

August 26, 2015

Hello all,

Below are excerpts from your letter in black with my responses in red.

...we do not know what information of substance, if any, will be revealed with their release. We believe that it is misleading, at best, to imply that it will lead to an investigation and the ultimate disclosure of the real 9/11 perpetrators and their activities.

We do know that the politicians who've read the 28 pages were dramatically impacted. We do know they've made references to not only Saudi funding, but "other Middle East countries", and "certain US agencies". They've also said there's intelligence in there that Congress needs today to form a national security policy needed today. They're implying that the Saudis continue to fund extremist groups creating havoc in the Middle East, and touted in the media as posing a threat of the next 9/11 style attack within the US. These are all compelling points which are of substance. As for leading to an investigation and full disclosure, what I've said is that demanding transparency on the 28 pages is a start. From there, citing Tom Kean's statement on CNN that everything should be released, I've said then we can call for declassifying testimony by Sibel Edmonds, Willie Rodriguez, and whatever else has been kept secret. This is on the site. So after pressure builds to a high enough level to release the 28 pages, this will create the conditions for phase two – more areas of evidence. Actually, I've already begun phase two by meeting politicians and family members who I gave copies of the 400 questions to as well as copies of ESO. Below I explain how hr14.org helped me accomplish these things. As for what I've implied, I've laid out all kinds of reasons that show there is a strong likelihood the 28 pages can lead to a larger unraveling, especially if the activist community plays its role in legislative activism and doing what I've done by connecting with people such as referred to below.

We are concerned that the message displayed on the HR14 campaign website does not support the facts as the 9/11 Truth Movement has come to understand them. Instead, it assumes the official story is true, with the slight twist that the Saudis were culpable because they financed the putative hijackers. In addition, the site ignores all the hard evidence that debunks the Official Conspiracy Theory (OCT).

I think you've misconstrued the purpose of the web site. HR14.org was never intended to be a 9/11 truth site. Maybe back in the beginning you weren't following how things developed. We knew 911truthoutreach.org already existed. That was intended as a "9/11 truth" resource. You all know there are already dozens of them and have been for years. Many of them are very well done in my opinion. However, let's be real. All that information has not resulted in political action. If anything, there is a widespread perception that "truthers" are a cult, they're out of touch with political reality, etc. So at this point I really don't think we need another 9/11 truth site.

If you can specifically make the point that hr14.org states or implies the OCT is to be believed.

Back to HR14.org. Roy Kendall had gotten the domain name which has the name of the actual resolution, hr14.org. So the idea was to use that as a site for the general public to become aware of the 28 pages, aware of the legislation, and how to take political action. That's it.

By framing the information the way it's been done on the site, I and others are able to go into places we need to be, that would not happen otherwise. I've connected with Congressmen, David Swanson & RootsAction.org, lawyers for the 9/11 families, and a few more family members such as Matt Sellitto and MaryEllen Salamone. None of this would have worked if they saw me as a "truther/conspiracy cultist". Several years ago I used to run into Norm Segal, the lawyer for Sally Regenhard. He played a major role in getting the NY Times to release the transcripts of the firemen's phone calls which David Ray Griffin analyzed and found over 100 which mentioned explosions. However, Norm still bought the official story and wouldn't talk to me because he saw me as a conspiracy chump. This is what we're dealing with and why hr14.org is structured as a tool to enable me and others to avert these roadblocks.

Furthermore, the site has many statements that make it clear the public has been misled and deprived of vital information on 9/11. Here are the first 2 sentences:

"Millions of people recognize the falsehoods of the official narrative of 9/11 and truly desire full spectrum truth and justice. Millions know the failure and outright deception put forth by the official investigations, – the Congressional Joint Inquiry and the 9/11 Commission. They have seen mainstream news interviews with members of the official investigations who admit to their own serious misgivings of the outcomes of their reports."

From there, the purpose is to inform the public about the Bush cover up, the existence of legislation to end the cover up, and give them tools to pressure their legislators to read the 28 pages.

Just as AE911truth focuses only on the towers, doesn't get into alleging who the perpetrators are, avoids all the geo-political subjects, foreknowledge, the new Pearl Harbor agenda, etc., etc., hr14.org is focused on a particular area of information and objectives. This is all to the good because nobody knows where the breakthrough is going to come through so we have to work different angles which are actually complementary. What we do know is – all of the substantial efforts by the research community has not come up with a breakthrough, or with the elements that make up a real movement such as the civil rights movement, the labor movement, climate justice movement, black lives matter movement, and on and on. Instead, the 9/11 truth community is on track to wind up like the JFK researchers.

As has been evidenced by David Swanson launching a petition on the 28 pages, the Left cannot argue with this aspect of 9/11. So by recognizing this common ground we have, we can cultivate relationships, build alliances, generate political activism, and draw more attention to 9/11 which

is exactly what's needed. This is exactly what I'm trying to do with David. The more attention that is attracted to a 9/11 issue such as the 28 pages, the more potential there is for people to realize the rest of the story doesn't add up. People will learn there is a 9/11 evidence that's been withheld, for no good reason, which is a logical pathway to wider information.

As you know from past correspondence, published and recognized leaders of the 9/11 truth movement, such as Kevin Ryan and Michel Chossudovsky, have raised serious questions about the purpose and intent of the 28-pages release campaign.

First, you fail to acknowledge that arguably the most radical journalist out there, Alex Jones, obviously strongly supports the 28 pages issue. Infowars aired a piece called "The 28 pages that could change the world". If you haven't seen it, here's the link:

<http://www.infowars.com/28-pages-that-will-change-the-world/>

Also, you really need to read this piece which is also on globalresearch.ca which goes into the Bush/Saudi connections, the Saudis and P-Tech, the Saudis and BCCI. This is a very important piece to the puzzle:

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/bush-family-ties-to-terror-suspects-re-opened-by-the-911-classified-28-pages/5433096>

As for Ryan and Chossodovsky, I've addressed this weeks ago. Here it is again...

I posted a response to this article on the Globalresearch Facebook page when I first read it a few months ago. As much as I respect Chossodovsky's work, he fails to consider some very important points. Here's what I wrote (with a minor edit):

"I personally attended the Jan. 7th press conference in DC where Bob Graham spoke, along with HR 14 co-sponsors Walter Jones and Steven Lynch. Yes, the declassification of the 28 pages would be a catalyst. I'm glad to see this article, but want to add some other insights. While Chossudovsky is obviously right that Graham has always stopped short of addressing the evidence of controlled demolition, he misses on the intent. He implies Graham is covering up and diverting attention. He, as well as Kevin Ryan, refers to actions by Graham taken in the months after 9/11 without recognizing the collective state of mind at that point and how years of further inquiry lead one to a far difference place. He also assumes that Graham was in a position to question the official story, and imply it was an inside job. The hard core reality is that Graham, as well as the rest of Congress, recognize the political reality of what would happen if they talk about demolitions. The power of how the military muscle behind the gov't figureheads controls the narrative is overwhelming. The threat to a public figure of being labeled a conspiracy theorist, especially regarding 9/11, is not a role they are willing to be burdened with. Additionally, it's reasonable to assume they want to be avoid being "Wellstoned". The truth movement needs to understand the ramifications. However, if there was a concerted effort to

pressure Congress members to read the 28 pages, there are strong grounds to believe there will be a sweeping shift in consciousness amongst the members. As Thomas Massie (R-KY) said, it forced him to rethink everything about 9/11. We should also remember that George W. Bush classified those pages illegally because they contain nothing that compromises national security. So rather than being a red-herring, the effort to declassify this information is a catalyst that could open a Pandora's box. It is a very tactical strategy that a few concerned politicians feel they can safely pursue without winding up like Wellstone, because it addresses the issue of transparency, providing evidence to the 9/11 families, and providing insight into Saudi Arabia funding extremists and mercenaries. The only realistic recourse is to become a political constituency that demands total truth in large numbers. For more on what's possible, see [www.hr14.org](http://www.hr14.org). See the automatic form to alert your Congress member."

If I wrote the response today I would have added more on Graham's ongoing 13 years of efforts to release the 28 pages, expose a "pattern of cover-up" by the FBI and other agencies, and make it clear there's no way the 19 Arabs could have acted on their own but had high level support. I would add more on the clamp down on questioning was put in place when Bush stated "never tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories". Also, with Chossudovsky's depth of knowledge of the machinations of powerful forces with agendas for empire, I'm very surprised he fails to consider how revealing the 28 pages would shine a huge spotlight on the Bush deep state operations which have gone on for decades, and how their dealings with Saudi royals would shock the conscience of Americans if widely exposed.

Also, Chossudovsky made a glaring error by stating "And now Bob Graham and 9/11 Commission Chairman Thomas Kean are accusing the FBI of camouflage and the Saudis of collusion in the 9/11 attacks, while failing to acknowledge coverup and complicity at the highest levels of the US government." This is false.

From LA Times article by Robert Scheer, <http://articles.latimes.com/2003/jul/29/opinion/oe-scheer29>

Obviously alluding to Saudi Arabia, Sen. Bob Graham (D-Fla.), the former Senate Intelligence Committee chairman, said Sunday, "High officials in this government, who I assume were not just rogue officials acting on their own, made substantial contributions to the support and well-being of two of these terrorists and facilitated their ability to plan, practice and then execute the tragedy of Sept. 11."

For a journalist of his caliber, this was very unfortunate. It shows that even people like him can make mistakes.

Also, In Chossudovsky's article he quotes Ryan saying "The Senate voted for one anyway, however, and that led both **Bush and Cheney to attempt to stop it or limit its scope. Apparently the best they could do was to make sure that Goss and Graham were put in charge.** That seemed to work as the Inquiry began in February 2002, more than five months after

the attacks, and **the approach taken was one of uncritical deference to the Bush Administration and the intelligence community.**”

**I hope all can understand this point. Players on the intelligence committees are appointed because the Congressional leaders want “yes men”, not anyone who will raise challenges. A staff member at Walter Jones office informed me of this. Well as soon as Bush excised that entire chapter, Graham objected right away and hasn’t stopped since. THIS IS THE OPPOSITE OF WHAT WAS EXPECTED OF HIM FROM THE POWER STRUCTURE. Also, rather than choosing the easy path of silence, he has taken a long series of actions against what he has termed “a pattern of cover up”.**

**Then Ryan wrongly states “The FBI did not cooperate but that didn’t seem to bother Goss and Graham.”** Forget about Goss, we’re talking about Graham. Graham has been after the FBI for years to divulge what they know about what went on in San Diego, Sarasota and other locations. His effort led to a FOIA case in Florida in which a judge ordered the FBI to turn over 80,000 pages of documents which they said they didn’t have. At one point he was about to do the unthinkable, serve the FBI a subpoena. They lied to him saying it wouldn’t be necessary. Then the time limitation ran out and he couldn’t. He now says his biggest regret is not serving the subpoena. Why would he have gone to all this trouble beginning in 2003 till today?

By way of analogy, suppose someone claimed that certain classified documents could prove that known patsy Lee Harvey Oswald was secretly financed by the Soviet Union, and that this would conclusively reveal who was truly behind JFK’s assassination. Would anyone among the serious researchers uncritically accept this information? Would they not label such a claim a red herring, which undermines the fruit of years of painstaking research?

If exposing there was a cover up on Russia financing Oswald would also expose certain state crimes, attract widespread media coverage reaching millions, with potential to lead to wider questioning by the public, inspire politicians to submit legislation despite the great risk to their careers, serve as a platform to create alliances with other organizations and movements, serve as a platform to coalesce into a political constituency – this would all help create the result those serious researchers were after in the first place. The red herring and limited hangout argument fails to recognize the potential value of these developments which exist with the release of the 28 pages.

Also, your own question here is missing a huge piece of reality. There are encyclopedias worth of research done on JFK. Has all that research resulted in generating a political movement? Has it resulted in accountability and justice? Obviously not. This is why what is most needed is **pragmatic political coalition building and lobbying efforts**. As we’re all aware, there’s a huge amount of 9/11 truth material out there already. But in the lanes of power and media influence, there is no indication that this material can make the difference. On the contrary, there are far too many indications that the establishment will not go near the alternative research including the

science. Those who have tried paid the price and the politicians in office now are fully aware of the line they cannot cross if they want to keep their job. Some may even fear for their lives. So what's the point? Why would we miss an opportunity to create an undercurrent of serious challenges to criminal actions that took place which lead to the Bush/Saudi/neocon/covert ops nexus? In these discussions lasting months now, you've consistently ignored this point.

By the same logic, whereas we all agree it is critical to expose the real 9/11 perpetrators, since the 9/11 Truth Movement has forcefully established that 19 alleged hijackers could not have been responsible for the complete destruction of 3 of New York's tallest skyscrapers (not to mention the Pentagon event), why should the question of who financially supported these known (by definition, falsely blamed) patsies be considered so momentous?

Absolutely, we want to expose the real perpetrators. They include the Bush/Saudi/CIA/FBI crime faction. Just because there are likely other perpetrators shouldn't mean we don't expose these.

Firstly, there is only one instance of the term "hijacker" which is in a quote by Walter Jones. So I think you've really overblown this whole charge and fail to consider all the other points which argue for transparency not only on the 28 pages but beyond. That said, I don't mind looking for a different quote from Jones to replace this. Furthermore, as stated before, the purpose here is to focus on the wrongful classification by Bush, the legislation, and the call to political action. You bring up the Pentagon. Remember, AE doesn't touch the Pentagon either. I've also explained several times the likely scenario that the hijacker story would begin to fall apart even for those new to the information by virtue of the fact that it just makes no sense that our government has protected the source that funded them in the most horrific attack ever committed against the U.S. The whole thing smells rotten. So on the contrary, the 28 pages helps to undermine the myth, not reinforce it. And the 28 pages issue and hr14.org site take nothing away from all the alternative evidence. If anything it starts the uninitiated on the path to that alternative evidence, plus serves as a platform to take political action in an arena that already has begun to get traction.

Do we not then have good reason to question the purpose of the website's message which falsely assumes that revealing Saudi financial support will finally, conclusively, reveal who perpetrated 9/11? It flies in the face of everything the 9/11 Truth community has struggled for years to publicly demonstrate!

In no way does HR14.org state that revealing Saudi financial support will finally, conclusively, reveal who perpetrated 9/11. This is plainly misrepresentation. This excerpt on the home page refutes your claim.

"Now there is a bi-partisan resolution in the House of Representatives, H. RES. 14, which focuses on educating members of Congress and the public about a particular set of 9/11 issues described below. This effort has great potential to lead to a widespread unraveling of 9/11 myths."

The 9/11 truth community had enough evidence back in 2004 that was presented at the first big national conference in San Francisco. They had more at the LA Citizens Grand Jury. They had more each year which was presented at various symposiums around the country. Over 50 million people have seen Loose Change. None of this has translated to successful legal action or legislation. As much as you hate to consider Saudi involvement in 9/11, solving a crime necessarily involves following the money. It leads to the Saudis which by extension leads to the Bush deep state operators which have been functioning for decades. It leads to the CIA operatives managing the “visa express” in Saudi Arabia. Remember, the 9/11 families could sue anybody they want because of how they’ve been damaged. They can sue anybody they want because they have the morally protected position. They’re suing the Saudis.

We do not make such serious assertions lightly. Several of us have carefully scrutinized the hr14.org website and have unexceptionally discovered what can only be called a regurgitation of the OCT. (Our detailed analysis is available upon your request.) We therefore regard hr14.org as, at best, a hindrance to the aims of the 9/11 Truth Movement, which, on the basis of hard evidence, has solidly debunked the false narrative that your website appears to openly advocate.

We would also like to ask you how the statements of people with clear but undisclosed conflicts of interest can be featured on your website as though they were somehow heroic? Porter Goss and Bob Graham have well established CIA connections, and litigants in a lawsuit against Saudi Arabia, such as Terry Strada (whose case and opportunity for financial award hinges on essential confirmation of the OCT), can hardly be considered disinterested on this question either!

You’ve carefully scrutinized hr14.org? There is not one mention of Terry Strada or Porter Goss. I did a word search. Not there. If I’m wrong and you show me where they’re mentioned, I’ll remove them gladly.

As for your list of requested changes, feel free to put that information up at 911truthoutreach.org. As explained above, that site was for the truth community. Wayne and Tim are open to making it available for whatever you’d like to do. If you think doing so will widen the base, attract media attention, help build coalitions, inspire politicians to enact legislation, create a platform for grassroots legislative activism, all within the foreseeable future, by all means go for it.

Since the purpose of hr14.org is to have a tool that stands apart from anything that will invite the accusation that I and others aligned with this effort are conspiracy nuts, it would be very counter-productive to turn this into a truth site, so I will not. I will look for a different Jones quote without a reference to hijackers. I will also post a link to the 9/11 Family Steering Committee site where they have the 400 questions, which really are a Pandora’s box of information. I will look to see if any other verbage can be revised and strengthened within the parameters of the site. I’m super busy at the moment with event planning, then a 2 week trip overseas, but I can do a few of these things over the next few weeks.

In your closing you referred to “moral obligation”. Please know that I feel it’s my moral obligation to be able to have a web site I and others can associate with that gives us legitimacy with politicians, organizations, and other activists which we can work with to further the cause now. With the prospects of another Bush in the White House and prospects of a show trial to convict KSM, there’s great urgency. Also, I suggest that you have a moral obligation not to unnecessarily provoke divisions within the activist community.

I’ve corresponded with a lot of people over recent months and find there are many, many people who feel as I do. There are people joining the 28 Pages Facebook Group every week. There are people confronting presidential candidates with the 28 pages issue in New Hampshire and Florida. But going forward, I’m assuming you won’t want to be part of grass roots organizing on the 28 pages effort. That’s totally fine. Do the work you’re driven to do and allow me and others to do the same, which is only fair.

Respectfully,

Les Jamieson