

The Unz Review • An Alternative Media Selection

A Collection of Interesting, Important, and Controversial Perspectives Largely Excluded from the American Mainstream Media

The Two 9/11s: How Israel Hijacked the American Deep State

LAURENT GUYÉNOT • JULY 17, 2026 • 5,600 WORDS • 195 COMMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS



Fun “fact” about 9/11: Two weeks after being recognized as the most successful terrorist in human history, Osama bin Laden decided to become the first 9/11 conspiracy theorist by stating that “the United States should try to trace the perpetrators of these attacks within itself”, among “the American Jews, whose first priority is Israel” (in [an interview](#) with the Pakistani *Daily Ummat* (Sept. 28, 2001)



Osama Bin Laden, September 28th, 2001
<https://www.globalresearch.ca/interview-with-osama-bin-laden-denies-his-involvement-in-9-11/24697>

I have already said I am not involved in the 11 September attacks in the United States ... I had no knowledge of the attacks, nor do I consider the killing of innocent women, children and other humans as an appreciable act. ...

The United States should try to trace the perpetrators of these attacks within itself; ... persons who want to make the present century as a century of conflict between Islam and Christianity. ... I have already said that we are not hostile to the United States. We are against the system. ... This system is totally in control of the American Jews, whose first priority is Israel, not the United States. It is simply that the American people are themselves the slaves of the Jews. ... So, the punishment should reach Israel.

Anyone who has paid attention, or ever heard of WTC7, knows that bin Laden was *just a patsy*. If we are to believe a YouGov poll of November 2023, 20% of Americans believed it was

“definitely true” (6%) or “probably true” (14%) that “the U.S. government was behind the 9/11 attacks on New York City,” and 14% were unsure. Among the 66% who didn’t blame the U.S. government, how many blamed Israel? Pollsters didn’t ask.

But hopefully the 25th anniversary will provide an opportunity to gauge how much the theory that [“9/11 was an Israeli job”](#) has gained traction among American dissident opinion-makers. I expect Nick Fuentes to devote a long video to the event and conclude with “Case closed: Israel did it”, as he did in his almost perfect [show on JFK](#) last January.

I don’t agree with Nick on every issue. I think he is wrong to mock Candace Owens for her investigation on Charlie Kirk’s assassination; the information coming from the [preliminary hearing](#) in the case against Tyler Robinson seems to prove her right: Tyler is *just a patsy* too.

On 9/11, however, Nick is a step ahead, as he is on the JQ in general. He was already claiming that Israel was behind 9/11 [three years ago](#), whereas Candace Owens only took that step last year, and Tucker Carlson merely thinks that the “dancing Israelis ” (seen celebrating the first impact in New York and later identified as Mossad agents) [raise the question](#) of possible “foreknowledge” on Israel’s part (as he did in his documentary aired a year ago, [The 9/11 Files](#)).

The serial false-flag terrorist state

Overall, Israel has made a spectacular rise on the list of suspects in the past ten years, and especially in the last three years. The key factor is, of course, the deterioration of Israel’s image; it is now viewed as a criminal and genocidal state that flouts international law, scorns the death and misery of non-Jews, and constantly resorts to lies, corruption, and blackmail to mobilize U.S. military power for its own benefit. Through their habit of making predictions that sound like threats, the Israelis are even helping to draw suspicion upon themselves, as when Beni Sabti, a member of an Israeli national security organization, [tweeted on June 20](#): “Maybe USA needs another Pear Harbor or 9/11 to remember who is the enemy and who is the friend” (a tweet quickly [commented on by Carlson](#)).




Among the factors making the theory of an Israeli-made 9/11 increasingly believable is the growing awareness of Israel's attack on the USS Liberty on June 8, 1967 — a premeditated war crime intended to be blamed on Egypt and provoke the United States into bombing Cairo. The operation is known only because it failed: despite four torpedoes and 75 minutes of machine-gun fire and bombing, the Israelis did not succeed in sinking the ship and exterminating the crew. Congressman Thomas Massie did Americans a great service by paying tribute to the victims and survivors [on the House Floor](#) on the 59th anniversary of this act of treachery, and by calling for an official recognition of this “intentional murder by the State of Israel.”

Definitely, if there is one serial false-flag terrorist on this planet, Israel it is, going back at least to July 22, 1946, when Jews “dressed as Arabs” bombed the British administrative headquarters in Jerusalem (King David Hotel).



The United States has a long history of war crimes, but there is no known instance in which the U.S. government carried out a false-flag attack against its own citizens. The exception is Operation Northwoods, a plan for a U.S.-staged Cuban terrorist attack to justify an invasion of the island, submitted in March 1962 by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, but rejected by President Kennedy. This project exists only in the form of a single copy of a memorandum conveniently brought to public attention in April 2001, in James Bamford's book *Body of Secret* and Bamford's interview on [ABC News](#). There is the possibility that the memo is a forgery. When asked about it by David Talbot, McNamara said he has “absolutely zero recollection of it,” even though he could have taken credit for advising Kennedy against it.[1] I had suggested that the Northwoods memo was fake in my book *JFK-9/11*, but then dropped it for failing to convince anyone. However, since Bruce Baird has now brought up the subject again on [this thread](#), I will repeat my main argument: for his book, Bamford was given [“unprecedented access”](#) to the NSA archives by then NSA director Michael Hayden (as advertised by author and publisher, and mentioned even in [Wikipedia](#)). It is therefore probable that Bamford got the Northwoods memo directly or indirectly from Hayden. Since Hayden later became [“a Principal at The Chertoff Group”](#), the security firm founded by Michael Chertoff, there is a strong possibility that the Northwoods memo was planted just in time to predispose truth seekers in favor of the “inside job” theory rather than the “Israeli job” theory. Remember that Chertoff, son of an Orthodox rabbi and of a Mossad

agent, headed the Criminal Division of the Justice Department in 2001, a position that allowed him to shield Israeli agents (including the dancing ones) and cover up the traces of Israel. In 2003, Chertoff became head of the new Department of Homeland Security, which allowed him to control dissent while continuing to restrict access to the 9/11 files through the Sensitive Security Information program.



The reason I mention this memo is that, when Dylan Avery, Jason Bermas and Korey Rowe produced their film *Loose Change*, gone viral on YouTube in 2006, they built their “inside job” theory on that false-flag attack that caused zero deaths because it never happened, while they forgot to mention the real attack on the USS Liberty, a textbook case of Israeli false-flag war crime which left 34 Americans dead and 171 wounded. Nor did they mention the five “dancing Israelis,” or allude to the “dual” loyalty of the [Jewish neocons](#).

Today, a documentary on 9/11 that would omit to mention any of those things would instantly be branded “controlled opposition.” Victor Thorn was slandered by the 9/11-Was-An-Inside-Job movement led by Alex Jones when he wrote, in 2011, that “the slogan ‘9-11 was an inside job’ was quite possibly the greatest example of Israeli propaganda ever devised.”[2] Today, he is vindicated. So is [Michael Collins Piper](#), while Alex Jones is deservedly [shamed](#).

Was 9/11 an Epstein job?

The whole world now understands that there are no moral limits to what Israel will do in order to coerce the United States into bombing Israel’s enemies. Over the past year, news has spread of a large-scale Israeli operation designed to lure influential people into sexual relations with minors in order to blackmail them. Unsurprisingly, some Israelis closely involved in that Epstein scandal also appear as likely key conspirators in the 9/11 attacks. Ehud Barak, former head of Israeli military intelligence and former Israeli prime minister, met with Jeffrey Epstein at least thirty times at Epstein’s home. Among the “Epstein files” made public are friendly [email exchanges between the two men](#), as well as a three-hour [conversation](#) recorded by Epstein during a meal at his home in March 2013, while Barak was still Minister of Defense.



Barak was also at the BBC studios barely an hour after the 9/11 attacks, [calling for](#) “a globally concerted effort ... against all sources of terror,” naming repeatedly Iran, Iraq, and Libya as the “rogue states” that needed be bombed. By then, he was out of government and was working for SCP Partners, a security firm serving as a front for the Mossad in New York, located less than six miles from another Mossad front company, Urban Moving Systems — the employer of the infamous “dancing Israelis.” According to *Haaretz*, Barak was close to Larry Silverstein who “in the past offered [him] a job as his representative in Israel.”^[3] That’s a lot for one man.

With figures like Ehud Barak being exposed in both the 9/11 false-flag operation and Jeffrey Epstein’s honey-pot operation, no wonder we now have a documentary titled [“9/11 Was an Epstein Job.”](#) And since the Trump presidency is now increasingly perceived as another Israeli job in and of itself, I’m looking forward to new revelations on the ties between the Trump-Kushner-Witkoff mafia on the one hand, and the World Trade Center gang on the other. Those New York real estate sharks obviously don’t eat each other.



The big winner

In retrospect, that 9/11 was an Israeli false-flag operation should have been the working hypothesis of 9/11 truthers from the start. Didn’t Benjamin Netanyahu [let slip](#), on that very day: “It’s very good. ... It will generate immediate sympathy ..., strengthen the bond between

our two peoples.”[4] The same afternoon, George Friedman [rejoiced](#) on his pro-Israeli geopolitical website STRATFOR: “The big winner today, intended or not, is the state of Israel. ... There is no question, therefore, that the Israeli leadership is feeling relief.”[5]

WORLDVIEW
Powered by Stratfor

The Israeli Dimension

Sep 11, 2001 | 05:00 GMT

By George Friedman

The big winner today, intended or not, is the state of Israel.

Israel has been under siege by suicide bombers for more than a year. It has responded by waging a systematic war against Palestinian command structures. The international community, particularly the United States, has pressured Israel heavily to stop its operations. The argument has been made that the threat of suicide bombings, though real, does not itself constitute a genuine threat to Israeli national security and should not trigger the kind of response Israel is making.

Today's events change all of this.

First, the United States no longer can argue that Israel should endure the bombings. Moving forward, the domestic American political mood simply won't tolerate such a stance.

Second, Israel now becomes, once again, an indispensable ally to the United States. The United States is obviously going to launch a massive covert and overt war against the international radical Islamic movement that is assumed to be behind this attack. Not only does this align U.S. and Israeli interests but it also makes the United States dependent on the Israelis – whose intelligence capabilities in this area as well as covert operational capabilities are clearly going to be needed.

There is no question, therefore, that the Israeli leadership is feeling relief. Given that pressures

Tzameret Fuerst, known as the [“smiling Israeli woman”](#), couldn’t conceal her joy in New York that day; what mattered to her was “that now people understand what we [Israelis] have to deal with, the kind of people that we’re dealing with on a day-to-day basis.”



Given that the *Cui bono* question had such an obvious answer , it took a determined and well-organized campaign of gate-keeping to distract the early skeptics from Israel’s conspicuous fingerprints. The inside-jobbers who blamed the Deep State, the New World Order and the Military-Industrial Complex, failed to inform us that five Mossad undercover agents (Sivan and

Paul Kurzberg, Yaron Shmuel, Oded Ellner and Omer Marmari) were the only suspects arrested on that day in connection with the attacks. Those “dancing Israelis” should have been the stars of every 9/11-Truth event, but it was not before 2010 that they had the honor of being mentioned by Alex Jones.

The Pentagon 9/11 and the WTC 9/11

The theory that Israel was behind the September 11 attacks is not, however, as straightforward as it may seem. There are two major objections: one about the motive, the other about the means.

The motive: the United States’ immediate response to 9/11 was the invasion and regime change in Afghanistan. Israel had no obvious interest in this intervention. If that was the main objective of the 9/11 false-flag attacks, the Israelis should be ruled out as suspects.

The means: the success of the operation depended on the active participation of U.S. military and intelligence units that Israel could not control directly. To begin with, it required the NORAD (North American Aerospace Defense Command) and its NEADS (Northeast Air Defense Sector) division to be occupied with five training exercises, three of which simulated hijackings. According to Colonel Robert Marr, head of NEADS, up to twenty-nine virtual “hijacked planes” appeared on NORAD’s radar screens at the very moment the actual attacks took place, rendering the emergency situation completely unmanageable. The impact on the Pentagon — regardless of its origin — also required the deactivation of all defense systems at the world’s most heavily protected building, not to mention the rapid confiscation of footage from the 85 surveillance cameras located around the building. There is therefore no doubt that the attack on the Pentagon was an “inside job”.


In contrast, Israel’s fingerprints are everywhere in the WTC attack — if we include in our definition of Israel the countless *sayanim* residing in the United States, with their highest concentration in New York.[6] More than any other, Larry Silverstein embodies the archetype of the *super-sayan*: a prominent member of the United Jewish Appeal Federation of New York, the largest American fundraising organization for Israel, he is also a close friend of Benjamin Netanyahu, according to the *Haaretz* article of November 21, 2001 already mentioned.[7] With Larry Silverstein, Frank Lowy, Ronald Lauder (who as head of the New York State Privatization Commission awarded the Twin Towers to Silverstein and Lowy in April 2001), Maurice Greenberg (who insured the towers for Silverstein but took the precaution of reinsuring the policy with competitors), his son Jeffrey Greenberg (CEO of Marsh & McLennan, which occupied floors 93 through 100 of the North Tower, where the Boeing 767 allegedly struck the building), not to mention Howard Lutnick, whose investment bank Cantor Fitzgerald occupied the floors just above, and who, like Silverstein, “[escaped death](#)” that morning by taking his son to preschool), it is clear that the pro-Israel Wall Street elite had sufficient control over the Twin Towers and Building 7 (also owned by Silverstein) to blow them up. In the final analysis, there are enough Israeli fingerprints and smoking guns at the WTC crime scene to classify this event as an “Israeli job”.

Was the Pentagon attack an inside job, and the WTC attack an Israeli job? Two other significant differences between the two events makes this line of inquiry worth exploring. First, as **Barbara Honegger highlighted**, the Pentagon is a military target, while the WTC is a civilian target. From the perspective of international law, only the attack on the Pentagon could be considered an “act of war” (comparable to Pearl Harbor) and justify the invasion of a sovereign country like Afghanistan.[8] Crashing commercial airliners into skyscrapers constituted an act of pure terrorism, which was no different, in principle, from the bombing carried out against the same Twin Towers on February 26, 1993, which led to 8 people being charged with “conspiracy, explosive destruction of property and interstate transportation of explosives” ([Wikipedia](#)).

The two events — at the Pentagon and at the WTC — also differ in their scale. Blowing a hole into one side of the Pentagon and dropping a few ridiculously small pieces of fuselage on the lawn to make it look like an airplane crash, required far less personnel, technical skills, and preparation time than what was needed to reduce three skyscrapers to dust with two airplanes (or whatever else). The Pentagon scenario involved only a single hijacked plane and a reported death toll of 184, though the actual number is likely very low. In contrast, the two attacks on the World Trade Center resulted in the destruction of New York’s two tallest skyscrapers and of the surrounding complex, as well as the immediate deaths of thousands of civilians and hundreds of firefighters. This was not the work of a small team, but of an international criminal network comprising hundreds of technical experts in explosives. It required months, if not years, of preparation, whereas the attack on the Pentagon could have been planned in a matter of days.

This difference is reflected in the visual and emotional impact of the two events. The Pentagon is an isolated building, and images of the crash into its east facade are virtually nonexistent, whereas those of the towers being struck in the heart of New York, then collapsing amid enormous clouds of dust, spread instantly around the world and were broadcast on a loop. The reported death toll sparked immense global emotion. The attacks on the WTC can be described as **“catastrophic terrorism”** (the field of expertise of Philip Zelikow, executive director of the 9/11 Commission).[9]

Let’s imagine for a moment that only the Pentagon had been hit. That, plus a schoolbook picture of Bin Laden’s cave in Tora Bora, might have been enough to convince the U.S. Congress and the American public that Bin Laden had to be hunted down, and that the Taliban regime — long demonized by all Western media — had to be overthrown. But it could never have generated enough momentum to trigger a clash of civilizations in the Middle East.



With a shockwave of public opinion that was incomparably more powerful and long-lasting, the attack on the WTC was not intended to provide a rational justification for a one-off military operation against a hated and weak regime, but rather to plunge the American public into a state of shock that would short-circuit its ability to reason and make it extremely vulnerable to war propaganda. That, plus the anthrax letter attacks and the mantra of Saddam Hussein's Weapons of Mass Destruction, would force Bush Jr. to do what his father had refused to do ten years earlier: overthrow Saddam and plunge Iraq into chaos. Compared to the tsunami-like trauma of the WTC attacks, the Pentagon attack was of the magnitude of a ripple. Only the former could impulse a comprehensive and radical geostrategic reorientation of the United States and its allies. It was a psychological operation of unprecedented scale, beyond the CIA's wildest dreams.

The theory of the hacked false-flag

These profound differences led me to hypothesize, in [a 2022 article](#) and later in [a book](#), that the two events were staged by two distinct groups pursuing distinct objectives: one group carried out the "inside job" at the Pentagon, while another group carried out the "Israeli job" in the WTC. According to this hypothesis, most of the team that orchestrated the Pentagon attack had no foreknowledge of the WTC attack, whereas those responsible for the WTC attack had precise foreknowledge of the Pentagon attack.

Not only did the Israelis have foreknowledge of the Pentagon false-flag operation: the idea of it may have originated from them. We know that the decision-making process at the Pentagon was under Israeli influence through Richard Perle, Douglas Feith, Paul Wolfowitz and a few others. Perle was director of the Defense Policy Board, Feith was Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, and Wolfowitz was Deputy Secretary of Defense, as well as the principal author of the “Wolfowitz doctrine” justifying preemptive wars, which suddenly became the “Bush doctrine” in the aftermath of 9/11. These crypto-Israelis did not have the capacity to organize the Pentagon operation on their own, but, in concert with other crypto-Zionist neocons in the White House and the State Department, they had the power to instigate it and direct it.

Thus, the Perle-Feith-Wolfowitz group was planning operations at the Pentagon, while the Lauder-Silverstein-Greenberg group was laying the groundwork for the attack on the WTC. These two groups may not have been in direct contact with one another, but both were in direct contact with top Israeli leaders: Silverstein talked weekly with Netanyahu on the phone, according to the aforementioned *Haaretz* article, while Perle and Feith were both advisors to Netanyahu, for whom they had drafted their famous “*Clean Break*” report in 1996.[10]

The distinction remains crucial, however: the Pentagon operation received approval from the Bush administration, probably at the level of the National Security Council, because it served the geostrategic agenda of American imperialism. Traditional American imperialism is best represented by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). The CFR defends the interests of the bankers and investors who founded it. It is not, as a general rule, pro-Israel, and one of its priorities has always been to maintain friendly relations with the Gulf States, as illustrated by its 2022 report, [*The Case for a New U.S.-Saudi Strategic Compact*](#). The “pipeline war” is a major concern for these neocolonial imperialists. In the 1990s, there were plans for the Unocal Corporation to build an oil pipeline connecting the Caspian Sea to the Indian Ocean, passing through Turkmenistan and Afghanistan. Afghanistan’s strategic position had already been a determining factor in the decision by Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter’s national security advisor and a prominent member of the CFR, to begin destabilizing the pro-Soviet Afghan regime in 1979 by arming the mujahideen. After 1996, despite the Taliban’s takeover of the country and rhetorical condemnations of their human rights violations, negotiations continued. But in July 2001, the United States lost confidence in the Taliban and, overnight, viewed them as an obstacle to the project; a military invasion and a regime change were planned.[11] All that was needed was a pretext acceptable to public opinion. The fact that the invasion was launched less than a month after the 9/11 attacks proves that it had been planned well in advance. To facilitate matters, the new U.S. ambassador to Afghanistan, Zalmay Khalizad, and the new U.S.-installed president, Hamid Karzai, had both served as consultants for Unocal.[12]

The Jewish neoconservatives, for their part, were not interested in Afghanistan. What they wanted was the destruction of Iraq. In 1990, following Operation Desert Storm in Kuwait, they had exerted strong pressure in favor of invading Iraq and overthrowing Saddam Hussein, but President H.W. Bush had not yielded and had stuck to the mandate of the UN Security Council. As a result, the pro-Israel lobby sabotaged his chances of a second term and backed Democratic candidate Bill Clinton, whom they nevertheless failed to coerce into attacking Iraq, despite resorting to the charms of [*Monica Lewinsky*](#). The neocons then focused their efforts on their think tank, the PNAC (Project for a New American Century), with Perle and Feith among the

signatories of the report titled *Rebuilding America's Defenses*, which was submitted to the newly elected President Bush in 2000.

In the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, the difference in reaction between traditional American imperialists and pro-Israeli neoconservatives was striking. Brzezinski, for example, immediately supported the invasion of Afghanistan, hoping to repair the damage he himself had caused there. On the other hand, he [firmly opposed](#) the war in Iraq and, on February 1, 2007, denounced before the Senate “a historic, strategic and moral calamity ... driven by Manichean impulses and imperial hubris.” In contrast, neoconservatives and other Israeli officials were quick to capitalize on the national trauma to advocate for the destruction of [“seven nations,”](#) starting with Iraq and ending with Iran. It is no coincidence that the “seven nations” punished by God for opposing Israel constitute a biblical motif (Deuteronomy 7 and Joshua 24) well known in rabbinic tradition; the seven “rogue states” targeted by Bush in his September 20 speech are a cryptic signature.

The conspiracy within the conspiracy

So, were the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, “a new Pearl Harbor” and the kickoff of the “New American Century” that the neoconservatives had loudly proclaimed? Or was it intended to trigger a [“Jewish Century”](#) 2.0 and move the Greater Israel project forward by mobilizing American military might against Israel’s enemies in the Near East? Was it devised by incompetent American imperialists, or by Machiavellian crypto-Zionists? Was 9/11 an “inside job” carried out by the American deep state, or an “Israeli job” led by high-ranking *sayanim*? If both, in what combination and in what proportions?

There are no simple answers to these questions, but I have attempted to present a complicated answer as simply as I could. The mystery of 9/11 is a double equation with two unknowns. The starting point is to recognize the basic fact that there were not one, but two 9/11s, each bearing a different signature. I have kept out of the equation the “crash” of UA 93 in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, 25 minutes after the Pentagon, which hardly matters, given its small degree of reality. Suffice it to say that flight UA93 was not operating on Tuesdays but is claimed to have exceptionally replaced flight UA91; it [was reported](#) as landing in San Francisco at noon; none of the families of the “victims” [has claimed compensation](#).^[13]

According to the theory I have just summarized, the attack on the Pentagon was organized by high-ranking officials in the U.S. military and intelligence agencies, with White House approval, in order to justify regime change in Afghanistan. The attack on New York was a doubling down on the Pentagon operation, intended to transform that false pretext for invading Afghanistan into a cataclysmic event capable of traumatizing the American people and instilling in them enough rage to make them accept—or even demand—all-out war against any country designated to them as harboring Islamist terrorists (Iraq, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Libya, etc.). Unlike the invasion of Afghanistan, the U.S. war against Iraq had not been planned by the American deep state prior to September 2001; that is why it required two more years of preparation and propaganda to get going.

Why, you might ask, did Israel need to tie its ambitious false-flag operation in New York city to the more modest one carried out in Washington, D.C.? The answer is obvious: Israel needed to create a situation in which any exposure of Israel's treachery would first and foremost reveal, to Americans and to the world, the Machiavellian machinations of the American deep state. This situation, reinforced by Israel's control over the mainstream media, made it possible to force the Bush administration to cover up both operations, which looked like one to the public.

But another objection arises. Since the attack on the Pentagon happened 51 minutes after the first plane struck the North Tower, why didn't the Pentagon conspirators abort their operation, if the WTC attacks were not part of their plans? Before answering this question, let's examine why the Israelis had to launch their operation *before* the one on the Pentagon. As noted earlier, the operation against the Pentagon required the prior neutralization of air defenses, notably by overwhelming NORAD with drills. But once the Pentagon was hit, one could expect air defenses to mobilize in force: this could have compromised the WTC operation if it had been carried out afterward. How, then, were the Israelis able to ensure that, after the crashes into the Twin Towers, the operation against the Pentagon would not be called off? Fortunately, we have a clue thanks to the testimony of Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta, who was with Dick Cheney in the Presidential Emergency Operations Center (PEOC, the secure bunker beneath the White House) during the half-hour leading up to the Pentagon explosion. Mineta [reported](#) to the 9/11 Commission that a young man had entered the room several times to inform Cheney that the "plane" was approaching Washington.

And when it got down to "the plane is 10 miles out," the young man also said to the Vice-President, "Do the orders still stand?" And the Vice-President turned and whipped his neck around and said, "Of course the orders still stand. Have you heard anything to the contrary?"

Mineta says he does not know what "the orders" were, but it is likely that they were not to shoot down "the plane" heading toward the Pentagon. With President Bush conveniently sent to an elementary school in Florida to read *My Pet Goat*, Vice-President Cheney had the authority and the opportunity to call off the operation, but he refused to do so.

At this point, let's clarify the role of the inseparable duo formed by Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney. Their federal careers began in the Ford administration in the wake of the Watergate scandal. Rumsfeld, the older of the two, first took office as the president's Chief of Staff and appointed Cheney as his Deputy. Rumsfeld then took over as Secretary of Defense and arranged for Cheney to replace him as Chief of Staff. Thus, in 1975, the combination of Rumsfeld at the Pentagon and Cheney at the White House appeared for the first time. The two then opened the doors to the neoconservatives, who at the time were determined to escalate the Cold War at all costs. In 2000, Cheney directed Bush Jr.'s presidential campaign, *secured the vice presidency for himself, appointed Rumsfeld as Secretary of Defense, and filled the administration with Jewish neocons*. According to his biographers, "Dick Cheney has become the most powerful Vice-President ever to occupy the office, exercising authority that often

subsumes the President's.”[14] In reality, Cheney and Rumsfeld acted, as they always had, as mercenaries for the neoconservatives—that is, for Israel.

Additional clues

I can still add two intriguing differences between the attack on the Pentagon and that on the World Trade Center, each of which finds an explanation within the framework of the double conspiracy theory. First, of the nineteen identified hijackers, fifteen resided in or around the small town of Hollywood, Florida. Those who didn't were the four hijackers of AA77, the plane that crashed into the Pentagon. This is particularly significant because Hollywood, Florida was also home to more than 30 of the 140 Israeli agents who were arrested on U.S. soil in the months leading up to 9/11, according to a [DEA report](#) first revealed in an article in the French newspaper *Le Monde* by Sylvain Cypel, and later published online by the French magazine *Intelligence Online*.

Second, the plane that allegedly crashed into the Pentagon had taken off from Washington's Dulles Airport, located just 25 miles from the Pentagon. The planes that struck the Twin Towers, by contrast, had taken off from Boston's Logan Airport. Given its proximity, Dulles Airport was a natural choice for a group operating out of Washington. Logan Airport, on the other hand, was a natural choice for a group of Israeli agents, as it outsourced its security and passenger management to [Huntleigh USA Corporation](#), a subsidiary since 1999 of ICTS (International Consultants on Targeted Security), an Israeli company founded in 1982 by former Israeli military officers and veterans of Israeli intelligence services, including Menachem Atzmon.



In conclusion, Israel's fingerprints can be found not only on the WTC towers, controlled by Silverstein and his associates, but also at the airport from which the flights supposedly crashed into the towers departed, as well as at the place of residence of the alleged hijackers. These three sets of Israeli traces are missing in the case of Flight AA77 at the Pentagon.

And of course there weren't any "dancing Israelis" around the Pentagon.

Nor do we know of any Israeli prophecy of an attack on the Pentagon, whereas the skyscrapers of New York have inspired several such prophecies. Isser Harel, the father of Israeli intelligence, made the following prediction to Michael Evans in 1980: "In Islamic theology, the phallic symbol is very important. Your biggest phallic symbol is New York City and the tallest building will be the phallic symbol that they [Islamic terrorists] will hit."^[15] Netanyahu [himself boasted on CNN](#) in 2006 that he had predicted in 1995 that "if the West doesn't wake up to the suicidal nature of militant Islam, the next thing you will see is militant Islam is bringing down the World Trade Center." Prophecy is easy when you do the planning.

The scenario I have proposed does not cover every aspect of the 9/11 attacks, but I believe it could fit them all. I have not taken into account the financial profits made here and there, because I don't think they were the primary motives. They range from the [gold bars](#) possibly looted from the vault below the WTC, to the [embezzlement](#) of the Victim Compensation Fund. Most conspicuous was the "\$2.3 trillion in transactions" that the DoD "cannot track," according to a public statement made by Donald Rumsfeld on September 10th. The next day, the "hijacked AA77" crashed precisely where the financial analysts of the RSW (Resource Services – Washington) were trying to solve this mystery in the Pentagon. All died. One of them, we are told, died there not because he was in his office, but because he was in the plane that hit it. According to [the Washington Post's Pentagon victims database](#), "Bryan C. Jack ... was a passenger on American Airlines Flight 77, bound for official business in California when his plane struck the Pentagon, where, on any other day, Jack would have been at work at his computer." Yahweh works in crazy ways.

The Washington Post

Remembering:
The Pentagon Victims

Name Search:

Type Full or Partial Name



Bryan C. Jack
Attack Location: AA Flight 77 (Pentagon)
Age: 48
Home: Alexandria, Va.



Bryan C. Jack was responsible for crunching America's defense budget. He was a passenger on American Airlines Flight 77, bound for official business in California when his plane struck the Pentagon, where, on any other day, Jack would have been at work at his computer.

Notes

[1] David Talbot, *Brothers: The Hidden History of the Kennedy Years*, Simon & Schuster, 2007, p. 107.

- [2] Victor Thorn, *9/11 Made in Israel: The Plot Against America*, Sisyphus Press, 2011, p. 7.
- [3] Sara Leibovich-Dar, [“Up in Smoke,”](#) *Haaretz*, November 21, 2001.
- [4] James Bennet, [“Day of Terror: The Israelis; Spilled Blood Is Seen as Bond That Draws Two Nations Closer,”](#) *New York Times*, September 12, 2001.
- [5] George Friedman, [“The Israeli Dimension,”](#) September 11, 2001, on worldview.stratfor.com
- [6] Fifteen thousand *sayanim* on American soil, according to Gordon Thomas’s conservative estimate in *Gideon’s Spies: The Secret History of the Mossad*, St. Martin’s Griffin, 2015.
- [7] Sara Leibovich-Dar, [“Up in Smoke,”](#) *Haaretz*, November 21, 2001.
- [8] YouTube, [“Behind the Smoke Curtain – The 9/11 Pentagon Attack by Barbara Honegger.”](#)
- [9] Ashton B. Carter, John Deutch and Philip Zelikow, [“Catastrophic Terrorism. Tackling the New Danger”](#), *Foreign Affairs*, November 1, 1998. Zelikow’s [Wikipedia entry](#) is well worth a read.
- [10] Stephen Sniegoski, *The Transparent Cabal*, Enigma Edition, 2008, pp. 90–96; James Bamford, *A Pretext for War: 9/11*, Anchor, 2004, pp. 262–263.
- [11] Jean-Charles Brisard and Guillaume Dasquié, *Forbidden Truth: U.S.-Taliban Secret Oil Diplomacy and the Failed Hunt for Bin Laden*, Nation Books, 2002, p. 43.
- [12] Sniegoski, *The Transparent Cabal*, *op. cit.*, pp. 128-136.
- [13] Vincent Sammartino, [“The 9/11 Passenger List Oddity”](#), on 911scholarship.ning.com
- [14] Lou Dubose and Jake Bernstein, *Vice: Dick Cheney and the Hijacking of the American Presidency*, Random House, 2006, p. x.
- [15] Michael Evans reported it in 2004, as cited by Christopher Bollyn in *Solving 9-11: The Deception that Changed the World*, 2012, p. 71.

Donate

