

Editorial

It's What They Haven't Told You

Of the American media's performance since the events of Sept. 11, 2001, it may best be said: "What they don't tell you, may kill you."

From the moment the hijacked planes crashed into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the U.S. major media have been waging a 24 hour-a-day campaign to "out-Goebbels Goebbels," a non-stop barrage of disinformation, aimed at literally brainwashing the majority of Americans—including policymakers—into accepting the preposterous conclusion that "Osama bin Laden" masterminded the hideous irregular warfare attack of Sept. 11, the sophisticated financial warfare on international markets which preceded and followed it, and so forth.

From the first hours that morning, Lyndon LaRouche has warned that the bin Laden organization clearly lacked the capacity, alone, to conduct such a sophisticated, precision attack against American targets. In America, the media have censored these warnings, as they censored LaRouche's warnings, during the 2000 Presidential campaign, of the coming, now undeniable economic collapse.

During a live interview on K-TALK radio in Salt Lake City the morning of Sept. 11, as the first word came of the attacks in New York and Washington, LaRouche warned: "The first suspicion that's going to be on this is Osama bin Laden. That name is going to come up prominently."

Asked whether there was reason to doubt the bin Laden authorship, LaRouche replied, "Osama bin Laden is not an independent force." He detailed how Zbigniew Brzezinski and others launched the "Afghanistan war on the border of the Soviet territory" in the late 1970s, and "recruited a lot of Islamic people to fight Communism and defend Holy Islam. . . . Osama bin Laden was one of the big funding agents of this." LaRouche warned: "So now you can blame Osama bin Laden. At some point, you go in and kill him, and you say the problem was solved. But you never considered who sent, who created Osama bin Laden, and who protected him, and deployed his forces and name for these purposes."

More than three weeks after LaRouche issued this prescient warning, the entire American media remain in lock-step, behind this Goebbels-esque "Big Lie." Hundreds of thousands of words of print, and weeks worth of TV and radio coverage, have focussed on minute details about bin Laden and his al-Qaeda organization, but nowhere has the issue of the extraordinary sophistication and insider knowledge, required to have conducted the Sept. 11 attacks and surrounding events, been raised. To publicly raise such questions would be to immediately shoot down the "bin Laden did it" mantra.

In all successful propaganda/brainwashing campaigns, the secret is to lure the victim in with a stream of apparently "accurate details"—even though the "accurate details" periodically change!—that distract his or her attention from the larger questions, the questions that must be asked in order to conduct a successful truth-seeking effort. The American media have played the game of distraction-bombardment with precision, since Sept. 11.

In stark contrast to these media psy-ops, LaRouche—in many interviews, mostly with radio and TV stations *outside* the United States—warned that while assets of the Afghansi mujahideen may have been involved at the operational level, the overall operation had the character of a strategic covert irregular warfare attack, that required the involvement of contaminated elements of the U.S. military and security structures.

While scores of government officials and professional analysts around the world have privately concurred with LaRouche's assessment of an "enemy within," likely engaged in an ongoing coup d'état operation, the mass media have completely censored the very question itself, of such a deeper level of attack. But so long as Americans stay in a stupor of fixation on bin Laden and Afghanistan, the prospects of further acts of irregular warfare, challenging the very foundations of our Constitutional system, remain great. In this regard, CNN, Fox TV, the *Washington Post*, et al. are complicit, after the fact.