point?

If some among us are willing to accept censors and those who rip-off others, at what point will this 'acceptance' end? If somebody calls themselves a patriot, will we then accept shoplifters, bank robbers, arsonists, muggers, rapists and murderers? Hell, as Lisa Guliani said, if we use this type of logic, does that mean we should even unite with George Bush and his New World Order cronies because THEY call themselves patriots too! When will it stop?

Has our collective mindset become so severely degraded that we've fallen down a rabbit-hole of insanity, or entered a Clintonesque realm of thinking where there is no distinction between right and wrong, but instead nothing but indistinguishable gray areas? Can't you see what they're doing to you? Just because somebody calls themselves a "patriot" doesn't mean they're virtuous, or that we should accept them among our ranks. In fact, we don't want to unite with any of the above-listed scum-bags.

Whatever happened to being accountable for one's actions? If we as a people can't be held responsible for our actions, then what kind of hope do we have of making our world a better place? Furthermore, how can we ask the mainstream media and government to clean their houses when we're not willing or able to clean our own?

What we're talking about goes even further than simply exposing the New World Order. It all boils down to confronting the TRUTH! And do you know why so many of the individuals included in this book are mad at us? Because we can't be controlled, we won't hide their dirty little secrets, and we're not a part of their Company Man cabal. They've become so accustomed to perpetuating their

protection racket and getting away with pulling the wool over your eyes that they thought it would last forever.

But guess what. *No More Illusions* has arrived, and the government's COINTELPRO operatives have been exposed. This book is the most comprehensive study ever compiled on the alternative media. At 350 pages, it is damning in its implications, for undeniable evidence now exists which points to massive infiltration of the patriot movement — and it's all compiled in one place!

By the time you reach the last page of this book, hopefully you'll come to the same realization that we have: it's time to WAKE UP, because if we want truth, we better start demanding it.

INFOWARS = INFOMERCIAL

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

In a move that is sure to turn heads, a source close to Alex Jones has revealed that the filmmaker plans on changing the name of his various business ventures sometime this summer. Beginning in June, Infowars.com, as well as his daily radio show, will officially be known as **INFOMERCIAL.com**.

When asked why this change was taking place, the source said, "Alex wanted the name to reflect his mission, and since we all know that Jones is increasingly into the hard-sell, and he wants his audience to *buy buy buy*; what better suited his purpose than **INFOMERCIAL.com**? Heck, Pepsi, McDonalds, and Chevrolet don't even push their products as hard as Alex does."

In addition, the source went on to say that Jones may also change the name of PrisonPlanet.com to **PURCHASE PLANET.com**.

"Ya figure," he said, "that every time Alex calls into a radio show, the only reason is to plug his latest video or his pay-per-view website. He's notorious for using these shows (and their hosts) for free publicity and free advertising. We even joke about how many times he can frantically pitch his products in 60 seconds. I think his record so far is 12 times in one minute. But don't worry," the man laughed, "He'll beat that sometime soon! Sure, it's all shameless promotion, but Alex doesn't care. Opportunism is his schtick."

Finally, when asked what affect these changes will have in the future, the source replied, "There's a question in the newspaper business that goes something like this: what is NEWS? The answer, of course, is everything that fits between the ads. Similarly, anyone who has ever listened to Alex's radio show knows that the "news" is only what fits between him selling his videos and over-priced t-shirts, or trying to get paid subscribers to his website. One of these days we might even do away with the news altogether and run one big long infomercial, or a tape-loop that repeats over and over again: BUY MY VIDEO. BUY MY VIDEO. BUY MY VIDEO. I mean, that's pretty much what people are getting right now anyway, so why not just turn it into one great big money-grubbing plug!"

ALEX JONES' AMERICA: FEAR SELLS

By Lisa **Guliani**

It's an eight-hour road trip from Austin, Texas to Oklahoma City. Why didn't NWO warrior Alex Jones make it a point to be at the OKC Memorial events, considering how important it is for the American public to learn the truth about the bombing which occurred on April 19, 1995? Considering his huge listening audience, why wasn't Jones devoting a significant portion of his air-time to regular announcements about these events and urging people to attend? The fact is, he didn't devote even one-minute to promoting this event. Furthermore, why wasn't he in Oklahoma City himself, or why didn't he send a representative to cover the rally and speakers' forum? Where the hell was Alex Jones? It's not as though he didn't know about it, because WING TV and the OKBIC circulated information about this event for months. Why, then, were these events largely unreported, with the exception of WING TV, the *American Free Press*, and Darrell Smith on his old radio show, *The French Connection*? Was there more urgently breaking news that merited totally burying this story? Of course not. Yet for some inexplicable reason, Alex Jones (and others in the alternative media) didn't seem interested. Why not? If we are ever to become a viable force in countering the mainstream media monopoly and its blackout on truth, then we **MUST** monitor events like the OKC Day of Truth. How will we ever be taken seriously if we don't even care enough to be where the news is happening? What kept Alex Jones from running with this story? What was he talking about instead?

The answer to that is obvious. Jones was engrossed in the same old thing he does on any other given day: marketing and self-promotion. The same old blah, blah, blah "Buy-My-Video" schtick. How many of you feel like you've been bashed repeatedly over the head with the hard-sell hammer after three hours of Jones' fire & brimstone psychic driving? Does this man even realize what he sounds like on the radio? In between ranting and raving like a lunatic, he oozes paranoia like a wet sponge. The "fearful truth" approach to sales is not new, and admittedly Jones has turned it into an art-form. In his own words just a few days ago during his broadcast, Jones said that, "We're growing by millions of listeners every month." If this equates to millions of new monthly subscribers to his pay-per-view website, then the "hard-sell" hammer is working like a charm. So what's the problem, you might ask?

The problem is that Jones spends most of his air-time conditioning his listeners with repetitive self-promotion. I'd even go so far as to say that this seems to be what he is most obsessed with, rather than motivating people to take specific

action or organizing the public in any meaningful way. We don't see him supporting or promoting other independent media venues (except GCN), even if their information is important. So, on any given day, the listener is subjected to the hashing and rehashing of Alex's adventure at Bohemian Grove (ad nauseum), which of course segues nicely into an increasingly boring - not to mention tiresome - rendition of "Buy Mv Video". Can we all agree that the shenanigans at Bohemian Grove have been exposed for quite some time now? So, why does he keep repeating this story like nobody's ever heard it? What's the point, especially when this is advertised prominently on his pay-per-view website? It's more about maintaining the moneymaker than anything else, so dear listeners, be prepared for endless loops about Bohemian Grove until the cows come home (despite breaking news like the OKC rally).

But what else is Alex selling?

How about a double dose of fear and paranoia? We hear Jones bellyaching over and over again that America is a police state. In fact, on Friday, April 28th, I heard Alex say that "America's turning into a nightmare police state ... and it's real." A nightmare police state?? Where?? He also stated, "The country is turning into a total police state and we're gonna expose it." Yes, do expose it - again. And then go one step further, Alex. Expose and PINPOINT for us the geographic location of this so-called "nightmare police state". Of course dangerous legislation is being put in place on a daily basis by our government, but Victor Thorn and I would very much like to see this POLICE STATE for ourselves, because somehow we've missed it. Maybe we're suffering from a nasty concussion caused by all the infotainment and repeated bonks on the head from Alex's hard-sell hammer. Thorn and I recently returned from a road trip halfway across the country, stopping in big cities and small towns along the way, but for some odd reason we weren't able to locate this Police State. So exactly where is it, Alex? The cities we drove through were not teeming with mace-spraying police brandishing batons or big guns. In fact, they were rather quiet and calm. There was no police state, no matter where we looked or who we spoke to. In fact, officers in Oklahoma City were actually supportive of our efforts once they realized we were trying to expose the murder of Terence Yeakey. Nobody seemed to know about this nightmare police state. So, we'd really appreciate it if Alex could be more specific as to where it is, since the "whole country" is supposedly undergoing this scary transformation. Where exactly is the police state, Alex? Or is this just another marketing tool to recruit subscribers and sell videos?

Now let's get into the paranoia. It's a wonder Jones' listeners have the nerve to even crawl out from beneath their beds every day with the amount of paranoid conditioning they're absorbing on a daily basis. This runs in direct opposition to what we and others in the freedom movement and independent media are trying to

accomplish: empowerment of the people. Jones rattles on about how the government is monitoring everything in our lives, from what we listen to on our car radios to the ding-dongs we buy at the 7-11. This is alternated with screams about "martial law", which coincidentally segues nicely into another ear-splitting chorus of "BUY-MY-VIDEO". Would somebody please explain why the government even cares what radio stations people listen to, or which books they check out of the public library? And when you think about it, does the government even have the means to do this kind of tracking - assuming they're doing it at all - for 300 million people? If you say YES, then please be prepared to provide some proof of this to qualify your statement. I'm sure the Feds do listen in on some people here and there, but not on the massive, all-encompassing scale that Jones would have us believe. Why would they even CARE when the government knows that most of us aren't doing anything? Yet there are people who believe this is the gospel truth. And most importantly, how does Alex's peculiar form of conditioning differ from that of the mainstream media?

Furthermore, Alex constantly makes a point of saying that people want to kill him for exposing the NWO's dark underbelly. I would think that if somebody *really* wanted Jones dead, they wouldn't simply make idle threats. Wouldn't they just go ahead and finish him off? Or is this simply another marketing tool being used to corral the sheep into different pens?

Also, Jones often broaches the subject of his own ego by saying that other people are trying to mimic him. (His exact line was, "I'm often imitated but never duplicated"!) First of all, who talks about their own ego, especially on a radio show? Isn't that the epitome of egomania? Apparently so, because Jones spends an inordinate amount of time assessing his own ego, which he tells us is becoming smaller as time goes by, while the egos of those around him (he doesn't specify exactly WHOM) are growing larger. Is that so, Alex? How laughable is this coming from someone who touts himself as the "Grandfather of 9-11," and then proceeds to tell us other people are trying to be like him. Who exactly is trying to copy or duplicate Alex Jones? I haven't seen even one instance of this in the last few years. What the hell is he talking about? I think it's fair to say that we're dealing with a very bloated ego here, and Jones' self-assessment is so skewed that I think it's fair to say that he's looking in his own mirror.

Of course Alex's ego-stroke is immediately followed by an inevitable "screened" caller who continues the ego-stroking by saying Jones is a hero, a true patriot, and the next best thing to pizza. And true to form, Jones responds in typical fashion by agreeing, which conveniently segues once again into yet another enthusiastic round of "BUY-MY-VIDEO" paranoid conspiracy infomercials. And this is only the LIVE portion of his talk show, folks. When he cuts to commercial, Alex is back once again playing pre-recorded alarmist sonatas of "POLICE STATE!!"

"MARTIAL LAW!!" and "BUY-MY-VIDEO!!" It's all paranoid conditioning, it's all pitch, and it's comin' at you all the time. Oh, and if you're hard of hearing, you can always subscribe to Alex's pay-per-view website. That way, you'll be sure to catch the screeching and ranting with even crisper audio clarity.

Considering the above information, I've noticed a significant amount of cognitive dissonance throughout the Internet when we've dared to question or challenge certain popular spokesmen. More often than not, we are ridiculed and criticized for doing so. This is very surprising because people almost act like Alex Jones and others are above criticism and should never be questioned. Yet why isn't Alex Jones encouraging others to stand up and take specific or direct action rather than passively watching his videos? Plus, if we go "out on a limb" and say that a man should honor his word, why is it "tacky" or "low" or "divisive" for us to challenge Jones or call him out on the carpet for NOT honoring his own words? Why should we overlook certain things simply because he makes good videos? Frankly, we smell a rat, and I hope many of you are noting not only what Alex says on his show - but also what he doesn't say. I'm not just referring to *9-11 On Trial*, which he refuses to touch with a ten-foot pole, even though it PROVES more than any other book that the government lied about the WTC collapses. This should be considered the story of the century, yet Jones ignored it completely. Why? And nobody, other than Victor and I, will challenge him on it.

But that's not the only thing Alex won't talk about. What about the subject of Zionism in America and the pervasive Zionist influence throughout every power center of the world? Why does Jones never beat this subject with his mighty hammer? From my observations, Alex does his best to distance himself from the topic of Israel and Zionism, even though the Zionist factor is intrinsic in the bigger picture. In fact, I heard him just a few days ago declaring: "We don't say a Jewish cabal controls world events." What about the Zionists, Alex? Why does he run from this discussion, and who is he trying to protect? Does it hit a little too close to home? How can he ignore the powerful Zionist element that has been so clearly exposed by others? What possible reason justifies this critical omission from his discussions? It seems peculiar to us that he won't point a finger in this direction EVER. Why is this topic taboo on the Alex Jones show?

By broaching these subjects, Victor Thorn and I have been openly criticized for daring to open our mouths and asking hard questions of people like Art Bell, Mike Gallagher, Amy Goodman, and Mike Ruppert. As WING TV viewers know, we've taken it on the chin many times because we've refused to go along silently with the rest of the herd. Instead, we've dared to stand up and speak out, despite people telling us to keep quiet and not rock the boat. But as time has shown, we were ultimately proven RIGHT about Bell, Gallagher, Goodman, and most recently, Mike Ruppert. I daresay we'll also be proven right again about Alex

Jones in due time. What we're trying to show you is the games people play with your minds, which is why we've repeatedly urged everyone to use discernment in processing the information overload. Likewise, we've warned everyone not to fall into the traps set by fear-mongers and alarmists, and a lot of you have heard this message and are wiser for it. We respect Alex Jones' hard work and we're not challenging most of his information, but we do question his motives when he pushes fear-mongering and paranoia instead of direct activism.

Alex must also tell us why he hasn't honored his word about coming together and working in a spirit of cooperation - something we have tried in vain to accomplish with him - because success in defeating our common enemy lies in how well we all stand together. Ego must NEVER factor into this equation, nor should profit. It's all about having integrity and being big enough to rise above ourselves. And we can't defeat evil until everybody decides to do this. We've been accused of fracturing and splintering the "freedom movement," the "9-11 movement," and the "truth movement." I heartily disagree with this sentiment, because as anyone can see, every single one of these "movements" was already a splintered, divided, fragmented effort, and they remain so to this day with or without our input.

Finally, let me say that I admire a lot of the work Alex Jones has done, but he has other issues which need answers. The hard-sell, fear-mongering, psychic driving, and paranoid-alarmist conditioning really need to stop. It's not necessary to put people into a permanent psychological fetal tuck to sell products or fight the NWO. This is not productive, constructive, or beneficial to anyone but the pitchman and the people who sponsor him. It also isn't effective in motivating people to do anything other than make copies of his shows (which is, by the way, a great form of free advertising). In my opinion, we need to EMPOWER the public and help them bolster their courage, not soak them in more terror. And we need to do this while paying attention to and reporting the truth - ALL OF IT. This includes big news like the OKC rally. We want people to show up at these events, not just listen to them after the fact (which is exactly what Alex did). Independent media cannot afford to drop the ball if it is to be taken seriously. There is no margin for error.

If we really believe in what we're doing, this shouldn't be a point of contention, and even Alex Jones should be able to make the connection. Fear and paranoia must never dictate our actions if the people are to win this battle and reclaim our country. The times are frightening, but we can draw strength and inspiration from one another to speak out, rise up, and resist. Fear and paranoia are not inspiring. They debilitate and paralyze. That's the bottom line as far as I'm concerned. Fear may sell, but I'm not buying. What about you?

OVERT CENSORSHIP

By Victor Thorn

We need to ask ourselves a very important question: does a man's word mean anything? I ask this question because I have a very peculiar personality trait: when people say something, I take them at their word. I'm going to repeat this statement: when people say something, I take them at their word. Thus, if a person honors their word, I subsequently place my trust in them. On the other hand, if a person's word doesn't mean anything, then how can we possibly place our faith in that individual? When it comes to the patriot/truth movement, this distinction is essential. Does a person's word matter to us? From my perspective, I'd rather be criticized until the end of time than remain silent about someone's blatant hypocrisy.

I bring this point to bear because on January 11, 2005, Alex Jones called into a radio show and proclaimed: "Everyone in the freedom movement should join together and not worry about past grievances." Regrettably, Alex didn't mean one word of what he said, and that is the reason why we're bringing this information to the public's attention. Alex Jones is snowing you in a big way, and it's time to start calling him on his actions.

How do I know? Well, here's a behind-the-scenes account of what happened. After Alex said that all of us should put aside our grievances and join together, I spoke with him on two different occasions. The reason why? Lisa Guliani and I wanted to get the word out about the controlled demolition of the World Trade Center towers, and also an upcoming rally commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Oklahoma City Bombing.

Considering that we appeared on dozens of different radio shows (sometimes doing four interviews in one day), and considering that this is precisely what the alternative media is supposed to be in existence for, it didn't seem out of the ordinary to want to appear on Alex's radio show, especially since he was the one who said we should all come together. But once I started speaking with Alex, I discovered that he had a problem with an article we had written two years earlier entitled Alex Jones = Bis Brother where we questioned why he deliberately censored a number of articles (more on that later). Anyway, I said very clearly that we should let bygones be bygones and focus on the bigger picture. Furthermore, to show our sincerity and to act in good faith, we agreed to write an explanation for the above-mentioned article and give Alex's side of the story. We honored our word, and the article appeared two days later (Alex Jones & the Common Cause: United We Stand). This is what is meant by eliminating past grievances and moving forward.

On the other hand, Alex had no obligation whatsoever to have us on his show, so I told him on at least three different occasions, "If you don't want us to appear as guests, just tell me now and I'll never broach the subject with you again." Every time Alex responded, "Oh no no no, it's not that. I'm just real busy and we'll get you on sometime."

But once again Alex didn't honor his word, for he had absolutely no intention of having us on his show, and refused to speak about either one of the monumental events that we found so pressing:

- the WTC's controlled demolition, and
- the OKC tenth anniversary truth rally

The big question is: why? We extended an olive branch to Alex, let bygones be bygones, and acted entirely in good faith; yet he still failed to honor his word. This is very disturbing and disappointing, for it is now clear that Alex Jones is not a man whose word can be trusted. I mean, if he's going to publicly make a proclamation about unity and putting our differences behind us, then he better damn well be ready to back it up. He better mean it! And if he didn't mean what he said; then why not be man enough to tell me on the telephone? A man's word has to mean something, and it can't just be lip service. Isn't this important to you?

Think about it: for the common good, we were willing to overlook how Alex deliberately censored Lisa Guliani's material on two different occasions. And please, I urge you: don't let Alex fool you into thinking this was some sort of accidental mistake. Rather, Alex went into a piece written by Randy Lavello (*Bombs in the Building: World Trade Center 'Conspiracy Theory' is a Conspiracy Fact*) and deleted an entire sentence referencing Lisa Guliani's article, along with the adjoining hyperlink - without notifying the author beforehand, and without the author's permission (*See: Alex Jones = **Bis Brother***). This is a direct case of **OVERT CENSORSHIP**, and Randy Lavello was irate about it. Worse, Alex Jones refused to answer any of the repeated inquiries from Lisa Guliani or Randy Lavello as to why he engaged in such a sordid practice. Alex's actions are very troublesome, and they should be of great concern to each and every person who demands a free press. In fact, when my **9-11 on Trial** op-ed piece appeared in the *Centre Daily Times* (a Knight-Ridder subsidiary), guess what they did. Censor my article - just like Alex Jones did to Randy Lavello's article! Doesn't this trouble you to your very core that Alex's actions are mirroring those of the mainstream media?

Finally, the big question is: should we remain silent about Alex refusing to honor his word, and for his direct censorship, or should we speak out? You can stay silent, but I absolutely refuse to.

ALL BARK, NO BITE

By Victor Thorn

We recently heard from a very reliable source how much money Alex Jones makes per year; and it literally made our jaws drop. And even though we won't release the exact figure (at least not until its confirmed), we will say that we're talking about **MAJOR LEAGUE MAINSTREAM MEDIA-like** money hundreds of thousands per year (with a lot of zeros)! Now the big question is - how many of YOU are making that kind of dough off the NWO? Almost every single person we know in this field is either broke all the time, or making it week-to-week. Yet Alex Jones is getting RICH by tapping into the least-common-denominator and the basest of all emotions - fear.

Worse, when Alex had a chance to really shine by promoting the Oklahoma City Bombing tenth anniversary truth rally, guess what he did - absolutely nothing. Instead, over the past few years Alex has spent hundreds of hours talking about his lame Bohemian Grove video. But when he had an opportunity to get people active at OKC, how much time did he spend on it before the event? None. Zero. Zilch. Not even one second. Why is there such a disparity? Because Alex has a Bohemian Grove video for sale, while OKC didn't have a profit margin for him. Isn't it obvious where Alex's loyalties lie? When given a choice between making money or getting people active, which does Alex select? Answer: \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$.

Jones did have a guest on his show after the OKC rally and speaker's forum (Craig Roberts), and guess what Alex talked about. How the turnout for this event could have been higher. Jones even went so far as to tell his guest, "Yeah, I guess I should have had you on before this event and given it some attention."

Can you believe this guy's audacity? Furthermore, think about how many endless hours Alex spends hyping his videos, books, overpriced t-shirts and pay-per-view website. Then ask yourself how much more active we would be if all this energy was channeled into ACTIVISM. I mean, all of us already know what's going on in the world. Do we really need Alex Jones pounding this information into our heads like a jackhammer - buy my video ... buy my video ... buy my video.

On the other hand, what if Alex pulled some of his energy away from ceaseless self-promotion and directed it at ACTIVISM. Think about how much more progress we could make because, in all reality, the NWO elite could care less how much we know if we never stepped from behind our computers. Why should they? Knowledge without action is useless.

Here's a guy who has a very successful radio and cable access show and he's doing nothing to organize people in a specific direction. This, I am sorry to say, is the greatest danger Alex Jones poses to the patriot community. He's deliberately keeping us fractured, isolated, and inept. As I said before, we already know what's wrong in the world, and who the guilty parties are. Selling another video won't make the world a better place - it'll only pad Alex's pockets and make the world a better place for him!

There has never been a movement in history that has accomplished anything or overthrown any type of power structure which didn't take its fury out into the streets. Look at what recently happened in Kyrgyzstan. The people were so fed-up that they rallied together and overthrew their oppressors. That's precisely what WE need to do - get organized and take action!

Yet Alex Jones says that we shouldn't become organized; that we don't need a centralized power base. I agree that we don't need "centralized power," but right now we have absolutely NO organization. That's why the Controllers don't fear us. It's not a lack of knowledge; but instead a lack of organization. In addition, according to Alex Jones, all we need to do is have millions of Americans become aware (and of course, the only way to do that is to buy his videos). This stance, though, is utter garbage because the NWO couldn't care less how aware we are. What would happen if 20 million Americans knew everything about the global conspiracy, but failed to leave the seat in front of their computer? Nothing whatsoever would happen. So, if we continue to do what we're doing right now (sending articles and copying videos), I guarantee you that no change will ever take place.

In other words, the powers-that-be won't get the message of resistance and feel threatened unless we reach a point of active critical mass. On the contrary, if we remain isolated from each other and fragmented, we won't ever be a concern to the government because there's no threat behind our knowledge.

Picture it this way. What if an 800-pound lion lurked outside your door, but there was absolutely no possibility that it would attack you. Would you feel threatened? Of course not. That's how we are right now. We're too passive and unorganized. What we need, and what Alex is failing to provide, is an impetus to unite and become strong. We know the mainstream media doesn't feel any responsibility to the people, so shouldn't we - the alternative press - pick-up the slack and fill this responsibility? In other words, we need some BITE to our BARK.

In closing, since Alex completely dropped the ball on OKC, here's a good test to see if he's for real or not. On September 11 in New York City at high noon, we're urging everyone in America to congregate at Ground Zero and raise their voices in

protest over the 9-11 lies that continued to be perpetrated. So, what we're asking Alex Jones is this: instead of spending thousands of hours hard-selling your products; why not re-direct this energy into urging people to rise up on 9-11 and join us in New York City. As you can see, this is quite different than what Alex usually does (the hard-sell) and it urges people to do more than simply sit in their living rooms and passively watch his videos. Rather, it implies ACTION!

So, let's see if Alex has any BITE, or if he'll simply continue to BARK like a rabid dog selling his videos.

CULT OF FEAR

By Victor Thorn

How did Charles Manson exert control over his followers? Answer: he conditioned them through fear and paranoia. Likewise, how did Jim Jones exert control over his followers? Answer: he conditioned them through fear and paranoia. Lastly, how did Marshall Applewhite of *Heaven's Gate* fame exert control over his followers? Answer: he conditioned them through fear and paranoia.

In this same vein, how was the U.S. government able to stir the masses for our recent "War on Terror" and push through the unconstitutional Patriot Act? Answer: they conditioned them through fear and paranoia. Similarly, how are huckster TV evangelists and organized religions able to keep their congregations passive and "in hand"? Answer: they condition them with fear and paranoia.

Are you starting to see a trend? The absolute most debilitating concepts that can be thrust upon an individual are fear and paranoia. Thus, when these notions are constantly hammered into a person's head (i.e. psychic driving), the result is something so antithetical to human freedom that each and every one of us should be constantly vigilant that we don't become debilitated by such influences.

Tragically, Alex Jones has created an empire for himself by manipulating people through fear and paranoia. How, I'm asking you, can this phenomenon be beneficial to anyone, especially when we're battling the New World Order elite for control of this country? How can repeated doses of heavy-handed fear and paranoia delivered by Alex Jones help our cause?

If can't, and this is the fundamental difference between Alex Jones and WING TV. We tell people that if they want to change the world around them they need to rise up, be strong, and let their voices be heard. In other words, we'll never pose a serious threat to the NWO unless we're organized and active! On the other hand, Alex Jones' radio show oozes, drips, and secretes so much fear and paranoia that it's a miracle that half his listeners aren't hiding beneath their beds.

If you don't believe me, really *listen* to his show sometime. Alex is constantly talking about the government spending each and every second of their time listening to our phone conversations, monitoring what TV shows we watch, which websites we log onto, what books we check-out from the public library, and even what roads we drive on. He trumpets this fear and paranoia to such a fevered pitch that he tries to convince people that Big Brother is literally lurking behind every corner.

Well, guess what, folks. Here's the cold hard truth: the government doesn't care what 99.999% of the populace is doing because ... nobody's doing anything! Here's what most people do - they go to work, then willingly allow Uncle Sam to steal money from their paychecks (taxation) before they ever get their hands on it. Now, we have more guns in this country than any other nation on earth, yet we let the IRS steal our money. What more could any government ever want from their people? It's an ideal situation for them. They get fat, bloated, and more corrupt while we slave away for them. So, the government doesn't want to monitor our every move; they simply want to keep collecting our money.

Of course legislation is being put in place that is ominous beyond words, but to prevent it from being enacted in a big way, we can't cower and hide beneath a cloud of fear and paranoia. It's that simple. But what Alex is doing is so completely counter-productive that I can't believe so many people fall for it. Listen to his show. He's always talking about his life being in danger and that the government is trying to kill him.

So, let's examine this scenario. If the government really is monitoring our every move, then they must know where Alex lives, where he works, what car he drives, and where he shops. In this sense, if they *really* wanted to murder him, don't you think they'd just do it instead of *talking* about it? I mean, Alex has been doing his show for ten years now and no-one's snuffed him. Why? Don't you think they would have gotten around to it by now? If these blood-thirsty monsters really wanted to do a hit on somebody, they'd do it without a second thought! What do you think professional assassins do - post a message in the center of town that says, "We're going to kill Vito Genovese at 12:00 noon on June 4th?" Hell no. They just KILL HIM, and then it's over and done.

Alex is doing nothing more than creating an illusion of fear and paranoia so that everyone will buy his "Police State" videos. It's nothing different than Charles Manson did with his Helter Skelter race war, Jim Jones' Guyana mass suicide rants, and Marshall Applewhite telling his crackpot followers that the world was going to end so they better kill themselves and jump on an incoming comet. Sure, the packaging is different, but the end result is the same - a massive indoctrination program of fear and paranoia.

If you want to live under this cloud, so be it. But on WING TV, we're exposing Alex's insane games, and then telling people to stand up, get organized, and take their lives into their own hands. Which of these alternatives do you think is more beneficial?

TEN QUESTIONS

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

- 1) We have 100% verifiable proof (including a transcript, tape, and first-hand testimony) that you censored your radio show archives on Tuesday, May 3, 2005 by deliberately erasing a phone call made by "Steve from Ohio" where he mentioned 9-11 on Trial. Since people who subscribe to GCN aren't given a disclaimer stating that these archives can be altered at the host's discretion, please explain why you've chosen to engage in this practice of overt, Big Brother-style censorship.
- 2) Approximately how many times in the past have you censored your archives, and do you plan on censoring them in the future?
- 3) Similarly, on May 21, 2003, you censored a *Prison Planet* article written by Randy Lavello after it had already been published, and without notifying the author or getting his permission beforehand. Worse, you ignored repeated inquiries as to why you chose to do this. Do you feel that it is proper for you, or anyone else in the mainstream or alternative media, to engage in direct censorship?
- 4) On January 11, 2005, you called into a radio show and declared, "Everyone in the freedom movement should join together and not worry about past grievances." In the ensuing months, we did everything humanly possible to extend an olive branch to you and let bygones be bygones; yet you failed to hold yourself to the same standard which you advised others to uphold. In your opinion, how important is it that a man honor his word after making a public pronouncement?
- 5) You've been accused of being a huckster, a walking advertisement, and that your radio show is nothing more than a long, extended infomercial for your products. You've also stated on your radio show that "money doesn't matter to you," while Ted Anderson (GCN president) has discussed with at least one source the extremely lucrative nature of what you do (i.e. Big \$\$\$). With this in mind, will you reveal how much money you make a year off the New World Order?
- 6) You've been on the air for a decade now, and you constantly allude to "being murdered" by forces within the NWO. In addition, if we live in a total 'Police State' as you proclaim; then it's safe to say that these potential assassins know where you work, where you live, what kind of car you drive, and where you shop. If you really were such a threat to them, don't you think

that these bloodthirsty monsters would simply KILL YOU instead of talking about it for nearly a decade?

7) You often refer to people who refuse to answer for their actions as "Lord," such as "Lord" Bush, "Lord" Rumsfeld, and "Lord" Rothschild. Up until now, though, you have absolutely refused to answer for your actions in regard to direct censorship and other issues. In this sense, what differentiates "Lord" Alex from "Lord" Cheney, "Lord" Rockefeller, and "Lord" Kissinger? Secondly, do you feel any responsibility to answer for ANY of your actions, or are you entirely above reproach, just like the NWO-elite?

8) On WING TV, we strongly advocate activism over fear-mongering. For the sake of unity against our common enemy, will you join with us to get as many people as possible to New York City for a 9-11 activist event to show that we don't believe the government's "official" story? This means posting information on your website, interviewing specific guests, and talking about it on a regular basis?

9) When you hung-up on "Steve from Ohio" on Tuesday, May 3, 2005 after he wanted to know if you were familiar with 9-11 on Trial, you immediately said afterward, "My broadcast is about serious issues." Considering that the caller's question dealt entirely with the issue of 9-11, were you stating that 9-11 itself isn't a serious issue?

10) In light of the fact that you've covered numerous aspects of the New World Order, including the Freemasons, Bohemian Grove, Illuminati, Bilderbergs, etc.; why have you so conspicuously avoided the topic of Zionism and its pervasive influence in American politics and society? Does your silence imply that you are protecting certain individuals from scrutiny? If not, what are the reasons for your silence?

CENSORSHIP SNEAK

By Victor Thorn

Alex Jones is the most blatant censor in the alternative media; and incredibly, he engages in this practice on an almost daily basis by deliberately altering his radio show archives (the most recent time being yesterday - May 11, 2005). And right now, Jones censors more material than mainstream media venues such as *The New York Times*, CNN, and *Time* magazine combined. In fact, his actions are torn directly from the playbook of those used by the communist Red Chinese and Stalin's KGB agents, and are a mirror image of Big Brother's "memory hole" in George Orwell's *1984*.

Think about what this hypocritical little man is doing. After his radio show is over each day, Alex Jones sneaks into his archives and CENSORS OUT the information which he doesn't approve of. And he does this regularly, as can be proven by a recent e-mail which we received from Craig S.: "I have only been a subscriber to GCN for 2 weeks and I have already encountered about 5 or 6 instances where Alex either hung up on someone or edited or outright deleted entire calls from his archives. I have paid for 6 months up front for this crap and I am furious that this is happening. The live audience gets one version of events and I get another version on the late night re-feeds."

With this in mind, what differentiates Gestapo Thought Police Alex from what all of us in the truth movement are fighting against? Nothing does, for he has become the embodiment of all that we're standing in stark opposition against. Alex Jones is a **censor**, and this sickness on his part is such an insidious disease that it is corrupting him to his very core. Plus, now that we have direct, verifiable proof that Alex Jones has become the King of Censorship, I'd like to ask a very important question: Are you going to tolerate overt censorship in your midst? The answer to this question is vital, because if you refuse to speak out against censorship, then you have already accepted *1984* and the New World Order.

Please think about the ramifications of this situation. Do you want to overlook censorship and remain silent about it? Likewise, do you really want to allow a sneaky, dishonest man like Alex Jones to corrupt all that we've been working for? His behavior is so inexcusable — so against everything that the TRUTH represents — that he needs to be held accountable for his egregious, cowardly actions.

In closing, let me ask one final question: what matters to you? If it's the truth, then you better start acting like it because whether you want to admit it or not, Alex Jones' censorship is exactly and precisely the same type of behavior that the mainstream media and the plutocrats are engaging in.

THE GREAT DEBATE

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

With the WING TV-Alex Jones brouhaha hitting a fevered pitch, people are wondering: what will it take to bring this to an end? Well, we have also considered this question, and have ultimately arrived at a solution.

Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani are officially extending an invitation to Alex Jones to debate us - on radio - over a variety of issues that have been raised within the past few weeks.

Also, to show our sincerity in this matter, we'll allow Jones to select which radio show he'd like the debate to appear on. In fact, he can even choose a venue on GCN - his own flagship station - if he so desires (as long as the host remains a non-partisan moderator). In other words, we're going above and beyond what would be expected of us because that's how willing we are to put our cards on the table and get some answers. Furthermore, Jones can even pick the date, time, and any other variable for this debate. From his perspective, what more could he ask for?

In addition, we'll make a guarantee right here and now that we won't delve into personal attacks or cheap-shots during this debate. Rather, we'll stick strictly to the issues that have been raised in the past few weeks which, needless to say, have a great deal of bearing on the alternative media and patriot movement.

So, does our proposal sound reasonable to everyone who has been following this story? We're acting in good faith, and are seeking a resolution that will finally provide some answers which everyone has been waiting to hear. People keep telling us — take your questions straight to Alex. Well, that's what we've been trying to do behind-the-scenes for the past three months, and that's exactly what Lisa did when she called into Alex's show on Friday, May 13th, 2005. Regrettably, Alex was the one who didn't want to discuss the issues, so he hung-up on her, just like he's done to every other caller who broaches this topic.

On a final note, we're going to forward this article to Alex Jones, and also try to contact him via telephone. The only thing we ask in return is: don't give us excuses why you can't engage in this debate. The mainstream media is masterful at shoveling excuses for why they can't do things; and in all honesty, we're tired of it. So, Alex, step up to the plate and let's make some arrangements to get this debate going. We're here, we're ready, we're not afraid of anyone or anything, and we know that tons of people would gladly tune in.

The ball is now in your court, Alex. Are you going to keep acting like the corporate mainstream media by ignoring these pressing issues, or are you going to step out from behind your microphone? We're all waiting

PROOF: MONEY **GRUBBING GREED**

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

For weeks now we've been pointing-out that Alex Jones' excessive greed and appetite for money is so pronounced that it has become the number one priority on his radio show and pay-per-view website. In fact, his hard-sell *buy buy buy* advertising is so incessant that it is patterned directly after the government's mind-control psychic-driving exercises (and that should erect red-flags for everyone).

Now we have first-hand, verifiable proof of how all-encompassing this drive for money is with Alex Jones and his wife Violet. What follows is an appalling tale of a man and wife who epitomize the biblical adage, "The love of money is the root of all evil."

For three days in October, 2003, radio talk-show host Michael Corbin (whose program, *A Closer Look*, was carried at the time by GCN) appeared as a guest-host for Alex Jones. In case you don't know, Jones' show lasts three hours each day, **so** right off the bat there's nine total hours. But the total amount of time that Corbin sacrificed was much greater.

Here's what we mean. Even though our WING TV broadcasts are only about 25 minutes long each day, the total time it takes to get this show online is about five hours! Likewise, try to imagine how much time Michael Corbin had to spend preparing for these shows (i.e. news updates, booking guests, technical issues, etc). So, this original nine-hour time investment became more like 15-18 hours!

In addition, Michael Corbin received NO PAY for his guest-host appearances, and did it instead as a professional courtesy.

With this in mind, guess what gratitude he received for his efforts. Corbin told us during his June 8, 2005 appearance on WING TV (see transcript below) that during the third hour of his final day as guest host, he received a phone call from Violet Jones (Alex's wife).

And what did she say to Corbin? Did she thank him for sacrificing 15-18 hours of his life - without pay - to host Alex's show? No, Violet Jones chastised him because ... get this ... Alex's video sales had fallen because **he wasn't pushing them hard enough!**

Can you believe for even one second this woman's audacity and ingratitude? What did she want Michael Corbin to do - turn each three-hour show into one big, long extended infomercial for Alex's products — just like her husband? Then, when Corbin left a message for Jones voicing his displeasure, guess what happened? Alex didn't return his call, nor did he even thank him! Corbin's a professional broadcaster who was doing Jones a favor, and here's what he gets — yelled at by Alex's wife because he wouldn't be a snake-oil salesman for his videos, and then not even a thank you courtesy call from Jones.

You can read the entire transcript below, but before doing so we have one last thing to say: when it comes to low-lives, there aren't many people who are lower than the money-grubbing couple of Alex and Violet Jones — you two should be absolutely ashamed of yourselves.

TRANSCRIPT: WING TV - June 8, 2005

Lisa Guliani: You used to fill-in for Alex Jones. You did it a couple of times on his shows, correct?

Michael Corbin: Yes.

Lisa Guliani: Okay. Tell us a little bit about how that went for you and what happened afterward with Alex's wife - what she said to you.

Michael Corbin: Well, I used to be on the *Genesis Communications Network* and I was asked in October 2003 to fill in for him for three days, which I did. I got no pay for it, it was more a professional courtesy. And at the end of the third day, the last hour, Alex's wife chastised me because the video sales had dropped and she was upset because the sales had dropped. She didn't feel that I had pushed the videos hard enough. I was kind of disappointed because I did not get a "thank you" for filling in for Alex during that time.

Lisa Guliani: Really.

Victor Thorn: Not only didn't you get a "thank you," you got chastised.

Michael Corbin: Right.

Victor Thorn: You know, we've brought this up on our show before, and we've said that there's nothing wrong with selling products and making the public aware of them, but we said that on this show (Alex's), it's like psychic driving where they just pound it into your head.

Lisa Guliani: And you know what, Michael? His show is really long - for somebody to take that many hours out of their day to do a courtesy for someone else...

Victor Thorn: To get yelled at...

Lisa Guliani: Yeah.

Michael Corbin: Well, like I said - I was very disappointed in that, and again, I called Alex and didn't get a return phone call from him. I didn't get a "thank you" from him, and it was like I was disappointed because of what happened with that. But you know; the thing is that when I was on that network, I got a lot of e-mails and a lot of response from people when I did the fill-in for him. Of course, some people complained about his abrasive way of delivering his message, but you know, my response was always: that's Alex, that's his schtick.

Lisa Guliani: That's everybody's response (laughs).

Michael Corbin: We're supposed to be working for the same thing here.

Victor Thorn: But it seems like the money takes much more precedence on that show than on any other show we've ever heard on the Internet or in the alternative media. It just seems to be right at the forefront.

Michael Corbin: Well, I'm sure you guys are aware of it too in your venture and mine; you know we have to make money to try and keep the program going.

Lisa Guliani: Right.

Michael Corbin: Because all of us are not in the mainstream, and of course we can't get an AT&T or somebody like that.

Victor Thorn: Well, none of us are retiring tomorrow, that's for sure.

Michael Corbin: Exactly. You know, I think the thing is that we find working in the alternative media - we're not the favored sons and daughters of the country when it comes to the mainstream population and how they perceive us. My thing has always been: you struggle with this, and I'm happy to struggle. I've got a firm commitment with myself that I would never get involved in anything that would compromise the truth.

Victor & Lisa: Right! Good for you!

Michael Corbin: That's why it is so important, and even if we're struggling, which we all are, we are still somewhat effective in getting our message out.

Lisa Guliani: Let me ask you this, too. You don't work for GCN anymore, correct?

Michael Corbin: I never worked for them. My program has always been owned by me.

Lisa Guliani: Okay, I mean you don't do a show for them.

Michael Corbin: They were a distributor of my program.

Lisa Guliani: Okay.

Michael Corbin: But I'm not with them anymore, no.

Lisa Guliani: What's going on with your archives?

Michael Corbin: I'm sorry?

Lisa Guliani: Your GCN archives?

Michael Corbin: Oh yeah. Here's the deal. GCN was never allowed or authorized to sell archives of my show, *A Closer Look*. I discovered about four months ago, I got an e-mail from a listener who told me they had been listening to an archive from the month of July last year, and they had some questions. They indicated to me they had purchased a DVD from GCN for an entire month of my shows.

Lisa Guliani: What are they selling them for, Michael?

Michael Corbin: The guy told me that they were selling them - I think he said \$30 or \$40. I don't have the exact amount.

Victor Thorn: How much money did you make off of that?

Michael Corbin: Nothing. Now see, this is why I'm very disappointed in GCN and their behavior because even after I'm gone from the network, they're still making money off of my archives.

Lisa Guliani: So, they've been doing this how many months now?

Michael Corbin: I don't know because I turned this over to my attorney. He is

dealing with them. He's sending them a cease-and-desist letter and demanding an accounting of everything they have sold of *A Closer Look*. The thing is, I find this very, very unprofessional; and it's wrong. I mean, anybody would know that they don't own my show. So they do not own the archives.

Victor Thorn: It sounds completely unethical.

Lisa Guliani: And illegal.

Michael Corbin: It shows what kind of mentality they have if they go cavalierly about selling the archives and not even reporting it to me.

Victor Thorn: Michael, that's what we brought up yesterday. We said, do you think that the mainstream media became this cesspool overnight? Well, it didn't. There were a lot of good people that turned their heads and didn't do anything as we went into this sewer; and we're trying to tell people that if we want to lose the alternative media, if we want it to become the same cesspool, then all we have to do is turn our heads and not say anything either.

Michael Corbin: Absolutely.

Victor Thorn: It's so important because we don't HAVE anything else. If we lose this alternative media, there IS nothing else.

Michael Corbin: Victor, you're absolutely right. First of all, if we ever hope to succeed at getting the message out and gaining an audience, we have to have our integrity, we have to tell the truth, and we can't act like the people in the mainstream media.

Victor Thorn: We want everybody out there watching this show right now to give this guy a standing ovation because this is the kind of attitude we need. Michael, we wish we could keep you here for the next three days.

Lisa Guliani: Yeah, forever.

Victor Thorn: We just want to thank you. Again, everybody go out there to *For a Closer Look*. Its KHNC 1360 AM. The host is Michael Corbin, and this guy is FANTASTIC.

Lisa Guliani: Our hats are off to you, Michael. We love you.

Michael Corbin: Well, I tell you, same here to you guys because again, what you guys are doing is wonderful, and it's valuable, and it is very needed.

CENSORSHIP REIGN OF TERROR

By Victor Thorn

Powerful forces in Texas, including those closely associated with Alex Jones, have been extending a blanket of censorship over the alternative news media like that which has never been seen before. In addition to verifiable, documented proof that Alex Jones censors articles on his website, as well as his radio show archives, we're now seeing the ante being upped against any "critical talk" that is spoken against him.

Prior to delving into the specifics of this article, though, ponder for a moment exactly what we're talking about. Alex Jones has in the recent past deleted entire sentences and hyperlinks from already published articles without notifying the author beforehand and without their permission. This is BLATANT CENSORSHIP, and has been proven by researcher Thomas Holbrook in his *TH2 Underground Newsletter*. In addition, he deletes entire portions of his radio show archives (reminiscent of George Orwell's infamous Memory Hole in *1984*) while failing to mention this fact to subscribers who PAY to get the entire broadcast. This is also blatant censorship, and we're including it at the beginning of this article because it shows an undeniable pre-existing tendency (or predilection) toward censorship on the part of Alex Jones.

What makes this situation even more egregious is that Alex Jones and his cohorts at *Radio Free Austin* are now attempting to control the content of other radio show hosts on entirely different networks than his own.

A perfect case in point is Frank Whalen, whose show - *Frankly Speaking Radio* — is carried on RBN (Republic Broadcasting Network), KFFK 1390 AM in Arkansas, as well as by *Radio Free Austin*. That was until Lisa Guliani and I made an appearance as guests on June 23, 2005 to discuss (ironically) the subject of censorship. 38 minutes into our segment of the interview, RBN and KFFK began receiving threats from Mike Hansen of *Radio Free Austin* that they were going to pull his signal. A very vocal on-air brouhaha ensued, and shortly thereafter four Texas-based micro-broadcasters, including RFA, dropped Frank Whalen from their schedule and refused to carry his show in the future. This ban is still in effect today simply because we were exposing Alex Jones' penchant for censorship.

The following day, Joe McNeil, who heads the Micro-Broadcasters Association of America, said that such a move is certainly not indicative of their policy regarding censorship, and even went so far as to say the Texas micro-broadcasters were "acting like little girls!" Thus, as it stands now, citizens of the Lone Star state cannot hear Frank Whalen's show on *Radio Free Austin*, or any of the other Texas

micros. And remember - the federal government didn't shut down Whalen's broadcast, the mainstream media didn't shut them down; nor did local law enforcement or the CIA. *Radio Free Austin* - supposedly a member of the "independent" media - is the one who shut down *Frankly Speaking Radio* from its broadcast schedule.

It should also be noted at this point that Mike Hansen - one of the most influential members of the *Radio Free Austin* steering committee - is also a long-time associate and cameraman for none other than Alex Jones. Hansen was also involved in the notorious **John Gray Affair** with Jones. Furthermore, he was the individual who phoned into Frank Whalen's June 23, 2005 show and initially made threats to remove his program from the airwaves. Once again, the censorship links all lead back to one person - Alex Jones.

But censorship at *Radio Free Austin* doesn't end with Frank Whalen. Peter Schaenk, host of *The Peter Principle* on RBN, has pointed-out that his show was also cancelled by *Radio Free Austin* two days after Alex Jones called into his show on April 4, 2005 and disagreed with Schaenk's views on Zionism and illegal immigration. TWO DAYS LATER the commissars at *Radio Free Austin* yanked Schaenk's show. On top of that, Jones telephoned Schaenk directly after Lisa Guliani and I appeared on his show (June 30, 2005), and chastised him for having us on as guests to talk about his censorship practices.

Even radio talk show host Bill Brumbaugh (*Proactive News* on First Amendment Radio) was threatened with having his radio show pulled from the airwaves in the days prior to when he was scheduled to interview Lisa Guliani and myself.

As a recent viewer of WING TV commented, what we have here at *Radio Free Austin* is nothing less nefarious than Soviet-style **COLLECTIVISM** where a small cabal of individuals (Alex Jones & his cronies) are using heavy-handed tactics to censor not only his own radio show and pay-per-view website, but also the content of other people's shows on other networks! And anyone that says this practice doesn't smack of Iron Curtain policies in the old Soviet Union or Red China is fooling themselves.

Contrast the above information with an occasion when we recently protested George Bush's appearance at Penn State University where we had a 14-foot long banner that declared: 9-11 WORLD TRADE CENTER CONTROLLED DEMOLITION. At this event, Lisa Guliani was yelling at the top of her lungs for 1/2 an hour straight, and guess what happened? Nobody censored us. Not the Secret Service, not the local police department, not the campus cops ... nobody tried to muzzle our freedom of speech. The same lack of censorship took place when we protested in Oklahoma City for the tenth anniversary of the Alfred P. Murrah

bombing.

But now we have Alex Jones and *Radio Free Austin* censoring information left-and-right. Can't you see what's taking place? Alex Jones doesn't like the truth being told about him, so he effectively had Frank Whalen and Peter Schaenk's shows removed from the airwaves so his Texas listeners couldn't hear what was being said about him. Plus, with his sidekicks at *Radio Free Austin* in tow, it's almost as if a Nixonian dirty tricks campaign is being waged. And who ultimately pays the price - the people of Texas, because now they can't hear these fine shows on their radios.

I don't know if you're willing to tolerate this type of behavior from the "alternative" media, but Lisa Guliani and I sure as hell aren't, and every time it takes place, we're going to shout it from the rooftops.

Final Note: A very prominent 9-11 researcher recently wrote to us and made the following comment: "When trying to figure out if a person is an agent, I look at whether they are trying to stop people from talking." In this regard, Alex Jones isn't promoting the widespread dissemination of information, but rather he's trying to CONTAIN it solely to what he thinks you should be hearing. How does that make you feel having Big Brother watching over you? In addition, there's an old saying: Give a person a little bit of power and try to imagine what they would do with it. Specifically, what if Alex Jones suddenly had an extreme amount of power laid at his disposal. What do you think would result? Would there be MORE censorship in the world, or LESS? Please ponder that point for a moment, because from our perspective it is very troublesome. And remember, people that tolerate censorship will also tolerate even worse infringements on their civil liberties. Is that the slippery slope you want to be on?

PROOF: ALEX JONES **SELLS-OUT TO ABC**

By Victor Thorn

Investigative researcher Thomas Holbrook has done some outstanding work in shedding new light on a case which has become known as *The Alex Jones Affair: A Christian Family Betrayed*. For those of you not familiar with this inexcusable example of betrayal, allow me to quickly rehash what took place. Before beginning, though, I must add that all credit for what follows goes to Mr. James Lloyd, whose outstanding article this overview is based upon. Then, after introducing you to this story, we'll follow-up with Thomas Holbrook's latest revelations.

In January, 2000, patriot John Gray and his family came under siege from government authorities in Trinidad, Texas; and they have been living under these conditions ever since. Shortly after this Waco-like situation developed, Alex Jones and his cameraman Mike Hansen visited the Grays and requested a videotape interview. Mr. Gray gave his permission under one condition: the film could only be released after the siege came to an end. Jones agreed to this request, as John Gray recounts (verbatim): "Alex promised me this would only be used for documentary purposes when this was all over. We have several witnesses to this. He also assured us again that none of the video would be shown anywhere."

Please keep these words in mind, for they will become very important.

So, after gaining Gray's trust, Jones was permitted to film this family's residence, including, as James Lloyd writes, "crucial defensive locations" that "revealed significant logistical information." This point is also vital, because the last time there was a stand-off in Texas against a family of Christian patriots, we all know what happened. David Koresh and 80+ other men, women and children were burned to death in a blazing inferno. And, considering 9-11, Oklahoma City, Randy Weaver, and many other government-sponsored acts of terrorism, another Waco is not outside the realm of possibility.

Anyway, shortly after documenting the Grays, Jones returned to their home a few days later, but this time he had a very peculiar request. He wanted John Gray to let the ABC News show *20/20* videotape him.

Now, before continuing, I have a question. First, how did Jones come in contact with *20/20*? In case you need reminding, ABC is the enemy! In fact, they epitomize the New World Order's corporate-controlled mainstream media; and

they've done serious damage to the Truth Movement over the past few decades with their cover-ups and lies. Why in God's name is Alex Jones working in unison with them? Please think long and hard about this point, because just recently the station which Jones broadcasts his radio show on - GCN - became an ABC satellite affiliate; and they're also carrying ABC programming and advertising. How can the alternative media remain viable and trustworthy if they're openly consorting with the enemy?

Naturally, John Gray refused time-and-again Jones' persistent requests to let ABC inside his house, so when *20/20* was set to broadcast this story, guess what happened. Jones told Gray that he SOLD his videotapes to ABC's *20/20*! According to Gray, "Jones called me and said he had done something very wrong. He had let *20/20* have the video." In addition, "Alex said he had sold the video for \$700.00."

Consider for a moment that Alex Jones was the only person allowed inside the Gray residence. He was also the only one allowed to shoot any video, and he was the only one entrusted by John Gray. Yet what does Alex Jones do? He blatantly betrays this family and endangers their lives by selling his soul to ABC for a lousy \$700.00. Not only is such an act despicable, it should also send red-flags up to every patriot in this movement; because if Jones could so easily sell-out this family, how much loyalty do you think he has to the rest of us?

But, despite being Judas'd by Jones, John Gray showed his true Christian colors by telling Alex that all he wanted him to do was "get on the air and apologize and tell the patriots what he had done." That's not much to ask, yet Alex responded that he was "afraid the bad patriots would take him out" (his exact words).

Incredibly, once again we see Jones' unbridled paranoia and drama queen theatrics - y'know the kind where he gets all hysterical every few months and says the New World Order is trying to kill him. But as we've pointed-out numerous times before, if these monsters truly wanted to snuff Jones, guess what they'd do. They'd KILL HIM and not just talk about it for ten years. How do you think government hit men operate? Do they post a flier in town square saying they're going to murder Alex Jones? Hell no. They just off him, no questions asked. Thus, the whole "death threat" scenario is another hyperactive ruse where Jones is either a bald-faced liar, or he's so whacked-out off his rocker that he should be locked in a rubber room and fed massive doses of thorazine.

To make matters worse, Jones began lying by telling people that John Gray had signed a contract with him. But as Gray states very clearly, "I didn't sign a contract to give Alex any permission to air the video on *20/20*."

To prove that he was telling the truth, Gray contacted GCN president Ted Anderson and wanted to broadcast his grievances on-air. But he soon discovered that, "The Genesis tactic has been to completely bury the story, and refuse to allow any scrutiny of Alex Jones." James Lloyd also adds, "Every host that has any knowledge of the matter has uniformly refused to allow the issue in any public forum. All callers to any of the various GCN programs that even hint at mentioning the matter are immediately taken off the air and hung up on."

I don't know about you, but doesn't this sound exactly like the way the government and mainstream media operate? If they don't want you to know about something, they simply bury it. It seems Ted Anderson and Alex Jones are absolutely horrified of this story; for once they're exposed as money-grubbing turncoat betrayers for the world to see, their Wizard of Oz cover will be blown to kingdom come once-and-for-all.

So, this is where journalist Thomas Holbrook enters the picture. He's been investigating GCN and the Gray Affair for the past few months, and has finally tracked down the elusive John Gray via United States Postal Service general delivery. The following responses came to Holbrook via a letter, where John Gray unflinchingly says, "After this thing with Alex Jones, we do not trust anyone in the media, newspapers, magazines, even shortwave."

After being raked over the coals and betrayed by Alex Jones, I can't say I rightly blame Mr. Gray for his suspicions.

Also, Gray stated that he stood by everything written by James Lloyd in his article, and that, "90% of everything Alex and Mike [Hansen] said were lies! Alex has all the people on shortwave convinced that we are feds and nuts." He continued, "We did not contact Alex for publicity. We are not feds or Masons!!!"

Y'see, Jones was the one who opportunistically contacted John Gray, and similar to every other venture he engages in, Jones found a way to make \$\$\$\$\$ off of it (this time by selling out the Grays to ABC News). Also, Jones has used the exact same disinformation techniques on us here at WING TV when we started uncovering his censorship practices (among other things). Y'see, whenever Alex gets exposed for his dirty-dealings, the first thing he does is lie and say that the ones exposing him are COINTELPRO or government agents. This tactic is pathetic beyond words, especially when Jones contacts a family under siege - the Grays - then betrays their trust, endangers their lives, and ultimately profits from selling them out to a tentacle of the NWO. In my book, this makes Alex Jones a coward and a low-life rat that absolutely cannot be trusted any longer.

Finally, John Joseph Gray reiterated much of what James Lloyd covered in his original article, while adding a new twist:

Alex got real jealous because we wouldn't call them when Chuck Norris came out here. That's when he began to badmouth us.

Alex just sold us out. He thought we would be dead before *20/20* was aired. He's just trying to cover himself. Alex tried to talk me into letting *20/20* come up to the house and video. I told him he was the only one who had taken video around the house which wouldn't get out till this was all over with, and I didn't want *20/20* up here. I met *20/20* at our front gate when they came in, and stayed several yards away from the house."

After reading these words, I feel it is appropriate to hearken back to how John Gray opened his letter to Thomas Holbrook: "Thank you for being concerned. The truth will get out on Alex before it's over with." God bless John Gray, and yes, he is correct - the truth is getting out about the way Alex Jones operates.

Of course there are still many unanswered questions, such as how Chuck Norris fits into the picture. But Thomas Holbrook is following up with the Grays, and hopefully more information will arise in the near future.

In the meantime, we are going to post a list of questions to Alex Jones on Monday concerning his betrayal of John Gray, along with his affiliation with the ABC News network. In addition, I did leave a message for Alex Jones before running this article, but once again he chose to hide instead of returning my phone call. Considering his repeated exhibitions of cowardice, how are we supposed to believe that this guy is going to "fight the New World Order" when he's not even man enough to answer our questions and take responsibility for his actions? Worse, if Alex Jones has already sold his soul to the dark-side once, who's to say that he hasn't done it again?

TEN QUESTIONS: ALEX JONES **BETRAYS PATRIOT FAMILY**

By Victor Thorn

Ten Questions

As a follow-up to my article chronicling how Alex Jones sold-out John Gray and his family to ABC News, I am submitting ten questions to him that undoubtedly need answering.

PROOF: Alex Jones Sells-Out to ABC

- 1) Exactly how much money did you receive from *20/20* for the John Gray videotape that you promised not to release until this siege was over?
- 2) Considering that ABC News is the enemy, who precisely did you work with at that network before you sold-out the Gray family?
- 3) In the 5 1/2 years since *20/20* paid you for the Gray videotape, how many other times have you been compensated monetarily by ABC News, or any other mainstream media venue?
- 4) You've stated that you had a signed contract with John Gray to sell his videotape to ABC, yet he vehemently denies this statement. Would you produce a copy of this contract for everyone in the alternative media and patriot movement to see so that your claim can be verified?
- 5) Considering that crucial defensive locations and logistical information was contained on the videotapes you sold to ABC, and that they were in a stand-off situation with the authorities, did you place any importance on the fact that you were potentially placing the Gray family's life in danger (i.e. Waco)?
- 6) Why were you so adamant in wanting to get reporters from ABC's *20/20* inside the Gray residence? What motives did you have?
- 7) Do you view ABC News as an ally or an enemy? If you responded "enemy," why did you take money from them to betray the Gray family?
- 8) Has GCN imposed a network-wide policy to censor information about the Gray Affair? If so, please explain Ted Anderson's refusal to speak about this matter.

9) If GCN hasn't placed a ban on this topic, do you have any plans in the near future to explain your betrayal of the Gray family?

10) Lastly, does your past and/or present working relationship with ABC News have anything to do with why you continually shield Art Bell (an obvious disinformation agent and blatant attacker of 9-11 researchers) from criticism, even going so far as to chastise callers into your show who take him to task?

ALEX JONES = BIG BROTHER

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

As much as we despise the New World Order elitists that are systematically destroying this country, we must say one thing: they have never censored, suppressed, or removed one of our articles from the Internet. Regrettably, we cannot say the same for Alex Jones' *Prison Planet* website. On May 20th, 2003, an article that we had written entitled *Deprogramming 101* appeared on *Prison Planet*. The only problem was: Lisa Guliani's name was the only one to appear on the piece. (Lisa had, at that time, recently become a weekly columnist for *Prison Planet*, and her pieces had appeared in the first three weeks of May). To rectify this situation, Lisa contacted Paul Watson (*Prison Planet's* webmaster) and told him that the article in question had been co-authored by her and Victor Thorn. To his credit, Watson quickly made the appropriate change.

Then, on May 21st, without notice or explanation, *Deprogramming 101*, along with other archived articles by Lisa Guliani (*The American Media Violates Its Own Code of Ethics* and *Apostles of the War Machine*) were ABRUPTLY PULLED from the *Prison Planet* website. Since that time, Lisa has repeatedly e-mailed Paul Watson to find out why this material has been removed, especially since he had so favorably received her previous political articles. She has yet to receive a response. To make matters worse, *Prison Planet* columnist Randy Lavello wrote a piece which had, in its original form, a direct link to Lisa Guliani's article entitled *Destruction of Dissent*. But when it ran on *Prison Planet*, Alex Jones removed an entire sentence referencing this article - along with a link to it - another result of DIRECT CENSORSHIP, and again without explanation!

From our perspective, Alex Jones and *Prison Planet* are acting in not only a hypocritical way, but also in one that should alarm every person reading these words. Why? Because Alex Jones has become quite renowned via his books, videos, and radio show for denouncing the Patriot and Homeland Security Acts for infringing on our First Amendment rights of free speech and freedom of the press. Yet he is now suppressing vital information in a much more heavy-handed way than the current administration ever has. As we said: George Bush has never removed our material from the Internet; Alex Jones has.

The big question at this point is: why did Alex Jones, with whom the ultimate responsibility lies, make this decision? As we said earlier, no one at *Prison Planet* has answered Lisa's queries, but we have heard on good authority that Mr. Jones did not approve of the content that appeared in our former publication, *Babel Magazine*. And why is that? Quite simply, because we ran a smattering of 'adult-oriented' material which was (without any candy-coating) quite risqué in nature.

But here's the rub: our article - *Deprogramming 101* - did not even remotely contain any offensive material; nor does any of our other anti-New World Order writing. It was strictly political in nature (and right on the mark, if we do say so ourselves). Yet the powers-that-be at *Prison Planet* found it necessary to suppress this information. But all we're doing is precisely what Alex Jones and every other person who believes in the Constitution says we should be allowed to do - exercise our First Amendment right to free speech and freedom of expression.

At this point we would like to ask one very important question: is Alex Jones becoming an embodiment of that which he is supposedly fighting against? In our eyes, the only way we can save this country is by making as many people as possible aware of the New World Order cabal's nefarious motives. This requires a vast dissemination of information to people in all walks of life. Yet Alex Jones, who is in a prime position to do just that, refuses to let people see the above-mentioned material. This stance is confirmed in an article by Louis Black that appeared in *The Austin Chronicle* on July 14, 2000 where he wrote: "Jones' respect and support for freedom of speech ends with those voices with which he personally agrees." We shudder at the ramifications of such hypocrisy!

In the end, what differentiates Alex Jones from the Controllers that he opposes (at least superficially)? Our local newspaper does not want its readers to become aware of Victor Thorn's explosive expose, *The New World Order Exposed* (which is now in its twelfth printing and is one of the hottest alternative-political books in the country), so they refused to review it. But at least they published an announcement/blurb when it was released. Alex Jones and *Prison Planet*, on the other hand, engaged in a none-too-subtle form of suppression by deliberately deleting an entire sentence and link to Lisa Guliani's article. Which one is worse? Likewise, although George Bush's Justice Department is passing horrifyingly unconstitutional legislation, they have yet to censor one word we have ever published. Alex Jones and *Prison Planet* have now done so on more than one occasion. Which one is worse? Finally, similar to a stonewalling Congressman that acts in an Orwellian fashion, yet fails to offer any explanation, Alex Jones and Paul Watson at *Prison Planet* have similarly failed to answer any of Lisa Guliani's repeated e-mails. Again, which one is worse?

When all is said and done, we're beginning to wonder if Alex Jones has become what he supposedly most despises - an iron-fisted Big Brother-type demagogue who feels that the only information the public should be made aware of is what HE thinks they should be made aware of. We certainly hope that this is not the case, and that in the future Mr. Jones chooses to not only answer these questions, but to also make vital information available to his readers and listeners rather than suppressing and censoring it.

BEWARE THE FEARMONGERS

By Victor Thorn

In recent months I've noticed a dramatic increase in the amount of alarmist-type activity emanating from certain alternative news sources. It seems as if these individuals are filled with a rabid, manic drive to satiate the Internet with as much fear and paranoia as possible. I bring this point to bear because I recently had the opportunity to watch a film clip from one of these fear-monger's latest videos, and in all honesty it caused me to arrive at a troublesome conclusion: the New World Order elite must love the individuals behind this movement.

You may wonder: what factors brought me to this result? Well, think about it - when are people most easily controlled? Answer: when they're in a state of continual fear. This has been readily proven in numerous psychological and sociological studies, and the manipulators atop our world's control pyramid are well aware of this fact. That is why the government and media have indoctrinated us with so much fear over the past few years concerning terrorism, anthrax, beheadings, the Patriot Act, etc.

It's bad enough that we have a concerted effort being waged against us by politicians and the TV/radio networks, but when those within our own ranks bombard us with video after video (not to mention a seemingly endless array of articles and links), we have to start asking ourselves why we're being assaulted with such heavy-handed doses of FEAR. In fact, this seems to be their forte - their prime specialty. They're fear-mongers; and either wittingly or unwittingly they're doing the NWO's dirty work.

Now, some people may object, saying that we need to know this information; and I agree wholeheartedly. But anyone who has done their research doesn't need a daily and/or weekly onslaught to realize that the government doesn't have our best interests at heart. That's evident. It's now time to accept what we already know and move on in a more pro-active direction - namely organization. When all of that other stuff is pounded into our minds like a sinister form of psychic driving, it becomes old hat.

Can't you see what's happening? The Internet fear-mongers are simply picking-up where the government/mass media fear-mongers leave off. If you don't believe me, look at their videos some time - they're filled with an over-abundance of rapid, quick-cut, fear-laced *Clockwork Orange* images that are exactly the same as those used by the trauma-based mind-control thought-benders. Likewise, apocalyptic cult leaders such as Charles Manson, Jim Jones, and Marshall

Applewhite (of Heaven's Gate fame) all used similar fear-laden techniques to overwhelm and control their followers. Is this where we want to be going?

The most disconcerting aspect of this scenario is that the fear-mongers aren't empowering people, but instead crippling them with fear. At the same time, they're also misleading them into accepting an acute state of paranoia where they think that Big Brother is watching and obsessing over their every move - what radio stations they listen to, Internet sites they log onto, which books they read, and even what highways they drive on. But here's a dirty little secret that crumbles the entire foundation of that premise: the government doesn't give a damn what 99.999% of the populace does because — guess what — nobody's doing anything that falls outside of their accepted parameters!

Isn't it obvious? The New World Order isn't some type of dismal, futuristic version of George Orwell's *1984* nightmare. Rather, the New World Order is in existence right here-and-now. This is what it looks like! We're right smack-dab in the middle of it, and those in the seats of power only want three things from us:

- 1) They expect people to be gainfully employed and to carry their own weight so as to not be a drain on society.
- 2) They want us to keep the Machine running by producing goods and services, while at the same time consuming these goods and services. The entire System is based upon this simple concept.
- 3) Most importantly, they want their subjects to readily and unquestioningly surrender a significant portion of their income through a variety of taxes, which allows them to maintain their power and keep the System running.

In other words, they want their subjects to be docile, passive, and 'well-trained,' without the ability to become organized. And sadly, I think they've been very successful in these endeavors because that's precisely the direction our political leaders and media have led us toward. Regrettably, the fear-mongers also fill this role by paralyzing people with increasing amounts of apprehension so that they can be more easily controlled.

So, with the above rationale in mind, I have some friendly words of advice for these individuals: drop the fear-schtick and start trying to unify people so that they can free themselves; not live in states of perpetual mental bondage that you're creating on a daily basis. We have enough books, videos, and articles on this subject to last a lifetime. Now it's time to move on because you're playing right into the hands of those who you are supposedly fighting against. We should be

helping people NOT be afraid to stand-up and free themselves from the NWO's tyranny, not to be further enslaved by it.

Of course everyone should be vigilant, but who wants to constantly be afraid or debilitated? Instead, be loud, get active, and never let them see the fear in your eyes; because if you do, it's all over (and who wants that). It's time to rise up, raise our fists, get organized, and start fighting back. To hell with fear (and those who promote it); it's now time to be strong and unafraid. How else are we ever going to take this country back?

ADVERTISEMENT FOR *FEAR WORLD*

By Victor Thorn

Sideshow Barker: Ladies and gentlemen, come one, come all, to a little place we like to call *Fear World*. Yessiree, step right up and let your paranoia and suspicions run rampant.

Audience Member: Gee, Mister, in *Fear World*, do you try to bring everyone together as a united whole so that they can be stronger and have a better chance to fight against their real enemies?

Sideshow Barker: Silly boy! Of course we don't try to bring people together in *Fear World*. In fact, we act as if we're the only game in town. That way, nobody will have any ideas contrary to the ones we're trying to shove down their throats.

Audience Member: Hey, Mister, in *Fear World*, do you bring together all the best minds from a variety of research fields so that people can get a broader perspective on their existence?

Sideshow Barker: Are you crazy, son? There can only be one head kahuna in *Cult World* ... er, I mean *Fear World*, and that's King Fear himself.

Audience Member: Mister, do you want people to be strong, unafraid, and action-oriented in *Fear World*?

Sideshow Barker: Hell no! In *Fear World*, people are more easily controlled when they're feeble, weak, and submissive; so to gain even more power over their minds and emotions we keep them smothered in fear. And if you want to know a little secret, it doesn't matter if the threats we conjure are real or only "perceived". If something has the potential to induce fear, then we can manipulate it to our benefit; and in the end, that's all that really matters.

Audience Member: Sir, does your *Fear World* differ much from the government's *Fear World*?

Sideshow Barker: No, it doesn't. In fact, King Fear takes over where the politicians and mass media leave off. As twisted as it may seem, our world is nothing more than an extension or continuation of theirs.

Audience Member: Mister, in *Fear World*, should people try to find a cause that is larger than their leader?

Sideshow Barker: Not a chance! *Fear World* is all about self-aggrandizement and self-advancement. King Fear only uses Causes as a vehicle to induce even more fear so that someday he'll be so big that there won't be anyone else but him.

Audience Member: Mister, can we expect to be free in *Fear World* so that we can express our own ideas and opinions?

Sideshow Barker: Come now, young man; don't think so much for yourself. King Fear doesn't like that. He wants *Fear World* to more closely resemble George Orwell's *1984* than a place where people can voice what's on their mind. And don't ever disagree with King Fear. That's an unmitigated no-no. If you do, he'll censor that idea as if it were a cancer. Like I said, we're not that much different than the government's totalitarian *Fear World*, and in some instances, we're even worse.

Audience Member: Gee, Mister, I'm not so sure about this *Fear World*. It doesn't sound like you're giving people an accurate perspective on reality. I mean, if they keep listening to you and King Fear, they'll stay so far down that they'll never escape from their chains.

Sideshow Barker: Of course they won't! That's the whole point. That's how we control them! We want people to think that the government and Big Brother listen to every word they say and track every movement they make. Likewise, we want them to think that the Thought Police monitor every website they access, every radio station they listen to, and every TV channel they watch; when in reality, those in power could care less what 99.99% of their subjects do. Why? Because they aren't doing anything! They're not a threat to the status quo because they've already been adequately conditioned into a passive state of being. And no one ... I mean no one ... should tell them otherwise - that they CAN BE FREE! If somebody does start preaching this freedom nonsense, there is only one course of action on our part: we absolutely refuse to have anything to do with them. Free-thinkers are anathema to us. Y'see, we can't let them know that they can escape, because if they try to free themselves from this multi-pronged conditioning-trip, they wouldn't live in fear any longer. And in all honesty, once that happens, people won't come back to *Fear World* any more. That's why we try to make *Fear World* a drug - more sensationalized - more rabid - more crazed - so that with every visit people become addicted to the rush of fear and paranoia that we're peddling. Then, once they get their fix from King Fear barking and frothing at the mouth, we don't have to worry about them thinking for themselves and becoming empowered. No sir, we'll just keep them right here in our suffocating little empire

of fear. So come one, come all. Step right up to *Fear World*, a place where paranoia and suspicions run rampant...

ALEX JONES & THE COMMON CAUSE: UNITED WE STAND

By Victor Thorn

On January 11, 2005, Alex Jones made a very profound statement during a call-in to Jack Blood's *Deadline Live* radio show. He said, "Everyone in the freedom movement should join together and not worry about past grievances." He continued, "We should get on the same team instead of nitpicking like we're in a sewing circle."

Upon hearing this revelation, I realized that Jones was correct. Our battle against the New World Order has too often been marred by in-fighting, back-biting, and a volley of snipping between various forces. And in all honesty, we here at WING TV plead guilty to being part of this divisive behavior. Some of it, in our opinion, was justified, while others were not.

Which brings me back to Alex Jones: after his call-in to Jack Blood, I contacted him and discovered that a "tiff we had about 2 1/2 years ago was nothing more than a misunderstanding that got blown-out of proportion. I won't delve into all the details, but the crux of this mix-up revolved around an article we wrote accusing Alex of censorship. But after hearing his explanation as to why he removed certain articles and links from his website, I told Alex that we would clarify this situation on the WING TV homepage (i.e. a lack of communication). So, in the spirit of unity (and to show our good faith), we want this article to serve as a bridge and an olive branch on our behalf.

Hopefully, this acknowledgement will suffice with Alex, because when he said that all of us in the patriot community and alternative media should unite and let bygones be bygones, we took him at his word. This is precisely what we want, and we hope that we can put our heads together and join forces in the near future. After all, the bottom line of our common struggle is this: the global elite love nothing more than when we fight among each other. Regrettably, that's what's been happening too often in our ranks. In fact, I could name off the top of my head at least a dozen of these little squabbles that are taking place right now between alternative researchers. And more than likely, none of them hold any more merit than the one that took place between Jones and WING TV.

Let's look at it this way. What if all of the biggest alternative media outlets and websites joined forces and set their sites on a mutual goal: challenging the NWO cabal. Think about it - Coast to Coast AM with George Noory and Art Bell, the American Free Press, Alex Jones, WING TV, The Power Hour with Dave von

Kleist and Joyce Riley, Jack Blood and everyone at RBN, Jeff Rense, along with Genesis Communications Network, The American Voice Radio Network, Anti-War.com, all the various 9-11 organizations, Democracy Now with Amy Goodman, and so many others. Sure, all of these venues approach the political arena from a different angle, but what if they came together and set four or five top priorities; then unleashed their combined fury against THEM? Despite our differences, we might truly stand a chance in the face of this multi-tentacled monster.

Now I'm not talking about a huge centralization of power; but instead, a common unification of goals. Because, when you think about it, don't we all, in one way or another, have the same purpose in mind - to defeat the global forces which are rapidly eroding our freedoms and sovereignty? The primary difference between them and us is simple: our opponent is highly organized, and we aren't. And if we remain fragmented and isolated, I guarantee that absolutely nothing substantive will change. Is that what we want, or are we big enough to rise above ourselves and join together? This is the crux of our struggle.

Regrettably, we are faced with a glaring problem; one that we can't simply ignore. What if an organization, person, or media outlet is obviously nothing more than a Gatekeeper or plant? What should members of the patriot community do - keep their mouths shut for the sake of "peace," or expose them? This situation creates quite a quandary for all of us, and there aren't any easy answers.

A good start, though, in determining if someone is real or not can be found in their stance on 9-11. In other words, 9-11 was undeniably the most dramatic and traumatic event of the 21 st century, and it has done more to affect our lives into the future than anything else (war, Patriot Act, social terror, erosion of the Constitution, etc). The way I see it is as such: if a group or person doesn't want to discover the entire truth about 9-11, and then disseminate it to a much larger audience, then we have to question their authenticity. I mean, if the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth doesn't matter to a person about 9-11, then what *does* matter to them?

In simplest terms, the truth about 9-11 should be our litmus test, and if someone fails it (i.e. thus failing their fellow patriots and the American public at large), then they **SHOULD** be exposed as phonies or saboteurs. Do you agree? It's a bitter pill to swallow, but think about it - isn't that what the mainstream media does in regard to 9-11 — they hide, conceal, and lie about 9-11 truths. And if those in the patriot movement and/or alternative media do the same thing, aren't they mirroring the establishment media? So far, the true perpetrators behind 9-11 have been able to get away with their mass murder and subsequent cover-up (at least on an "official" level), largely because the corporate media is protecting them. But

should we tolerate this same, grossly deplorable behavior from those who are supposedly within our own ranks?

From our perspective here at WING TV, the answer is a resounding NO! We need to see who is real, and who's deceiving and double-dealing. That's what Lisa Guliani and I are currently doing with 9-11, and if someone tries to ignore or suppress the truth, we're going to report their deliberate malfeasances for all to see.

Now, before you protest that this is "attack journalism," please understand that all we're doing is asking others to help spread the word about 9-11. Can anyone object to that? In case you've forgotten, exposing the truth about 9-11 is still a 'good thing.' And if anyone in a position to do so DOESN'T want to reveal this truth in the largest way possible, then we're not afraid to say that there's something seriously wrong with them. It's that simple, and we see nothing wrong in pushing the envelope to see where everyone stands.

In the end, Lisa Guliani and I are devoting our lives (at great cost and personal consequence) to exposing the truth about 9-11, the Oklahoma City Bombing, the destruction of TWA 800 and the USS Liberty, and a host of other similarly atrocious acts. Likewise, there are scores of others who seek this same truth, and we salute their efforts and hold them in the highest regard. But if someone purports to be a patriot or an 'alternative' to the mainstream, yet ignores or suppresses this truth, then damn it, they deserve to be exposed for what they are.

Time is of the essence, folks, and we here at WING TV truly mean what we say. That's why we're extending our hand to others and trying to set an example. We need to come together, become empowered, and take-on our opponents as a unified whole. If we don't, then sadly, everything we're doing will be for naught.

"ALEX JONES"

PARODY INTERVIEW

by Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Victor Thorn: Last Friday we ran a parody article which stated that you were going to change the name of your website and radio show to INFOMERCIAL.com. What did you think of it?

"Alex Jones": Thanks for breaking that story, and if you want to know the truth, I think it's a great idea. After thinking about it long and hard, the reason behind the name change is obvious: I need something to accurately reflect my mission; and since I'm doing the hard-sell and want people to *buy buy buy*, there couldn't be a better name than INFOMERCIAL.com. For the same reason, I might also change the name of Prison Planet to PURCHASE PLANET.com. So remember everybody - buy my videos. Buy my videos.

Lisa Guliani: On January 11, 2005 you called into a radio show and said the following: "Everyone in the freedom movement should join together and not worry about past grievances." Well, Alex, over the past few months we've tried to do just that with you by extending our hand and offering you an olive branch. We even wrote an article entitled *Alex Jones & the Common Cause: United We Stand* which showed our sincerity. So, when you said that we should all come together, we took you at your word, but for some reason you didn't honor your own words. Why?

"Alex Jones": C'mon now, everybody knows that I never meant what I said. That was just lip-service. I was just showboating and trying to bolster myself. Plus, the only reason why I call into these radio shows is to plug my videos. That's obvious, isn't it? All I do is use these other radio hosts for free advertising and free plugs. I never really intended to be a team player. It just sounded good at the time and puffed-up my reputation. I never expected anyone to actually call me on it. I just want people to buy my videos.

Victor Thorn: Another thing that we were very much disappointed in with you Alex was your refusal to help us get the word out about the tenth anniversary of the OKC bombing. Considering the proximity of Austin to Oklahoma, why weren't you a part of this larger cause?

"Alex Jones": Are you kidding? I do have a cause - to make as much money and sell as many videos as I possibly can. What other cause is there?

Lisa Guliani: I'd like to follow-up on that question, Alex. When we were at the OKC speaker's forum, we heard somebody asking why you weren't in attendance, and why you hadn't promoted this event. Then somebody else answered, "There wasn't any money to be made, that's why!" What are your thoughts on this?

"Alex Jones": Believe it or not, they're absolutely correct. The only time I do something is when it puts money in my pocket. Look at my trip last year to the Republican National Convention in New York City. Do you think I cared about this larger cause? Of course not. I went there to film my latest video so I could sell it to my listeners. I mean, how much money did you guys make in OKC?

Lisa Guliani: Actually, we lost money going there, but that didn't matter to us because we weren't selling anything. The books we did take with us we gave away for free.

"Alex Jones": Y'see, that's what I mean. I never do anything unless there's a profit motive in it for me. Plus, there's another reason why I didn't go to OKC. Since I wasn't the one sponsoring this event and it wasn't about me or my videos, I wasn't going to give any attention to anybody else. I don't do anything unless I'm the center of attention. Just remember - Alex Jones doesn't play second fiddle to anybody, so buy my video. Buy my video.

Victor Thorn: Since you mentioned wanting to be the center of attention, is that one of the reasons why you don't have certain guests on your show?

"Alex Jones": Of course. I don't want people going to too many other sites because that means they'll spend less time on my site. Plus, if they spend less time on my site; that means there's less chance that they'll buy my products. The world should revolve around me. I'm Alex Jones!

Lisa Guliani: Alex, we close our television show every day with the following message in our photo gallery: "Don't pay for Internet news - WING TV always free." What do you think of that slogan?

"Alex Jones": I hate it. I absolutely despise it. And do you know why — because it puts the wrong idea into people's heads. I don't want my customers ... I mean my listeners ... to know they can get TV for free on the Internet. If they did, then they wouldn't subscribe to my pay-per-view site. Here's the bottom line: I want people's money - and lots of it. Buy my videos. Subscribe to my pay-per-view site. You guys at WING TV are ruining everything because you're giving people information for free. That's why I don't want anyone going to your site. People should pay pay pay for information, not get it for free.

Victor Thorn: How do you respond to people saying that you're nothing but a walking advertisement, or that your radio show is one long infomercial?

"Alex Jones": I'd say it's true because if there's a dollar to be had, I'll sniff it out. And if you want to know the truth, there's not much difference between me and Ron Popeil, or those guys who sell Ginsu knives and Chia pets at 3:00 in the morning on late-night TV. So what I did was see an opening in the New World Order market, and then capitalized on it. Some people are waging this battle for purely selfless reasons - to get the word out - but not me. I make MORE MONEY than anyone else in this field, I'm king of the hill, and it's going to stay that way! Even when I tell people to make copies of my videos and give them out, there's a strategy behind it.

Victor Thorn: What's that?

"Alex Jones": It's free advertising, stupid. Can't you see? I get people to spend a lot of money buying my video in the first place; then they spread the word about me for free so that other people will buy my products. Hell, this is Wall Street marketing 101.

Lisa Guliani: Was this why you absolutely refused to criticize Art Bell after he had the propagandist Ben Chertoff from *Popular Mechanics* on his show telling blatant lies about 9-11?

"Alex Jones": Absolutely. Art Bell's a total phony, but since he butters my bread and lets me on *Coast-to-Coast AM* to sell my videos, I'll never bite the hand that feeds me. Even when every other person in the alternative media field was screaming bloody murder, did you notice that I never said a bad thing about him? What I did instead was distract attention away from Art and put it onto Chertoff so as to not jeopardize my chance to get back on *Coast-to-Coast*. I'd even go so far as to get mad at callers who tried to criticize Bell. Remember, it's not the truth that matters, but protecting one's self-interests. So c'mon, buy my videos!

Victor Thorn: On WING TV, we're very big into telling people to stand-up, get active, and be unafraid. But on your radio show, it seems as if you're the king of fear-mongering, which ultimately cripples people and keeps them passive. Why is that?

"Alex Jones": The answer is simple. Fear sells and it pads my pockets. It's much easier to control someone when they're traumatized or in a state of panic, and therefore it's easier to have them buy my videos. Psychologists and sociologists have known this for decades. So, if I did make people strong and unafraid, they wouldn't buy into the fear-mongering schtick that I make my living off of. And in

the end, how would that ultimately benefit me? I want people to buy my videos, so that's why I constantly create this world of fear around them. It's nothing more than a self-serving form of psychic driving.

Lisa Guliani: Let's speak for a moment about an article we wrote called *Alex Jones = Big Brother*. In this piece we point out how you not only removed all of my articles from your site, but you also censored an article written by Randy Lavello where, in addition to removing a hyperlink to my article, you also deleted an entire sentence that Lavello wrote in reference to my article. Alex, this is outright censorship, and you've refused to answer for your actions to either Lavello or me. How do you respond?

"Alex Jones": You guys are starting to irritate me, and I don't like it. I've spent a lot of years carefully crafting my image, and now you're chipping away at it and letting people see the real me. Now, getting back to your question, yes, I DID censor the article you referred to, and in that sense it makes me exactly like the people I'm supposedly rebelling against. Alex Jones isn't Big Brother, but he is the next best thing to God.

Victor Thorn: I'd like to note at this point that never once has George Bush, the New World Order, or the U.S. government censored our material, but Alex Jones deliberately altered Randy Lavello's article by deleting an entire sentence - along with a hyperlink - without notifying the author beforehand, or without his permission. This is direct censorship, and we should think about this point for a moment because it should send shudders down your spine.

"Alex Jones": Don't keep repeating that; you're making me look bad. And to everyone watching WING TV right now, I command you: do not read the *Alex Jones = Big Brother* article, or any others on their site. It's killing the image that's taken me so long to create. Instead, all you should do is buy my videos and let me do your thinking for you. Forget about all that other stuff, don't ask any questions, and just listen to me. I know what's best for you.

Lisa Guliani: When you spoke with Victor on the phone a month or so ago, he told you on at least three different occasions that if you didn't want us on your show, just say so and he'd never broach the subject with you again. But you kept saying, "Oh no no, that's not it. I'll have you guys on sometime." But now it's clear that you never had any intention whatsoever of doing so. On the other hand, if we don't want someone on our show, we have the guts to say flat-out that we don't want them. Alex, why weren't you man enough to tell Victor the truth instead of dancing around in circles?

"Alex Jones": Because either way I lose; and that would make me look bad. And before I go on, remember that where I'm concerned - appearances are EVERYTHING! With that in mind, if you were on my show, more people would find out that WING TV is free, and they wouldn't fork-over their hard-earned money to me for my pay-per-view site. Conversely, if I said I didn't want you on my show, then you'd tell people about it and they'd start asking me the reason why. And since lots of people are starting to wonder why I won't talk to you about the controlled demolition of the World Trade Center towers, I'm between a rock and a hard place. So let's forget all about it and just buy my video.

Victor Thorn: Alex, I hate to say this, but in my opinion it's VERY PATHETIC that the mainstream media - specifically, a Knight-Ridder subsidiary - has given our information more coverage than you have ... and you're supposedly at the forefront of the Patriot media movement. We want everyone to think about this, because in our mind, this doesn't make any sense, especially when you said on January 11 that all of us should come together as one. How can that be?

"Alex Jones": I ... I ... I don't know what to say. Just subscribe to my pay-per-view-site.

Lisa Guliani: Alex, you act like you don't know anything about our show, but when Victor spoke with you on the phone a couple of different times, you seemed to be quite knowledgeable about it, like who does the opening music and the Art Bell exorcism.

"Alex Jones": Believe me, I keep an eye on my competition ... er, I probably shouldn't say it that way. What I meant was; I know what my adversaries are up to. Oh wait, that sounds hypocritical too because according to me, we're all supposed to be on the same team.

Lisa Guliani: Alex, you must see the world differently than we do because we did everything humanly possible to join forces with you - even going so far as to write a retraction for our *Alex Jones = Big Brother* article ... just like you asked us to do. But you still refused to accept our olive branch. Why?

"Alex Jones": Because if we became organized as a whole, it would take the focus away from me and I wouldn't be the center of attention any longer. So I plan on telling everyone that your criticisms are nothing more than a distraction; then I'll jump right back into my fear-mongering schtick. It's vitally important that the people in my cult ... I mean my listening audience ... don't slip away and start thinking for themselves. That would be a disaster.

Victor Thorn: Last but not least, Alex, since you mentioned the mainstream media, we've noticed that you're beginning to look a lot like them. Specifically, (a) you restricted the free-flow of information by not telling your listeners about *9-11 on Trial* and the OKC 10th anniversary truth rally, (b) you engage in overt censorship, and (c) you're obsessed with the hard-sell of your products. How do you respond?

"Alex Jones": Let's see. I have refused to cover *9-11 on Trial*, just like the mainstream media, and I have deliberately censored essential material, just like the mainstream media. On top of that, I push my products harder than McDonalds, Pepsi, Chevrolet, or a used-car salesman. So, even though I hate to admit it, I am becoming like the mainstream media. Ugghghhhh! I'm out of here - BUY MY VIDEOS! BUY MY VIDEOS!

MIKE RUPPERT UNMASKED

By Victor Thorn

Note: The following is a profile of Mike Ruppert, the man. It should not be taken as an indictment of his book, *Crossing the Rubicon* (released last week), which I have not yet had an opportunity to review.

"Sometimes pointing out that one was right is not about ego"

Mike Ruppert

On this date - Friday, August 6, 2004 - the world was the same as it was any other day - filled with allegations, suspicions, criticism and threatening lawsuits. Even crazy old Dick Eastman entered the fray. Yes, this was the world of Mike Ruppert - king of the conspiratologists, perpetual center of attention, and legend in his own mind.

So, I figured: it's time to figure out what makes Mike Ruppert tick - to see what he's all about. Sure, I already knew the basics — LAPD cop quits the force, enters a mental institution, chases some crazy broad around the country, struggles through tough times, turns whistleblower, confronts CIA Director John Deutsch in South Central L.A., begins *From the Wilderness*, and releases his *Truth and Lies of 9-11* on video.

But there had to be more, especially when the Internet was buzzing with so many rumors about Ruppert - the whispers developing into deafening echoes. From my perspective, there were only two courses of action. I could either unquestioningly buy into all the gossip, or investigate this matter for myself.

Mind you, I had never spoken directly to Mike Ruppert, nor had I ever even corresponded with him via e-mail. The only "contact" I ever had with Ruppert was via a review that I had written about his 9-11 video, which later appeared in my book, *The New World Order Exposed*.

All this changed on Friday, August 6, 2004 when I noticed that Ruppert was threatening to sue 9-11 researcher Dick Eastman. (I can't remember exactly what this lawsuit entailed, but I'm pretty sure it revolved around an argument they were having about whether or not a Boeing 757 hit the Pentagon on the morning of 9-11.) Anyway, my first thought was: how many people has Mike Ruppert threatened to bring lawsuits against now? But then an even better idea popped into my mind: why don't I invite Ruppert and Eastman onto WING TV and get both sides of the story.

So, without further delay, I reeled off an e-mail to Ruppert inviting him to appear on WING TV. In addition, I also addressed some of the innuendo and outright accusations surrounding him:

"We have been receiving tons of e-mail in the past few months that are seriously calling into question your validity and honesty as a 9-11 researcher. Some of the claims being made are that you are a PATRIOT FOR HIRE (in other words, just in it for the money), and that you have sold out (i.e. a cop on the take). Finally, others are saying that you are deliberately covering up what actually happened on 9-11 by steering people away from it toward peak oil. These things are definitely not going unnoticed, and we would like your take on these matters."

Before proceeding any further, I would like to make a few things perfectly clear. First, this was a private e-mail from me to Mike Ruppert, and was not posted in any other forums. In fact, I have never criticized Mr. Ruppert on any Internet group or in any discussion rooms. Thus, my note remained solely between him and me.

Well, about two hours later, right before Lisa Guliani and I were about to eat supper, the phone rang. I answered it, only to hear Mike Ruppert on the other end. After introducing himself in a very surly fashion, Ruppert growled that he was RECORDING this conversation for legal reasons; and that if I didn't cease-and-desist in my threats and slander toward him, he would proceed to take immediate legal action! Yup, you guessed it - my name was now added to an already lengthy list of people Mike Ruppert was threatening to sue.

Anyway, after listening to Ruppert rant, rave, and swear about Dick Eastman and how sick he was of people questioning his motives, I assured him that I didn't even remotely slander or threaten him. Rather, I repeated some of the charges being leveled against him; then invited him onto our show to address these issues. That, I explained, was what responsible reporters and journalists do instead of simply shooting from the hip like a cowboy. I even went on to say that it would be real easy for us to appear on WING TV and repeat these rumors, but such tactics would be unfair to him; thus, the invitation.

Well, after somewhat calming Ruppert down (twenty minutes later), I asked him once again if he would like to appear on our show; to which he responded that I would have to contact his representative, Ken Levine. I agreed to do so, and after hanging up the telephone, I commented to Lisa, "That's the angriest and most paranoid man I've ever spoken to." This ended chapter one of my interaction with Mike Ruppert.

Shortly thereafter I turned on my computer to find an e-mail from Ruppert where he once again threatened to sue me:

"I sent out the following statement to Eastman yesterday. If you or he represent my position in any other way than what I say here, you can rest assured that legal action will follow, and quickly."

[As a sidebar, I have never spoken directly to Mr. Dick Eastman in my life, and have e-mailed him less than half-a-dozen times. Thus, any implied relation is non-existent.]

Ruppert then went on to explain his views on the 9-11 terrorist attacks, specifically where he stood in regard to what hit (or did not hit) the Pentagon on the morning of September 11, 2001. He only did so, though, after telling me, "This is addressed on my website, if you are intelligent enough to find it." I mention this point because, as you will see later in this essay, it is indicative of Mike Ruppert's modus operandi where he feels compelled to take nasty, abusive pot-shots at those who he views as detractors.

Anyway, for the next three weeks I periodically spoke with Mr. Ken Levine and tried to schedule Ruppert for WING TV. The results, though, were less than optimal, for Levine kept "fluffing me off and running hot-and-cold with me. Even after hearing how we were booking the hottest names in the 9-11 field (including Dave von Kleist, John Kaminski, George Humphrey, Eric Hufschmid, Phil Jayhan, Jim Hoffman, Michael Elliott and Ian Barksdale), along with numerous presidential candidates, Levine wouldn't commit; instead telling me he'd keep working on it. (This point is important to remember, as you'll soon see.)

Finally, on August 31, 2004, I decided to go directly to the source once again, and thus sent the following e-mail to Mike Ruppert:

Mike,

Victor Thorn here from WING TV. I spoke with you on August 6, 2004 about appearing on our television show (via telephone), and you referred me to Ken Levine.

Over the past 2-3 weeks I have been trying very diligently to set-up a date for you to speak about your new book, but thus far have not been able to get a commitment from Mr. Levine.

This is puzzling to me, because without trying to sound boastful, we have the hottest TV show on the Internet (bar none), and have been interviewing everyone who's anyone in the alternative research field, including Jim Marrs and David Ray Griffin; along with seven different presidential candidates and a variety of other heavy-hitters.

In addition, there is not an organization in existence that wants to uncover the truth about what really happened on the morning of 9-11 more than we do, along with uncovering other examples of government dirty-dealings, such as CIA drug trafficking, etc.

In other words, we have a custom-made audience that would be very receptive to *Crossing the Rubicon: 9/11 and the Decline of American Empire at the End of the Age of Oil*. On top of that, I devoted an entire chapter of my book *The New World Order Exposed* (now in its eleventh printing) to your videotape, *The Truth and Lies of 9/11*. I would also like to distribute your new book from our WING TV bookstore, and also plan on reviewing it as soon as it is released. (Needless to say, I would welcome a pre-release copy to create some advanced publicity.)

So, what I'm doing is coming directly to you to say: let's set-up a date for you to appear on WING TV. We'll give you a huge number of viewers all across the 'Net, and will promote this appearance to the hilt. Considering the explosive nature of what you'll be presenting in your book, many people from both inside and outside the 9-11 truth movement will be gunning for you. What we are offering you is a fair shake with maximum coverage and no bullshit.

As I told you earlier this month during our telephone conversation, we're not cowboys or bomb-throwers. Rather, we play it straight and want only one thing - to expose the truth.

With all of this in mind, Mike, let's arrive at a date for you to appear on our show. I realize you're busy, but all we're asking for is 20-25 minutes of your time on the telephone. That's it. Surely within the next month or so you can arrange that. Whether intentionally or not, Ken has been giving me the run-around - fluctuating between hot and cold - and in all honesty we haven't had this much trouble EVER getting a guest! So I'll lay it all out to you straight: you pick the time and date (Friday, October 1 would be ideal), and we'll do whatever we can to accommodate you. All we're asking for is 20-25 minutes - that's it.

To close, we plan on doing a Mike Ruppert show in late September/early October, and we would very much like you to be a part of it. Considering all the benefits outlined in this letter, we don't know how a sweeter deal could land in your lap. WE'LL SELL BOOKS FOR YOU AND GET THE WORD OUT!!!

Mike, those in the alternative research field (not the mainstream media) have been your core supporters for years, and WING TV stands at the forefront of this audience. Please keep this in mind as your book goes to press and you start booking interview dates. We're on your side, and we'll do anything we can to help. Work with us, okay.

Victor Thorn
WING TV
Sisyphus Press

Ruppert's response on Wednesday, September 1, 2004 was truly bewildering. He began his e-mail by stating: "We have tried to be polite. It didn't work." Well, actually, Mike, you weren't polite in the least, as I have shown. Levine was, but on two different occasions you threatened to sue me. That's polite?

Ruppert continued in the e-mail's second line: "I will not now or ever be on your television show. There will be no discussion." Again, more of Mike's politeness.

He then goes on to say: "The reason is that you are an extremely careless researcher. Your book contains a number of errors which could have caused me and my business harm. I evaluated your book almost a year ago and decided then that I would never have any association with you."

Ruppert then proceeds to list all of the "errors" in my book, but not before once again trying to bully me with this completely absurd threat: "Please cease and desist all attempts to contact either me or Ken Levine. If you do not respect this request then I may ask you to reimburse us for all the trouble you have caused with your errors."

Take a moment now to think about the totally unfounded and, in all honesty, irrational nature of this statement. Ruppert wants to "charge" me for trying to schedule him for our show - to pay his personnel costs! It's ludicrous.

The situation gets even worse, for one of the supposed first "errors" that he cites in *The New World Order Exposed* is this passage: "Mike Ruppert begins his *Truth and Lies of 9-11* videotape by offering a \$1,000 cash reward to anyone that can disprove the information contained within this presentation. To date, the money still stands."

I checked this quote, and that is indeed what I wrote. But Ruppert continues, "Problem number 1: the offer was only for information contained in the "Oh

Lucy" timeline and never for the entire tape. Problem number 2: the offer expired more than a year ago. (It has now been expired for more than two years, yet there are still people calling our office based on your book, making unfounded misrepresentations of my offer. Your book has cost my staff about 60 man-hours over two years. I pay the salary for that.)

The stupendous inanity of this statement is so mind-boggling (and, quite frankly, embarrassing to Ruppert) that I don't know where to begin. First, Ruppert prides himself on being an "accurate reporter." How did he figure the 60 man-hours? Does he have a formula? Did he actually sit down and calculate over a two-year period exactly how many phone calls he received, then trace them directly to my book? How can we take this guy seriously? Secondly, he says the offer expired more than a year ago, then immediately - in the very next sentence - says it expired more than two years ago. Which one is it? Is this accurate reporting? It almost sounds as if Ruppert has a standard form-letter which he sends out to people whenever this issue arises. (More on Ruppert's "form letters" later.)

Thirdly, *The New World Order Exposed* has only been in print for 1 1/2 years, and if anyone does a quick Google search, they'll find numerous sources quoting his \$1,000 reward offer (more inaccuracies). I would love to take credit for having such an influential book, but once more Mike is being overly dramatic and disingenuous. Plus, here we see Mike Ruppert yet again bellyaching about paying his employees and trying to place the burden on someone else.

Continuing his criticism of *The New World Order Exposed*, Ruppert points out a GLARING error where I say that "six of the first seven CIA Directors came from Wall Street," when in fact it should be six of the first seven DEPUTY Directors. Is it because of this oversight that he wouldn't appear on our television show? Plus, Ruppert also found one misspelled word in my book - one, in a 567 page tome. Well, I hate to inform Mr. Ruppert, but when I read the transcript of his speech at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, I certainly found more than one typo. So, if we used Ruppert's rationale, his entire speech should thus be discredited. I hope everyone can see how ridiculous these tactics are.

But none of the above examples truly reflect Ruppert's pettiness, obfuscation, and true motives more so than does the following: Mike Ruppert said that the reason he wouldn't appear on WING TV is because I am a careless researcher, and *The New World Order Exposed* is filled with errors. But let's look at the reality of this matter. First, this book is now in its eleventh small press run, and has sold this well with an advertising budget of zero dollars. That means people have found out about it via the ultimate form of advertising: word of mouth. In addition, *The New World Order Exposed* is being distributed by First Amendment Books in Washington, D.C., along with Adventures Unlimited in Illinois - two of the most

respected booksellers in the business. It has also been reviewed in nearly twenty venues, including *The American Free Press*, the highly-respected *Midwest Book Review*, *Black Diamond Books*, and nationally distributed *Clamor* magazine (not to mention blurbs and endorsements from Jim Marrs (*Rule by Secrecy*), Gordon Thomas (*Seeds of Fire*), Michael Collins Piper (*Final Judgment*), Paul Walker (*Aftermath News*), Meria Heller, and Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Marvin (*Expendable Elite*)). Lastly, the Japanese publisher, Tokuma Shoten, purchased the rights to *The New World Order Exposed*, and will release a translated version later this year.

Now, please understand; I'm not mentioning all these points to blow my own horn. Instead, I want to ask the reader one very important question — can all of the above people be wrong about this book, or is Mike Ruppert simply copping-out and searching in vain for a scapegoat? Ironically, the answer can be found directly from Mike's own *From the Wilderness* website, for shortly after my review of Ruppert's 9-11 video appeared in such respected publications as *Bank Index* and others, I was contacted by HIS people and congratulated for doing such a superb job. Now, keep in mind - I didn't contact them - they contacted me. Plus, they were so pleased with this review - the same one that Mike Ruppert is now criticizing - that they actually gave me a free one-year subscription to his *From the Wilderness* newsletter. Does it sound like they would do something like that for a sub-standard, error-prone review? Hardly. The thing I'm most curious about is: how did these glowing accolades which emanated from FTW itself suddenly turn so negative and bitter? Do you think it had anything to do with Mike Ruppert needing an excuse not to appear on WING TV?

As I've come to learn, though, these types of tactics (and his behavior in general) are typical of, and fit part-and-parcel with, Mike Ruppert's standard operating procedure. But before moving on to show you more of what I mean, I would like to bring one more point to bear. After receiving the above-quoted e-mail from Ruppert, I spoke once again with Ken Levine, who revealed to me a very interesting bit of information. He said that when Mike Ruppert sat down to decide which interview forums he would like to participate in after *Crossing the Rubicon* was released, he also created a list of shows he refused to do. And guess what show Mr. Levine said was on that list: WING TV! Now, considering that I had never spoken to Ruppert until last month, how conciliatory I was to him in my lengthy e-mail, and how I even gave his 9-11 video a glowing review; I wonder how he came to put me on his J. Edgar Hoover-like "black list."

The big question now is: if Mike Ruppert won't appear on WING TV, what types of shows and/or interviews is he going to do? Ponder this point very carefully, for his decisions are quite telling. If his first speech is any indicator (at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, frequented by the very ruling elite that he

is supposedly rebelling against), I think we should all wonder where Mike Ruppert's loyalties really lie.

Before anyone jumps to conclusions and proclaims that I'm the only person who harbors the above-mentioned misgivings about Mike Ruppert, what I will proceed to show in this section is that Ruppert's irrational behavior, questionable decision-making process, and his abusive modus operandi have been written about by many others in the alternative research field. As you will see, the preponderance of evidence is so overwhelming that all of us have to seriously consider whether we want this man to be our "self-appointed" spokesman, for at what point does one's negatives begin to outweigh their positive strides.

One of the most repellent traits that Mike Ruppert exhibits is the way he lashes out at people who criticize his work. As you saw in part one of this article, Ruppert took a swipe at me at every turn, and seems to be especially prone to such behavior whenever anyone is perceived to be a threat, or in opposition to his views. What results is an ugly display of arrogance and supposed mental superiority toward his detractors that ends up making him look foolish at best, and downright asinine at worst. What follows is just one example of these "flames," but believe me: many more exist on various discussion groups and forums on the Internet.

Response to Jerry Russell's article: *Peak Oil? Don't Buy Into the Hype!* - Posted on 911-strike.com: "Listen, let's take the passive-aggressive gloves off here you asshole." [Very classy, huh? I wonder what former Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney and all of Mike's petro-buddies would think of this intellectual retort?]

NOTE: If you have any other examples of "Mike at his finest," forward them to me. Maybe we could put together a "[Mike Ruppert Hall of Fame](#)" of nasty e-mails and bulletin board postings.

Quite possibly the finest example of Ruppert's tactics are provided by Dave McGowan on his *Center for an Informed America* website, newsletter # 54 (March 18, 2004). In this lengthy exchange, Ruppert's conceitedness, intimidation tactics, character assassinations, obsession with money, and agenda become perfectly clear. Of special interest are Ruppert's views on POPULATION REDUCTION, and McGowan's phenomenal response to it. Classic reading, and quite frightening in its implications.

NEWSLETTER #54

Dave McGowan

March 18, 2004

Ruppert Responds!

The official response is now in from Michael Ruppert, and it is a doozy. Although Ruppert's missive is filled, as was Chin's, with juvenile insults, misrepresentations, and completely unfounded accusations, I will, out of respect for my readers (though certainly not for Ruppert, who has earned no measure of respect from me), make every effort to take the high road here (several of you have written to caution me not to let these people provoke me into losing my cool, and that seems to be sound advice).

I will first present Ruppert's formal reply in its entirety (another suggestion from some of you), so that readers can get the full flavor of how this man operates. In many ways, his missive requires no commentary from me, for he has done a fairly respectable job on his own of revealing what he is, how he operates, and what his agenda is. Nevertheless, there is much here that I cannot let pass without comment.

Here then, exactly as it was received, is Ruppert's formal response to my counter-proposal for a public debate. I have added only a bit of subtle emphasis, because I felt certain that Ruppert would want to ensure that one point in particular gets across loud and clear:

Mike Ruppert Letter

Mr. McGowan:

How interesting and how revealing that in posting your onerous rebuttal and pseudo-acceptance of my debate challenge, you sent it out to everyone but me. This is quite revealing as I sent my challenge directly to you personally. I guess you were assuming that either: a), I am an avid reader of your web site, or; b) that I would be unaware of your postings so that you could then misinterpret my non-response as some kind of evasive behavior. The psychology of your move is quite revealing. It shows that you have no faith in your own arguments and that you are interested only in holding a public stage and my time for as long as you possibly can or until your apparently insatiable ego is gratified. You know what my email address is.

In the two-plus years since 9/11 an increasingly sophisticated body of researchers has become aware of tactics intended to stall and distract, rather than educate. Your recent postings seem to indicate that this argument is to be won by the sheer

number of words that can be thrown at the subject as opposed to arguments addressing an issue of the utmost importance to mankind. Not only have I, but a great many others, become wise to such tactics, we have learned to counter them. The debate you have assumptively proposed (as opposed to the one I challenged you with) is one which will allow you to occupy center stage for endless hours while engaging in the most insidious and duplicitous kinds of sophistry which would never be permitted in a courtroom or in a properly moderated debate, governed by rules of critical thinking and analysis.

You have employed dishonesty, straw arguments, and libelous character assassinations instead of addressing the only question that matters to anybody.

That question - is abiotic petroleum and natural gas readily available and making its way into commercial use in sufficient quantities to establish that there is no imminent energy shortage? — is rightly the only question any of us should give a damn about. That is the question for debate.

Instead you are dancing around the issue with falsehoods which are typified (as only one example) by your statement that I and a number of petroleum scientists argue that oil is derived from dinosaurs. Neither I nor any reputable scientist - especially those who are warning of Peak Oil — has ever made such a claim. We all gagged as you put these words in our mouths. Yet it suits your purpose to falsify our statements and then defeat words which we never uttered to prove a point and thus boost your ego. You remind me of Norman Solomon. I don't participate in these kinds of debates. The Arabs have a saying that one should never argue with a fool or a liar because people might not be able to tell the difference.

You have also attacked me and others as being part of some kind of covert operation intended to promote infinite war, yet you ignore several facts:

1. Instead of advocating war I oppose it. Anyone who has attended any of my more than 35 lectures in eight countries (more than 15,000 live audience members) will know, of a certainty, that my position on solutions is absolutely clear. **I advocate** an immediate cessation of all military conquest and imperialism by the US government and industrialized powers; an end to the war on terror. I advocate an immediate convening of political, economic, spiritual and scientific leaders from all nations to address the issue of Peak Oil (and Gas) and its immediate implications for economic collapse, massive famine and climate destruction (partially as a result of reversion to coal plants which accelerate global warming). This would, scientifically speaking, include **immediate steps to arrive at a crash program** - agreed to by all nations and in accordance with the highest spiritual and ethical principles - to stop global population growth and **to arrive at**

the best possible and most ethical program of population reduction as a painful choice made by all of humanity. It would also include arrival at a painful, but absolutely necessary, plan to implement a global program of "contraction and convergence" whereby consumption, rampant economic growth based on globalization, and corrupt economic practices is reversed in favor of a planned and executed program intended to reduce the size of a world economy which is inherently linked to the consumption of hydrocarbon energy. In stating this position I have made it clear that nothing of any real significance will be changed at all until a complete revision is made in the way money works — on a global and local scale — because it is financial activity and monetary policy which will dictate how any contingency plans are implemented and paid for.

You have attacked those who have warned of the dangers of Peak Oil as being employees of oil companies. Yet you ignore the fact that Heinberg, Darley, Deffeyes, Aleklett, Klare and Goodstein - to name only a few - are academics. Yes, Deffeyes once worked for Shell but he got out when he saw what was coming many, many years ago and his long tenure at Princeton and the fact that his income is derived from there speaks volumes. Neither Heinberg, Darley, Klare, Goodstein (Vice Chancellor of the California Institute of Technology), Dale Allen Pfeiffer or I have ever worked for the petroleum industry in any way, shape or form.

You also ignore the fact that peer review is only one of nine critical questions FTW has posed. If one paper has received peer reviews supporting it that does not, in fact, prove that the subject matter is true. It only states that the science is theoretically sound and that it may or may not be accurate when applied. Another peer reviewed paper was published in the late 1890s by Professor Langley who proved mathematically that man could never fly in heavier-than-air craft. That was a fine example of peer reviewed science, wasn't it?

The fact is that the advocates of abiogenic oil and gas keep refusing to appear in public to defend their work. No one has produced verifiable production data (even in the papers you cite) proving the theory. Nothing has been produced anywhere showing that any significant quantities of abiogenic hydrocarbons have ever entered productions streams. Thomas Gold's fabled Eugene Island is today a dry hole. (See below) In fact, the best scientific data available has just confirmed that for more than twenty years, mankind has consumed more oil than has been discovered and that last year - for the first time since the 1920s - there was not a single discovery of a field over 500 million barrels. The supposed increases in Mid-East reserves which occurred in the 1980s were the result of pencils and erasers rather than any actual change in oil in the ground. Those restatements came as the US sought a way to bypass OPEC production quotas (based on reserves) so as to flood the markets with cheap oil and destroy the Soviet economy. What the reserve figures show is that all Mid-East nations revised their reserve estimates

upward except Abu Dhabi which remained constant (because they were already selling all they could produce). Argue this point and then you will have to prove that God and science somehow partially refilled everyone else's tank but that the laws of your science were somehow suspended in the case of poor Abu Dhabi.

As for "Peak Groceries" you again distort because groceries can be located by a mere phone call or internet order. Oil must be found at great cost and developed at even greater cost. Why then is the oil industry laying off its exploration geologists and why are these curricula being phased out of academic instruction?

I am certain that you will find some point in your last diatribe that I did not respond to and state that this is proof that I am defeated. Not true. I never agreed to debate you on your terms. I never said that I was handing you an open microphone and unlimited amounts of my time. You are not worth it. I handed you a challenge which is clearly spelled out below. Either accept it or reject it.

TERMS OF DEBATE

I am more than willing and happy to engage in a face-to-face debate. It should take no longer than 90 minutes in a public forum to settle the question. I do not have time for the months and endless hours you intend to suck out of me and the poor readers to keep us from focusing on important work. I am willing to put my money and my reputation on it. However, in order to avoid your unethical argumentative protocols, distortions, and sophistry I will insist upon several conditions. They include:

1. You and I will both put into escrow the sum of \$1,000 before the debate. Your refusal to do this indicates that you do not believe you can win by ethical means. I want you to put a personal piece of you into this, as I am willing to do, immediately if you agree to the other terms set forth below.
2. The live debate will be judged and moderated by a panel of three. This panel will also determine the winner of the debate according to standard debating procedure and rules and award the prize. They will also enforce penalty points for ad hominem attacks, obfuscation, evasion of the issues and straw-man arguments. This panel of three can be selected from high school or college debate coaches or lawyers in the area. I am also willing to pay half of the expense for their compensation.
3. I am assuming that you live in the Bay Area. I will come to the Bay Area at my own expense for the debate, which will be well publicized and open to the public.
4. The panel of judges mutually agreed to by you and me, can be selected from the

Bay area. There is a large pool from which to choose and this should not be a difficult prospect.

5. The sole question to be debated will be: "Is abiotic petroleum and natural gas readily available and making its way into commercial use in sufficient quantities to establish that there is no imminent energy shortage?"

I have too much respect for my readers' time - apparently more so than you for yours - to believe that they would be interested in reading hundreds of pages of back and forth, especially when you resort to such childish and uncritical tactics. I also refuse to let you invade and occupy my productive hours when this is a question that can be settled in ninety minutes of direct, face-to-face, ethical and well-policed discussion.

I have attached below a response I posted earlier today to another kindred spirit of yours on the subject of abiotic oil. As far as I am concerned this ends my participation with you until such time as you show the integrity to accept the challenge as I have laid it out for you.

Sincerely,
Michael C. Ruppert

Dave McGowan's Response

Mr. Ruppert,

There is quite a bit of ground to cover here, so it is difficult to know where to begin. One thing, however, really seemed to jump out at me, so I suppose we should begin there. Obviously, I was mistaken when I said that you offered little in the way of solutions. I stand corrected. Thank you very much for clarifying that. And thanks for removing any doubt about what your true agenda is. I am sure that many readers will appreciate that.

I believe very strongly that you need to get that message out there more prominently. It appears that some of your readers aren't getting it. I believe that to be the case because one of them just wrote to me with the following comments: "Thank you so much for the 'peak oil' rant. I subscribed to FTW for one year and never could get a line on what he's saying." The reader (thanks, Joan!) explained that she got the 'we're running out of oil' concept, and she understood the 'there are no alternatives' part, but she didn't really understand what comes next. The problem, clearly, is that she did not pick up on the program of "ethical" population reduction.

You really need to pound away at that one. Why do you limit such critical information to just the 15,000 people in eight countries that have attended the lectures that you never tire of mentioning? Why not splash it across your home page in bold print? Or better yet, you might consider renaming your website The Center for the Study of Ethical Population Reduction - or something along those lines.

Before we move on, I have a few quick questions that maybe you can answer for me, when you can find the time: do you have a specific eugenics program in mind at this time, or are you still working out the details? Do you think we should start with all the non-white people? Will getting rid of the non-white people be enough, or will some of 'us' have to go as well? What exactly is your target population level? What do you think the criteria will be? My driver's license says that I have blond hair and blue eyes, but I am still wondering: is there anything more that I can do to increase the chances that I will be a 'keeper'? And one last question: have you considered showing true leadership in these troubled times by becoming the first person to volunteer for euthanasia? If we have to thin the herd here, Mike, I think you are missing a golden opportunity to set an example for your flock.

I think that covers all my questions on that topic (I realize that you are not going to answer any of these questions, but I am going to ask them anyway), so let's move on to other things. One of the most remarkable aspects of your missive is that you have repeatedly accused me of making libelous statements about you, even while you, at the very same time, shamelessly libel me by accusing me of: employing "tactics intended to stall and distract, rather than educate"; "engaging in the most insidious and duplicitous kinds of sophistry"; employing "dishonesty, straw arguments, and libelous character assassinations"; "dancing around the issue with falsehoods"; employing "childish and uncritical tactics"; and utilizing "unethical argumentative protocols, distortions, and sophistry." You have also strongly implied that I am partial to the use of "ad hominem attacks, obfuscation, evasion of the issues and straw-man arguments."

That is a remarkable list of charges to levy against someone, especially considering *that you do not offer a single concrete example to support any of the charges that you have made*. Not one example of "sophistry." Not one example of "dishonesty." Not one example of employing a "straw argument." Not one example of a "libelous character assassination." Not one example of an "unethical argumentative protocol." Not one example of a "distortion." And not one example of an "ad hominem attack," an "obfuscation," a "childish and uncritical tactic," or even an "evasion of the issues."

You did attempt to provide an example of a "falsehood," and that pathetic attempt of yours is quite revealing. Your one shining example of my use of falsehoods is

my supposed "statement that [you] and a number of petroleum scientists argue that oil is derived from dinosaurs." There is only one problem with your example, but it is kind of a big problem: I *never said that*. And since you obviously read my posting, then you know full well that I never said that. In other words, your one example of a supposed "falsehood" on my part is, in reality, an outright lie on your part — because we both know that what I really said was that I *was raised to believe that oil came from dinosaurs*. For the record, let's take a look at the actual excerpt:

As anyone who stayed awake during elementary school science class knows, oil comes from dinosaurs. I remember as a kid (calm down, folks; there will be no *Brady Bunch* references this week) seeing some kind of 'public service' spot explaining how dinosaurs "gave their all" so that we could one day have oil.

It is quite clear that I never said - in any way, shape or form - that you, Michael Ruppert, or any "petroleum scientists," claim that oil comes from dinosaurs. To the contrary, the origin of oil seems to be a subject that you prefer not to talk about at all.

Early on in your missive, you comment on the "psychology of [my] move." I found it rather odd that you would purport to be able to analyze my moves when you don't actually have, as far as I am aware, any training in that area. I found it odder still that you would do so when condescendingly addressing someone who actually does have a degree in psychology. Why don't we then take a fun look at the psychology of *one of your moves*? When you told the lie about what I supposedly said, you actually embellished that lie with a completely fictitious story about an alleged physical reaction that you supposedly had to something that never even happened. That is not simply a lie; it is a sign of a pathological condition. For that reason, I am not expecting an apology anytime soon for what was clearly a lie on your part - and a lie that was intended, ironically enough, to paint me as a liar.

As for your overall attempt to paint me as a disreputable charlatan; here is the situation as I see it: you pored over a 10,000-word essay that I composed; desperately seeking any example of a lie, distortion or misrepresentation, but you came up empty handed. That much we can safely infer from the fact that you resorted to making something up (as did your inept attack dog, Larry Chin). And then, armed with nothing but a lie, you proceeded to falsely accuse me of committing a number of egregious sins - and all the while, you actually had the gall to claim that it is *your* character that is being assassinated. You have also used your false and completely unsupported allegations to cast me as a lying egomaniac unworthy of the time required for a real public debate, thus enabling you to slip

away even while claiming to take the high road. That would be a very clever maneuver - except that you haven't even come close to pulling it off.

Let's turn now to some other accusations that you have leveled at me. You claim that I have attempted to "invade and occupy [your] productive hours." You have also accused me of showing a lack of integrity by not accepting your "challenge" as you have "laid it out," as though I am under some kind of obligation to debate you only under the strictly defined conditions that you have unilaterally imposed. At the same time, you dismiss my counter proposal as some kind of ego-driven publicity stunt, referring to it dismissively as "the debate that [I] assumptively proposed."

I think it would probably be instructive here to briefly review the chronology of recent events. As you know, I have a small, non-commercial website - otherwise known as a vanity website - just like millions of other people across the country, and around the world. On that site, I post my thoughts and opinions on a wide range of topics. I also send out mailings to a small, private mailing list composed of people who have expressed an interest in receiving my writings. That is the extent of my Internet activities (and what your acolyte has disturbingly described as "misusing the Internet"). I do not post to, nor participate in, any news or discussion groups. I post only to my own private website. Despite the accusations of both you and Chen, I have never conspired with anyone, in any way, to smear your character. As I said before, I am not affiliated in any way with any groups or movements, and certainly not with any other individuals or groups who have served as critics of yours (your apparent attempt to connect me with the Solomon/Corn crowd, I must say, is particularly pathetic, given my frequently voiced, and well documented, opinion of that bunch).

As you recall, this all began when you took offense at an opinion that I had expressed on my own website. At that time, *you invaded my space*, issuing a belligerent and uninvited challenge. Prior to that, I had little interest in you or your website. I had never, by any stretch of the imagination, come close to invading your "productive time." I had never so much as sent you a single e-mail. I rarely even visit your site. So it seems that it was not I who invaded your space, but rather you who invaded my space. And you did so by issuing a boorish challenge that you feel I was somehow instantly obligated to either accept, or reject and quietly slink away. Instead, I did what I always do, which was to air my argument in the only public venue available: my website. And at that time, as we both know, your people became completely unhinged.

I did not bring this fight to you as some attempt to bask in your reflected glory (and I'm the one looking to "boost [my] ego"?); I did not bring this fight to you at all. You bullied your way into my space, attempting to force me into playing the

game by your rules, as though you have some kind of divine right to do so (and I'm the one with the "insatiable ego"?). There is a very clear pattern of intimidation here.

One of the most telling aspects of your response is that it is actually a cut-and-paste form letter. I know that because, for reasons known only to you, you chose to attach a response that you sent to someone else who challenged your theories, and that response was a different version of the same form letter. There are other indications as well, such as the redundant passages, and the numbered paragraphs that never get past the number 1. The fact that it is a form letter is very significant, for a number of reasons.

Based on my experiences of the last couple of weeks, I have concluded that this is how your machine operates: whenever anyone is presumptuous enough to question your almighty wisdom, you immediately swoop in and try to intimidate them into backing off by issuing a demand (you can't really call it a request) for a formal debate. If they take you up on it, then they get the form letter imposing the restrictions and strictly limiting the scope of the debate to a false argument. When they, quite naturally, refuse your 'offer,' you then cast them as cowards and charlatans for 'ducking' the debate.

What this means, of course, is that *anyone* who you feel threatened by, and who you send the form letter to, is routinely accused of being a lying, disreputable glory-seeker whose behavior must be policed - regardless of their personal standing or the validity of their challenge. My guess is that the "example" is a fill-in-the-blank kind of thing, and in my case, you didn't have anything legitimate to fill in the blank. Nevertheless, you left all the unsupported accusations in the form letter and simply filled in the blank with a figment of your imagination.

You have accused me of attacking you "as being part of some kind of covert operation intended to promote infinite war." Your associate has implied that I have attacked you as being a shill for the Bush administration. I have never said, explicitly, that you are any such thing. But I will say that there is no question but that your tactics closely mirror those of the Bush administration (or pretty much any other U.S. presidential administration).

First and foremost is what we might call the "pot-calling-the-kettle-black syndrome." You engage in reprehensible character assassinations, even while claiming to be a victim yourself. You accuse your critics of employing tactics to stifle you, even as you employ those very tactics to stifle them. You accuse your critics of libel, even as you viciously libel them. You accuse your opponents of dodging a real debate, even as it is you who are dodging the real debate. You accuse your critics of being unable to stick to the issues and construct an ethical

argument, even as you dodge the real issues through the use of unethical arguments. Then there is your habit of unilaterally issuing uninvited, bullying, unreasonable, take-it-or-leave-it ultimatums, and then claiming that it is the other party's fault when the 'offer' is refused. I am thinking of Rambouillet here, but there are also numerous other examples that could be cited. So while I obviously cannot definitively say if there is someone pulling your strings, I can say that Karl Rove himself couldn't run a more well-oiled machine.

Let us turn now to the inherent fraudulence of your debate "challenge." The biggest problem, and the most telling aspect of the 'offer,' is with the framing of the question. You have chosen (and this isn't the original topic of debate, by the way, but one that you came up with after you read my critique): "Is abiotic petroleum and natural gas readily available and making its way into commercial use in sufficient quantities to establish that there is no imminent energy shortage?"

The interesting thing about that question is that it presupposes that your side of the argument has already been proven, even though we both know that that isn't true. It is interesting to note here that whenever people such as you and Mr. Chin mention abiotic petroleum, you are usually quick to claim that it is a "disputed" theory. However, you never attach such qualifiers to mentions of 'fossil fuels.' Don't you find that odd, considering that it is actually the reverse that is true?

You have admitted that petroleum can be produced abiotically (in your response to my "kindred spirit"). In fact, no one with any credibility can deny that fact. It has been demonstrated in the laboratory and verified with unchallenged mathematical models. It is a fact. The 'fossil fuel' theory, on the other hand, cannot be verified and is disputed by, at the very least, a large community of Soviet and Ukrainian scientists. Since abiotic petroleum is not disputed and is verifiable, the logical presumption, until proven otherwise, is that *all* the natural gas and petroleum in commercial use, and in the ground, and in storage tanks, and anywhere else, is abiotic oil and gas.

Your chosen question then is an entirely fraudulent one, selected so as to protect you from having to establish the basic foundation of your argument. Just as with Mr. Chin, you want to skip right over that and start building your 'Peak Oil' theory. It doesn't work that way, and all of *your* sophistry cannot change that fact.

A few other aspects of the debate 'challenge' seem problematic as well. You claim that you assume that I live in the Bay Area, when you know very well that I live in the Los Angeles area, just like you. You may pretend otherwise, but you have met me. We were introduced after an event in Santa Monica in 2002. You tried to engage me in conversation, but I wasn't interested and wandered off (or is that perhaps something that I have conjured up in my imagination to feed my ego?).

Why then the Bay Area? Perhaps the answer lies in condition number 4, and the "large pool" of judges that you seem to be familiar with. I don't happen to know anyone in the Bay Area, except for my cousin, and I doubt that he is part of that pool of judges. Your obsession with a purse is another problem, and an obvious attempt to discourage acceptance of your proposal (and judging by your response to my "kindred spirit," you don't pay up when you lose anyway). All I am going to say about this issue is that, unlike you, I am not in this for the money. How much have you made, by the way, off the September 11 attacks? I know you claim to have doubled your subscribers, to 10,000. That's 5,000 new subscribers at \$35.00 per year (more for the hard copy), or a minimum of \$175,000 per year. Then there are the speaking fees and the reimbursed travel and living expenses. Then there are, of course, all the 9-11 related books and videos that you hawk. Then there are the donations that you solicit. So how much is it, in total, over the last two-and-a-half years? Around a half mil? More? Why don't we do this: each of us will contribute to the purse all the money that we have made off the 9-11 attacks. You will put up your proceeds, and I will put up mine. Does that sound fair?

Before wrapping this up, I need to address several more brazen misrepresentations and specious allegations that you have made. You have claimed that I have attempted to win this argument "by the sheer number of words that can be thrown at the subject." The truth though is that I have written exactly one article that challenges what you are selling. You, on the other hand, have littered the Internet with dozens of hysterical, and sometimes quite lengthy, missives on the subject. Again I would have to say that the 'pot-calling-the-kettle-black syndrome' clearly applies here.

You have claimed that I must be "assuming" that you are a reader of this site (my ego again, I presume). But we both know that you are a reader of this site. Why else would you have responded with warp speed not only to my abiogenic oil posting, but to the posting that first caused your testes to draw up tighter than a newborn baby's? And I noticed, in reading through some of your material, that you have written things that appear to be direct responses to things that I have written (oops, there goes my ego again!). I will be commenting on that, and providing a clear example, in a future newsletter. As for your claim that I was hoping that you would somehow be unaware of my posting, we both know that that is absurd.

You claim that I have "attacked those who have warned of the dangers of Peak Oil as being employees of oil companies," but I said no such thing. I did identify the various geochemists quoted in news reports that I cited as "shills for the petroleum industry," but they were, in fact, identified in those reports as employees of various oil companies. It was nice of you though to volunteer the information that one of your experts once worked for Shell. And I would tend to agree that

Deffeyes "long tenure at Princeton and the fact that his income is derived from there speaks volumes."

You are now claiming that, "If one paper has received peer reviews supporting it that does not, in fact, prove that the subject matter is true." But when you previously wrote that "peer-reviewed articles ensure the validity of science," you gave no hint that that statement was conditional. For the sake of accuracy, should you not go back and change the posting to read "peer-reviewed articles ensure the validity of science, unless the conclusions reached contradict the theories that I am selling"?

You also claim that I "ignore the fact that peer review is only one of nine critical questions FTW has posed," but it is you who ignores the fact that your theory is inconsistent with the laws of thermodynamics, which you identify as the most critical of the nine questions (the one that "Most of the other questions in this list can be tied up into").

You claim that "advocates of abiogenic oil and gas keep refusing to appear in public to defend their work" (not unlike the way that you claim that your critics refuse to appear in public to debate you). But Dr. Kenney and some of his Soviet colleagues have said that that is an egregious lie, and I am more prone to believe them than you. They have also complained about news reports claiming that they were "unavailable for comment," when no one had made the slightest attempt to contact them.

You have written: "As for 'Peak Groceries,' you again distort because groceries can be located by a mere phone call or internet order." To say that this is a bizarre rebuttal would be quite an understatement. It has nothing to do with my argument, which concerned the consolidation of various industries. And for the record, I can buy a can of oil with a phone call or an internet order as well. So what? Is this one of those "straw arguments" you were so concerned about?

Finally, you have written that you are "certain" that I will find "something" in my argument that you "did not respond to and state that this is proof" that you are defeated. "Not true. I never agreed to debate you on your terms." As you are well aware (and as anyone reading this will be well aware), you responded to almost nothing in my "diatribe." Instead, you sent me a bullying, childish form letter filled with entirely unfounded allegations and pompous self-importance. And for the record, it is I who never agreed to, and was never obligated to, 'debate' you on your terms.

You have declared that you are through with me. And that is fine. No one ever invited you to this party to begin with. And you obviously have nothing of substance to contribute anyway.

With the above article in mind, I'd like to provide another one that seriously questions Mike Ruppert's judgment in regard to his journalistic endeavors. I'm broaching this subject because Ruppert, during his speech at the Commonwealth Club in August, 2004, stated unequivocally, "I'm a journalist by training." My dilemma at this stage of the game is: I've checked Ruppert's bio, and nowhere do I see a journalist degree from any university, a full-time job at any newspaper or television station, or even training in journalism classes. Now, I would be the first person to admit that one doesn't need a degree to be a competent journalist; but what if Ruppert came out and posited that he was a brain surgeon, even though he didn't possess a medical degree or any training. This point is quite important, for HE is the one that habitually demands that certain standards be kept, but this standard only seems to apply to others - not him.

Such a proposition becomes even more relevant in regard to Ruppert's coverage of a man named Delmart "Mike" Vreeland. As Ron Anicich shows so adeptly in the following article, if Ruppert's judgment and perceptions were so off-kilter in this matter, what other areas is he also lacking in, or wrong about? While reading through this lengthy dissertation, you'll once again see Ruppert's paranoia emerge, along with completely unsubstantiated claims, leaps of logic, shoddy journalism, plus a letter which appeared on a Yahoo forum (June 1, 2002) that is so bizarre that it entirely cracks the Ruppert veneer. In addition, Anicich provides further examples of Ruppert's abusive tirades when backed into a corner. In all, this is quite a pathetic display by a man who proclaims to be such a shining example of professionalism for others to follow.

I Delmart Vreeland: What Mike Ruppert Doesn't Want You To Know **A Detailed Analysis of Ruppert's Reporting of the Vreeland Story** **By Ron Anicich**

In an interview on KPFK in late-August, Michael C Ruppert describes the criticism he has received as a result of his reporting of the claims of Delmart Vreeland, who Ruppert says is an American spy who had advance knowledge of what would happen on September 11/2001, in the following manner.

"Mike Vreeland has been less than 10% of my coverage and 95% of all the criticism around the world that's been leveled at me, and none of that criticism has really dealt with what I was saying."

It is strange that Ruppert, in recent interviews and appearances, continually attempts to minimize the reporting he has done on this story. The "less than 10%" argument is regularly augmented by comments like, "Vreeland is only five minutes of my 2 hour lecture." Ruppert, however, still maintains that Vreeland had advance knowledge of what would happen on September 11/2001 despite having presented little evidence of this.

At any rate, his statement is quite incorrect. The best criticism of the Vreeland story was presented in an *LA Weekly* article by David Corn which was published this past June. In the article Corn effectively debunked the Vreeland myth as created by Ruppert. Mr. Corn's work was very reassuring for Greg Duffell and I. We had been conducting our own look at the Vreeland story, which we began to air on CKLN FM Toronto this past May, and had come to many of the same conclusions as Corn.

Seeing how Mr. Ruppert has the belief, however erroneously, that no one has yet criticized what he has written about Vreeland, I decided that I would oblige him by doing exactly that. What follows is a thorough analysis of various articles and letters by Mr. Ruppert on the subject of Delmart Vreeland.

A White Knight Talking Backwards

In his January 25/2002 article at FTW, Ruppert states that, "The US wants Vreeland back in the States on a Michigan warrant for credit card fraud - using his own credit card." The credit card which was used in the Michigan fraud case had the name Edward Delmar on it, not Delmart Vreeland, according to both Judy Horigan, the salesperson involved in the transaction, and Lt. Keith Frye of the Troy, Michigan Police Department, the police officer who headed the investigation into the fraud and evidence submitted into evidence at Vreeland's extradition. According to Frye, the company which issued the card, American Express, says that the application for the card was also found to be fraudulent, obtained using false identification and drawing on the credit history of another person.

In the same article Ruppert tell us that, "He has never had anything to do with intelligence according to 1200 pages of Navy records filed in Toronto Superior Court." The 1200 pages he refers to were never submitted to any court. In fact Vreeland himself has claimed in an interview on CKLN Radio on April 14/2002 that he has only 56 pages of his records from the Navy in his possession.

According to Canadian judges in the five hearings that have taken place on the matter of USA v. Vreeland thus far, Vreeland has presented no evidence other than his own word to confirm his involvement with the Navy or ONI. Also from the same Ruppert article: "the Crown Solicitor argued that Vreeland, who has been in jail and without access to a computer for thirteen months, had somehow cracked the Pentagon's personnel records and inserted his name, an office number, and telephone extension into the Pentagon database."

Not somehow. Evidence was presented in court which showed exactly how Vreeland accomplished this task. The judge in the hearing which Ruppert refers to found that the evidence presented by the prosecutors was far more convincing than any explanation offered by Vreeland. Evidence was presented by federal prosecutor Kevin Wilson that Mr. Vreeland sent, or caused to be sent, an email and a telephone call which had the effect of Vreeland being added to the Pentagon directory. In any case, in a CKLN interview with Ruppert on May 19/2002 he had changed his story to say that Vreeland had, in fact, had access to a computer at the time he was in jail. No written correction was forthcoming.

Once again, in the very same article, Ruppert asserts, "He faces a special danger in the US because he has also been an informant against an organized crime family in Michigan where the criminal charges originate."

Ruppert fails to mention that the people who Vreeland testified against had the charges against them dropped because of his testimony. It is more likely that Vreeland was paid by the accused than the incredible twist of logic that they would want to harm him for doing them this tremendous favour. In a *Detroit Free Press* article the judge who heard the case called Vreeland, "the least credible witness I have ever seen." These sentiments have since been echoed in the decisions of Canadian judges in his current case. What is their motive for killing him exactly?

Additionally, the Detroit "organized crime family" boss Jack Tocco which Ruppert refers to is not directly related to the Steven Tocco that Delmart Vreeland testified against in 1998 according to Eric Kaiser, the Michigan prosecutor who tried the arson case in question. Steve Tocco has been identified by both Vreeland and his half-brother Terry Weems as a childhood friend of the family. Bobby Moore, the owner of the St. Clair Shores restaurant where the arson took place, in addition to having all charges in the arson dropped, is also no stranger to Delmart Vreeland. Moore, who remains a successful restaurateur with no organized crime convictions, is married to Vreeland's sister.

Ruppert Defends His Work

In a March 3 letter from Ruppert published at *AlterNet*, Ruppert says, "No, the *Toronto Star* did not confirm Vreeland's story. The Canadian court system did."

The truth is that by the time this letter was composed five separate decisions were handed down by Canadian judges which, rather than confirming Vreeland's story, thoroughly discredited it. Ruppert's reporter must have missed that.

In the same letter Ruppert states that Vreeland, "wrote a warning of the 9-11 attacks a month before they happened."

Vreeland, his former lawyer, Paul Slansky, and others have repeatedly stated that this note was "not a warning note." Hard to believe that they didn't share that information with Ruppert. Indeed, upon inspection of the document it is difficult to see how anyone could characterize the note as a warning of anything.

Vreeland Attacked In Canadian Jail

A March 3/2002 article for FTW by Greta Knutzen, the reporter hired by Ruppert to sit in on the court proceedings, states that, "Vreeland has been subject to physical attacks while behind bars."

No evidence was ever offered in court to prove this aside from Vreeland's own testimony. The same article states that, "Upon his arrest, Vreeland was placed in solitary confinement. The reason for this treatment was the difficulty Toronto police had in confirming his identity..... he was removed from solitary confinement on Jan. 15, 2001."

Vreeland had been identified by Dec 8/2000. This would seem to contradict the assertion that he was in solitary confinement until Jan 15/2001 for the reason stated here. In Troy, Michigan Lt. Keith Frye was informed of the capture of Delmart Vreeland by Canadian authorities on Dec 8/2000. He must have been identified by this date despite the fact that he had provided the Toronto Police Fugitive Squad with two different aliases.

From the same article: "After he was removed from solitary confinement on Jan. 15, 2001, he learned that six days after his arrest, on Dec. 12, 2000, Bastien was found dead."

Vreeland has stated in a subsequent interview on CKLN and in an interview at FTW that he was not made aware of Bastien's death until August 2001 when he met with the RCMP. The article, while not incorrect, is extremely misleading.

Contrary to the assertions made in the CKLN and FTW interviews, information found in a sworn affidavit submitted by Vreeland to a Canadian court in October 2001 clearly states that he learned of Bastien's death from a December 14/2000 *Moscow Times* article in June 2001. The *Moscow Times* article was submitted by Vreeland as an exhibit in support of his affidavit. This is one of many examples of Vreeland contradicting his own story.

Vreeland in Safe House, All Canadian Charges Dropped, Temporary Refugee Status Granted

In a March 15/2002 article at FTW Ruppert starts right off by claiming that Delmart Vreeland is a "US Navy officer who wrote a written warning of the 9-11 attacks, a month before they occurred."

If Ruppert is referring to the exhibit N document that resides on the FTW website then we have already addressed this point. If however he refers to the alleged accompanying 37 page memo addressed to Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Vern Clark that Vreeland also claims to have written while in jail, then I would remind Mr Ruppert that no one has been brought forward who has even seen it.

Ruppert continues to tell the tale. "At the time the bail release order was issued, (Vreeland's) address was made part of the public record and announced in open court, raising immediate fears that Vreeland... would become easy prey for would-be assassins."

Since his release, however, Vreeland has made no secret of his precise whereabouts. He often meets with supporters and has even had at least one virtual stranger, Cameron Sexton, an Ohio native who had posted supportive messages at Vreeland's website, at his home for an overnight visit. Mr Sexton described his somewhat surreal visit with Vreeland in an interview on CKLN. The suggestion that Vreeland needs protection from "would-be assassins" would seem to be contradicted by Vreeland's willingness to part with knowledge of his whereabouts.

Vreeland has also seen fit to describe his whereabouts to journalists. According to an article by Andrew Wilt, "Vreeland is now, quite ironically, living in the World Trade Center in Toronto." These are simply not the actions of a man who is trying to avoid an attempt on his life. Mr. Wilt recently informed me that Vreeland had personally approved the article before it was published.

Ruppert flatly states that Vreeland "served as an informant on organized crime investigations in the US, allegedly while working as a Naval intelligence officer."

Allegedly is not an adequate disclaimer here. When Vreeland served as an

informant in Macomb County, Michigan against Bobby Moore, Steve Tocco, and others he was in jail on other charges, according to Eric Kaiser, who is the prosecutor who brokered the deal for Vreeland's testimony. Another detail of the event which was recalled by both Kaiser and Vreeland's half-brother, Terry Weems, was that Vreeland claimed that he had tried to warn the authorities in advance that the arson was going to happen. The "proof in this case was the date which Vreeland had written on his warning letter. However, the envelope he used to mail the warning was post-marked many days after the alleged arson took place.

Vreeland also offered to testify against Nestor Fonseca in Canada, who Vreeland said was involved in organized crime with Bobby Moore. Vreeland's testimony was quite sensibly not proceeded upon by law enforcement. Moore claims that he does not know Mr. Fonseca and no evidence is offered to suggest that he does.

Ruppert offers no evidence at all to support claims of Vreeland's involvement with organized crime or ONI at any time.

Later in the same article Ruppert states, "Canadian courts have continually refused to allow Vreeland or his attorneys to present mounting evidence validating his assertions — in many cases corroborated by official records..."

Ruppert should know of Vreeland's affidavit and the numerous exhibits which are attached to it. Some of these documents are available online, including exhibit N, the "warning note" that is available at FTW. These documents, of course, show that Vreeland was given the opportunity to present his case in court and in great detail. At least three Canadian judges have dismissed his story as the result of a vivid imagination, partly because of the fact that he was unable to provide any evidence as proof of his claims, other than his own testimony. According to Ruppert, "Vreeland's claims that a Canadian diplomat, Marc Bastien, was murdered in Moscow, originally denied by Canadian officials, have since proven true as a result of autopsy findings."

This statement is extremely misleading for several reasons, and plain incorrect on at least one point. During an interview on CKLN (April 14/2002), Vreeland stated very clearly that he didn't make the allegation that Bastien had been murdered until he met with the RCMP on August 8/2001. Corporal Kispol of the RCMP confirmed that the meeting took place on this date. The results of Bastien's autopsy, however, were delivered to family members on Dec 19/2000, over seven months before Vreeland made his claim, according to an *Ottawa Sun* article by Kathleen Harris. Also it is important to note that at no time has any Canadian official ever gone on the record as stating that Bastien was not murdered. The "natural causes" reason for Bastien's death was only ever offered publicly by

Moscow police, according to articles in the *Moscow Times* published in the days following the incident.

Additionally, no evidence was ever presented to prove that Vreeland had ever been to Moscow. No evidence was presented that he had ever even met Bastien.

What The CIA Doesn't Want You To Know

On April 4/2002 Mike Ruppert published a 35 question interview with Vreeland at FTW. In the preamble Ruppert claims of his Vreeland reporting, "It is a case that has sparked zealous attacks on FTW and me personally... These attacks are an indication of the threat Vreeland poses to the credibility of the U.S. government."

This is a stunning leap of logic that borders on delusion. Ruppert characterizes criticism of his work as an attack. This, of course, is absurd on its face. As I have demonstrated, criticism of Ruppert's coverage of the Vreeland story was inevitable as it was apparent that Ruppert has made many errors in his reporting and had made little if any attempt to establish the actual facts through an investigation. He follows that with the conclusion that this criticism is indicative of a perceived threat to the US government without establishing that this criticism has been directed at Ruppert, or has any connection to the government whatsoever. Mr. Ruppert's reasoning here is extremely flawed.

Ruppert continues, "Mike Vreeland has a very confusing criminal arrest record ~ some of it very contradictory and apparently fabricated — for a variety of petty criminal offenses including fraud."

Ruppert fails to point to any part of Vreeland's criminal record that is either contradictory or fabricated. Additionally, stealing a yacht in Florida, a crime for which Vreeland was convicted, stealing a Porsche, as described in police reports from Mishawaka, Indiana, and alleged purchases which Vreeland made worth tens of thousands of dollars on a bogus credit card (the Troy, Michigan charges he is being extradited to face) can hardly be described as petty. According to records from the Michigan Department of Corrections, Vreeland has spent almost his entire adult life under supervision. Once again, not at all petty.

Then Ruppert asks a question that can only be characterized as bizarre. "If a crazy man runs up to you on the street and says that a house is on fire with children trapped inside, and you smell smoke, who is the crazy one if you decide not to investigate?"

In light of what we have learned about Vreeland so far, a more appropriate question would be: If a crazy man runs up to you on the street and says that a

house is on fire with children trapped inside and it is clear that there is no fire, who is the crazy one if you decide to investigate?

According to Ruppert, "A growing pile of evidence, much of it filed in court records and undisputed by Canadian or U.S. authorities, establishes clearly that Vreeland was exactly what he says he was — a spy."

In reality, there was absolutely no evidence presented in court to establish Vreeland's employment by ONI or any other "spy" agency. The only thing that was clearly established in court was that Vreeland's story bore no resemblance to reality, according to the Canadian judges who had been hearing the case. Unlike Ruppert, they are actually aware of what evidence was presented to the court.

Ruppert's knowledge of his own work is also highly questionable. "We have described how, in open court on a speakerphone, his lawyers obtained direct confirmation from the Pentagon that he was a Navy officer. We have also reported that, as of March 14, all Canadian charges against Vreeland were dismissed."

The Pentagon phone call, which does not meet any standard of evidence, was successfully disputed by federal prosecutor Kevin Wilson. Wilson presented an email, sent either by Vreeland or on his behalf, which explained how the Pentagon directory scam was accomplished. One wonders what Ruppert was hoping to accomplish by continually refusing to acknowledge the decisions of judges and evidence presented by the prosecution in this case. Likewise, Ruppert reports on the dropping of the Canadian charges without offering an explanation for this, in order to falsely suggest that there is something to Vreeland's ridiculous stories. According to the officer seeking Vreeland's extradition, Toronto police, and Mr. Wilson, the Canadian charges were dropped to expedite the extradition.

In the same article we are given a glimpse into Ruppert's motives. "I avoid some of the questions being raised by dilettantes and neophyte journalists who take all of the threads of Vreeland's stories and run with them into a wilderness from which no professional journalist could credibly emerge."

Despite Ruppert's assertion, repeatedly ignoring all evidence which contradicts your personal position is not the hallmark of a professional journalist. A professional journalist would make himself aware of the facts of a case before publishing stories that are filled with misleading conjecture, half-truths and downright lies. His continual use of Vreeland and his former lawyers as the sole source for his articles show his contempt for journalism. His attempts to portray himself as a journalist are far from convincing given his practices. One question comes to mind: where did Ruppert study journalism?

Ruppert continues, "To the U.S. government, Vreeland is totally expendable. And those who run with every piece of information he has disclosed will themselves be proven fools in a fool's game."

Once again Ruppert diverges from reality. To the US government, Vreeland is a career criminal who needs to come home to face fraud charges in Troy, Michigan. This information is clearly spelled out in Vreeland's extradition request. Those who run with every piece of information that Vreeland has provided have unanimously come to the conclusion that Vreeland is a con man and liar. It is the "journalist" who prints Vreeland's unsubstantiated allegations who is being proven a fool in a fool's game. Once again, one must wonder what Ruppert's motives might be in discouraging people from investigating the various elements of Vreeland's story.

Ruppert suggests, "And if he knew something, based upon documents given to him by Russian officials indicating U.S. knowledge, and if the U.S. government went to great lengths to discredit him, rather than bring him in from the cold — then there is real meat on the plate for journalists, the American government, and all of mankind."

This is a very big "if considering the information we now have at our disposal. The documents which Vreeland allegedly brought back from Russia have not yet been produced despite the fact that Vreeland repeatedly stated he would be releasing them to the media. Surely, if these documents actually existed they would be an effective tool to silence Ruppert and Vreeland's many critics. To date; no convincing proof of the existence of these documents has been offered, nevermind the documents themselves. Also, the "meat" which Ruppert refers to has been largely and understandably ignored by the media. It is also strange that since making this statement Ruppert has minimized the importance of his Vreeland reporting at every opportunity. Ruppert needs to decide if the Vreeland story is "meat on the plate... for all mankind" or a small, insignificant part of his 9/11 reporting, as he now claims frequently in interviews.

Ruppert introduces the 35 questions and answers with the following statement. "Now you can read Mike Vreeland's answers as he speaks for himself."

Recently I was provided with a copy of the letter which was sent to Vreeland by Ruppert which contained the questions asked in this interview. Before the actual questions Ruppert gives Vreeland some curious advice. "It is extremely important that you keep your answers short. It is also extremely important that you do not overcomplicate or add any confusing issues. We've talked about that. OK to add additional data where it helps clarify you (sic) point. But before we talk you have

to think through your answers to be short and on-point. That will serve you better in the long run."

Surprisingly, Ruppert actually confirmed that he wrote this. He also claimed that these instructions did not violate any journalistic standards. Once again, where did he study journalism? In any case, these instructions suggest that the assertion Ruppert makes in his article - that Vreeland was "speaking for himself" - is somewhat less than accurate. Most journalists do not see a need to tell their interview subjects how to answer questions. This practice is deceitful. The question of what will "serve Vreeland better in the long run" is a concern best left to Vreeland's lawyers, not a self-proclaimed professional journalist who is trying to discover the truth. What are Ruppert's motives here?

The answers which Vreeland offers to Ruppert's questions are incredible. So far we have examined several of Vreeland's claims as reported by Ruppert, but there remain a few issues in this interview that would seem to require a little investigation.

Ruppert: 1. What part of the U.S. government did you work for? Was it the CIA?

Vreeland: "I worked for U.S. Naval intelligence. What the CIA directs us to do is their business, so we have no way of knowing whether we're working for them or not."

This must be some of that "professional journalism" Ruppert likes to speak of. After claiming in three articles that Vreeland worked for ONI, Ruppert finally gets around too asking him who he works for. Strange.

Ruppert: 3. Why were you in Moscow and Russia in the latter part of 2000?

Vreeland: "I was sent there by the U.S. government and the ONI [Office of Naval Intelligence]. I got my orders between Sept. 4 and Sept. 7, 2000.

"Marc Bastien departed for Russia on Sept. 7, 2000. I had orders to meet him. Bastien was going to work at the Canadian embassy regarding diagrams and blueprints of a weapons defense system. The U.S. government had a direct influence on his mission. The name of the defense system is SSST [Stealth Satellite System Terminator]..."

Regarding Bastien, it is important to reiterate that not a single person has been brought forward to confirm that Vreeland had ever even been in the same room as Bastien, nevermind the possibility that they might have worked together. The SSST reference is also curious. The US military does in fact have technology that

is known by this acronym. It is called a supersonic sea-skimming target, which is used to test the accuracy of cruise missiles. After an exhaustive search we can find absolutely no reference to Vreeland's SSST save for this one article on FTW and another which also used Vreeland as a source. It is absolutely indicative of Ruppert's incompetence that he would not have attempted to confirm this detail of Vreeland's story. Sadly, this is typical of Ruppert's reporting.

Ruppert: 8. Who put the information on the attacks into the pouch, and what would have been their motive for doing so?

Vreeland: "I am not allowed to answer that. It would jeopardize the lives of active agents, and it would violate the National Security Act of 1947."

Vreeland has stated clearly on several occasions that he had already violated the act mentioned above. That means that this part of his answer does not hold water. Also, it should be pointed out that pointing the finger at even more people who had alleged advance knowledge of what would happen on September 11th creates an even larger conspiracy, thus making his story even less credible.

Ruppert: 17. The most common excuse people use to discredit you is that you have prior arrests on fraud charges, and there are several press stories linking you to alleged criminal activity. How do you explain this?

Vreeland: "The American Express charges are b.s., and Amex has stated on tape that the specific charges in question were approved. They admit that there was no fraud on this card. That card had been issued to Lt. Delmart Michael Vreeland. The Amex people admitted that the card was a U.S. Navy card.

"The press stories that have circulated about my past are lies. Portions of the stories alleging fraud and ID theft are lies. I have threatened to sue these papers, and the stories have been pulled."

What becomes extremely clear once again in this portion of the interview is that Ruppert had done little, if anything, to confirm what Vreeland had told him. It would have taken Ruppert about a day (the amount of time it took us) to discover that the Michigan fraud charges were not on a card that had been issued to Lt. Delmart Michael Vreeland, but to Edward Delmar, one of Vreeland's many aliases. According to Lt. Frye, Amex says that the application for the card was found to be fraudulent and that several fraudulent transactions were made using the card. Additionally, none of the press stories which Vreeland refers to here have been retracted or corrected. This is also very easy to check. Ruppert seems happy to provide Vreeland a forum to tell many lies. It is no wonder that Vreeland speaks so highly of Ruppert.

As if Ruppert's work at FTW weren't enough, Ruppert's next Vreeland news left absolutely no doubt as to his incompetence. On a public forum at Yahoo on June 1/2002, Ruppert delivered the following report:

"I am writing this from a hotel room in Sacramento. There is little I can do from here except report what I know. I am presently without the ability to report in further detail. Both Mike Vreeland and his lawyer Rocco Galati have been poisoned. Both are apparently out of the woods, but for Vreeland it was a very close call.

Here's what I know. Approximately four days ago, shortly after releasing the first batch of FIN (financial transaction documents involving the FED) Vreeland received two bottles of wine from Allan (sic) Greenspan. Vreeland stated that he had spoken to Greenspan on the phone and knew that the wine was coming.

I was on the phone with Vreeland yesterday right after he had had about two glasses of the wine. Upon answering the phone Vreeland immediately stated that he had been vomiting blood. He looked in the mirror while he was on the phone with me and said that the whites of his eyes were turning blue and was feeling violently ill. I could hear sounds of the toilet flushing and water running. Vreeland was obviously ill.

He became disoriented, but as soon as he saw his eyes he said, "Shit, it's the same stuff they gave Marc [Bastien] - clozapine." In a frenzy he went to a stash or (sic) previously prepared syringes and took five successive injections of medications. I have a list of what he took but am not disclosing it now. I listened as the caps came off the syringes, hit the floor, and as he injected.

I stayed on the phone with him for about 45 minutes until a friend of his got in the apartment. Vreeland was fighting sleep. He didn't sound like he was faking at all. Today I learned from Vreeland that his attorney - Rocco Galati - had been poisoned while eating in a Toronto restaurant and had begun bleeding from his nose (and possibly ears) after becoming violently ill. There were apparently multiple witnesses to this incident. The Galati poisoning occurred on the same day that Vreeland received the wine. Galati is now out of the hospital, but extremely weak.

Galati apparently made the moves for an emergency hearing yesterday while Vreeland was opening the wine, but it may be the case that he made an emergency contact to the court today. I just don't know.

Galati has moved for an emergency court hearing and, due to other security issues, Vreeland is being (and probably already has been) relocated to another more secure location.

I have assigned my Toronto correspondent to meet with both Vreeland and Galati tomorrow. I am on the road and not back in my office until Monday. I will report more when I have more. Details are sketchy, and once FTW's reporter has sifted through it all we will have more and better details."

Mike Ruppert

This story is completely absurd on its face. An article had appeared on May 23/2002 in the *Toronto Sun* which indicated that Rocco Galati had been poisoned by food which he had consumed in a downtown restaurant. There is no indication in the article that it was anything other than food poisoning, although Galati alleged in court that he had also received death threats. No connection was made in this article to the alleged Vreeland poisoning, which is not surprising considering it happened more than a week later. The only person to ever put the two events together is Mike Ruppert. This is misleading to say the least.

As far as Ruppert's tale of the Vreeland poisoning goes, it appears as if Ruppert is asking us to suspend our disbelief because Ruppert tells us that "he didn't sound like he was faking at all." So we are to believe that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve sent Vreeland two bottles of wine. Then we are supposed to believe that the wine contained clozapine. Then we are supposed to believe that Vreeland repeatedly injected himself with some undisclosed antidote. All this because Ruppert says he didn't sound like he was faking it? Pardon me for not being convinced!

At least one explanation for Vreeland's prolific vomiting comes from the Ohio native, Cameron Sexton, who visited Vreeland that weekend and left on the very day that this alleged incident took place. Mr. Sexton described Vreeland's heroic alcohol intake in an interview with CKLN which was recorded shortly afterward. Sexton also says that Vreeland consumed cocaine during his visit, a fact which he also reported to the Toronto police. In any case, Sexton's description of his visit offers an alternative and vastly more plausible explanation for any apparent sickness which Ruppert may have observed.

The further details of this incident which Ruppert said he would provide in the future were not forthcoming. In an *LA Weekly* article by David Corn, Ruppert appeared to express his own doubts about the incident, claiming, "Since all of the information received was solely from Vreeland — who was obviously disoriented and ill — I couldn't go with a news story."

What is most striking about this is that Vreeland appears to be the sole source of information in the majority of the articles Ruppert has written about him. If not, he has certainly not given us any reason to think otherwise. The other stories are no more believable than this one, which begs the question: why stop now?

Over a month later my CKLN colleague Greg Duffell, with whom I have spent many months exploring the many facets of Vreeland's claims, posed the following questions to Ruppert on the same Yahoo discussion forum:

Mr. Ruppert,

I just wish you'd answer my oft-repeated question to you as to whether you discussed your interview with us at CKLN on May 16th with Mr. Vreeland and if you, as he claims, advised him not to do an interview with us scheduled for May 19th. I've asked several times on this forum. Perhaps you haven't seen it.

I'd also like to get clarification about the "Allan Greenspan" wine story, but you seem to avoid any real commentary about that.

I'd appreciate a response to either or both.

Sincerely,
Greg Duffell

What happened next was truly bewildering. Ruppert sent the following reply:

"It is futile to try to explain algebra to an impaired third grader. As far as covert operations go, you are in this class. It was either you or your partner who asked me one of the stupidest questions I have ever heard. At that point you became persona non grata to me because you had demonstrated not the slightest degree of humility, manners, or willingness to learn. You just assumed that you knew everything - about everything.

Your worst problem is that you assume great experience and understanding when you are dangerously naive. Your most accurate statement in one of your postings was that you were an amateur. I heartily agree.

As to the wine statement there is nothing to explain. Vreeland was disoriented, in obvious pain, and I recorded his statements over a hotel phone in Sacramento. When I made the posting I said that I had no way to verify what I had heard. Then I found out - thanks to this list - that Vreeland's attorney Rocco Galati had indeed been poisoned and that it had been reported in a Canadian paper.

I met with Galati in person on my last visit to Toronto and we discussed the poisoning among other issues. I have agreed not to make any further disclosures on the subject until after an upcoming court date where much more will be disclosed.

Your bad manners, your inept arrogance, and your bellicose private threats to me off this list are ample evidence of how you should be treated. There are times when a child should not be allowed to interfere in matters of life and death, especially when the child doesn't have the common sense possessed by an artichoke.

That is the last response you will get out of me. Now enjoy your ensuing tantrum. But trust me, as far as Mike Vreeland is concerned, you will have your comeuppance soon enough. And it won't be coming from me."

Have a nice day!

Mike Ruppert

This response speaks volumes about Ruppert. This collection of holier-than-thou unsupported accusations, childish insults, and self-righteousness perfectly sums up his attitude toward being questioned - even when the questions are quite inoffensive and reasonable.

It is also interesting to note that Ruppert admits to making the assertion that Rocco Galati had been poisoned before receiving any confirmation of the fact whatsoever. Even stranger when you consider that Galati was a phone call away the entire time.

As I have illustrated clearly here, Ruppert's reporting of the Vreeland story is misleading and inaccurate on many occasions. The innuendo which makes up the bulk of his reporting of this story, while he simultaneously claims to be a "professional journalist," is unconvincing. As far as journalistic standards are concerned, Ruppert rarely rises to the level of the *Weekly World News*. I am quite concerned about Ruppert's acceptance by people who consider themselves to be progressive for this reason. Many on the left now seem quite willing to lend an ear to a reporter who more closely resembles PT Barnum than a credible journalist.

While Ruppert asks questions that will not likely be answered any time soon, and may not even be valid, we run the risk of losing sight of the true post-9/11 tragedy, the undisputed curtailing of our basic freedoms in the name of a supposed war on terror.

It is essential that we examine Ruppert's motives for his irresponsible journalism.

Let's look at the facts. Ruppert sells videotapes of his post-9/11 lecture, lining his pockets with the misery and death of the victims. Other than the Vreeland story, which we have shown for the sloppy work that it is, Ruppert's reporting consists entirely of misleading interpretations of open source material. Vreeland is the ONLY story that Ruppert has done any original reporting on, and that is so flawed as to be unable to stand up to scrutiny. Is Ruppert simply an opportunist? Several sources have revealed to us that Ruppert is now writing a book. Seems he thinks there is even more money to be made. What is stunning is that he was able to find a publisher that agreed.

By far the most accurate summation of the absurdity of Ruppert's unwavering position on the Vreeland story is offered by David Corn in the above mentioned *LA Weekly* article.

"To believe Vreeland's scribbles mean anything — as does Ruppert — one must believe his claim to be a veteran intelligence operative sent to Moscow on an improbable top-secret, high-tech mission (change documents to neutralize an entire technology?) during which he stumbled upon records (which he has not revealed) showing that 9/11 was going to happen. To believe that, one must believe Vreeland is a victim of a massive disinformation campaign involving his family, law-enforcement officers and defense lawyers across the country, two state corrections departments, county-clerk offices in 10 or so counties, the Canadian justice system, and various parts of the U.S. government. And one must believe that hundreds if not thousands of detailed court, county, prison and state records have been forged."

I would only add that Ruppert has not seen fit to investigate any aspect of Vreeland's claims, and his articles are black-and-white evidence of this. Is it any wonder that Ruppert received the bulk of his criticism over this? He seems to think so, but in light of the fact that he has no other original investigations, I can't see why it would be any other way.

Before proceeding (with Ruppert's bizarre Yahoo-Vreeland-poisoning meltdown still fresh in our minds), I would like to add a few more articles of evidence to the Mike Vreeland case, for, without Ruppert's intervention into this matter, such lunacy would have never surfaced on the 9-11 scene. In this light, if Vreeland was nothing more than a con-man who led Ruppert in the wrong direction, could this same lack of discernment apply to other areas of investigation (i.e. peak oil)?

The first item to consider originates from GNN reporter Sander Hicks in an article entitled, *Down the Rabbit Hole* (September 26, 2002). Hicks explained that after

Vreeland purported to be a spy for the Office of Naval Intelligence, he also "claimed if he was extradited to the U.S. he could be killed." But, Hicks continues, "Just as Vreeland's star began to rise, it came crashing down. His long, colorful list of outstanding warrants in the U.S. was released to the public, and the international man of mystery was quickly dismissed as a two-bit con man who had concocted an elaborate yarn to avoid prosecution."

Somehow, Ruppert didn't see through this ruse, and as we have seen, even went so far as to spin some fantastic yarns that spiraled into the realm of the totally preposterous. Vreeland's claims were so outlandish that Judge John Macdonald pointed out that this man believed he "developed the theory for anti-Star Wars technology in 1986 based on high school courses." Yet Ruppert promoted him for the world to see. If he had been as diligent an investigator as Sheffield, Alabama Detective Greg Ray, he would have discovered a rap-sheet that extended for twenty pages, with "nine known felony convictions and five more felony charges." But he didn't, despite his claims of being an inscrutably thorough researcher. To close the Vreeland files, Michigan detective John Meiers summed it up best. "The bottom line: Delmart Vreeland is a con man. He's conned everyone he comes in contact with."

Adding further weight to this argument, Toronto screenwriter R. Marshall Smith wrote about his adventures with Mike Ruppert in a piece entitled, *The Asinine Case of Delmart "Spy boy" Vreeland or: How I Learned Not to Be So Paranoid and Trust my Instincts Again* (October 30, 2003). He begins by speaking about his proposed screenplay on Vreeland, and also Ruppert's typically abusive reaction. "After about two weeks, the treatment was complete and totaled 50 pages. I submitted it to Mr. Kroonenburg [an L.A. producer] for his consideration and waited on his response. I hadn't heard from Vreeland in awhile, so I sent off another email. Shortly thereafter, I received a garbled message from the faux-op, and it immediately raised a red flag in my mind. Thinking that Vreeland had in some way been compromised, I quickly wrote Mr. Ruppert for his advice. The investigative journalist replied promptly and basically lambasted me for bringing into question Vreeland's lack of skill with a keyboard, as I was obviously uninformed in the ways of covert operatives and he didn't have the time to educate me."

Smith then lands a knockout punch, for he was quickly able to see through Vreeland's ruse: "Incidentally, if you have ever had the misfortune of meeting Vreeland in person — like I have — then you will know this scoundrel and the word "intelligence" do not mix, and may as well be an oxymoron. How this pitiful little man was able to convince a vast number of people ~ some of them hi-profile — of

his absurd claims is beyond comprehension. Mine at least. I guess that old familiar phrase, "There's a fool born every minute," is a lot more applicable today than I thought."

Yet Mike Ruppert peddled his nonsense while absolutely failing to follow even the most elementary of investigative principles. This lack of judgment should send warning flags up in every direction. [And to think, Ruppert categorized my reporting as "sloppy" when he laid these completely unfounded whoppers on us. This guy has some nerve. Worse, in Ruppert's initial e-mail to me, he claimed that my work could have cost him and his business harm. Yet, try to imagine how many people repeated his bogus claims about Vreeland having foreknowledge of 9-11. I can only conclude at this point that it is Ruppert's lack of credibility as a journalist which has actually caused the real harm.]

Now that we've had a chance to digest all of the above-mentioned Vreeland material, what can we determine? I'm not sure about you, but if I were Mike Ruppert, I'd distance myself so far from this con-man that I wouldn't even acknowledge his name. Either that, or simply admit I was wrong and move on. But what does Ruppert do? He devotes two entire chapters to Vreeland in *Crossing the Rubicon*! Can you believe it? Plus, he mentions him in two other chapters. It seems he can't leave well enough alone, regardless of the ridicule. In fact, here is how Ruppert ultimately summarizes his relationship with Vreeland in *Crossing the Rubicon* (page 294): "I knew exactly what he was doing, and he knew that I knew. The unspoken deal between us was that I was going to let him try to trash me by feeding me bad information so that he could uphold his end of his deal with his handlers and maybe get out of Canada alive?"

Say what? This is sheer lunacy! Name one credible journalist in the world that would make such a statement. Ruppert was going to let Vreeland try to ruin him by disseminating bogus information so that he could please his shadow government manipulators? And it was all an "unspoken deal"? This is *Twilight Zone* material, and it's about time somebody finally pointed it out.

This scenario is so alarming that over the past two decades many have come to ponder Ruppert's competence as a researcher, along with his psychological make-up. These questions first arose in an October 11, 1981 *Los Angeles Herald Examiner* two-part article (by Randall Sullivan) where Ruppert's girlfriend Teddy lamented, "Doesn't it make you doubt the mental stability of someone who has become so obsessed with things that happened so long ago?" Ruppert's commanding officer in the LAPD reiterated her concerns, stating, "Any attempts to rejoin the Department by Officer Ruppert should be approved only after a

thorough psychiatric examination." (David Corn, *The September 11 X-Files*, May 30, 2002)

But this example certainly isn't the only one which brings into question Ruppert's reliability as a prognosticator of current events. Researcher Brian Salter, in a May 18, 2003 article entitled *Mike Ruppert on Amy Goodman and the 9/11 Latecomers*, reproduces a statement made by Ruppert after being savaged by the phony left-leaning alternative media. I couldn't agree more with his assertions in regard to these charlatans, but near the end of this article, Ruppert opines, "Having been vindicated so many times I point again to Saudi Arabia and also now to West Africa. Nine months ago FTW wrote that Saudi Arabia would tour after Iraq. Little noticed details of the recent bombings in Riyadh confirm it. And recent developments in Africa, especially Nigeria - the world's sixth largest oil producer - are sounding alarms that al Qaeda may be about to reveal an African face, including that of Osama bin Laden."

He continues, "Every time my analysis is vindicated, every time a FTW prediction comes true, it is more affirmation that Peak Oil is real."

Whoa, let's slow down for a moment. I'm sorry to inform Mr. Ruppert, but now, in 2004, a full two years after he uttered the above proclamation, the U.S. has not invaded Saudi Arabia, or any country in West Africa. Yet Ruppert boasted that his prediction was "affirmation that Peak Oil is real." And this, as we all know, is what Ruppert claims is the real motive behind 9-11, as he made clear in a recent speech at the Commonwealth Club: "*Crossing the Rubicon* is a detective story that gets to the innermost core of the 9/11 attacks. It places 9/11 at the center of a desperate new America, created by specific, named individuals in preparation for peak oil: an economic crisis like nothing the world has ever seen."

I'm sure Ruppert doesn't like to be reminded of his past words, but he can't have it both ways. If peak oil's reality is, as he proclaims, predicated on an invasion of Saudi Arabia or West Africa, then he is utterly wrong in his assertions. It's that simple. This picture is similar to Ruppert's unwavering claim of being a top-notch researcher, yet all the while being duped into embarrassment by Mike Vreeland.

By combining peak oil, 9-11, and the war machine into a huge jumbled mess, then making predictions based upon these views (some of which have been proven to be faulty), Ruppert is not only muddying the water, but also drawing a huge amount of criticism which ultimately does not help the cause for those who want to discover what actually happened on the morning of September 11, 2001.

One of Ruppert's detractors is Angela D'Urso, who wrote a piece entitled *The Creepy Side of the 911 Truth Movement* (September 10, 2004): "Ruppert appears

to be a volunteer mouthpiece for the oil industry/government, who seeks to - through 911 truth exposure - spread the peak oil scam as well as make people believe there are no viable alternative energies worth pursuing."

In addition, Ruppert's horrifying social views are once again exposed by D'Urso. "As for creepiness, get this; Ruppert also wants to inform us that because of 'peak oil,' population reduction is a necessity. The only question we have to decide, he told us all at the 911 Inquiry in San Francisco, is whether we want to do it 'nice or nasty'."

I don't know about you, but my first reaction to this type of agenda is: WHO THE HELL DOES MIKE RUPPERT THINK HE IS? Who made him an Olympian god that determines who should live and who should die? What we're delving into here, folks, is pure New World Order treachery - i.e. a Rockefeller-style eugenics/euthanasia nightmare.

In a commentary on this article, journalist, researcher, and author John Kaminski (*The Perfect Enemy*) responded in typically incisive fashion, "Ruppert? What is it with this peak oil shit? Who cares? We're after mass murderers! We don't care WHY they did it. We just want them arrested and sent to Guantanamo in orange jumpsuits."

This sentiment was reiterated to WING TV co-host Lisa Guliani in a private e-mail from a noted 9-11 researcher (whose identity we will protect), who stated that Ruppert is a "limited hang-out agent inserted into the 9/11 movement by clear Cointelpro 'legend making'." He continued, "Ruppert sells not only the already well known drug angle (long exposed by others), but the bogus Peak Oil angle that subtly allows progressives and neoliberals to lend credence to the war."

There are also references to Ruppert that get into the realm of unbridled "high weirdness." Take for example this passage from an e-mail sent on Monday, September 27, 2004 by Leuren Moret, who is a geoscientist, environmental commissioner in Berkeley, and researcher-turned-whistleblower in 1991 at the Livermore Nuclear Weapons Lab. She wrote: "Michael Ruppert and his office mates were having a horrible time in LA with bad moods, squabbling etc. One of them finally brought a geiger counter into the office and compared the meter readings inside and outside their office. The Geiger counter was used in Russia at the US Embassy when the workers and ambassadors were dying and getting sick. Apparently microwaves have a distinctive pattern on geiger counters - a peaked pattern. Sure enough the meter readings inside were much higher than outside; and after they made a big public fuss about it, the harrassment stopped."

My question is: are we to believe that Mike and his office mates brought a geiger

counter into their office to determine why they were experiencing such "squabbling, bad moods, and horrible times"? I suppose we must, because Ruppert writes about this very same phenomenon in the "VREELAND II" chapter of *Crossing the Rubicon*. Or, God forbid, could the tension among his associates merely be a reflection of Ruppert's notorious anger-laced tirades? Catherine Austin Fitts said of him in the introduction to *Rubicon*, "Mike's temper is big." So, once again, instead of accepting responsibility for his actions, Ruppert magnifies everything to monumental proportions, directs it outward, while at the same time deflecting all blame from himself.

Another insight into Ruppert's combativeness, paranoia, and inability to accept criticism can be found in this e-mail to me from CKLN radio personality Ron Acinich (September 25, 2004). In this note, Acinich elaborates on Ruppert's frenzied reaction to his investigation of Mike Vreeland, along with his relationship to publisher Adam Parfrey of Feral House Press:

Victor,

There are a few things that might be of help to you.

First of all, yes, paranoid is accurate. An acquaintance of mine described the content of one of his conversations with Mike. When I related the details back to Mike he assumed, incorrectly, that I was illegally monitoring his email and tapping his phone. He, of course, also accused me of working for the CIA. Being an anarchist, and Canadian, I was very amused by this.

Abusive is also accurate. When Mike first got word that we were debunking his Vreeland story he turned on us completely. We had already interviewed him about Vreeland and would have liked to interview him again in light of the new information which we had uncovered.

You might also want to speak with Adam Parfrey at Feral House Publishing. They were going to print Mike's book. However, in the end, parts of it were unpublishable. Apparently the publisher shared my concerns with the Vreeland stuff. When their editor got in touch with Mike about dropping that part of the book, Mike turned on the whole lot of them, accusing them of being part of the vast CIA conspiracy against him.

Acinich followed-up by providing me with an e-mail from Adam Parfrey (May 11, 2003) where he asks why Feral House decided to "disengage" themselves from Ruppert's publishing project. Parfrey responded:

"It is what happens every once in a great while after a book goes through a copyedit process, particularly with a first-time author. Mr. Ruppert didn't see the virtues of some cuts suggested by an excellent, thorough copyeditor I hired (Shane Davis of the University of Michigan), who also copyedited the soon to be published *Inside the Shadow Government* by Harry Helms for Feral House. After Mr. Ruppert's initial upset, I did concede, for sake of togetherness, the retention of four excised chapters, and Mr. Ruppert was, for a time, content. But weeks later he discovered other problems, and I became concerned that his discontent would never end. I was interested in having the book focus better upon the subjects of its title, and attract a bigger audience its primary subjects deserved by retailing it for less than twenty dollars, and being concise enough (450 pages!) to allow foreign publishers to translate and publish it. **I must also admit to not feeling strong enough to weather Mr. Ruppert's language and threats. It was difficult to engage in a professional relationship** (emphasis added). Among other accusations, I did not wish to be accused of engaging in a conspiracy to diminish Mr. Ruppert's book."

As a side-note, I did contact Adam Parfrey at Feral House (who I interviewed in the past (May, 2002)), but his response was that I should contact Ruppert directly. Thus, I would be very interested in asking Mike if the above description is accurate (along with many other facets of this article); but since he refuses to be interviewed by me, I am not able to relate any other information to you at this time.

The criticism of Ruppert's stances have become so extensive that I've been noticing detractors from every angle - on Internet posting forums, from political commentators (*Antiwar.com* founder Justin Raimondo referred to Ruppert's views as "tin foil hat conspiracy theories" — and yeah, I know, Raimondo is somewhat of a Gatekeeper, but still, is this the type of publicity we want?), and talk radio. What follows are a few of the juicier tidbits made by Fintan Dunne on his September 6, 2004 broadcast of *Break for News*:

- 1) "So, the question we ask tonight: is Mike Ruppert a rebel without a rebellion, a fearless defender of truth, justice, and the American way, or a dirty double-crossing rat whose name will go down in history?"
- 2) "Some people say Mike Ruppert is simply pawning off oil company propaganda without you even knowing it."
- 3) "On a host of key issues, Mike Ruppert's alternative outsider stance is completely at one with that of the establishment."
- 4) "It's good to see Mike Ruppert taking this Mr. Big line on 9-11 because it

reveals to me it is total and complete bullshit. So you can take your Mr. Big of 9-11, Mike, and shove it."

5) "This is oil company propaganda that Mike Ruppert is putting out."

Finally, to close-out this section, a resounding question haunts many in the 9-11 research movement: Why has Mike Ruppert chosen to sit on the information regarding Dick Cheney's alleged involvement in the 9-11 war games for so long? Considering the monumental nature of what occurred on that fateful morning and how it traumatized an entire nation, shouldn't this information have been released IMMEDIATELY? Nobody is begrudging Ruppert the right to publish a book, but what is more important - the truth, or money? This question becomes even more pressing when we see how guarded Ruppert is of the war game information, especially when attorney Stanley Hilton began speaking out on the same topic. He even went so far as to state on September 17, 2004 that, "to his knowledge there is no record anywhere that Stanley Hilton broke information on the war games preceding 9/11 before I did." Then, in a September 15, 2004 e-mail, Ruppert slams his perceived competition: "Hilton's research and legal work to date have been extremely sloppy, very reminiscent of Daniel Sheehan's sabotage of the Iran-Contra movement. He and [Alex] Jones are trying to put spin on my research before the book gets out." Ruppert also slides a few racial overtones into the mix by referring to Hilton and the Protocols for the Elders of Zion. Thus, it seems that one-upmanship and who can lay claim to "getting the scoop and breaking the story" takes precedence over all else. If you ask me, this is a very regrettable turn-of-events, especially when matters of life and death are thrown into the equation (on both 9-11 and our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan).

This matter is something all of us should think seriously about, not to mention the tremendous amount of money that Ruppert is raking in from his FTW website (if my addition is correct, it comes to over a million dollars a year — 16,000 subscribers at its current rate of \$65.00/year = \$1,040,000; not to mention his top-dollar video and book). My question to everyone in the 9-11 community is: how many of YOU are making a million dollars a year? And if you remember correctly, one of the initial complaints that numerous people were voicing against Ruppert that I listed in my first e-mail to him was that he was seen as a PATRIOT FOR HIRE. You, the reader, can now decide that issue for yourself.

In closing, some people may argue that the only reason I wrote this expose was because Mike Ruppert wouldn't appear on WING TV - that this is nothing more than sour grapes. And in all honesty, maybe they're partially correct. But from my perspective, a more accurate appraisal would be as such: Mike Ruppert made his

name (and a lot of money) in the alternative research field (not the mainstream), and these are the very people he should be most gracious toward. And, yes, of course Ruppert should also try to invade the mainstream media space (as Lisa Guliani likes to call it). But what I've noticed over the past few years is that he conveys a very pervasive, mean-spirited attitude of condescension toward many of his fellow researchers. Such a stance (or character flaw) is inexcusable in my book, and one that Ruppert will hopefully change in the near future because, as a former police officer, he knows all about "patterns of behavior" and a "preponderance of evidence." Can all of the people cited in this article be wrong, involved in a conspiracy to destroy him, or be part of a CIA psy-op? Of course not.

Also, since Ruppert declined our offer to appear on WING TV, the big question now is: which shows and publications will he grace with his presence? And remember, WING TV accepts no corporate donations (as does NPR, PBS, and Amy Goodman's *Disinformation Now*), nor do we accept any advertising revenue from any source (thus, nobody is able to potentially compromise our views). In addition, we don't require people to subscribe to WING TV to see it, or beg incessantly for donations. We even sell our books and videos at such a low profit margin that oftentimes we undersell the publishers themselves. In this sense, it all boils down to a philosophical question which everyone must ask themselves: why are we involved in the 9-11 truth movement? What are our motives? At WING TV, we're not in it for the money, but instead are simply trying to make this vital information about the New World Order available to as many people as possible. Thus we have, at least from our perspective, one of the purest, least money-oriented sites on the Internet; and in this day-and-age, that's saying a lot.

So, when Mike Ruppert refuses to appear on our show (especially after considering the lame excuse he gave (see Section One of this essay)), we have to seriously question not only where his loyalties lie, but also what his ultimate agenda is. In addition, I assured both Mike Ruppert and his publicist, Ken Levine, that we would give him a fair shake during his interview on WING TV. Sure, we'd ask tough questions like we do with other guests, but it wasn't our intention in the least to do a hatchet-job on him. If this is what Ruppert feared, then the only thing I can attribute it to is his infamous paranoia and aversion to criticism.

Lastly, I would like to reiterate that this essay is not an indictment of Ruppert's new book, *Crossing the Rubicon*. I do intend to review *Rubicon*, but in the meantime I wanted to let others peek behind the veil and see what I've seen of Mike Ruppert. With as much at stake as we have in the world today, his repeated patterns of behavior which are exposed in this article seem inexcusable, especially when directed at fellow researchers. Hopefully, Ruppert can reign-in his outbursts, become more of a team-player, and rally people together rather than denouncing

and alienating them. From my vantage point, Mike has two courses of action: he can either use the same pathetic tactics that have been so abundantly exposed in this article (by a variety of different sources), or he can finally grow-up and start conducting himself in a responsible manner. Only time will tell which path he selects.

As for *Crossing the Rubicon* itself, there isn't anyone who would like to see the psychopaths responsible for 9-11 nailed to the wall more than I would. If Mike Ruppert's able to accomplish this feat... well ... I'll tell you the exact same thing that I told him during our initial telephone conversation on August 6, 2004 - I'll be the first person anywhere to give him a standing ovation and a pat on the back! Now let's get those bastards!

MIKE RUPPERT: TEN QUESTIONS

By Victor Thorn

NOTE: The following article is being posted under the threat of a lawsuit from Mike Ruppert. In the name of fairness, we have extended to Mr. Ruppert an open invitation to respond to these questions on WING TV. We sincerely hope that he takes us up on our offer.

After reading my 36-page expose, *Mike Ruppert Unmasked*, the subject of this article - Mike Ruppert himself- responded on October 4, 2004: "Can't anybody do any better than this? This is boring."

Boring? With all due respect, Mr. Ruppert, there are many of us who don't find the advocacy of population reduction (i.e. wiping human beings off the face of the earth) boring. Nor are we bored to discover that a certain 9-11 researcher has ties to shadowy underworld crime figures, or discredited con-men like Mike Vreeland. In fact, many of us were actually enlightened by this information! But for some odd reason, whenever you have been asked to address the many issues brought out in this essay, you've completely avoided them, or opted to instead self-servingly tell people to "buy your book" (\$\$\$\$\$).

But if the number of people who have contacted me in regard to this article are any indication, your flippant wisecracks are, quite bluntly, simply not good enough. In other words, many people (including myself) expect some answers, and until they arrive, I think it's fair to say that your continued silence makes us highly suspicious of your motives and agenda.

1) POPULATION REDUCTION: You are quoted as saying that you would like "to stop global population growth and to arrive at the best possible and most ethical program of population reduction."

Question'. Do you have a specific program in mind to achieve this goal? Who do you feel should be in charge of it - someone like the Rockefeller family, who has a history of such endeavors via their eugenics programs? In your opinion, how many people should be eliminated? And finally, what "ethical" criteria do you suggest using to determine who is eradicated?

2) PINNACLE QUEST INTERNATIONAL: In Daniel Hopsicker's article, *Cointelpro 9-11: Peak Oil & the Level Above Saudi*, he writes about a company named Pinnacle Quest International, which was involved in banking scams, money

laundering, wire & mail fraud, and tax evasion. Yet you admit to being the recipient of two all-expense paid trips by them, and are even quoted as saying, "I have great respect for Pinnacle Quest International."

Question: Is your opinion of Pinnacle Quest International still the same today; and in the future do you plan on accepting any payments from them (or any other entities engaged in criminal activities)?

3) AMR IBRAHIM "TONY" ELGINDY: I am in the possession of e-mails between yourself and Tony Elgindy, a "short seller" who was arrested for running a racketeering ring using information obtained from corrupt FBI agents. He has also served time for, or been charged with, insurance fraud, bribery, illegal stock market manipulation, and extortion.

Question: Please explain your relationship with Mr. Elgindy (who now faces conspiracy and racketeering charges in a Brooklyn federal court), and also the circumstances revolving around your public apology to him in November, 2002.

4) MIKE VREELAND: Over the past few years, Delmar "Mike" Vreeland's credibility as a witness and/or information source has been severely eroded by 9-11 researchers, law enforcement officials, judges, lawyers, radio personalities, and virtually every other individual who has ever come in contact with him.

Question: Since you devoted two entire chapters of *Crossing the Rubicon* to Mr. Vreeland, do you still place credence in him as a reliable source, and if so, please explain why?

5) ALAN GREENSPAN: On June 1, 2002 you relayed an incredible report to a Yahoo public forum where you stated that Mike Vreeland had been poisoned by Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan.

Question: At the time of that message, did you find it even remotely possible that Alan Greenspan would try to poison a career criminal and con-man with two bottles of delivered wine? If your answer is "no," do you find the above post an example of "shoddy, error-prone" journalism?

6) LAWSUITS: After reading about your propensity to threaten detractors with lawsuits, a well-known 9-11 researcher/chronicler e-mailed the following to me: "I can assure you that at least 5-7 people came forward in the last two years telling me that Ruppert tried to take legal steps against them too. The last bizarre, almost public threat was against the writer of the play *j'accuse Cheney* two weeks ago."

Multiple choice question: During the past five years, approximately how many people have you threatened to sue: (a) 1-50 (b) 50-100, or (c) over 100?

7) **POISON PEN:** Your attacks on detractors (and even colleagues) are legendary. Since *Mike Ruppert Unmasked* blazed across the Internet on October 1, 2004, I've received scores of reports from others who were also subjected to this type of onslaught. One such illustration originates from a woman who is well-known to 9-11 researchers. She wrote: "I have an example of Mike at his finest, exhibiting just those traits you describe so perfectly. He attempted to intimidate me on the 9-11 Truth Alliance list when I alerted people to his new stance on the Air Force stand-down and criticized his war games line back in June 2004. In response to this, he posted the following flames: per Ruppert, I am a "crazy woman," I'm "stupid," I'm a "fool," I'm a "nuisance and distraction," "I have an IQ under 50," "I filter every piece of information through [my] psychological needs," and I have put erroneous words and interpretations into his mouth - all this while I was quoting directly from his written work, and linking to a recording of him at a public gathering."

Question'. Why do you find it so necessary to continually lash out at fellow researchers; and in your opinion, is this pattern of behavior one that generally harbors positive or negative consequences? Secondly, do you make a habit of treating women this way all the time? If so, do you feel anybody should have any respect for you whatsoever after reacting in such a fashion?

8) **PATRIOT FOR HIRE:** In a response to *Mike Ruppert Unmasked* (October 4, 2004), you carefully avoided and/or ignored 99% of the content (36 pages worth), and instead boasted about how many books you were selling on Amazon (i.e. money money money).

Question: What is more important to you - the truth about what actually happened on the morning of September 11, 2001, or the revenue which can be generated from it? Also, how do you plan to dispel rumors that you're a Patriot for Hire when revenue from your various activities seems to be of such prime importance?

9) **MEDIA:** You stated in an e-mail to me on September 1, 2004, "I will not now or ever be on your television show. There will be no discussion."

Question: What criteria do you use to determine which media venues you will appear on, and have you ever compiled a J. Edgar Hoover-like "black list" such as the one your publicist mentioned to me over the telephone?

10) FLIP-FLOPPING: When my review of your *Truth and Lies of 9-11* video first appeared in *The New World Order Exposed*, the people operating your *From the Wilderness* website were so pleased with it that they gave me a free one-year subscription to your newsletter. But then, just last month, you completely flip-flopped and denounced my research as sub-standard.

Question: How frequently do you undergo such dramatic, almost schizophrenic turnarounds, and do you foresee any other flip-flops in the near future when they become "convenient" for you (i.e. peak oil)?

To bring this article to a close, Mike Ruppert concludes an update on Peak Oil in his *From the Wilderness* newsletter (September 23, 2004) by declaring: "Now the real work of caring for the human race, and especially its children, begins." Considering Mr. Ruppert's bizarre views on population reduction, I can't help but notice the hypocrisy of such a statement.

Likewise, in a response to my *Unmasked* article, a 9-11 researcher shared my sentiments when he very eloquently wrote that you, Mr. Ruppert, have, "resorted to threats with lawyers rather than defend your views against critics/questioners/opponents etc. - acting for all the world that you want to keep people from telling other people about your true pro-negative population growth Club of Rome sounding [views] - so congenial with the Malthusian justification of keeping wealth from the breeding masses that has been the mainstay of the Anglo-American ruling elites justifying their accumulation of wealth in their own hands for about 250 years."

He continued, "I think you should put your views out for all the classes to see - that would have avoided the current loss of support of the little people that you didn't really deserve in the first place. I hope your wealthy sponsors will continue to keep you well-fed and happy, even if your capacity to control and deliver the minds of the 'ordinary people' has, by these revelations, been diminished."

This individual concludes, "I believe [the author] has done a great service to the many people who supported you but would never have supported you had they known your views on "surplus population" and trashing and destroying a large segment of the population to achieve the American financial oligarchs' idea of sustainability of their fortunes against wealth, happiness and survival of now-living humanity whose creativity and industry and discovery is the ultimate guarantee that continuing worthwhile futures will unfold in ways the Club of Rome, much less, Thomas Malthus could never predict."

In the end, we must now decide: is Mike Ruppert a gloom-and-doom Peak Oil Pied-Piper leading his followers toward annihilation? The only way we'll find out is if he directly answers these questions once-and-for-all.

MIKE RUPPERT: 9-11 SABOTEUR

By Victor Thorn

Mike Ruppert has done more damage to the 9-11 Truth Movement than any other individual in this field, and during the course of this report I will show how he has filled the role of a Gatekeeper to deliberately squelch any substantive progress that has been made in determining what *actually* happened on the morning of September 11, 2001 in terms of the two primary crux issues:

- 1) how controlled demolitions brought down the World Trade Center towers
- 2) how the Pentagon was not struck by a Boeing 757

Before delving into these topics, though, I would like to address some of the points Mike Ruppert made in his response to my *Ten Unanswered Questions* article (October 8, 2004). My reason for doing so is as such: to truly understand Ruppert's stance in the 9-11/peak oil arena, you first have to know "The Man" himself. This is precisely why I wrote my 36-page expose, *Mike Ruppert Unmasked* (October 1, 2004). From my perspective, someone had to put this information in the public domain so that others could see it. Of course, some people criticized me for doing so, and said that I should have instead focused solely on his work. Well, you'll be pleased to know I am going to do precisely that later in this article.

But first I'm going to show how Mike Ruppert duped quite a few of his most ardent followers by using the exact same techniques that government handlers and conditioners use to distract their subjects away from the crux of an issue. Y'see, Mike learned quite a lot about the CIA's secrets, and now he's putting them to use on his own followers. Needless to say, this tactic should throw red-flags up in every direction.

Here's how he did it. After finishing his responses to my *Ten Questions*, Ruppert queried directly to me, "So now, let me ask you a couple of questions, publicly and for the record. What is your real name? Is it Scott? Have you ever been arrested? Have you ever received any money from any agency of the United States government for any services rendered?"

The intent of this question was obvious. Ruppert wanted to plant a seed and leave his readers with the notion that there was something hidden or lurking in my current or past history. But instead of falling for his guise and immediately responding to these loaded questions, I stood-back and waited to see how many people would get sucked into this little trap. And sure enough, the e-mails started flying. Why? Because to draw attention away from my questions (many of which

Ruppert completely avoided answering, as we'll see), he dropped a few "false-flag bombshell diversions" that were deliberately meant to incite suspicion in his readers' minds. It's the EXACT same thing the government and corporate media do with their innuendo/distraction techniques.

Anyway, I don't mean to disappoint all of those who jumped on this piece of raw meat, but:

a) My real name is Scott Makufka, but I go by the pen-name Victor Thorn for one specific reason. Throughout my life, my last name has been virtually impossible to say and spell (with variations including Kamufkama, Macukfu, and the best of all, Scott Mafucka (think about that one))! To prove this point, every person who has recently tried to spell my name has gotten it wrong (including Jim Hoffman, Mike Ruppert, and syndicated radio talk show host Mike Gallagher). So, to avoid any unnecessary confusion, in the year 2000 I selected a name that could not be any simpler (i.e. Victor Thorn). And, if Ruppert had bothered to check, there are various articles in the public domain on the Internet written about me using my real name. So, my pseudonym is no great mystery, and nothing I've ever tried to hide. It's just a simple *non de plume*, and the individuals who are playing these little games are doing nothing but diverting attention (once again) away from the real issues (just, I might add, as Mike Ruppert intended).

b) In regards to a police record, not only have I never been convicted of any crime, I've never even been arrested - ever! Now, being that Ruppert was a former member of the LAPD, he could have very easily checked and verified this fact. I'm sure he still has a few buddies on the force. But instead, he deliberately misled his readers by insinuating something that has no basis in reality whatsoever. Ruppert frequently talks about "sloppy journalism," and not only is this tactic a blatant example of such practices; it goes far beyond that. What he has willingly and knowingly done is exploit his audience with an obvious false-front. Specifically, this technique is called "coercive persuasion" (see Ralph Omholt's article by the same name), which is defined as: "the methodical - often subtle or even clandestine - application of psychological manipulation." This point is vitally important to remember because I'll show later in this paper how Ruppert uses the exact same techniques in relation to 9-11.

Can't you see what's going on? For years this guy has been using the same techniques that operatives use, and it's about time we start calling him on it. He's duping people with nothing more than blatant CIA/media/propaganda tactics. It's the oldest trick in the book, and I genuinely feel sorry for the people who fell for this ruse. It's an overtly manipulative process used to draw

attention away from all of his shortcomings outlined in my articles. Mike, you know better than this, and you should be ashamed of yourself for sinking to such depths.

c) Lastly, Ruppert asked if I had ever received money from the government for services rendered. Again, sorry to disappoint you, Mike, but the answer is a profound NO. And just so people won't be swayed by your smokescreens any longer, I'll explain: to insure that we're not even remotely compromised; we don't accept advertising money of any kind for WING TV (even though it has been offered). The same applies to corporate donors, which should be anathema to anyone in the alternative news field (do you hear that Amy Goodman). We're so disinterested in such matters that we don't even have a hit-counter on our site. In other words, we don't want anyone having a thumb over us or controlling what we say or write, especially the government.

How, then, some may wonder, can we afford to put our show on the air? The answer is simple. Both Lisa Guliani and I work day jobs to cover the costs associated with WING TV. In fact, I get up at 3:30 am six days a week, work between 45-50 hours/week, then come home and immediately launch into preparing WING TV for broadcast. Lisa likewise splits her time between outside work and our show. Thus, from noon until late afternoon we set-up the camera, do sound-checks, film the show, publish it, do the html computer work, put together the photo gallery, burn it to disc, and finally upload it to the Internet. It's an extremely complicated process, and a 25 minute show takes about five hours to complete. Then, in our "free time" we have to contact future guests, do research to prepare questions, write articles, answer viewer e-mail, and maintain our site (not to mention other mundane tasks such as cooking supper, raking leaves, etc). In all honesty, it's a brutal lifestyle; and we usually only get 4-5 hours sleep a night. But to insure that no one will be able to manipulate our broadcasts or writing, it's the course we've chosen to take. Plus, to make WING TV available to everyone, we don't charge subscription fees, nor do we continually beg for money like Truthout.org does. As we say at the end of each show - Don't Pay for Internet News - WING TV Always Free!

Now, Mike, would we go on four hours of sleep a night six days a week if the government was bankrolling us? Once again you've deliberately misconstrued a situation and distorted reality, and this shows just how low you can go with your coercive persuasion games. It's really quite pitiful, and you should know better. It's time we start calling this guy on what he's doing.

But wait, folks; there's much more to Mike Ruppert "The Man" that he doesn't want you to know. Namely, in my follow-up to *Mike Ruppert Unmasked*, I asked:

10: FLIP-FLOPPING: When my review of your *Truth and Lies of 9-11* video first appeared in *The New World Order Exposed*, the people operating your *From the Wilderness* website were so pleased with it that they gave me a free one-year subscription to your newsletter. But then, just last month, you completely flip-flopped and denounced my research as sub-standard.

Question: How frequently do you undergo such dramatic, almost schizophrenic turnarounds, and do you foresee any other flip-flops in the near future when they become "convenient" for you (i.e. peak oil)?

Ruppert responded:

"Boy, you're really not going to like this one. FTW has had a firm and consistent policy that it will sell no product or affiliate with any entity that I have not first approved. The employees you refer to were both terminated several months ago for multiple violations of company policy. One Cynthia (last name withheld to protect privacy) was a retired FBI agent who did a number of things in an apparent attempt to sabotage my business. She showed me your book. After two minutes of looking at the cover I realized that under no circumstances would I ever be affiliated with you or sell your products. I told her this. She ignored my direct instructions and continued a relationship with you behind my back and in secret. This was possibly as part of an FBI-engineered COINTELPRO type operation to discredit me by attacking me for affiliating with your absolutely horrendous journalism and well-documented errors.

I fired her (and another employee, Tim) for this and other violations of my company rules. I have never once, inside or outside my office said that I wanted to be connected to illuminati jerks, UFO advocates or David Icke's Lizard people. Anyone who knows me at all knows that this is ironclad policy with me."

Now, before I expose a fistful of blatant lies on Ruppert's part, I would like to interject another thought. Ruppert boasts at every turn about being a journalist of the highest degree. Yet re-read his following statement: "After two minutes of looking at the cover [of *The New World Order Exposed*] I realized that under no circumstances would I ever be affiliated with you or sell your products."

Think about the absurdity of this narrow-minded pronouncement. There has never been a better example of shoddy, myopic journalism than this. Ruppert claims that by simply "judging a book by its cover" he could tell what was inside it - all 570

pages - without even opening it! How did he perform such an amazing feat - via psychic powers? If so, he should start playing the lottery because his powers appear to be far greater than even Kreskin's! Plus, *The New World Order Exposed* has blurbs on the back cover from Jim Marrs, Michael Collins Piper, Gordon Thomas, and Paul Walker of *Aftermath News*. These are some of today's leading figures in the alternative research field, yet Ruppert dismissed them (and the entire book) in 120 seconds without ever opening it. How utterly pathetic. How can we trust anything this guy says after he makes such a patently absurd statement? It's a joke, especially when we look back at his equally preposterous Vreeland equivocations.

Worse, Ruppert blamed this entire *New World Order Exposed* flip-flop not on himself, but an employee named "Cynthia" who he said was possibly a retired FBI agent that conspired behind his back to sabotage him under some type of FBI-engineered COINTELPRO program.

Upon reading this response when it initially came out, I instantly turned to my WING TV co-host, Lisa Guliani, and said, "Ruppert's lying through his teeth. I've never in my life spoken to anyone named Cynthia at *From the Wilderness*. The only person I dealt with back then was named Michael Leon. I don't even know who Cynthia is."

The only problem was: I couldn't prove it. It was Ruppert's word against mine. That was until I received a dramatically eye-opening e-mail on October 11, 2004 from one of Ruppert's former employees. To preserve this individual's identity and any possible retaliation on Ruppert's part, I will merely call him X.

Anyway, this person wrote:

Victor Thorn,

To set the record straight, since Mike Ruppert has seen fit to use my name and that of my former co-worker in his rebuttal to you as posted on his site and Jeff Rense.

His claim that "60 man hours" was dedicated to answering queries re: the "Oh Lucy" timeline is utter BS. I have the distinct pleasure of having been fired by Ruppert 2x's. When I returned in August of 2002 (after being first fired in Sept. 2000) and through May 2004, I did not field a single phone call or email regarding the timeline award. I am aware that the \$1000.00 went to Tony's favorite charity.

Your free subscription came about through Michael L. [Michael Leon], our office

manager, well before Cynthia was hired. It was Michael L. who first brought your book to Mike Ruppert's attention.

After Ruppert's burst appendix in July of 2003 and after (prior) repeated warnings from Michael L.- to Ruppert - that he needed to secure medical insurance, both of us went to Ruppert's residence to confront him on his anger issues - which were becoming intolerable. Ruppert AGREED to get help. He has NEVER done so.

I have known Mike since 1993. In fact, he was my first AA sponsor. I have witnessed his anger completely out of control. He has been physically, verbally and emotionally abusive - to employees and to total strangers.

Unfortunately, what Mike sells is ... fear. He has consistently demonstrated knowledge of the problem and a complete inability to address the solution. When he spoke at the PQI Convention in Cancun, a good portion of the audience went to the bar to drink or up to their rooms to sleep off the depression after hearing his pitch. At the end of his pitch he stated: "Catherine Austin Fitts will give you the answers in her presentation tomorrow!"

What a guy!

Claudia, who coordinated the Cancun event, called me in mid-March and asked me to talk to Mike about doing a presentation that was solution oriented ... I suggested that she and Dave Struckman take this up directly with Ruppert - at this point I already knew I was history.

Ya' see, what Ruppert means by his (my) company policy is: I'm right/YOU are wrong, my way or the highway, I see YOU as an extension of me!!!

My perfect vision of Ruppert is: in a rubber room, daily thorazine injections, a cup for the drool - just down the hall from George W. Same coin, different sides.

Kind regards,

X

One day later, on October 12th, X followed-up with a second e-mail:

Victor,

When I spoke to Cynthia last night regarding this entire matter, I mentioned your name and her response was: "Victor who?"

Cynthia is a good person who deserves much more than being scapegoated by a paranoid, delusional LAPD x cop.

Michael Leon is now living on top of a mountain in New Zealand.

X

Can you see what's going on here? Ruppert absolutely and undeniably **LIED THROUGH HIS TEETH** about the entire *New World Order Exposed* matter. As I told Lisa Guliani, I had never spoken with a woman named Cynthia at FTW. And now I had the proof. To add even more ammunition, I did a quick search through my computer and found the initial letter that we sent to *From the Wilderness* in regards to my book. It was dated May 27, 2003; and guess who it was addressed to. Michael Leon, just as I had said. If anyone would like to verify this correspondence, I will gladly forward the letter to them.

For the sake of fairness, though, I gave Ruppert a chance to redeem himself on December 2, 2004 by sending him this question via e-mail:

"In your response to question #10, you stated that a former employee of yours named Cynthia was the individual who gave you my book, *THE NEW WORLD ORDER EXPOSED*. You also stated that she was possibly part of a FBI engineered COINTELPRO program, that she was attempting to sabotage your business, and that she "continued a relationship with me" behind your back. Do you stand by these statements, and if not, what part of it would you like to change?"

But instead of coming clean, Ruppert spun an even more elaborate explanation on December 3, 2004:

"I did not say that Cynthia was part of a COINTELPRO operation. I said it was possible and that I suspected it. That's a major distortion of my words on your part. [Actually, I did use the word "possible" in my original question — vt] Do I still believe it's possible or likely? Yes. Either that or Cynthia has other very serious personal issues. One thing I can say, because she made it public knowledge herself in front of many witnesses, is that she believes the government is tracking her

every move by satellite and bombarding her with rays that make her sick and cause her to get electric shocks from her car seat. She believes that helicopters follow her everywhere and that even the helicopters were bombarding her with rays. She believes that these "rays" are able to target just her in a room full of people, none of whom felt a thing. That was entirely different from the microwave attack on our office where everyone was hit at the same time and we all felt it at the same time. Cynthia would start ranting about it in the office when no one else felt a thing."

Now I don't know about you, but isn't it curious that Mike Ruppert (and supposedly everyone around him) always seem to be involved in completely outlandish situations (at least according to Ruppert)? It's like he lives every day in a perpetual episode of *The Twilight Zone* where people are being poisoned, microwaved, tracked and attacked. But since Ruppert went *X-Files* in his first description of Cynthia, why should we believe his second cock-n-bull story? Give us a break, Mike, and drop the dramatics!

Anyway, here's the bottom line: To this day I have still never spoken with or e-mailed "Cynthia." In fact, I don't even know her last name. Yet Ruppert, for whatever delusional reason, concocted the entire paranoid fantasy about the FBI and COINTELPRO, blamed it on an innocent employee (who he said was conspiring behind his back with me - a person she has never met or spoken with), all in order to cover his own tracks. There are only two explanations for this response: Ruppert is either a pathological liar, or he's insane. What other alternatives are there, especially when he's had every opportunity to correct this outlandish tale? How are we supposed to take this guy seriously any longer? He sounds like a drunken, overly-theatric Richard Nixon during the crash n' burn Watergate days. The lunacy which flows from Ruppert's pen at every turn is precisely why the mainstream media labels us 'crazed conspiracy theorists.' Ruppert is collectively damaging our credibility with all of these ludicrous statements. [As a reminder, take another look at his account of the Mike Vreeland-Alan Greenspan incident - it's frighteningly deranged.] So, not only did Ruppert use obvious CIA coercive persuasion techniques in his responses to my questions, he also **LIED THROUGH HIS TEETH**, and continues to do so even today!

Also, during an October phone conversation, X revealed how he and Cynthia actually had to perform an intervention at Ruppert's residence to confront him about his wildly out-of-control anger issues. In addition, he described Ruppert as being (verbatim): "insecure, paranoid, and out of touch with reality." These words, you must remember, are originating from someone who worked in close proximity to Ruppert on a daily basis. This, I am afraid to say, is Mike Ruppert "The Man." Anyone who has read my *Mike Ruppert Unmasked* article, along with this first-hand account, is finally starting to understand what type of individual we're

dealing with. The only thing I can suggest right now is for Mike Ruppert to get the professional (psychological) help he so desperately needs.

Moving on, as promised this lead-up will eventually meander its way back to 9-11, but first I would like to take a moment and quote from an October 19, 2004 article written by Brian Salter (*QuestionsQuestions.net*) entitled *Ruppert vs. Hopsicker, Thorn* in which he comments on Ruppert's responses to my original ten questions.

First, Salter touches upon Ruppert's propensity to attack and threaten legal action against practically anybody that disagrees with him (i.e. his LOCK-STEP mentality). Salter wrote: "I've already known for a long time that Ruppert is an asshole and a megalomaniac. That is reason for caution, but doesn't inherently mean that anything he's saying or doing is already wrong. But one example of something I take very seriously is Ruppert's bizarre penchant for making lawsuit threats, as illustrated by his recent threat against a theater production which he claimed had unjustly stolen his ideas concerning Cheney's role in the 9/11 op. This left me astonished and disturbed." Salter continued, "Thorn's question about Ruppert's lawsuit-mongering is obviously sarcastic and in jest, but at the same time I am totally unmoved by Ruppert's evasive "answer" on the subject, which offers no reassurance to those of us who are concerned about his behavior."

Salter then examined Ruppert's equally strange behavior in relation to Mike Vreeland, and the "nastiness" of his attacks upon fellow researchers. But the point which most intrigued me was when Salter alluded to the possibility of a deliberately-created "Legend" being built around Mike Ruppert. He wrote: "A search for "Brian Salter" in Thorn's "Unmasked" will bring up an example of how those of us who have rallied around Ruppert in the past have been sucked into backing up his "my way or the highway" interpretations of current events that haven't all come to pass. And those of us who have parted ways with Ruppert on the "peak oil" issue are now in an awkward spot, with his millennialist huffing and puffing that "peak oil is the only story." So, some of us who worked hard to shield Ruppert from attacks and build his credibility now find ourselves vilified and mocked by his site as "flat earthers" and the like for failing to fall in lock-step behind his "peak oil" line. Was Ruppert meant to be a lightning rod? Was the war with the "gatekeepers" a case of "legend-building"? Another researcher who is a "peak oil" skeptic wrote to me, "We've created a monster ..." and I find myself increasingly suspecting that he may be right, and I do not feel too good to be saying so."

This concept of "Legend-building" is vital to understand, for it exists at the absolute center of Mike Ruppert's universe. It is so vital, in fact, that author and researcher Dave McGowan (*the Center for an Informed America*) broached it during his November 30, 2004 appearance on WING TV:

Victor Thorn: So, right then, two days after this event happened [9-11], Ruppert's status as a Gatekeeper had already been established, hadn't it?

McGowan: In my opinion, absolutely. I believe that a Legend was created — so to speak — to elevate him into this position where he could assume the mantle of... I think he calls himself the "godfather of 9-11 research." I believe that was a very deliberate effort to establish someone as a point-man who could serve to plant red-herrings on the trail and to re-direct attention onto relatively insignificant matters, and I think they've done a very good job.

So, what we have here goes well beyond Ruppert being rude to fellow researchers, his overt lies, and his paranoid, bizarre claims in relation to Vreeland and the FBI. Rather, what if Mike Ruppert has actually been a "plant" or "strawman" from the onset, and a carefully choreographed Legend was indeed built around him to become the false-front damage-control "godfather" of the 9-11 movement? Look at it this way: an ex-LAPD officer with family intel connections falls on hard times, then is suddenly resurrected at a pivotal event - his conveniently videotaped "confrontation" with CIA Director John Deutsch in 1996 over the Agency's involvement in drug-trafficking and money-laundering. Shortly thereafter he launches his *From the Wilderness* website and begins parading around his Deutsch videotape to give himself "credibility." Then, to further build his "Legend," he engages in some staged "debates" with Left Gatekeepers such as Amy Goodman, Chip Berlet, and David Corn. All the while, he's bolstering himself to be the # 1 "government outsider" and self-appointed leader of the 9-11 Truth Movement.

But instead of being our savior riding in on a white horse, what if Ruppert was actually the anointed lightning rod that bullied, threatened, and shot down EVERY researcher that was getting too close to the truth or strayed too far away from the "official limited hang-out" party line? And I think every person in the 9-11 investigative community would agree that Ruppert has been a pit bull attack dog far more than anyone else (except for maybe Dick Eastman). Is that the kind of company you want to be in, Mike? Hell, in the two months since *Unmasked* was published, I've received scores of e-mails from fellow researchers who told me about being subjected to his lawsuits, heavy-handed tactics, and abusive behavior. And, when you think about it, isn't this precisely the role which a government-planted debunker would fill? They'd go to great lengths trying to silence those who were about to "crack the case."

If you're still not convinced, though, hearken back to the opening of this article where I illustrated very clearly how Mike Ruppert used the exact same techniques that our government, corporate-controlled newscasters, and the CIA utilize to mislead and distract their audience. I pointed this out for a very specific reason —

to show that Ruppert is not above utilizing very manipulative tactics to achieve his (their) ultimate goals.

With this premise in mind, please read the following passage from Dave McGowan's phenomenal article, *September 11, 2001 Revisited: A Three-Act Play* (September 15, 2004):

The collapses [of the World Trade Center Towers] represented a fundamental weakness in the master plan. Were it not for the virtually complete control exercised by Washington over the media, both mainstream and 'alternative,' the twin collapses would almost certainly have been recognized as an obvious smoking gun. Of course, the perpetrators never had any reason to doubt their ability to thoroughly control the flow of information, both in the media and in the so-called 'skeptics community.'

Many in that community have harshly denounced those intrepid souls who have questioned the cause of the collapse of the World Trade Center towers, just as they have cast aspersions on those who question whether it was really a commercial airliner that struck the Pentagon. *From the Wilderness* set the tone very early on with a post that was up barely 48 hours after the towers hit the ground:

Credible Evidence, Expert Witness Testimony Convincing: No Explosives Hidden in WTC Sept 13, 2001 -- 1500 PDT

(http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/09_13_01_No_Explosives.html)

FTW - Based upon a detailed review of an interview with a NY architect who is expert on high rise construction and upon today's *BBC* story which I have linked at the bottom of this page, I am now virtually certain that there were no explosives placed within the WTC buildings. The motive for such a move would have been unclear in light of the drama and the security risks for "pre-event" compromise posed by dual efforts that would have accomplished the same ends.

Discovery of the explosives before the hijacking would have emptied the buildings and placed the nation on alert before the hijackings could have been carried out. The WTC towers would have been evacuated and that would have reduced the impact of the crashes.

Gravity would have taken all of the unburned fuel down central shafts of the building and the physics in this story are consistent with both witness statements and other expert interviews I have read.

In addition, my ex-wife Mary lives a block away and witnessed both the second crash and the collapse of both towers from a close distance. Neither she, nor any other person she knows, heard any explosions or believe that secondary charges were a factor in of the collapses. I will be posting a more detailed bulletin for my subscribers on this shortly.

Mike Ruppert

http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/americas/newsid_1540000/1540044.stm

The phantom New York architect was never identified. The alleged "expert interviews" never actually existed. The *BBC* report was shown to be littered with errors. And the "more detailed bulletin" never surfaced. Instead, Ruppert allowed his hastily assembled initial post to stand for over two years as his only commentary on the collapse of the towers. The dust from the World Trade Center hadn't even settled yet and already the 9-11 gatekeeper position had been established, courtesy of Mike Ruppert and the *BBC*.

Please ponder for a moment the ramifications of this very intriguing excerpt. Only two days after 9-11, while everyone else in the country (and the world) was still in shock, Mike Ruppert emerges on the scene with his "damage control" and announces that there were no explosives hidden in the World Trade Center towers! This pronouncement completely and unwaveringly supported the government's "official version" of events — after only two days and zero investigation. None whatsoever! How unsettling is this notion?

Worse, McGowan also adds: "From the beginning, many of the most prominent 9-11 researchers have labored to either discredit, or ignore and direct attention away from these three key areas of research. *From the Wilderness*, for example, considered by many to be the preeminent 9-11 site, avoided commenting on the Air Force stand-down for many long months; dismissed the notion of controlled demolitions in a short, unsourced post just two days after the towers had fallen; and still has not, to this day, ever reviewed or addressed the photographic evidence from the Pentagon." Yet again, Ruppert has given us a textbook example of how shoddy journalism and disinformation can be used to deliberately divert attention away from the truth of an issue.

Note: The three key areas of research that McGowan is referring to above are as follows:

1. The perfectly symmetrical and total collapse of three commercial high rise office buildings that day (WTC1, WTC2, and WTC7), the first such collapses in history, can only be explained as controlled demolitions, requiring a considerable amount of advance planning, preparation, expertise and access.

2. The nation with the world's most formidable military apparatus, and with the world's most advanced air defense system, failed in every way imaginable to respond to the attacks, and failed to follow the most basic, routine, automatic procedures for responding to emergency situations. Not only did the Air Force and civil defense systems fail to respond, despite having more than ample time to do so, but the purported commander-in-chief also failed to respond, as did his staff and security detail, and all of his underlings.

3. It is impossible to reconcile the documented damage to the Pentagon with the notion that it was struck by a 757 passenger jet. Evidence instead indicates that it was either struck by a missile (and not one launched from a cave in Afghanistan), or taken out with explosives planted within the building.

So, without further ado, let's get down to the brass tacks of the 9-11 terror attacks.

- A) controlled demolitions brought down the World Trade Center Towers
- B) photographic and physical evidence is so lacking that it is impossible to prove that a Boeing 757 struck the Pentagon

These two points are the crux of 9-11 — the true "ground zero" for researchers — or, as Dave McGowan likes to call them, exhibits A and B, for without the monstrous devastation of these towers and the traumatic impact it created on our collective psyche, 9-11 would not have grown to such epic proportions (and subsequently allowed our government/New World Order controllers to move ahead with their agenda). The collapsing towers killed more people, created more trauma, and was by far the most memorable event in our minds. Everything else exists on the periphery. If we truly want to bring the guilty parties to justice, this is where we must begin. War games didn't bring down the towers, nor did airliners or burning jet fuel. Controlled demolitions did. Likewise, if the government wanted to prove that Flight 77 hit the Pentagon, they'd release each and every videotape taken with their own cameras, as well as those confiscated from a nearby Citigo station, Sheraton hotel, and the Virginia DMV. In addition, they would also open the doors to a warehouse/hangar that they claim holds the plane's

wreckage. Yet three years later, they've taken none of these simple steps.

Now, at this point I could engage in a lengthy discussion of how basic the case for a controlled demolition of the World Trade Center towers was, including:

- the scientific formula used to calculate a resistance-free gravity fall
- the melting point of jet fuel and construction grade steel
- or how steel buildings have never in the history of the world collapsed due to fire

But the single greatest piece of evidence is the two massive steel and concrete cores of each World Trade Center tower that supported all 110 floors. Even if, in the highly unlikely event that all of the floors did "pancake" to the ground, that would still leave standing the center CORE of each building that was constructed of concrete and steel. Can't you see? It would have been physically and scientifically impossible for them to fall. This is the most basic and elementary point in the world. Examine photos of the towers when they were being constructed. Look at their cores. Jet fuel cannot burn, melt, destroy, or pulverize to dust these massive 137' x 87' x 1360' foot concrete and steel columns.

That's it. The 9-11 case is closed with this simple premise. The government and corporate media's version of events crumbles to pieces with ONE PHOTOGRAPH! It's that simple ... that basic. The planes didn't bring down those columns, nor did fire. That only leaves one thing - controlled demolition. Its physics and logic 101.

With this single, rudimentary point in mind, let's jump back to Mike Ruppert's proclamation on September 13, 2001 — two days after 9-11 — where he said there was no evidence of a controlled demolition. Even if in the chaos of the moment Ruppert had made a mistake, he's had over three years to correct and update it. But he hasn't! Plus, he wrote a 670 page book which was published in October, 2004 entitled *Crossing the Rubicon*.

Now, whenever anyone asks specific questions of Ruppert, he constantly instructs them (mantra-like) to read his book, where "all the answers will be found." So, guess what I did. I read the review copy that he sent to me and looked for an explanation of 9-11's two crux issues:

- 1) how a controlled demolition brought down the World Trade Center towers
- 2) how no photographic or physical evidence can reconcile a Boeing 757 hitting the Pentagon

But much to my dismay, guess what I discovered. Nothing... no precise details whatsoever describing the core issues of 9-11. I even went to the book's index and looked-up every reference to "The World Trade Center" and the "Pentagon" — and still nothing. In 670 pages!

Here's the best Ruppert could do in regard to the towers (*Crossing the Rubicon*, page 590):

"For a long time I have not believed that the WTC towers collapsed as a result of the impacts."

Okay, that's a good start, but then Ruppert immediately cops-out with his constant standby: "I said from the first days after 9/11 that I had too much experience with the way physical evidence could be manipulated, even inside a courtroom, to waste my time arguing claims that could not be proven as thoroughly and concretely as the ones I have proven here."

Wait a second. Did Ruppert say that he didn't want to WASTE HIS TIME trying to argue that the towers were brought down by controlled demolitions? What kind of rationale is that?

He concludes: "While I cannot tell the general public, or you who have made so many excellent cases for your positions, how the buildings were brought down, I can certainly now point you to a likely suspect for the requisite studies of what would be required to do it."

Then, immediately after this passage, he skates away from this issue by referencing, of all things, the Kean Commission's Whitewash report, then a long-winded analogy by Mark Rabinowitz. And just like that - with no other information - he wants to erase the matter from our minds. There is even less information on the lack of evidence pointing to a Boeing 757 striking the Pentagon.

At this stage we have to ask ourselves: if Ruppert isn't writing - in 670 pages - about the two crux issues of 9-11, then exactly what does fill his book? Well, I'll tell you. Ruppert exerts a great deal of energy on "war games." Now, let me reiterate one last time so there's absolutely no confusion. Jetliners did not bring down the WTC towers, nor did jet fuel; and no Boeing 757 struck the Pentagon. Thus, the war games become nothing more than a peripheral issue that facilitated, or allowed, the planes to strike the towers. That's it. They were merely a SYMPTOM of the central CAUSE, and not the core issue.

In fact, *9-11 Skeptics Blogspot* creator Nico Haupt wrote in *911: The Lost Terror Drill* (November 30, 2004) that, "War games were obviously planted to construct a 'limited hangout' later." He added in the next line, "This indicates to me that traditional war games are a red herring."

For once, somebody is finally starting to get it! So, now that we're making progress, let's look at it this way. Even if Dick Cheney admitted that he was the commander of these war games, he could turn right around and say, "Yup, we were running these operations, and due to the distraction they created, the government and military was negligent and incompetent in stopping those pesky Arabs from hijacking our planes and ramming them into the towers." Thus, the official story is allowed to remain standing where 19 Afghani-trained terrorists were the perpetrators (and not a bloodthirsty cabal within the government) while the war games served as a convenient and well-planted distraction.

Nico Haupt was right. The war games that Ruppert is pushing full-bore are nothing more than a LIMITED HANGOUT in case the government gets backed into a corner. Thus, responsibility can be defrayed away from them (the true guilty parties within our own government who planned, executed, and covered-up their crimes) while still perpetuating the myth of Arab hijackers. It's a classic red herring, especially when it's coming from Mike Ruppert - a guy who absolutely refuses to confront the true crux of this matter — the controlled demolition of each tower. The same can be said for other members of what I call the "9-11 Cabal." These are individuals who have quite an extensive amount of media access and dominate the 9-11 conferences; yet never bring this information to the public, while at the same time excluding guests and voices that are trying to promote the truth. And I haven't even mentioned Ruppert's obsession with trying to distract people with PEAK OIL - a completely unproven theory that is once again used as a major source of distraction.

It is for these reasons that I've reached a conclusion: Mike Ruppert is a 9-11 saboteur who has done everything possible to divert people's attention away from crux issues which ultimately point to the government's responsibility for the 9-11 terror attacks. When we compound this matter with his deliberate fabrications and his use of government/CIA coercive persuasion propaganda techniques, it becomes clear what his agenda is. And it's highly disappointing, because just think if Ruppert had spent three years and 670 pages examining the WTC's controlled demolition and the government lies about a Boeing 757 hitting the Pentagon. This case might have been blown-open sky high by now. But Ruppert's done everything in his power to stay away from these issues (while at the same time attacking those who are exposing them).

These revelations have also allowed me to finally figure out why Ruppert's been so adamant about not appearing on WING TV. It's simple - he doesn't want to answer these tough questions in front of every member of the 9-11 Truth Movement. Why? Because he knows that Lisa Guliani and I will ask him very pointed, direct questions, and Ruppert wants nothing to do with that. Instead, he'll only agree to softball-fluff interviews with publications like *Newtopia*. In case you missed it, check out the two guys who interviewed Ruppert. One has written for *Entertainment Weekly*, *Boing-Boing*, and *PIX-elations*; while the other is a guitarist for a band named Lucid Nation. Gee, there are some real seasoned, hard-hitting 9-11 researchers, huh!

Think about it. Here at WING TV, we have spent more time than any other venue trying to expose the truth about 9-11. On the other hand, Ruppert just recently released a book that delves into this very same topic. You would think that these two forces are a perfect match. Yet Ruppert is deathly afraid to appear on our show. Why?

- Jim Marrs wasn't afraid.
- David Ray Griffin wasn't afraid.
- Dave Von Kleist wasn't afraid.
- Phil Jayhan wasn't afraid.
- Daniel Hopsicker wasn't afraid.
- Russ Wittenberg wasn't afraid.
- Eric Hufschmid wasn't afraid.
- George Humphrey wasn't afraid.
- Jerry Russell wasn't afraid.
- Jim Hoffman wasn't afraid.
- Don Paul wasn't afraid.
- John Kaminski wasn't afraid.
- Tom Flocco wasn't afraid.
- Michael Elliott wasn't afraid.
- Kyle Hence wasn't afraid.
- Nico Haupt wasn't afraid.
- Anthony Hilder wasn't afraid.
- Christopher Bollyn wasn't afraid.
- Dylan Avery wasn't afraid.
- Ralph Omholt wasn't afraid.
- Kee Dewdney wasn't afraid.
- Stanley Hilton wasn't afraid.
- Dave McGowan wasn't afraid.
- Jimmy Walter wasn't afraid.

And as future guests, it doesn't seem as if Karl Schwarz, John Leonard, Donn de Grand-Pre, Richard Stanley, or Webster Tarpley are afraid either.

Apparently, the only person who IS afraid is Mike Ruppert. The above-mentioned individuals are tops in the 9-11 research/activist field, and none of them ducked and ran for cover or hid behind flimsy excuses. Instead, they simply did what every other guest did - they allowed themselves to be interviewed. And, when you think about it, what Lisa Guliani and I do is pretty straightforward. We ask questions, and our guests answer them. It's a fairly uncomplicated process. And it's not like we're hurting for guests. In fact, we're booked solid for the next 2 1/2 months. Thus, we only want Ruppert to appear on our show for one reason - to see where he stands on the issues. I'll repeat this statement so there is no misunderstanding: we want to see where Mike Ruppert stands on the crux issues!

And in all honesty, since Ruppert has propped himself up to be the leading 9-11 researcher, people expect to know where he stands on certain issues. That's not too much to ask for, is it? In other words, all of us want him to answer some questions, especially when they're asked by people who aren't "controlled" by the powers-that-be. So, here is what I propose: Lisa Guliani and I are extending an open invitation to Mike Ruppert to appear on WING TV. And, to insure that he doesn't have any excuse not to appear, we guarantee there will be no personal questions asked of him. We'll stick strictly to the issues. So, Mike, the ball is now in your court. Everybody is waiting to find out where you stand. If you don't accept, it leaves us with only one explanation: you're afraid to handle the tough (real) questions.

Anyway, to bring this article to a close, all I can ask everyone right now is this: are you serious about exposing the essential truths about who was responsible for the 9-11 terror attacks? If you are, then re-read *Mike Ruppert Unmasked*, my *Ten Questions*; and finally, his curious answers to them. Then ask yourself: why is Mike Ruppert so adamant about steering people away from the WTC's controlled demolition, along with the absence of Flight 77 at the Pentagon? Also, now that you know everything you know about Ruppert, ask yourself another question: is he the kind of spokesman we want representing us, especially in matters of such importance? From my perspective, Ruppert has now been exposed by not only me, but also numerous other researchers and those who have worked closest with him. He's a charlatan at best, and a devious plant at worst; plus, the war games he's been pushing have gotten us nowhere, and they won't get us anywhere in the future. In this light, I feel there is only one alternative: let's kick Ruppert off his perch once-and-for-all as the self-appointed "godfather" of the 9-11 Truth Movement. His credibility has been shredded, and his true agenda is now painfully clear. It's time to wash our hands of Ruppert, because he's done (and not a minute too soon)! Now that this distraction is gone, let's focus on some REAL ISSUES!

HEY RUPPERT: 9-11 IS NOT DEAD!

By Victor Thorn

With an ego so overblown it defies description (or possibly an indication of something even more sinister), Mike Ruppert - and Mike Ruppert alone - has declared that 9-11 is now a dead issue.

If you don't believe me, here is what Ken Levine (Ruppert's publicist) wrote on January 19, 2005 for *From the Wilderness* in reference to Ruppert's speech at the University of Washington on January 15, 2005: "Ruppert explained [to them] that although the 9-11 cause is still alive, it is no longer useful as a political tool by activists. The window on 9-11 has closed. Simple as that."

The first question everybody should now be asking is: Who the hell does Mike Ruppert think he is, and who gave him the authority to close the case on 9-11? As Lisa Guliani said: "Is Ruppert going to tell the victims' families that 9-11 is now a thing of the past; or that they should focus their attention on something of far greater importance — like peak oil?" What audacity. What nerve. What cold-hearted callousness. How does this guy even remotely think that he can speak for the rest of us, especially all the 9-11 researchers who have tirelessly strived to get to the bottom of this despicable mass murder?

Well, Mr. Ruppert, I have news for you. 9-11 is **NOT** dead, and when my book *9-11 on Trial* is released next month, you'll see why. By culling together data from scores of the best 9-11 researchers around, we now have undeniable, definitive proof that there was zero possibility that the World Trade Center towers collapsed from either the impact of jet planes, or the resulting jet fuel fires. Zero chance. And we've now proven it! Better yet, we haven't used even one "conspiracy theory" in doing so. Rather, we've utilized mathematical equations, physics, scientific formulas, physical evidence, the laws of nature, and expert testimony to reach our conclusion.

Please take a moment and think about what we're telling you — the WTC towers did not collapse due to jet fuel fires or from crashing jetliners. And now it's all proven in one place.

With that in mind; let me ask everyone a question: how can 9-11 be an issue we should 'look beyond'? It's absurd, and Mike Ruppert should be absolutely ashamed of himself for even considering such a preposterous notion, let alone uttering it before a live audience. Those in attendance should have booed him off the stage.

But y'see, I'm not surprised by Ruppert's pronouncement, because this man has done more to steer people away from getting to the bottom of what happened to the WTC towers than anyone else. He did so in *Crossing the Rubicon* by diverting everyone's attention with his war-games limited hang-out. What precisely do I mean? Well, no one is denying that war games took place on the morning of 9-11, and no one is denying that our military stood-down. No one is even surprised that Dick Cheney was one of the individuals behind it.

But here is the crux issue of 9-11: war games did not cause the World Trade Center towers to physically collapse, and a military stand-down did not cause the World Trade Center towers to physically collapse. Therefore, what if Dick Cheney appeared on television tonight and admitted: "Yes, Mike Ruppert was correct. I was in charge of the war games, and because of the confusion created by them, our military was compelled to stand-down and not intercept the incoming jetliners. So, because of our INCOMPETENCE (yes, the 'incompetence angle'), those pesky terrorists careened their hijacked airliners into the World Trade Center towers, and that's what brought them down."

Can't you see what is taking place here? It's an unadulterated limited hang-out that, if ever played out like a trump card, still reinforces the government's official version of events that 19 Arab hijackers planned and carried out the 9-11 attacks; thereby removing all blame from them. But that's not what really happened. Being that burning jet fuel couldn't have brought down the towers, the jetliners striking WTC 1 and WTC 2 was merely a pretext for the deliberate demolition of these structures! That's the bottom line to 9-11.

Ruppert's limited hang-out is the oldest trick in the book, and I can't believe how many people have fallen for it. But what Ruppert doesn't want you to do (thus he diverts your attention) is to look at what actually caused the physical collapse of the WTC towers. More importantly, if that part of the government's version of events is undeniably proven false, the entire "myth" begins to crumble. This is precisely why they've gone to such great lengths to steer you away from this crucial point.

With this information in mind, how can 9-11 be dead, as Mike Ruppert asserts? How could we ever, in good conscience, turn our backs on this event and 'move forward' as Ruppert suggests? It would be a betrayal of the greatest magnitude. All I can say right now to Mike Ruppert is: you can close the door on 9-11 if you want to, but Lisa Guliani and I will never, until our last dying breath, leave this issue behind, and that's a promise.

MIKE RUPPERT'S PANHANDLING SCAM

By Victor Thorn

Mike Ruppert must think that people on the Internet are stupid, especially the "subscribers" to his *From the Wilderness* newsletter. In fact, he must think they're the most idiotic people on the face of the earth.

I mean, it's bad enough that Ruppert was run-out of the 9-11 Movement on a rail; that he's been proven to be a pawn of Big Oil via his cockamamie "peak oil" theories, and that he's regularly mocked, derided, and shown to be a liar on message boards all across the 'Net. Worse, numerous 9-11 researchers have unmistakably shown how Ruppert was put in place to deliberately distract everyone away from the WTC controlled demolition and other 9-11 crux issues.

But now Crazy Mike (and that's putting it mildly) has hit an all-time low. In his latest *FTW* newsletter, he's begging for money with such pathetic desperation that it's embarrassing to even read. Ruppert has fallen to such miserable depths that what little self-respect he was so desperately clinging to is now regrettably gone.

It seems Mike wants to move from Los Angeles to the Pacific Northwest; and he also wants to produce a new DVD.

But guess what. He doesn't want to pay for his move. He wants YOU to pay for it. Worse, guess who he wants to pay for the production of his next DVD? Himself. Hell no! He wants YOU to pay for it!

Now think about this peculiar notion for a moment. What if GM (which is also facing financial difficulties, like just about everyone else in America) sent a mass e-mail and said they wanted to produce a new car, but they wanted YOU to finance it. Of course they would pocket all the profits, and there was no mention whatsoever of profit-sharing. What would you think? You'd probably laugh your asses off, like I (and any other sane person) would.

But get this — Mike Ruppert wants YOU to pay to produce his video. Can you believe the unmitigated gall of this worm? Of course he throws in some scare tactics for good measure (about how we have to "prepare for the collapse"); and then Ruppert brags about how he's suckered people before into his little panhandling scheme. Once, in 2000, he "raised" \$11,000; then in 2003 he "raised" \$130,000 more. Not a bad little racket he has going, huh! I'm reminded of that song about "money for nothing."

But now, in Ruppert's own exact words, he tells us, "We need that much again and more."

Can you believe your eyes? In this lousy economy with families scraping to get by, Ruppert wants people to send him \$130,000+! I've never in my life witnessed such narcissistic arrogance. Hey Mike, have you ever considered getting a job like everyone else?

He continues, "I am not asking for loans." Of course not; he wants YOU to give him his money for free with no strings attached.

He then adds, "I am taking my own advice and refusing to go further in debt."

So let me get this straight. Ruppert doesn't want to go into debt; but to raise \$130,000 he wants YOU to go into debt! What a helluva nice guy, huh - always looking out for your best interests. I guess P.T. Barnum was right - there *is* a sucker born every minute because if there is even one person alive who'd fall for this scam, they'd surely have to have SUCKER written across their forehead.

Ruppert concludes this pathetic little ruse by declaring, "I cannot guarantee that we would be able to repay any loans anyway."

But wait a second. What about the profits from the DVD that he wants everyone to finance? Couldn't he repay them with those funds? Oh, wait a second, I forgot - Mike's going to use that dough to relocate himself (plus four other people and their families) to the Great Northwest. How foolish of me to forget.

But y'see, there's more to the story. Mike recently had a Summary Judgment leveled against him in L.A. County for \$5,072.00. This fine resulted from being taken to small claims court by a former employee. Now \$5,000 bucks ain't small change, and usually when ya reach this kind of fee, the judge wants some money or else he threatens you with the clanking of prison cell bars. Do you think Ruppert might want to use a little bit of YOUR money to pay-off the law man?

Furthermore, I recently quoted an e-mail from Elizabeth Pfeiffer (wife of former Ruppert employee Dale Pfeiffer) where she stated that Ruppert has been talking about the FBI extorting money from him.

Not only is the above assertion bizarre beyond words, but here is what else Ruppert talks about in his panhandling letter: *FTW* workers sabotaging his operations, troubles with the IRS, being shaken down as a burglary suspect, FBI "black bag jobs", money mysteriously appearing and disappearing from his bank account, retired FBI moles spying on him (isn't that a hoot), supposed

assassination threats originating from WING TV, surveillance on him in NYC and DC, how he was screwed out of a \$640,000 inheritance, how the NSA 'torpedoed' him out of \$11,000, and how he might have to seek refuge in a foreign country (whatever happened to Oregon)?

And all of the above was contained in a six-page e-mail! Hell, I was waiting for Ruppert to resurrect old con-man Delmar "Mike" Vreeland to add the final icing on the cake.

Anyway, I think you get the idea. The unleashed, unbridled paranoia running through this man's mind defies description. In fact, I think it's safe to say that he is stark-raving insane.

To close, all I can say is: if you want to join the sucker brigade and finance this man's panhandling scam, get out your checkbooks out and start scribbling. And don't forget to add a few extra "zeroes" to the end of the sum you're going to donate. After all, Mike needs all the dough he can get his greedy little hands on.

And by the way, while you're falling for this con-job ruse, all the rest of us will be laughing our asses off at you suckers! But don't think we're being heartless, because Lisa Guliani had a great idea. She said that all of us should send Ruppert our extra Deception Dollars, and I agree completely, for what could be a more blatant DECEPTION than this?

Nice try, Ruppert, but nobody's falling for it anymore.

ART BELL 9-11 OUTRAGE

By Victor Thorn

On the morning of Sunday, June 13, 2004, syndicated radio talk show host Art Bell betrayed, slapped in the face, and turned his back on every 9-11 researcher in this country (and the world). He did so by embarking on a venom-filled tirade where he called these truth-seekers "asinine," "reprehensible," "horrendous," and declared that they "didn't have a shred of proof" to substantiate their claims. Bell also made it known that he "couldn't believe elected officials would choose to kill thousands of its own citizens." Now, this isn't simply 'entertainment' as some have suggested. Rather, it is a direct attempt to influence millions of listeners and lead them in a direction that is contrary to some extremely well-researched evidence, and this is something I take very seriously.

The following day on WING TV we relayed these exact quotes, and the response from the 9-11 community, along with many others, was so overwhelming that it crashed our server. In addition, we received more feedback from this show than any other we have ever broadcast. The reaction was unanimous on every front: Art Bell is a phony, a sell-out, and a disinformation agent.

The following are a sampling of the responses that we received:

Viewer: Finally, somebody points out the obvious about Art Bell. He is a phony!!!! I think he was from the beginning. Bill Cooper wrote some interesting stuff about him too ... worth a read ...

Well-known activist: Not surprised are you really? He is a government mouthpiece and always has been.

Director of an online news service: Yeah, I heard the turd. He is just another propagandist. Noory seems better, but I fear he is simply there to cast doubts and to neutralize. Time will tell where he really stands.

The recipient of a recent review in the *American Free Press*: The reason why Art Bell is so huge is because he is one of them. They get the support so they can shout down any real investigators. Everything I have heard of Bell is that he is a farce in sheep's clothing. He best be shutting up.

Widely acclaimed author: This supports what we privately know about WHY the Art Bell show is such a hit, when in reality it is a pure bullshit propaganda radio machine for the NWO agenda. Eventually every criminal shows his face ... though from experience only about 25% who see it

actually identify the criminal.

9-11 author and researcher: The closer we get, the louder they'll yell.

9-11 investigator: Maybe I should offer to take him on, mano-a-mano!

In addition, we also received an e-mail from someone who said that he was the impetus for Art's diatribe: "I was the impetus for Art Bell's 9-11 conspiracy comments. On the Art Bell fan message board Fantastic Forum which Art frequently gives a nod to and obviously reads; I posted a thread critiquing his September denial. The thread caused a stir at the Fantastic Forum which I was quite surprised by. Apparently nobody had broached the subject at the forum before. The thread didn't last long, though, because the moderator deemed it too hot for the forum and didn't want poor Art to be critiqued. A few days after posting the September 11 thread, Art started railing against the 9-11 conspiracy. My post was definitely the reason Art made those comments."

Whether this statement is true is certainly open to debate, but I looked into the above-mentioned group and did indeed find page-after-page of material that confirmed this person's assertions. And even though I don't have the space to recount every message, the overwhelming sentiment can be summed-up by the following posts: "His publicly aired political views of late truly disturb me and seem extremely incongruent to the Art of the past," "I was surprised and baffled by Art's downright refusal to even entertain the subject... it just doesn't fit that he would flat-out ignore 9-11," and "something is up, something's wrong."

I could continue in this vein, but the big question at this point is: do we have a full-fledged disinformation artist on our hands? Or has Art simply sold-out his audience after signing-on with Clear Channel? Another possibility (albeit an unlikely one) is that Art Bell is simply uninformed. Now, I tend to doubt this scenario, for anyone who has listened to *Coast-to-Coast AM* knows that Art is one of the most well-read men in the country.

So, to give him the benefit of the doubt, and to also show that we're willing to play fair, we'll provide Art with a list of a dozen or so top-notch researchers who we are sure would love to enlighten him on his show. We will also send him copies of all the books we've written and published on this subject, including *The New World Order Exposed*, *The New World Order Illusion*, *9-11 Exposed*, *The Day America Died* by John Kaminski, and the soon-to-be-released *Where is Flight 77* by Ian Barksdale. Last but not least, if Art would like to discuss this matter in person with us, we are extending an open invitation for him to appear on WING TV - any time, any place.

So, Art, the ball is now in your court, and considering how 9-11 is the pivotal event of the 21st century, we feel that you need to further explain your views. As it stands now, what you have done to all the earnest, well-intentioned 9-11 researchers is inexcusable, for many of these people fall into an audience that has been your bread-and-butter and made you what you are today. More importantly, we aren't settling for the contrived mass media-government explanation of 9-11, especially since it has more holes in it than a block of Swiss cheese.

On a personal note, Art, I was one of the first 9-11 researchers in the country, and I've been saying for nearly three years now that if you had focused as much attention on this subject as you have on ghosts and shadow people, we would be a lot closer to exposing the crimes that were committed by a small cabal of psychopathic monsters inside and outside the government. You reach 9 million people in 550 markets, yet you've adamantly refused to pursue many of the underlying truths associated with this event. Why? Who are you protecting?

To close, last Sunday you threw down the gauntlet by making those caustic remarks about my fellow 9-11 researchers. Not only are you utterly wrong in your assertions, but you should also remember one very important point: sometimes when you bite that hand that feeds you, the people holding those hands bite back.

Art Bell's Response - June 17, 2004 (prior to the above article being written)

Just a quick note from Art Bell. How could I betray you when I was never with you in the first place? I am willing to entertain as many things as possible; however after a review of the evidence, I will NOT entertain the possibility that the U.S. Government killed its own people. The only OUTRAGE in my opinion is people like you who rush to take questions about a complex tragic event and turn them into so-called evidence. People like you who rush to think the nation of their birth and the best nation in the world (by measure of anyone well traveled) could do such a thing. My anonymity needs no protection because I am not ashamed of my opinion.

Art Bell

Victor Thorn's response

1) Art, not one of the above-mentioned individuals requested that their comments be "off-the-record". I elected to make them "anonymous" for one specific reason - to protect their privacy.

2) I certainly have not "rushed" to any conclusions regarding 9-11, for I, along with many others, have been painstakingly researching this subject for nearly three years now.

3) I agree with you completely that America is by far the greatest country in the world, and anyone who watches WING TV or reads my articles knows how much I support it. This is why we so adamantly want to know the truth about what happened on the morning of 9-11. One of the best ways to do this is by making ALL the information available in as many forums as possible. Open the doors and HELP US, Art, rather than closing them and blocking us out.

4) Lastly, I agree with you again that the vast majority of elected officials in the United States government would not deliberately kill their own citizens. But 9-11 wasn't planned, implemented, and covered-up by these individuals. Rather, it was executed by a small cabal of bloodthirsty lunatics inside and outside of our government. This point is crucial in understanding the 9-11 terror attacks.

ART BELL BURN IN HELL

By Victor Thorn

In mid-June, 2004, WING TV broadcast an episode called Art Bell 9-11 Outrage that received so many hits that it crashed our server. The topic of this show was some incendiary comments uttered by Mr. Bell on his *Coast to Coast AM* radio show where he called 9-11 researchers and truth-seekers "asinine," "reprehensible," and horrendous." He also added that those who didn't slavishly believe the official government/mainstream media version of 9-11 "didn't have a shred of proof" to substantiate their claims.

Following this broadcast, I began a correspondence with Art; my ultimate intent being to get some credible, hard-hitting 9-11 material into his hands that would contradict the lies being perpetrated by our current administration, corporate-controlled news puppets, and the 9-11 whitewash committee. To his credit, Art Bell agreed to take a look at these documents.

Thus, on June 21, 2004 I mailed a package to Art that included:

9-11 Exposed by Victor Thorn, which is highlighted by *Bombs in the World Trade Center* - Scott Forbes firsthand account of how the WTC towers were powered-down and laced with explosives. A must read.

The Day America Died by Florida-based researcher John Kaminski.

9-11: The Great Illusion, a fantastic video from George Humphreys, author of *Uncommon Sense*.

The New World Order Exposed, which contains some of the first 9-11 accounts ever written that contradict the official 9-11 version.

The New World Order Illusion by Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani.

In addition, I told Art that if he so desired, I would also send in the near future some publications that were not yet in my possession at that time, including:

Where is Flight 77 by Ian Barksdale, which shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that there was zero possibility that a Boeing 757 struck the Pentagon on the morning of 9-11.

Painful Deceptions and **Painful Questions** by Eric Hufschmid.

The New Pearl Harbor by theologian David Ray Griffin.

Inside Job: Unmasking the 9/11 Conspiracies by best-selling author Jim Marrs.

Regrettably, since mailing these publications, I have yet to hear one word from Art Bell, despite the fact that I have now sent him at least half-a-dozen e-mails (four of them within the past week). I know that Art received these e-mails, for none bounced back; and I also know that Art isn't on vacation, for he appeared in his regular slot over the weekend on *Coast to Coast*.

So, the big question now is: what is Art Bell so afraid of? Why has he absolutely failed to bring the above-mentioned alternative 9-11 information to his listeners' attention; or that of others such as Daniel Hopsicker, Barry Zwicker, Thierry Meyssan, and Michael Chossudovsky? In fact, if Art had legitimately and earnestly begun reporting the TRUTH concerning 9-11 from day one, I guarantee that millions of people around the world would have viewed this horrendous event in an entirely different light.

But instead, Art has done nothing but trumpet the government/corporate media's party line, and in my eyes this makes him the worst kind of phony possible - one that purports to be one thing, yet is nothing more than a shill for the establishment devils that pulled-off this ghastly act. The biggest question is: why? Who is pulling Art's strings to prevent him from relaying this vital 9-11 information?

The answer may be found in some of Art's e-mails to me where he said that 9-11 researchers don't have any PROOF of government/New World Order complicity in these attacks. But as I pointed-out to him, there is such a preponderance of evidence which directly contradicts the official version that it makes their story look like a huge block of Swiss cheese. Plus, even more importantly, the physical evidence at both the WTC and Pentagon was immediately carted away within hours by the government's damage control teams. These actions were criminal, and very deliberately executed to cover their tracks.

But the most disappointing and inexcusable aspect of Art Bell's stance is his cowardly refusal to debate this material MAN-TO-MAN. On his radio show he made some explosive comments that were an overt slap-in-the-face to many honest, selfless, hard-working researchers who want nothing more than the truth. Yet when faced with the evidence that I sent him, Art cringes and hides like a spineless, yellow-bellied worm.

Thus, Mr. Bell, until you reveal the whole story about 9-11 to your listening audience and expose those monsters that were implicit in it, this message (or curse) will haunt you like a shadow: an especially brutal damnation which extends

through eternity awaits those who directly deny the truth to others. In this same vein, a very wise man once said: The truth shall set you free. So, Art, I hope you've accepted your fate - one of shackles and chains that will enslave you throughout the remainder of time because there are no lower human beings than those who refuse to allow others to see through the veil of deception.

Burn in Hell, Art Bell.

ART BELL SELLS OUT

By Victor Thorn

As many people know, Art Bell created a firestorm on the morning of June 13, 2004 by declaring that 9-11 truth-seekers were "asinine," "reprehensible," "horrendous," and that they "didn't have a shred of proof." In the ensuing two months since that outburst, I have corresponded with Art Bell numerous times via e-mail, and eventually sent him a box of books and videotapes (which he agreed to receive). My only intent throughout our interaction was as such: I wanted Art Bell to tell me where our research was faulty, especially when there is such a preponderance of evidence showing that the government/mainstream media's version of events surrounding that horrible morning has more holes in it than a block of Swiss cheese.

On July 28, 2004, WING TV aired an Art Bell 9-11 Outrage video, along with an article I wrote entitled *Art Bell: Burn in Hell*. Then, on August 3, 2004 I e-mailed Art, asking: "When are you going to come clean about 9-11? Who has their hold on you? Please, speak out - tell the truth and let's expose these bastards once and for all. If anything at all matters to you on this planet or in this existence, you should throw all caution to the wind and expose them. Truth matters, Art ... show us that it matters to you too."

In responding to this note, Art showed his true colors by writing, "Are these really your words, or the little voices in your head?"

Can you see what Art is doing? He's using the oldest trick in the book that EVERY corporate-controlled media hack in the world uses - he marginalized us, just like Rush Limbaugh, Dan Rather, or *Time* magazine would do. It's the same exact tactic! Thus, Art none-too-subtly lumped every 9-11 researcher in the same category as black helicopters, Bigfoot, alien abductees, and the *National Enquirer*. Instead of seriously considering our evidence and maturely discussing it, he used the same techniques as the mainstream bought-out corporate media uses - he marginalized us to the edge while intentionally ignoring the facts.

My reply on August 4, 2004 was as follows: "Art, considering the importance of 9-11, why would you respond to me in the exact same fashion as those in the mainstream media - by marginalizing this subject and making a mockery of it? How very sad, and in all honesty, how pathetic. How old are you, Art? In your 50s? I would think you'd be a bit more mature. Maybe not. I seriously think you need to grow up, my friend. Anyway, let's cut through all the crap. How about I send you ten questions about 9-11 — inconsistencies, if you will — and you can respond to them and try to explain the many holes in the government/mainstream

media's version of events. Let's do this MAN TO MAN, Art. Are you up for it, or are you still going to keep playing games?"

Art responded later that day: "I let my listeners listen to your cute little video. I will not play ten or twenty questions with you. Please go bug somebody else."

But this isn't the only time Art has marginalized us or avoided questions regarding 9-11. Someone I'll call R.J. forwarded this e-mail that he sent to Art Bell on August 6, 2004, with the following message in the subject line: ART CRINGES AND HIDES LIKE A SPINELESS, YELLOW-BELLIED WORM: "So Art, why don't you just disseminate the truth about 9-11 sent to you by Victor Thorn from "Wing TV" and let your audience draw their own conclusions?! What are you afraid of? Or should I ask, who are you afraid of????!!!"

Art responded once again by using the same old tried-and-true tactic of avoidance and marginalization: "Not afraid of anybody, save kooks, nuts and well, you know ... those little voices!"

After reading these words, I was reminded of a piece entitled TWENTY-FIVE RULES OF DISINFORMATION written by the contributing editor of *Defense Watch*, Ralph Omholt:

Here is entry # 1: "Regardless of what you know, don't discuss it - especially if you are a public figure, news anchor, etc. If it's not reported, it didn't happen, and you never have to deal with the issues."

In addition, here is entry # 5: "Sidetrack opponents with name calling and ridicule. This is also known as the 'attack the messenger' ploy, though other methods qualify as variants of that approach. Associate opponents with unpopular titles such as "kooks," "right-wing," "liberal," "left-wing," "terrorists," "conspiracy buffs," "radicals," "militia," "racists," "religious fanatics," and so forth. This makes others shrink from support out of fear of gaining the same label, and you avoid dealing with the issues."

Don't these two passages perfectly describe what Art Bell is doing? There is no other conclusion that we can now reach - Art Bell is a disinformation specialist supreme!

Anyway, since Art Bell refuses to directly answer my 9-11 questions, what I'm going to do is lay them out on the Internet so that each and every one of you can turn up the heat and forward them to Art at: artbell@mindspring.com

TEN QUESTIONS ART BELL REFUSES TO ANSWER

By Victor Thorn

QUESTION ONE - The Pentagon: The government contends that Flight 77 - a Boeing 757 - struck the ground floor of the Pentagon, completely entered the building; then disintegrated due to intense heat from the explosion. Yet photographs of the initial hole in the northwest wall show it to be only 18 feet in diameter. This poses a problem, for a Boeing 757's wingspan is 124' 10" across, while it measures 44' 6" from the ground to the tip of its tail. How could this massive airliner fit through an 18' hole, especially when the windows on each side of the initial hole, as well as on top of it survived the crash and were unbroken? In addition, the front lawn of the Pentagon was photographed as completely untouched directly following the crash, with no tire marks, scorch marks, ruts, or burn marks. It practically looked like a putting green, yet the plane struck on the GROUND FLOOR. Last but not least, a Boeing 757 weighs 65 tons. The government contends that all the wreckage, including the tempered steel and galvanized aluminum it was made of, was vaporized into thin air; yet the Pentagon's infrastructure did not vaporize, while some of the deceased Pentagon employees were identified by their fingerprints! So, human flesh doesn't vaporize, but metal and aluminum do? Please explain.

QUESTION TWO - WORLD TRADE CENTER BUILDING # 7: Larry Silverstein, owner of the World Trade Center complex, admitted during a September 2002 PBS documentary entitled *America Rebuilds* that he ordered WTC #7 to be destroyed via a controlled demolition late on the afternoon of 9-11. Building 7 was not even struck by an airplane, and only had a miniscule fire inside it which was contained to one floor. When was this building wired for demolition - on the afternoon of 9-11 when pandemonium ensued throughout Manhattan, or beforehand? In addition, who specifically were the people who wired the building, whether on 9-11 or beforehand?

QUESTION THREE - WORLD TRADE CENTER TOWERS: The government/mainstream media version of events contends that the Twin Towers collapsed due to intense heat created by fire. Yet it takes a temperature of 2795 degrees to melt the type of construction-grade steel used to build the WTC, while jet fuel only burns at a maximum temperature of 1472 degrees. Also, all of the jet fuel that spilled from the airliners burned-up within a matter of 1-2 minutes. Thirdly, never in the history of the world has a steel building collapsed due to fire, including those which burned for infinitely longer periods of time with much more intense flames. Fourthly, the South Tower was struck 17 minutes after the North

Tower, had most of the fuel from the jet splash outside the building, and burned at a much slower pace. Yet it fell 30 minutes before the North Tower. How can this highly improbable (not to mention physically impossible) scenario be explained? Lastly, when we bring physics into the equation and put to use a scientific formula to calculate how long it takes a structure to do a resistance-free gravity fall from top to bottom ($H=1/2 at^2$), we would find that the WTC towers would drop in approximately nine seconds - which is exactly how long it took both of them to fall. How can this phenomenon be explained, considering all the massive columns, floors, walls, and equipment inside each tower that would provide considerable resistance? Also, just out of curiosity, explain the pool of molten steel that burned seven-stories beneath ground level at both towers for 5-6 weeks after 9-11? Did this also derive from the miniscule amount of jet fuel that that burned out in 1-2 minutes?

QUESTION FOUR - HIJACKERS STILL ALIVE: Five of the 19 men purported to have been suicide hijackers on the morning of 9-11 have been verifiably proven to still be alive and well. FIVE OF THEM. In addition, not one Arab name was found on any of the passenger records for any of the four hijacked airliners on the morning of 9-11. How do we account for these discrepancies?

QUESTION FIVE - LACK OF PILOTING SKILLS: While on the subject of 'hijackers,' there is an overwhelming amount of first-hand testimony presented by the flight instructors who gave lessons to the supposed pilots at the schools they attended prior to 9-11. While acting as pilots-in-training, they were unanimously characterized as incompetent, inept, and without the mechanical skills to even operate an automobile, let alone an airplane. These instructors also stated that these men were utterly incapable of performing the highly complex maneuvers utilized on 9-11. How could these men - Afghanistani cave-dwellers - who were nicknamed "Dumb and Dumber," miraculously be able to execute moves that were only achievable by the upper Top Gun elite of our Air Force?

QUESTION SIX - MILITARY STAND-DOWN: From September, 2000 to June, 2001, the Pentagon launched fighter jets 67 times to intercept wayward planes. In fact, a very rigid set of rules, procedures, and protocol has been in place for years that have to be lawfully followed whenever any type of aircraft strays off its course or is hijacked. Within the past decade, and every day after 9-11, these procedures have been followed to a T, and have not been corrupted or ignored. Yet on the morning of 9-11, on FOUR separate occasions, this system fell apart beyond comprehension. In fact, from the time the FAA discovered that the first plane had been hijacked until the Pentagon was struck - a total of 84 MINUTES had elapsed. On top of that, the Pentagon houses the NMCC (National Military Command Center), and possesses anti-aircraft and missile installations; yet none of these protective devices were activated or used - even after EVERYONE knew

that the WTC towers had been attacked. This outrage so far exceeds mere incompetence that author David Ray Griffin wrote, "The attacks could not have succeeded unless some U.S. officials had given stand-down orders for standard operating procedures to be cancelled on that particular day." How are all of these curious anomalies explained?

QUESTION SEVEN - FLIGHT 93: Wreckage from Flight 93 that was downed in Pennsylvania was strewn over an area stretching for eight miles from the crash site. Is this physically possible from a mere plane wreck, or was this flight shot from the sky, thus leaving a trail of parts (some of the pieces weighing over 1000 pounds) for eight miles?

QUESTION EIGHT - 9/11 WAR GAMES: On the morning of 9-11, the CIA's National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), headed by John Fulton, was performing test exercise 'war games' where jet planes were to be flown into buildings. In addition, NORAD was also conducting an exercise called Vigilant Warrior. Why hasn't the American public been told about these tests, and why has nearly every member of the Bush administration stated that they could have never conceived of airplanes hitting buildings where there have been numerous government studies documenting this very subject (with Donald Rumsfeld being well aware of all of them)? Lastly, if the FAA, NORAD, and NMCC were all 'confused' on the morning of 9-11 as to whether these exercises were tests or the real thing, how did the 'hijackers' coincidentally know which day to select for their attacks?

QUESTION NINE - 9/11 PRE-KNOWLEDGE: While the subject of pre-knowledge is on the table, when President Bush was whisked-out of the infamous Florida classroom where he read a book about goats, it was revealed that the 'terrorists' had obtained top secret codes for the White House and Air Force One. The NSA's top secret Echelon surveillance system had also been cracked; while the CEO of Israel's Odigo Instant Messaging service admitted that text messages warning of the 9-11 attacks had been transmitted two hours before the WTC had been struck. Further, the short-selling of stocks relating to insider information for both American and United Airlines can be directly traced back to the CIA's Buzzy Krongard. Are we to believe that 19 cave-dwellers in Afghanistan had the capabilities to derive this inside information, and why hasn't the CIA (which uses Echelon and Promis software to monitor such stock trading) revealed who was behind the highly suspect short-selling of stocks?

QUESTION TEN - REMOVAL OF EVIDENCE: Finally, if you want direct evidence, why don't you question why the government immediately hauled-away all of the physical evidence from the World Trade Center without even a cursory inspection from FEMA, fire inspectors, or the FBI, which is a direct violation of every ethic and law concerning a crime scene? Also, why did the government

immediately bring in wrecking balls to destroy the Pentagon's facade, while at the same time removing every piece of evidence without inspection? In addition, why did they immediately tear up the lawn in front of the Pentagon (which revealed no tire, burn, or scorch marks)? Why did the FBI retrieve every videotape from a variety of gas stations and locales surrounding the Pentagon; then refuse to make them public? Further, why has the Pentagon only released five frames of videotape from the attacks that THEY filmed? Why not the entire film for public scrutiny and review? Likewise, why won't the FAA make available tape recordings made by air traffic controllers on the morning of 9-11 that contradict the official cover-story?

CONCLUSION: Art, due to the length of these questions, I did not provide any corroborating source material for you to verify these statements. But if you wish, I will immediately provide for you (without delay) the necessary footnotes and resources for you to fact-check each and every detail.

On the morning of June 13, 2004 you made an outrageous, unfounded statement that 9-11 truth-seekers were asinine, reprehensible, horrendous, and didn't have a shred of proof. The ball is now in your court, Mr. Bell - are you man enough to back-up your words (as I have), or will you continue to hide behind your microphone and shrink from your responsibility as a broadcaster and American to give us the truth? Millions of your listeners and readers are awaiting your response.

ME, ART BELL, & 9-11

By Lisa Guliani

On Saturday, March 5th, 2005 I called Art Bell's *Coast to Coast AM* late-night radio talk-radio program - at least 50 times. I got through to Art once, at approximately 1:45 am. God must have intervened because it's very difficult to get Art on the phone nowadays, especially when the theme of his show is going to be debunking 9-11 conspiracies. In addition to calling Art on the telephone, I also fast-blasted him numerous times and sent him several regular emails with questions for Ben Chertoff, research editor of *Popular Mechanics*. I had quite a few talking points I wanted Art's guest to address - like this one:

Explain the pools of molten steel burning 70 feet below street level for 100 days after 9-11. Since we know the jet fuel burnt off within a couple of minutes and jet fuel fires cannot even come close to the temperatures it takes to create a molten or liquid state in steel, then how do you explain this? This is addressed at length in *9-11 on Trial* by Victor Thorn. FEMA's report even stated that the WTC fires burned at, or below temperatures in a typical office fire. So, if we know that hydrocarbon fires can only reach a maximum temperature of 1517 degrees Fahrenheit, how could they possibly have melted this steel, when the melting point of steel is 2,795 degrees and the boiling point of steel (when it becomes a molten liquid) is 5,182 degrees Fahrenheit.

The existence of these burning pools of molten steel was confirmed by:

- Mark Lorieux of Controlled Demolition, Inc
- Peter Tully, President of Tully Construction
- and the *American Free Press* newspaper

Please explain where these molten pools of steel came from, because hydrocarbon fires are not going to burn in an oxygen-starved environment as these underground fires did.

Art actually answered the phone when I called in during that first hour. I was calling too early, he said. His guest had not yet been introduced. I still laid out the above issue, and also mentioned that the official version of the WTC collapses defy both Galileo's Law of Falling Bodies, and also Isaac Newton's First Law of Motion. He suggested I fast blast him with the information to help him remember it. So I did. In fact, I emailed him many times, with different talking points and pertinent scientific questions about 9-11. I made a concerted effort to be concise, succinct, to stay on-point, and use no "conspiracy theory". I kept my finger on the speed-dial for four hours, alternating between the three phone numbers he

provides for listeners to call in to his show. A few times, I heard the phone ringing, but Art never picked up. Instead, after MANY rings, a recorded voice terminated the call. The rest of my call-in attempts for the duration of the show were unsuccessful.

I made a point of depriving myself of sleep not merely to listen to Art Bell's program tonight, but to actively participate and engage in some serious, scientific dialogue with both he and Ben Chertoff. I waited and waited for him to broach the subject matter I had laid on the table in the first hour. Bell conveniently failed to do so, even though my numerous emails and fast-blasts must have constituted a nice chunk of his inbox. He never touched the points I made to him earlier in the show - but instead allowed his listeners to be subjected to some of the most ludicrous, imbecilic, incomplete disinformation I've heard since the "hologram theory" first made its debut. Chertoff and Bell had a helluva time disparaging and marginalizing 9/11 "conspiracy researchers," and he made no bones about telling everyone how "angry" he was to be labeled a traitor by a number of people in his audience. Art himself gives legs to conspiracies such as crop circles, extra terrestrials and shadow people, and appears to embrace such "entertaining" conspiracies with a level of attention and seriousness that is apparently more 'worthy' of serious thought than those of us who pose intelligent questions about the government's official version of what happened on 9-11. In fact, Bell has allowed many of his past callers to ramble on incessantly about ghostly experiences or stories about seeing dead people - but tonight, he cut me off about 9-11 after just a very few minutes and never followed up on my questions with his guest. Despite the impression he gave (that he would address my points with Ben Chertoff), Art never bothered to utter a word once his guest was in the hotbox.

The more Chertoff spoke, the more I realized that the team of *Popular Mechanics* "experts" had absolutely failed to research the most salient issues regarding not only the WTC tower collapses, but also the anomalies surrounding the Pentagon strike and what happened to Flight 93. I found myself asking aloud how Chertoff could possibly have consulted with so many so-called "experts," and then subsequently present such lopsided unconvincing explanations to the public. When the matter of WTC steel was raised, Chertoff said that the steel was "weakened" by the heat of the fires in the towers, which we were told burned at approximately 1800 degrees F. Absolute rubbish! The maximum temperature that hydrocarbon fires will burn is 1517 degrees, but the WTC fires never burned hot enough nor long enough in order to attain this temp on 9/11. Chertoff was talking about the plasticity of steel. So my fast blast to Art said the following:

"At 1022 degrees, steel reaches a point of elasticity, and at 1320 degrees it attains plasticity. Elasticity means that when the steel is bent, it returns to its original shape and will spring back. Plasticity means that the steel is permanently

deformed and does not return to its original shape. The steel would have had to be heated to 1320 degrees to be weakened to 20% of its original strength. Since the fires did not reach any of the critical temperatures needed to melt the steel - and didn't even come close to these temps, how could the buildings collapse due to plasticity? The towers were rated to bear five times their rated strength. Even if the steel was reduced to 60% of its rated strength, it would still be able to support three-times its rated strength and would not have been weakened sufficiently to cause the collapses. The core columns were robust structures of steel and concrete. If the towers collapsed due to plane impacts and subsequent fires, then the 47 steel/concrete core columns should have been left standing. Remember, the damage to the towers was NOT uniform and the fires did not burn uniformly."

I would have loved to get Ben Chertoff to answer the many questions I had waiting for him, but regrettably, every single email and fast blast was in vain. Art and Ben were apparently having more fun diminishing the work of independent 9-11 researchers and mischaracterizing the whole lot as "off their nut". Rather than selecting the most intelligent talking points and laying them on the table, Bell chose instead to accept his guest's explanations as accurately "etched-in-stone," when in fact, they are not. A number of callers did manage to get through, and almost none of them were buying Chertoff's asinine assertions. He was pressed about the annoying little fact that several of the 9/11 hijackers have been found to be alive when they're allegedly dead (at least according to the government). In response, he replied that this is an unsubstantiated rumor which started with a BBC report, yet failed to mention the meticulous research of David Ray Griffin, which presents credible evidence that many of the so-called "dead" suicide hijackers are indeed still alive in other countries. Chertoff tells the audience that his team didn't really get into investigating that part of the story. Why not?

Another caller broached the subject of government foreknowledge of 9-11 and how certain officials were warned not to fly. We must add this to the "gray area" because *Popular Mechanics* failed to look into this as well, and Chertoff could not even remotely answer the question. Callers continued to back him into a corner as the night wore on, despite Bell's official 9-11 government ass-kissing and his ongoing snide commentary, repeatedly referring to conspiracy theorists as "wing-nuts".

The topic of the Pentagon strike was also presented, and here we all got to witness some really blatant lying on the part of Chertoff. My fingers were burning into my keyboard and phone pad as I listened to him spout off that Flight 77 actually hit the Pentagon, and the subsequent shinola about damage to the Pentagon lawn. Excuse me, Mr. Chertoff - what damage might this be? Are we looking at the same photos? Where exactly are the scorch-and-burn marks you're talking about? Whose lawn is he looking at? Chertoff's Pentagon non-explanations were so

outlandish, it's no wonder people have an easier time believing in shadow people. The *Popular Mechanics* editor casually cited evidence of plane wreckage and bodies of victims at the crash scene. Hello? Bodies? What bodies? Are we examining the same crime scene? Mr. Chertoff, could you please point out to me even ONE dead body found at the Pentagon on 9/11? Who's "off their nut" here?

Still another caller pointed to the five frames of video footage which have been the subject of intense scrutiny over the last few years - you know, the doctored frames with the incorrect date stamp that do not show any jetliner? Again, we were told by Chertoff that this is terrain that the "experts" of *Popular Mechanics* have yet to traverse. What are they waiting for - a formal invitation? Furthermore, he sidestepped around the FBI's utter failure to release the videotapes seized from surrounding entities like the Citgo gas station, Sheraton Hotel, Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles, and the Pentagon's own videos. According to the sputtering Chertoff, this is understandable because the Pentagon strike is still under official investigation. No kidding - an "official" investigation, huh? Wow, who could tell? I really wanted to ask him what his "team" had discovered regarding the Pentagon jetliner in light of the fact that the FBI first said the entire plane had vaporized, and then did a complete 180 and later said that they have reconstructed nearly all of the aircraft and are storing it in an FBI hangar. Has Chertoff, or any of his crack investigative team, examined this alleged evidence? The only time I ever hear this subject brought up is among independent investigators and researchers. Not surprisingly, it wasn't discussed on Art Bell's show.

Chertoff must be privy to some inside scoops the rest of us aren't worthy to know, although he seemed rather clueless about his own family tree. Perhaps the most laughable claim made by Chertoff during this broadcast was his unconvincing dismissal when questioned about his familial tie to Michael Chertoff, the new homeland security czar. You see, it's now known that Ben is Michael Chertoff's cousin (surprise, surprise!) according to Christopher Bollyn of the *American Free Press* newspaper. Bollyn's letter was sarcastically read aloud by Bell during the broadcast, during which time Bell also took a jab at Jeff Rense, labeling Rense's website as "anti-Semitic." I guess Art had the time to fire off pot shots at independent researchers like Victor Thorn, but didn't have time to address important inconsistencies in the official government version of 9/11. What a sad, unnecessary waste of valuable time, Art. Chertoff's response to this newly "discovered" family link? He didn't even know (until now) that Michael Chertoff just happens to be his cousin. Sure, Ben. We believe that one.

Apparently, his "team" also didn't bother to investigate the mysterious stock put-options that took place just prior to September 11, 2001, or the fact that the government scenario regarding the WTC collapses defies the laws of nature, even

though we "conspiracy theorists" have been focusing on this material for more than three years now and drawing increasing public attention to these matters. Why would *Popular Mechanics* fail to examine the most credible arguments and glaring inconsistencies with the official story and choose, instead, to shine a spotlight on selective and often less relevant, weaker conspiracies surrounding 9/11? After all, the experts at *Popular Mechanics* have Victor Thorn's book, *9-11 On Trial*. Again, do they need a formal written invitation? Well, we sent them one via the U.S. Postal Service. Will they decide to do a follow-up addressing the conclusions in this work, or will they refuse to "go there?"

This show proved one thing to me last night, and hopefully it proved something to many of you listeners out there: Art Bell is not about TRUTH. He's about chasing tails, spinning yarns, and creative storytelling. His abject willingness (not to mention ability) to ignore facts that are right in his FACE never ceases to amaze me. How disillusioning it must be for all his groupies, because all Bell is doing with respect to 9-11 is simply taking everybody for yet another ride. This is evidenced by his propensity to peddle sloppy half-baked research, poorly investigated claims, and absolute garbage as truth rather than deal with the topic honestly. I'm also not buying into his phony self-righteous indignation, either. It's no wonder the public has barraged him with scathing criticisms and angry accusations over his failure to confront the status quo and rise above it. For all intents and purposes, Bell has effectively shown his hand as a government shill once and for all, which hardly surprises me. Last night, he had the chance to show millions of listeners around the world what he's made of- and he most certainly did, without question. His repetitive mantra of "I don't believe for ONE SECOND that the government had anything to do with this," simply amplifies the obvious: Bell refuses to play hardball with the government while he continues lobbing softballs at his audience. Art seems to have an aversion to taking a serious look at all the real scientific facts and serious inconsistencies with many aspects of 9/11, for whatever reason. I hope the payoff is well worth the choice he's made.

Likewise, Ben Chertoff (Art's guest) is either largely uninformed, incompetent to take on the task of speaking to these issues, or he too is akin to the paid pundits we see on our nightly television news networks. This would hardly be a revelation to me, considering that the Hearst Corporation doesn't exactly have a reputation for dealing in honest journalism. Moreover, the Hearst Corporation is better known for its outright lies of the past more than anything else. I'm kind of surprised that one of these gentlemen didn't bother to throw in an alien sighting for good measure, just for kicks. That certainly would have had more plausibility than the propaganda-tripe Chertoff regurgitated (at Bell's invitation) to a rather huge late-night global audience.

Finally, I was inundated with emails from people I know who also listened in during this show, and they forwarded to me copies of fast blasts they sent to Art during the program, which he obviously never bothered to take the time to address. Shame on you, Art. You ARE a coward. Maybe Amy Goodman and Mike Gallagher will move over and give you a seat in the SHILL VIP box. I have just one more question for the King of "Coast to Coast": When do we get our turn, Art?

OPEN LETTER **TO GEORGE NOORY**

By Lisa Guliani

I've heard that *Coast to Coast AM* plans on taking another crack at the 9-11 issue with a roundtable discussion sometime in the near future. If true, I think it is of the utmost importance that George Noory includes Victor Thorn and myself to talk about the information in *9-11 on Trial*. Considering the recent Benjamin Chertoff/*Popular Mechanics* debacle, it's time to bring some heavy-hitters onto the scene that don't mince words and who will give your listeners something they can sink their teeth into. Let's face it, George: people are tired of disinformation and the endless chain-jerking schtick that parades as news. In this sense, you cannot have a complete discussion of 9-11 if you fail to include the research contained in *9-11 on Trial*. It's as simple as that.

As a matter of fact, no other book on the market today so clearly disproves the government's "official" version of events, or presents such undeniable proof of direct U.S. government involvement in the World Trade Center tower collapses. Even Ben Chertoff's team of "70 experts" would find themselves spinning their wheels trying to negate Galileo and Isaac Newton. This is the most dangerous book in America right now. Do you know why? Because it systematically and categorically proves that the WTC towers could not have collapsed the way the government says they did. And it does so by using physics, mathematical formulas, rock-solid scientific equations, physical evidence, expert testimony, and FEMA's own reports.

George, you've had a copy of *9-11 on Trial* for two months now, so you're well aware that the towers were brought down by controlled demolitions rather than from the airliner impacts or their subsequent jet fuel fires. We can't imagine you'd want your listeners to actually BELIEVE the lies they've been told for the last 3 1/2 years, would you? After all, we're talking about the most traumatic event to ever occur on American soil in our nation's history - the mass-murder of nearly 3,000 innocent citizens! In this sense, if you're going to give people the goods, then do it for real. Americans far and wide can handle the truth, and we know they're ready to hear it.

Victor Thorn and I very much look forward to appearing on your show and getting the word out on these matters, so please don't shut the door on us. *9-11 on Trial* taps into the best research ever done on this subject (including the work of Eric Hufschmid, Jim Hoffman & Don Paul, Christopher Bollyn, David Ray Griffin, Jim Marrs, Dave McGowan, plus Jerry Russell & Richard Stanley), and our

inclusion in this roundtable could prove to be an historic, unforgettable event. And in all honesty, George, you've had other people in the past talk about 9-11 on your show; but what did it change? What results were achieved? If we're not aiming for **a complete paradigm shift** in the way we view 9-11, then why bother? On the other hand, we guarantee you and your listeners some of the most riveting talk radio ever heard on the airwaves. No serious discussion of this subject can take place without including the key aspects of Victor Thorn's book.

George, we know this whole government b.s. story doesn't sit well with you, and we have vitally important things that need to be heard by millions of people everywhere. Likewise, you realize that too much time has already been wasted on the perpetuation of massive public deception. It's time to lay all our cards on the table and let people hear the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Mr. Noory, we're the real thing, and the truth matters to us. We hope it matters to you, too. Please include us in your upcoming roundtable discussion, because if we're not there, it will be glaringly apparent for all to see that something is definitely awry.

I look forward to hearing from you.

COAST-TO-COAST AM

9-11 ROUNDTABLE

By Victor Thorn

On Thursday, June 16, 2005, George Noory is going to host a roundtable on his Clear Channel-controlled syndicated *Coast-to-Coast AM* radio show. The official theme will be a discussion of "whether Muslims acted alone on 9-11, or not," with Jerry Corsi and Peter Lance supporting the government's "official" version of events, while David Ray Griffin and Alex Jones provide counter-arguments.

One 9-11 commentator has already written that, "This show's not reliable; the debate will be a sham," and as it stands right now, I'm tending to agree with this sentiment. Why? Well, first we need to remember that *Coast-to-Coast AM* is owned by Establishment media powerhouse Clear Channel (*Clear Channel Privacy Policy*): therefore an extremely urgent question comes to mind: does Clear Channel want the absolute truth about 9-11 to emerge, or do they want to perpetuate the government's ruse? The answer is obvious, because if Art Bell and George Noory had been legitimate truth-seekers instead of Company Men, they would have devoted a significant portion of their lives (as so many others of us have done) to destroying the Bush administration's smokescreen-illusion.

Stated differently, 9-11 was an act of State-sponsored terrorism; yet we have Art Bell actually supporting Benjamin Chertoff's *Popular Mechanics* 9-11 propaganda article. Worse, while 9-11 researchers and activists were screaming bloody murder about Bell's atrocious, inexcusable actions, Alex Jones refused to say one negative word about him. In fact, Jones even went so far as to chastise callers to his show who were critical of Bell. Why? Why would Alex Jones go so far out of his way to protect a man [Art Bell] who is so deserving of our wrath and scorn? The answer is simple: Jones knew he would be "used" again in the future, and if he denounced Bell's show as blatant propaganda, then people would ask him why he's appearing on a show that is an obvious tool of the government. So, to compensate, he simply deflected attention away from Art Bell, just like a good Company Man would do! From my perspective, this is nothing more than Company Man A (Alex Jones) protecting Company Man B (Art Bell).

On the other hand, a few other Company Men in the "alternative radio" business are trying to paint an equally deceptive picture of *Coast-to-Coast AM*. Y'see, they're saying that Art Bell has sold-out, but that George Noory is still legitimate. Such a portrayal, though, is a ruse, because remember - Noory and Bell both work for Clear Channel. In essence, then, what we have is a **good cop/bad cop** routine taking place right before our very eyes where Noory fills one role, while Bell

assumes the other. How does it feel to be bamboozled yet again by these Company Men?

In addition, we need to hearken back to an article Lisa Guliani and I wrote entitled **GCN an ABC Affiliate** where radio talk-show host Alex Merklinger was mentioned. The following excerpt should be of vital interest to everyone:

A few years ago, Merklinger was approached by Clear Channel to host a syndicated radio talk show. The money they offered to him was substantial, and he would be heard all over the country. There was only one drawback. In Clear Channel's contract, they clearly stated that they had complete editorial control over Merklinger's content and guests. In other words, they were the ones who determined whether or not a subject or personality was too controversial for the airwaves.

To his credit, Merklinger turned down their offer, and now he does his own independent radio show. But think for a moment about Art Bell and George Noory. They're both employed by Clear Channel, and they're forced to abide by the very same editorial control rules as those presented to Alex Merklinger. Now can you see why certain guests never appear on *Coast-to-Coast AM*?"

Lastly, we need to realize precisely how much money it takes to buy these individuals off. When Art Bell appeared in the State of Tennessee's 20th Judicial District Court on November 19, 1999, he revealed (among many other things) in his testimony the vast amount of money he was being paid for doing *Coast-to-Coast AM* (See Art Bell Lawsuit pages 28-32).

As you can tell, the numbers are quite significant, and Art Bell was so resistant to these figures being released that he threatened legal action against the individual who forwarded the transcript to me. Now is it clear why Bell has aligned himself with the 9-11 debunking cabal? Likewise, when we follow the money, how much more evidence do we need to determine that Clear Channel is pulling the strings of both Art Bell and George Noory?

Now do you think this "debate" will be completely on the up-and-up? Face it: Art Bell is an establishment Company Man. George Noory is also an establishment Company Man. And now, guess who they've "selected" to be one of their "controlled opposition" 9-11 representatives at the June 16 roundtable - GCN Company Man and censorship king Alex Jones - the very same individual who has done everything humanly possible to squash all information on **9-11 on Trial**, the definitive book on the WTC's controlled demolition. Are things beginning to seem a bit too "managed" for you? Additionally, Alex Jones was the only person

we know of who went to great lengths to deflect all criticism away from Art Bell when he sold the entire 9-11 movement down the tubes by lauding *Popular Mechanics'* Benjamin Chertoff - cousin of Homeland Security Director Michael Chertoff. And now, guess who was hand-selected to "represent" the 9-11 truth movement for Bell's protege - George Noory? Yup, you guessed it - none other than Alex Jones!

Is this whole "roundtable" debacle starting to smell fishy to you? Also, why aren't any other radio show hosts or alternative media sources giving you this information - especially the Company Men at GCN (which is, by the way, an ABC affiliate)? Instead of the truth, all they do is keep pushing the "George Noory is a good guy" schtick, all the while perpetuating the above-chronicled scam job. I hate to say it, folks, but you're being bamboozled — AGAIN — and its time to wake up to what's taking place around you.

PART TWO

Now that we've seen how a couple of GCN Company Men are protecting their Clear Channel Company Men counterparts Art Bell and George Noory (similar to ABC, NBC, CBS, CNN and Fox protecting each other), let's turn our attention to the actual roundtable debate which will be held on the evening of June 16th. Specifically, there is only ONE way that David Ray Griffin and Alex Jones can defeat their government shill opponents, and that is to unceasingly push information proving that the World Trade Center towers were destroyed via a controlled demolition.

Let me repeat this point: Griffin and Jones need to hammer home without mercy the crux, central core issue of 9-11, and that's the controlled demolition of WTC 1, WTC 2, and WTC 7. Every other issue is peripheral (secondary), and can be manipulated to promote the government's incompetence and negligence cover stories.

Listen! In *9-11 on Trial* we've cracked the case for 9-11! This one book more than any other proves that the government's "official" version of events is a bold-faced lie, and that the WTC towers were deliberately demolished. This is State-sponsored terrorism, and we've compiled research from over 40 of the world's best researchers to prove it.

With this sentiment in mind, we need to already be suspect of *Coast-to-Coast AM* host George Noory's motives, for this is how the overall roundtable theme was framed:

"Did Muslims act alone on 9-11, or not?"

So, right off the bat Noory is giving credence to the government's "19 Arab hijackers" ruse. If this guy was legitimate and not a Clear Channel Company Man, he would have set the tone by asking, "Was 9-11 an act of State-sponsored terrorism," or "Were the WTC towers destroyed via a controlled demolition?" But of course Noory has already sidled-up with the "establishment" angle, and this should erect red-flags for everyone.

With this premise in mind, it's obvious that Noory and his two guests - Peter Lance and Michael Levine (substituting for Jerry Corsi) - will do everything humanly possible to divert attention away from the crux issue - controlled demolition. Thus, whenever they mention Ruppertesque war games, pods, holograms, galvanic corrosion, peak oil, Osama bin Laden, military stand-downs, the Pentagon, or the 9-11 Whitewash committee, Griffin and Jones need to immediately draw them back to the controlled demolition. These above-mentioned issues (and others) either directly play into the government's cover-story, or lend credence to the "limited hang-out" angle (i.e. LIHOP Let It Happen On Purpose negligence).

But once we prove the controlled demolition (as has been done beyond any shadow of a doubt in *9-11 on Trial*), every other aspect of the government's "conspiracy theory" is shredded beyond repair. Case closed! It's like we kept saying at the Oklahoma City Bombing tenth anniversary rally - **BOMBS IN THE BUILDING - BOMBS IN THE BUILDING!** Everything else is secondary. If Griffin and Jones don't keep pushing this angle, then you'll know something is definitely awry.

Lastly, I'd like to give some advice to Alex Jones before his appearance:

1) First and foremost - Don't act like Alex Jones. In other words, dump the frothing at the mouth lunatic-fringe antics and debate like a rational human being. I say this because I was recently speaking with somebody at the *American Free Press* and they said they'd be embarrassed to even give anyone a copy of your videos because you come across as such an unhinged maniac (i.e. an epitome of the "crazed conspiracy theorist" that is continually mocked and derided - a total stereotype). Alex, we don't need psychotic madmen babbling and blathering ... anyway, after watching one of your "lost" videos where your sidekick tells you to "quit putting on an act and just be real," we know this is all phony-baloney theater. So drop the Rush Limbaugh schtick and just give us the facts.

2) Don't — under any circumstances — delve into this "I'm the grandfather of 9-11" b.s. When David Ray Griffin appeared on your show a few weeks ago, it was one of the most pathetic performances we'd ever heard. I mean, here's a guest who wants to speak rationally, and you launch into a five minute diatribe about being

"the grandfather of 9-11." We were cringing, and we're sure David Ray Griffin was too. Others who heard the show were also appalled by your grandstanding. It was truly embarrassing. Plus, don't ramble on about "how little your ego" is. Get over it! Nobody cares about your ego, and nobody cares about you being the grand-daddy of anything. Who in God's name even talks about their ego on the radio anyway? Don't you know how this crap comes across? You're making us look bad, so STOP IT!

3) Last but not least, don't turn your entire appearance into one long, extended infomercial for your videos and pay-per-view website. You're not there to be a snake-oil vendor. Just stick to the issues. I mention this because during one of your last appearances on *Coast-to-Coast AM*, after babbling on for two hours with this BUY MY VIDEO BUY MY VIDEO mantra, a caller phoned-in and asked, "Alex, what can we do to combat the New World Order? What's the solution?" And guess what you immediately told her. "BUY MY VIDEO!" Do you know how crass and low-class this sounds? Stop it!

Anyway, we'll be listening; and remember - Controlled Demolition is the utmost 9-11 litmus test — don't fail us, and don't let them off the hook.

GEORGE NOORY & THE SHADOW RODENTS

By Victor Thorn

During the past year, Lisa Guliani and I have been telling everybody how badly they're being bamboozled and manipulated by certain elements within the alternative media. But something happened last week - August 13, 2005 - that took the cake in regard to sheer lunacy. George Noory, host of *Coast-to-Coast AM*, was talking about seeing 'shadow rodents' which scurried along the baseboards of his house, or ran across the road at night in front of his car. Noory also said that these creatures have antennae, are oblivious to human beings, and he has actually seen them with his own eyes. Incredibly, he added that these shadow rodents look like armadillos, and his automobile goes right through them when they cross the street in front of him. Lastly, he concluded this segment of his broadcast by theorizing that shadow rodents come from some sort of parallel universe, and they're 'out-of-sync' with the beings on our plane (earth).

Now, pause for a moment and consider the huge audience and vast potential for change that George Noory possesses. But instead of stressing that on the morning of September 11, 2001 the World Trade Center towers were destroyed via a controlled demolition that was planned, orchestrated, and executed by a small cabal of psychopathic monsters within our government; Noory is continuing the 'shadow people' ruse that was begun by the king of misdirected energy himself, Art Bell. Incredibly, this vast psy-op is still in operation today! And the worst part is; Bell and his Tavistock mind-benders are howling with glee from behind-the-scenes at how many imbecilic people are falling for this crap.

Think about it. A few years ago Bell concocted this whole 'shadow people' ruse, then furthered it by creating shadow dogs & cats, shadow aliens, shadows of shadow people; all of which led to shadow rodents. And in all honesty, George Noory should be ashamed of himself for continuing this deception, especially when you consider how many vitally important issues are on the table confronting mankind.

Then again, what are we supposed to expect from this Corporate Company Man who sold his soul to Clear Channel? Likewise, do you *really* think that Clear Channel wants the American people to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about 9-11? If they did, wouldn't they be pushing this issue as if there was no tomorrow? But instead, we're inundated on a daily basis with Prophet Yahweh (a UFO lunatic), crop circles, ghost stories, and shadow rodents.

Some people may object, though, by saying, "At least George Noory has Alex Jones on his show once in awhile." And that's a good point, because the last time Jones appeared on Noory's show (August 3, 2005), there was absolutely no discussion about the four most crucial topics facing American citizens today:

- 1) 9-11 controlled demolition
- 2) Agenda 21
- 3) Zionist influence on our government and foreign policy
- 4) How we can defeat our unjust federal income tax system

In fact, here is what Jones kept telling the *Coast-to-Coast AM* listening audience they can do for solutions:

- 1) Call their congressmen (can you believe it?)
- 2) Hope that more whistleblowers speak out
- 3) Of course, BUY HIS VIDEOS, BUY HIS VIDEOS (\$\$\$\$\$\$)

Can't you see? This guy doesn't have any answers - none whatsoever. His appearance with George Noory was a charade; and all they did was play ring-around-the-rosie with each other while failing to confront the REAL issues (and solutions) of our time.

Even worse was a guest spot by Steve Quayle on July 21, 2005 in which the following information was relayed during the final half-hour of Noory's broadcast:

- 1) A perpetuation of the Osama bin Laden myth where he continues to mastermind and orchestrate global terrorism.
- 2) More fuel thrown on the fire that "Muslims" were behind the July 7 London bombings, while failing to mention Benjamin Netanyahu's foreknowledge of this horrific event.
- 3) Al-Qaeda as the sole 9-11 culprits, while failing to mention the government's involvement in the WTC controlled demolition.
- 4) Massive doses of unadulterated end-times fear-mongering that made even Alex Jones look tame in comparison.

But the most despicable moment came when a listener called-into *Coast-to-Coast AM* and started talking about the ongoing Israeli spy scandal that has corrupted our government ... that's when George Noory abruptly cut him off and said that his commentary was "way off base."

Can you believe this guy? Noory will entertain shadow rodents, Bigfoot hunters, and every other conceivable notion under the sun (or moon); but when somebody actually raises a legitimate question about what's happening in our world, Noory hangs up on them.

What truly amazes me is that after Noory completely reinforced the government's story about 9-11 (with Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda being the Orwellian bogeymen), talk show hosts like Jack Blood and Alex Jones laud him as if he were the second coming. Jones has even berated callers in the past who took Art Bell to task for supporting disinformation specialist Ben Chertoff (cousin of Homeland Security czar Michael Chertoff). Why would he shield somebody from the dark side? Doesn't that boggle your mind? Anyway, I hate breaking this news to you, but people like Bell and Noory aren't on our side, and the phony Corporate Company Men who protect them is astounding. I mean, isn't their behavior reminiscent of how the government and the mainstream media cover-up each other's misdeeds? But hey, I guess one dirty hand has to always wash the other!

Anyway, when Noory brought his July 21, 2005 show to a close, these were his final parting words: "Something just doesn't feel right, does it?"

Yeah George, you're right, something doesn't feel right, and do you know what it is? YOU and your Corporate Company Men co-horts — you're the ones who aren't right. I wrote once before that Art Bell is going to burn in hell for selling his soul and deliberately deceiving the American people; and now I'm convinced there's another spot reserved for George Noory right alongside him.

At least they'll have a long time (in fact, an entire eternity) to think about their asinine shadow rodents.

P.S. We keep wondering if anyone out there is taking this stuff seriously, or if it's all just a big game. Large segments of the alternative media are doing a great disservice to all of you. When are you finally going to start holding their feet to the fire and demand something REAL? The mainstream media won't broadcast our concerns, but the alternative media should. How long are we going to keep waiting before we start speaking-up; or will we settle for shadow rodents and more of the same status quo b.s. until the next 'spike' event takes place?

GEORGE NOORY: **DISINFO SPECIALIST**

By Victor Thorn

Although he has plenty of competition, George Noory has now emerged as the #1 traitor disinformation specialist in the "alternative" media. Noory sunk to new lows on the evening of Sunday, September 3 when he had (yet again) Peter Lance on as his guest. If you remember correctly, Lance was one of the stooges invited onto Noory's disastrous 9-11 Roundtable last summer who incessantly pushed the al-Qaeda terrorist angle. (The only bright spot in this roundtable was David Ray Griffin who, regrettably, was continually drowned-out by the other loudmouth egomaniacs.)

Anyway, an extremely bright listener called into Noory's show on September 3 and asked Peter Lance if he felt al Qaeda wired WTC 7 for destruction. Incredibly, Lance spun a tale involving an Arab who supposedly stole a fireman's uniform, then snuck into WTC 7 and planted an "incendiary device" (his exact words).

Now take a moment and consider how preposterous this statement is. We know for a fact that there are only a few companies in the world who have the technical expertise to execute a controlled demolition. Yet according to Peter Lance, ONE ARAB CAVE-DWELLER tossed a stick of dynamite and shazam, it brought an entire 47-story building down perfectly into its own footprint. Lance's claim was so preposterous that a 2nd grader wouldn't have believed it.

Yet guess what George Noory did. Nothing! He didn't refute this outlandish disinformation for a second, and instead let it pass as fact. But if we go back in time a few weeks, do you recall how horrendously Noory and Richard C. Hoagland beat-up on Eric Hufschmid? The poor guy couldn't get a word in edgewise without being pummeled by the Noory-Hoagland tag-team. Yet Noory lets Peter Lance off the hook without any objection whatsoever. And in case you didn't know; this is precisely how disinformation specialists operate.

But wait, there's more. Peter Lance then went on to say how extensively the Bush administration was infiltrated by ... say what ... Arabs! Did I hear this guy correctly? Arabs? Yes, Lance called them the "Wahabi Lobby."

Then, to add insult to injury, Lance said that he agreed with Alex Jones about Arab infiltration of the Bush cabinet. I couldn't believe my ears. Peter Lance, Clear Channel, and Alex Jones are still promoting the Arab terrorist angle!

But as we all know, 19 cave-dwellers didn't plan, coordinate, and execute 9-11. Nor have Arabs taken over control of our government. Rather, all one has to do is read Michael Collins Piper's *The High Priests of War* and *The New Jerusalem* to realize that Bush, Cheney, and the neo-cons have 100% sold-out to the Zionists. They have utterly and completely surrendered our nation's soul to the Israeli lobby, and to say otherwise is pure, unadulterated disinformation.

Can't you see what's taking place? George Noory is doing the dirty work for Clear Channel, who are bowing down to the Israeli neo-con Zionists. Plus, if you've been paying attention, you would have noticed that Noory only has a 'carefully selected' group of guests on his *Coast-to-Coast AM* radio show — those who unequivocally push the neo-con agenda. This includes Mike Levine, Peter Lance, and Alex Jones. And whenever a guest appears "outside" of this cabal - supporting controlled demolition and Israeli foreknowledge - they're trounced and pummeled into the ground (i.e. Eric Hufschmid).

So here is what we have. George Noory and Art Bell are the front men for Clear Channel's disinformation cabal, and they only allow "select" guests into their little club, just like the mainstream media does with their "select" guests. Alex Jones is one of these guests because he adamantly refuses to finger the Zionist lobby in this country. Also, Jones sticks up for Art Bell and George Noory at every turn; just like the mainstream Company Men do for each other on ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, and Fox. Are you beginning to see the big picture now?

In addition, are you starting to realize why George Noory won't have REAL guests on his show like Lisa Guliani and me? The answer, of course, is simple. We tell the truth, and absolutely refuse to follow their Clear Channel game-plan. All those other Company Men toe-the-line and perpetuate their neo-con ruse, but we sure as hell won't.

In the end, if you can't see what kind of con-job is being pulled on you, then you're no brighter than the zombies sitting in front of their TV's watching Bill O'Reilly and Wolf Blitzer. The only difference between the mainstream media Company Men and the alternative media Company Men is that they're corralling you into different pens. And we all know what kind of creatures get put into pens, don't we: SHEEP!

JEFF RENSE DUPES AUDIENCE

By Victor Thorn

In September, 2004 when we were turning up the heat on Mike Ruppert, he made a drastic mistake by underestimating his audience. Y'see, to distract attention away from himself, Ruppert asked a couple of questions that were purely psy-op tactics straight out of the CIA playbook. (The *Tragic Fall of Mike Ruppert*) Specifically, he floated the notion that I used a pen name because I either had a criminal record, or worked for the government - a very typical ploy when one is desperate.

Well, after seeing how many people foolishly took Ruppert's bait - hook, line & sinker - I followed-up with my response, which undeniably proved that Ruppert's attempts at distraction were completely bogus and that he was engaging in what Ralph Omholt calls "Coercive Persuasion." (Definition: "the methodical - often subtle or even clandestine - application of psychological manipulation.") This one moment eventually became the turning point where people wised-up and realized that Ruppert was utterly and completely manipulating them with his distraction techniques. And once their eyes had been opened, they never again had faith in what Ruppert had to say, for they saw his phoniness and desperate maneuvers. Months later, Ruppert "resigned" from the 9-11 truth movement, and is currently operating as a front-man for Big Oil with his peak oil sham.

Now, let's fast-forward to May, 2005. Amazingly, the exact same phenomenon is taking place with Alex Jones and Jeff Rense. Y'see, we posted ten very relevant questions to Mr. Jones on May 6th, and to this day he has refused to answer them. [To their credit, at least Mike Ruppert, and more recently Karl Schwarz, were man enough to stand-up and face their detractors.]

Anyway, instead of answering for his actions, what Alex Jones did was get his Chihuahua trying-to-be-a-pit-bull sidekick Jeff Rense to write some entirely bogus hit pieces about us under the names "Alastair Wiggins" and "Anonymous." Yes, Jeff Rense wrote these articles, and he's too cowardly to own up to it.

But wait, their tactics get even more pitiful. To distract people away from Alex's blatant censorship, our Ten Questions, and an article entitled Alternative Media=Mainstream Media, they've started using the exact same gimmicks that Mike Ruppert utilized. This time, though, they're saying that Lisa Guliani and I are government agents. (I know, truly the acts of desperate people.)

I mean, ya think these guys would have learned their lesson from Ruppert, but they haven't. It's actually kind of disappointing because I thought they were

brighter than this. So, what we've done is sit back and watch to see how many people would get suckered into their trap. And sure enough, even though most EVERYONE saw through Rense's totally phony smokescreen, a few gullible souls bought it hook, line & sinker.

So, here we go again, folks. It's time to show you how badly you're being manipulated. Y'see, we can prove with verifiable evidence that Alex Jones censors articles on his website, along with his radio show archives. I'll repeat: WE CAN PROVE IT. On the other hand, Jones always says that whenever he talks about the New World Order, he has the data (newspaper articles, documents, etc) to back-up his assertions. And in all honesty, that's a good policy.

With this in mind, Alex Jones and Jeff Rense, why don't you put your money where your mouth is and PROVE your claims ... prove that Lisa Guliani and I are government agents. That's not asking too much, is it? Step up to the plate and be men right here and now ... either that, or shut up because the people out there listening to you aren't stupid, and they're not so easily bamboozled as you think they are.

To show how silly these guys are making their audiences look, I'll prove that their claims are preposterous.

- 1) When we started WING TV, we didn't want to fall into the advertising trap which compromises so many news sources. So we vowed to be 100% independent.

- 2) To do so, I've done what I've been doing for years now - I work for a living at an outside job to pay our household bills, and also those for WING TV. In other words, we accept NO advertising, we don't operate a pay-per-view site that forces people to PAY to watch it, we have no subscription fees, and we have no think tank/corporate donors (like Amy Goodman).

- 3) To prove this, we invite anybody at any time - including Alex Jones and/or Jeff Rense - to visit us here in State College, Pa. Once here, you'll see that both Lisa Guliani and I get up at 3:30 am (yes, that's 3:30 in the morning) six days a week. In addition, I work between 45-50 hours a week at my job, in addition to all my responsibilities on WING TV.

- 4) Let me tell you a little bit about what it's like getting up at 3:30 am six days a week. It's a brutal, ugly picture, especially in the winter where there's eight-inches of snow and the temperature is ten degrees above zero.

On top of that, I only get about four hours sleep a day (five if I'm lucky); and believe me, such a schedule takes its toll on a person's body.

5) Now don't get me wrong — I'm not complaining. Rather, I'm simply showing you what lengths we'll go to so that we're not compromised at WING TV. It's the price we're willing to pay to be a completely independent media source with no network impositions, advertisers, or peer pressure.

6) So ask yourself: would we get up at 3:30 am six days a week and go on four hours sleep a day if we were some kind of intelligence agents getting tons of money from the government? Trust me - the answer is NO. Furthermore, would Lisa and I spend 65 hours round-trip on a jam-packed, smelly Greyhound bus to Oklahoma City for the tenth anniversary rally? Try it sometime - spend 65 hours on a bus with drug addicts, lunatics, the unwashed, and a wide array of other "interesting" people. Don't you think that if we were high-priced CIA agents we'd fly on a corporate jet (or at least first class) and dine on steak dinners instead of eating out of overpriced vending machines? I'll bet when Alex Jones recently visited the GCN studios in Minnesota he didn't take the bus!

7) Can't you see what's going on here, folks? You've been suckered again, but this time it's been done by Jeff Rense and Alex Jones instead of Mike Ruppert. Worse, these guys don't have enough respect for their audience to answer our questions, or YOURS for that matter. Rather, they have such little regard for you that they deliberately threw out a red herring to distract you away from the REAL ISSUES (like blatant censorship). All of Mike Ruppert's supporters felt like complete fools when they realized what little games had been played on them; and guess what - now the same thing has been done to you!

Here's the bottom line: these guys think you're STUPID! They don't want you to ask them questions, and they certainly don't want to answer any. What they do want from you is a nice, passive silence; just like the mainstream media wants from their audience. Is that what you want? To be condescendingly patted on the head and told to shut up and stay in your place? If so, then keep staying silent and you'll fit perfectly into the little mold they've created for you.

On the other hand, if you don't want to be one of their mindless zombies, then speak up because you deserve some long-awaited answers. As it stands now, Jeff Rense and Alex Jones are two frightened little Company Men using extremely desperate measures to distract their audience away from the truth. If you don't

believe me, then DEMAND that they answer our questions and YOUR questions. We're not afraid to lay it all on the table for you; why are they?

Folks, they're playing you for suckers, just like Bill O'Reilly and Rush Limbaugh do. They're making fools of you, and they don't think you're smart enough to realize it. How does that make you feel? When they say we're government intel agents, DEMAND PROOF! And if they refuse to provide it (because their claims are completely baseless), then realize that they're lying to you and feeding you a boatload of disinformation.

Jeff Rense Addendum: During the past couple of months, two different Rense columnists have informed us that Jeff Rense told them that Lisa Guliani and I are "cointelpro," and that - get this - we somehow conjured-up the whole "Fintan Dunne" episode with Fintan Dunne. Now, not only is this man too **cowardly** to actually make these accusations to our face, but he's so far off-base that it's deplorable. For the record, we have only spoken with Fintan Dunne once in our lives, and that's when we interviewed him on WING TV (far in advance of his hit piece on us, Rick Stanley, and Alex Jones). So, once again, Jeff Rense - you sniveling little weasel - either show some proof for your allegations, or shut up and become like the worm you really are and crawl back into your hole. Rense, you are a pathetic little Company Man, and we feel sorry for someone that goes as low as you do.

JEFF RENSE SHOWS HIS TRUE COLOR: YELLOW

By Lisa Guliiani

On July 5, 2003, I penned an essay entitled *Sons of Freedom, Sons of War*. This piece of writing described my thoughts and feelings about the State College, Pa. Fourth of July fireworks display I had watched the previous night. Upon completion, as was customary, I circulated this essay to various political websites around the Internet, and it was subsequently published on several independent media and anti-NWO venues. One of the first individuals I submitted it to was Jeffrey Bennett, who edits *The Federal Observer*. This piece (*Sons of Freedom, Sons of War*) remains in the archives of Bennett's website (as well as other places on the Internet).

At that time I also sent this essay - with my name clearly shown as the author - to Internet publisher Jeff Rense. However, Rense did not post the piece on his website. But lo and behold, two years later on July 4th, 2005, I once again e-mailed this essay to a few close friends, and posted it on two political Internet groups to which I belong. I didn't give the piece another thought until early this morning - July 6, 2005 - when I opened an e-mail from a friend in New York telling me that this same essay was now featured on Rense's website - **without** my name on it as the author. Below this piece, my e-mail signature - a quote from Thomas Paine - had also been posted as if the entire essay - as well as the Paine quote - had been copied-and-pasted and subsequently posted right on Rense's website. I was also a little puzzled when I saw the name "Jim" below the Paine quote being listed as the "author".

I'd seen some strange material on Rense.com before - things like disinfo hit pieces written by fictitious writers, articles that were textually out of context or factually incorrect, and of course, articles published by "anonymous" writers. But this latest nonsense really took the cake. Now Jeff Rense was running my articles; except, of course, without including my name...

Anyway, I e-mailed Jeff Rense, as did several other people who recognized that it was indeed my essay. Rense was politely asked by each of us to please add my name to the text, since he had been displaying it on his website since July 5, 2005.

Since that time, I have received no reply from GCN Company Man Jeff Rense. Worse, rather than simply adding my name to a piece I had written and originally submitted to him more than two years ago, he chose instead to completely remove the essay without a word - no apology, no explanation, no nothing.

Am I to conclude that Jeff Rense simply publishes written works without even knowing - or caring - who the author is? The essay in question was widely circulated around the Internet when it first appeared in 2003, and was picked up by various websites at the time. No one to date has ever removed my name from an article I had written - until now - when my writing made a brief appearance on Rense.com.

This is a little too much like deja vu, isn't it? Where - and with whom - have we all seen this before? What we're seeing here mirrors the exact same tactics used by GCN Company Man Alex Jones when he removed my writing from his site, and also censored other people's material referencing my articles. Very, very interesting, Mr. Rense; and also very pathetic. It seems like you and Alex lift your dirty tricks out of the same playbook. And do you know what? It really makes you look bad because you could have been a stand-up guy and simply added my name to MY ARTICLE; but instead you showed your true colors, just like the title of this article implies. And we all know what color that is: YELLOW!

KYLE HENCE'S FALSE FRONT

By Victor Thorn

"People aren't ready for the truth."

This is what Kyle Hence told me off-air following his appearance on WING TV (August 17, 2004) when I asked why he wasn't providing hard-hitting, substantive information about 9-11 on his various websites and at his symposiums.

Upon hearing this response, Lisa Guliani and I both wondered, "Who in the hell is Kyle Hence to determine when people will or will not be ready to handle the truth?" The elitism and arrogance of such a stance is preposterous, and one that should trouble every person who IS ready for the truth.

But after watching what Kyle has been doing for the last couple of years in regard to 9-11, his response is certainly not surprising. In fact, it fits in perfectly with someone who is filling the role of a "false front." What exactly do I mean? The answer can be found in an article by Peter Meyer (November 27, 2003) entitled *9/11: The Fake Opposition*: "Kyle Hence and John Judge are a new layer of cover-up - the fake opposition that will be puffed up by media and other moles in the investigative community - so that they and they alone will be giving the "responsible" critique of 9-11."

This point is crucial to understand because Kyle and his "9-11 cabal" have become self-appointed spokesmen for the 9-11 truth movement, and have thus taken it upon themselves to determine precisely what is in opposition to the official government/mainstream media version of events. In reality, though, what they are promoting differs little, if any, from the cock n' bull story that has been fed to us since day one. In other words, the 9-11 cabal is still pushing two vital strains of disinformation:

- 1) 19 Arab cave-dwellers from Afghanistan, led by Osama bin Laden, master-minded and executed the 9-11 terror attacks
- 2) The Bush administration was simply negligent in preventing it from happening

Such a position is incredibly damaging and deceptive, for, as Peter Meyer points out in his article, "The fake opposition pretends to be making genuine attempts to examine the official story and to ferret out the truth, but their real purpose (for whatever ultimate reason) is to obscure the truth, to make sure that it never comes out, and in effect support the official story" (emphasis added).

Now, considering the overwhelming preponderance of evidence proving that our government overtly lied about every aspect of 9-11, including its planning, execution, and cover-up; it's inconceivable to imagine that Kyle Hence is still peddling an 'incompetence' theory (i.e. the government simply dropped the ball). But as we have shown on WING TV via dozens of articles and interviews with numerous guests, to simply stop at 'negligence' is a gross miscarriage of justice.

To prove how under-whelming Kyle Hence's approach has been, simply log onto his 9/11 Citizens Watch website, where you'll find articles quoting 9-11 Whitewash Committee member Bob Kerrey, CBS News, Condoleeza Rice, and many others advocating the negligence angle. But where is information that goes for the throat ... that will finally make people stand-up and take notice? For instance, why isn't Kyle Hence telling us to watch videos of the World Trade Center towers on the morning of 9-11 where we'll notice that they didn't just fall; but instead exploded outward with such force that 425,000 cubic yards of concrete was pulverized into dust. Plus, pools of molten steel (which reach a temperature of 5200 degrees) were still bubbling in the WTC sub-basement (seven stories below street-level) five weeks after 9-11. How could this phenomenon have resulted from a few thousand gallons of jet fuel which burned-out after 1-2 minutes (and much of which splashed outside of the second tower)?

I could list hundreds of other hard-hitting facts (all of which are revealed on our *WING TV Ultimate 9-11 Collection*), but oddly none of this material appears on any of Kyle Hence's websites. Why? Is this the type of information that he feels people aren't "ready for" yet?

So, instead of laying it all out on the line, Kyle Hence wrote (a few months ago) in a mass-circulated e-mail to his Citizens Watch group about "complicity (facilitation) through the 'coincidental' occurrence of multiple war games." In all honesty, I don't care if a hundred war games were taking place that morning and Peter Pan was flying over New York City. The bottom line is this: both WTC towers and WTC7 were wired with explosives in the weeks preceding 9-11, and all three of these structures were deliberately leveled via very powerful explosions. If you don't believe me, read the Underwriters Laboratory report by Kevin Ryan, or Morgan Reynolds fantastic revelations. They both say in no uncertain terms that jet fuel couldn't have caused construction grade steel in the WTC towers to simply "melt."

At this point, everything else merely exists on the periphery, for the only real question is: who did it? If you say Osama bin Laden's 'terrorists' did it, please explain how the North Tower, the South Tower, and WTC7 could all be wired for demolition (a process, by the way, which takes many weeks, if not months, to accomplish) without anybody finding out about it. And, if they were successful in

pulling off this monumental feat, why did they also go to all the trouble of 'hijacking' four jumbo jetliners? Why not simply push the panic button and watch each building fall? It seems a lot easier, doesn't it?

Since it is highly unlikely that 'terrorists' wired all these buildings, who else had the means, money, and motive to pull it off? Answer: a tightly-knit cabal inside and outside our government that needed a "new Pearl Harbor" to get our country into another war. Thus, the only 'facilitation' and 'complicity' taking place revolved around the CIA, FBI, and Mossad trailing these 19 Lee Harvey Oswald patsy hijackers prior to 9-11 so that they could conveniently place the blame on them after the fact.

But for some reason Kyle Hence and his cohorts won't go anywhere near this material. Rather, they keep dawdling away with the 9-11 Whitewash Committee and their 'limited hangout' games. In this sense they want everyone to believe that it was "mistakes and failures" that led to the 9-11 attacks. But that's not the case by a long-shot. It's much more dire and deadly, and those of us who know it have to DEMAND that they start telling the truth. If we don't, Kyle Hence will keep insulating and diverting his Family Steering Committee (or should I call it the Family Conditioning Committee) away from what actually happened. Hell, these folks are so deluded that after the 9-11 Whitewash Committee released their final "Warren Report" they "applauded the 911 commission for the outstanding work they did" and said that they looked forward to working with them in the future. The absurdity of such a statement is mind-boggling, yet Kyle Hence didn't object in the least!

Even more deplorable is the fact that during his two C-SPAN press conferences, Kyle Hence didn't once say anything which dispelled the notion that Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda were behind the terror attacks. Angie D'Urso very accurately summed-up this situation in *Watching the 911 Citizen Watchers* (July 18, 2004): "This televised press conference [by Kyle Hence] REINFORCED the official story, while making people think they were hearing from the 911 opposition." She continued with this very powerful observation: "When else has anyone in the 911 Truth Movement gotten coverage on a nationally televised television show and at such an opportune time - immediately following the hearings? And to REINFORCE the official story ... I think it's fair to characterize such an action as a betrayal to the movement and all those working so hard to counter the official story." Truer words could not be spoken.

Unbelievably, as D'Urso points out, at another C-SPAN telecast, a member of the Family Steering Committee actually declared, "I think the committee did a good job. I think Tom Kean did a STELLAR job. America owes a debt of gratitude to Tom Kean for holding the Committee together." Is this the absolute biggest load

of rubbish you've ever heard? It's like a cow thanking their executioner outside the slaughterhouse, yet again Kyle Hence didn't find it necessary to speak out against this obviously ludicrous statement.

I could continue with countless other examples where Kyle Hence is acting as a saboteur to the 9-11 movement, but instead I'll simply address him and all the others in his 9-11 cabal. The terrorist attacks on the morning of September 11, 2001 were the single most traumatic event to ever befall this nation. For whatever reason, you have taken it upon yourselves to be the 'leaders' and 'spokesmen' for this cause. But as you know, three years after this tragedy, you have failed us miserably by willfully and deliberately keeping vital information out of the public arena. And that, I am not afraid to say, will no longer be acceptable. It's time that certain individuals stepped up to the plate and started swinging for the fences.

In closing, I will direct these final comments specifically to Kyle Hence.

Kyle,

You've had more access to the national media and the 9-11 victim's families than probably any other person in our field. Yet despite such premium access, you haven't laid the hard-core evidence that will blow this case wide open on any of these entities. You've actually been on C-SPAN twice, and not once did you hit a home run. Rather, you bunted; then trotted gingerly off the field. Can't you see — that's not good enough! Hell, the 9-11 family members are still in the dark to such an extent that they actually thanked Tom Kean. It's a disgrace that you should be screaming bloody murder about!

Thus, it's finally time for somebody to say point-blank: either start telling the truth and including ALL relevant information about what transpired on 9-11 (not just what fits in with the government 'limited hangout' angle), or else step-down from your post and be done with it. This issue holds life-and-death consequences, and by giving us nothing but softballs and lightweight fluff, you're simply not doing it justice. A growing number of American people don't believe the official government/mainstream media version of events any longer, and despite what you think, **WE ARE READY AND ABLE TO HANDLE THE TRUTH.** Now start giving it to us!

KYLE HENCE-GEORGE SOROS **CONNECTION**

By Lisa **Guliani**

So, let's be clear on this: Kyle Hence gets his face on C-Span yet again, is somehow afforded the opportunity to speak to Lee Hamilton and other members of the 9-11 Commission, and sure enough fails yet again to ask them why they omitted information in their report provided to them by David Ray Griffin in his book *Omissions & Distortions* that several of the purported "suicide hijackers" are still alive post-9/11. He also fails to mention that the official government "story" of the WTC collapses defies both common sense and accepted science, fails to mention that the fires never burned long enough or hot enough to melt the steel, mentions nothing about controlled demolition, and fails to broach any of the numerous inconsistencies and discrepancies in the Commission's official version of events of 9-11. Furthermore, Hence fails to ask them to comment on the fact that Morgan Reynolds, a former Bush administration cabinet member, has been speaking out publicly about the case for WTC controlled demolition. According to the 9-11 Mafia (aka 911truth.org), we're supposed to consider Kyle Hence, King of the 9-11 Gatekeepers, a hero now. A hero? Let's be serious, shall we?

Instead of asking any of the critical questions he could have asked, Gatekeeper Hence chose instead to ask a moronic question about wire transfers to alleged hijacker Mohammed Atta. Now you tell me, is this the most burning or immediate question that needs to be answered regarding 9-11? Yet for some unfathomable reason, 911Truth.org inexplicably calls Hence a hero, despite the glaring omissions he has made regarding 9-11 in every single one of his public discourses and interactions with the mainstream media. Every single one of them. Why is this self-appointed "9-11 Truth" spokesperson avoiding the crux issue of controlled demolition in these public/media forums? Why does he avoid serious discussion of the issue altogether? Is it more important for us to chase our tails asking inane questions about wire transfers to alleged hijackers, thereby promoting the government's ridiculous version of the events of 9-11? How does this help the call for 9-11 Truth? How does this expose the government's role in the mass murder of nearly 3000 people? How does this line of questioning expose the lies of 9-11 to the American public and to the world-at-large? Answer: it doesn't. Yet hardly anybody is standing up and calling Hence out on this except WING TV. Why?

Over the last few years, Victor Thorn and I have stood back and closely observed how the 9-11 Gatekeeper crowd has repeatedly, deliberately, intentionally, and calculatedly avoided any public discussion of the CRUX ISSUE OF THE WTC event, which is the controlled demolition, in spite of our numerous attempts to

engage them. We've watched various people - and particularly Kyle Hence - consciously skate around the central topics of 9-11, choosing instead to draw public attention away from the core issues and move them toward inconsequential, peripheral matters and irrelevant avenues of discussion. Essentially, the 9-11 Gatekeeper Mafia has served more as cheerleaders for the government 9-11 myth; moreover, their work serves as a major distraction and detriment rather than an asset to the so-called Truth movement. We've seen how they commandeered and co-opted public events devoted to 9-11 in the distant and recent past. Examples of this are found in the 9-11 International Inquiries held in San Francisco and Toronto, and the D.C. Truth convergence held in July, 2005 in Washington, D.C. We watched with great concern as speakers like Webster Tarpley, Jim Marrs, David Ray Griffin and Morgan Reynolds were ignored by the mainstream media at Lafayette Park, yet conveniently enough Kyle Hence managed to steer this same media toward a press conference after the rally to promote a new book authored by Nafeez Ahmed. Does the promotion of this book rate higher as a media priority than steering his mainstream media pals toward coverage of 9-11 Truthtellers such as Reynolds, Marrs, Griffin and Tarpley? If so, why is this? Is it more important to focus on peripheral issues, LIHOP theories, and shooting squirrels while avoiding the giant BEAR in the middle of the room? How does this advance the cause for 9-11 Truth? Furthermore, are we going to continue to allow the 9-11 Mafia to forge ahead in shaping public opinion in this fashion?

So, I started wondering, just who is this 9-11 Mafia puppet named Kyle Hence? His bio states:

Kyle F. Hence

- RYA Yachtmaster
- Freelance Researcher, Investigative Journalist, Photographer
- Former Director/Head Instructor, Adaptive Sailing Program, Shake-A-Leg
- Independent Producer/Director, Multi-media events/Electronic Field Trips
- Publications: Research for From the Wilderness, Open letter to Media at Centre for Research on Globalization., On Insider Trading
- Photography: see Issue #2 "Global Outlook"; published by Centre for Research on Globalization

What his bio doesn't tell us is that he was employed by Jonathan Soros, nephew of George Soros, financial backer of Bill and Hillary Clinton. As of late 2003, Hence was still in contact with Jonathan Soros, according to a conversation he had with 9-11 researcher/activist Nico Haupt at a [MoveOn.org](#) event. It is interesting to note that Jonathan Soros hobnobs with the Rockefellers, evidence of which can be seen at the following:

Jonathan Soros & the Rockefellers

Kyle Hence is also connected to a man named Danny Schechter, who spoke recently in July at the National Press Club in D.C. for the 9-11 Truth Convergence. In 2004, 9-11 researcher Brian Salter wrote: "Danny Schechter is currently working with Kyle Hence of 9-11 Citizen's Watch to fund and produce a film about 9-11." Schechter is the co-founder of an independent media production company named Globalvision, which expanded to the Internet under the name Globalvision New Media. "Globalvision's diverse clientele includes NBC, ABC, CBS, CNN, Fox, The United Nations, The World Bank, Time Magazine, Reebok, Polygram, The Body Shop, Sierra Club, Universal Pictures, Amnesty International, Sony, Marie Claire Magazine, Turner Broadcasting, MTV, Nippon Television, and many others."

Please note: All of the above are corporate mainstream media venues or globalist entities.

To continue, Globalvision's New Media subsequently launched a subsidiary company named The Media Channel, of which Danny Schechter is the founder and executive editor. Of great interest is the fact that in 1999 George Soros' Open Society Institute gave a \$126,000 grant to the International Center for Global Communications Foundation toward the launch of Media Channel, which calls itself the 'first global media and democracy supersite on the Internet.'

Schechter has also interviewed George Soros in 1997.

Researcher Brian Salter further comments that:

"It is important for 9/11 activists to remember that Soros is currently taking a very active and high-profile role in funding the Democrats against President Bush. The fact that Schechter has received such crucial past support from Soros' Open Society Institute could make the 9/11 Truth Movement vulnerable to charges of being tools of partisan politics if he comes to be seen as a prominent representative (the same obviously applies to other Soros funding recipients as well)."

So what we're seeing here is a relationship between Kyle Hence and Jonathan Soros, nephew of George Soros, who hobnobs socially with Rockefellers. Soros is also a significant financial backer of the Clintons, who are behind many left-wing groups. We also find a close relationship between Kyle Hence and Danny Schechter, who is in turn also connected to George Soros. Could these connections explain Hence's remarkable ability to garner media coverage for specific events, while at the same time dropping the ball at every turn? When you examine the major difficulties experienced by most of the 9-11 Truth Movement in getting mainstream media coverage for their speaking engagements, rallies, and protests,

doesn't it pique your interest that Hence seems to have no trouble in this department whatsoever? It's not only regrettable, but highly suspect, that he chooses to cover only those events that serve questionable purposes, such as the perpetuation of the peak oil ruse.

So, the most important thing we need to ask ourselves at this point is: why didn't Hence make the most of this opportunity when he had the ear of Lee Hamilton and two other panelists from the 9-11 Commission, as well as various members of the mainstream press. Furthermore, does Hence appear to be speaking truth to power, as Bill Douglas of *911Truth.org* asserts in an e-mail I recently received (excerpted below):

Bill Douglas e-mail Excerpt:

From: Wtcqd2000@aol.com

Date: Sat, 6 Aug 2005 23:23:33 EDT

Subject: [911truthalliance] 9/11 Truth Action URGENT: Kyle Hence challenges Lee Hamilton live on C-SPAN today!

9/11 Truth Action URGENT: Kyle Hence challenges Lee Hamilton live on C-SPAN today !!!

"Kyle Hence of 9/11 Citizens Watch IS A HERO. View the video clip today of him speaking TRUTH TO POWER at the 9/11 Commission event on C-SPAN. PLEASE DO NOT LET KYLE'S COURAGE BE WASTED."

I absolutely refute this assertion of Hence being characterized as a "hero" in any way, shape, or form regarding 9-11. Instead, he has shown himself to be - at the very least - nothing short of a coward; and considering his extremely disturbing associations with the Soros family, which is clearly tied to the evil NWO cabal, as well as Soros' minion Danny Schechter, why is former yachtsman Kyle Hence being paraded as a spokesman for the 9-11 Truth Movement in any public forum? Do these connections unsettle you at all? In my book, the 9-11 firemen who lost their lives in New York City are heroes. Are we now to expand the definition of "hero" to include shaky individuals such as Kyle Hence and his cronies who deliberately steer public attention away from any serious discussion of the crux issue of the WTC collapses, which is the controlled demolition? Along with peak oil scam artist Mike Ruppert, these 9-11 Mafia Gatekeepers are doing a colossal disservice toward the advancement of truth, and every single instance in which they are allowed to co-opt a public/media venue is one more instance in which they are essentially spitting upon the memory of 3000 people who were murdered on September 11, 2001. A hero rises above his fear and follows his conscience in doing the right thing. A hero doesn't shy away from speaking TRUTH to power or

to the public, no matter the personal risk involved. This is because true heroes make their courage greater than their fear. To afford the likes of Kyle Hence "hero" status is not only obscene and disgusting, but also demeans the real heroes of September 11, 2001. Think about that and listen to your conscience.

9-11 MAFIA'S WILD GOOSE CHASE

By Victor Thorn

So let's get this straight. On September 11, 2005 - the fourth anniversary of the 9-11 terror attacks - 911truth.org and other members of the 9-11 Mafia squad want everyone to participate in a march from Times Square to the U.N., then past the offices of NBC, CNN, and Fox News.

Now, while these people are engaging in a wild goose chase through the streets of Manhattan, guess where all the mainstream media cameras will be: at Ground Zero. And guess where all those who want to commemorate this event will be: at Ground Zero. And guess where the emotional epicenter will be, along with all those who want to know the truth about this atrocity (including the victim's families). You guessed it - at Ground Zero.

Doesn't it seem peculiar yet again that the 9-11 UnTruth Mafia is doing everything humanly possible to steer people *away* from the crux issue and focal points of interest in regard to 9-11? In other words, for the past four years they've done everything under the sun to prevent people from examining the government's 9-11 Achilles heel - Controlled Demolition. Similarly, instead of encouraging people to take their signs, banners, fliers and voices to where the real action will be - at Ground Zero - they want to lead them on a ring-around-the-rosie tour of Manhattan on Sunday afternoon like mindless Pied Pipers.

As e-mailer Vicky told us: "I can't think of anything more absurd than to have people walking a route past the U.N., *New York Times*, NBC & Fox on a Sunday afternoon. All they are going to do is have these people walk through a ghost town and wear them out for nothing. What you might do is try to find somebody to shoot some video of NYC on a Sunday in the next week so that people can see how ridiculous this plan is. I know it's a little late, but it's important for people not to be tricked by the jerks who came up with this plan."

These imbeciles also want to demand that the U.N. "immediately open an investigation into the unresolved crimes of 9/11." Now, I shouldn't have to clue them in to this obvious point, but the U.N. is the enemy! They don't want the truth about 9-11 to be revealed. Do you know why? Because it will interfere with their plans for global governance. Their pie-in-the-sky plan is akin to telling John Dillinger that he should surrender to J. Edgar Hoover. It isn't going to happen.

In regard to their little do-si-do around CNN, Fox, and NBC, maybe they've forgotten that 9-11 falls on a Sunday, and the only people in these offices are the second-stringers ... chumps like Mike Gallagher who fill-in for the big leaguers on

the weekends. That means heavy-hitters like Bill O'Reilly, Wolf Blitzer, and Brian Williams will be lounging in the Hamptons, or sipping pina coladas along the beaches of Malibu. C'mon, let's get real - the flunkies who are manning the desks at CNN or Fox don't have the authority to swat a fly, let alone give coverage to a dozen stragglers from the 9-11 UnTruth Mafia. Are these space cadets so far removed from reality that they don't consider these things, or is their wild goose chase another deliberate attempt to water-down and sabotage 9-11?

A couple of final notes. First, have you noticed that the point-man for this fiasco is Nicholas Levis? It seems that Kyle Hence, their usual distraction ringleader, has been so discredited and exposed as a GATEKEEPER that they needed a new bozo to fill the role. But hey, Levis, we know that a leopard can't change its spots, and you're of the same ilk as Hence, so don't think you're fooling anyone.

Finally, I've read every press release related to this 9-11 wild goose chase, and here is what Levis & company have been talking about:

- Cynthia McKinney's whitewash hearing on Capitol Hill
- Osama bin Laden (yup, they're still perpetrating the government's official story)
- Mohammed Atta and how our intelligence agencies were simply negligent and incompetent (LIHOP)
- Valerie Plame (there's a nice distraction)
- The U.N.
- Cindy Sheehan (we admire her courage, but this event is about 9-11!!!!)
- New York State Attorney General Eliot Spitzer, who doesn't give a damn about 9-11 truth
- The Kean-Zelikov 9-11 Whitewash Committee

But in all of these pages, guess what wasn't mentioned once - not even ONCE - the World Trade Center controlled demolitions. Hmmm, how convenient that the one crux issue which could bring these psychopathic government bastards down is once again 'forgotten.' Folks, whether you accept it or not, Nico Haupt is 100% correct - the 9-11 UnTruth Mafia is nothing more than WAR CRIMINALS who have been put in place from day one to keep the ultimate truth from everyday American citizens.

Be at Ground Zero, and forget about their cockamamie wild goose chase!

9-11 MAFIA = WAR CRIMINALS

By Victor Thorn

Activist/researcher Nico Haupt is 100% correct - 911Truth.org and other similar Mafia gatekeeper organizations should now be viewed as War Criminals. In other words, individuals such as David Kubiak, Jan Hoyer, Kyle Hence, Nicholas Levis, John Judge, and Janice Matthews should be placed on trial and convicted of war crimes against the American people for their overt, deliberate role in suppressing crucial information about 9-11 (see Nico Haupt's article, [Boycott 911Truth.org's Bogus March on 9/11](#)).

It has now been proven that these groups and individuals are deliberately being funded by New World Order globalists (see [Lisa Guliani's article, The Kyle Hence-George Soros Connection](#)). Do you get it? They're false-front plants that work directly for the enemy! In fact, that's why they were established in the first place - to prevent the truth from coming out about 9-11 being a government inside job Controlled Demolition.

Think about it: a member of George Bush's first term cabinet - Morgan Reynolds - has become very vocal about the World Trade Center controlled demolition, yet the 9-11 Mafia War Criminals do everything humanly possible to steer people away from this subject. Why? Their avoidance of this issue is so extreme that they're even worse than the globalist-controlled mainstream media.

If you don't believe me, take a look at the July 23, 2005 DC Truth Convergence as an example. Lisa Guliani, Michael Langston, and I held a huge 14-foot banner at this rally that proclaimed:

9-11 WORLD TRADE CENTER CONTROLLED DEMOLITION

We also held it in front of the White House ([White House Controlled Demolition photograph](#)), and paraded it through the streets of our nation's capital. Hundreds of photos were taken of this banner, yet Jan Hoyer has deliberately not included one picture of this banner in two different Truth Convergence photo galleries (even though the 911Truth.org people took pictures of it). Hoyer also used this same little snippy passive-aggressive technique when censoring photos from her OKC photo gallery after they had already been published. If you ask me, it seems like she's been spending too much time at George Orwell's 1984 Memory Hole.

And do you know why Hoyer and her cohorts are engaging in such tactics? Because they don't want people on a massive scale to know this information.

They're preventing its widespread dissemination, and it's a slap-in-the-face and pure, unadulterated betrayal of every person who wants the truth. This avoidance tactic is exactly and precisely the same technique used by the mainstream media and the government. They don't want anybody to know about the controlled demolition, and neither do the NWO-funded 9-11 Gatekeepers. Worse, scores of people who attended the DC Truth Convergence rally, along with many of the guest speakers, said that our banner was by far the best one there. Yet Jan Hoyer and the 9-11 War Criminals completely blacked it out of their coverage.

What these false-front operatives are essentially doing is spitting on every American citizen, every person who died that fateful day, and every 9-11 activist/researcher who wants to get to the bottom of this atrocity and see the guilty parties brought to justice. Lisa Guliani and I will even go so far as to say that Hoyer, Hence, Levis, Kubiak, Judge, Matthews, *911Truth.org*, *9-11 Citizens Watch*, *Unanswered Questions*, and *9-11 Visibility* should receive the exact same sentence as those in the mainstream media who are behind covering-up this debacle.

The people who perpetrated these crimes are mass murderers, and its time we start going for the throat instead of playing ring-around-the-rosie. Regrettably, all of the individuals and groups listed above still want to mamby-pamby their way around 9-11, and to be very blunt about it, that's just not good enough.

9-11 TRUTH.ORG: FIRE YOUR PHONY LEADERS

By Victor Thorn

After 9-11 Truth.org's wild goose chase through Manhattan last Sunday, followed by their completely ineffective "preaching to the choir" rally near the U.N. (in an empty park square), it's clear that dissatisfaction with this organization is not only external, but is also growing among its own members.

The reason why is obvious. Four years after a cabal within our government planned, coordinated, and executed a controlled demolition on the World Trade Center towers, the leaders of 9-11 Truth.org still don't "get it." Rather than converging at the emotional epicenter of 9-11 - Ground Zero - 9-11 Truth.org led everyone past a variety of mainstream media venues - all to no avail. And, just as everyone predicted, they received absolutely no coverage from these corporate entities. (What rocket scientist in their right mind ever thought they would anyway, especially on a Sunday afternoon?)

On the other hand, we were interviewed by at least a dozen different media sources at Ground Zero, including a *Village Voice* article that highlighted our 14-foot **9-11 WORLD TRADE CENTER CONTROLLED DEMOLITION** banner. Furthermore, our rally was real, raw, dangerous, and highly charged with energy; not safe, contrived, controlled, and CONTAINED like the one at Dag Hammarskjold Park.

Murmurs of discontent are even growing among those in 9-11 Truth.org, as was evident last Sunday when numerous people told us that everyone should have been at Ground Zero, not eight miles away in the middle of nowhere. Plus, the various forums are buzzing with members now openly questioning their "Mafia" board of directors.

With this in mind, it is time for those in 9-11 Truth.org who desperately want the truth to do one thing: fire your so-called "leaders" and replace them with those who will be actual Leaders. That means:

- Get rid of Nicholas Levis
- Get rid of David Kubiak
- Get rid of Kyle Hence
- And get rid of Janice Matthews

Similar to how we've all been calling for the impeachment of our corrupt, ineffective government leaders in Washington D.C., so too should you get rid of 9-11 Truth.org's incompetence at the top.

It's either that, or you can keep doing the same thing that you've been doing for the last four years - being led around by a cabal of Gatekeeper Pied Pipers who don't even have the guts or foresight to take their rally to Ground Zero. But then again, what would you expect from someone like Kyle Hence, who pretentiously told us, "The American people aren't ready for the truth."

At this point, you have to ask yourself one very important question: Do you want to lead, or do you want to follow? If you said "follow," then ask yourself this: Do you still want to tag along, or chase your tail behind the likes of Hence, Kubiak, Levis and Matthews?

NICHOLAS LEVIS: **TARRED-AND-FEATHERED**

By Victor Thorn

What would you think if I told you that the majority of people will never, ever, EVER know the definitive truth about what happened on the morning of September 11, 2001 ? Think about this notion for a moment. Although most people now suspect that something is very wrong with the "official" explanation of events for 9-11, they will never know the truth about how this terror event was planned, orchestrated, and executed by a bloodthirsty cabal within our own government.

And why won't people know this ultimate truth? Is it because 9-11 writers and researchers haven't done their job in exposing the stark reality of what took place? Hell no. The proof of a World Trade Center controlled demolition (and more) is readily available in all its gory detail.

So why aren't everyday people being made aware of the truth? It's because of traitors, betrayers, and gatekeepers like Nicholas Levis who keep sabotaging our movement on a daily basis.

What did Levis do this time, you may be wondering? Well, Patricia Hurtado of *Newsday* wrote an article on October 1, 2005 entitled, *Sept. 11 Conspiracy Theories Abound* in which she quoted Levis as saying, "He believes that planes did bring down the twin towers, but he also believes government operatives played a role."

So here we go again with 9-11 *Truth.org's* LIHOP crap being shoved down our throats. Nobody who has spent even one-hour researching 9-11 believes that jetliners brought down WTC 1 and WTC 2. Only the most idiotic fools still fall for this neo-con cock-and-bull story. In fact, NIST (the National Institute of Standards and Technology) has admitted that aircraft couldn't have destroyed the towers, and so has Thomas Eager, who admitted "the impact of the airplanes would have been insignificant because the number of columns lost on the initial impact was not large, and the loads were shifted to remaining columns in this highly redundant structure." In addition, Leslie Robertson, WTC structural engineer, compared the plane's impact to a pencil piercing a mosquito net. (See *9-11 on Trial*). Even a former Bush cabinet member, Morgan Reynolds, has stated that the Towers were destroyed by a controlled demolition. This is Bush's own people!

Yet gatekeeper-disinformation specialist Nicholas Levis is still, after four years, disseminating untruths and myths. Why would he do such a thing? The answer is

simple. That's what he and others in the 9-11 Mafia were chosen to do since day one.

When are we going to realize it once-and-for-all? Better yet, when are we going to do something about it? Every time a glimpse of 9-11 truth emerges (such as the New York Fire Department's incoming chaplain Intikab Habib's recent doubts and revelations), the mainstream media immediately goes to these gatekeepers to lay out their false flags. Look at how many times Kyle Hence has betrayed us on C-SPAN and in other venues. He never mentions any of the vital, crux issues; but instead pushes information that closely parallels that of the government. The same applies to Levis. He could have confirmed that the WTC towers were destroyed via a controlled demolition, but yet again he sides with the perpetrators by stating that AIRPLANES felled the towers.

Why do you think the corporate media keeps going to these guys? It's obvious. They've been put in place to LIE about what really happened. It's the same with those guests who appear on the Art Bell-George Noory radio show. They're all part of a carefully-selected cabal that diverts public attention away from the ultimate truth. On the other hand, why do you think they never call us for sound-bites? Because we'd tell the truth and blow their cover to smithereens.

Think about it. Levis had a chance to tell the truth in *Newsday*, a mass-circulation newspaper, yet he chose instead to simply regurgitate George Bush and the neo-cons pabulum. How can this not fill you with glaring rage? And y'know, Lisa Guliani and I personally saw Nicholas Levis in action in New York City where he stood across from the U.N. leading a "preach-to-the-choir" rally - hand daintily resting on his hip, hip cocked to one side, while his wrist hung limply by his side. This guy is a complete embarrassment - and it boggles my mind how ANYONE could let him lead them in anything! In fact, he's the one who kept 300 activists away from Ground Zero on the 4th anniversary of 9-11 and instead paraded them through the streets of Manhattan on a preposterous wild goose chase. Again, another lost opportunity. How many more of these are we going to accept before we go stark-raving mad?

Yet for some inexplicable reason, *9-11 Truth.org* allows this nonsense to persist. Why? What Levis deserves is to be spat upon by not only me, but by tens and thousands of 9-11 writers, researchers, truth-seekers, activists, and all good people of conscience who are sick and tired of his Judas betrayal. I'd even go so far as to say that Levis, Hence, David Kubiak, Janice Matthews, John Judge, and Jan Hoyer should be drowned in the spit of our communal disgust. When are you going to realize that these gatekeepers are not about to expose the truth about 9-11? Instead, they blatantly perpetuate the government's lies. Hoyer and Janice Matthews refuse

to even read about the 9-11 controlled demolition (either that; or they simply lie about it).

Yes, Nico Haupt is correct. These 9-11 Mafia gatekeepers should be put on trial at The Hague for their war crimes. And I'd even take it one step further. After being found guilty for covering-up the government's crimes, they should be sentenced to death along with the actual conspirators.

Damn, it, why aren't we running these bastards out of our movement on a rail? And why aren't others in the alternative media speaking-out about their atrocities? Are they all part of the same Company Man clique that protects each other, regardless of their egregious actions?

At a recent Rock the Capitol rally in Harrisburg, Pa., Lisa Guliani and I saw 2,500 angry protestors tar-and-feather a mock legislator; then have his head dunked in a commode. It's now time to do the same to Levis & company.

9-11 Truth.org, stand-up and get these sickening turncoats out of your organization. They're a cancer that's eating away at our soul, and until they're eradicated, the truth about 9-11 will NEVER be known and proven on a widespread basis.

Is that what you want?

DOES WING TV ADVOCATE MURDER?

By Victor Thorn

Over the past few days, two different individuals - Mike Ruppert and Nicholas Levis - have stated that WING TV now advocates their murder. Here is what we discovered:

1) Mike Ruppert: In an October 8, 2005 e-mail from Elizabeth Anne Pfeiffer (wife of Dale Pfeiffer, former Ruppert employee), she stated: "Mike Ruppert is telling people that you guys have called for his assassination. Is this true?"

After asking Mrs. Pfeiffer for more details about Ruppert's hyper-paranoid claims (sources, verification, etc), she wrote, "This was on a private list (energy roundtable). All I can tell you is that Mike said, 'WING TV has called for someone to assassinate me as a war criminal.' Those are pretty serious charges. This is a list of people who talk about energy issues. Dale [Pfeiffer] helped to start the list, and Mike sort of took it over. Maybe you can check around and see if he is saying this to other people. He [Ruppert] says he has to get out of town fast. Says the FBI extorted money out of him and now he is broke. You don't seem like such a bad guy to me, but this thing might make you look bad."

2) Nicholas Levis: This second example of hysterical exaggeration comes from Nicholas Levis (October 9, 2005) on the 9-11 Truth Alliance discussion forum. "What I consider a call for potentially deadly violence on my person (and others) published by WING TV last week. It includes physical descriptions of how I should be assaulted and/or killed, and a general recommendation that I and all others who are associated with 911Truth.org be eradicated."

Why, you may wonder, are Ruppert and Levis so up in arms? It is because I wrote **an article on October 3, 2005 entitled *Nicholas Levis: Tarred-and-Feathered*** where I stated:

"Yes, Nico Haupt is correct. These 9-11 Mafia Gatekeepers should be put on trial at The Hague for their war crimes. And I'd even take it one step further. After being found guilty for covering-up the government's crimes, they should be sentenced to death along with the actual conspirators."

To check the veracity of this quote, or to read the entire article, click onto ***Nicholas Levis: Tarred-and-Feathered*** (and by the way, unlike the censorship practices of Alex Jones, not one word of this article has been altered).

Anyway, what was I trying to say in the above article? My main thesis is that anyone who has been engaging in a cover-up of the government's lies and crimes about the 9-11 terror attacks should be put on trial, and if found guilty, they should be given the death sentence alongside the actual perpetrators.

Now, does this sound like I'm advocating murder? Or, am I saying that everyone who planned, coordinated, executed, and covered-up 9-11 should be tried in a court of law, and if found guilty, they should be given the death sentence? How can anyone object to this stance? Before answering, please remember: this was the most atrocious act ever waged against the innocent citizens of this country (and others) where almost 3,000 of them lost their lives. What are we supposed to do; keep pussy-footing around this issue by slapping the perpetrators on the wrists? 3,000 people were mass-murdered, and damn it, somebody better start paying!

Thus, I stand by my assertions 100%, and this potential death sentence includes any deliberate 9-11 conspirators from the government (both domestic and foreign), Defense Department, private industry, intelligence, mainstream media, alternative media, and the 'activist' fields.

In other words, I'll repeat: anyone who planned, coordinated, executed, and covered-up the crimes of 9-11 should be placed on trial; and if convicted, should face the death penalty.

So, to make myself perfectly clear, allow me to address the person whose name was specifically mentioned in the title above article:

Question to Nicholas Levis: Do you believe that the World Trade Center towers were deliberately destroyed via a controlled demolition that was planned in advance of September 11, 2001?

From my perspective, you have three potential answers:

1) No. If you don't believe a controlled demolition was responsible for destroying the World Trade Center towers (as you said in a recent *Newsday* article), then you are either the planet's biggest horse's ass, or you're a gatekeeper of enormous proportions.

2) Unsure. If, Levis, you're not certain whether a controlled demolition brought down the WTC towers, I will send you a free copy of **9-11 on Trial** to read. Upon completion, I am certain that any doubts you (or anyone else may have had) will be entirely dismissed.

3) Yes. If your answer is affirmative - that a controlled demolition did befall the

WTC towers - then why aren't you doing everything humanly possible to promote this information to the public?

Now, for all our readers, we've been trying to get an answer to this question from Nic Levis for days now, and for some inexplicable reason, he won't answer it. Doesn't that seem peculiar? Why won't he answer this one simple question, especially when he was quoted in an October 1, 2005 article stating that he believed AIRPLANES brought down the WTC towers? To show how helpful I am in this matter, I am now providing you with a top twelve list of books and videos that expose the WTC controlled demolition:

- 1) Jim Marrs: Inside Job
- 2) Jim Marrs: The War on Freedom
- 3) George Humphrey: 9/11 - The Great Illusion
- 4) Victor Thorn: 9-11 on Trial
- 5) Victor Thorn: 9-11 Exposed
- 6) Eric Hufschmid: Painful Questions
- 7) Eric Hufschmid: Painful Deceptions
- 8) David Ray Griffin: The New Pearl Harbor
- 9) David Ray Griffin: Omissions & Distortions
- 10) Don Paul & Jim Hoffman: Waking Up from Our Nightmare
- 11) Webster Tarpley: 9/11 Synthetic Terror
- 12) American Free Press: Debunking 9-11

I would also add to this list the fantastic work done by Morgan Reynolds, Jimmy Walter (with his \$1,000,000 challenge), Dave McGowan, Christopher Bollyn, and so many other researchers who have contributed to this body of work.

From my perspective, considering that you're associated with one of the most visible 9-11 websites and activists groups, why don't you post this link (in full) so that every single person who visits your site will have the opportunity to view this information? I mean, isn't that what somebody would do that wants the absolute truth to emerge?

It's been four years now, Levis, and all you've been doing is playing ring-around-the-rosie with this issue. It's time to PUBLICLY take a stand and let everyone know your views. That's not asking alot, is it? So, do you believe that the World Trade Center towers were destroyed by a controlled demolition? If so, then start publicizing this information instead of concealing it.

The ball is now in your court, Levis. Are you going to promote the crux issue with every bone in your body, or are you going to remain a cover-up gatekeeper? If

your answer is the latter, then yes, I think everyone would agree that you should be tried as a war criminal, and let the chips fall where they may.

As a final note on Mike Ruppert, when are we going to accept that this guy is quite possibly the most unhinged paranoiac that's in the alternative media? Furthermore, what is he doing hanging out with the FBI? And why would the FBI be trying to "extort money" from him? Is this just another example of Ruppert's delusional world, or another attempt to create some Mike Vreeland-style sensationalism? Either way, it's very pathetic, and yet another sign that this guy, like Alex Jones turning into a spider, is losing his marbles.

Oh, and if you haven't figured it out by now, WING TV does not advocate murder. What we do propose, though, is that the guilty parties responsible for 9-11 should be brought to justice. And if you're a person who falls into this category by covering up these egregious crimes in any way, then you deserve the harshest penalty possible. **Let the punishment fit the crime!**

JANICE MATTHEWS: QUEEN OF PETTINESS

By Victor Thorn

Do you want another example of what treachery we're dealing with in regard to the 9-11 Gatekeeper Mafia? We received a phone call today from Paul Topete, lead singer for Pokerface, America's premier patriot band.

Anyway, Paul explained how a friend of his told Janice Matthews - a *9-11 Truth.org* board member and organizer for an upcoming Midwest 9-11 rally this fall - that Pokerface would love to perform at one of their events, free of charge. In other words, Pokerface would volunteer their time and efforts to entertain the attendees at their event, as well as help spread the word about 9-11.

But what did Janice Matthews do? She absolutely refused to allow Pokerface to play at any of their events. And what was her reason? She said that Pokerface wouldn't perform at any of her events because they wrote favorably about WING TV on their website!

Take a moment and think about this woman's audacity. What she has done is put her personal animosity for us above and beyond the advancement of 9-11 truth. Pokerface offered to help their cause, and Janice Matthews spit on them!

Worse, she's one of *9-11 Truth.org's* primary movers and shakers. But this isn't by any means the first time Janice Matthews has stood in the way of truth. We offered to record a controlled demolition video for their October 9-11 symposium, and yet again Janice Matthews refused to get the truth out about this crux issue. In fact, she is so disinterested in the truth that she didn't even bother to read the definitive book on controlled demolition, *9-11 on Trial*.

Of course *9-11 Truth.org* is the same group that supported the 9-11 Gatekeeper widows when they refused to appear on the same stage as David Ray Griffin. Why? Because, according to them, he spoke too often about government complicity and conspiracy in 9-11.

Furthermore, Kyle Hence threatened to have Nico Haupt evicted from the premises of a press conference at the *DC Truth Emergence* if he asked a question of Nafeez Ahmez. It seems as if freedom of speech and inquiry are seen as criminal acts, at least according to *9-11 Truth.org*. Hence is also the person who stated very unequivocally that, "The American people aren't ready for the truth."

So, in the end, we have to ask yet again: why do you think more progress hasn't been made in exposing the truth about 9-11? The greatest contributing factor is simple: *9-11 Truth.org* and their partners in crime have been put in place since day one to prevent the truth from emerging. Yet for some inexplicable reason, we still tolerate them instead of running these War Criminals out of our movement on a rail.

JACK BLOOD SELLS OUT

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

"I would sell-out if the price was right."

These are the EXACT words that RBN founder and radio show host John Stadtmiller said that Jack Blood confessed to his wife.

This allegation - along with numerous others - was made during the February 21, 2005 broadcast of Stadtmiller's *National Intel Report*, which can be found on his site in the archives section.

In our eyes, selling-out is the utmost mortal sin of all in the alternative media field, and the ramifications it carries cannot be overstated. So, before getting to other issues that Stadtmiller brought-up during the above-mentioned broadcast, we have one - and only ONE - question for Jack Blood today (other articles will follow throughout the week, finally reaching a crescendo on Friday).

Here is our question: **What exactly did you mean when you said, "I would sell-out if the price was right."**

In other words, we don't want any obfuscation, distraction, or divergence on your part for this question. We simply want you to answer it without any sidesteps, deflection, or excuses. So, to be perfectly clear, we'll repeat our question: **What exactly did you mean when you said, "I would sell-out if the price was right."**

Now, from our perspective, Jack, you have two options:

One, if you admit uttering these words to Sandra Stadtmiller, then explain - in detail - what exactly you meant by "selling-out if the price was right," because to us, there can be no more alarming concept in regard to the alternative media than one of its own "selling out" to the New World Order's dark forces.

Think of it this way: Art Bell of *Coast-to-Coast AM* sold-out to Clear Channel because "the price was right," and look at how he betrayed the entire 9-11 truth movement. Likewise, Amy Goodman of *Disinformation Now* sold-out to the Ford Foundation (and others) because "the price was right," and she too has spit on 9-11 researchers, in addition to the entire patriot movement as a whole.

So, Jack, if you made this damning, egregious statement, we want a full explanation as to what exactly you meant.

On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, there is another alternative. You can deny ever saying these words to Sandra Stadtmiller. If this is the case, then you are, in essence, calling her and John Stadtmiller liars. For the sake of full disclosure, though, we would like you to know that we spoke with Mr. Stadtmiller yesterday (June 6, 2005) to confirm what was said during his February 21 broadcast (we like to check our sources), and he absolutely corroborated that what was disclosed that day was accurate. In any event, if you didn't make this statement about "selling-out," then we'll once again contact both of them and get to the bottom of this matter. After all, if you deny making this statement, then the bottom line is simple: either you're lying, or the Stadtmillers are lying. There are no other possibilities.

Anyway, for the time being, Jack, here's what we, and obviously many other people, would like to know:

- (a) Did you make the following statement to Sandra Stadtmiller: "I would sell-out if the price was right."
- (b) If so, please explain exactly and in full-detail what you meant by it.
- (c) If you didn't make this statement, then please explain the full details as to why you feel what was said about you is false.

COZYING UP TO FOX NEWS

By Victor Thorn

After listening to John Stadtmiller's blistering broadcast on Jack Blood, (**Jack Blood Exposed**) a couple of things are evident. First of all, everything that dozens of people have told us about GCN president Ted Anderson is abundantly clear. This man is a snake, and the network he operates - often called "**Genocide Communications Network**" - is by-and-large (with some notable exceptions) a den of vipers. This information comes directly from broadcasters with first-hand knowledge of the alternative and short-wave radio industry, and the story they tell is one of treachery, deceit, and underhanded business practices. For a fuller picture, all one needs to do is read *The Alex Jones Affair* and *Short-Wave Wars* by James Lloyd and you'll see exactly what I mean.

But since this article focuses on Jack Blood, let's turn our attention once again to what is found in the Jack Blood February 21, 2005 broadcast. As we now know, Jack Blood once told Sandra Stadtmiller, "I would sell-out if the price was right."

But there's plenty more, like Jack Blood's real name (which will become increasingly important in regard to WING TV's Friday article). Also, during the course of this 1 1/2-hour expose, we hear a sordid tale of lying, duplicity, stealing, opportunism, back-stabbing, riding on coattails, collusion, and disingenuousness. I won't delve into specifics at this time, but I urge you to listen for yourself and make-up your own mind — this one's a real barn-burner!

I could also discuss a variety of other topics brought out during this broadcast, but instead I'll tell you about how we became suspicious of Jack Blood. Last summer, we received an e-mail from Blood, who said that he was covering the Democratic National Convention in Boston, and he was wondering if we'd like to do some live-feeds on WING TV. We agreed, but after his first report, we definitely had second thoughts.

Y'see, Blood was doing his broadcasts from the FOX NEWS command center, and the way he was fawning-over and ass-kissing these guys was so reprehensible to us that after the show Lisa and I actually discussed canceling his follow-up reports throughout the week. Our reason was obvious: Blood was lauding the Fox News crew with such lavish praise that we couldn't believe our ears. As a side-note, think about how frequently GCN is operating hand-in-hand with the mainstream media. GCN is now an affiliate of ABC and Clear Channel, Alex Jones betrayed a patriot family by selling videotapes to ABC's 20/20, and Blood had Fox News press passes and was using their facilities at the DNC. Stop for a moment and ask yourself: could YOU get a press pass from Fox News? I know we

couldn't! But alas, Jack Blood got passes from Fox for both the Democratic convention and the Republican convention in New York City. How? And more importantly, WHY would he want to rub shoulders with them? We need to remember that Fox News - like ABC, CBS, NBC, and Clear Channel - is the ENEMY! And here we had Jack Blood idol-worshipping them from the Democratic convention in Boston.

Instead of embarrassing Blood, though, we listened to his subsequent reports; but when he contacted us again to do the same feed from the RNC in NYC, we turned-down his offer and didn't re-book him. Of course we never found out until later, but this is the same guy who told Sandra Stadtmiller that he would "sell-out if the price was right." Needless to say, we didn't want any part of that ... but consider for a moment, what if Fox had offered Blood a deal beneath the table? Do you think he's the kind of guy that is so virtuous that he'd walk away from it? Before you answer, wait until you read our upcoming article on him!

Anyway, let's fast-forward to February 2005, when we had Blood scheduled for an appearance on WING TV. In the weeks leading up to this spot, though, Lisa and I had been hearing a variety of troubling reports about Blood emanating from Austin, Texas (where he was living). [See Lisa Guliani's article tomorrow for more details] All of these allegations were confirmed during Stadtmiller's broadcast, as well as by other independent sources in Austin. But the real bombshell came when I heard Blood's, "I'd sell-out if the price was right" comment; because to me, there is NO more egregious sin in the alternative media than selling-out to the dark side. And considering how much collusion there is between GCN and the mainstream media, this phenomenon should trouble everyone.

Now, if we hadn't scheduled Blood to appear on WING TV the following day, this matter would have passed. But here's where an extra added element enters the picture. Y'see, a few days earlier before Stadtmiller's explosive broadcast, I spoke with Blood on the phone, whereupon he told me that he had a big announcement to make on our show. When I asked him about it, he said it was real "hush hush" and that "a lot of people would hate him for it."

Well, over the weekend I spoke with Blood again and asked him what this big announcement was. This time he revealed that he was going to jump-ship from RBN to GCN, and that a lot of people would be furious. The two things that most bothered Lisa and me were:

- 1) Blood's "secret" wasn't really secret at all because the deal had been in the works for quite some time, and a number of people had been aware of it for weeks. In essence, he lied to me.

2) Blood hadn't even told his boss, John Stadtmiller, yet, and was going to use us and WING TV to make this announcement. It goes without saying that such a sneaky tactic didn't settle well with us. Furthermore, if Blood was so proud of his move to GCN, why didn't he announce it on his own show? After all, he had weeks to do it.

With all these sordid details in mind, Lisa and I decided that we didn't feel comfortable with Blood appearing on our show (February 22), so I called him on the telephone MAN-to-MAN (like he should have done with Stadtmiller instead of "leaking" the information), and told Blood that I heard a lot of things in the past few weeks that I was very disappointed in and disturbed with, and that we didn't feel comfortable having him on our show the next day. I also added that after this controversy blew-over, we'd look into re-scheduling him, and that I absolutely would not bring this matter into the public arena.

Up until this week, I have 100% honored my word. In fact, quite a number of people have been wondering why we haven't brought Blood into the whole GCN debacle. Well, that's the reason. But as of late, Blood has been increasingly critical of Lisa and I on his website forum, other message boards, and in e-mails to other people (they've forwarded them to us). So, not being one to sit idly, we decided that all bets were off and we'd tell our side of the story.

Lastly, during Stadtmiller's expose on Jack Blood, he labeled him a "sociopath," then went on to say:

"The true meaning and definition of a sociopath is: everything is okay in their eyes. They can do and say anything that they want to, and the only time there becomes a problem is when they get caught. That's when there's a conflict. And if you want to know the true definition of a sociopath, you have Jack Blood."

In other words, their biggest fear is BEING EXPOSED.

Well, guess what, Jack - in my follow-up article, the entire world is going to see exactly who you really are, and believe me, it's not a pretty picture.

GIVE A MAN ENOUGH ROPE ...

By Lisa **Guliani**

In light of recent Internet postings made by GCN's *Deadline Live* radio talk show host "Jack Blood," we are now compelled to publicly clarify a certain matter and set the record straight. We had hoped for the last few months that we wouldn't ever have to "go there," but it appears this isn't to be the case. Sadly, the old adage is true - if given enough rope, a man will eventually hang himself.

On February 22, 2005, Jack Blood was scheduled to be on WING TV. A couple of days prior to his scheduled appearance, though, we learned that Jack intended to make a "big announcement" on our show. When Victor first asked Jack about it, Jack wouldn't disclose his secret. However, after we pressed the issue, Blood informed Thorn that he was leaving RBN and planned to announce his "exodus" on our show. According to Blood, nobody at RBN had any idea this was coming, so his "announcement" would have blindsided his boss, John Stadtmiller. Since we didn't know the RBN crew very well at the time, and even to this day we have only spoken with John on three different occasions, we really had nothing upon which to base our opinion either way. So, when we learned of Blood's intention to use our program in order to make his big announcement to leave GCN, we were faced with a strange dilemma.

Around this same time, I was receiving e-mails from some friends in Texas who know Jack Blood, John Stadtmiller, and Alex Jones. Little by little, a picture of what was taking place in Austin began to grow clearer in our minds. I was very troubled that Blood wanted to use Victor and me - along with WING TV - to take a parting jab at his boss, John Stadtmiller. Jack had made it perfectly clear to us that this was what he intended to do on our show. I felt strongly (and still do) that if Blood wanted to leave RBN and work elsewhere, then he should have handled the situation like an adult in a proper manner and kept the matter between himself and his employer - without involving others. But Jack wanted to use us to retaliate against Stadtmiller by "sticking it to him" on our show. Since he had not given his employer any prior notice, he essentially planned to bail-out of his show without notice and "resign" on WING TV - a little "shock & awe" Blood-style. He also planned on announcing his "big move" to GCN at this time. I later discovered that Jack had discussed his plans with other radio insiders, and at least one 9-11 researcher, Phil Jayhan. (Phil later told me that he knew of Blood's plans a few weeks in advance.)

I was very unsettled by all of this, and asked Victor why Blood didn't just make the "announcement" on his own show. Why did he want to use us to do such a thing? Naturally, if we would have allowed him to do it, some would surely believe we were "in on it" and seeking to hurt Stadtmiller and RBN, or that we

were in cahoots with Blood - and I wanted no part of this potential misperception. As I said, we didn't really know these people, and we had no beef with RBN or John Stadtmiller.

Thorn and I argued about this issue bitterly because we didn't want to cancel or postpone Blood's appearance. On the other hand, we didn't want to be used in this way, and were very conflicted about what to do, for Blood's intentions had placed us in an awkward position. However, after carefully considering the entire scenario, we decided that we didn't want - or need - to be drawn into whatever problems existed between John Stadtmiller and Jack. So, we ultimately decided to cancel Blood's WING TV appearance for the 22nd and reschedule him for a later date once the whole situation had blown over. We thought - and still think - this was the best decision we could make under the circumstances, and we don't regret it.

Victor subsequently made a phone call to Jack Blood after we appeared on John Stadtmiller's February 21st broadcast to tell him what we'd decided - and why. Victor didn't want to make that call because he felt bad about canceling Jack, but he went ahead with it anyway.

So, what happened?

Let's just say that Jack was less than understanding of the position we were in. He was angry at us for the cancellation, unable to accept the reasons why we'd made that decision, and resentful that we didn't defend him on Stadtmiller's show. The phone call didn't end on a happy note, and Jack made it clear that he felt betrayed - by US. As stated earlier, Thorn and I didn't like doing it, but it was the right thing to do. We haven't spoken to Jack Blood since that phone call. Since that time, Blood has taken many opportunities to spread the word around the Internet that we "backstabbed" him.

As fate would have it, we did appear on John Stadtmiller's *National Intel Report* on February 21, 2005 - to discuss Victor's recently released book, *9-11 on Trial*. The guest spot had been previously arranged, and the reason we were on that show was to talk specifically about our new book release - not Jack Blood. We felt uncomfortable about this in light of the "situation" underway at the time, but were grateful for the opportunity to reach an RBN audience with important 9-11 information. We had no intention of discussing Jack Blood, and never did.

So, Victor and I sat down and proceeded to listen to John's show while waiting for our second hour cue. What we heard for the first one and a half hours of that broadcast was enough to make us cringe. 2/3 of the program was about Jack Blood. Jack had jumped the RBN ship and John was telling his listeners about a side of Jack Blood they knew nothing about. Victor and I just looked at one another, unsure where this was leading. The program was extremely intense.

During that broadcast, Stadtmiller was definitely angry and clearly felt hurt and betrayed. He proceeded to tell his listeners all the gory details of his business relationship with the man everyone knows as "Jack Blood". It wasn't pretty. We also learned Jack's real name is John Clayton. We learned that some good people in Texas had paid Jack's way (and his family's way) to make the move from Rhode Island to Austin, Texas - to the tune of \$2000. We also learned that these people paid the deposit on John Clayton's (Jack's) apartment. Stadtmiller also discussed the purchase of a car for his new "Radio Gun," and the fact that Blood had subsequently failed to repay him for the cost of the vehicle. Stadtmiller eventually forgave the debt and ended-up giving the car to Blood - a pretty generous thing to do by anyone's standards.

Stadtmiller also talked about how Jack Blood had generated over \$14,000 in advertising sales during his first week at RBN, and then stopped doing his job after that first week ended. He laid out the rocky relationship between the two men and made some particularly alarming statements. He described (during the second hour of the broadcast) how "Jack Blood" had previously told Sandra Stadtmiller (John's wife) that he "would sell out if the price was right."

This comment about Jack being willing to "sell out" made my blood run cold. Regrettably, the picture John painted of his former employee grew uglier by the minute. He accused Blood of stealing. He read and refuted - point by point - an e-mail he had received from Blood. The e-mail was an after-the-fact letter of resignation - and yet, within the same e-mail, Jack also stated (contradicting himself) that he had been fired by John Stadtmiller. Victor and I also knew Blood had not been fired. He quit of his own volition. He just did it the wrong way. In fact, it appears that a lot of people in Austin bent over backwards to assist and support Blood and his family, monetarily and otherwise. So it must have been a terrible shock for Stadtmiller to discover that his radio host had been making deals under the table with GCN's Ted Anderson while talking out of the other side of his mouth to the folks at RBN. To hear John's side of this story, listen to the broadcast for yourself. It's an eye-opener.

Okay, now jump ahead to May, 2005. Months have passed and John Clayton (aka "Jack Blood") is now settled in at GCN. The dust has long since settled and there has been no contact between WING TV and Jack Blood. We did notice that he'd deleted the WING TV link from his website links page and replaced it with the words — "removed due to backstabbing." This was clearly a passive-aggressive little jab at us for refusing to aid and abet in his wrongdoing. I've also been reading public Internet postings by Phil Jayhan of *Lets Roll 9-11* in the past couple of months in which he repeated a number of comments made privately to him by Jack Blood. According to Jayhan, Blood had told him that Thorn and I had "backstabbed" him and warned Phil that the same would probably happen to him as

well. Again, we never backstabbed Blood. We simply refused to participate in a backstabbing.

So, Jack feels "betrayed" by Thorn and me - for what? Blood has been running the Internet circuit telling anyone that would listen that we "backstabbed" him, yet I've never seen one specific example of exactly how we supposedly did anything of the sort. Correctly stated, what Victor and I did was refuse to PARTICIPATE in a backstabbing, no matter who was at fault in the Blood-Stadtmitter scenario. John Clayton (Jack) knows this is the true nature of events, but his public comments have now led me to believe that he did not appreciate our honesty with him back in February, and is continuing to harbor serious resentment toward us. I guess if we had chosen differently and decided to go along with Blood's planned "announcement," thereby allowing him to use us and WING TV, we would still be in his good graces. Instead, we chose to act in integrity and not be drawn needlessly into the whole affair. We do not believe this is a "betrayal" by any definition of the word, nor do we regret the decision we made. Blood apparently sees it differently. Does being a friend to Jack Blood mean you have to go along with his plans, even if they are dead wrong, cowardly, spiteful, vindictive, and malicious? I guess so.

I repeat: We have backstabbed no one. What we did was REFUSE to PARTICIPATE in a BACKSTABBING.

Recently, I was discussing this situation with a friend in Texas who happens to personally know Blood, Stadtmitter, and Jones. My friend decided to set the record straight with John Clayton, since she was a first-hand eyewitness to the whole Blood-Stadtmitter situation. Here is the e-mail she sent to Clayton-Blood a couple of weeks ago, on May 23, 2005 (excerpted below):

Hi Jack,

I am not one to indulge in other peoples feuds; however, something came across my email that was a little concerning ... Here is a summary of what I need to say.

I know first hand that Lisa and Victor did NOT backstab you a few months back. The incident happened like it did because of a difficult choice by both of them not to be used for the announcement you were planning. It was not a good way for you to tell John you were quitting. John, no matter how weird he is, didn't deserve to have that sort of shock. There were apparently people from the station who knew of this, and that is how John found out. WING made the choice and they never back-stabbed you. The choice was in the context of your quitting and announcing so on their show. It was not personal, nor would they of not had you on at another time with a different intent and conversation. They didn't want to be the vector for

that sort of activity. That was poor judgment on your part in that episode. I think with hindsight and objectivity you too can see the other side.

And if you are happier at GCN... that is good. No problem wanting a job that is not a stresser! No one I know has a problem with you leaving ... it was how you were going to do it that wasn't right.

The above electronic communication was sent to John Clayton (Jack) and when he responded, I am told his e-mail was filled with rationalizations. I felt very sorry for John Clayton's apparent state of denial and his inability to own up to his own actions in the past - UNTIL we began learning more about this person everyone calls "Jack Blood". He refuses to take responsibility for his own words, actions and conscious choices in attempting to use us and our program to do something that would have been very wrong. He refuses to rise above his own pettiness and spite and take the high road. He points a finger of blame at us rather than pointing that finger back at himself, where it belongs. John Clayton would rather characterize us as "backstabbers" than admit the truth, even to himself. To date, Victor and I have not spoken publicly about this matter because Thorn told John Clayton that we would not. Unfortunately, now that John Clayton has decided to force the issue himself with overtly false inferences and direct misstatements, we are compelled to set the record straight.

I'd like to respond to some of his recent Internet forum comments:

First, regarding GCN's affiliation with ABC and ClearChannel: GCN had ABC stamped on one of their "Network" streams and "Clear Channel" on another. Recently, these headings have been stripped off their schedule page and removed. GCN is not only an ABC affiliate, but a Clear Channel affiliate as well.

Secondly, if GCN is so hard up for cash to pay for satellites, then maybe some of the millions of dollars generated off of Midas Resources should be diverted to "help out" its "flailing" radio network. See the May, 2005 Dunn & Bradstreet report in our article, ([GCN an ABC Affiliate](#))

Let's face it: GCN is in bed with the beast we are all supposedly fighting, and they should be honest with their listeners. If they were, we wouldn't be getting a ton of e-mail from people who are angry, disappointed and disgusted because they had NO IDEA of this affiliation? We are also getting a ton of e-mail from listeners and radio insiders alike describing their rotten experiences with GCN. In addition, we are also getting a ton of feedback from GCN subscribers saying their e-mails to Alex Jones and GCN are being completely ignored. FYI: The ABC/Clear Channel info is also corroborated by a former GCN host Michael Corbin.

Others within the radio biz on different networks say they are NOT surprised and equally as disgusted. One former host (Corbin) says GCN has been illegally selling his show archives since last September, and now has his lawyer investigating this matter. Another radio insider, Francis Steffan of the *American Voice Radio Network* says this about GCN: "Ted [Anderson] has made a practice of raiding schedules. For instance, he contacted every host on a network called the *Christian Media Network* and offered everyone free airtime. Five hosts left that network in one day." Real ethical, Ted.

With this information in mind, John Clayton (aka Jack Blood) has posed the following question: "Which of us should throw the first stone from our Glass House?"

My response: At WING TV we're all for dealing in reality - not 'realities'. Regarding "throwing the first stone," we'd have to say it looks like YOU hurled the first rock, buddy, when you decided to use us and our show to commit an obviously ill-conceived, angry, vindictive action. You then began casting more stones in our direction after deciding we were your enemy just because we wouldn't go along with your juvenile little act of revenge and refused to become entangled in the problems between you and your former employer. Get over it already. I'm beginning to think Stadtmiller was correct in his on-air assessment of you, Clayton - maybe you ARE a **sociopath** after all.

JACK BLOOD EXPOSED: **WALE RADIO SCAM**

By Victor Thorn

Fraud. Scam-jobs. Lies. A string of lawsuits and phony misrepresentations. This, and much more, was business as usual at WALE 990 AM in Providence, Rhode Island. This den of vipers was so distrusted that *New England Radio Watch* referred to them as "a rip-off, a scam, a con, operated by liars and thieves."

Note: the information contained in this article should be of great interest to those who get their news from the alternative media because the executive producer at this station, as well as at an affiliate - KFNX in Phoenix, Arizona - was J.C. Clayton. If this name doesn't ring a bell, it's because he now uses the alias "Jack Blood". But prior to this latest incarnation he was also known as J.C. Clayton (aka John Clayton).

Also, before proceeding with this sordid tale of deceptiveness, I'd like everyone to know that I've done an extensive amount of research into this matter, and have spoken with a variety of individuals who had first-hand knowledge and exposure to this ongoing scam at WALE. This includes former employees, the owner of WALE, members of a radio watchdog organization, a veteran radio consultant, and good-intentioned people who were ripped-off by Blood/Clayton and WALE, as well as an individual who actually sued the station's owner - Francis Battaglia - and won a huge settlement. In other words, I didn't simply do a Google search and write an article. The documentation is all right here, and it is corroborated by numerous other reliable sources. In fact, one individual told me that he has over 100 files on WALE, including every conversation he ever had with Blood/Clayton, along with every e-mail, fax, and all original contracts! We even have press releases listing Blood/Clayton as the station's "executive producer," along with his (former) business telephone number, home phone number, e-mail address, letterhead, etc. These will all be reproduced at the end of this article, so please don't let Mr. "Blood" fool you into thinking that he was never associated with WALE, or their "brokered-time" scam jobs.

Anyway, what you are about to read is a classic case of some unscrupulous individuals (Blood included) who preyed upon and deceived dozens and dozens of people out of hundreds of thousands of dollars. This wasn't some petty little operation; but instead their fraudulent practices were so overt that Scott Fybus of *New England Radio Watch* wrote on June 25, 2002, "It's not often that we say 'good riddance' to a broadcast owner, but we'll step on the editorial soapbox and

note that we're probably not the only ones glad to see the last of Francis Battaglia's North American Broadcasting in New England."

Fybush continued, "For years now, we've been seeing fraudulent coverage maps that claim the 50,000 watt daytime signal reaches Boston and Worcester, when in fact it shoots just a narrow beam over Providence and out to the ocean - and we've been hearing stories from non-radio folks who have been offered a chance to "host" their own radio shows on WALE. More often than not, those shows turn out to be leased-time broadcasts fed in on bad phone lines to no listeners - and do you think those folks will ever consider radio as a serious advertising medium after being burned that way?"

So, without further ado, let me describe exactly how this scam operated. First, representatives from this station - "Jack Blood" included - would seek out individuals to host a radio show on WALE. I confirmed this point with R. Michael Gray, program director and general manager at WALE for seven years, and also author Will Phillips, who was unfortunate enough to get bamboozled by this ruse.

Gray told me during a June 11, 2005 phone interview that WALE "actively solicited others" for what is called a "brokered-time" radio show. Stated differently, WALE actively sought them, not the other way around. Will Phillips confirmed this point by stating in a June 7, 2005 telephone interview that J.C. Clayton (Blood) "actively contacted him," and that he had never heard of this radio station before then. He did, after all, live on Oregon at the time, while WALE operated out of Rhode Island.

To further prove the point that WALE and "Jack Blood" were the prime movers of this scheme and not simply innocent bystanders, Francis Battaglia himself - WALE owner - told me during a June 15, 2005 phone conversation [in reference to "brokered clients"] that J.C. Clayton (Blood) "called clients and solicited clients." Former WALE host Thorn Parrott also confirmed in a June 12, 2005 e-mail that WALE "cold-called" him, while Peter Ferrand wrote on August 12, 1998 [in reference to the "WALE scam"] that, "The aforementioned J.C. Clayton of WALE called me at WNTK and asked if I had any religious programming that I would like to distribute." He concluded by stating that, "It could be that WALE is trying to scam people who are, in turn, trying to scam others." Thus, I want there to be absolutely no mistake about it - "Jack Blood" was one of the individuals who actively solicited "clients" for their brokered-time scam.

Anyway, here was their pitch: first of all, WALE/Clayton/Blood would tell potential 'victims' that they had the most powerful station in the Connecticut, Massachussets, Rhode Island area; and that they reached three-million listeners. (Now remember, Clayton was the one who actively sought clients, not vice versa.)

To become a part of this enterprise, the mark in question had to fork-over \$4,498 to cover the "initial production costs" of a thirteen-week pilot.

In return for their "investment," Clayton/WALE promised to reimburse the individual(s) 100% of all sponsor revenue until the full amount of \$4,498 was received. Then, thereafter, they would be privy to 50% of all ad revenue.

But, as Wade Phillips told me, WALE never secured even one sponsor for him and his co-host, even though they personally provided the station with a list of 20 potential advertisers who were tailor-made for their broadcasts. Thus, Phillips never received even one penny of reimbursement for his \$4,498 investment, and he said he has personally documented at least 15-20 other people who were roped into this same scam. [More later]

So do you want the low-down on why no advertisers were ever secured? The answer is simple: there was never a sales staff at WALE for the "brokered-time" broadcasters in the first place! None. Zero. It didn't exist. As program director and general manager R. Michael Gray told me during a telephone interview on June 11, 2005, "There was no advertising sold for these people. They just wanted to get the contract signed." He also told me that prior to being fired (and then subsequently filing a lawsuit against the Battaglia family and winning a six-figure lawsuit); he personally saw dozens of people who were bamboozled by this scam. "It was out-and-out FRAUD" he concluded!

Scott Fyburg of *North East Radio Watch* reiterated this sentiment during our aforementioned phone conversation by saying, "They wanted to lease time to these individuals without them figuring out that they were just leasing time and getting nothing else in return." When asked if there was ever a sales force for the brokered-time clients, he replied, "Certainly not."

Thorn Parrott also wrote in an e-mail to me, "What I was told and what I got in writing were different in pretty significant ways. They made no attempt to sell advertising within the range of the station." He also added, "I was on twelve weeks and never saw a dime. Production quality was terrible — we did better with volunteers on public radio."

As time went on, Phillips asked WALE and Clayton for a list of sponsors that they had contacted (obviously to verify if anyone had ever been approached to buy ad time). But guess what - no list was ever produced. Why? Because there was no sales force for the brokered-time clients!

So, Mr. Phillips - who has, by the way, over 100 files on the WALE debacle, including a copy of every e-mail, fax, and telephone conversation that ever

transpired - eventually contacted J.C. Clayton again, and was now told that he should contact his own sponsors and have them send checks directly to him and his co-host. More importantly, J.C. Clayton told him that he should solicit the guests that they had on their show and have them buy air time! Can you believe this guy's audacity? [As a side-note, guess what Wade Phillips' co-host's name was - Mary BLOOD! After J.C. Clayton bilked them out of their money, he even stole her name (i.e. "Jack Blood")!]

Sensing that a scam was taking place, the following is a direct quote from Wade Phillips: "On June 29, 1998, we faxed J.C. Clayton and Francis Battaglia formally requesting the name and phone number of the account representative for soliciting sponsors for our show, as we began doubting they even had a sales staff."

This information was also never provided by executive producer J.C. Clayton; and to make certain that this information is 100% accurate, Mr. Phillips has written that he "can provide documentation of every contact we have had with WALE, including the initial written agreement and all phone calls and faxes."

Phillips also asked Clayton to provide information on what type of sales strategy was being used for other network hosts, along with what sponsors they had contacted for them; but by this time their calls and faxes were not being returned. Unsurprisingly, not one sponsor ever materialized.

But wait, things get worse. As this appalling drama was unfolding, Phillips reported that on May 19, 1998 he received several high-pressure phone calls from J.C. Clayton and owner Francis Battaglia. The nature of these calls was ... get this ... they wanted even MORE money out of Phillips so that they could simulcast his show on their Phoenix, Arizona station (KFNX).

To prove once again that "Jack Blood" was directly involved in this ruse, what follows is a quote from J.C. Clayton (May 19, 1998) 'justifying' why he wanted more money: "It's certainly going to be much easier for us to sell it if I could, even for pennies on the dollar, put the show on in Phoenix as well."

Please don't forget that there was no sales force for the brokered-time clients, so Clayton was unequivocally lying through his teeth. The whole thing was a scam from beginning to end! Plus, we know that Clayton also represented the KFAX 1100 AM station because his name appears on a February 25, 2002 press release for author and filmmaker Kenny Kemp. The exact data is as follows:

Contact information: Executive Producer J.C. Clayton
at jcluckv4u@netscape.com
Phone number: (866) 277-5369

Station owner Francis Battaglia also confirmed in a June 15, 2005 phone interview that J.C. Clayton was employed at the Phoenix, Arizona KFNB station up until the year 2002.

Take note of this date in question: 2002. This means that J.C. Clayton/"Jack Blood" was still involved in this scam as little as 2-3 years ago! How's that for being a "pay-triot"?

But please don't think the extent of this fraud is over. If you examine the official contract at the end of this article, you'll notice that each perspective host was promised six-weeks of training. But what did they actually receive? According to both Wade Phillips and R. Michael Gray, the training was, in reality, two one-hour phone calls (paid for at the host's expense!), and one fax. That's it! Furthermore, the promotional copy provided by WALE was so unprofessional that Phillips said the name of his book was misspelled three-times in the press release, and there were so many other typos and grammatical errors that it appeared to have been written by an elementary student.

On top of that, WALE didn't even have a program guide so that potential listeners could find the show if they wanted to hear it!

If you're still not convinced of their dirty dealings at this stage of the game, let's examine a document compiled by Thorn Parrott for *New England Radio Watch*:

Comparison of statements made by WALE and the truth

WALE WROTE: "W.A.L.E. continues to make a tremendous impact throughout all of Southern New England."

THE TRUTH: New England Radio Watch says, "WALE is considered something of a joke in the New England broadcast community."

WALE WROTE: "W.A.L.E. reaches out to over three million people in our tri-state area of Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Connecticut."

THE TRUTH: per N. E. Radio Watch, "They come in very well in downtown Providence and very poorly almost everywhere else." "At night, WALE runs just 500 watts and can barely be heard anywhere." "They... have no measurable audience."

WALE WROTE: "... that's W.A.L.E., the powerhouse AM station that's bringing hordes of listeners back to the AM side of the dial."

THE TRUTH: per N. E. R. W., "They... have no measurable audience."

WALE MAP: shows "COVERAGE" of substantial areas of Rhode Island,

Massachusetts and Connecticut.

THE TRUTH: per N. E. R. W., "the map... is a lie."

WALE WROTE: their signal strength is "50,000 WATTS"

THE TRUTH: per N. E. R. W., "At night, WALE runs just 500 watts..."

WALE WROTE: The contract says this: "\$3,900.00 is to cover all production costs."

THE TRUTH: I had to pay long distance phone connection to WALE to do the programs — clearly a production cost.

WALE WROTE: The contract says: "Client to receive 100% of all gross ad revenue up to \$3,900.00; 75% thereafter for run of show."

THE TRUTH: There was no gross ad revenue. While I understand there is no guarantee I would recoup my investment, WALE knew they had "no measurable audience" and that this clause of the contract was grossly misleading.

WALE WROTE AND SAID: In convincing me that I was making a reasonably good investment, Jeff Spenard repeatedly stressed that I would recover my investment from ad sales. I was led to believe that WALE made its profit from ad revenue.

THE TRUTH: Spenard clearly knew I was unlikely to make any money from "gross ad revenue." WALE, in fact, makes all its money by selling air time to suckers like me.

Anyone knowing anything about commercial radio knows that they work aggressively to sell advertising and have full-time staff for this purpose. WALE obviously intended their written and verbal statements to give the impression they had an aggressive ad sales staff. I asked Bryant, Spenard, and WALE owner Francis Battaglia repeatedly to tell me how many people they had selling ads and they refused. The only reason I can think of for their refusal is that the answer is "none."

[Please recall that "Jack Blood" was executive producer at WALE for FOUR YEARS!]

In regard to WALE's claims that they were a blowtorch 50,000 watt station, in reality Scott Fybush told me on June 14, 2005 that this is what they call a "Letterhead 50" where they claim to have massive output, but their "restrictive directional pattern" hardly reached past their hometown of Providence, Rhode

Island. Peter George also wrote on August 13, 1998 that, "WALE is not the most powerful station in Southern New England. Sure, it is 50,000 watts, but those 50,000 watts serve the "fishies" of the Atlantic coast of Rhode Island and Southeastern Cape Cod. I live less than 30 miles from Providence and even with a GE Superadio II or III, that signal is in the "mud" at best." Here again, more deceptive lies from WALE exposed and confirmed by multiple sources.

In addition, on June 9, 2005 I interviewed veteran radio consultant Donna Halper, who lists as her credentials:

- 1) A radio and management consultant since 1980
- 2) Faculty member of Emerson College in Boston, where she teaches media history, media criticism, and media literacy
- 3) Author of numerous articles and essays, along with her most recent book, *Invisible Stars: A Social History of Women in American Broadcasting*
- 4) Two Master degrees, and working on a Ph. D.
- 5) Discovered the rock group RUSH, who dedicated their first two albums to her

Needless to say, this is an individual I feel it is safe to trust. Anyway, Ms. Halper described to me the tremendous debt WALE racked-up during their tenure in New England, along with a string of lawsuits, bankruptcy, and how they would put just about anybody on the air (provided they fell into their trap first and ponied-up the necessary money). Lastly, she told me, and these are her exact words, they had a "pretty sleazy reputation."

Ms. Halper also posted a message on August 11, 1998 with the subject line asking, *A Scam at WALE?* "Anyone heard of people being scammed by WALE??? This was forwarded to me by somebody in the industry who I have always found trustworthy, and who wanted me to verify if any of these claims were true. While I have heard some WEIRD programming on that station, I didn't realize it may have ventured into [the] illegal or unethical ... do any of you know what is going on at that station?"

Upon hearing Donna Halper's above-mentioned comment, I immediately hearkened back to some comments John Stadtmiller made during his February 21, 2005 *National Intel Report* expose' on John Clayton-"Jack Blood." After describing how a clinical psychologist labeled Blood a "sociopath," Stadtmiller went on to say:

"The true meaning and definition of a sociopath is: everything is okay in their eyes. They can do and say anything that they want to, and the only time there becomes a problem is when they get caught. That's when there's

a conflict. But up until that point there is none. And if you want a true definition of a sociopath, I'm describing John Clayton."

Stadtmiller concluded by calling "Jack Blood" a "lying sack of sociopathic crap." At the time, some people may have dismissed this diatribe as nothing more than sour grapes, but after everything we've read in this article, Stadtmiller's overview takes on an entirely new meaning in regard to "Jack Blood".

If you consider this assessment too harsh, please be aware that at the time when J.C. Clayton was scamming Wade Phillips, WALE boasted of producing 91 shows. If each of these individuals was screwed-out of an original investment of \$4,498; that comes to over \$400,000! And Wade Phillips was only associated with this station for thirteen weeks. Try to imagine how many others got swindled out of their money. This isn't tiddlywinks, folks — it's some serious money. And, as we've seen, Clayton and WALE did absolutely nothing to honor a variety of promises made in their original contract; the worst being that they secured absolutely no sponsors for their hosts because there was no sales force! It was nothing more than out-and-out FRAUD!

To close, during my phone interview with Wade Phillips, I asked what his initial impression was of J.C. Clayton (aka John Clayton, aka Jack Blood). He told me, "I got the impression that he was a salesman, and that his actions didn't meet his words and promises."

And after this shakedown scam-job was over, I asked what his impression was of J.C. Clayton. Without hesitation, Phillips replied, "He is an absolute lunatic crook." He also made a very interesting comment to Lisa Guliani prior to our subsequent conversation. Phillips said that, "People are chasing him down all over the country." Do you think this remark has anything to do with J.C. Clayton's use of the alias "Jack Blood"?

So, there you have it, folks. As we can see from the chronological dates listed above, Blood-Clayton was employed by kingpin Francis Battaglia for at least four years (until 2002), and he was not an innocent bystander in this company's fraudulent activities. Instead, Blood (among others at WALE) actively participated in bilking innocent, good-intentioned people out of hundreds of thousands of dollars. The evidence provided is overwhelming, originates from numerous unrelated sources, and is fully documented with names, dates, and places. More damning is the fact that every person I interviewed told the exact same story of rampant fraud and deceit. Of course "Jack Blood/JC Clayton/John Clayton" will *deny deny deny* this overwhelming preponderance of evidence, but you have to ask yourself: who are you going to believe now - him, or ALL of the other people quoted in this article?

On WING TV, we continually tell our viewers that the alternative media must set a substantially higher standard than the mainstream media. Jack Blood's past behavior proves that he didn't even remotely adhere to this code. Instead, he was at the forefront (as executive producer at WALE) of giving this entire industry a garish black-eye. Furthermore, we now need to ask ourselves a very simple question — when Jack Blood tells us something (or plugs a product), how can we ever believe a word he says about anything? I know there are a lot of people who have been swindled out of a considerable amount of money who would NEVER again believe a word this guy says; and in all honesty, I won't either.

DOCUMENTATION

Original WALE Contract with J.C. Clayton contact information:

WALE 990 - "RENEGADE RADIO"
NORTH AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO., INC.
1185 NORTH MAIN STREET
PROVIDENCE, RI 02904
PHONE: 401-521-0990
FAX: 401-521-5077

Contacts phone number fax number
J.C. Clayton, wk 401-521-0990 401-521-5077
J.C. Clayton, hm 401-276-0318

Theme of "In Your Dreams" show:
"dreams, consciousness, and personal growth
"also, mind-body healing (prodromal dreams; dreams that reflect physiological symptoms prior to conscious recognition)
"Duration of contract - 13 weeks (May 18 - August 10), renewable with same terms

Terms of contract
Initial production cost of \$4,498.00
"\$3,000.00 deposit due by 4/22/98
"sent via Fed Ex on 4/20/98, using WALE's acct #183938843
"balance of \$1498.00 due on 5/6/98
"sent via Fed Ex on 5/4/98, using WALE's acct #183938843
Contract is non-refundable, and non-cancelable (by either side)

Renewable by client at same terms

Client to receive 100% of all gross ad revenue up to \$4,498.00 ("usually recouped in a couple of weeks"); then 50% thereafter for run of the show

"the \$4,498.00 includes all production costs, preparation, training for program, production of program, and production of client's and sponsor's commercials

Client owns Syndication/Copyrights to show and will receive taped copies of program Client controls all weekly topics and Guests on show

Letter to NBC's Dateline from Will Phillips - August 10, 1998

STORY SUGGESTIONS

DATELINE NBC

ROOM 510

30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10112

To the Producers of Dateline NBC:

Good Morning,

Mary Blood and I just completed co-hosting a 13-week program on radio station WALE 990 AM in Providence, Rhode Island, and suspect we are two of many people who may have been scammed out of a total of over \$400,000.00.

I am the author of a book on Kensington Publishing's Trade Paperback Best Seller list (Every Dreamer's Handbook, Nonfiction/Self-Help, Kensington, NY 1996), and have taught classes in dream understanding and personal growth since 1984 at colleges (Rollins College in Winter Park, Florida and Lane Community College in Eugene, Oregon) and independently. My co-host, Mary Blood, has been teaching classes in Sleep and Dreams at Portland State University and done research on melatonin and circadian rhythms for over ten years.

In April of 1998, WALE radio (also known as North American Broadcasting Co, 1185 N. Main Street, Providence, RI 02904, ph: 401-521-0990 or fax: 401-521-5077) contacted a colleague of ours in California, telling her they were looking for someone knowledgeable on dreams to host a weekly radio talk show for their station. She contacted us shortly afterward, saying that she didn't consider herself the radio talk show host type, and wondered if we might be interested. After some discussion, Mary and I contacted WALE, and they ended up extending the offer to us.

J.C. Clayton, executive producer, told us that WALE has the most powerful AM station in the Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island area, with a listening audience of over three million people. He told us that because this would be a new show, we would need to come up with the initial production costs (\$4,498.00, or \$346.00/week for the 13 week pilot show), then would be reimbursed as WALE's sales team secured sponsors for our show. He said we would receive 100% of all sponsor revenue until our initial expenses were reimbursed, and then 50% of all sponsor revenue after that. He suggested a likely return of around \$200/week to start with, increasing as more sponsors were secured.

We were wary of the terms, but contacted a couple of friends in the radio business who said they had heard of similar deals, although they didn't know much about them. We contacted the BBB in Providence, RI, and were told they had no information on WALE one way or the other. We also investigated them on the internet, and discovered that it was true that WALE has a 50,000 watt transmission signal, which is ten times as powerful as the next most powerful AM station in southern New England. We also contacted Gebbie Press (PO Box 1000, New Paltz NY 12561, ph: 914-255-7560, FAX 914-256-1239), which claimed to have full information, including mailing address, station format, metro market ranking and email addresses for thousands of USA radio stations. I spoke with Mr. Gebbie personally, and he told me that WALE AM is ranked 31 out of 200 in the Providence metro market.

After considering WALE's proposal for a couple of days, Mary and I decided to accept their deal, approaching it as an investment in our own abilities, and an opportunity to promote the personal growth work we both so deeply believe in. We split the \$4,498.00 production costs and, after doing our own research, sent in a list of over twenty companies we felt were excellent suggestions for WALE to have their sales team contact as potential sponsors. The first "red flag" popped up immediately after we signed the agreement and sent WALE a Cashier's check. When we read the promotional copy and commercials for our show sent to us by WALE's producers, we discovered they had misspelled the name of my book three different ways on the one-page copy, and made so many other errors that Mary and I (who have both taught at college level) both felt it looked like the work of an elementary student.

The next red flag was that their promise to provide us with "six weeks of training" turned out to be two one-hour phone calls (at our expense) and a fax.

Perhaps the most disturbing red flag was when J.C. Clayton called and suggested WE CONTACT SPONSORS ON OUR OWN AND HAVE THEM SEND THEIR CHECKS DIRECTLY TO MARY AND I PERSONALLY.

We can provide you with numerous examples of WALE's lack of professionalism, and have documented all of our conversations with WALE. But the bottom line is, they have not gotten a single sponsor, nor even given us the name of one single company they have contacted about sponsoring our show.

The executive director, J.C. Clayton, told me on May 19th, 1998 that he hoped to be calling around mid-June with good news about sponsors. Instead, we received several high-pressure calls around that time from both he and WALE owner Francis Battaglia asking us to come up with more money to produce a simulcast on their new Phoenix station. When we asked about the status of sponsors, J.C. stated, "it's certainly going to be much easier for us to sell it... if I could, even for pennies on the dollar, put the show on in Phoenix as well."

J.C. Clayton and Francis Battaglia both claimed that WALE was trying to sell our show to sponsors, but neither could name a single company contacted by WALE, nor have they responded to our repeated requests for the names of any other hosts of WALE programs who might be able to assure us that WALE had secured sponsorship for their shows. Instead, they encouraged us to solicit the guests we were interviewing on the show to buy commercial time, and again, TO HAVE THEM MAKE THE CHECKS OUT TO MARY AND I PERSONALLY.

On June 29th, 1998, we then faxed J.C. Clayton and Francis Battaglia, formally requesting the name and phone number of the Account Representative responsible for soliciting sponsors for our show, as we began doubting they even had a sales staff. We had at that time done seven shows, and interviewed internationally known guests who Mary and I both felt should have been a strong draw for quality sponsors. At that point, we were still assuming that WALE was approaching companies to sponsor our show, and hoped we might be able to help the Account Rep (if there was one) by offering information that could help sell our show.

Neither J.C. Clayton, Francis Battaglia, nor anyone else responded to our fax, so I resent it on July 13th, 1998, but to this date we still have received no reply from either of them, and increasingly began suspecting a scam.

We searched the internet and collected names of other people who are doing, or have done, shows on WALE, and have learned that we are not the only people who have lost a great deal of money to them. WALE claims to be producing 91 shows (however, they have no Program Guide and their website, now requires a password to enter, although it was accessible in April of this year when we were first contacted).

At \$4,498.00 per show, they may be bringing in as much as \$409,318.00 every 13 weeks, and may not be doing anything whatsoever to keep their promise to secure

sponsorship for those shows. Because Mary and I do believe in the work we are doing, and because we believe we had an ethical obligation to fulfill our end of the bargain-even though WALE has not appeared to make any attempt to fulfill theirs-we honored our promise to complete the 13 week contractual obligation. However, we also feel we have a moral obligation to alert people if WALE is indeed scamming well-meaning folks like ourselves out of hundreds of thousands of dollars. We initially contacted the Providence, RI Better Business Bureau, and were told they had no jurisdiction and we needed to contact the Rhode Island Attorney General. When we contacted the Attorney General, we were informed that it was not their jurisdiction, either, and referred to the FCC. We contacted the FCC in July, but have heard nothing back from them. We're beginning to see how WALE could be getting away with such a scam.

We can provide the names and phone numbers of over a dozen people who are doing, or have done shows on WALE. I can also provide documentation of every contact we have had with WALE, including the initial written agreement and all phone calls and faxes.

Thank you for your consideration,
Will Phillips

Will Phillips - Notes taken after phone conversation with Francis Battaglia - June 10, 1998

I just got a "hard sell" call from Francis Battaglia, WALE owner. He said that he had just read the fax I sent JC and belligerently told me he had invested 5 million dollars and years of his life in building WALE before seeing a return on his investment and belittled me for expecting to see a return on my investment within a month before "pulling the plug." I told him there must be a miscommunication somewhere, because Mary and I have no intention of "pulling the plug" on the show we're doing in Providence. We simply don't care to invest more money in another show in Phoenix based on our experience so far on the Providence station.

He said, "Well, would you consider doing a simulcast in Phoenix for free?" I said, "Would it involve taking another day or would it be at the same time?" He said, "At the same time, just on the two stations." I said, "I suppose that would be all right. In fact, yeah, I'd like that." He said, "So you're willing to let me spend 5 million dollars to build up the station and you want me to give you a station for free? You're not willing to invest fifty dollars an hour?" I said, "No, I'm not. I realize in the context you just placed it, that sounds outrageous, but that's how I

feel. I don't want to invest another penny in the radio show until I see some evidence that it's going to pay off."

I told him that Mary had asked JC for the names and numbers of 3 people doing similar shows to ours so we could ask them how long it took them to recoup their investment. Francis said, "I could give you hundreds of names, but considering the fact that I'm the owner of the station and have years of experience, I think I would be the best person to give you the information you want."

I told him that Mary and I entered into the original agreement on good faith, based on what we were told by JC and Bob Cotoia. Francis said, "When people go into business together, there has to be a certain degree of trust." I then pulled up my notes (above) and listed the reasons we started to lose confidence in the station. I mentioned the first three points:

"When I asked for a WALE Program Guide, I was told there wasn't one. Our "Six Week Training" turned out to be two one-hour phone calls and a fax. "The promo and commercial copy prepared by WALE was extremely amateurish and misspelled the name of my book three times on one page. Not only does that makes it hard to confidently tell guests that WALE can produce quality advertising copy for them, but I would be appalled if a colleague of ours were to received similarly-written ad copy.

I think I caught him off guard with my preparation. He said, "If you would have brought that to my attention or JC's attention at the time, we could have taken care of it." I told him that we DID bring it to the attention of either JC or Bob Cotoia-whichever of them faxed it to us, and that we re-wrote it and eventually it was produced to our satisfaction. He said, "Well, you can't form an impression of an entire radio station based on one five-dollar-an-hour employee." I told him that when that's the only contact a client has with the station, that's exactly how they base their entire impression of the station, and that if that copy had been the first thing I saw from WALE, I never would have signed the contract.

At that point, he said, "Just a minute," and put me on hold with some Chinese doctor show from Vancouver (again with no ads except his own). I set my 3-minute timer and hung up when it went off.

He called back about ten minutes later and left the following message on my machine:

"Yes, Will, I just had a production emergency, I greatly apologize. Francis at WALE radio. Again, we've all had employees work for us, Will. Maybe some of ours are sub-par, though we are doing hundreds of ads here at the station,

obviously the work that they did is not tolerated, though again, when I know about the problems immediately, or management, or senior management knows about the problems, they can be solved, I guess fortunately a lot sooner, though that still doesn't diminish the opportunity we have to reach another four million people in Arizona, which is why I bought the station-continue to reach people here, do it inexpensively, build a show, help a lot of people, don't want to let negativity and a few minor problems stop all of that, Will. So if you can get back to me, or get back to me with Mary on a conference call, we'll discuss the details and see if we could possibly work something out... um, as I said, very inexpensively, maybe get sponsors to pay for the show there, or here, so we can continue to work together, and get you on there, starting in July when we start, and see what we can work out. Again, Francis at WALE, 401-521-0990. I'm in till seven o'clock Eastern time nightly, and, uh, hopefully we'll speak to you soon and see if we could work something out to help both of us out for the future here. Thanks, bye."

THE WORST INTERVIEW EVER: JACK BLOOD & TOM FLOCCO

By Victor Thorn

It seems Jack Blood keeps plummeting to new lows. His latest embarrassment involved an interview with master schlock-meister Tom Flocco (September 23, 2005) who Blood heaped accolades on by saying he did "exemplary work." Flocco, as everyone knows by now, is the biggest laughing-stock in the alternative media field (even worse than Phil Jayhan, who is another frequent guest and substitute host on Blood's show ... talk about scraping the bottom of the barrel).

Anyway, Flocco's latest *National Enquirer* put-on involved the supposed arrest of Barbara Olson. This story has received so much scorn from the patriot community that Michael Rivero of *What Really Happened* ran stories on three successive days entitled:

- 1) Tom Flocco Officially Discredited
- 2) Okay Tom, Time to Put Up or Shut Up
- 3) Tom Flocco Now Thoroughly Discredited

Rivero also ran an article that pointed-out how Flocco's latest fakery - the New York subway bombing story - was almost identical to his fake Chicago subway bombing article (which had also been completely discredited). Flocco's a disgrace, and we should treat him like the leper-pariah that he is.

But what does Jack "I don't have the common sense of a slug" Blood do? He brings this buffoon-charlatan onto his show and gives him a forum, calling his Olson schlock an actual "news story."

No, Jack, it's not a "news story" — its gossip at best, and an outright lie at worst. Don't you have any discernment abilities whatsoever? Blood went on to say (exact quote): "We report things that are newsworthy. This doesn't necessarily mean it's true or that we're endorsing the story." He continued, 'If she [Olson] turns up, it will turn the 9-11 world upside-down."

But Flocco reported that Olson was discovered alive. In fact, he said on Blood's show that French intelligence had arrested her.

Blood responded once again, "It doesn't matter if I believe these stories or not. I have a responsibility to report them."

So what are you telling us, Jack? If the Tom Flocco, Sherman Skolnick, Tom Heneghan, Lenny Bloom, Sorchia Faal, Stew Webb cabal writes their next cock-n-bull story where they say Elvis Presley was found alive in Afghanistan with Osama bin Laden, and they were the two who plotted the 9-11 terrorist attacks together - all, of course, from "unnamed sources" with no documentation - then is this "news" too?

Where does it end? What if Flocco said Santa Claus was real, or that he had "proof the moon was made out of green cheese? At what point, Jack Blood, do you quit being a horse's ass and quit spewing this garbage? Can't you see you're being made a fool of? Not one credible independent journalist is treating these deliberate lies as serious news except you. Why? On top of that, you're ruining it for everybody else in this field who wants to do reputable, thoroughly-sourced work.

As for Tom Flocco's "sources" who "leak" this nonsense, let's get one thing perfectly clear. There are no sources. It's all a charade. Of course Flocco & Company are veiling their claims in these mysterious "unnamed sources," but it's all a put-on. They're making it up. It's that simple. Can't you see what's happening? These guys sit around and laugh their asses off at the crap they're pulling on all the idiots who believe them, or who take this pabulum as somehow credible. And Jack, you're promoting this con-job. Again, why?

As Lisa Guliani commented, this rubbish isn't "newsworthy," it's "gossip-worthy." There's a huge difference. News is verifiable, factual, and sourced. Gossip is simply innuendo, lies, hoaxes, and fabrications. Aren't you able to see the distinction, Jack? Flocco admitted on your show that there's no documentation for the Olson story.

But y'know what? I don't even think you cared because your interview with Flocco went for more than half-an-hour, and NOT ONCE did you ask him about any of the glaring inconsistencies. That would have been the first thing out of our mouths on WING TV. Do you know why? Because that's the hallmark of serious journalism; not this Company Man crap that you're pulling.

We would have asked: "Hey Tom, explain how you got so many aspects of this 'hoax' wrong that you even misspelled Barbara Olson's last name; you misspelled lira as lyra, and you said she was captured at the Polish-Austrian border (which doesn't even exist)." Again, Michael Rivero of *What Really Happened* mocked Flocco with a headline that declared that Amelia Earhart and Barbara Olson were found picking counterfeit apples in central France.

But Jack, you didn't even bring these topics to the table. It's incredible! In fact, Flocco had to actually mention these inaccuracies himself, and then blamed it on being up too late at night. Worse, you didn't even challenge him on this lame excuse, but instead let it slide as if nothing was out of the ordinary.

Who are you trying to be, Jack, the new Larry King with all your softball questions? Hell, we remember how you kissed ass with the Fox News crew at the Democratic National Convention in Boston; but you were so lame with Flocco that it was outright pathetic.

Rather than asking the tough questions, here is one that you did ask Flocco:

"Do you think there is a relationship between Special Prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald and John Fitzgerald Kennedy?"

Say what? Because they both have the word "Fitzgerald" in their names? How inane and sophomoric can you get? Even Flocco was dumbfounded by that floating turd.

Flocco then went on to report that his most recent JFK Jr. article received 22 million hits, and that it caused such a furor that George Bush Sr., George W. Bush, plus Bill and Hillary Clinton all met secretly at the White House to discuss it. But of course, what verification did Flocco offer for these claims? None. Zero. Zilch. Instead, he asked, "Why isn't *The Washington Post* reporting this story?" Answer: Because it's all b.s. Show us proof that both Bushes and Clintons huddled clandestinely in the White House because they were so worried about your story. Give us a break. In addition, isn't it funny that Flocco repeatedly reports on events that no other journalist in the whole wide world is privy to? In other words, he's the ONLY person on the entire face of the earth that can crack each and every one of these cases. If anybody's allowing themselves to be bamboozled by these obvious fabrications, then they should also be waiting for Santa Claus on December 25th.

But Jack Blood enabled this shyster by allowing him to peddle his lies. Of course Blood explains this away by saying, "We just put the news out there, then you have to go out and verify it."

Wait a minute. Yet again, Blood is so far off the mark that it's ludicrous. Y'see, Jack, a responsible journalist has the obligation to authenticate his work before it's published. What do you want us to do - follow every cockamamie wild goose chase story under the sun that these jerk-offs are putting out? What are we supposed to do next, help you verify Flocco's story that Bigfoot slept with Laura Bush in the Oval Office and conceived a secret love child? Hell, according to your

backward logic, EVERYTHING is news regardless of how preposterous it is.

Using your formula, Jack, there is no differentiation between *The National Enquirer* and Michel Chossudovsky's *Global Research*, or *The Weekly World News* and a Jim Marrs article that's been researched for ten years. To you they're all "news." I mean, it's sad, but are we going to have to take you back to school and teach you what the definition of NEWS is? Get with it, Jack, because it's embarrassing to even have to be writing these words about you. I mean, there are eighteen-year-old freshmen in Penn State's college of journalism that even know these basic fundamentals. Why don't you?

Last but not least, Jack Blood is also the first person to yell that no one in the alternative media or patriot movement should criticize anyone else. And do you know why he says that? Because he and his ilk don't want to be exposed as (take your pick): fear-mongers, gatekeepers, money-grubbing shills, sensationalists, shoddy journalists, distraction artists, or outright con-men. They don't want their actions to come under the glaring light of inspection; so they peddle this "kumbaya-why can't we all get along" mamby-pamby schtick to divert people's attention away from the real issues such as censorship, betrayal of the Gray Family by Alex Jones, etc.

But from our perspective, the media's first job is to be a watch dog by keeping a vigilant eye on wrong-doing - by the government, the mainstream media, and also the alternative media. And guess what: that's exactly what we've doing here at WING TV for nearly two years now. Best of all, look at what we've uncovered during this tenure. Ruppert's been exposed, Alex Jones has been exposed, Amy Goodman's been exposed, Art Bell's been exposed, along with a host of other phony balonies. If we had followed your bogus advice, Jack, all of this nonsense would have still been covered-up. Sure, that's what the people behind the rip-offs & lies & wrong-doing want; but it sure as hell isn't what we want at WING TV, and we're not afraid to say it.

In closing, Jack, your interview with Tom Flocco was the worst we'd ever heard on the alternative media, and it's time to start raising the bar. Quit being a pawn, and quit making a fool of yourself. It's really getting embarrassing. Either that, or go back to fleecing people at WALE in Rhode Island. That gig seemed to be right up your alley.

POSEUR PATRIOT

By Victor Thorn

"As a human being, sure, Jack Blood is a piece of shit. "

Rick Stanley in an October 29, 2005 phone conversation

Just when you thought Jack Blood couldn't sink any lower, think again. He has now sunken to even lower depths by aligning himself with a group of 'compatriots' who attacked his "mentor" and supposed friend Alex Jones. Here is what they recently said about Jones and his wife Violet. (Warning: the following excerpt is very graphic and has not been censored in any way)

Alex Jones Attacked by Jack Blood Associates

"I like Alex. He makes good movies and shit, ya know what I'm saying. I always said it - I think he's a cornball and I wanna fuck his wife. But you know what I'm sayin'? She's hot, man; I'll do her ass in. And that probably pisses Alex off. But you know; he needs to do some sit-ups. Get your ass in the gym, Alex! Quit eatin' so fuckin' much. It ain't even that you're eatin' so much. It's just sittin', you know. Alex will be the first to tell ya he do like eighteen hours a day sittin' on his motherfuckin' ass readin' articles. You're gonna be a fat bitch after a minute if you keep readin' articles all fuckin' day and don't run around the damn motherfuckin' block. But he's sensitive about it. I put on a few pounds too, but you know, I ain't fat like that motherfucker."

Real nice, huh? And incredibly, Jack Blood does more to promote and incite these individuals than ANY other person on the Internet. I suppose you didn't know about that side of him, did you? Anyway, we apologize for the above material, but we wanted to give you an accurate portrait of the real Jack Blood and the people he's now chosen to be his cohorts. And believe us, there's more ... much more ... but what you've read above is simply a taste of what kind of people Jack Blood is now associating with. In fact, we have literally dozens of examples saved in our computer that directly link Blood to them ... where he calls himself their "Blood Brother" and signs off by saying, "With much love, amigos."

Now, as most people know, we're not big fans of Alex Jones, but we would never cross the line and attack his wife or his personal appearance. Rather, we stick to pertinent issues such as censorship, fear-mongering, and rampant commercialism. Yet Jack Blood is championing the people who attacked Jones' wife and is supporting them 100%. And in all honesty, we're not even sure if Alex Jones is aware of what Blood is doing behind his back. If he was, we can't imagine he'd be

very pleased with such antics, especially when they involve his wife. This situation got so bad that GCN president Ted Anderson had to actually intervene behind-the-scenes and prevent Blood from doing a show that would have undoubtedly destroyed his network. At least Anderson had enough common sense to realize that his audience was comprised of Christian and Patriot listeners; so why would Blood want to attach himself to the likes of those who'd want to communicate this type of stuff about Alex Jones and others? We're warning you: be very, very wary of Jack Blood.

Regrettably, this tale doesn't end here. After author and researcher Eustace Mullins appeared on WING TV (July 12, 2005), we received an influx of e-mail saying, "Ask Eustace Mullins about the time Jack Blood ripped him off for a bunch of books." Now remember, Eustace Mullins is 83 years old, and he's a living legend - a national treasure - and one of the foremost authorities ever on the Federal Reserve System. Anyway, I called Mullins and asked him about this matter, and sure enough, he said that it was such a hassle receiving his money for two cases of books that he'd sold to Jack Blood ... and how it dragged on for month after month ... that he decided he would never again do business with him.

Mullins isn't the only patriot Blood has maligned. On more than one occasion in February, 2005, Blood bad-mouthed Rick Stanley to such an extent that I realized this guy wasn't "one of us." In fact, Blood went so far as to say that Rick Stanley was the kind of patriot that we didn't "need" ... in his own words, "The gun-toting macho asshole." It seems Stanley was irritated with Blood for bowing-out of an event he was scheduled to cover, so Blood started ragging on him behind his back to get even. What a guy, huh?

This story is none too surprising; especially after one reads about Jack Blood's former underhanded business practices (see WALE Radio Scam). After one gets to the end of that article, we don't think there's much argument that Mr. J.C. Clayton (aka John Clayton, aka Jack Blood) is one of the least ethical persons in the alternative media.

Clearly such information would trouble most people, but as you'll see, Jack Blood has some very peculiar notions about what a "patriot" is. In a post dated Monday, June 27, 2005 (11:11 pm) entitled *What is a Patriot?*, here is what Mr. Blood wrote: "It has become clear to me that I was never, and will never be accepted in the patriot movement. As I was "recruited" and never set out to be a "patriot" staple, I am happy to have FINALLY come to this conclusion."

Let's pause for a moment and analyze this statement. First of all, Blood states that he "never set out to be a patriot" and that he was "recruited" into this movement. What the hell does that mean? If he never intended to be a patriot, then what is he

doing here among us? I think a lot of REAL patriots would be very curious about such a contradictory and/or hypocritical stance. Even more troubling is his assertion that he was "recruited." By whom? Who "recruited" you, Jack? And since you never wanted to be a "patriot" anyway, WHY were you recruited? What was the purpose, and what was the agenda?

But wait, it gets worse. Two paragraphs later, Blood continues: "Patriots don't like Jack Blood, and though I will continue to support "patriot" meetings and events, or issues ... I breathe a sigh of relief knowing that I am NOT a patriot, and do not have to live by their laws."

What in God's name does that mean? First of all, notice how Blood puts quotation marks around the word "patriot" as if it's a term of derision, or as if he doesn't take it seriously. Then, yet again he repeats that he is NOT a patriot - and concludes by declaring (in capital letters), "Deadline Live is not a patriot radio show."

After reading the entirety of Blood's diatribe, what one sees is a very bizarre, anarchy-laced portrait of a man who seems to be on the verge of cracking-up. In between the paranoia, delirious outbursts, and delusions of grandeur, you'll read about how Blood "refuses to comply with the rules of 'Patriot Correctness,' how he is being attacked by 'Patriot Police' and 'Stepford Patriots,' and how he doesn't 'have to comply with collective laws and dogmatic control' from the patriot community. For whatever reason, it almost seems as if Blood hates those in the patriot movement.

Likewise, his words hearken back to a very insightful statement made by John Stadtmiller during his February 21, 2005 National Intel Report broadcast where he labeled Blood a "sociopath" who adheres to a philosophy where, "Everything is okay in their eyes. They can do and say anything that they want to, and the only time there becomes a problem is when they get caught. That's when there's a conflict. But up until that point there is none. And if you want a true definition of a sociopath, I'm describing John Clayton." These words by RBN's president appear to ring truer with every passing day.

The saddest aspect of this scenario is that Blood's mental deterioration is affecting the quality of his radio show, where he has now become a tired pitch-man for various extended infomercials. One listener even sent us an e-mail on July 8, 2005 describing Blood's show that day:

"Its 45 minutes into the first hour of Deadline Live and Jack is now doing a Berkey infomercial with Debbie Morrow. Before that he was doing an Enerfood infomercial with Darren (with the British accent). Before that he

was doing an Alex Jones infomercial with Alex. And in between all of these infomercials there were a bunch of commercials! And after all the commercials were all the heavy metal clips and George W. Bush clips. Jack has a low information content show. Junk food alternative media. Low information content ... junk food alternative media. How sad.

Regrettably, here's a man who supposedly craves freedom, but now he's been reduced to nothing more than a third-rate GCN Company Man pimping cheesy health food supplements and water filters that can't even get state approval in Iowa and California. Gee, Jack, you sure are a rebel! Hell, we remember when your show was actually good before it became a radio version of the Home Shopping Network! On top of that disgrace, Jack whines and cries on his show and in his posts that nobody's buying these products, and that he's not making any money.

Well, guess what, Jack — after everyone heard John Stadtmiller expose you, then read about your WALE brokered-time radio scam, your credibility is now ZERO! Zilch. Non-existent. Do you think anyone believes this con-man shyster schtick, especially with your track record? What do you think all of us "patriots" (the same ones that you sneer at) are - stupid? Well, we're not, and it's no wonder we're not falling for your used-car salesman spin.

With this information in mind, you may be wondering: what is Jack Blood's latest scheme. Well, now he's taken it upon himself to start recruiting "interns" who will work for him for free! If you don't believe us, check-out this pitch (reproduced verbatim) from a post dated June 24, 2005 (10:12 pm):

"I cannot afford to pay employees, and can ONLY train serious applicants for internship. I have run multi-million dollar radio companies, and have a lot of information to impart as payment. You can also work with me to get a foot in the door to the media world."

Whoo-hoo! There's the deal of the century! Can you believe this guy? Where does he think he is - back at WALE in Providence, Rhode Island trying to hook another bunch of suckers? And what is this "multi-million dollar radio company" he's referring to? WALE, which got run out of town on a rail? But just think, at least you'll "get a foot in the door to the media world!" Hey, with that and 99 cents maybe you could buy a cup of coffee! Does Jack Blood's audacity have any limit? How many people do you think are going to jump right on this amazing offer!

More incredibly, earlier in this same post, Blood declared (again verbatim): "We need an engineer, we need a PC, we need a webmaster, we need affiliate relation

people, we need producers, we need sales associates, we need researchers, and we need investigative reporters."

Of course Jack can't PAY any of these people to build his mini-empire, so we guess he just expects them all to bow at his feet and work for free! Doesn't this sound exactly like the glorious promises that Blood and WALE made to all their brokered-time broadcasters that ended up with absolutely nothing in the end? Hell, while we're at it, why don't we take up a collection and start buying Jack's groceries, paying his rent, and giving him a few hundred bucks a week spending money. Who the hell does this guy think he is? The world doesn't owe him a free ride just because he's "Jack Blood." In fact, here's a novel idea. Instead of putting all this time and energy into begging for money and free equipment, why don't you go out and get a job, Jack?

Lastly, we do want to say something in Jack Blood's favor - he advocates the free-flow of information, and is more anti-censorship than most anyone we've ever met. That's why it must kill him on a daily basis to be deliberately muted at his radio station, especially when he sees such rampant, overt Big Brother-style censorship taking place by Alex Jones. But y'see, Jack, that's what happens when you sell your soul and become a GCN Company Man - so much for your aspirations of freedom and rebelliousness.

Can't you see what's taking place, Jack? You're being used by all these people. Your new "buddies" who attacked Alex Jones and others are using you to make a name for themselves (while you publicly take all the heat for their actions); whereas GCN is using you to fill a time-slot and get paid for their air-time. Even Alex Jones is using you when he appears on your show three-times a week to pitch his videos. He's making all the money, while you're forced to be the sucker and beg for interns. Do you think your "buddy" Alex would ever reduce himself to such a sorry state? Hell no! But he'll sure use you every chance he gets. That's part of his tried-and-true formula that has been transpiring for years now. You're just part of the revolving door that keeps him propped up atop his altar.

None of these people give a damn about you, Jack. If you truly seek freedom, then its time to clean-out all this negative baggage and become your own man. It's either that, or you can stay in your cage of enslavement that is currently surrounding you. At your core, though, Jack, you know you're not a Company Man; so why do you keep playing one at GCN?

THE TOM FLOCCO DEBACLE

By Victor Thorn

Tom Flocco Officially Discredited

Do you ever wonder why "conspiracy theorists" and other Internet news services aren't taken seriously? It's because of sensationalistic horse's asses like Tom Flocco, who has yet again put-out completely unsubstantiated information, this time in regard to perjury and obstruction of justice indictments being issued to George Bush, Dick Cheney, Andrew Card, Scooter Libby, John Ashcroft, Mary Matalin, and Alberto Gonzalez. Remarkably, not one other news source in the entire world has come forth with this same information, either in the mainstream or the alternative media - only Tom Flocco. Worse, Flocco has a history of releasing similar news reports, and likewise creating hysterias with absolutely no proof to back them up. The latest example was when he (and others of his ilk) said gay GOP plant Jeff Gannon was actually Johnny Gosch, who was kidnapped when he was nine years old. Of course there hasn't been a single stitch of actual evidence to support these claims, but from their perspective, why should that bother us? Isn't conjecture good enough? So, Flocco poisoned the Internet with this crap, appeared on numerous radio talk shows, and essentially duped a wide array of people with this wild goose chase; and he's been pulling similar stunts for years.

But the problem with this type of "cowboy journalism" extends much deeper than to stooges like Tom Flocco. What really disturbs us at WING TV is how many knee-jerk idiotic trained-monkey fools ran with this obviously absurd 'indictment story' and posted it across the Internet and on message boards. They did this, of course, with no corroborating evidence, no sourcing, and no verification. They simply spread the lies like wildfire; and thus, in effect, discredited the entire alternative media in the process. This, regrettably, is what they call disinformation. So, all I can say to everyone who took part in this nonsense is: you should be ashamed of yourselves. By falling hook-line-and-sinker for this ruse, you made us all look bad — so STOP IT!

On the other hand, all I can say to Tom Flocco is: what's wrong with you? Are you so needy and desperate for attention and traffic on your website that you have to periodically spew this garbage across the 'Net? As far as I'm concerned, you're now officially discredited, and every word you print in the future should be taken with a huge grain of salt.

Luckily, people like Chris Emery, Peter Meyer, Lisa Guliani's *New World Order Corner*, and APFN looked into this matter and discovered that it stunk to high

heaven and didn't add up (hence, they did some legwork). That's the difference between them (real journalists), and those who shoot from the hip and didn't check a damn thing. I mean, to all those who disseminated Flocco's b.s., I shouldn't have to say this, but start using some discretion before you pass information around the Internet. What if Flocco wrote a story next week saying that the Earth stopped turning? Would you buy that one too without question?

Here's the bottom line: I hear everyone complaining about not getting enough respect from the mainstream media; but if you want respect, you have to act like you deserve it. You can't "earn" it by being bamboozled. This entire Tom Flocco debacle was an embarrassment, and we need to do better - much better.

REVEALED: TOM FLOCCO'S NEXT TEN ARTICLES

By Victor Thorn

As everyone knows, Tom Flocco's credibility has plummeted to new lows with his recent bogus articles about Barbara Olson, the Chicago MI-5 subway shootings, the Bush-Cheney indictments (which he said actually took place last July), and a slew of other obviously false stories. These sensationalistic-disinformation pieces always quote "unnamed sources" and provide no verification whatsoever. Of course none of these "sources" even exist because all he's doing is making this stuff up. It's that simple. Thus, anyone with even one ounce of sense now knows that anything Flocco publishes should be taken with a pound of salt (not just a grain of salt).

Luckily for us here at WING TV, these same "unnamed sources" that have supposedly been feeding information to Flocco and the other shysters recently contacted us with a list of Tom Flocco's next ten articles. Due to the amount of crap he has been taking, it now seems he is focusing his attention on the alternative media.

It is our intention to examine these potential "news stories" and verify whether they are legitimate, or once again outright fakes, which is so often the case with Flocco. So, without further ado

TOM FLOCCO's NEXT TEN STORIES

1) Mike Ruppert found in homosexual tryst with Exxon executive.

Analysis: Of course Ruppert is in bed with Big Oil to promote their gloom-n-doom peak oil scam, but there is no validity to the above story. FALSE.

2) George Noory has discovered the identity of the shadow rodents that he's been seeing in his house and along the highway, and it turns out to be none other than Art Bell.

Analysis: Although Noory has admitted on his radio show to seeing "shadow rodents," he and Art Bell live in different geographical locations around the country. So, unless "shadow rodents" can teleport themselves at will, there is no validity to the above story. FALSE.

3) Revealed: Alex Jones is seen at Bohemian Grove bowing at the altar of an

omnipotent Owl where he is worshipping the Almighty Dollar (\$\$\$\$\$\$).

Analysis: Very likely TRUE! Considering how Alex Jones sold-out and betrayed the Gray Family to ABC's 20/20, the way his wife scolded Michael Corbin for not pushing the sale of his videotapes hard enough, and how his show has become nothing more than one big long extended infomercial, Flocco is probably right on the mark with this story.

4) Jeff Rense has been abducted by an alien UFO entity where he was subsequently given a new Tiny Tim wig to wear as a disguise.

Analysis: Even though Rense is known to wear wigs, false glasses, and contact lenses to conceal his identity, there seems to be no validity to the above story. FALSE.

5) Nicholas Levis and Kyle Hence of 9-11 Mafia fame are going to have sex-change operations and re-name themselves "The Gatekeeper Queens."

Analysis: Even though Levis and Hence are notorious for concealing the truth about 9-11 and the World Trade Center controlled demolitions, as far as we can tell, this story has no legs. FALSE.

6) Patriot Jim Kujawa is one of the most dedicated patriots in America, and his commitment to exposing and defeating the New World Order is unparalleled.

Analysis: True with 100% accuracy. Flocco hit the nail on the head with this one.

7) Jack Blood has become such a lap-dog sycophant to Alex Jones by refusing to expose his censorship practices that he has now taken to mowing his grass, raking his leaves, and cleaning his garage on the weekends - all free of charge.

Analysis: Although it is true that Blood - a staunch anti-censorship proponent - has blatantly shirked from his responsibility as an independent journalist to denounce Alex Jones' sordid censorship practices, we have uncovered no evidence that Blood is serving as a weekend handyman for Jones (even though John Stadtmiller did say that Blood considered Alex Jones his "hero"... how pathetic is that?). FALSE.

8) Amy Goodman, Air America, Counterpunch, Truthout, Antiwar.com, and a slew of other liberal alternative press venues are finally going to start confronting the issue of 9-11 by exposing the truth instead of shielding and protecting George Bush and his cabal of mass-murdering criminals.

Analysis: We would love to think this story is true, but when one examines the track record of these phony false-front operatives, it is only wishful thinking. As far as we can determine, they'll continue - like the corporate mainstream media - to promote the left/right paradigm and keep accepting big money pay-off "grants" to keep them quiet about 9-11 Truth. FALSE.

9) Breaking News: God just informed Phil "Commander Pod" Jayhan that he will discover Flight 77 on the lost city of Atlantis.

Analysis: Despite the fact that Jayhan once wanted to dredge the entire Atlantic Ocean to search for all four 9-11 airliners, and he thought that a dead Mossad agent was hacking into his website, we cannot verify that God is actually communicating with Phil Jayhan about anything! FALSE.

10) Tom Flocco, Sherman Skolnick, Tom Heneghan, Sorch Faal, Stew Webb, Fintan Dunne, and Lenny Bloom are exposed as complete phonies who are duping the public and discrediting the alternative media with their gossip-rag bogus sensationalistic stories.

Analysis: TRUE! These charlatans have now been so thoroughly discredited that they're nothing more than laughing-stocks, and anyone who believes one word they say is an even bigger fool than they are.

SHODDY JOURNALISM

RUN RAMPANT

By Victor Thorn

Once more certain members of the alternative media, along with their hyperactive keyboard commandoes (who personify the motto: hit the SEND button at any cost without any verification whatsoever) dropped the ball yet again. Y'know, it's a good thing these people don't have their finger on the atomic bomb panic button, because as quickly as they react, we would have all been blown to smithereens ages ago.

Anyway, this time the Internet was buzzing with the following "urgent" "breaking" news story:

Cindy Sheehan Arrested

But was Sheehan *actually* arrested? The answer is a resounding NO. Rather, rally organizer Paul Zulkowitz was arrested for not having a "permit," while Sheehan was simply scurried away by supporters to her *Bring Them Home Now* tour bus. These must have been the same people who, in early August, said Sheehan would be arrested at George Bush's Crawford Ranch because she was a "threat to national security." Guess what: she wasn't arrested then either.

Of course it's ludicrous that Sheehan and those around her weren't allowed to speak in New York City, and I certainly don't condone the authority's actions; but there's a huge difference between being scuttled away by followers, and being arrested.

And where did this "arrest" news originate? Well, I'll give you the answer. It was started by someone named "Five of Diamonds."

Yes, you read correctly. The person at the forefront of this "news" didn't even have an actual name, but instead went by "Five of Diamonds." And from this one source, the sensationalism junkies went hog wild, just like they did with the "Chicago MI-5 Subway Shoot-out" that never happened.

Within minutes, these SEND-aholics were zapping Ms. Sheehan's "arrest" news across every message board and chat room in existence. In addition, reports started flying that Cindy Sheehan had been seriously injured in the "melee."

But in reality, Ms. Sheehan, by her own admission, was only "hurt slightly" in a "scuffle" when someone "grabbed her backpack and pulled it back pretty hard."

Again, I'm not advocating that anyone should be removed from a public protest, but can you see what I'm trying to get at? The news that these people were disseminating was INCORRECT. Now can you see why so many people don't take the alternative media seriously? Look at how dramatically wrong they got their stories. Cindy Sheehan wasn't arrested, nor was she paralyzed, beaten unmercifully, or dragged kicking & screaming through barbed-wire by snarling police dogs. She was simply "shoved around a little bit," then escorted away to her bus.

After all, who really needs "responsible journalism" when we have all these hair-trigger cowboys who go-off on a moment's notice? I suppose it was time for these alternative media junkies to get another one of their "sensationalism fixes." How pathetic.

PHIL JAYHAN **ATTACKS ALEX JONES**

From WING TV

The following message was recently posted by Phil Jayhan on his *Let's Roll 9-11* website.

" Ya, nice website. He's NOT getting a link until he links to us. Why? Because "I" am not all about Alex. And since Alex wants to be on his own, the lone ranger, far be it from me to upset his apple cart. He doesn't want us, or need us.

Fuck Alex Jones. There, I said it. What every 911 person feels about Alex Jones. Everyone of us hates him. Because he is all about him. There isn't a single 911 researcher who doesn't feel this way. They ALL hate Alex Jones because of how he acts."

Commentary from WING TV: The strange thing is: Phil Jayhan has criticized us for exposing Alex Jones, but we have never made any personal attacks whatsoever against him. We are simply bringing into question Jones' practice of Big Brother-style censorship, hard-sell advertising, fear-mongering, lack of activism, and his refusal to answer for his actions. It's never been personal. We simply feel Alex is becoming a mirror-image of the mainstream media.

On the other hand, Phil Jayhan was venomous, going straight for the throat! He tore Alex such a new asshole that the next time Jones goes to the bathroom he's going to need TWO commodes! Jayhan's hypocrisy is beyond comprehension.

PHIL JAYHAN: LAUGHING-STOCK

From WING TV

Let's Roll 911 is quite possibly the most censored "discussion forum" on the Internet. Its host, Phil Jayhan, has even gone so far as to say that his site is "not a free speech forum," and when we once asked him if he thought the alternative media had a responsibility to uphold higher standards than the mainstream media, he said he "wasn't sure." Jayhan is also responsible for the "pod theory," which, as a peripheral issue, has been one of the biggest distractions since the 9-11 terror attacks. (See: *The 9-11 Pods*). Jayhan has also made the following revelations directly to Lisa Guliani and myself:

- a) He knows where the four 9-11 hijacked planes are (in the Atlantic Ocean!), and he wanted Ellen Mariani to collect her Victim Compensation Fund money from the government (after the deadline had already run out, no less) so that she could finance a million-dollar expedition where he'd scour the ocean trying to find these planes! We swear to God we're not making this up. Can you imagine Ellen Mariani picking-up the phone to hear Jayhan saying, "Yes, ma'am, all you have to do is give me a \$1,000,000 and I'll start searching the ocean." The guy is out-of-his-mind delusional! Where's he going to start looking next - Atlantis!
- b) He also told us that he thought a Mossad agent - Daniel Levin - who was supposedly killed on one of the downed 9-11 airliners, was still alive and hacking into his website! Can you believe this guy? What a joke!
- c) Finally, right before guest hosting on a GCN radio show, Jayhan called us and said that God was speaking directly to him, and told him that he should expose the satanic government pedophilia ring that, coincidentally, everybody else in the alternative media had been talking about for the past few months.

There's plenty more, but all we can say is that this guy is definitely off his rocker. In fact, this is a message that he recently left on his *Let's Roll 911* forum.

"This is the effect I was seeking after. I come out, be an asshole, and piss off those who oppose me and make them speak up. That way I can then swing my sickle, and harvest the wheat from the chaff and ban those who don't contribute anything to the forum. Crude but effective. I don't need everyone to like me or agree with me, as I have enough friends already. And if some no name anonymous person doesn't like it, oh well. I have had it up to HERE with being criticized."

Talk about megalomania and delusions of grandeur gone awry! And just remember that this guy - Phil Jayhan - is the one who orchestrated the entire "pod theory" in the first place. Makes you want to feel a whole lot of confidence in him, doesn't it?

Jayhan has even gone so far as to tell a very well-known 9-11 researcher that the hosts of WING TV are possessed by Satan because, get this, they wear dark clothes every day on their show, and they both have black hair. In addition, he said that the cover of *9-11 on Trial* was occult in origin because of the bright orange flames coming out of the World Trade Center towers. To clarify, we don't wear dark clothes every day on WING TV; Victor Thorn's hair is actually blonde, and the bright orange flames on the cover of *9-11 on Trial* originated from burning jet fuel, not Beelzebub. This guy needs to be locked in a rubber room for awhile!

THE 9-11 PODS

by Victor Thorn

When it comes to whether or not there were pods attached to the jetliners which struck the WTC towers on the morning of 9-11, we have to ask ourselves if this matter is really of the utmost importance to us. I mean, if you look at the big picture, the pods are really only a peripheral issue at best. Why? Because here is the bottom line: a very sophisticated controlled demolition is what ultimately destroyed the World Trade Center towers. Thus, the airplanes didn't bring them down; the resulting jet fuel fires didn't bring them down; and if there were pods attached to each plane, they didn't bring them down either.

So, rather than focus our attention on the most crucial 9-11 CORE ISSUE - controlled demolition - we've been distracted by the pods. Now this article is not a criticism of any single person or group, because a number of people have done some exceptional work in bringing this issue to light, and I commend them for doing so. But what I want to remind all 9-11 activists and researchers of is that we shouldn't be exerting such an inordinate amount of time on matters which aren't at the crux of our investigation. Think about how much energy has been spent on the pods in both the alternative and mainstream media. It's considerable, and where has it gotten us, especially since these pods didn't actually destroy the towers.

This situation is similar to a physician being brought into an emergency room to treat someone with a horribly broken leg. But when asked by his assistant what he's going to examine, the doctor replies, "I'm going to check the hangnail on this person's middle toe."

"But sir," his sidekick objects, "this man was in a terrible motorcycle accident and his leg was wrapped around a tree. There's blood everywhere, exposed bones, plus he's screaming like a banshee. Why are you paying so much attention to his hangnail?"

This is precisely what the pods have become in relation to the WTC controlled demolition - nothing more than a hangnail - a diversion. Thus, if no pods ever existed in the first place, it becomes a moot point. More importantly, even if the pods did exist, it's still a moot point in relation to the controlled demolition because pods didn't bring the towers down! So, the pods can't be seen as anything other than a secondary issue - one that exists on the periphery of the true crux issue.

RESPONSE TO FINTAN DUNNE: **PHONY LEFT/RIGHT PARADIGM**

By Lisa **Guliani**

I've just finished listening to Fintan Dunne's Monday, February 14th monologue on *Break For News*. From the 'headline' on his web-page, one might expect the expose of the year. Instead, I felt like I was listening to Geraldo Rivera opening Al Capone's vault and - VOILA!!! Where's the beef, Fintan?

Dunne's commentary is a classic example of what is wrong with the so-called Truth Movement today. He repeatedly refers to 'left' and 'right' as if there were any genuine distinctions to be made between Skull & Bonesman "Republican" George Bush and Skull & Bonesman "Democrat" John Kerry. What is clear to us is that Fintan remains stuck in the trenches of the old 'left/right' paradigm. If he can't even move beyond that basic illusion, how far behind the 8-ball is the rest of his analysis? This 'left/right' false distinction is something Victor and I have been consistently trying to steer away from, because it is a manufactured deception. Both the establishment left and the establishment right receive their funding from the same sources, as we've pointed out on numerous occasions. Dunne's remarks serve to preserve the already existent divisions between various groups within our country, and are wholly counterproductive to changing the status quo. We see nothing whatsoever 'wrong' in trying to unite and mobilize all Americans.

We are not focusing on just the Christians or just the Patriots, or solely the left or only the right. We want to unite ALL Americans against our common enemy. It's a pretty simple concept. What exactly is wrong with uniting 'Patriots' with those on the 'left'? America is comprised of many various groups, isn't it? And yes, we have extended an olive branch to Alex Jones in order to move beyond those issues upon which we've disagreed in the past in order to focus on more important matters. We must become a larger, more cohesive force if we're to save our country - another concept that is easy to comprehend. We cannot do this if we continue to be divided. Victor and I seek to accomplish the very same thing with Rick Stanley, Amy Goodman, Michael Rivero, Jeff Rense, George Noory, and even Fintan Dunne. What could possibly be wrong with this?

Dunne's assertions are regrettably off-base. Our acquaintance and friendship with Rick Stanley is well-known and long-standing. So what, Fintan? What's your point? Our "ties" to Stanley did not just "suddenly" arise, as many other informed people are well-aware. Where have you been, Fintan, and why do you have a problem with unifying the entire country? Is it better that we remain split, fragmented, and ineffective? I wish I had counted how many times he used the

words "left" and "right" in his monologue. Talk about "skin'deep" analysis. Get beyond this false right-left paradigm, Fintan. We're way beyond that, and by now you should be too. Moreover, Victor Thorn's new book, *9-11 On Trial*, shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that the government clearly lied about the World Trade Center collapse. If Fintan had bothered to even look at the case presented in this book, perhaps he might feel it necessary to retract his characterization of us as "useful idiots". There is nothing "skin-deep" about the physics and mathematics which provide rock-solid arguments for our case against the government.

Ask yourself why Dunne has decided to launch such a decidedly deficient campaign against individuals who are trying to bring the nation together rather than see it drift farther and farther apart. We all face a common enemy, and petty disagreements should not continue to divide and distract us from the core issues. The core issue is that we must reclaim America, or there will be no America to reclaim — yet another extremely simple concept to understand. Would Dunne prefer to see us all continue marching in lockstep toward a certain and collective demise?

Shame on you, Fintan - pretty skin-deep, in my opinion.

RESPONSE TO FINTAN DUNNE: **9-11 THE TRUTH RESONATES**

By Lisa Guliani

Fintan, Fintan, Fintan...

I suppose, according to your obviously twisted logic, that perpetuating a criminal cover-up of mass murder and remaining silent about the government and mainstream media lies about the WTC collapses is a form of respect for the living and the dead. Is that it?

If you had bothered to be there at Ground Zero on 9-11, you would have seen something incredible, something historic. You would have seen a mostly receptive public, which included victim family members, firemen, police officers, and passersby on 9-11 - all of whom listened intently to what I had to say with many people nodding their heads in agreement, coming up to us and thanking us for doing what we were doing, shaking our hands, hugging us and grabbing our DVDs and fliers faster than we could give them away.

Now think about it. Why would they nod in agreement? I'll tell you why. Because people are not as stupid as you presume them to be. Truth resonates in people on a cellular level.

I suppose none of those people really wanted to hear this information, according to your pathetic way of thinking - is that correct, Fintan?

Furthermore, when Paul Isaac, Jr. (a well-known New York City auxiliary fireman) told us in front of several others that he knows that 9-11 was an inside job, and then pointed to other law enforcement officers standing there at the WTC with us and said that they also know - that they ALL KNOW - I suppose he was just disrespecting the dead too, huh? How do you plan to spin that one, Fintan? There were witnesses who heard him saying this to us at Ground Zero the other day. Are they all liars? Will you now be labeling them CIA too?

I suppose that the police officer who gave a "thumbs up" gesture as we all left Ground Zero was just blowing smoke up our ass, too - right, Fintan? Is he CIA too?

For someone who feels compelled to paint himself as the only "legitimate" news source on the Internet - at least, according to your moronic and patently b.s.

disinfo "list," you sure are spewing a boatload of nothing but pure crap these days. Gee, Fintan - are YOU CIA?

I really must ask you - isn't there any news for you to spin across the pond? Are you that bored, Fintan? I for one would love to see you qualify the names on your CIA disinfo "list". I'm sure you will have no problem doing that, right? I suspect that a lot of other people would very much love to see you substantiate what you're saying about WING TV and all the other websites on your "list". But of course we all know why you're doing it - sheer jealousy and a desperate need for attention.

Go ahead. Please prove what you're saying. And while you're busy trying to weave that little tale of fiction, we'll continue to do what we've been doing all along - telling the truth. And I will add to this what I said at Ground Zero, and what I have said at every public venue: We don't honor the dead through our silence. We don't honor the dead by following the sheep to the slaughter. We honor the dead by speaking out in their names and seeking justice for them. We honor the dead by telling the truth, dissolving the myths, lies, illusions and misperceptions. We honor the dead by refusing to remain silent in the face of the perpetration of a crime.

In this case, the crime of 9-11 was mass murder.

The truth belongs at Ground Zero more than anywhere else in America. Even a little fishy like you from across the pond should be able to comprehend this, Fintan. It's a no-brainer.

Until you get off your dead ass and stop hiding behind your microphone and your monitor, until you start talking truth where it counts - out on the street, looking directly into the eyes of the people who need to hear it most - I suggest you re-think casting aspersions upon those of us who do have the guts, integrity, and conscience to do it.

Remember, it's not what you say. It's what you do that counts. I bet that even applies in Ireland.

If you don't have the balls to tell the truth Fintan, then get the hell out of the way. Because I do have what it takes ... and then some. Victor Thorn and I are not afraid to tell it like it is, no matter who's around or where we are. Four years is long enough to keep a lie going, isn't it? The dead demand justice, not some bogus "list," Fintan.

If you had any integrity or conscience or sense of self-respect, you'd be kicking your own ass for such blatant, transparent publicity stunts as this tripe of an article

you're running here. Let me say this to you, Fintan. I don't give a damn what garbage comes out of your face. You will not stop us from getting the truth out. If you were any kind of decent human being, you'd be standing with us doing the same damn thing we're doing, and what we've BEEN doing all along.

It's your soul, Fintan — yours to save or destroy. The TRUTH will prevail in spite of, and despite, the likes of worms such as you. Let me make this very clear so there is no misunderstanding. You will not stop people from knowing the truth. No matter what you say or what you write. We will not let you or any other gatekeeper keep this truth from the American people. Period. You can't stop it. 911Truth.org can't stop it. The mainstream media can't stop it. The government can't stop it.

Choke on that for a little while, you disgraceful lying zero. Maybe you should ask the CIA for a job. You seem rather obsessed with them....

CYNTHIA MCKINNEY'S **9-11 WHITEWASH**

By Victor Thorn

How many times are the 9-11 gatekeepers and those in the 'distraction brigade' going to repeat their lies before people get completely fed up with them? Specifically, Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda were not the perpetrators of 9-11. Instead, they were nothing more than convenient CIA assets that have assumed the role of scapegoat and Orwellian perpetual enemy. On the other hand, what actually brought the World Trade Center towers down was a controlled demolition which was planned, orchestrated, and executed by a small cabal of individuals inside (and outside) our government.

This information has long been established, so why is the alternative media publishing (without personally rebutting it) articles that laud Representative Cynthia McKinney's recent Capitol Hill hearings on July 22, 2005 where she reiterates and reinforces the government's official party line? Wasn't the 9-11 Whitewash Committee bad enough? Why do we need another snow-job chaired by Cynthia McKinney?

If you think I'm being too hard on the congresswoman, take a look at who her staff assistant was for these proceedings - none other than John Judge, a man who still adamantly pushes the blatant disinformation line that Flight 77 struck the Pentagon!

McKinney herself seems to fall in line with the official government story, for she said during the proceedings that, "What we are doing is asking the unanswered questions of the 9/11 families." But the prominent 9-11 families, led by the likes of Kristen Breitweiser, Mindy Kleinberg, Lisa Beamer, and Laurie Van Auken, have historically shown absolutely no interest in learning the truth about what actually took place on 9-11. I know, because we've tried numerous times to relay the truth to them, but have received nothing but silence in return. I suppose they'd rather be kept in the dark by Kyle Hence and the other 9-11 gatekeepers. In fact, their interest in suppressing the truth is so widespread that Barbara Honegger relayed this account on the *9-11 Truth Alliance* message board (July 27, 2005):

"Professor David Ray Griffin [was] specifically NOT invited to speak at the McKinney hearings - we were told because the Jersey Girls believe he 'goes too far' in his books and talks in the direction of a government conspiracy, and they wouldn't appear with him."

Can you believe their audacity? How can women who lost their husbands and other loved ones *not* want to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? It's preposterous. Of course their actions (or lack thereof) are not McKinney's fault; but why is she summoning to testify those who don't have the courage to stomach the truth? Why not instead call on those who'll go for the throat and expose the ultimate truth about 9-11 being a highly-complex controlled demolition?

Isn't it obvious what is taking place? McKinney's hearing was nothing more than a charade where she went through the motions to once again contain (or restrict) information within some very narrowly-defined parameters.

Marilyn Rosenthal, who lost a son in the attacks, commented: "9-11 could have been prevented." Sadly, this sentiment was the overall premise of these hearings: our government simply dropped the ball through negligence and incompetence, and thus those pesky terrorists snuck through on their hijacked airliners.

So, yes, 9-11 could have been prevented, but only if we had stopped the Neo-Cons, Mossad, CIA, Pentagon officials, and defense contractors from executing a controlled demolition! That's the key, not the subjects discussed at McKinney's bogus hearings, such as: Osama bin Laden, George Bush reading a goat story, al Qaeda, John Negroponte, Philippine intelligence and the Abu Sayyaf Group, Saddam Hussein, or how 19 cave-dwellers financed their operations in Afghanistan.

Ms. McKinney, listen closely: Osama bin Laden wasn't behind the 9-11 attacks, so quit perpetrating the myth. Also, instead of play-acting, why don't you stand on the Senate floor and declare in no uncertain terms: **9-11 was a controlled demolition, and it's time to lay out our proof of it to the American people.** Ms. McKinney, this is the only way we're going to solve this case and bring the guilty parties to justice. Otherwise, if people continue to follow your lead, they'll do nothing but chase their tails in circles, for everything outside of controlled demolition is merely a peripheral issue.

CHARLES KEY SELLS-OUT

THE OKBIC

by Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Victor Thorn: We're doing this show today with a heavy heart.

Lisa Guliani: Yes.

Victor Thorn: In fact, this is probably the most disappointed we've ever been since we started doing WING TV, because someone that we had a whole lot of faith in, someone that we trusted and someone that we considered - and still do consider - a good friend is taking a turn for the worse.

Lisa Guliani: Victor and I don't have a lot of faith in many people, but we really like this person very much. We still like him. It's unfortunate, though, that he's now aligning himself with 9-11 gatekeepers, and this has been the most difficult show that I've had to do so far.

Victor Thorn: We've brought this up to other people, and it seems like this individual - his name's Chris Emery - is being seduced by the 9-11 gatekeepers. And I'll ask, when you see somebody going down a dangerous path, what do you do? Do you stay silent, or do you try to draw them back and show them that they should get back on the path of truth?

Lisa Guliani: The worst thing about it is that Chris Emery, who is with the Oklahoma City Bombing Investigative Committee (OKBIC), knows damn well that these people at 911Truth.org are gatekeepers. He knows this. And I have proof because of emails he's sent to me.

Victor Thorn: Yes, and we're going to get to that in a little bit. We've tried talking to Chris Emery about this, especially in the last few days, and we don't know if this is the case, per se, or not. But, has somebody gotten to him, or as somebody else said to us, has he been seduced by these gatekeepers? Let me give you an analogy. What if there was a band of arsonists and they went around the city setting fire to all the buildings. Then, there was another group of people who tried to have these arsonists arrested and convicted, but every time they tried to do something, there was a third group that protected the arsonists. This third group that was covering for the arsonists stopped all the progress. Well, what would happen if one of the good people in your group started siding with the cover-up artists?

Lisa Guliani: And started helping the first group get away with setting fires.

Victor Thorn: How would you feel about that? This is what we're faced with right now. Here's another example: what if there was a talk show host on AM radio, say out in Dayton, Ohio. He's earning \$35,000 a year ... making a living, but nothing spectacular. But then the "powers that be" in the NWO see that this guy has some value, that they can use him. So they send him two round trip tickets to New York City, wine him and dine him, put him up in a big hotel, and get him a limo. Then they ask him, "Hey, do you like this kind of lifestyle? If you do, why don't you side with us?" The big question we have to ask right now is: why is Chris Emery aligning himself with the 9-11 Mafia? Why?

Lisa Guliani: Right. Chris Emery told us months ago that he was going to Ground Zero on 9-11, and subsequently, we announced that on our show. We were very proud to stand with Chris Emery, as we felt that he was an unimpeachable source of integrity and a great person. Now he has changed his tune and he's going to be hanging out with the gatekeepers in Colorado, like "Mr. Mamby-Pamby" Michael Wolsey of Colorado *9-11 Visibility*.

Victor Thorn: He told us that the reason he was going there is because they're buying him a round trip ticket, and they're also going to put him up. At WING TV, we don't have the money to buy round trip tickets for anybody.

Lisa Guliani: And when we put someone up who travels here, we put them up on our couch. We can't afford a hotel room for these people, and we don't have friends with big houses to accommodate such free arrangements.

Victor Thorn: We talked to Emery about this last week, and in an e-mail he said that he not only respects us, but he also respects the people in the 9-11 Truth Mafia, these war criminals.

Lisa Guliani: That remark is enough to send me up the wall. That drives me crazy, because I don't know how a man (in good conscience) like Chris Emery, who does have a conscience, can respect people who are perpetuating a criminal cover-up of mass murder.

Victor Thorn: We have no respect whatsoever for these individuals. They're like the people who are covering up for the arsonists. That's what the 9-11 Truth Mafia - these war criminals - are doing. They're covering up for the criminals. Chris Emery gave us a good example of this: when we were down at the D.C. Truth Convergence, the day after we left, they had some seminars. Emery was talking about ordnances (explosives) in the Alfred P. Murrah building in Oklahoma City. Well, one of the 9-11 Mafia members, Jan Hoyer, was in

attendance. When she heard Emery say that, Emery told us that she rolled her eyes and stormed out of the room because she didn't want to hear this kind of stuff. Jan Hoyer's also the one that deleted all of our pictures from the OKC photo gallery. Now, we had our 14-foot banner with us down there in D.C. Not one picture of this was included in their photo gallery. Why? That's the same exact thing the mainstream media does. They exclude information and keep it from you. That's the role of a gatekeeper. Jan Hoyer should be embarrassed and ashamed to do that.

Lisa Guliani: Speaking of Jan Hoyer, 9-11 activist and political author Michael Langston was also at the *OKC Bombing Day of Truth* event back in April 2005 along with us. He remembers Jan Hoyer confusing the numbers of the planes that hit the buildings on 9-11-01 (the flight numbers) when she was up on stage speaking to the audience at that conference. How familiar are these people with the information if they can't even get the flight numbers right?

Victor Thorn: That's just like Janice Matthews, one of the members of *911Truth.org*, who organizes some of these events. She's organizing one in Kansas City to be held in the fall, I believe. It's another 9-11 gatekeeper event. Well, I sent her a copy of *9-11 on Trial*, and she hasn't even read it. The controlled demolition of the WTC towers is the crux issue of 9-11, and she hasn't even read about it. Another example of the blatancy of these gatekeepers has to do with Kyle Hence. He tried to worm his way into the speakers' forum at the OKC event. Well, Chris Emery (before they got to him), flatly turned Kyle Hence down. Here are some of the comments he made about this guy, Kyle Hence.

Lisa Guliani: Emery also asked Victor, me, and author John Kaminski our impressions of Kyle Hence, and we gave him our impressions, which is why Hence was not allowed to speak at the OKC speakers' forum, although he did try to worm his way in there.

Victor Thorn: Emery said he didn't want any gatekeepers speaking at that event.

Lisa Guliani: In an e-mail to me dated March 19, 2005, Chris Emery said this about Kyle trying to worm his way in there. He said, "I look at it in one of two ways, and this is a real short menu to choose from. a) Charles (Charles Key, head of OKBIC) was blowing smoke up someone's rear end and pulled the email and phone call he got from Hence out of the clear blue, which was followed up by his ten minute conversation with me about him (Hence) and what I thought of him, which was followed by my call to you (Lisa Guliani) within 45 seconds thereafter, asking your opinion of Mr. Hence. Or, b) Mr. Hence is a pathological liar." Emery follows that by saying "Mr. Hence is a moron."

Victor Thorn: Yes, and there are plenty of other things he's said in these emails, too.

Lisa Guliani: Yes, he said Hence is a weenie, that he's counterproductive and detrimental to the movement; that he ass-kisses with political movers and shakers; and tries to ass-kiss with members of Congress that don't give a rip about 9-11. This is what Chris Emery thinks of *911Truth.org* and Kyle Hence. Emery also calls Mike Ruppert (peak oil scam artist and 9-11 Gatekeeper) a weenie in these emails.

Victor Thorn: We understand that Emery and all of us have limited time and money. So, considering the limited amount of time and money, why is he choosing to spend his time siding with gatekeepers instead of truth-tellers?

Lisa Guliani: If you have limited time and money, why don't you channel your efforts and energies toward the people who are trying to tell the truth, rather than people who are perpetuating the LIE?

Victor Thorn: On 9-11-05, Emery's going to Colorado to be with Michael Wolsey. Well, we did an interview with Michael Wolsey on WING TV on August 8, 2005, and at one point he said that we don't really know what happened on 9-11. Guess what? We DO know what happened. It was a controlled demolition. Yet all of these 9-11 gatekeepers keep repeating this mantra of "we don't know what happened".

Lisa Guliani: We saw back in April (2005) at the OKC Truth event that these people (9-11 Truth Mafia) were trying to co-opt the OKC people and that event. We saw this. And subsequently, our names and website were removed from their press release and the flier. We said something about Bob Barr's presence at this event, and we blame his presence there totally on Charles Key.

Victor Thorn: Wolsey was also the person that refused to denounce Kyle Hence. So what they do is; they all stick together like Company Men, and the reason why they're trying to co-opt Emery and the OKBIC is because this 9-11 Truth Mafia has been so discredited and so exposed as phonies that they need to find someone that's squeaky clean.

Lisa Guliani: Right, so you have Chris Emery, who's "Mr. Clean-Shiny-Sparkly", a man with a conscience and an "unimpeachable" source, and you have *911Truth.org*, who isn't worth the paper to wipe you're butt with, who needs somebody to bolster their sagging, deflated credibility. So they sidle up and hook themselves to Mr. Clean.

Victor Thorn: What they're doing is using Chris Emery, and he can't be this naive not to see it.

Lisa Guliani: No.

Victor Thorn: By Emery attending and/or helping to organize their events, he's supporting the gatekeepers and condoning what they're doing. And in the process, he is giving them credibility through his association with, and endorsement of, them. That is something totally inexcusable to be doing. Chris, you can't be doing that. Expose these people for what they are.

Lisa Guliani: Right. You can't play both sides against the middle. You have to get off the fence. Another issue is our website and the section dealing with the OKC Bombing. It was created by us just for the OKBIC.

Victor Thorn: Yes, but first let me say this: anyone that sits in the middle of the road - and that's what Emery is doing, he's sitting in the middle of the road trying to play both ends against the middle - but you end up getting run over when you do that. We've warned him and warned him countless times...

Lisa Guliani: And he's agreed with us.

Victor Thorn: He does agree with us because there's so much evidence against these gatekeepers. Read what 9-11 researcher and activist Nico Haupt's written. Go into our WING archives and read what we've done. It's all right there. Nobody can say that they didn't know.

Lisa Guliani: 9-11 researcher Rabbi Philo had a very good article a few months back on the same subject.

Victor Thorn: Chris Emery isn't a mindless idiot. He knows this stuff, so we have to wonder why he's now consorting with the enemy. We also asked Emery to contribute to a controlled demolition project we're going to do sometime in the future. He agreed with us right off the bat to do this.

Lisa Guliani: We asked him to do a short video presentation on controlled demolition at the Murrah building.

Victor Thorn: He thought it was a super idea at the time. But as everybody knows, the 9-11 Mafia never talks about controlled demolition, and now for some reason they've gotten Emery to back out of the project. He makes excuses about why he's not going to do it now, but come on.

Lisa Guliani: The whole thing is; they don't want to have anything to do with anyone who has anything to do with us. See, so you get the ultimatum there. If you're gonna be with us, you can't be with them.

Victor Thorn: Right; and we place a lot of this blame on a man named Charles Key. He's been on our show before, and the first time we knew something was wrong with Charles Key was at the dinner in OKC in April, the night before the speakers' forum. That's when Key brought in a guy named Bob Barr.

Lisa Guliani: As in Bob Barr, who used to work for the CIA.

Victor Thorn: Yeah, Bob Barr was in the CIA for seven years. They paid him a \$2,000 honorarium to be the keynote speaker at this event, and they put him up in this swanky hotel. We saw the hotel.

Lisa Guliani: Yes, we went there with Chris Emery to pay for his room reservation.

Victor Thorn: Think about it. We traveled to Oklahoma City on a bus, and they're putting the CIA guy up at this hotel and giving him \$2,000. We also knew something was wrong with Key when we were informed that our website and our names had been removed from all of the advertising and all of the fliers for this OKC event. They took our names off right before the event.

Lisa Guliani: And that whole rally was our idea in the first place.

Victor Thorn: Emery said that Charles told him the reason our names/website were removed was because Bob Barr wasn't happy with our "Zionist" stance. Yet, John Kaminski's name was left on, and John Kaminski's written a thousand times more about Zionism than we have.

Lisa Guliani: And his writing about Zionism is more abrasive than ours. But they left his name on. They also kept his name on the press release, and subsequently John Kaminski ditched their event altogether and never went. He bailed out of it and didn't tell the truth about why he didn't go.

Victor Thorn: Exactly. When we did meet Bob Barr, we mentioned we were from WING TV. He wasn't even familiar with it. Either he's a real good liar, or... He was like, "WING TV, what's that?" So, who was telling the lies here? Somebody was, and it was either Barr or Charles Key. Another thing that's really suspicious is that the OKBIC website has no links to all of the interviews that these OKBIC people did with us.

Lisa Guliani: We created the OKC section of our website specifically for them. We put all their information about press conferences, upcoming events and the many interviews we did with OKC survivors and OKBIC committee members on that section. The whole point of this - and we all mutually agreed on this - was to get the information out to as many people as possible. Well, why aren't they linking to any of that information on their website? They're defeating the sole purpose for putting it up there to begin with. Also, they don't direct people to that information when they appear on radio shows, which is mind-boggling.

Victor Thorn: These interviews we did with them are the best out there, and they come right from the survivors' and researchers' own mouths. Yet, there's no link to it. They also have no information about a chapbook I wrote on the subject called *The OKC Bombing-Elohim City Connection*. Michael Collins Piper said this is the most valuable piece of information about the OKC bombing, yet no link to it whatsoever. Somebody is doing a big job of covering up this vital information. Chris Emery says every time we ask him that Charles Key is the one in charge of it. Why is he keeping this information from the public?

Lisa Guliani: We also noticed that they don't talk about the internal ordnances - the bombs in the Murrah building - unless we pressure them to do so.

Victor Thorn: Yeah, Charles Key was a representative for the state of Oklahoma before he got voted out. He gave a big press conference a week or so before the tenth anniversary of the OKC bombing, right in front of the weeping Jesus statue. They had the mainstream media from OKC City there and not once did he mention the crux issue of the OKC bombing: the controlled demolition. We were watching the video Emery sent to us of the press conference, and we were like: What's he doing? He mamby-pambied through the whole thing. He had a chance right in his hands, and again he covered it up.

Lisa Guliani: He seems to be perpetuating a LIHOP (incompetence/negligence) angle.

Victor Thorn: Yeah.

Lisa Guliani: Meanwhile, there's some mistrust within the ranks of the OKBIC itself for Charles Key. In fact, we were talked to by somebody who is a member while we were in Okalahoma City back in April.

Victor Thorn: That was Hoppy Heidelberg.

Lisa Guliani: The dismissed federal grand juror from Timothy McVeigh's trial.

Victor Thorn: He said that Charles Key approached him to ask if he would contribute money toward bringing Bob Barr, the CIA guy, in for this event.

Lisa Guliani: And Hoppy Heidelberg was furious about it. He had smoke coming out of his ears.

Victor Thorn: He said no, absolutely not! Now, at this speakers' forum, Bob Barr was, as we mentioned, the keynote speaker. After his speech, he took some questions from the audience. This was a dinner for the high-rollers. Charles Key has political aspirations, and he wanted to bring in some of the money people, so they threw some softball questions to Bob Barr. Then Hoppy Heidelberg, Lisa, and I started asking questions, and we were bangin' it out for him. Finally, Bob Barr said that he believes the government's version of events [in regard to the OKC bombing]. So Charles Key brought in a former CIA member that reinforced the government's explanation.

Lisa Guliani: No, he PAID a CIA guy to come in and defend the government. Hoppy Heidelberg was furious about it, and so were we.

Victor Thorn: Chris Emery also told us that there was going to be a rally on the anniversary of the bombing, which was our initial idea. Funny thing was; Charles Key wasn't there. Emery said that Charles Key didn't want anything to do with the rally.

Lisa Guliani: So why is Charles Key disassociating himself from his own rally?

Victor Thorn: It's unbelievable. Hoppy Heidelberg asked us, when they brought Bob Barr in, who stood to profit from this? Did the truth stand to profit? Absolutely not, because Bob Barr spit on the truth. Did the survivors or any of the people at the rally benefit from this? No. The only person who benefited from the entire scenario was Charles Key, because Bob Barr still has connections in D.C., and Charles Key wants to ride on his coattails. It's unbelievable. There are so many other things Hoppy was talking about, too. Like how it took so long to print up the big OKC book, *Final Report*, and then three weeks after its release, 9-11 happened and that pretty much put the whole thing onto a back shelf.

Lisa Guliani: We know that Chris Emery doesn't call the shots when it comes to the OKBIC. He's a very tireless worker, and as I've said before, he's a great person. Charles Key is the one who calls the shots with the OKBIC, and I think he's leading them all down the whole LIHOP path of destruction. It's a shame because a lot of people believe in Charles Key, Chris Emery, and the OKBIC's efforts to get the truth out. Well then, why the hell aren't they getting the truth out? And why are they siding with freakin' gatekeepers?

Victor Thorn: I spoke with a journalist out in Oklahoma last week and asked him about Charles Key and the OKBIC. He said this is the biggest joke there is anywhere because all the people in Oklahoma City are sick of Charles Key for sitting on the fence. He threatens to bring the hammer down, but then he mamby-pambies it. It's been ten years. This case is solved. My book, which is on the WING TV website home page, is free. You don't even have to buy it. The case is solved and Charles key is not bringing this information out. General Ben Partin has all of the information about the controlled demolition of the Murrah building. They're not talking about this stuff. Even Pat Shannon from the *American Free Press* was talking with us and Hoppy Heidelberg, and he said he got a real weird vibe when they brought in Bob Barr. It's inexcusable.

Lisa Guliani: We wanted to say something about all this back in April, and the reason we didn't was because of our friendship and respect for Chris Emery, and also our respect for the truth and the bigger cause. So we kept our mouths shut because we didn't want to do anything that would take away from their anniversary event and all their efforts and hard work. So we kept our mouths shut, but over the last few months we've sat back and watched and listened and seen the way people are diverging off and going down the wrong path.

Victor Thorn: One last thing that Charles key does is every time he gives a speech, he always brings up the "Arab" element. It wasn't Arabs that did Oklahoma City. It absolutely was not. It was these people that were working for the ATF, the FBI, and the CIA out of Elohim City. These people were Aryans. They were white race purists. Ask yourself, how many times have you seen them working with Arabs? They don't. What Charles Key is doing at every opportunity is bringing up the Arab element. He's just reinforcing the neo-cons because the neo-cons want to wage war against the Muslim world, so by saying that there was an Arab that was John Doe #2, what he's doing is aligning himself with the neo-cons and diverting again away from the real solutions and answers.

Lisa Guliani: I guess for somebody with political aspirations, it doesn't behoove him (Key) to go out and talk about the truth, because if you talk about that, you don't end up back in some kind of position in the government.

Victor Thorn: As we said at the beginning, we do this with a heavy heart. We want to appeal directly to Chris Emery. Chris, everybody knows that these people you're running around with right now are 9-11 Mafia gatekeepers. They're covering up the greatest crime ever committed against the United States of America, and you're aligning yourself with them. In good conscience, get away from them.

PAUL ISAAC JR: NAILED!

By Lisa Guliani

On Monday, October 24, 2005 at 9:23 PM EST, Victor and I received a call on our home phone. The caller was male, did not identify himself, and proceeded to say the following:

"This message is for Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani. We met at Ground Zero on 9-11 and you ran a story on it the next day on your website. Well, we have a videotape that will bury your story, so I think you'd better retract that article very quickly or you will face a libel suit. The videotape we have refutes the version of what is portrayed on your website.

God bless you both ... see you next year at Ground Zero."

The caller then hung up the phone. After our movie was over, we checked the answering machine and listened to the call. The man's tone of voice was very sarcastic and menacing. I had a pretty good idea who it was at the time, but wasn't about to announce this either in writing or on our show until I could confirm it. After all, I'm not Tom Flocco. So, the first thing I did was hit the *69 feature on our phone and wrote down the number. I then went onto my computer and began checking area code listings and found the one for "347". It turns out that "347" is the area code for New York, specifically the Bronx, Brooklyn, Staten Island and Queens. Whaddaya know? The telecommunications company that serves this area code is Teleport Communications Group, which is, according to my buddy Rick in New York, located in Staten Island. Teleport Communications Group, (conveniently enough) is heavily involved in government work, which is evidenced by a statement on their website.

This was getting interesting, so today I decided to call the phone number I got from *69. A woman named "Marguerita" answered, and she and I had a very interesting conversation. After establishing that the phone number was correct, I learned that she has a husband, a daughter and a son; but her husband was working on Monday night, and her son was in Florida. I asked her if she knew of any man who would have had access to her cell phone on Monday night. She said that she keeps her cell phone in her bedroom. According to Marguerita, at about 9 PM every night, she goes downstairs to watch TV with her mother. She leaves her cell phone in the bedroom when she does this. Now, remember, the call was made to us at 9:23 PM EST.

I then asked Marguerita if she knows anyone connected with the New York Fire Department or who's worked in an auxiliary capacity as a fireman for NYFD. She slowly said, "No."

I followed that up with, "Do you know anyone by the last name of Isaac?"

She hesitated for a moment and then replied, "I would have to say yes, I do."

"Paul Isaac, Jr.? I asked.

"Yes."

"Is he related to you?"

"No."

"But you do know him."

"Yes," she answered.

She told me that her daughter was home with her on Monday night. Okay, now we're getting somewhere. After reassuring her that I'm simply trying to find out who called my home and left a threatening message on my answering machine, I asked this nice lady if her daughter is dating Paul Isaac, Jr. She said, "Yes." Bingo! Imagine my shock.

If you don't know who Paul Isaac, Jr. is, please read Victor Thorn's *Fireman Admits Again: 9-11 Inside Job*.

This article must really be scaring the hell out of the powers-that-be! Paul Isaac, Jr. was at her home on Monday evening, October 24, and apparently walked into Marguerita's bedroom and called Victor and me long distance at 9:23 PM EST while Marguerita, the poor unsuspecting woman who owns the phone, was downstairs watching television with her mother. Isaac was not given permission to use Marguerita's phone and she told me she had no knowledge this going on. Remember, Marguerita was downstairs keeping her mother company at the time.

Marguerita let out a big sigh and told me that her family has been having some "problems" with Isaac. She went so far as to use the words, "mental problems" and told me he's been giving them "trouble". Understandably, she was upset that he'd used her phone for such a cowardly, rotten purpose and felt embarrassed that Isaac had done this. In fact, at no time whatsoever during our conversation did Marguerita ever intimate that she disbelieved what I was saying or that she was

"surprised" in any way that Isaac did a sneaky thing like this. She just didn't know that the next little "stunt" he pulled would be via her cell phone.

Marguerita apologized to me for what Isaac did without her knowledge. I let her know she has nothing to apologize for. Isaac is responsible for his own lousy behavior. She went on to say that her daughter thinks he's "the greatest", but that this view isn't shared by everyone else in the family. She said she plans to confront Paul about this call and let him have it. She also plans to warn her daughter of what he did. I think that's pretty wise under the circumstances. I know my mother would take the same exact approach to the situation and not only tell me, but also confront my "boyfriend," to put it mildly.

I told Marguerita to be careful not to speak with him about this matter when she is alone with him. She agreed. Hmm, seems like Isaac gives off a decidedly unpleasant "vibe" on the home front. We chatted for a few minutes longer, and just so everybody knows, I identified myself to this woman. We had a very pleasant ending to the conversation. Marguerita is a very nice, innocent woman and doesn't deserve to be drawn into Isaac's little 9-11 head games in this way. It's too bad that Isaac wasn't intelligent enough to figure out that using his girlfriend's mother's phone on the sly to anonymously threaten somebody would come back to bite him in the ass. And this is the loser to whom I gave away my personal copy of 9-11 on Trial, precisely because of the statements he made to us at Ground Zero. You see, I was looking dead into his eyes when he made those statements standing inches away from my face. I believed he was sincere when he told me that he knows 9-11 was an inside job, a controlled demolition, and that all the firemen and cops know it too. I believed him. So I gave him my book. If Marguerita looks around the house, she might even find it.

Interestingly enough, Paul Isaac, Jr. also made a point of contacting the *American Free Press* newspaper a few weeks ago for the same purpose. He spoke with the editor, Chris Petherick, saying he had a "videotape" that refutes the article by Victor Thorn about our protest at Ground Zero. The article at issue repeats what Paul Isaac, Jr. told both Thorn and I directly to our faces that morning. Isaac wants that article to go away.

But guess what: not a chance. The article is staying exactly where it is. Period. Petherick told Isaac to write a statement and send them a copy of the "alleged" videotape. At this writing, if Isaac has done so, I haven't heard about it; and I would certainly expect to know about it. Apparently, Isaac thought that he could "persuade" *AFP* into retracting Thorn's article, and when that didn't work, he had to grow a ball and actually call us. It must have had his belly roiling, because after all, we published this piece almost two months ago. I have this visual of Isaac hiding behind Marguerita's bed doing his pathetic intimidation "schtick" and then

cackling to himself when he completed his "prank call". This is supposedly an "adult"?

Paul Isaac, Jr., this is what I have to say to you: **I NAILED YOU**. What kind of gutless abortion of a "man" are you to prank call two people and make bogus threats while using someone else's phone without their permission? What kind of sicko creep uses his girlfriend's mother's phone to pull such a prepubescent weenie-butt stunt, thereby drawing an innocent woman into the Isaac "lie-fest"? Isaac, if you were my boyfriend, I'd not only kick your sorry ass up and down the street for involving my mother in this pathetic little attempt at damage control and for using her phone without her permission, but I'd eat popcorn and make a video of my own while watching my mother kick your sorry butt. If Marguerita's daughter has any common sense, she'll waste no time in dumping your gutless yellow-belly, lying ass at the curb in front of your mother's house - pronto.

It boggles my mind that a grown man with such a well-established, well-documented history of publicly commenting on the WTC controlled demolitions over the last few years is now squirming like he has an overextended bladder, is ready to pee down his leg, and is out of Depends, just because he was quoted yet again about the collapse of the twin towers on September 11, 2001. We're not the first to break this news to the public, Isaac. What did you expect? You obviously knew who you were talking to, because you knew of our website and pronounced this to the crowd later that day when you pulled a little "Rumpelstiltskin" act at Ground Zero.

Am I to presume that you are contacting every other journalist who has quoted you about this issue over the last 2+ years and demanding retractions? In a recent article by Greg Szymanski, Isaac was all over the case for controlled demolition of the WTC towers, yet toward the end of that article, he denies saying anything to Victor Thorn and me at Ground Zero nearly two months ago. Szymanski never bothered to contact us to see what we had to say about this, which says a lot to me about Szymanski. Kind of odd, too, because if Paul wanted to retain some credibility and not stick his foot in his face again, he would simply shut up about the WTC collapses and not discuss his views about "controlled demolition," "reports of explosions in the towers," or how "9-11 was an inside job" with anyone, least of all, multiple reporters over a span of at least two years. Isaac apparently likes the attention of getting his name in print - usually, until now, that is. It seems to me that somebody is finally putting the clamps on Isaac's big yap. This is called, as I mentioned previously, "damage control." It is obvious, it is lame, it is bullshit, and most importantly, it is not working. You have zero credibility, Isaac. I think you've said too much for too long. Think about it.

I'm not afraid to repeat myself here because I want to make WING TV's position

crystal clear on this matter. Victor Thorn and I absolutely stand by the article in question, inclusive of the quoted statements made to us personally and directly by Paul Isaac, Jr. on September 11, 2005 at Ground Zero. Furthermore, Isaac was also observed by 9-11 researcher Vincent Sammartino telling people gathered around us that day the exact same things he told us. Hey Isaac, are you now going to use your girlfriend's mother's phone to prank Vinnie's house? Are you calling ALL of us liars? Any rational-thinking person should be able to see that there is a common denominator in this situation, as well as every single other instance resulting in a direct quote from Paul Isaac, Jr.

The common denominator IS PAUL ISAAC, JR.

Either all of these various reporters, researchers and authors are lying ... or Isaac is lying. Now, what does your common sense tell you? It's a no-brainer as far as I'm concerned.

Isaac, I'm going to tell you this straight-up again. I DARE you to confront us on WING TV. I know you are checking out our website, and since you want to talk to us so badly, let's do it in a public forum: on our show, so the whole world can hear what you've got to say. I will testify under oath, allow myself to be interrogated after being injected with truth syrum, submit to any number of polygraph tests, confront you directly to your face, and stand before God and the whole world on this issue. I dare you to do the same.

One thing I've learned from this whole situation (other than that you're a pathological liar and a coward) is that you, Paul Isaac, Jr. are NOT one of the "brave, fearless men of 9-11. If you were, you wouldn't be acting like such a gutless, lying, poot-butt. You would stand by your words, hold your head high, act according to your conscience, and be a man instead of acting like a punk - or a little girl. You owe Marguerita and your girlfriend an apology for pulling such an embarrassing, shameful stunt and involving them in your web of lies. Actually, I'm kind of glad this all happened, because now I won't ever make the mistake of confusing you with being a hero.

Hell, I was almost respecting you there for a few days, Isaac.

Shame on you.

AMY GOODMAN: DISINFORMATION NOW

By Victor Thorn

The big question that keeps resonating among 9-11 truth-seekers is: why are Amy Goodman of *Democracy Now* and almost every other member of the "left-leaning" media parroting the official party line on 9-11 (the same one that the Republican Party is spouting)? If there was one issue that would blow the current administration out of the water, it would be their foreknowledge of the World Trade Center/Pentagon attacks 2 1/2 years ago. In fact, there is so much incriminating information regarding this diabolical event that the Left could bury George W. Bush and his cronies. Yet they either remain strangely silent, or else spew tons of establishment misinformation.

A perfect example of this pathetic state of affairs is Amy Goodman, host of *Democracy Now*. Scott Loughrey wrote about her in a March 14th issue of the *Baltimore Indy Media*: "Amy Goodman should be regarded as a Left Gatekeeper. Left Gatekeepers, like the journalists in George Orwell's 1984, function to promote the official propaganda of the state. They amplify what is not credible while excluding other voices from challenging the government's lies of the day."

I don't think anyone could better describe the phoniness of our supposed "leftist" media in this country. The situation is so bad that one day I visited a Barnes & Noble bookstore and selected a dozen different "progressive" publications to see where they stood on 9-11, government drug trafficking, money laundering, arms dealing, and other criminal activities such as the government's role in the Oklahoma City Bombing. Well, guess what I found. Nothing! Not a word that varied even remotely from the official establishment stance.

The big question is: why? Why won't Amy Goodman, Mother Jones, Common Dreams, Alternet, Z Magazine, or Pacifica Radio go after their supposed Republican foes? The answer is simple - money. The same forces which support the right are the very same that finance the left. In this sense, the leftist press is no different than those at Fox News. In fact, they're two sides of the very same coin ... two heads of the same serpent. All they're doing is spouting propaganda, reinforcing the status quo by serving as an enforcement arm for the elite; and dividing people against each other via a Hegelian Dialectic. But, as Executive Director John Moyers of TomPaine.com says, "If they don't like what we're doing, we don't get funded next year." [For a complete chart of how the Gatekeepers are funded by elitist foundations, click onto: <http://www.leftgatekeepers.com/chart.htm>] This trend is so pervasive that some

people have even begun calling Amy Goodman's show *Disinformation Now*.

Considering the seriousness of all that's taking place in our country and around the world, it's despicable beyond words that the left is rolling over and playing dead to such an extent. I know this first-hand because when we were doing research for WING TV before it aired on February 1, 2004, we watched a few episodes of *Democracy Now*. After every show was over, I'd turn to Lisa Guliani and say, "There's no difference between them and PBS, NPR, or the major networks." It was lame beyond words; and very disheartening because what Amy Goodman and her ilk are doing is sucking liberals into the old left-right paradigm that the Controllers have designed years ago to preserve their power base. But, since their information is supposedly coming from an "alternative" source, for some reason viewers think they're getting more legitimate news than what the corporate mass media is giving them. But in reality, they're being duped all the same. *Democracy Now* and other venues with similar policies are nothing more than wolves in sheep's clothing; total sell-outs that are doing much more harm than good.

WILLIAM RIVERS "MONEY" PITT

by Lisa Guliani

"The time has come, bluntly, to get over September 11, to move beyond it, to extract ourselves from this bunker mentality which blinds us while placing us in mortal peril. It happened, and it will never be forgotten, but we have reached a place where fear and obeisance can no longer be tolerated."

"Will the final chapter of your story be one of fear, one where you staggered along behind grandiose incompetence because you were too afraid to do anything else?"

~ William Rivers Pitt ~ excerpted from his article, **"Nine Eleven"**

Today yet another example of Internet puke made its way into my inbox, as well as into various political Internet discussion forums, and although I've kept my mouth shut for the most part on this subject up until now, I've finally had enough of this crap.

The e-mail excerpted below was authored by a woman named Marsha, who belongs to many political groups on Yahoo. The text was in response to Truthout.org's latest attempt to psychologically and emotionally mug their readers for a hand-out. Before commenting on this woman's message, though, I'd like to illustrate just how persistent Truthout.org is in their requests for money. Unlike other sites that put the tin cup out once or twice a year, Truthout.org begs for money on a weekly basis via mass-circulated spam e-mails that hound, cajole, and strong-arm their readers for funds. They also use heavy doses of guilt, which is curious because considering the anemic state of our economy with high gasoline and fuel oil prices, and how the Christmas season is rapidly approaching, Truthout.org greediness for your money is appalling.

Anyway, Marsha is one of the suckers who was bamboozled by Truthout.org's ploy, for her e-mail was a plea to help financially support William Rivers Pitt and his Truthout website for all the good "services" they provide. Get a load of this (in its unedited form):

Subj: Re: **Imagine a Properly Funded Truthout**

Date: 10/20/2005 6:45:51 AM Eastern Standard Time

"If I won that Power Ball millions I left Ohio and went to Pennsylvania to buy lottery tickets for, you can be sure William Rivers Pitt will get all needed as will many of our VIP's... That's Very Important Patriots and their worthy causes I never buy lottery tickets but so many of our causes need

funding so desperately... They need to be able to grow to continue in the delivery of truth to our people everywhere... So I said a prayer and me and a friend rushed off and bought all we could afford."

While reading the above words, I nearly choked on my coffee. First of all, what sort of idiot a) keeps falling for Pitt's incessant not-so-subtle panhandling which always seems to include the boring line-up of heart-wrenching, gut-roiling, arm-twisting "reasons" why his readers should continually fork over their money in order to pay his way through life; or b) who in their right mind would actually go out and purchase as many lottery tickets as they could afford for the express purpose of enabling Pitt and those of his ilk to keep milking the free cash cow? She even got someone else to go along with this idiocy. Mind you, Marsha admits that she probably won't win the lottery, but hey - it's only money, right? And hell, who needs the perpetual handout more than this pathetic Internet beggar known as "William Rivers Pitt"?

It never ceases to amaze me that people fall for this crap. Not only do I despise reading these arrogant, in-your-face begging letters being circulated by losers who refuse to pay their own bills, but what's even more revolting is that now we've got people like "Marsha" who should know better, positioning herself as an enabler by perpetuating the begging and trying to recruit other people into this crap. I will also add that I think William Rivers Pitt is not simply running an "OPM Racket" (Other People's Money), but he is also an intellectual coward and an elitist hypocrite to boot.

What necessary services is he providing us? Let's go over it. Pitt has a website called Truthout.org, at which one can peruse a voluminous amount of decidedly "progressively-leaning" aka "liberal" Internet articles in which he links to mainstream sources and perpetuates the false left-right paradigm. Is this a necessary service his readers must finance? Also to be found at the aforementioned website is a multimedia page consisting of videos and some audio clips of telephone calls he's had with several people. Hmm...

Now, I might have been able to ignore Truthout.org's propensity toward begging (which is occurring with increasing frequency) if I hadn't seen Pitt's published biography, which states the following:

"William Rivers Pitt is an internationally best-selling author of three books: War on Iraq - What Team Bush Doesn't Want You to Know,' 'The Greatest Sedition is Silence,' and 'Our Flag, Too - The Paradox of Patriotism.' He is the Managing Editor and Senior Writer for truthout.org". Mr. Pitt is a political analyst for the Institute for Public Accuracy. He spent several years as a high school teacher of English

Literature, Writing, Grammar, Journalism and History, and was a Dean. Mr. Pitt currently resides in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He is 31 years old."

Now maybe it's just me (and maybe it's not), but does anything in the above bio give you the impression that William Rivers Pitt is incapable of supporting himself and his website? And, if you scroll back up to the two quotes at the beginning of this article, do you get the distinct impression that Pitt is actually not providing the most vital services needed? Look again at his statement regarding 9-11.

"The time has come, bluntly, to get over September 11, to move beyond it, to extract ourselves from this bunker mentality which blinds us while placing us in mortal peril. It happened, and it will never be forgotten, but we have reached a place where fear and obeisance can no longer be tolerated."

Is this not virtually a clone of something we were all subjected to by peak oil scam artist Mike Ruppert in months past? Ruppert also tried to spray this kind of vomitus all over the Internet, telling the world and the entire 9-11 community of researchers, activists, and truth-seekers that we should all just "get over 9-11 and move on." Guess what? It didn't flush for Ruppert, and it's not going to flush for Pitt, either. In fact, William has managed to twist some pretty sharp horns with his *Nine Eleven* article, which, in my opinion, should be framed and prominently displayed at his Alma Mater - Yellowbelly University - as a masterpiece of intellectual cowardice. Does Pitt's refusal to touch the issue of 9-11 - and particularly the voluminous and credible research regarding the WTC controlled demolitions - say anything significant to you? Even after we and others have repeatedly asked him to make this information available to his readers (whom I presume are adults capable of making their own decisions), Pitt manages to completely skirt around the topic. Here's what the good folks at Serendipity.com had to say to Mr. Pitt on this subject:

Note by Peter Meyer:

"The most offensive sentence in William Rivers Pitt's article *Nine Eleven* is: The time has come, bluntly, to get over September 11, to move beyond it, to extract ourselves from this bunker mentality which blinds us while placing us in mortal peril. So in other words: Don't concern yourselves with what really happened on 9/11. Don't think about who really planned the attacks on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon, and the consequent traumatization of the American people. Don't even consider the possibility that perhaps it was really the work of elements within the U.S. government, as a ruse to enable them to declare war on the rest of the world and to turn American into a totalitarian police state. No! Be good little sheep and

give no thought to the direction in which we are heading as a result of the bogus "war on terror" created by those who committed mass murder on 9/11. William Rivers Pitt, like Noam Chomsky, Amy Goodman and other formerly respectable commentators, has shown himself by his statements to be complicit in the cover-up of the crimes of 9/11."

You can read the entire e-mail exchange at this link: **Shame On You, William Rivers Pitt!!!!**

Okay, so let me get this straight. William Rivers Pitt is too chicken-shit to tell his readers the truth about the WTC controlled demolitions, or even let them know the research is available to them. What he is capable of doing can be summed up in short order: He manages to squirt out some lame and very familiar Kyle-Hence-style-poo as to why people aren't ready for this information and how they just wouldn't be willing to accept it, further adding his endorsement of the official government conspiracy theory regarding 9-11. He is also apparently targeting the most suggestible liberals, er, I mean *progressives*, in his articles, thereby perpetuating the false right-left paradigm. Add to this the obnoxious, never-ending boatload of begging letters which Truthout.org shamelessly circulates with abandon and what do you have?

I'll tell you what you have. You have a guy with a racket, milking his readers for money he should damn well be earning, instead of mooching off of the generous, genuine people who patronize his website and believe in him. Remember the bio you read a few minutes ago? Well, it mentions that William Rivers Pitt is a political analyst for the Institute for Public Accuracy. I read something interesting on the IPA website that might be of interest here.

Background on the Institute for Public Accuracy

"The Institute for Public Accuracy was founded in mid-1997 by its current executive director, Norman Solomon, with the support of a two-year \$100,000-per-year Public Interest Pioneer grant from the Stern Family Fund. IPA opened its national office in San Francisco in October 1997. Several months later, IPA established its media office in the National Press Building in Washington, D.C. It is a 501(c)(3) organization. IPA increases the reach and capacity of progressive and grassroots organizations (**at no cost to them**) to affect public policy by getting them and their ideas into the mainstream media."

So, allow me to submit this to you. William Rivers Pitt is a political analyst for IPA, which states on its own website that one of its purposes is to **increase the reach and capacity of progressive (liberal) and grassroots organizations AT NO COST TO THEM**. Also, IPA's founder and director, Norman Solomon, is

another notorious Left Gatekeeper who was exposed long ago as one who carries water for the government. Considering his role within IPA (a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization) whose purpose is to "increase his reach and capacity" to get him and his ideas into the mainstream media at no cost to him, why does William Rivers Pitt need so damn much of your money? It appears he already has the world by the shorthairs, with free assistance from IPA. I also can't help but wonder if his connection with IPA has anything to do with the fact that Pitt refuses to touch the truth about 9-11 with a 10-foot pole. It certainly shouldn't be casually dismissed, should it? \$100,000 is a lot of money. Just ask Amy Goodman. She gets the same kind of grant money, and she too refuses to speak the truth about 9-11. Coincidence? I don't think so.

So, are we to believe that Pitt's ongoing, deliberate silence and willful refusal to inform his readers or to correct their misperceptions of reality are the "necessary services" for which we are supposed to feed him more money? What is behind Pitt's intentional public misdirection and endorsement of the "official line" of 9-11? (By the way, the government's "official" version of events for 9-11 happens to be the ORIGINAL conspiracy theory.) When I see a journalist in the alternative media consciously suppressing important information that his readers have an absolute right to know - in essence, lying by omission - I don't feel obligated to either respect this person, nor do I find his "services" (whatever they are) to be even remotely "necessary."

As a matter of fact, my position on William Rivers Pitt is crystal clear at this point. I'm calling you out, Pitt, as an intellectual coward and a hypocrite who refuses to hold himself to the same standard that he preaches to others. I'm also calling you out as a traitor and a war criminal for complicity with the enemies of America by perpetuating the lies of 9-11. I charge you with willful deceit of your readers, many of whom actually buy into the whole bogus OPM racket and don't see you for the intellectual coward you are. Suppression of information regarding the WTC collapses is an **unforgivable sin** in my book, and when the truth finally corners and overtakes you, the clueless *progressives* to whom you preach, and the rest of the sleeping majority, know this: You will be counted among the guilty for being a 9-11 Gatekeeper who is preventing the truth about 9-11 from ultimately being known. Again, this is an **unforgivable sin**.

Anybody who throws you a penny is nothing but a sucker. Lastly, here's a tip: maybe you should change your website's name from Truthout.org to Handout.org!

PITT: A GOOD OLD-FASHIONED DEBATE

By Victor Thorn

Y'know, I'll give you credit for responding to our questions. Chalk one up for you. So, instead of getting wrapped up in all this \$\$\$ fundraising nonsense, how about we cut to the chase.

We're inviting you onto WING TV anytime you can fit it into your schedule to talk about one subject: the World Trade Center controlled demolitions - of buildings 1, 2, and 7. That's it. No other tomfoolery. What do you say? We'll discyss the physics, mathematics, and science of these demolitions. You bring whatever you have to the table, and we'll bring whatever we have to the table. Sounds fair to me. How about you? Let me know. We're going to announce this request to you on our show Monday, and also your previous stance(s) on 9-11 (or lack thereof). And just so you know, we'll engage in this "debate" as fairly as humanly possible.

Let's do this 9-11 Controlled Demolition debate. And, to assure you that we'll play it on the up-and-up, what we'll do is come up with a list of guidelines that we'll read to our audience before the debate - y'know, things like no verbal assaults, no overt name-calling, no sandbagging, etc.

Now, we have a pretty tough audience, so if we renege on our word, they're going to let us have it w/ both barrels. The same, of course, would also apply to you. In other words, what we'll have is a good old-fashioned debate on the issue of whether the WTC towers were destroyed via Controlled Demolition or not. You bring your best to the table, and we'll bring our best.

After all, isn't this the cornerstone of what's supposed to be great about a "free" society - freedom of speech, and freedom of the press - that we can actually engage in this type of endeavor (i.e. the freeflow of ideas in the public arena). So, once again, you have my word that we'll play it straight with you. And even though we may not be in agreement about everything in the political spectrum, I'm pretty sure about one thing: we both want to see that bastard George W. Bush and the rest of his criminal cabal OUT of the White House; and even more so, behind bars for their crimes. And whether you admit it or not, their primary Achilles heel is still the crimes of 9-11. We've nailed them on it via the Controlled Demolition, and we can't for the lives of us figure out why the Left hasn't capitalized on this research. Anyway, drop me a line and we'll see where we stand on this. And who knows? Maybe something good may actually come of this.

THE "PEAK OIL" **INTERNATIONAL BANKING SCAM**

By Victor Thorn

As the "peak oil" scam moved from the boardrooms of ExxonMobil, British-Petroleum, and Royal Dutch Shell (where it was conceived) to the Big Oil-controlled scientific community; then into the alternative press (where it was peddled by people like Mike Ruppert), and finally into the mainstream media, we need to realize what is actually taking place with this phenomenon. After being inundated with a slew of gloom-and-doom scenarios like those proposed in James Howard Kunstler's *The Long Emergency*, or after listening to Ruppert's feeble reasoning for why we need a "population reduction" plan that falls right in line with Rockefeller-style eugenics, it is imperative that we peer through the propaganda and see the true motives for these "peak oil" fear tactics.

Y'see, the world isn't in imminent danger of oil depletion any time in the near future. In fact, Daniel Sperling of UC Davis' Institute of Transportation Studies recently stated in an AP article on May 29, 2005 that, "Even in 30 to 40 years there's still going to be huge amounts of oil in the Middle East." This sentiment is also reinforced in the works of Lyndsey Williams, Dave McGowan, and many others.

Yet "peak oil" has suddenly become an umbrella for every apocalyptic end-times economic disaster conceivable to mankind, including rampant inflation, a 1929-style Great Depression, widespread unemployment, and even the ultimate downfall of our industrialized-technological society.

Rather than getting caught up in the hype, though, consider this possibility for a moment: what if we are indeed careening toward an economic downturn - even a major depression - but it isn't due to "peak oil." After all, reports filtering out of the Bilderberg 2005 conference in Germany did predict such a calamity within the next two years.

But what if this "collapse" is actually the result of a deliberate plan carefully implemented by the international banking cartel over the past few decades? In other words, what if "peak oil" is only a smokescreen being used to cover for the elite "pulling the plug" on the economy? These monsters need a new smokescreen that will work as brilliantly as their 1929 stock market collapse ruse.

Alas, here's where the "peak oil" scam enters the picture. Just like the AIDS umbrella is used to cover for global starvation, disease, improper sanitation, and

polluted water, etc; so too is "peak oil" a perfect cover for the banker's "Great Depression II". Can't you see how perfect it works for them? Since these cowardly men who lurk in the shadows fear being exposed for their actions, they utilize hired agents to blame it all on the convoluted theory of "peak oil."

This cabal of organized criminals is planning to capitalize on this "unexpected" economic catastrophe by using "peak oil" as their propaganda weapon of choice. If you don't believe me, take a look at ExxonMobil's record-breaking profits last year (it's called 'price-gouging'). In addition, these organized criminals will also seize innumerable properties through foreclosures when interest rates skyrocket, while at the same time gobbling-up even more natural resources (to monopolize and "manage" them for our own well-being).

I could continue, but the main point should be clear by now: "peak oil" is yet another ruse being foisted upon us to (a) conceal the global elite's methodically staged economic calamity and (b) to further their New World Order globalization agenda. And I haven't even mentioned the Zionist War Machine angle! Try to imagine how much money these greedy bastards are making off this phenomenon. Just think of it as another 9-11 (which was actually an act of State-sponsored terrorism used to implement the Patriot Act and to get us into the 'war on terror'), or the contrived WMD's (used to begin a war with Iraq and beyond). They might even have the gall to recycle their farcical 9-11 lie that "Nobody could have predicted this would ever happen!"

We're getting bamboozled yet again, folks. Is that what you want? If not, then it's time to open your eyes instead of blindly stumbling along beneath their well-crafted lies.

Note: This article was updated on July 16, 2005, with assistance from Bob F. in Canada

\$10/Barrel

by Victor Thorn

\$10/barrel. That was the price of oil in January 2000. Can you believe it? In just 5 1/2 years, the price of oil has increased six-fold to \$60/barrel. In addition, the price of gasoline in January 2000 was \$1.10/gallon. That means if you filled your car twice a month and spent \$40, now you'd be spending about \$88 a month (at \$2.20/gallon). Of course commuters in Los Angeles and other cities are obviously getting gouged even worse due to longer distances and stop & go traffic. Plus, if you were dropping \$500/year on home heating fuel in 2000 (at a price of approximately \$.89/gallon), you'd now be forced to surrender nearly \$1150 (at a price of \$2.18/gallon) for the same amount of oil.

So, let's examine what this means. If you're putting forth an extra \$48/month on gasoline for your car, that's an additional \$600/year. Likewise, if residential home heating fuel costs have increased by \$1150/year, the sum total for just these two variables is \$1750/year!

Think about this scenario for a moment. In half-a-decade — a mere five years — we're forking-over nearly \$1800 more for energy. And we're not even factoring in the skyrocketing inflation associated with elevated oil prices (higher grocery bills due to increased trucking costs, etc), as well as higher utility bills for electricity, natural gas, and the like. And since this trend isn't expected to reverse itself, over the next five years we'll be bamboozled out of \$9,000 minimum (\$1800 x 5). Now, what do you think you could do with an extra \$9,000? I'm sure all of us could come up with an array of answers, but we'll never get to put them into practice because this sum of money will have been directly stolen from us via the 21 st century oil hoax.

To make matters worse, the New World Order elite have been planning for years at their annual Bilderberg meetings to implement a global tax on the citizens of this world - especially Americans. But, realizing that the outrage over such a concept would be more than they wanted to deal with, they simply created the "peak oil" scam and gouged us indirectly through meteoric energy costs.

Peak Oil = an indirect hidden tax.

\$10/barrel in January 2000. Now we're being extorted out of \$1800/year by a cabal of excessively greedy international bankers and heads of multi-national corporations. Think of how many bills could be paid with this "lost" amount of money - or how you wouldn't have to work so hard to make ends meet - or the extra things you could buy for your kids - or, God forbid, how you could even

SAVE a few dollars for a rainy day. But instead of allowing us to keep our own hard-earned money, the blood-sucking bastards atop the control pyramid are stuffing it into their own pockets (see Exxon-Mobil's record-breaking profits for 2004 & 2005).

Things aren't right, folks; and it's time we started raising some hell about it!

PEAK OIL: U.N.-ZIONIST SCAM

By Victor Thorn

In an article dated July 3, 2005 ([\\$10/Barrel](#)), I pointed out that the financial elite have discussed a world tax at their annual Bilderberg meetings for years now. But since they couldn't come right out and implement such a tax upon us, they side-skirted the issue and levied an indirect "surcharge" via skyrocketing oil prices. Thus, I concluded that "peak oil" has come to represent a hidden global tax thrust on consumers far-and-wide, especially Americans.

But the "peak oil" ruse goes much deeper than what I had originally written, as I discovered in an article by Wendy Campbell entitled [The Secret Relationship Between Israel and Oil: What the US Media Hides](#). As Campbell tells us, it is the U.S. media (which is largely controlled by Zionist forces) that determines who is "influential." In the case of "peak oil," Dr. Colin Campbell, a gloom-and-doom oil company front-man, has suddenly become an opinion-shaper in newspapers across the country.

Why, you may wonder? Well, as Campbell reports, "Dr. Campbell is at the center of a small but suddenly influential band of contrarians known as the "peak oil" movement. Their general thesis is that the world is running out of oil quickly." In addition, it is "because the media, which is run by pro-Israel forces, want people like Dr. Campbell to be in the spotlight." The reason, of course, is that, "Dr. Campbell's views help support the pro-Israel agenda of that suddenly influential band of contrarians known as the Neo-Conservatives." And, of course, "The Neo-Conservatives are mostly Zionist Jews" who almost completely direct America's foreign policy.

Hence, Campbell writes, peak oil "is being pushed forward by mostly pro-Israel forces for their own narrow agenda that has nothing to do with the vast majority of the American people's interests."

On top of that, all one has to do is examine the United Nations' sordid **Agenda 21** policy papers to realize that what they ultimately want to do is control human behavior via non-elected 'visionary boards' and planning commissions. (See: [Agenda 21](#)) To do so, it is imperative that they brainwash each and every one of us into believing that we're running out of oil, and only THEY are capable of determining how the world's natural resources are distributed and used. In fact, this is a quote directly from the United Nations which highlights their arrogance: "It is simply not feasible for sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual nations." In other words, to insure that *their* New World Order framework is properly erected - with the cornerstone being Zionist control over the Middle East

- then nations such as the United States must willingly surrender their sovereignty to these Globalists.

So, here is what purpose the "peak oil" scam has served:

- 1) a hidden Bilderberg global tax via skyrocketing gasoline prices
- 2) justification for our Neo-con/Zionist foreign policy in the Middle East
- 3) total control of human behavior via the UN's Agenda 21
- 4) a very glaring distraction for 9-11 investigators and activists

Now how do you feel about being duped by Mike Ruppert and his co-horts, who are nothing more than front-men for Big Oil? Makes you feel pretty foolish, huh?

GCN AN ABC AFFILIATE

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Did you know that GCN - the network which carries Alex Jones and Jeff Rense - is an ABC affiliate? Yes, ABC - as in the Disney-owned American Broadcasting Corporation - the epitome of mainstream corporate media and home of propagandists such as Peter Jennings.

Now, we're not sure how deeply ABC's tentacles extend into the Genesis Communications Network, and we're fairly certain that its President Ted Anderson and others will brush-off this "affiliation" and say it amounts to nothing; but here's the way we see things. Any time there is a financial arrangement made between two entities - for whatever purpose - there exists a huge probability that some sort of manipulation will result at a future point in time (if it hasn't already). In addition, any time the "alternative" media starts co-mingling with the MAINSTREAM media; it has to give people an uneasy feeling. What it boils down to is that if GCN is giving money to ABC to be its affiliate, it amounts to nothing more than feeding the beast. A perfect analogy would be a parent giving their nine-year old son to Michael Jackson for an "innocent" sleepover. So yes, if you subscribe to GCN, you are indirectly financing ABC. To us, something just doesn't sound right about that.

And, to prove how on-the-mark we are, I recently spoke with Nancy Koernke, wife of imprisoned patriot Mark Koernke, and she told me that once, a few years ago, she met with GCN President Ted Anderson, who said that his ultimate goal for GCN was to make it a **MAINSTREAM NETWORK!** (See: *Does Alternative Media = Mainstream Media?*) We'll repeat: his ultimate goal was to make GCN a mainstream network. Do you think becoming an affiliate of ABC has anything to do with attaining this goal? Also, do you think black-listing certain truth-telling guests has anything to do with GCN squashing controversial information? Hell, they even broadcast corporate mind-control news feeds from the USA Radio Network - another mainstream source! Furthermore, here is a viewer e-mail describing the USA Radio Network's ties to the Armed Forces Radio Network:

GCN's "news" outlet of choice is the USA Radio Network. As you can see from USA Radio Network's own website (*USA Radio Network*), they are tied in heavily with the Armed Forces Radio Network. It would not be outlandish to assume that the Pentagon has some control over the news content that goes out over the Armed Forces Radio Network. The Pentagon's policy is to shoot journalists who aren't embedded and who are independent. Doesn't this give you a great deal of confidence in GCN's

news? How is GCN any different from CNN or Fox with regard to military oversight? No different. - Mark

P.S. If GCN's news is affiliated with a military radio network, doesn't that at least indirectly make GCN's hosts government agents? They are the "honey" that makes the listeners take the bait of government/military news propaganda. Think about it....

In addition, when I asked Mrs. Koernke where she thought Ted Anderson stood on the truth movement (i.e. if he really believed in its ideals), she said that "he was a businessman out to make money off the patriot movement, and he was just using them as a source to sell gold and silver for Midas Resources."

Furthermore, every single person in the radio business that we've spoken to has said the exact same thing: Ted Anderson is in this business (and that's what it is to him - a business) for only one reason: MONEY! [**Sidenote:** Ted Anderson is also president of Midas Resources, whose U.S. sales in 2004 were \$8,500,000 ... not too bad for someone who keeps begging his audience for money to pay for bandwidth! Source: Dunn & Bradstreet.]

If this information isn't troubling enough, please read how Alex Jones sold-out a patriot family by selling video footage to ABC's **20/20**. (See: *The Alex Jones Affair*). Yes, ABC has once again entered the picture, which is a strange coincidence since Alex Jones' flagship station is ... GCN!!!

What makes the GCN-ABC association even more troubling is that it is part of a larger trend in the "alternative media." How so, you may wonder? Well, let's look at a few supposedly "independent" venues and their affiliations and practices:

1) Art Bell and George Noory's *Coast to Coast AM* radio show is syndicated by Clear Channel, one of the ultimate propaganda devils around today. To confirm this, log onto their website where you'll read the following disclaimer:

Terms of Use Agreement: This site is owned or managed by Clear Channel Communications, Inc. ("Clear Channel") and is part of the Clear Channel family of companies, which includes other quality entertainment brands such as broadcast and internet radio stations, television stations, Clear Channel Outdoor, Clear Channel Entertainment, and the Premiere Radio Networks (each a "Clear Channel Website," and collectively the "Clear Channel Websites"). (See: **Clear Channel Privacy Policy**)

An example of how damaging this network can be is found in Art Bell's denunciation of ALL 9-11 researchers (*Art Bell 9-11 Outrage*), and his complete

approval of *Popular Mechanics'* Benjamin Chertoff, whose 9-11 debunking article did more damage to our movement than quite possibly any other. (See: [Questions to Art Bell](#)). [As a sidenote, in the near future we are going to publish a transcript of Art Bell's testimony in a court case where he reveals how much Clear Channel is paying him, and believe us, it's six-figure MAJOR LEAGUE MONEY with lots of zeros behind it!] Strangely, Alex Jones **never once** criticized Bell for this slash-and-burn 9-11 broadcast, and even went so far as to rebuke callers to his show who took Bell to task for his betrayal. One can only wonder why — when every single other person in the 9-11 Truth Movement was screaming bloody murder - Alex Jones shielded Art Bell!

2) Amy Goodman's *Democracy Now* (often referred to as *Disinformation Now*) has received enormous donations on multiple occasions from the Ford Foundation (**Ford Foundation Sponsors Democracy Now**), and anyone who logs onto (**Left Gatekeeper Links**) will see in frightening detail how her show is interconnected with a host of intelligence forces, think tanks, and multi-national corporations. And yes, if you missed it, the sum "granted" to *Democracy Now* by the Ford Foundation was \$150,000. Is it starting to become clear why Amy Goodman refused to expose the truth about 9-11?

3) Mike Ruppert's *From the Wilderness* website is now nothing more than a mouthpiece for Big Oil as he peddles their gloom-and-doom scare tactics and population reduction agenda under the guise of "peak oil"

4) As mentioned earlier, GCN is an affiliate of ABC, and now they're even running advertisements from the same companies on their "mainstream" and "alternative" radio networks. How convenient, especially in regard to censorship, which has become a major issue at GCN. (See: [Power Hour Blocks Kaminski at Last Minute](#)). Hmm, isn't this just like Fox News canceling Kaminski at the last minute, too! The similarities are eerie, and should erect red-flags for anyone still interested in preserving the First Amendment.

5) 911 [Truth.org](#) (and others of a similar vein) began as, and still is to this day, the most notorious source of disinformation, obfuscation, distraction, and diversion in existence. With the likes of Nicholas Levis, David Kubiak, and Kyle Hence (who once told us after appearing on WING TV that "the American people aren't ready for the truth") at their helm, these groups have done more to prevent the truth about the government's direct planning, execution, and cover-up of the 9-11 terror attacks than any other entity. (See Angela D'Urso's **The LIHOP - MIHOP Distraction Continued**). In addition, they have done everything humanly possible to prevent information from reaching the American public on the most crucial aspect of 9-11 — the controlled demolition of the World Trade Center towers (See: **9-11 on Trial**)

6) Air America - totally worthless partisan clap-trap. One of their producers - Gabriel Zuckerman of *The Al Franken Show* - even compared 9-11 researchers to Live Elvis Sightings (See: **Media Cowards: The Games Are Over**). Abysmally pathetic.

7) The John Birch Society, who pulled a stunt similar to *Popular Mechanics* by trashing 9-11 researchers with their propaganda hit piece. (See: **Von Kleist Challenges John Birch's Jasper**).

8) *Let's Roll 911* - quite possibly the most censored "discussion forum" on the Internet. Its host, Phil Jayhan, has even gone so far as to say that his site is "not a free speech forum," and when we once asked him if he thought the alternative media had a responsibility to uphold higher standards than the mainstream media, he said he "wasn't sure." Jayhan is also responsible for the "pod theory," which, as a peripheral issue, has been one of the biggest distractions since the 9-11 terror attacks.

9) Partisan left/right sites that not only refuse to even remotely touch the 9-11 issue (in fact, they act as if it never even occurred); but who also perpetuate - ad nauseum - the Republican/Democrat paradigm that is so detrimental to any meaningful progress in this country. Examples are: Counterpunch, Newsmax (which is operated by Richard Mellon Scaife protege Christopher Ruddy), and TruthOut.org, etc.

10) Network Company men Alex Jones (See: **Alex Jones Master Link**) and Jeff Rense, who have done more to spread a culture of fear in the patriot community than anyone else (See: **Rense & Jones Make Fools of Audience**). **Either by** blackballing potential guests from their shows (and literally, the entire Genesis Communications Network), acting as censors and gatekeepers, or barring writers who speak-out from their websites, these two establishment Company Men epitomize the heavy-handed tactics used by the mainstream media to silence those who refuse to remain within the well-defined parameters of their thinly-veiled CONTAINMENT MOVEMENT.

After reading this list, one thing becomes perfectly clear - nearly the entire "alternative media" has been corrupted, tainted, bought-off, or used as a form of CONTAINMENT to quell the truth. Think about it! What is written above should trouble each and every one of you to no end. Can't you see that we've been infiltrated, prostituted, and bamboozled by an array of agent provocateurs? If you're not convinced, ponder this story told to us by Alex Merklinger, host of *Mysteries of the Mind*. A few years ago, Merklinger was approached by Clear Channel to host a syndicated radio talk show. The money they offered to him was

substantial, and he would be heard all over the country. There was only one drawback. In Clear Channel's contract, they clearly stated that they had complete editorial control over Merklinger's content and guests. In other words, they were the one's who determined whether or not a subject or personality was too controversial for the airwaves.

To his credit, Merklinger turned-down their offer, and now he does his own independent radio show. But think for a moment about Art Bell and George Noory. They're both employed by Clear Channel, and they're forced to abide by the very same editorial control rules as those presented to Alex Merklinger. Now can you see why certain guests never appear on *Coast-to-Coast AM*? Now can you see why they've never invited Lisa Guliani and I onto their show to talk about *9-11 on Trial*, which is the most explosive book ever written on the government's controlled demolition of the World Trade Center towers?

Likewise, now that GCN is an affiliate of the corporate-controlled media magnate ABC, can you see why Jeff Rense and Alex Jones have absolutely refused to speak about or discuss the information contained in *9-11 on Trial*, essentially withholding and depriving from the public any information presented by over 40 of the best researchers in the world on the World Trade Center towers controlled demolition. This combined research is a direct, undeniable indictment of the government's smokescreen, and does more than any other source to discredit their "official" conspiracy theory. Moreover, every article and review since this book's publication has been blacklisted from their sites, despite glowing endorsements from David Ray Griffin and the *American Free Press*. Doesn't this seem a bit suspicious to you? Think about it! If we really want to crack this case, shouldn't this information be made available for mass public consumption? Yet Jones & Rense put a gag order on it, effectively becoming Gatekeepers of the first order. How can anyone justify such behavior that is so reminiscent of the mainstream media?

Regrettably, the deeper one digs into this scene, the more they realize that NONE of the sites, individuals, forums, and networks listed above are independent - none of them! And this trend is continuing to grow and spread throughout the alternative media. The biggest question now is: when will it end? Do you want the entire alternative media to become a mirror-image of the mainstream media? There should be absolutely NO affiliation whatsoever for any reason between the alternative media and the mainstream media. None! Don't you get it? They're the ENEMY, and in our book, cavorting with the enemy is classified as TREASON! Also, there should be absolutely NO money passing back-and-forth between us (the independent media) and them (the controlled media) - ever!

Lastly, in case you haven't figured it out yet, what we're trying to do is keep something very important from becoming broken. Regrettably, large segments of the alternative media are already severely compromised and corrupted; and inconceivably, too many people accept the fact that some of the biggest names in this field are now undeniably infiltrated and controlled by the powers-that-be. To us, their silence in this matter is inexcusable, because if we really believe in an independent media that isn't a mirror-image of the corporate media, it's our responsibility to fix it. And if we don't fix it, then we never really believed in it in the first place.

With this information in mind, here's one last question: Where do you stand on this issue — with those who remain silent and passive (just like the New World Order controllers want them to be), or with those who are now speaking out and saying that we're not going to tolerate this infiltration any longer?

GCN GOES MAINSTREAM

By Victor Thorn

When we wrote about GCN being an ABC affiliate (June 3, 2005) and how GCN President Ted Anderson said that his primary goal was to make GCN a mainstream network, people screamed that it couldn't be so. But if you log onto GCN's homepage right now, the first promo you see declares:

Coming August 20: College Football Conference Call with Gary Danielson of ABC NEWS!

In addition, some of GCN's hosts are actually apologizing for the type of ads that are currently being run on their station. What types would that be? Well, for starters, how about commercials for Sam's Club and Tucker Carlson. Yes, you heard that right. What could be more mainstream than Sam's Club - a tentacle of Wal-Mart's New World Order global shopping network? And how about Tucker Carlson, who used to be a pundit on CNN's *Crossfire*, and is now employed by MSNBC and the government/corporate-funded PBS. GCN is actually publicizing shills for the opposition!!! How much phoniness are we supposed to tolerate? Now can you see why hosts like Jack Blood are apologizing for their sell-out? WING TV would never in a million years run ads for Wal-Mart or the mainstream pundits. Why is GCN? Even their newsbreaks originate from the USA Radio Network, another mainstream source.

With this information in mind, we're starting to wonder what's next. Will GCN start running ads for *World News Tonight* with Peter Jennings, *20/20*, and *Primetime Live*? Worse, maybe they'll just start giving shows to people like George Will, Rush Limbaugh, and Michael Moore. After all, it seems like they're moving further away from "real news" on a daily basis and instead turning to car shows, gardening shows, animal shows, sports shows, home improvement shows, and computer shows. If you want a network to become mainstream, this is exactly how to do it - hook-up with ABC, and then fill your schedule with fluff (least-common-denominator) programming. We wouldn't even be surprised if they booked a psychic hotline show.

Doesn't this all seem a bit curious, especially when you view this situation from Ted Anderson's perspective? Y'see, every person I've ever spoken to about Anderson has said the exact same thing - he's a businessman who doesn't give a damn about the patriot or truth movements. It's simply a vehicle — a means to an end. So, as he becomes more and more mainstream, Anderson will realize that ads for his "conspiracy shows" (which seem to dwell on body odor, toenail fungus, energized wacky water products, and over-priced food supplements) don't bring in

as much revenue as do shows for "brainwashed America." So, the hard-hitting programs will be pushed-out in favor of those carried on ABC. Hell, GCN even runs commercials from the same companies that are included on the ABC radio network. Can't you see the writing on the wall? What's next in line - *Martha Stewart Living* and jingles for McDonalds? What do they think their audience consists of: fools?

I wouldn't even be worrying, but when I see GCN's attitude toward **Alex Jones' censorship**, it becomes very troublesome. When bringing this issue to Ted Anderson's attention, he told Lisa Guliani that if censorship wasn't a problem for Alex Jones, it wasn't a problem for him either. How can such an attitude make anyone feel comfortable, especially when we know how much information the networks censor and suppress? Furthermore, what'll happen if one of these big-money high-rollers approaches Anderson and says, "We'd like to work with you more in the future, but those Illuminati shows make us nervous"? What do you think Anderson would do - maybe nudge his hosts to soften their stance, or even eliminate that type of programming altogether? Before we know it, GCN could become Clear Channel-lite, with massive sell-outs like Art Bell and George Noory at the helm.

It's certainly something to consider; and you have to admit, weirder things have happened.

ANALYSIS: RBN **YANKS PETER SCHAEK**

By Victor Thorn

Last week, John Stadtmiller, president of the Republic Broadcasting Network, cancelled Peter Schenk's *Peter Principle* radio show. The reason for this termination stemmed from an appearance by Bill White, spokesman for the National Socialist Movement, who was scheduled to speak about the media-hyped "race riots" in Toledo, Ohio.

As with most interviews, the topic of conversation progressed to other subjects, and soon Schenk's guest was discussing the Constitution in relation to 18th century Freemasonry, America's attitude toward 'legal fetishism,' and the possible myth of Holocaust death camps during World War II.

To be sure, all of the above talking points are hot button issues, but we need to ask ourselves a very important question: considering that free speech in relation to taboo subjects has become virtually non-existent in our popular culture due to hyper-sensitive political correctness (i.e. the Zionist-controlled corporate networks), the alternative media would appear to be the final bastion for undaunted First Amendment rights.

But regrettably, as we have so readily pointed-out during the past year on WING TV, censorship is alive and well - even thriving - at venues such as GCN, the Clear Channel-dominated *Coast-to-Coast AM*, and now even RBN. As we have illustrated time and again, Alex Jones alters, deletes, and manipulates his print and radio archives to such an extent that he has become known as the King of Censorship. The same concept applies in varying degrees to George Noory, Art Bell, Amy Goodman, the 9-11 Mafia, and Mike Ruppert — all of whom don't necessarily "censor" material overtly; but instead simply prevent or conceal vital information from becoming available to their audiences. This practice is so widespread that the alternative media is now on par with their counterparts in the mainstream, and that should send Shockwaves through every person who still has a pulse in their body.

Anyway, in an October 21, 2005 article entitled *Republic Broadcasting Network Yanks Shanktalk*, Peter Schenk commented on his recent firing. "With patriots like these, who needs a dictator?" He continued, "Evidently our interview was too hot for the management at RBN. I believe our broadcast was civilized, and there was no profanity or anything that might be considered worth censoring. Yet my

boss at RBN [John Stadtmiller] feels that your group [the Nationalist Socialist Movement] doesn't have the right to free speech."

Now, whether one agrees with the opinions of Bill White, or any other individual in our society today, we need to consider once again where we stand on freedom of speech. If we've realized that our government, mainstream media, schools, and churches have historically suppressed information, then the last hope we have of hearing and/or reading uncensored political expression is in the alternative media. In other words, if this avenue is impeded or restricted, there are few, if any, other possibilities; and the result is that we'll end up staring into an abyss of nothingness.

Which brings us back to Peter Schaenk, whose insight into this phenomenon is so on-the-mark that his voice should be heard far-and-wide. In a response to investigative journalist Thomas Holbrook, he comments on the prevalent role censorship has assumed in the alternative media.

"Censorship is now the policy of RBN, RFA, and GCN. The Patriot movement is too preoccupied with appearances that might be misconstrued as 'racist' by the Zionist media. This is not the way to create a meaningful coalition to fight the corrupt Zionist regime. A group who spends its time worrying about what the regime in power might think will not last long as an independent group. It will eventually become like the group it claims to oppose by kow-towing to that group's criticism."

Schaenk then directly addresses what transpired at RBN in regard to John Stadtmiller, RBN's owner.

"I thought a network that claimed to be 'uncensored' as RBN claims would allow all sides of a story to be heard over the air. Evidently, Caucasian groups don't have the right to come on the air and give their position in today's current political environment. Think about it. How many other RBN/GCN shows have white groups on to discuss their point of view? Answer ... Zip, None, Nada. Some of the hosts reluctantly talk about the Zionist controlled media, but what does it matter when you behave as if you were part of that media elite?

I am not a Socialist, Nationalist, or otherwise, but I believe something as important as the Toledo riots called for the other side of the story. We have heard the non-white side of the story for days on the Zionist controlled media. Mr. White and the National Socialists weren't allowed a chance to give their side of the story; the side of the story that represents the plight of the Polish neighborhood under attack. Say what you want about Nazis,

but they have a right to be heard, as do ALL Americans. Not just the non-white, PC crowd. Why should we fight to prevent 'Hate Speech' legislation from passing when we have "Patriot" groups implementing their own "Hate Speech" and "censorship" laws?

I was told that Stadtmiller accused me of yelling "FIRE" in a crowded theater on my broadcast. Listen to my interview with Bill White and tell me if I was lying or making up a story out of whole cloth. I have no agenda or axe to grind. I was in search of the truth and the other side of the story. If the theater is on fire then you must yell "FIRE" to get people out of the building. It is the only humane thing to do."

In the sake of fairness, John Stadtmiller was given an opportunity to address this issue, yet he reacted in a manner which leaves a lot to be desired. Late last week, Thomas Holbrook of *TH2 Underground News* contacted Mr. Stadtmiller at his office and told him that, as an independent journalist, he was trying to get both sides of this story. This, in our opinion, is indicative of what responsible research should be. But instead of answering for his actions, Stadtmiller responded, "Print what you will. I will not turn this into a high school debate." Stadtmiller then very unceremoniously slammed down the phone and hung-up, which has regrettably become one of his trademarks.

Lastly, Schaenk sums up what he considers quite possibly the impetus for this rampant wave of Big Brother-style tactics: "This censorship started with *Radio Free Austin*, and evidently it has infected the entire 'Patriot/Truth' (and I use that term mockingly) movement. I believe it's time to make people aware of the hypocrisy of this group."

We at WING TV can vouch for *RFA's* heavy-handed tactics, for a number of micro-broadcasters (all under *RFA's* umbrella) yanked Frank Whalen's radio show while it was still on the air when he was interviewing Lisa Guliani and me on June 23, 2005. Ironically, at the time the plug was pulled on this show, we were discussing Alex Jones' censorship practices!

Furthermore, one of *RFA's* most prominent members is none other than Mike Hansen, who is not only closely affiliated with Alex Jones as his former cameraman, but also called into Whalen's show during our interview threatening to take Frank Whalen's show down. (This was, by the way, just prior to four Texas micro-broadcasters cutting Whalen's feed and refusing to carry his show for many months afterward.)

Coincidentally, earlier this year Peter Schaenk wrote about how Alex Jones was instrumental in having *Radio Free Austin* pull his show from their line-up. [Please read Peter Schaenk's excerpted letters at the end of this article.]

As you can see, a tangled web of overt censorship has descended over the alternative media, and Peter Schaenk's firing is the latest example of it. Worse, his dismissal won't be the last, for the iron-hand of Big Brother is being unleashed by the alternative media network structure - i.e. GCN, RBN, RFA, Pacifica Radio, and *Coast-to-Coast AM*.

Can you hear what I'm saying? The 'networks' in our midst operate under the exact same censorship, fear, and retribution guidelines as do the corporate Zionist mainstream media networks. They use the same techniques to keep their listeners CONTAINED in nice little paralytic boxes. Or, as Peter Schaenk explained in an online debate with Jack Blood on October 25, 2005, both networks (GCN & RBN) are terrified of, "Being exposed for what they have become. Money making scams used to foment fear in the Patriot community in order to sell 'End of the World' products." He added, "If they won't talk about the issues and won't have all sides on to discuss different points of view, then they are using their positions in broadcasting for propaganda and not truth-seeking. They are no more than a propaganda warehouse instead of an information clearinghouse."

WING TV couldn't agree more with this sentiment. Luckily, there are a few exceptions to this rule, like Frank Whalen and others on our Radio A List; but by and large, the only solution at hand right now is to place our hope in the truly independent broadcasters who don't fall under the tyrannical grip of these censorship-motivated networks.

To ultimately be free, finding new truths is vital, but losing one's illusions is even more essential.

PETER SCHAENK SPEAKS OUT (excerpted letter - June 26, 2005)

I was listening to the Frank Whalen rebroadcast from June 23, 2005, and I was surprised to hear Mike Hansen call the show. Mike Hansen has been a flunky for Alex Jones for ten years. He shot much of the video on the early Alex Jones videos and public access shows. Now Hansen is one of the leaders of *Radio Free Austin*, which runs all the micro-broadcasting in Texas. When he called the show and threatened Frank with shutting down the broadcast, he was singing a familiar song for me.

I host a radio show on RBN that was shut down a few months ago because of Mr. Hansen and the commissars at *Radio Free Austin*. They objected to my coverage

of illegal immigration and Zionism. Hanson said I was divisive and hurting the patriot movement, and was trying to persuade me to change my message on the radio under threat of being shut down. He was even working on my producer trying to get him to convince me to keep quiet about illegal immigration. I was sounding too racist for his taste.

The credo of *Radio Free Austin* is "Uncensored Radio." This is a blatant lie, as they have censored my broadcast, and now they have threatened to censor Frank Whalen. They are phonies, and closely aligned with Alex Jones. They use the same tactics, and should be exposed as phonies.

"How can we get Hispanics in Gonzalez, Texas to buy Alex Jones' videos when you are always attacking the illegal aliens and interviewing white supremacists?"

This is what Mike Hansen asked on my radio broadcast one evening. A few weeks later Alex Jones called in to the broadcast and told me not to waste time on Zionism because they are untouchable. The next day my broadcast was taken off the air in Texas courtesy of Mike Hansen and *Radio Free Austin*. Was Alex Jones involved in this? I don't know for sure, but he didn't come to my defense with his good buddy and flunky, Mike Hansen. Neither did Jack Blood, both of whom claim to support my show and abhor censorship of any kind. You would think Alex and Jack, who advocate a united front in the patriot movement, would support a fellow broadcaster who was being censored because of his point of view. Isn't this what the major media outlets do to suppress discussion of provocative topics?

Follow-up excerpt (June 27, 2005)

In my last e-mail I stated that Alex Jones said, "Forget about the Zionists because they are untouchable." I was paraphrasing. The following quote is more accurate (however, I believe you can read between the lines and come up with the same interpretation):

Alex Jones - April 4, 2005 - call in to *The Peter Principle* on RBN Live: "I agree with about 90% of what you are saying, but I have to disagree with you on this illegal immigration/Zionism subject. We are certainly not going to get the Zionists to become buddy-buddy with us because that is a very predatory, elitist, racial group. But as far as Hispanics go, and I have been doing this for a decade, they are the easiest group to SELL on freedom ... most of the Mexicans I talk to ... the ones that BUY MY VIDEOS, get my t-shirts ... and I use that as a gauge ... they're serious."

ANATOMY OF A BETRAYAL

(part one)

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

PART ONE: GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS

1) Corporate Company Men

Examples: Alex Jones, Art Bell & George Noory (*Coast to Coast AM*), Jeff Rense
Ties & Money Sources: Clear Channel, ABC, and hollow patriot Ted Anderson

2) Left Gatekeepers

Examples: Amy Goodman (*Disinformation Now*), William Rivers Pitt (*Truthout.org*), Justin Raimondo (*Antiwar.com*), Alexander Cockburn & Jeffrey St. Clair (*Counterpunch*), Noam Chomsky, David Corn (*The Nation*), Chip Berlet, *Air America*, Pacifica Radio, *The Progressive*
Ties & Money Sources: Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Carnegie Endowment, and various corporate think tanks

3) Right Gatekeepers

Examples: Christopher Ruddy & Carl Limbacher (*Newsmax.com*), Joseph Farah (*World Net Daily*)
Ties & Money Sources: Richard Mellon Scaife and other GOP bigwigs

4) 9-11 Gatekeepers

Examples: Kyle Hence, Nicholas Levis, David Kubiak, John Judge
Groups: 9-11 Truth.org, 9-11 Citizens Watch, 9-11 Truth Alliance, Unanswered Questions.org
Ties & Money Sources: George Soros and the Open Society Institute

5) Peak Oil

Examples: Mike Ruppert (*From the Wilderness*), Jenna Orkin, Jamey Hecht, Michael Kane, Dale Allen Pfeiffer
Ties & Money Sources: Big Oil

6) Establishment

Examples: Cynthia McKinney, Ray McGovern (ex-CIA agent), Phil Berg, Catherine Austin Fitts

7) Sensationalists

Examples: Tom Flocco, Sherman Skolnick, Stew Webb, Tom Buyea, Tom Heneghan, Lenny Bloom (*Cloak & Dagger*), Fintan Dunne, Sorch Faal

8) 9-11/Conspiracy Crackpots

Examples: WebFairy, Gerard Holmgren, Phil "Commander Pod" Jayhan, Nancy Lieder, Sherry Shriner

How the Alternative Media & Patriot Movement Are Betrayed from Within

Do you every wonder why nothing substantive ever seems to get accomplished in the Patriot Movement, despite the fact that we have tons of information that blows the global elite out of the water? The answer is simple: the alternative media in this country has been so infiltrated and compromised that it is effectively useless right now as a means for real change. Of course every alternative media source doesn't fall into this category (see the **Radio A+ list for those who are still legitimate**), but there is nothing worse in life than betrayal, especially when it is done in the name of patriotism, truth, and freedom.

And this is what is being waged against you right now — overt, unadulterated BETRAYAL!!!! The infiltration of our alternative media and activism movements by the controlling elite is so blatant that we're amazed that everyone hasn't seen through it. You're smarter than that, aren't you? Then why do so many among us keep being so easily duped? Let's face it: these movements have been historically eroded and destroyed for decades by programs such as COINTELPRO, and regrettably our current situation is no different.

To counter this deteriorating situation before it's too late, we at WING TV have a two-fold mission:

- (1) To expose the New World Order cabal, including global government, multinational corporations, mainstream media, and every other control system (education, organized religion, etc). A perfect example would be our investigation into the controlled demolition of the World Trade Center towers.
- (2) To expose those within the alternative media/activism movements who are not going for the throat by ignoring the most vital crux issues confronting us.

Thus, during our battle against the NWO, we are simultaneously setting our sights on individuals and groups in two distinct categories: those outside our movement, and those within our movement. So, despite people's reluctance to accept this reality, these two forces - those who function outside, and those who operate within - actually work hand-in-hand with each other to suppress the truth from you, while at the same time keeping you corralled and contained.

Can't you see what's happening? You're deliberately being nullified, while your hopes and actions are being squashed by this blatant betrayal.

To compensate, the above model serves as a general overview of those entities within our movement who are acting as direct detriments to full truth disclosure and activism. Some of these individuals and groups overlap and operate in interweaving circles, and not all the information they provide is necessarily negative. Instead, what we are trying to establish is a framework which everyday people can use as a litmus test to see if their information sources are legitimate. Then, directly below is a set of characteristics which will allow you to see whether your news sources are playing on the up-and-up.

CHARACTERISTICS AND TACTICS

- Money-grubbing, materialism, and excessive salesmanship
- Sensationalism, without documentation or verification
- Fear-mongering
- Partisan politics (perpetuating left/right paradigm)
- Distraction with peripheral issues
- Marginalization
- Exclusion (from events, broadcasts, and websites)
- Suppression and/or avoidance of crux issues
- Refusal to promote activism
- Disinformation
- Cover-up for the misdeeds of others
- Sycophantism

Of course the above list is not complete, but it does provide a basic foundation upon which you can determine for yourself whether a particular news source is above-board, or if they've sold themselves over to the dark side.

ANATOMY OF A BETRAYAL; **THE CRUX ISSUE**

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Do you want to be dragged kicking and screaming from your burning house when the next "spike" event takes place (because it *is* coming)? If you don't, then damn it, WAKE UP! At this very moment, the way of life that we have become accustomed to in this country is being destroyed, and for some reason, people aren't taking this notion seriously. We're now in a war against the New World Order elite, and we have to start acting like that's what it is. The mamby-pamby ring-around-the-rosie politically correct nonsense that some groups are advocating has to stop, because if we don't start focusing the entirety of our energy on the crux issues of our time, we're going to be goners.

Do you get it? R.I.P.

This is the bottom line: everyday American citizens are being led like cows to the slaughterhouse to have their throats slit by the powers-that-be. It's that simple. There's no time to waste. We need to open our eyes and see the reality before us. We're being marked for destruction, and our politicians and mainstream media aren't doing a damn thing to help us. In fact, they're part of the plot to undermine us. What's worse is that a significant portion of the so-called "alternative media" is contributing (either wittingly or unwittingly) to this plot to destroy us. Just like the sell-outs at *Newsweek*, *CNN*, *Fox*, and *The Washington Post*, certain members of the alternative media aren't giving their audiences the necessary information to combat those people who want to destroy us. And the obvious question is: WHY?

Once again, let us remind you: we're at WAR! Do you want to see the corrupt, evil Bush administration brought to its knees? Likewise, do you want the NWO elite (and all its multi-armed tentacles which comprise it) exposed for the world to see? If your answer is yes, there's only one way to do it - we need to show every person on this planet that the World Trade Center towers were destroyed not by Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda terrorists, but via a controlled demolition orchestrated by a small cabal of monsters within our own government.

Is this perfectly clear? Nothing else is going to do it. Not depleted uranium, not the Downing Street memo, not the Valerie Plame scandal, not war protestors, not information about Mohammed Atta, not global warming, not Patriot Act rebellion, not peak oil, not a new Social Security bill, not WMD's, not Democrat/Republican wrangling, and not hysteria about a police state.

Sure, all of these issues are important, but none of them are ultimately going to change the status quo. Why? Because this administration - as well as those who sit atop the control pyramid - will simply fluff these topics off and not pay them any heed. If you don't believe me, look at how often they're shuffled to the wayside and ignored. It happens every day.

If we want results, we have to go for the throat; and the only way to do that is by convincing the American public that members of our government wired the WTC towers before 9-11, then pressed the panic button and had them destroyed that fateful morning. The outrage that each and every American citizen will feel over this revelation will be startling, and a true paradigm shift will then take place. In other words, all of us will be screaming bloody murder. Or, as President George Bush Sr. once said (paraphrasing): "If the American people ever knew the whole truth, we'd be chased down in the streets and lynched."

We don't need more "awareness," we need a revolution! And if you're not ready for one, then get the hell out of the way and make room for those who are. We're not pussy-footing around any more.

The New World Order elite can talk their way out of all the subjects I listed above (usually by lying), but there's no way they can weasel their way out of how they planned, orchestrated, and executed the World Trade Center towers controlled demolition. It's their Achilles heel, and we have to disseminate this information to the max if we ever want to topple their demonic empire.

Amazingly, though, hardly any of the individuals or organizations included in our *Anatomy of a Betrayal* article even talk about the 9-11 controlled demolition; and if they do, it's merely as a secondary or peripheral issue.

Don't you get it? Controlled demolition is our only hope of collapsing their house of cards. Everything else is merely an exercise in futility - nothing more than spinning your wheels, chasing your tails, or shadow boxing an opponent that isn't even in the same ring as you.

So, what we're going to do tomorrow is re-visit our *Anatomy of a Betrayal* article and let you know which people and organizations on this list absolutely refuse to speak about controlled demolition. And, in all honesty, we even like some of the people that are included, such as Ray McGovern. Our problem with him, though, is that he won't get off the fence and declare once-and-for-all that 9-11 was an inside job. Ray's a helluva guy, but he's still pushing the al-Qaeda myth, and at this stage of the game, that's not good enough.

Finally, when this list is presented, you have to ask yourself: who should we be mad at: Lisa and Victor at WING TV for pointing-out all those who deny this information to their audience, or the individuals and groups themselves for deceiving you? It's a vitally important question, and one we can't take lightly because what we're talking about right now isn't simply news or information or awareness - we're talking about our very lives! And in that sense, you have to ask yourself one more question: **is your life worth fighting for?** In our case, we're going to fight all the way to the very end, and we're going to keep exposing those people within our own ranks who are doing you a disservice by glossing over the one issue that will bring those bastards down - CONTROLLED DEMOLITION.

ANATOMY OF A BETRAYAL: WHO'S WHO

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Now that we've established that Controlled Demolition is the only issue which will decimate the Bush administration and those sitting atop the global pyramid, we're going to analyze every individual and group that was included in our *Anatomy of a Betrayal* article and establish where they stand on Controlled Demolition. We are taking these steps so that each and every person can see for themselves why more progress isn't being made in this area. Of course the mainstream media won't expose the truth about Controlled Demolition; but what excuse can be made when members of our own "alternative media" won't take the necessary measures?

LEFT GATEKEEPERS

Amy Goodman (*Disinformation Now*): Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

William Rivers Pitt (*Truthout.org*): Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

Justin Raimondo (*Antiwar.com*): Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

Alexander Cockburn & Jeffrey St. Clair (*Counterpunch*): Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

Noam Chomsky: Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

David Corn (*The Nation*): Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

Chip Berlet: Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

Air America: Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

The Progressive: Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

RIGHT GATEKEEPERS

Christopher Ruddy (*Newsmax*): Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

Joseph Farah (*World Net Daily*): Focuses much more energy on perpetuating the Arab-hijacker angle, and essentially perpetuating the neo-con's agenda.

9-11 GATEKEEPERS

Kyle Hence: Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition. In fact, he

even went so far as to arrogantly say that the American people aren't ready for the truth. He has done more to divert people's attention away from this issue than anyone else.

Nicholas Levis: Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

David Kubiak: Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

John Judge: Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

PEAK OIL

Mike Ruppert: Even though he has been forced to confront this issue, he was the individual who, on September 12, 2001 - one day after 9/11 - said there was no possibility that the World Trade Center towers were destroyed by a Controlled Demolition. Now ask yourself: how could he have "known" such a thing so quickly, especially after only one day? Ruppert is also the individual who refused to confront physical evidence, and instead is diverting people away from the crux issues with his peak oil scam.

ESTABLISHMENT

Cynthia McKinney: Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition. Furthermore, during her recent 9-11 hearings on Capital Hill, she allowed the 9-11 "Jersey Girls" to prohibit David Ray Griffin from sharing the same stage with them because he "focused too much attention on the government's involvement in 9-11."

Ray McGovern: Although he's the nicest guy in the world, he won't take the final step and say, once-and-for-all, that 9-11 was an inside job. Instead, he still perpetuates the al-Qaeda/Osama bin Laden myth.

Phil Berg: He has destroyed our best case to date for prosecuting the guilty parties in regard to 9-11 (i.e. Ellen Mariani). A recent article by Christopher Bollyn in the *American Free Press* reflects how damaging he's been to our movement.

Catherine Austin Fitts: Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled Demolition.

SENSATIONALISTS & CRACKPOTS

These individuals divert people's attention with stories that have absolutely no corroboration, sourcing, or verification (example: the preposterous Chicago subway shooting where four MI-5 agents were supposedly gunned-down); or they throw-out absurd theories such as holograms hitting the WTC towers, or dredging the entire Atlantic Ocean looking for the four 9-11 airliners (Phil Jayhan).

CORPORATE COMPANY MEN

Art Bell (*Coast to Coast AM*): Absolutely refuses to speak about Controlled

Demolition, and even goes so far as to vehemently attack those who do.

George Noory (*Coast to Coast Am*): Although he does allow guests to speak about Controlled Demolition, every time he talks about 9-11, it is still in the context of it being masterminded and committed by Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda.

Jeff Rense: Does run articles about Controlled Demolition, but definitely does not make it a high priority, especially among the other spectacles that he features like Brother Yahweh (UFO lunatic), ghosts, Bigfoot, or crop circles.

Alex Jones: To his credit, he devotes more time to Controlled Demolition than any other individual on this list. Regrettably, this issue is only peripheral to him, and definitely takes a back seat to his fear-mongering and BUY MY VIDEO spiel. Also, when Art Bell had 9-11 disinformation specialist Benjamin Chertoff on his show, Jones did everything humanly possible to deflect blame away from Bell and to protect him. Why?

So, with the above information in mind, ask yourself this question: who should the blame be placed on - us for divulging this information, or those who ABSOLUTELY REFUSE TO TALK ABOUT THE 9-11 WTC CONTROLLED DEMOLITIONS, or those who make it a subject of the utmost importance? Before answering, consider this: are you serious about wanting to bring those blood-thirsty bastards to justice who were behind 9-11, or do you want to keep playing silly little games that will get us nowhere? We're going for the throat here at WING TV, and we can't for the life of us understand why the people listed above aren't doing the same. So here's an idea: if you *are* serious about changing the world, why don't you contact them and ask why they're not making it a priority of the highest degree.

BREAKING THE ILLUSION: DOES ALTERNATIVE MEDIA = MAINSTREAM MEDIA?

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

In one of the greatest songs ever written about independence and rebellion, Tom Petty opens *The Last DJ* with these lines:

**You can't turn him into a Company Man
You can't turn him into a whore**

This tune, of course, is about how money and a corporate atmosphere based on phoniness have ruined modern music and FM radio. Regrettably, this same cancerous scourge has afflicted the "alternative" news field, and during the course of this article we'll show in shocking detail how closely the "pay-triot" networks mirror the mainstream media. In other words, these "independent" sources are precise mirror-images of what they are supposedly fighting against.

Before delving into the meat of this story, though, take a moment and think about how you feel in regard to those people who get all their information from CNN, Fox, CBS, Clear Channel, *The New York Times*, Rush Limbaugh, and *Newsweek*. If our perceptions are correct, you probably laugh at them for being so naive in their beliefs that these venues are being 100% upfront with them. Plus, whenever you try telling them that they're being duped, a form of denial (cognitive dissonance) sets in where they refuse to believe they're being bamboozled.

On the other hand, the rest of us have all risen above the "illusion" and could never be fooled again ... right? But what if we were to prove that alternative media sources at the uppermost levels are playing the exact same shell-game on you as the mainstream media? Would you also relapse into cognitive dissonance, or would you be open to the possibility that everything isn't as it appears to be in the alternative media field?

Your answer is very important, because if you're not open-minded enough to seriously consider the possibility, we urge you right now to not read any further because what follows is so illusion-shattering that it will be an even more bitter pill to swallow than the reality that the mainstream media is nothing more than a corporate whore that is used to cover-up the government's dirty deeds.

Conversely, if you choose to enter into this expose with open eyes, fasten your seat belts because it's going to get bumpy!

TEN REASONS WHY THE "ALTERNATIVE" MEDIA EQUALS THE MAINSTREAM MEDIA

1) Lack of Accountability

When the mainstream media doesn't want to discuss an issue, they completely ignore all inquiries or e-mails and refuse to answer any questions about it. Either that, or they hang-up on callers to talk radio shows. Mike Gallagher has done this to us on dozens of different occasions. **(The Gallagher Chronicles)** In addition, try to imagine how many of your queries have gone unanswered by the big networks. In other words, the mainstream media and/or government sources seem to be above reproach and don't feel obligated to answer for their actions, as if they're somehow above the little people.

Similarities to the Alternative Media

Recently, GCN absolutely refused to address the issue of (as well as a flurry of questions about) Alex Jones' practice of censoring his archives. **(Alex Jones Master Link)** Both of these entities will gladly take your subscription and/or pay-per-view money, but they don't feel compelled to answer your questions. Why?

Test

If you don't believe that the alternative media is mirroring the mainstream, please contact Ted Anderson **(877-996-4327)** and ask him why he won't make a public statement on Alex Jones' censorship. Or, call into Jones' show **(800-259-9231)** and mention the WING TV-censorship issue and see if he hangs up on you, just like Rush Limbaugh would. Of course Rush makes excuses for why he hangs up, and so does Alex; but neither of their reasons hold any water.

2) Fear of Retaliation - Company Man Syndrome

If someone in the mainstream media gets out of line by broaching *verboden* topics, they are immediately threatened with a severe rebuke or dismissal (economic hardship). Why do you think none of them seriously discuss what really happened on 9-11, the Oklahoma City Bombing, Flight 800, Israel's deliberate attack on the USS Liberty, or so many other issues? Because if they did, they'd be fired.

Likewise, if one of their own "does bad," they all close ranks and keep a lid on the scandal. A perfect example is Bill O'Reilly's recent phone-sex debacle. **(Bill O'Reilly's Tawdry Sex Case)** All the Company Men at Fox News naturally kept

a tight lid on things, but even his harshest critics (liberals and Democrats at the competing networks) were strangely silent after a day or so. Hell, shouldn't Michael Moore and Al Franken still be trumpeting his lascivious behavior? Why aren't they, you may wonder? Because they're all part of the same cabal which protects their own, regardless of how vile their behavior. The exception, of course, is when the power elite want to bump somebody; then the media is unleashed like rabid dogs.

The end result is that there are no checks and balances, and bad behavior is enabled. Look at Bill O'Reilly - he's a total sex degenerate, but except for paying his accuser some high-dollar hush money, he's still on the air - virtually unscathed. And all the Company Men stood silently by without saying a word.

Similarities to the Alternative Media

After we provided verifiable proof of Alex Jones' overt, Big Brother-style censorship practices, not a single media figure at GCN spoke out about it. Why? Because they're all protecting their own. In fact, they're doing so because, according to James Lloyd in *The Alex Jones Affair*, "Jones represents what is usually called 'the franchise' at Genesis. His program is the number one show on the network. Indeed, the entire business plan at GCN has been focused on furthering the listenership of Alex Jones through affiliate AM and FM stations. It's clear GCN has sought to make Alex Jones the next Michael Savage or Rush Limbaugh." **(The Alex Jones Affair)** The next Rush Limbaugh? Doesn't the corporate sell-out hypocrisy of this notion wreak to high heaven? My God, Rush Limbaugh should be the LAST thing any of us in the mainstream media should aspire to be.

Anyway, to protect their 'investment' and to insure that he receives no 'bad press,' a climate of fear has been created at GCN which is so pervasive that a radio show host called us and said that even though he disagreed with Jones' actions, he was afraid to mention it on his own show because, "Alex Jones would call his boss and have him fired" (exact words). Now, doesn't this sound frighteningly like what would happen at Fox News or CBS? Plus, a Jeff Rense columnist told us that they were afraid to write about the censorship issue because Rense would pull their articles from his site and refuse to publish them in the future. Is this what we want ruling the alternative media scene - FEAR of retaliation being peddled by Company Men who work for the same network? Isn't this exactly what dominates the mainstream media?

Test

If you don't believe that the alternative media is mirroring the mainstream, call one of these hosts during their show and ask them why they haven't spoken-out against Alex Jones' censorship practices. And please don't let them brush you off with an array of flimsy excuses (believe us, we know them all). Instead, ask them this: if censorship is anathema to the Truth Movement, and if it's the height of hypocrisy to supposedly support the First Amendment while at the same time putting information into Big Brother's Memory Hole, why aren't they publicly speaking out about it? The mainstream media won't touch certain issues because they're AFRAID. Is this also the same reason that the alternative media won't do it?

3) Suppression of Information

Prior to the release of *9-11 on Trial*, (*9-11 on Trial*) Lisa and I decided to perform an experiment. Namely, we wanted to see which alternative media outlets would allow us to speak about this book (which is, by the way, the best indictment ever against the government's "official" explanation as to how the World Trade Center towers collapsed). Anyway, we knew that mainstream outlets wouldn't give coverage to this explosive book, but there should be NO REASON why the alternative media wouldn't. Even if they didn't "like" us, that still isn't any reason to suppress vital information, is it?

Similarities to the Alternative Media

To our amazement, even though numerous alternative radio show hosts gladly welcomed us onto their programs to speak about *9-11 on Trial*, and even though we received nearly a dozen print reviews (including the *American Free Press* plus an excellent blurb from David Ray Griffin); (*9-11 on Trial Reviews*) the largest radio shows and news organizations absolutely refused to let us speak out about how the World Trade Center towers were destroyed via a controlled demolition. These radio shows and hosts are: Alex Jones, Jeff Rense, Amy Goodman, Art Bell, George Noory, and Air America. Now take a moment and ask yourself this question: why are these entities acting as Gatekeepers to prevent information from reaching the public? Plus, considering the millions of people that these shows reach all over the world, how much more knowledgeable would ALL of us be if they had let us speak about *9-11 on Trial*?

Now some people may object by saying: "All you want to do is talk about your book." And we'd respond by saying, "Yes, that's one of the reasons, but certainly not the only one!" After all, isn't this one of the primary reasons why we have an

alternative media in the first place? More so, aren't we the ones who are supposed to be talking about topics that the mainstream media won't touch? If the alternative media won't do that, why should it even exist? Hell, even the mainstream media (i.e. Knight-Ridder's *Centre Daily Times*) gave us more coverage than the above-mentioned hosts. **(9-11 on Trial Cracks Mainstream Media)** And that, in our opinion, is inexcusable.

Test

If you don't believe that the alternative media is mirroring the mainstream, then ask all of the above hosts why they are engaging in a total information blackout by patently refusing to mention (i.e. suppress information about) *9-11 on Trial*?

4) **Marginalization**

When the mainstream media feels threatened by a particular issue, one of their favorite tactics is to marginalize the party in question. **(Ralph Omholt's Coercive Persuasion: The Transcendence of Brainwashing)** Words such as "conspiracy theorist," "crackpot," "tin foil hats," etc are constantly used to deride and mock the presenter of information which doesn't fit into the "party line." Syndicated radio talk show host Mike Gallagher has done this to us countless times.

Similarities to the Alternative Media

On numerous occasions, Art Bell has called us "Wing Nuts" (in reference to our website) on his *Coast-to-Coast AM* radio show, while Corporate Company Men Jeff Rense and Alex Jones have made it a habit of late to attack us as being "cointelpro" and "slanderers." But what they're doing is avoiding the primary issue — censorship — while diverting people's attention with a textbook distraction technique. Plus, how could we be slandering Alex Jones when we have the tapes proving that he censors his show! Thus, to avoid the truth, they've started a spin campaign against us - the people who have exposed their wrong-doing - instead of actually addressing the issues - just like the mainstream media does.

Test

If you don't believe that the alternative media is mirroring the mainstream, e-mail or call the above-mentioned figures and ask them why, instead of marginalizing us with name-calling, they don't directly address the following questions.**(Alex Jones: Ten Questions)**

5) Failure to Present Both Sides of the Story

The mainstream media (despite calling themselves "fair and balanced") refuse to present both sides of many particular issues. A perfect example is the government's cover-up of 9-11. Although they gave the Kean-Zelikow Whitewash Committee endless hours of coverage, where were the independent researchers to be found? Nowhere.

Similarities to the Alternative Media

When both of our exposes on Mike Ruppert and Alex Jones were published on hundreds of different websites and posting forums, Corporate Company Man Jeff Rense absolutely refused to run them (despite obviously being made aware of them via e-mail). But on each occasion, he ran scathing rebuttals by Ruppert or Jones' cronies. Then, to make his one-sidedness even more blatant, Rense refused to run counter-articles. To prove our point, author Michael Langston sent two different rebuttals to Rense to show both sides of the story, yet neither of them appeared. **(Michael Langston's Open Letter to Alex Jones)** The glaring similarities to the mainstream media in this instance are painfully obvious. Just like *Time* magazine running to the defense of *The Washington Post* when the going gets rough, so does Rense to fellow Company Man Alex Jones (with absolutely no opposing viewpoints found anywhere to their "official party line").

Test

If you don't believe the alternative media is mirroring the mainstream, contact Jeff Rense and ask him why Michael Langston's articles were never published to give his readers a fair and balanced view of this situation.

6) Get Others To Do Your Dirty Work

When Gary Webb published a series of articles exposing the CIA's role in bringing cocaine into the gang-riddled streets of L.A., the mainstream media pounced on him like a pack of bloodthirsty wolves, effectively getting his newspaper (*The San Jose Mercury News*) to retract the stories while at the same time relocating Webb to a locale in the middle of nowhere. They also incited such a media outcry against Webb that they shut down any future exposes for fear of similar ridicule. Is that what we really want in the alternative media - a fear factor that prevents others from writing hard-hitting articles?

Similarities to the Alternative Media

To date, Jeff Rense - a Corporate Company Man on Alex Jones' same network (GCN) - has published three different hit pieces on us after we exposed Alex's censorship practices. And in our opinion, that's fair if both sides of the story are presented. But one of these articles was so outlandish that nearly every person who read it instantly told us they were certain that the author ("Alastair Wiggins") was none other than Alex's sidekick, Paul Joseph Watson. **(Michael Langston's Response to "Alastair Wiggins")** Furthermore, as proof of their cowardice, these hosts never refer directly to us by name when speaking about us on their shows. Instead, they allude to us. Of course, they use the excuse that "they don't want to give us any publicity," but this is (once again) exactly what mainstream phony Mike Gallagher does when referring to us. Why? Because they're so afraid of the information contained in our articles that they don't want any of their listeners to actually SEE the lurid details for themselves. If they did, it would definitely cast them in a harsh light, and detract from their carefully crafted images.

Test

If you don't believe that the alternative media is mirroring the mainstream, ask Alex Jones why he won't debate us over these issues. **(The Great Debate)** We'll even do it on his good buddy Jeff Rense's show. In other words, he'll have a complete home-court advantage, but we don't care. That's how confident we are in our assertions. This way, there won't be any more innuendo on Alex/Jeff's part, or passive-aggressive forms of attack. We'll simply lay it out for all to hear and let the chips fall where they may. We're not afraid ... why are they? Or could it be that the information we have against them is so damning that - similar to the mainstream media - they have no defense against it?

7) Financial Rewards

To prevent their Company Men from speaking out about forbidden topics, the mainstream media overlords reward their underlings quite well monetarily. Look at the salaries of Rush Limbaugh, Dan Rather, Bill O'Reilly, or Wolf Blitzer and you will concur with what we're saying.

Similarities to the Alternative Media

One 9-11 website editor said that he wouldn't speak out about censorship because Alex Jones and other GCN hosts would never have him back on their shows again to promote his products or website. Thus, the promise of a future financial reward was effectively used to buy his silence and cooperation.

Secondly, after Art Bell inexcusably lashed-out at 9-11 researchers, **(Art Bell 9-11 Outrage)** then brought propagandist Ben Chertoff of *Popular Mechanics* onto his show and backed him 100% in his assertions, Alex Jones absolutely refused to criticize him for doing so. He even went so far as to rebuke callers into his show for denouncing Bell. Thus, what he did instead was to deflect all attention away from Bell and onto Chertoff. And his reason for doing so was obvious - Jones wanted to continue appearing on Bell's show to hawk his videos and pay-per-view website.

Lastly, the night before we were to appear on Dave Von Kleist's radio show, he called and told us not to speak badly about Art Bell because Joyce and he wanted to be asked back onto his show in the future to sell their products. Yet this was the main reason why Marie Gunther - the *Power Hour's* publicist - called Lisa Guliani and invited us onto their show in the first place. She had seen the buzz created by Lisa's article, *Me, Art Bell, and 9-11*, and wanted to run with it. **(Me, Art Bell, and 9-11)** Regrettably, because of Von Kleist's intervention, the ugly truth about Art Bell was subordinated so that yet another person could cash in on Art's disinformation show. Isn't this exactly the way the mainstream media operates?

Can't you see what's going on? It's the same little type of cabal that characterizes (some say "infects") the mainstream media. These people walk on eggshells around each other and never step on each others toes; then they all have the same little circuit of guests appear on their shows - the same ones, by the way, that get rewarded for staying silent about certain "hot button" issues (i.e. censorship).

Test

If you don't believe that the alternative media is mirroring the mainstream, ask Alex Jones why he adamantly refuses to publicly denounce Art Bell once-and-for-all as a total shill for the New World Order. His silence on this matter is deafening ... just like the mainstream media whenever they circle their wagons to protect a guilty party.

8) Distraction

Whenever the mainstream media wants to avoid the crux of an issue, they distract the public with obfuscation and distraction. A good example would be blaming the entire Oklahoma City Bombing on Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols when it was in fact a blatant example of state-sponsored terrorism. In addition, there was zero possibility that an ANFO bomb in a Ryder truck could have brought down the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building, yet that was another distraction used to distract

from the real issue - bombs inside the building! (The OKC-Elohim City Connection)

Similarities to the Alternative Media

Since the controlled demolition of the World Trade Center towers is the CRUX issue of 9-11, imagine how much time and energy has been diverted with the "pod" issue, or other such inanities such as galvanic corrosion, etc. (The 9-11 Pods)

Test

If you don't believe that the alternative media is mirroring the mainstream; then tell them to put aside all the secondary, peripheral issues about 9-11 and get to the true core of this matter. Some of these individuals have now spent years distracting us, and its time we get to the core information - a controlled demolition of the WTC towers that was planned, orchestrated, and executed by a bloodthirsty cabal within our government.

9) Hard-Sell Advertising

McDonald's, Chevrolet, Pepsi, etc ad nauseum.

Similarities to the Alternative Media

A hilarious example of this phenomenon is found in our satirical article about Alex Jones changing the name of his radio show and website to Infomercial.com. (**Infomercial.com**) Enough said!

Test

If you don't believe that the alternative media is mirroring the mainstream; then tell Alex Jones to quit his unceasing hard-sell advertising barrage that is even more hardcore than that used by Budweiser, Doritos, and Tide.

10) Herding Sheep Into Different Pens

The mainstream media is superb at labeling and herding people into different categories to keep us inactive and ineffective. To them, all of us should either be seen as Republicans, Democrats, old, young, male, feminists, straight, gay, black, white, yellow, rich, poor, conservative, liberal, etc. This way we'll always remain

divided and distracted without being able to focus our attention on who the real enemy is (and how to combat them).

Similarities to the Alternative Media

Those of us who have seen through this smokescreen want something more substantive from our existence, thus we've joined the Truth Movement. Knowing this, certain alternative media network figures have targeted the disaffected among us and are now simply herding them into another pen, while at the same time failing to promote any type of direct activism. What they do instead is simply TALK and babble for hours on end (along with selling their products) without telling people to get up and take a stand like they did in the 1960's.

Ask yourself: why didn't Alex Jones spend even one minute in the months preceding the OKC tenth anniversary rally urging people to attend this event? It's atrociously inexcusable behavior, especially when all he did was pitch his videos and pay-per-view website. What's happening is that we're being dumbed-down, except instead of giving us orange Kool-aid they're giving us yellow Kool-aid. If we want to change our world, we have to become ACTIVE, for knowledge without action following directly behind it is useless. Talking on the radio for three hours a day and passing around videos won't cut it. It'll make some people rich, but it won't affect the New World Order elite. In fact, they're happy that we're sitting behind our computers and not out on the street. Sadly, Alex Jones' idea of activism is getting people to PAY to see his videos at a movie theater, where he can also sell even more of his videos and t-shirts. Ask yourself: is this activism, or blatant profiteering?

Test

If you don't believe that the alternative media is mirroring the mainstream; then see if all of the individuals named in this article will help us spread the word about the 9-11 High Noon Ground Zero rally in New York City on the fourth anniversary of **9-11,(9-11 NYC: High Noon)** We're not selling anything, and there aren't any commercial backers. Instead, we're simply trying to get people active by showing our strength in numbers. We want to see a huge 9-11 truth presence at Ground Zero which speaks truth to power and to the people of New York City. Of course the mainstream media doesn't want a huge throng of people showing up on 9-11 in NYC, so ask these alternative radio hosts and media figures if they'll help us get the word out. Ya figure, it's the least they could do to differentiate themselves from the mainstream! Will they pass this litmus test? Judge for yourself.

Conclusion

When it comes to the alternative media, the gravest danger facing us today is the "network" structure which is more and more beginning to resemble the corporate mainstream media hierarchal framework. But despite the fact that we have focused primarily on the "personalities" who are undermining our movement, the real blame lies at the very top of this network system.

Ted Anderson, president of GCN and Midas Resources, is a case in point. When Lisa Guliani asked him where he stood on Alex Jones' censorship practices at GCN, Anderson replied, "If it's not a serious issue with Alex, then it's not a serious issue with me either." Doesn't his response sound exactly like what the president of Fox News, Roger Ailes, would say: "If Bill O'Reilly doesn't think the truth about 9-11 matters, then I don't think the truth about 9-11 matters either." It's abysmal. (As a sidenote, we're currently conducting an in-depth investigation of GCN, including its inception, lawsuits, and business ties. More to follow.)

In this light, network corruption starts at the top, and by example is filtered down through the system. What we have is a **centralization of power** that is based upon money and fear — just like the mainstream media! Worse, to protect its status quo and the bad behavior which results from it (just like the federal government), a form of protectionism takes place where the guilty parties feel they are above questioning from the very people they are supposed to be serving (again, just like the federal government).

This hierarchal power structure which resembles that of the mainstream media is precisely why the New World Order elite aren't worried about what the alternative media is doing. Why? Because the Corporate Company Men mentioned in this article are the very ones who are suppressing information, censoring information, and preventing us from becoming action-oriented.

Can't you see what's going on? These network Company Men are doing the NWO's dirty work for them! The similarities between them and the mainstream media are undeniable, not to mention downright troublesome. Money, control, and fear comprise the bottom-line, and by exerting their heavy-hand over the Patriot community, they're actually keeping you in line just like the power elite want them to do. They're keeping you controlled, because the most effective method to maintain the opposition is to actually LEAD it. Thus, is there any better way to minimize or nullify the alternative media's effectiveness than to make it become a mirror image of its nemesis - the mainstream media!

These people tell you that it's all right to criticize the government and mainstream media, but this same scrutiny doesn't apply to them. How can that be? More so, why won't they answer your questions? Do they have such little respect for you that they're above reproach? What do they think you are - stupid ... that you can't see through their smokescreen ... that you can't think for yourself... and that you should do nothing but stay silent and swallow everything they peddle? Well, we know this isn't true because many of you are canceling your GCN & Infomercial.com subscriptions until you get some answers. And you have every right to because these individuals have a higher standard to uphold than the mainstream media, and they're simply not doing it.

We realize that the information contained in this article is a bitter pill for many people to swallow, so all we'll ask of you is this: ask the individuals named in this article the very same tough questions that we've asked above; and don't let them off the hook. They'll arrive at all kinds of excuses as to why they can't or won't answer them; but their silence is merely an evasive tactic used to deflect attention away from their sordid practices. Furthermore, if we can ask these same questions of our political leaders and mainstream media figures, why can't we ask them of the alternative media? Do they get a special pass just because they call themselves "patriots"? The answer is no - they're not above reproach - and until they come clean with us, we'll keep shining a bright light on their actions. Isn't this what a REAL, independent media is supposed to do? After all, the heart, soul, and future of this movement - and our country as a whole - is at stake, and in our opinion, it's too damn important to simply let slide. Get mad at us if you want, but demand some answers, folks; you deserve it!

TRUTH MOVEMENT **VOICES OF CONSCIENCE**

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Over the years we've heard of various Internet writers being called the "conscience" of the 9-11 movement, or the "conscience" of the patriot movement.

But from our perspective, the conscience has always been something that reminds us of, or points out, wrongdoing. In fact, here is a definition from Dictionary.com: "The awareness of a moral or ethical aspect to one's conduct together with the urge to prefer right over wrong: *Let your conscience be your guide*" But when our conscience fails to trigger alarms and instead falls silent, it no longer fills its role as - nor can it be thought of as - a conscience.

This point is of vital importance because we desperately need "writers of conscience" to keep the Truth Movement honest. The reason why is obvious: if we fail to uphold a higher standard than the mainstream media, then we'll eventually become mirror-images of them. In addition, the commentaries produced by these scribes serve as a rallying point for that which is right, ultimately leading us in the proper direction. But when these voices are muted by heavy-handed forces within our own alternative media, a vacuum arises and our moral compass spins out-of-control like a ship without a rudder.

The worst part is: these very same authors have in the past shouted from the rooftops that if just a few people in the government or the corporate media spoke out, it would expose an array of injustices, sway public opinion, and potentially eradicate the mess surrounding us. But due to an ominous fear-factor which has increasingly made the alternative media reminiscent of the mainstream media, so too are these writers being quieted, just like their counterparts at *Newsweek* or *The Washington Post*. This "fear factor" about which we speak occurs when writers are afraid to speak out because their articles will be black-listed by certain website owners (i.e. Jeff Rense), or they'll be prohibited from appearing on various "Company Men" radio shows. Is this how you think the "alternative media" should operate?

And it truly is a shame because what we've been speaking about lately on WING TV is censorship - on radio shows, archives, websites, and forums. Instead of promoting open, responsible discussion, though, these radio show hosts, moderators, and website owners simply hang up on their callers (just like the mainstream media), delete entire articles (just like the mainstream media), or censor anything that they don't agree with or which casts them in a negative light

Gust like the mainstream media). The end result is that our First Amendment is being trampled in a fashion that is far worse than that being done by the government or corporate media. This disturbing phenomenon should rock each and every one of us to our very core, for if we allow the cornerstone of our Constitution to be so summarily dismissed, then everything that is left of our freedom will surely follow behind it.

Is this what you want? If the answer is no, then let your conscience rise above your fear; and let your voice ring out louder than those of network company men like Jeff Rense and Alex Jones who want you to remain meek, silent, unquestioning, and passive. We're talking about not only the heart and soul of this movement, but also our nation as a whole. Your silence in this matter implies complicity; and if you fail to become part of the solution, you are - by default - part of the problem.

Luckily, there are still a few among us who aren't rolling over and playing dead on the censorship issue, specifically: radio talk show host Vyzygoth of *From the Grassy Knoll*, Chris Emery from the Oklahoma Bombing Investigation Committee (OKBIC), patriot extraordinaire Rick Stanley, Rick Biesada (Chicago talk-show host, Minuteman member, and author of *The Angry White Male*), *9-11 Verses* commentator Michael Langston, researcher Thomas Holbrook, and all those in *The New World Order Corner* discussion forum. Plus, we've been inundated by hundreds of e-mails from WING TV viewers who tell us they "get it" and who encourage us to keep their feet to the fire and not back down. All of these individuals are our current **Voices of Conscience**, and we can't commend them enough for their work.

MEDIA COWARDS: THE GAMES ARE OVER

By Lisa Guliani

Belief is with them mechanical, voluntary: they believe what they are paid for—they swear to that which turns to account. Do you suppose that after years spent in this manner, they have any feeling left answering to the difference between truth and falsehood?

William Hazlitt

I've been playing mainstream media's little "game" for more than three years now. The game involves trying to have an actual conversation with one of them. Unfortunately, this isn't as easy as one might think. Nowadays, the media is virtually inaccessible to the general public unless you enjoy speaking with employees in the mailroom or circulation department. Forget trying to talk to the big players, the plastic heads we see every night on television or their editors and producers. Editors and producers have now achieved "untouchable, unknowable" status. The average person will rarely be considered worthy of live discourse with one of them unless, perhaps, you give birth to a three-headed baby and somehow link it to Michael Jackson. If you happen to witness people being shot in the mall, chances are Rita Cosby will have you repeat yourself several times on national television in order to further feed their speculation. They might even trip over their own feet to talk to you in such a circumstance. Sadly, the more sensational, ridiculous or scandalous a story is, the more easily it triggers the press into action. Let's not pull any punches here: the establishment press has seriously devolved into "trash over truth" tabloid garbage. As long as there's a public demand for it, they'll keep feeding it to you. So, stop demanding fiction and filth and start demanding truth. When their ratings start spiraling downward faster than the dollar, they'll get the message loud and clear.

Of course, not all scandals get reported in the news. The 9-11 cover-up is perhaps the biggest scandal going on right now and nobody in the mainstream press is even raising an eyebrow. So, I decided to make some phone calls and send e-mails to major news networks, talk-radio stations, mainstream newspapers and alternative media. In the last month, these venues have received a significant amount of communication from me. What they do with it is anybody's guess. I've called all the major media outlets to let them know about the release of *9-11 On Trial* by Victor Thorn. Since this book proves that the government lied to the public about the World Trade Center collapses, I figure this is major news - the biggest story of the century. So, let's see if major media bites on big stories or if they're only into parading gossip, myth and speculation as fact.

At many news services, the phones are answered by either a computer-generated recording, or in some case, a taped message from someone who actually has a pulse. On occasion, you may get a live human, but this doesn't rate as actual progress, since they won't tell you anything. We've all been treated to the endless main menu directory that seems to be so popular nowadays whenever you call some organization, and the media is no different. So what happens is you end up on hold in a never-ending vacuum of dead air or muzak, while waiting in an invisible line for your call to be routed to yet another robotic voice answering system. You could spend an eternity withering in phone hell, being punted from voice mail to voice mail, leaving message after message. No one will respond unless, as I've pointed out, you pull that mutant baby out of the hat and have the pictures to add to their ratings. Does anyone in the media even pay attention to messages on their voice mail merry-go-round? You would hope so, right?

Years ago, one could call a media newsroom and a live person would pick up the phone and speak to you. A few weeks ago I called the FOX newsroom (for the umpteenth time) and a real person actually answered the phone. She assured me I had reached the newsroom. Great! However, this was as far as I was going to get. Talking to this woman was like trying to learn the words to a song being played backwards. The curious thing about calling FOX: you cannot get anyone's name. Not even a first name. Not even initials. Names are classified material at FOX. But since I wanted to send Bill O'Reilly Thorn's new book, *9-11 On Trial*, I needed the name of a producer or assistant in order to make sure it got to O'Reilly. No such luck. FOX News will not give out any names - period. I asked the live person, "How do you people get mail?" The response was, "Just send the book to the show." In this case, that would be *The O'Reilly Factor*. Are they totally paranoid or what? It was a very weird conversation. I expressed concern that my package might get lost in the shuffle, but was told the mailroom people have their act together. I was left with no other option, but find it hard to believe that no FOX employee ever receives business mail personally addressed to them. This is how they hide. You send them mail and nobody has to take responsibility for what happened to it. That's slick. So the package was sent and I waited. Of course, it would be unthinkable for anyone to call and confirm that O'Reilly got this book, so another call was made the following week to see what had happened to it.

Once again, Ms. No-Name answers. She gives me the same speech and I ask if my book has arrived. She has no idea. I am then connected to some nameless mailroom employee, who is speaking a very broken mix of hybrid language which I can barely grasp. Supposedly they have their act together in the mailroom, according to Ms. No-Name. They do not. The mailroom flunky can't tell me anything about this package. Since no progress is being made with this department, I am redirected back to Ms. No-Name, who then supposedly left a message for Bill O'Reilly's assistant. All No-Name would divulge to me was the

gender of this person. She is a woman. Now that's an inside scoop for ya. I'm told the woman might return my call. She might? Okay, so now I know O'Reilly's assistant is a woman (surprise, surprise), but when I ask her name (since she now has mine), I am denied. This information is too classified for Joe Q. Citizen. Not surprisingly, the woman has yet to be heard from.

Phone calls to CNN were even more annoying. After the initial three-ring run-around I was connected to Senior Booking Director Gale Chalef. Ms. Chalef seemed highly irritated by my phone call and made it clear that she had no interest in a verbal exchange with me. No interest in the biggest story of the century - just measurable impatience because apparently her time is more valuable than mine. Chalef rudely instructs me to "Send an email to me with whatever it is you're pushing." I tell her I'm pushing the truth about 9-11, that it involves no conspiracy theory and is based on physics and mathematics, physical evidence and expert witness testimony. Hurriedly, I explained that our local newspaper is interested in running an article on this book and I urge CNN to cover this important story. Ms. Chalef's reply: "Just because your newspaper is reporting on it doesn't make it national news." I countered with, "Are you saying 9-11 isn't national news?" She repeats herself that just because our local newspaper is running an article on 9-11 doesn't make it national news, so I ask if I can quote her on that. She promptly hangs up on me.

My calls and e-mails to other mainstream print news organizations have also hit brick walls. At the *New York Post*, an operator did provide me with the address and name of a person to which I could address my package, and a book was sent. I don't know if they've received it. I may never know. I'll keep at them until they tell me one way or the other. The book has also been sent to Peter Jennings at *World News Tonight*, and I've left several phone messages and e-mails at *The New York Times*, *Daily News*, *Canarsie Courier* (Brooklyn's oldest newspaper), CBS, NBC, MSNBC, ABC, C-Span, *Newsweek*, and so on. No live humans, just more rides on the voice-mail message-go-round.

I've had slightly more luck with getting some responses from so-called "alternative" media, although they employ similar filtering mechanisms. If they give a name, generally it's a first-name only. Of course, they do make sure they get YOUR name right off the bat - and the reason why you're attempting to bother them in the first place. You see, their time is more valuable than yours or mine.

Air America is another well-known alternative news outlet. You would think that they'd be interested in 9-11 truth, wouldn't you? They're supposed to report the stories mainstream won't touch. If they have an ax to grind with the Bush administration, this story should be right up their alley, right? Guess again. In fact,

one of their producers, Gabrielle Zuckerman, who works on *The Al Franken Show*, actually replied to a few of my e-mails.

Subject: Media Inquiry from WING TV
Attention: Gabby Zuckerman - Media Inquiry
re: The O'Franken Factor

Hello Ms. Zuckerman,

Lisa Guliani here from WING TV. Hope all is going well for you. I'm dropping you a line to let you know that in about two weeks we will release *9-11 On Trial*, a book that refutes the official government version of events in regard to the collapse of the World Trade Center towers, and proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that there is zero possibility that it could have happened the way they've portrayed it. To prove that it was physically impossible for the plane impacts and burning jet fuel to collapse the towers, we rely on physics, mathematical equations, scientific formulas, expert testimony, the laws of nature, and physical evidence. No "conspiracy theory" is involved.

In the end, the results are so damning to the government's official story that their credibility is absolutely shredded beyond repair. With this brief description in mind, we would like to appear on the *O'Franken Factor* sometime to talk about this book, and also our upcoming televised video presentation on this subject. It is attracting quite a bit of attention already, and we would love to appear on Air America programs and introduce your audience to this research and discuss it. Drop me a line sometime and let me know.

Best wishes, Lisa Guliani, WING TV

Zuckerman: We're focusing on political battles happening in Washington DC at the moment. There are a host of other shows on our network who might be interested. I'd suggest contacting them.

Gabrielle Zuckerman - *The Al Franken Show* - *Air America Radio*

Guliani: May I ask why you're not interested?

Zuckerman: Thank you for thinking of us but we're going to pass for the time being.

Best, Gabrielle

Guliani: Ms. Zuckerman, We're approaching you with absolute proof that the World Trade center towers did NOT collapse the way the government says they did. As a news and political force that positions itself in stark opposition to the policies of the Bush administration, by denying us an opportunity to reveal this information, do you realize how peculiar your response will seem to the public? I look forward to your response.

Best wishes, Lisa Giuliani - WING TV

Zuckerman: Unfortunately we don't have the resources to vet this story. I'd suggest you submit it to the *Washington Post* or *The New York Times* where they can get an investigative reporter on it and then we'd be able to run with it.

Guliani: Why do you need resources to do an interview? All the legwork has been done. We're not asking for a full-scale expose from you, just an interview. I cannot imagine why or how you could resist such a story.

Zuckerman: Let me just posit this to you - if someone approached you and said that Elvis was still alive, wouldn't you want to check it out? I understand that you're convinced of the truth of your story, but that's not how journalism works. We need to independently verify and stand behind the interviews on the show, and as I mentioned in my last e-mail we don't have the resources to vet this story. Thank you for your pitch, but I'm going to have to point you in the direction of the other programs on the network.

Guliani: Well, please allow me to posit this to you. I think it is very condescending of you to compare 9-11 with an Elvis Presley sighting. We're talking about 9-11, the biggest story of the 21st century. Rather than taking an apathetic position on this information, you should be banging down the door to find out what the proof is. Please explain to me, considering that you apparently have the resources to do interviews on other subjects, why you aren't even interested in LOOKING at the information we have? This book will be out in less than two weeks. I urge you to please reconsider and look deeper into what I'm saying. This is of vital importance.

Zuckerman never responded. Basically, they would rather report on political theater in Washington than on the truth about 9-11.

I've sent e-mails to Janeane Garofalo, Laura Flanders, Randi Rhodes and a slew of others. The producer for Randi Rhodes did reply, requesting a copy of the book, which was then sent to them. I'll be following up with them. Air America's *Unfiltered* and *Morning Sedition* producers have not responded. I called Terry

Keaney, who is in charge of programming for Air America. Her voice message advised me that while she will not discuss media inquiries over the phone; she will accept e-mail inquiries. Very well, Ms. Keaney. I'd like to know when exactly I might expect a reply to my e-mail to you dated Sunday, February 6th? I know Ms. Keaney received my e-mail because I got her auto-generated response. Typical.

Alternative Radio was another disappointment. David Barsamian is the big kahuna over there, and his employees tell me he won't touch stories on 9-11 - ever. No reason given, he just won't touch them. One of his staff members sounded sheepish even saying this, and admitted she agrees that he should report on this information. I'm sorry, she says, but he just won't do it.

This sounds pretty bleak, doesn't it? Well, there are many good internet talk radio hosts - people like Duke Skorich, Darrell Smith, Kelly McGinley, Jeff Bennett, Rick Biesada, Meria Heller, GeorgeAnn Hughes, Michael Corbin, Vyz, Clay Douglas, Andre Eggelletion, John Stadtmiller, and others who aren't afraid and will bring you the goods. The list is longer than those I've named here, and we appreciate them all. It is plainly obvious to me that the only media receptive to reporting straight-up news without hesitation is to be found mostly online. The silence of other prominent alternative press personalities, while deafening, speaks volumes to me. What is it saying to you?

This silence we're seeing simply reinforces the notion that there is nothing alternative or independent about many of those within the media with whom we're all familiar. Like their mainstream New World Order counterparts, these people are about as far away from the real deal as they can possibly get. Ask yourself why the self-proclaimed alternative press has a problem exposing the biggest story of the 21st century? Doesn't truth in news matter? Instead, they choose to steer your attention away from what's important, or simply avoid the issue altogether because they're too "busy" trying to suck more money out of your pockets.

It's discouraging that this wall exists between media and the people it's supposed to serve, and it's reprehensible that the very same people we're supposed to trust to inform us about what's really going on have the audacity to bite the hand that feeds them in this manner. Nevertheless, we mustn't allow obstructive behavior to deter us from what must be done. Each one of us must utilize every possible avenue available to get the word out to America, with or without the help of the gatekeeper press, whether it's labeled mainstream or alternative. They have slowed the process down, but they haven't been able to stop the flow of information. This is why they hide from people like you and me, because they know that the truth is here and it's about to hit them right between the eyes. No wonder they exhibit this desperate, paranoid need for anonymity, filtering mechanisms and screeners. We must work harder to rouse the attention of

America, to counter the lies and spin, to overwhelm these media cowards with the very thing they fear - the truth. Ignoring us will not make us go away.

The question is: will truth ever mean anything to the intellectual prostitutes currently sitting on the most important criminal cover-up of our time, those who represent this nation's establishment, and a good chunk of alternative "media"? I'd say "time will tell," but in all honesty, the clock's winding down on us. We must put pressure on our handcuffed press NOW. Walter Lippman once said, "The news and truth are not the same thing." Folks, we must not settle for just being an "alternative". Truth and news should (and must) go hand in hand. I'm putting all you mainstream and alternative cowards on notice: the games are over. We're coming in. You're either with the people or with the "terrorists". Which is it?

POPULAR MECHANICS

9-11 CHALLENGE

By Victor Thorn

In its March, 2005 edition, *Popular Mechanics* (under the tutelage of editor Jim Meigs) set about to "debunk the myths" surrounding the 9-11 terror attacks. To do so, they focused their attention on the sixteen most prevalent "myths" surrounding this horrific event. But prior to beginning this process, *PM* engaged in a smear campaign that set the tone for what would ensue in their article.

How so, you may wonder? Well, for starters, Meigs very pointedly questioned the patriotism of those who engaged in "conspiracy theory" by saying: "Those who peddle fantasies that this country encouraged, permitted or actually carried out the attacks are libeling the truth — and disgracing the memories of the thousands who died that day." He then went on to declare that "the facts used by conspiracy theorists to support their fantasies were mistaken, misunderstood or deliberately falsified."

Both of these claims are very damning in their assertions, and needless to say I take exception to both. And, similar to Jim Hoffman, I could spend page-after-page refuting Mr. Meigs' claims. But instead, I'll simply say that in my book, *9-11 on Trial*, I don't use a single "conspiracy theory." Rather, I rely solely on physics, mathematical formulas, scientific equations, physical evidence, the laws of nature, and expert testimony to prove my thesis.

Thus, to illustrate how limited *Popular Mechanics* was in their analysis of what actually took place on the morning of September 11, 2001, I am submitting a copy of *9-11 on Trial* to Mr. Meigs, along with this challenge:

If *Popular Mechanics* can conclusively disprove beyond any shadow of a doubt that the primary thesis of *9-11 on Trial* — that the government's "official" explanation of events in regard to the World Trade Center collapse is an unmitigated lie — then I will not only offer a full retraction, but I will also permanently pull this book from the market.

These are admittedly bold words, but I stand behind each and every one of them. So, Mr. Meigs, the ball is now in your court. I will place a copy of my book in the mail this afternoon. In the meantime, put those 70 "experts" on alert - the same ones you placed so much emphasis on in your article - because they have plenty of work in front of them. The only thing I'm wondering about right now is: will you run another cover story on 9-11 when you discover that it was physically

impossible for the WTC towers to fall the way the government said they did?
We'll be waiting with bated breath!

COMPANY MEN PUPPETS

(MEDIA SLEAZE 101)

By Victor Thorn

Have you ever wondered how the mainstream media is able to retain its seemingly united front in covering-up for the government's increasingly illegal behavior? Although they'd never readily admit it, here is how they accomplish this goal: an enormous amount of money is funneled from above, along with a healthy dose of monetary blackmail and retaliation regarding the future of each broadcaster's career. Therefore, the predominant factor in keeping everybody "in line" and "on the same page" is reduced to the least-common-denominator: good old-fashioned fear and greed. The global elite essentially BUY their "news" reporters and commentators, and thus keep them silent from reporting on any wrongdoing. There isn't any loyalty here - it's simple economic leverage. Wolf Blitzer, Rush Limbaugh, Bill O'Reilly, and the editors of *Time* magazine and *The Washington Post* are paid enormous salaries to conceal the New World Order's hidden agenda.

Some people may object by saying: what about all the dissent we see on Sunday morning news shows, or hear on talk radio? Doesn't this antagonism prove that those on the "left" and "right" go for each other's throat?

The answer, of course, is that what you're watching and listening to isn't real; it's simply a carefully choreographed illusion. Each participant in these debates is nothing more than "controlled opposition" who are following a pre-determined script. In fact, many of the participants are "paid contributors" who are on salary to a particular network. A perfect example is Mike Gallagher. Even though he has his own syndicated radio talk show, he's also paid by Fox News to fill a particular role.

So, when you see these "combatants" going at it, simply think of professional wrestling, because that's all it is. Sure, the drama is compelling at times, but the desired result has already been determined beforehand.

The formula is very elementary — it's corporate media sleaze 101. The faces and voices that represent the global elite are nothing more than highly-paid mercenaries used to deceive us on an ongoing basis. Nobody actually goes for the throat (unless somebody has 'fallen out of favor' or poses an imminent threat to the status quo establishment) because they've already been bought-off and are now under the protective umbrella of a network system. Think of it as a highly-selective private country club — it's that simple.

Thus, what differentiates the mainstream media from a truly INDEPENDENT news source is one thing: monetary control. To be authentically independent, there can be no network structure, large corporate ownership and think tank grants, or widespread advertising dollars (i.e. at the Clear Channel level). When any of these elements rear their ugly heads, guess what happens — independence is slowly compromised for the sake of bottom line \$\$\$\$\$\$.

A good rule of thumb in determining if a news entity is truly independent is as follows: (1) are they entirely free of corporate monetary entanglements, and (2) are they unafraid to expose wrongdoing at any level. In other words, if somebody within their network structure is doing wrong, will they: (a) fill the Company Man role and remain silent, or (b) point-out the egregious behavior and demand that it ends?

At WING TV, Lisa Guliani and I will never play the part of Company Men, and if we're aware of wrongdoing that hurts the patriot movement (i.e. censorship, fraud, questionable business practices, etc) we'll go for the throat every time. Can others who supposedly consider themselves part of the "independent" media say the same thing, or will they passively and obediently sit silent like their corporate media Company Men counterparts?

NYC INDY MEDIA **9-11 CENSORSHIP**

By Victor Thorn

The trend toward blatant censorship and information suppression in the "alternative" media has reared its ugly head once again. It has come to our attention that this week, the editors at NYC Indy Media announced that they are censoring all posts relating to questions concerning the government's "official" 9-11 story (despite a declaration on their homepage stating, "This is an open publishing forum"). Their reason: 9-11 is now being associated with anti-Semitism because researchers are pointing-out Israel's role in the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Thus, once again a small cabal of Gatekeepers in New York City - similar to a small cabal of Gatekeepers at *Radio Free Austin* in Texas who have had their micro-broadcasters censor Frank Whalen and Peter Schaenk's radio shows due to their questioning of Alex Jones - are determining what information does and does not reach the public. And remember, it's not the federal government that is pulling the plug on these radio shows or censoring news on message boards; nor is it the mainstream media, law enforcement, or even the CIA. Instead, the "independent" media itself is becoming the biggest censor of all.

If this wave of Orwellian subterfuge spearheaded by Alex Jones and a cadre of "Indy Media" Gatekeepers in New York City doesn't have you screaming mad, then in all honesty, I don't know what will. A lack of censorship is one of the fundamental tenets of a free press, and this concept is rapidly becoming lost among certain members of our alternative media. It's time to speak out and take back your media! What are we waiting for? We're not keeping quiet here at WING TV, and neither should you. There *is* an info war being waged against us - but it's being orchestrated by individuals within our own circles, and we better put a halt to it before it's too late.

ARE YOU A CONDITIONED THINKER?

By Victor Thorn

- 1) **Question:** Are you comfortable with the fact that certain elements within the alternative media are increasingly becoming a mirror-image of the mainstream media? If you answered yes, then you're a conditioned thinker, because this is exactly what the powers-that-be want from you.
- 2) **Question:** Do you accept censorship (without objection) in any form from the mainstream media or the alternative media? If you answered yes, then you're a conditioned thinker.
- 3) **Question:** Are you afraid of speaking out publicly about controversial issues because you could be potentially ostracized, criticized, or blackballed by Big Brother-like figures in the alternative media? If you answered yes, then you're a conditioned thinker.
- 4) **Question:** Are you concerned that alternative media venues and personalities are increasingly making more ties to mainstream media outlets (such as ABC and Clear Channel)? If you answered no, then you're a conditioned thinker.
- 5) **Question:** Do you feel that (a) passively listening to a radio talk show host babble for three hours a day (b) passing around articles and/or (c) watching videotapes will change the New World Order's evil behavior? If you answered yes, then you're a conditioned thinker, for information that is not followed by action is useless.
- 6) **Question:** Do you feel that just because people calls themselves "patriots" they are above reproach and should not be questioned on their negative actions? If you answered yes, then you're a conditioned thinker.
- 7) **Question:** Should we demand a much higher standard from the alternative media than we get from the mainstream media and politicians? If you answered no, then you're a conditioned thinker.
- 8) **Question:** Do you think that the techniques used by the mainstream media to dupe people are any different than the tactics used by the alternative media to dupe people? If you answered yes, then you're a conditioned thinker, because they're both exactly the same.

- 9) Question: Do you believe that there was already a "false-front" opposition (created by the NWO elite) already in place prior to the 9-11 terrorist attacks which was ultimately used to distract people and lead them in the wrong direction (away from the truth)? If you answered no, then you're a conditioned thinker, because there absolutely was.
- 10) Question: Do you see any difference between the hard-sell advertising used by mainstream media figures and televangelists and those used by certain individuals in the alternative media? If you answered yes, then you're a conditioned thinker because they all use the exact same techniques.
- 11) Question: Do you think alternative media Company Men should speak out about wrongdoing, even if it occurs at their own network? If you answered no, then you're a conditioned thinker because wrong is wrong regardless of the source.

OUTFOXED: ALTERNATIVE MEDIA **MIND CONTROL TECHNIQUES**

By Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Victor Thorn: We'd like to touch upon a video tape that we finally got to see last night. I know it's been out for a while. It's called *Outfoxed: Rupert Murdoch's War on Journalism*. What did you think of it, Lisa?

Lisa Guliani: I thought it brought up a lot of good points, except for one thing. The video seemed to be targeting FOX News solely, when the issues they were addressing really apply to all the mainstream media networks - not just FOX.

Victor Thorn: Yeah, after this documentary was over, Lisa and I were talking about it and we said it would be real easy to come out on the show today and say "FOX and the Republicans are bad, while ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, and the Democrats are good." Of course, that would be simplistic and naive, and it would be stupid for us to say. Life isn't that simple. And we're not saying that FOX is good, because they're horrific.

Lisa Guliani: They are.

Victor Thorn: Horrific beyond words - but so are ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, MSNBC, etc...

Lisa Guliani: And on and on and on.

Victor Thorn: The FOX news network was launched in 1996. So think back to before that date. How was the media before then? Who covered up the JFK assassination? Who covered up Martin Luther King and Bobby Kennedy's assassinations? Who covered up all of these other scandals when FOX News wasn't around? Of course it was the mainstream media.

Lisa Guliani: Right. What they do is exactly the same thing the other networks do. They blare out propaganda, while other mainstream networks are echo chambers that regurgitate it back to you. So you're just hearing the propaganda in surround sound from every direction.

Victor Thorn: What the people that made this documentary want you to think is that now FOX is the great evil of all time, but in actuality it's the entire mainstream media.

Lisa Guliani: FOX is just one appendage. And we have to say who's backing this particular video, *OUTFOXED*. It's George Soros, along with others; but Soros is listed first in the credits as a financial backer. Now remember, he's a globalist too.

Victor Thorn: So you have George Soros financing this film, and the target is Rupert Murdoch. These are two globalists; two people who belong to the New World Order elite.

Lisa Guliani: Soros is also a globalist who backs Hillary Clinton.

Victor Thorn: All they're doing now is perpetuating the left-right paradigm. They want you on one side or the other. But what they don't want you to do is focus on who the real enemy is. The real enemy is the mainstream media, the politicians that are protected by them, and also the New World Order elite that are above them. They want you to keep doing Democrat-Republican, Democrat-Republican, and if you're still caught up in this mind frame, you're way behind the 8-ball.

Lisa Guliani: Right. One of the things brought up in this film that applies to all the mainstream networks - not just FOX - is the fact that what you're getting is not news. Really, it's a particular point of view.

Victor Thorn: Just like the other media venues. It's like drinking orange Kool-Aid or grape Kool-Aid. It's the same thing. We're going to have two different takes on this now. The first is: why is the Right winning - the Republican Party and the FOX network? FOX is number one in the ratings, the Republicans are in the White House, and Republicans control the Senate. Why is that? Well, the answer is real simple. And we've been talking about this forever, it seems like. It's because the Left is so pusillanimous that they're not fighting back! That's why they keep getting trounced by the Right. A perfect example is 9-11.

Lisa Guliani: Yes. Here you have the perfect case to blow this administration and the Republicans out of the water. Yet, what do they do? The Left keeps its mouth shut.

Victor Thorn: Right, they sit there exemplifying that old saying: "See no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil." That's what they're doing. We begged the Left before the election last year to bring out the truth about 9-11.

Lisa Guliani: It's tailor-made for the Democrats, and yet they're bypassing this golden opportunity. Why?

Victor Thorn: They refused to touch it then, and they still refuse to touch it now. There are plenty of mainstream news sources that are covering the WTC controlled demolition now, yet the Left still refuses to touch it, especially those in the alternative media. Amy Goodman just had someone on her show the other day that reaffirmed that 19 Arab cave dwellers were the ones that did it. Amy Goodman should be yanked off that program.

Lisa Guliani: But she won't be because she's doing what she's supposed to be doing, which is perpetuating the government myth.

Victor Thorn: And the Left keeps falling for it. It's beyond my comprehension that anyone even watches that show or can sit through it. What it boils down to is, the Right is fighting dirtier than the Left, and as usual the Left is rolling over and playing dead. If you guys want George Bush out of office, then damn it, you'd better start fighting to get him out.

Lisa Guliani: One of the points they brought up on this video is that the reporters and correspondents at FOX (and I'm sure this applies across the board to all the networks) are told to "embarrass, humiliate, challenge or disrupt a target any way they have to". A target is any person they bring on or oppose; someone with a counter-viewpoint.

Victor Thorn: That's an excellent point, and it leads into my second talking point. It's very eerie, but the same techniques used by FOX News are the exact techniques used by certain people in the alternative media who go against their message. I want to tell everybody what our main purpose is on WING TV. Is it to expose the New World Order? Of course, that's part of it. Is it to expose the media and politicians? Yes. We're also here to give you news. But primarily, our main goal is to expose how readily your mind is being controlled - not only by the mainstream media, but by the alternative media as well. Our main goal is to free your mind, to wash out all that other crap so you can finally think freely.

Lisa Guliani: People who are not paying attention, who aren't looking, are more easily propagandized than those who are. Remember that.

Victor Thorn: How does it feel if you're one of those people who drink the Kool-Aid? How does it feel to be brainwashed - to be conditioned and propagandized - because the same techniques that FOX is using are also being used by all these other venues in the alternative media, too. The main technique that FOX uses to influence and control people is fear.

Lisa Guliani: Themes of fear and danger.

Victor Thorn: What have we been talking about for the last year and a half on WING TV? How people like Mike Ruppert, Alex Jones and others use fear as their main method to control you. They use fear the same way FOX does. Are you starting to see the correlation? Now, here's what we do on WING TV. We come out with our exposes and give you proof. Examples? When we said that Alex Jones censors material, we proved it. We proved that Alex Jones sold out the Gray family to ABC's 20/20. We proved that Alex Jones is a money-grubber by the way he treated Michael Corbin.

Lisa Guliani: Right. GCN was selling - receiving money - for Michael Corbin's shows without Michael Corbin's permission or knowledge after he was no longer doing radio shows for GCN.

Victor Thorn: Also, Alex Jones' wife chastising Corbin for not pushing Alex's videos hard enough when he guest-hosted on Jones' show. We've proven that Art Bell is an enemy of the 9-11 movement through various articles. We've disproven all of Mike Ruppert's lies in print. We've proven Amy Goodman's links to the Ford Foundation and other establishment think tanks.

Lisa Guliani: What have they proven about the allegations they make against us? They call us government agents, but have they substantiated that in any way?

Victor Thorn: No they haven't. They also (just like FOX News) call us names like "WING-NUTS". Before we get into all of this, we proved that Jack Blood was ripping people off at WALE for years. I mean, it was a 15-page article - chapter and verse - that proved it. Finally, how about the 9-11 Untruth Mafia? I don't know how many times we've proven that what they're trying to do is restrict and suppress information.

Lisa Guliani: In fact, they help us more than anybody else because their own words and actions incriminate them every time.

Victor Thorn: Exactly. There's one other thing that we could bring up about Alex Jones, and we've heard this from various sources, but right now we can't prove it. This is probably the worst-kept secret in the alternative media because we've heard it from so many different people every time we turn around. However, we haven't yet been able to prove it. It would be real easy for us to come out and say, "Hey, guess what we heard about Alex Jones?" But we refuse to insert unsubstantiated rumors into the mix.

Lisa Guliani: I am going to say one thing though. If we are ever able to confirm these rumors, it's going to be the most damning, incriminating, knee-crushing information, and there will be no way he'll wiggle out of it. I guarantee that.

Victor Thorn: Yeah, and Alex Jones knows what we're talking about, but we can't prove it yet. So rather than give you innuendo, we'll just sit on it until we have the proof.

Lisa Guliani: You mean; we won't do a "Flocco."

Victor Thorn: Right! Exactly! Getting back to FOX News, they use all these mantras and parrot the puppet line. For example, if you're anti-war, they'll say you're a traitor against America. If you believe there was a 9-11 cover-up, you're a conspiracy wacko; and if you're a Democrat, you're a loony liberal. These are mantras they keep saying over and over. In the film we saw, they showed how they do it. Funny thing is, the people in the alternative media do the same thing to us, don't they?

Lisa Guliani: Absolutely.

Victor Thorn: They say to us: Well, the only reason you're picking on Alex Jones is because you're jealous or because you can't get on his show. Or they say we just want to sell our book.

Lisa Guliani: I guess they think that by saying things like that, they're saying something substantive.

Victor Thorn: Or they say we're dishing out government disinfo. None of these things have been proven, but they do it nonetheless. It's the same type of mantra used by FOX News.

Lisa Guliani: You know why? It's the same reason mainstream networks do it. They don't have to win the argument. All they have to do is muddy the water. That's all they have to do, and they consider it a victory if that can be accomplished.

Victor Thorn: Yeah, so when they repeat these mantras, there's not one shred of evidence; it's arbitrary, it's subjective and it's innuendo.

Lisa Guliani: It serves to distract and divert you off of the important issues you were focusing on, and then you end up wandering off on all these tangential side roads that have nothing to do with anything.

Victor Thorn: The worst part is; these little mantras originate right from the top. We've heard Alex Jones, Jeff Rense, Mike Ruppert, Art Bell, Fintan Dunne, Jack Blood, the 9-11 Mafia - we've heard all of them repeat these things. So what they're saying is that the people listening to their mantra are just as stupid as the

people watching and repeating the FOX News mantras. Then what they have are a couple of well-selected people who go into Internet chat rooms and spread these mantra messages to further poison your mind.

Lisa Guliani: Right.

Victor Thorn: It's unbelievable. If you fall for the FOX News mantra or you fall for the Alex Jones mantra and you parrot it back, then you should know that you're being propagandized.

Lisa Guliani: We see this in the false-flag *9-11Truth.org* group, too. Whenever we bring up the controlled demolition of the World Trade Center towers, they won't discuss it or debate us. They won't talk about it with us, and they won't come on the show to publicly talk about it either.

Victor Thorn: This is ultimately a battle for the freedom of your mind. And as Lisa said last night, this is a war. In war, you don't sit around and mamby-pamby. That's why we come out so strong, because we're saying that these people we keep mentioning are the ones that are poisoning your mind using the same techniques that FOX and the other mainstream media networks use.

Lisa Guliani: We get e-mails sometimes saying that we've become a lot more abrasive in the last few months. Yeah, I guess so. You know why — because they've ratcheted up the fight. This is not a tea party. This is a fight. It's a fight to get the truth out. And they don't like the direction we're going.

Victor Thorn: When people graduate from watching mainstream news and turn to the alternative media, they invariably think they're getting true information. But what if the mantra used at FOX is the same mantra used in the alternative media? You're just being taken for a ride, from one pen to another, but you're still like a cow headed for the slaughterhouse.

Lisa Guliani: Right. And you're still left with the same results, this constant sense of unease, always looking to someone, whether it's the government, the President, Alex Jones, Mike Ruppert - whoever - to save you and be the guru or the hero. And this plays right into their hands because they want you to think like that.

Victor Thorn: I'll tell you what, when the New World Order planned this whole infiltration of the alternative media, there's one thing they didn't count on - us!

Lisa Guliani: Nor did they count on all the other people just like us. And there are a lot of you out there. We need to ratchet it up, too. If they're going to fight

dirty with one set of rules, we have to be able to fight too. The playing field is not level. If we keep our elbows off the table and keep it polite and well modulated and politically correct, we're not going to get anything done. We won't get the truth out and we won't defeat them. Four years have passed since the mass murder of 9-11, and everybody has played by those rules like it's some kind of tea party. Well, those tactics have gotten us nowhere.

Victor Thorn: We're not controlled by them, we're not afraid of them; and regardless of what they do we're going to come out fighting and keep exposing them. You have to ask yourself, do you want to fall under the same mind control techniques used by FOX, Alex Jones, Rense, Bell, Noory and Ruppert? If you want to fall for that mind control and propaganda and you want to be conditioned, then go ahead. There's nothing we can do to change that. But our goal here is to expose how your mind is being manipulated and controlled, and we want to free it so you don't fall for any more of these smokescreens.

Lisa Guliani: Yes. They said another significant thing on that video, too. They said that the more you consume of mainstream television, the less you know about what's really going on. We can apply this same thing to many elements of the alternative media as well.

Victor Thorn: The more you consume of Alex Jones' or Mike Ruppert's fear, the less able you are to discern truth from fiction. Remember, the easiest way to control someone is through themes of fear and danger. Is that what you want? Do you want to be controlled? Then keep being afraid. Go listen to Alex Jones for three more hours; then crawl underneath your bed because that's what's going to happen.

Lisa Guliani: Ultimately, you have to decide whose rules rule YOU - theirs or yours?

ACTIVISM vs. FEAR-MONGERING

By Victor Thorn

It absolutely amazes me how many people in the "freedom" movement actually seem like they WANT a police state. They crave it - they desire it - and they lust after it to exist with every bone and fiber in their body.

Why do they so desperately want this police state? The answer is simple: so they can say they're right, and all their fear-monger heroes on the radio are right.

Of course these are the very same people who have never once in their lives attended a protest ... never once held a sign or banner before the public ... or handed-out fliers on a street corner. They simply sit behind their computer monitors and type out messages of fear, or else they crawl under their beds after listening to the fear-mongers for three hours on the radio.

Naturally there are examples of "potential" police state happenings which take place on a daily basis, and I'd never deny them for a second. But a "potential" **or** upcoming police state is one helluva lot different than an ACTUAL police state.

Lisa Guliani and I, on the other hand, have taken part in eight different protests and rallies in the past five months. They include:

- The Oklahoma City Bombing tenth anniversary in Oklahoma City
- Protest of George Bush's speech on the campus of Perm State University
- Protest of Mike Gallagher's book signing in downtown State College, Pa.
- Speakers at an America First political convention
- Washington, DC Truth Convergence
- Fourth anniversary of the 9-11 terror attacks at Ground Zero & the U.N.
- Huge anti-war rally surrounding the White House
- Pa. Clean Sweep in Harrisburg, Pa.

Now you tell me: how could we already be in a police state when we held huge banners at Ground Zero and in front of the White House (when we were surrounded by police officers and secret servicemen), which read:

9-11 World Trade Center Controlled Demolition

If we actually lived in a police state, do you know what would have happened to us? We would have been arrested (at the very least), imprisoned, or even murdered. That's what would have happened in Red China, Communist Russia,

Iran, or North Korea. But we said whatever we wanted, and continue to say whatever we want on WING TV with 100% freedom.

On the other hand, do you want to know why all these people so desperately want a police state? Because it would mean that they don't have to do anything. They have an easy excuse to sit at home and complain about how bad things are instead of actually doing something about it. In other words, they don't have to take responsibility for the world around them. What they remind me of are End-Time Christians who possess such fatalistic attitudes that they've literally given up all fight and are simply waiting for the apocalypse.

These people are cowards, and their cult-like fear-mongering gurus are leading them straight to demise.

Think about it. After Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker were exposed as being greedy conniving liars and rip-off artists, everyone said: How could anybody be stupid enough to fall for their scam? But that's the exact same thing these fear-mongers are doing to their followers. They're creating a message of damnation (i.e. the televangelists use HELL as their scare tactic, while the fear-mongers use the NWO as their bogeyman). Worse, while they program and condition their robotic automatons to be consumed by fear, they're also sucking tons of money out of them on top of it. Can't they see the racket that's being played on them?

Since we're talking about greed, just think if all the time these money-grubbing "patriot" televangelists spent on trying to suck more dollar bills out of their listeners via extended infomercial radio shows was actually spent on advocating activism. How much different do you think our world would be? Instead of spending three hours every day saying BUY MY VIDEO BUY MY VIDEO BUY MY VIDEO, what if they would have spent all that time urging their listeners to go to Oklahoma City for the tenth anniversary of the Alfred P. Murrah bombing; or if they would have spent all that time organizing a huge rally at Ground Zero.

But nah, they only use these events as a pretext to make money. It's that simple. It's the oldest con-job in the world, and amazingly, thousands of people are still falling for it.

In addition, why do you think the fear-mongers are "allowed" to appear on George Noory's *Coast-to-Coast AM* radio show, while activists aren't? Well, here's why. We all know that *Coast-to-Coast AM* is owned by Clear Channel, which is a complete tool of the New World Order. So, ask yourself this question: what do these corporate elitists want from the populace? Of course the answer is: they want widespread FEAR! They thrive on fear because people are much easier to control when they're trembling like feeble little mice. Conversely, what's the last thing the

NWO wants from the masses? Answer: a message of positive activism. Thus, since they want society OD'd on fear, who are the best people to bring onto their corporate-controlled radio shows? The fear-mongers, of course. They're doing the New World Order's dirty work for them by dousing everyone with fear.

C'mon, this isn't that hard to figure out, is it?

Ask yourself one last question: why would somebody want to indoctrinate another person with so much fear? The answer is easily explained: they want to CONTROL THEM! Isn't that what the government does? Isn't that what mind-bender cult leaders do? And isn't that what organized religion and the mainstream media do? Although their messages are slightly different, they're still using the exact same techniques on you as all of the above. And what is the end result? You're simply being corralled into a different pen like an obedient sheep ... just like the people who are being controlled by the government/mainstream media/religion, etc. Can't you see — you're being **CONTAINED!!!**

Is that what you want? If not, then don't fall for their manipulative little mind-control techniques. Break free from their fear!

Finally, to all those people who say that activism doesn't matter because it's inevitable that the New World Order is going to take us over anyway - that our efforts won't change anything. Well, if these people have so little hope and belief in themselves, why don't they do their self and everyone in the world a favor and commit suicide, because such a loser defeatist attitude sure as hell doesn't do us any good.

Now damn it, get with the program and start trying to change the world around you instead of rolling over and playing dead.

OPM: OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY

By Lisa Guliani

Several months ago I received a phone call from a journalist who happens to be a regular columnist for Jeff Rense. I'll call him Mr."X". We were discussing the whole "patriot/truth/9-11 movement" and he wanted to give me some advice on how he thinks Victor and I should be "playing the game".

When he asked how we finance WING TV, I told him we work day jobs. His response to this was hearty laughter, followed by the comment, "Listen, your problem lies in the fact that you guys don't have a racket. You need to get a racket."

My reply: "We're not interested in getting a racket."

Mr. "X": "Haven't you ever heard of OPM?"

Me: "OPM? No. What is OPM?"

Mr. "X": OPM is an acronym for 'Other People's Money'. "X" then went on to tell me how much easier it would be to run WING TV if we'd simply get other people to foot the bills for doing what we're doing. According to "X," that's how anybody who is successful is doing it. That's how the "big boys" like Jones and Rense are doing it. After all, you don't see them working day jobs, do you? The reason they're successful is because they understand how to play the game. And the name of the game is OPM.

I was pretty disgusted with this type of advice coming from someone who I'd presumed to be a person operating under honorable and ethical guidelines. I made it clear to "X" that we have no intention of playing their "OPM game". "X" said we're stupid if we don't do it because "everybody's doing it."

Everybody's doing it? No, not everybody. There are people like Thorn and me in the alternative media who are not feeding off the OPM free cash cow.

We ended the phone call, but this man's words have haunted me ever since.

Think about it. He's correct in saying that shysters atop the alternative media food chain are sucking money out of you like your pocket is a sieve, and that their shows and websites are breeding grounds to foment irrational fear and paranoia in the listening audience. And it works masterfully, because the most suggestible listeners dutifully pay up.

You don't see the "big boys" like Jones and Rense out there working for a living, do you? No. They don't have to, because they've got you doing all the work — then forking over your hard-earned money to them.

Their websites are slick, polished, and highly suggestive that there is quite a bit of money behind them. So, where does the bulk of that money come from? It comes out of your pocket.

By buying their "end of the world" and "New Age" remedies, energized water, fake food (Ener-Food), toe fungus, British water filters, etc, you are enabling the OPM racket to flourish and thrive. You, the listener and consumer, are making it possible for these shysters to peddle their snake oil and propaganda on an ongoing basis. This makes it possible for the fear-mongers to sit back and watch the dollars roll in. With a scam like this, why should they go out and get a real job? The OPM racket is not a new one. We've all seen this before with unscrupulous televangelists. Peter Schaenk even compared these individuals to the huckster Elmer Gantry. You're their meal-ticket as long as you remain freaked out and sweating bullets. These men are fully capable of working (even part-time jobs) to pay their own bills. But y'see, they'd rather have you do that for them. That's why it's called a "racket".

In essence, you are paying them to bullshit you and feed you heavy doses of fear on a daily basis, and they hold themselves to be above questioning. The snake oil salesmen have no accountability because YOU don't hold them accountable. No wonder they're so smug.

Nice little racket, huh?

BENNETT & STADTMILLER: **STRANGE BEDFELLOWS**

By Lisa Guliani

For years now, a countless number of "patriot radio" listeners have been dished the goods on RBN's John Stadtmiller by the one and only Jeffrey Bennett of *The Federal Observer*. Bennett has been more than happy to tell anyone within earshot the multitude of sins committed by his former business associate - in fact, his listeners have been told that Stadtmiller ripped Bennett off for tens of thousands of dollars. When this story was told, it was absolutely mesmerizing. We know this, because Thorn and I have heard many times the hate-drenched, scornful, derisive litany recounting the "screwing-over" of Jeffrey Bennett by one John Stadtmiller. We're not talking about chump change, folks. Bennett has told God knows how many people that Stadtmiller ripped him off for (if I remember correctly) \$75,000 in the past!

Strangely, within the last few weeks, Bennett has emerged as a prominent figure at Republic Broadcasting Network, the very home of the man he has spent years despising and portraying in less than glowing terms. Bennett now broadcasts his one-hour show in the time slot formerly filled by Peter Schaenk, who was unceremoniously dumped from the program line-up only weeks ago. From what I and many others have observed, these two events (the emergence of Bennett and ditching of Schaenk) practically coincided with one another. Bennett has also merged forces with Stadtmiller once again in a joint business venture that can only be described as bizarre. Bennett and Stadtmiller (B-S for short) now operate the Republic Trading Group, which deals in selling gold and silver.

Suddenly, this inexplicable scenario has been plopped into the minds of numerous bewildered patriot talk show listeners who have been left to wonder: What gives with this sudden B-S business partnership, considering that Bennett has been very effective in convincing us of Stadtmiller's shady character while making it perfectly clear that this man should not be trusted with your money. Are all these befuddled listeners supposed to now forget the ranting we've been subjected to for years - just like that? But if they dare to question this bi-polar merging of two opposing forces, they're likely to encounter the mean end of some very long, sharp verbal knives and the exposed fangs of Bennett-Stadtmiller, who now call one another "buddy." Okay, so now it's "buddy." The hatchet is buried, folks; just like that. Truly amazing how money makes strange bedfellows, isn't it?

To skeptically persist in questioning this "incredible-hatchet-burying" is to subject yourself to a generic script of sneering, mocking non-answers which not only

insult one's intelligence, but blatantly and clumsily divert attention away from the question at hand. Be forewarned: if you ask taboo questions of people who don't want to be questioned regarding their actions, prepare to be ridiculed, yelled at, and castigated as a "pot-stirrer."

So now we're shown the warm, fuzzy, new-found camaraderie that exists between these two long-standing enemies. Love is in the air. So is the smell of money. Lots and lots of money. YOUR money. And now RBN is going to completely submerge its listeners in even more commercials and infomercials (as if being up to our nostrils in them already wasn't bad enough) because they are pushing the gold and silver theme hot & heavy. Bennett's sales pitch effectively utilizes his God-given brains and business savvy in conjunction with a voice that is undeniably made for radio. The pitch? Well, buy my tiny gold pieces, buy my silver rounds, buy them now, buy a lot, and then sit on them and await the apocalypse. Once it hits, you will have the edge over those of us who didn't have the extra thousands of flat dollars to burn on little gold rocks and silver coins. How do you know what you're buying for your money? Well, dear listener, it's stamped right on the round.

My question is: if our dollar isn't worth a crap any more, why do the gold and silver peddlers so readily accept it as payment for their tiny rocks and rounds? Furthermore, how do you really know the value of what you're purchasing unless you spend even more money getting the stuff independently appraised? Moreover, consider this: you send Bennett-Stadtmitter two grand of your hard-earned money for their "exciting special package." Upon receipt of your \$2000, B-S can immediately spend that cash on anything their hearts desire - that is, goods and services. Now, what about you, dear customer? What do you get? Well, you get to sit on your purchase until ... the apocalypse hits. Isn't that exciting? Bennett says it's very important to have these rocks and rounds because, "You never know when you're going to have to get up and go in the middle of the night." Nothing like a little old fashioned, fear-based, end-of-the-world-style snake oil salesmanship, is there?

Oh, I suppose you could scour your community trying to locate a merchant who'd be willing to sell you goods or services with your little rocks and rounds. But remember, Internet metals dealers aren't exactly considered "reputable" by mainstream brokers. But you, the faithful RBN listener, already have the "edge" because you know the sordid past of John Stadtmiller's previous business conduct, thanks to his buddy Jeff Bennett. Considering how much trust must be involved in purchasing gold over the Internet for \$1,975, how can we put any faith in this partnership, especially after all Jeffrey Bennett has said about John Stadtmiller?

But Jeffrey Bennett isn't the only one saying these things. Check out this little ditty from Christian Media Research:

John Stadtmiller: Co-founder of the original Republic Radio Network with Jeff Bennett. Sold network to Dan & Loris Thompkins. Years broadcasting at Genesis, then stole Republic name from Thompkins and formed another network now known as Republic Broadcasting. As a competitor of Genesis, Stadtmiller inexplicably promotes Alex Jones - raising suspicions concerning the real role of Ted Anderson of Genesis. As the original Republic network had a "silent" partner that was concealed, it is consistent with Stadtmiller's long standing pattern of broadcast deceit to be fronting for another party. A thoroughly untrustworthy individual who ends most telephone conversations by abruptly hanging up when he doesn't get his way.

So, let me get this straight. I give B-S \$2000 bucks, and in exchange I have to hide my rocks under my bed until the apocalypse arrives. Meanwhile, Bennett and Stadtmiller are out eating giant steaks at the Outback Steakhouse and drinking champagne while I'm sitting on rocks (not to mention pins & needles) waiting for the end of the world.

Exciting, isn't it?

Addendum: Snake Oil Gold Peddlers

By Victor Thorn

As we've pointed-out numerous times before, the basis for all that is wrong in the patriot movement can be traced back to fear-based advertising and profiteering. It's that simple. At the heart of this scourge is an element which seems to afflict nearly every media venue within this movement - gold. Not only does this substance epitomize the root of all evil (greed and the love of money), but it is also surrounded by so much fear-mongering that the combination is deadly.

Thus, whenever one hears the sales pitch to buy gold, it is invariably delivered in apocalyptic end-of-the-world terms that are meant to frighten every listener into forking over their cold hard cash. The same exact audience that these gold-peddlers target is eerily reminiscent of those targeted by televangelists and Elmer Gantry-style hucksters who enter a town preaching gloom-and-doom to sell their snake oil. They all use the same technique (overt fear) to arrive at the same result (getting your money).

Here's what it all boils down to. Suppose a gullible listener who has had apocalyptic messages psychically driven into their head for hour-after-hour and

day-after-day finally succumbs to the trauma-based advertising (manipulation) and shells out \$2,000 for the "gold package." What happens? Well, they get an array of coins or rocks (or even certificates in some instances), while the gold vendor receives \$2,000 in cash which they can spend on goods & services.

But what about the person who bought the gold - the same one who's terrified of the apocalypse - what do they have? Well, some coins and/or rocks that they'll either hide in their bedroom or seal-away in a safety deposit box. So, effectively \$2,000 which could have used to prepare for the "end of the world" has now been taken out of their hands and put into somebody else's. I mean, if they were really so concerned about the end-times, why not take that \$2,000 and instead buy a small generator, stockpile canned foods, water, toilet paper, and even fuel.

Think about it. If helter-skelter chaos breaks loose and I ran a small oil distributorship, but my family was starving to death; what am I going to want? FOOD! At that point I don't give a damn about little shiny coins or rocks. I'll barter for food, medicine, and water; not shiny rocks. Look at the people in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina ravaged their city. Did they want shiny rocks and coins? Hell no. They wanted food and water! And if this fundamentalist mentality end-times apocalypse does arrive, the same concept will apply to you.

Can't you see what's taking place? These shysters are flooding the gullible with so much fear (just like the televangelists) that a person ends up taking money out of their own pocket (which could have been used to buy goods & services) and puts it into somebody else's pockets so THEY can buy goods & services! This same concept is used by the fear-monger video salesmen (*buy my video, buy my video*), TV fire & brimstone preachers, and the traveling snake-oil vendors of days gone past. What most amazes me is that people today keep falling for this tired old schtick? Can't they see through the b.s. and realize the obvious - all these people want is to fill you with so much fear that you'll give them YOUR money.

Lastly, I spoke with a highly respected financial advisor yesterday who knows more about economics than just about anyone I've ever met, and I asked him point blank: "If you had \$2,000, would you buy gold from one of those Internet radio shows?" His response was one word: NO! Rather, he said that if people really wanted gold they should go to reputable dealers and buy it for asset and inflationary protection - not out of fear for the apocalypse. But even before that he said people should first "take care of their belly." In other words, you should prepare yourself with food and water and other necessities first so that if disaster does strike, you'll be able to survive. The only thing these Internet dealers are doing is preying on people's fear and greed with visions of getting rich quick or the arrival of the end-of-the-world. It's nothing but an overt selling technique used to lure in the naive and gullible and take their money.

So, before you throw your money out the window, please consider all the alternatives, keep things in perspective, and don't fall for the oldest trick in the book - fear fear fear fear fear.

TRUTH: THE SUPREME REALITY

By Lisa Guliani

Rick Stanley, a prominent well-known Patriot, has been critical of WING TV within the last few days. We have had some lengthy, impassioned e-mail exchanges followed up by an even lengthier long distance telephone call to discuss his comments. Although Victor and I have stood behind Rick for vocalizing his views on the NWO, as well as for his very public activism, we do not see eye-to-eye on all matters - particularly on this matter of exposing wrongdoing within the so-called "Patriot" movement.

Stanley believes that we are "attacking" certain individuals for their "mistakes" and "human failings". He believes that there is no point in doing this, and that it is damaging the entire "Patriot" movement. He thinks we should stop pointing out what he characterizes as the "sins" and "mistakes" of others, and rightly says that we are all sinners. He also adds that Victor and I have made ourselves the "judge" of other people's conduct, and this is very damaging. He says that we do not understand that what we do is "counterproductive, detrimental, and dividing" the so-called "movement".

Stanley also states that Alex Jones' act of selling out the Grays, a patriot family who trusted Jones, is "bullshit," but is *very human*. He states that there are many "good patriots" who are still shysters and con-men for the almighty dollar. He calls this unfortunate, but excuses it as "*human nature*" adding that, "*this is how people are.*" He points out that he honors all people who stand up for America, regardless of the mistakes they've made in their lives.

Rick says none of us are perfect. We agree on that. Nobody is, including Thorn and me. However, we see things very differently and take issue with much of what he's said above. Let me explain why.

Consider the word "mistake" for a moment:

mistake

1. An error or fault resulting from defective judgment, deficient knowledge, or carelessness
2. A misconception or misunderstanding
3. An unintentional error

Now, consider the word "deliberate":

deliberate

1. Done with or marked by full consciousness of the nature and effects
2. Arising from or marked by careful consideration: *a deliberate decision*
3. Unhurried in action, movement, or manner, as if trying to avoid error
4. To think carefully and often slowly, as about a choice to be made
5. Characterized by or resulting from careful consideration
6. By conscious design or purpose

Next, think about the meaning of the word "premeditated":

premeditated

1. Characterized by deliberate purpose, previous consideration, and some degree of planning

Finally, please reflect upon the definitions of the word "truth":

truth

1. Conformity to fact or actuality
2. A statement proven to be or accepted as true
3. Sincerity; integrity
4. Fidelity to an original or standard
5. Reality; actuality
6. That which is considered to be the supreme reality and to have the ultimate meaning and value of existence
7. A fact that has been verified

It is not difficult to comprehend the distinct differences between the definitions of "mistake" and "deliberate". A mistake does not involve conscious, willful planned intention, but rather an incorrect perception or faulty judgment. On the flip side, a "deliberate" action involves full conscious thought a careful consideration and a fixed purpose. As much as I like Rick Stanley, I don't see how he can characterize the following as "mistakes":

- a) Jack Blood conning and ripping people off for a number of years through brokered-time radio scams. Doesn't this more than suggest a conscious, willful act with a deliberate fixed purpose?
- b) Alex Jones selling out and betraying the Gray Family for money. Are we to actually believe this was just an "honest, inadvertent error in judgment" on the part of Alex Jones? A mistake? Doesn't this more than suggest that if Jones would betray one patriot family for the "almighty dollar," that he could conceivably do this to *any* patriot family? Furthermore, doesn't this tell us something significant about his character?
- c) GCN selling Michael Corbin's shows after he no longer broadcast on their network, without his permission or knowledge, forcing him to take legal action against them. Was this also a "mistake," an inadvertent error in judgment, or a deliberate, conscious action on the part of GCN?
- d) Alex Jones altering and subsequently deleting approved articles after publication, which is quite different from the "editing" process. Editing occurs *prior* to publication, not afterward, and without the author's permission. Moreover, are we to presume that Jones' alteration and subsequent deletion of calls made to him during his radio broadcast from his archives to be a "mistake"? Who is anybody kidding here?
- e) What about the massive lack of accountability for rampant unethical conduct, illegal activity, and dishonesty of many individuals and groups, for which we collectively condemn the government and mainstream media? How come Rick Stanley and others seem so willing to **embrace** such conduct within the "Patriot" movement and "alternative media"? How can we come to terms with such blatant contradiction?

Stanley goes on to say that we should all be the "glue" to cement the various people within the "Patriot" movement, whether they are criminals or not, honest or not, shysters or not, traitors, cowards, fear-mongers, hypocrites, or COINTELPRO. Pardon me, but why would anyone want to be united with a criminal? Why would anyone calling their self a patriot want to be aligned with and "glued" to a traitor, a censor, a coward, a hypocrite, or COINTELPRO? Aren't these the very things we denounce in the political and mainstream media circles? Aren't "patriots" always pointing-out these phonies and unsavory characters to the rest of us? Why bother to call them out, or display contempt for those people when we are willing to rationalize, make excuses for, justify and accept the very same behavior from people within the "movement"? Is it enough that they label themselves "patriots" to overlook such actions and questionable characters? Why don't prominent people within the "movement" care enough to even *try* rising above our merely "human nature"? It is certainly a challenge, but not something that I'd call "impossible". Our conscious free will, which gives us

the ability to choose wrongly, also provides the choice to do the right thing. Our free will is what makes it possible. Someone once said: we are only as strong as our weakest link. I ask you, with so many weak links within this "Patriot" movement and its corresponding alternative media, how can we ever hope to defeat the evil that is destroying America?

Yes, we are all sinners. This is very true. But we don't have to sin. When we sin, we are making a conscious decision to do so. This is a deliberate action, not a mistake. We can also choose not to commit those sins and conduct ourselves in honest, ethical, and truly decent ways. It's all up to us.

Victor and I have committed ourselves to fighting the New World Order in all of its various infiltrations, whether they manifest in our government, mainstream media, alternative media, or within the alleged and highly questionable "movement". I repeat; this is a FIGHT, not a tea party. It is getting vicious and it is for real. Need I remind anyone that these New World Order SOBs are cold-blooded murderers? Keeping our elbows off the table is not an option. As Rick Stanley once pointed out to us on our old radio show, "Does America have the stomach for freedom?" This is an excellent question, because if we do have the stomach, we better have the guts that go along with it. We better have the conviction and integrity that goes along with fighting for our very freedom. If we lack any of those elements, we will be destroyed. The "enemy common to us all" doesn't fight fair. They fight to win, and they're not used to losing.

Victor and I do not feel compelled to be "glued" to COINTELPRO, to crooks, traitors, censors, hypocrites, bold-faced liars, sociopaths and con artists. As Victor says, if anyone has a problem with what we're doing, perhaps they should address those who are consciously and deliberately engaged in the wrongdoing and tell them to stop it. When they do that, we can shut up.

Until this occurs, and until people do more than just "talk the talk without walking the walk," we believe that it is a responsibility of ALL genuine "patriots" - not just us - to do our absolute best to rise above human nature, to raise the bar of conduct higher than what we despise in the government and mainstream media, and be better people than those who wield power over this nation. We are fully capable of doing this, of being better than them, and rising above them, **if we choose to do so**. We must also strive to hold ourselves and those in positions of power, both politically and journalistically, accountable for their words and actions.

Lastly, I'd like to say that Victor and I are absolutely not concerned with how our information is perceived or if people "like us". We do what we do because our consciences dictate that this must be done. We are not in this for a popularity contest; and truth should not - and **MUST NOT** - depend upon mere "perception". I maintain; truth is **absolute**. When we begin rationalizing bad behavior, excusing it, turning a blind eye to it, and accepting it, then the "patriot" movement is

doomed to failure. Then we have a lot more to worry about, because in so doing, we literally become the enemy we claim to despise. Think carefully about this. Think *Animal Farm* by George Orwell.

Remember, silence is construed as consent. Acceptance of the status quo, apathy, and ignoring our consciences have led to the horrifying state we're in as a nation. How can we expect change if we continue to repeat the same actions again and again and again? It is insanity to believe you can get a different result by doing the same thing over and over again. It is crazy to think that by attaching to people who do the exact same things we condemn is going to be our salvation, or lead to it. Settling for illusion is a piss-poor substitute for reality, unpleasant as it may be.

In the end, we all have a choice as to how we conduct ourselves. Either we do it honestly and aspire to rise above those things and unscrupulous persons that drag us further down, or we uplift ourselves and one another by aiming higher and setting a higher standard. You may choose to ignore, rationalize or deny what I have said here, but in the end, truth is the ultimate, supreme reality; and as Morgan Reynolds says, "Truth must always be sung, though the heavens fall." If you choose to accept deliberate wrongdoing and hypocrisy, then this is NOT a mistake. This is a willful, conscious action, and perhaps you need to examine what this says about you.

It's time to decide which path to take. Our destinies lie in our own hands.

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Rick,

I don't think my article was harsh. I simply made my points in response to the things you said on the phone and in e-mails. What are you so worried about? You sure had no problem being highly critical of us, did you? Well, we also have very strong beliefs and opinions. We also have the facts. And just so you know, the "enemy" is already too close for comfort. I'm certainly not going to sleep with the enemy. What the hell are you thinking? So, you're disappointed? Well, guess what, amigo; so am I, particularly in the fact that you seem to think we should lay down with shit instead of cleaning up our house. Is this "good form"? For whom? The NWO?

The old Rick Stanley would never have said we should unite with criminals or hypocrites. I don't seem to recall you ever saying anything like that before you went to jail. The old Rick Stanley stood fearlessly at the front line against the bad guys. The old Rick Stanley didn't lay down with shit or tell others to do it. I know this because I saw you out on the street. I don't know what changed, but

somebody has done a 180, and it ain't me. Are you saying what I've written makes no sense? Come on already. It's a no-brainer, Rick.

We disagree. So what? I didn't misquote you, and I didn't smear you. I told the truth. I have no reason to use "bad form," Rick. You're just embarrassed because you know damn well how your own words make you appear. I didn't say them. You did. And I'm sorry you did. And I had a strong response to those words.

I have to say, though, I am the one who is disappointed. Something has changed with you, and it's very troubling. You can rationalize your position all you like, Rick. I admire the good things you've done in the past, and I have defended you to every person who ever said a bad word against you over the last few years. I wrote glowing articles about you, and even wrote to the governor of Colorado defending you. I have sung your praises from the rooftop. Why? Because I respected you tremendously, as I've already pointed-out. You have been nothing less than inspiring to me, and many others. But I disagree with your thinking now because I know it is wrong. It is DEAD WRONG. Simple as that.

If you're disappointed, maybe you should hold the mirror up to your own face and ask yourself who it is you're really disappointed in. I didn't do the 180. We don't have to agree, but don't try to give me some guilt trip for telling the truth. It's maybe the one thing about my self that I genuinely respect. And think about it: what cause would I have to lie to you or to anyone else? Have I ever lied to you before? The answers to that is "no".

To even suggest that the deliberate wrong actions of this phony "truth/patriot/9-11" movement and alternative media are "mistakes" is absurd. To even suggest that intentional dishonesty, hypocrisy, censorship, betrayal and fear-mongering are something akin to an inadvertent error is mind-boggling to me. To even suggest that we lay down with those who act the same way as those who are the "common enemy" is very strange to hear, particularly coming from you.

Very strange and very disturbing. Hell, if you're going to tell people to do that, then maybe you should just tell them to unite with George Bush, the NWO, or the mainstream media. Is that what people should do, Rick? Just embrace the enemy and everything will be swell? God almighty.

So, you got to speak your mind yesterday and we listened and didn't bite your head off or attack you in any way. I'm not attacking you now. You said all you wanted to say and we heard it all, although there is a lack of factual information in the things you put forth to us. We have provided proof of everything we say, and still you make excuses for people deliberately doing the wrong thing. You are okay with it because you say its "human failing" and seem to think that by uniting

with these con-men, hypocrites, etc that somehow the problem will go away? Uhh, think again. Does that seem like linear logic to you? It makes no sense to me. Maybe you should re-read *Animal Farm* by George Orwell.

Something has definitely changed with you, my friend. And this, I'm sorry to see. I have looked up to you for a long time, but I am oceans apart from you on this one. Your point was not primarily that each person is unsavory to someone else. And that is a lame point in my mind anyway. Your basic point - both on the phone and in your e-mails - was that we shouldn't point out wrongdoing, but instead be "glued" to the people behaving badly, conning people, running rackets, censoring people, betraying people, COINTELPRO ops, you name it. We should unite with all of them. And if we don't, then we're "damaging and dividing" the "movement". Guess what, Rick? There is no damn movement. I know we want there to be a movement, but as of this time, there is no damn movement. There are a lot of e-mails and articles going around the Internet. That is not a movement, my friend. I still can't believe you said that. I really can't. Remember, you e-mailed me first about all this. You were highly critical based upon perception or ... "something" other than fact. It is absurd and unrealistic to think Victor and I would have no response. We always have a response, especially in regard to misperceptions and off-base criticism.

I don't sleep with the enemy, Rick. And I never, ever, ever will. I can promise you that.

To each his own I guess.

Lisa Guliani