

FABRICATING INTELLIGENCE FOR POLITICAL GAIN

By Michel Chossudovsky

www.globalresearch.ca 3 August 2004

The URL of this article is:

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CH0408A.html>

The decision to launch the code orange terror alert in New York City, Washington DC and northern New Jersey was taken on the night of John Kerry's acceptance speech at the Democratic convention.

No "specific" intelligence out of Pakistan was reviewed at that Thursday evening meeting on June 29 at CIA Headquarters at Langley.

The intelligence used to justify the terror warning, not only turned out to be "outdated", it was only made available to counterterrorism officials ex post facto, once the decision to increase the "threat level" had been endorsed by President Bush.

The Administration has put the country on "high risk" terror alert six times since September 11, 2001 including the latest August 1st alert which is limited to New York City, northern New Jersey and Washington. DC. Without exception, Osama bin Laden's Al Qaeda has been identified as "a threat to the Homeland".

Since September 11, 2001, disinformation regarding an impending terror attack on the Homeland has been consistently fed into the news chain.

Since last December, following Sec. Tom Ridge's fake Christmas Terror Alert, the US public has been led to believe that a second 9/11 is imminent: "the near-term attacks will either rival or exceed the 9/11 attacks". "You ask, 'Is it serious?' Yes, you bet your life. People don't do that unless it's a serious situation." (Donald Rumsfeld).

(See Bush's Christmas Terror Alert, by Michel Chossudovsky, 24 December 2003, <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CH0312D.html>)

According to official police sources, at least two out five of the previous high profile code orange terror alerts were based on fabricated intelligence and Sec. Tom Ridge was directly behind these alerts.

(For further details, see: The Criminalization of the State, by Michel Chossudovsky, February 2004, <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CH0402A.html> , See also Bush's Christmas Terror Alert by Michel Chossudovsky, 24 December 2003 : <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CH0312D.html>)

According to Sec. Tom Ridge, the latest terror alert is "different", because the intelligence, this time round, is said to be far more precise:

"Compared to previous threat reporting, these intelligence reports have provided a level of detail that is very specific."

Sec Tom Ridge in his August 1st statement points authoritatively to "specific credible information" from multiple sources:

" ...This afternoon we do have new and unusually specific information about where Al Qaida would like to attack....

"The quality of this intelligence, based on multiple reporting streams in multiple locations, is rarely seen, and it is alarming in both the amount and specificity of the information. Now, while we are providing you with this immediate information, we will also continue to update you as the situation unfolds.

"As of now, this is what we know: Reports indicate that Al Qaida is targeting several specific buildings, including the International Monetary Fund and World Bank in the District of Columbia, Prudential Financial in northern New Jersey and Citigroup buildings and the New York Stock Exchange in New York.

"Let me assure you -- let me reassure you, actions to further strengthen security around these buildings are already under way. Additionally, we're concerned about targets beyond these and are working to get more information about them.

"Now, senior leadership across the Department of Homeland Security, in coordination with the White House, the CIA, the FBI, and other federal agencies, have been in constant contact with the governors, the mayors and the homeland security advisers of the affected locations I've just named."

(For full text of transcript:

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CRG408A.html>)

Yet barely two days later, US officials are obliged to admit that the intelligence referred to by Sec Tom Ridge is not so precise after all. In fact, its even less specific than in previous terror alerts.

In an ABC interview, Deputy National Security Adviser Fran Townsend acknowledged that the August 1st alert was based on "outdated intelligence" going back to 2000/2001, in other words prior to 9/11:

"What we have learned about the 9/11 attacks, is that they do them (plan for attacks), years in advance and then update them before they launch the attacks," (ABC Good Morning America, 3 August 2004).

According to Townsend, "the surveillance actions taken by the plotters were 'originally done between 2000 and 2001, but were updated - some were updated - as recently as January of this year,'" (NBC Today, 3 August 2004, quoted in the Guardian, 3 August 2004).

Townsend is Richard Clarke's successor on the National Security Council. She is Number 2 after NS Adviser Condoleeza Rice. She heads the White House Counterterrorism program.

And yet her own statements on the nature of the intelligence blatantly contradict DHS Sec Tom Ridge. And then she tells us that the terrorists are, so to speak, involved in some kind of long-term

planning.

Tom Ridge referred in his August 1st to "the quality of this intelligence, based on multiple reporting streams in multiple locations".

Yet in this case, again, the official Homeland Security narrative is contradicted by official intelligence reports. The latter confirm that the hundreds of photos, sketches and written documents used to justify the "high risk" terror alert, emanated largely from one single source of information, following the arrest in mid July of a 25-year-old Pakistani computer engineer, Mohammad Naeem Noor Khan. (AP, 3 August 2004).

Other than a New York Times report (August 2, 2004), which has been quoted extensively by news agencies around the World, we know nothing about this illusive individual. On his computer, Noor Khan, described as a mid-ranking Al Qaeda operative, had information dating back to 2000 and this data, we are told, was the main source of intelligence used by the CIA, with its 30-billion-dollar-plus budget, to document the threats to financial institutions in DC, NYC and Newark, N.J.

This Pakistani connection focusing on the 25-year-old engineer is presented by the media as the missing link. The fact that Pakistan's military intelligence (ISI) has consistently been supporting Al Qaeda, while maintaining close links with the CIA is of course not mentioned. Nor is there any mention of the ISI's role in financing the alleged 9/11 terrorists, which is corroborated by an FBI report published in late September 2001.

Contradictory Timeline: The Thursday July 29 Decision

The CIA held a key counterterrorism meeting on Thursday the 29th of July starting at 5 pm. (WP, 3 August 2004). This meeting, which was described as routine, was attended by senior officials from the CIA, the Pentagon and the FBI.

(See <http://www.cia.gov/terrorism/ctc.html>)

The decision to launch the terror alert was taken at this meeting on Thursday evening, within hours of John Kerry's acceptance speech at the Democratic Convention.

At that meeting on July 29th, it was decided to:

"launch a number of worldwide operations, including the deployment of increased law enforcement around the five [financial] buildings." [World Bank, IMF, NYSE, Citigroup, Prudential] (WP, 3 August 2004)

On what intelligence was that far-reaching 29 July decision taken?

On Thursday, 29 July, when the decision was taken to increase the threat level, the "precise" and "specific" information out of Pakistan including "the trove of hundreds of photos and written documents", was not yet available.

The information from the Pakistani computer engineer, Mohammad Naeem

Noor Khan, was only made available ex post facto on Friday:

"One senior intelligence official said translations of the computer documents and other intelligence started arriving on Friday [one day after the decision had been taken]." (WP, 3 August 2004)

According to a White House aid, President Bush had been "informed of the potential threat Friday morning [July 30] aboard Air Force One". (WP, 2 August 2004).

In other words, President Bush's approval to raising "the threat level" was taken before the "specific intelligence" had been examined by counterterrorism officials on Friday evening:

"'We worked on it late, and through that night,' [Friday] he [the intelligence official] said. 'We had very specific, credible information, and when we laid it in on the threat environment we're in,' officials decided they had to announce it."

At first, "top administration officials had decided to wait until yesterday [Saturday] to announce the alert, but more intelligence information was coming in -- both new translations of the documents, and analysis of other sources' statements -- that deepened their concern about the information, and persuaded them to move ahead swiftly. 'There was a serious sense of urgency to get it out,' the senior intelligence official said...

"On Saturday, officials from the CIA, the FBI, the Homeland Security and Justice departments, the White House, and other agencies agreed with Ridge to recommend that the financial sectors in New York, Washington and North Jersey be placed on orange, or 'high,' alert. Ridge made the recommendation to Bush on Sunday morning, and Bush signed off on it at 10 a.m.". (WP, 3 August 2003)

Following the DHS's Sunday August 1st advisory that the Bretton Woods institutions were a potential target, the World Bank spokesman Dana Milverton retorted that the information was "largely out of date," and "a lot of it was actually public information that anyone from outside the building could have gotten.'" (Guardian, op cit)

"One federal law enforcement source said his understanding from reviewing the reports was that the material predated Sept. 11 and included photos that can be obtained from brochures and some actual snapshots. There also were some interior diagrams that appear to be publicly available." (WP, 3 August 2*004)

According to the NYT (August 3, 2004) report:

"the information, which officials said was indicative of preparations for a possible truck- or car-bomb attack, left significant gaps. It did not clearly describe the suspected plot, indicate when an attack was to take place nor did it describe the identities of people involved."

Fabricated Intelligence

Not only was the intelligence used to justify the warning "out of

date", the actual decision to launch the code orange alert was taken on the night of Kerry's acceptance speech, before this "outdated intelligence" out of Pakistan had been made available to counterterrorism officials.

Tom Ridge was asked "what he would say to skeptical people who see a political motive in the terror alert, he replied: 'I wish I could give them all Top Secret clearances and let them review the information that some of us have the responsibility to review. We don't do politics in the Department of Homeland Security.'" (WP, 3 August 2004, <http://msnbc.msn.com/id/5581230/>)

No specific intelligence from the illusive Pakistan engineer's computer was reviewed at that Thursday evening meeting on June 29. (WP, 3 August 2004)

In other words, everything indicates that the decision to increase the threat level had no foundation whatsoever.

The threat of an impending terror attack had been fabricated.

The deployment around the five financial buildings was totally unnecessary.

Public opinion had been deliberately misled.

Fabricating intelligence for political gain or as a pretext for the introduction of emergency measures is a criminal act.

Yet nobody in Washington seems to be concerned that the Bush Cabinet has triggered a campaign of fear and intimidation based on phony intelligence in the months leading up to the November presidential elections.

=====

Related Articles:

Coup d'Etat in America? by Michel Chossudovsky, 13 July 2004
<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO407B.html>

Will the 2004 Election Be Called Off? Why Three Out of Four Experts Predict a Terrorist Attack by November, by Maureen Farrell, April 2004, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/FAR404A.html>

CIA warns of "New 9/11": Why has John Kerry remained Mum on the Issue of Postponing the Elections? Michel Chossudovsky, 16 July 2004, <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO407D.html>

Bush Administration "Guidelines" for Postponing or Canceling the November Presidential Elections by Michel Chossudovsky, 10 July 2004, <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO407C.html>

Bush Regime working out Procedures for postponing November Election by Webster Griffin Tarpley, 10 July 2004, <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/TAR407B.html>

Rumor Becomes Fact as Bush Administration Asks for Authority to Suspend the Election by Michael C. Ruppert , 13 July 2004
<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/RUP407A.html>

Bush backers discuss canceling elections, Emergency Rule and Martial Law, by Webster G. Tarpley 12 July 2004
<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/407A.html>

The Criminalization of the State, by Michel Chossudovsky,
<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO402A.html> February 2004

Homeland Defense: The Pentagon Declares War on America by Frank Morales, Global Outlook, Issue 3, Winter 2003,
<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/MOR312A.html>

"Homeland Defense" and the Militarisation of America by Frank Morales, 15 September 2003,
<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/MOR309A.html>

FBI points finger at the CIA: Terror Alert based on Fabricated Information, 14 February 2003,
<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CRG302A.html>

Bush's Christmas Terror Alert, by Michel Chossudovsky, 24 December 2003, <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO312D.html>

Manufacturing Hysteria: Bogus Terror Threats and Bush's Police State, by Kurt Nimmo, 31 December 2003,
<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/NIM312A.html>

Orange Code Terror Alert based on Fabricated Intelligence, by Michel Chossudovsky 3 January 2004.
<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO401A.html>

E-Democracy: Stealing the Election in 2004 by Steve Moore, 11 July 2004, <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/MOO407A.html>

Email this article to a friend

To express your opinion on this article, join the discussion at Global Research's News and Discussion Forum , at
<http://globalresearch.ca.myforums.net/index.php>

The Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG) at www.globalresearch.ca grants permission to cross-post original Global Research (Canada) articles in their entirety, or any portions thereof, on community internet sites, as long as the text & title of the article are not modified. The source must be acknowledged as follows: Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG) at www.globalresearch.ca . For cross-postings, kindly use the active URL hyperlink address of the original CRG article. The author's copyright note must be displayed. (For articles from other news sources, check with the original copyright holder, where applicable.). For publication of Global Research (Canada) articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: editor@globalresearch.ca .

For media inquiries: editor@globalresearch.ca

© Copyright M CHOSSUDOVSKY 2004. For fair use only/ pour usage équitabile seulement.