

War and International Affairs

War Costs, Deaths, and Injuries

1) Open: Do you feel safer now than you did before we went to war with Iraq?

2) How much is it costing to run the war with Iraq and Afghanistan per month?

\$5.4 billion (\$4.4 billion in Iraq, \$1 billion in Afghanistan) per month.

Source: "Disparity in Iraq: Afghanistan War Costs Scrutinized," Bradley Graham, *Washington Post* staff writer, Nov. 11, 2003, p. A13, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A23970-2003Nov10.html>

3) How many US military deaths and injuries in the war and occupation of Iraq?

Death, injury, and illness have claimed 10,000 US victims in Iraq.

Source: "Death, injury, illness toll at 10,000 for U.S. in Iraq," Roger Roy, *Orlando Sentinel*, Nov. 29, 2003, http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/nationworld/2001803475_senthome290.html

578 US service members have died.

Source: [US deaths in Iraq](#), *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 03/23/04, <http://www.cleveland.com/news/plaindealer/index.ssf?base/news/108004297563460.xml>

4) What are the total estimated deaths of Iraqi civilians?

The Medact report, *Continuing Collateral Damage*, estimates that 22,000 to 55,000 people on all sides, including those in the military, have died in the war and its aftermath.

Source: "Iraqi's 'Health Will Suffer for Generations'," James Meikle, *Guardian Newspapers Limited*, 2003, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Iraq/Story/0,2763,1083106,00.html>

5) How many US military deaths in the war and occupation of Afghanistan?

97 US soldiers have died in Afghanistan.

Source: "US deaths in Afghanistan," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Nov. 27, 2003, <http://www.cleveland.com/news/plaindealer/index.ssf?base/news/1069936256100340.xml>

6) What are the total estimated deaths of Afghanistan civilians?

3,800 civilian deaths in Afghanistan as of December 2001.

Source: "Afghanistan's Civilian Deaths Mount," *BBC News*, Jan. 3, 2002, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/1740538.stm

7) How much has the war in Iraq cost taxpayers so far?

The total spending allocated to Iraq is \$141 billion.

Source: "The Cost of War for States and Selected Cities," *National Priorities*, <http://www.nationalpriorities.org/Issues/Military/Iraq/CostOfWar.html>

8) Do you know what depleted uranium is and what the main health and environmental effects of depleted uranium are?

Depleted uranium (DU), the byproduct of enriching uranium for nuclear weapons or reactors, is used in armor-piercing shells and becomes deadly immediately after hitting a solid object. Once detonated, DU bursts into a burning spray of radioactive dust, spreading as far as 26 miles from its point of impact. With such a wide range of radiation, DU has disastrous consequences for the nearby land, water supply, civilian population, and affected soldiers.

Described as a “serious health threat” by the US Defense Nuclear Agency, DU is a particularly lethal toxin because it poses the double risk of chemical and radioactive poisoning. Former US army colonel Doug Rokke, who served in the Gulf War to advise on radioactive clean up, says almost every person in his 30-member team is now seriously ill because of DU, and three have died of lung cancer. Yet DU poisoning doesn’t stop there. In one military unit, 67% of children born to US Gulf veterans had severe illnesses or birth defects. And one Canadian study of a DU-affected site in Basra, Iraq showed cancer rates increase at seven times the normal amount after uranium weapons were used.

Sources: “Q&A: Depleted uranium weapons,” Alex Kirby, BBC Environment Correspondent, BBC News, World Edition, Jan. 4, 2001, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/1101447.stm>

“Forum: Ask Alex Kirby,” BBC News, Jan. 9, 2001, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/talking_point/forum/1106746.stm

9) According to Nuclear Posture Review, leaked to the press in January 2002, the US has targeted what countries for nuclear attack on hair trigger alert?

North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, Russia and China.

Sources: Nuclear Posture Review, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>

Los Angeles Times article at www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-op-arkinmar10.story

Iraq

1) Did the CIA claim that Iraq was an "imminent threat"?

No. In his first public defense of prewar intelligence, CIA Director George Tenet said that U.S. analysts had never claimed Iraq was an imminent threat, the main argument used by President Bush for going to war.

Source: CIA Boss: Iraq Not Called Imminent Threat, CIA Director Defends Intelligence Community, Says Analysts Never Called Iraq an Imminent Threat, *The Associated Press*, Feb. 5, 2004, http://abcnews.go.com/wire/Politics/ap20040205_918.html

2) After concluding that Iraq had no Weapons of Mass Destruction, what advice did Kay give to President Bush?

Since resigning last month, Kay has said repeatedly that U.S. intelligence was wrong in claiming that Saddam had stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and advanced nuclear weapons programs. Those programs were the main justification for the Iraq war. Former U.S. weapons inspector David Kay is advising President Bush to acknowledge he was wrong about hidden storehouses of weapons in Iraq and move ahead with overhauling the intelligence process.

Source: Kay: Bush Should Admit Error on Iraq WMD: Ex-WMD Inspector David Kay Advises Bush to Admit He Was Wrong About Weapons in Iraq, *The Associated Press*, Feb 13, 2004, http://abcnews.go.com/wire/Politics/ap20040213_696.html

Bush, Aides Ignored CIA Caveats on Iraq, *Washington Post* - Feb 6, 2004, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=&contentId=A20194-2004Feb6¬Found=true>

3) What other reports confirmed Kay’s findings?

A report from UN weapons inspectors to be released this week says they now believe there were no weapons of mass destruction of any significance in Iraq after 1994. The report, which will be presented to the UN Security Council Friday, is the first outside study that confirms the statements Kay made in January to the US Senate. At that time, Kay told a Senate committee that he believed there were no WMD in Iraq.

Source: Kay calls on Bush to 'come clean' about WMD, *Christian Science Monitor*, March 4, 2003, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0304/dailyUpdate.html?s=entt>

4) Did Bush order the Pentagon to explore an invasion of Iraq prior to September 11, 2001?

“President Bush ordered the Pentagon to explore the possibility of a ground invasion of Iraq well before the United States was attacked on Sept. 11, 2001” an official told ABCNEWS, confirming the account former Treasury Secretary Paul O’Neill gives in a book written by former Wall Street Journal reporter Ron Suskind. The official, who asked not to be identified, was present in the same National Security Council meetings as O’Neill immediately after Bush’s inauguration in January and February of 2001. O’Neill says that from the very start of his administration, Bush was focused on ousting Saddam.

Source: “Corroborating O’Neill’s Account: Official Confirms Claims That Saddam Was Bush’s Focus Before 9/11,” John Cochran, ABC News, Jan. 13, 2004, http://abcnews.go.com/sections/wnt/US/oneill_charges_040113.html

5) What specific evidence came from former Treasury Secretary O’Neill and others concerning Bush’s plans to take over Iraq prior to 9/11/01?

A Pentagon document dated March 5, 2001, “Foreign Suitors for Iraqi Oilfield Contracts,” includes a map of potential areas for exploration and outlines contractors around the world from 30–40 countries.

An earlier document marked Secret (January 2001), “Plan for post-Saddam Iraq,” envisioned peacekeeping troops, war crimes tribunals, and even divvying up Iraq’s oil wealth.

Source: “Bush Sought ‘Way’ To Invade Iraq?” 60 Minutes, CBS News, Jan. 11, 2004, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/01/09/60minutes/main592330.shtml>

6) The administration claimed that Iraq was a threat to our security while countries neighboring Iraq were not threatened. Have any nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons been found in Iraq as of 10/3/03?

No such weapons were found according to the UN weapons inspectors, the CIA-led Iraq Survey Group (ISG), and the Pentagon’s own Defense Intelligence Agency.

Sources: “Search in Iraq Finds No Banned Weapons,” Dana Priest and Walter Pincus, *Washington Post* staff writers, Fri., Oct. 3, 2003, p. A01, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A35638-2003Oct2?language=printer>

“2002 Report Found No Iraqi Arsenal,” Bryan Bender, *Boston Globe* article, reprinted in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Sat., June 7, 2003, p. A-1, <http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2003/06/07/MN208710.DTL>

7) During the 1980s who sold weapons to Iraq — and what kind? What kind of assistance did the US provide and who was a special envoy to the Iraqi regime?

US, British, and German companies sold deadly weapons to the Iraqi regime. Even with well-known reports of Hussein’s malicious use of weapons against his own people, the Reagan and Bush Administrations both authorized the sale of lethal weaponry to Iraq, including poisonous chemicals and deadly biological viruses, such as anthrax and bubonic plague. The Pentagon has since identified these strains of anthrax as a central element of the Iraqi biological warfare program.

US assistance to Iraq in the war against Iran also included the supply of cluster bombs through a Chilean front company. Donald Rumsfeld, then a special presidential envoy, helped to secure this “special relationship” at a time when Iraq was using chemical weapons on an almost daily basis. The Commerce Department also facilitated the export of insecticides to Iraq, despite growing evidence that they were “highly toxic” to humans and could be used for chemical warfare — a direct contravention to the Geneva Protocols of 1925. It should come as no surprise, then, that the same American-mandated UN weapons inspectors found USA brands on many of Iraq’s chemical and missile components after the Gulf War.

Source: “U.S. Had Key Role in Iraq Buildup,” Michael Dobbs, *Washington Post* staff writer, Dec. 30, 2002, p. A01, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A52241-2002Dec29?language=printer>

8) The administration claimed there was a connection between Al-Qaeda and Iraq. What is or was the connection?

To date, the administration has not come forward with any evidence of a close relationship between Iraq and Al-Qaeda.

Discrediting the significance of a leaked Pentagon memo purporting a connection, one former senior intelligence official likened the memo to a series of “data points . . . among the millions of holdings of the intelligence agencies, many of which are simply not thought likely to be true.” The Pentagon followed suit, issuing its final word on the memo soon after the leak had been released to the press. “News reports that the

Defense Department recently confirmed new information with respect to contacts between al Qaeda and Iraq . . . are inaccurate.” The Pentagon also said the memo “was not an analysis of the substantive issue of the relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda and drew no conclusions.”

Source: “CIA Seeks Probe of Iraq-Al Qaeda Memo Leak,” Walter Pincus, *Washington Post* staff writer, Nov. 18, 2003, p. A18, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=&contentId=A54452-2003Nov17¬Found=true>

9) Colin Powell made a case before the UN to go to war with Iraq. From what sources was Colin Powell’s report plagiarized, and how old were these sources?

Colin Powell’s speech before the UN Security Council cited a 19-page British dossier that was plagiarized, in large part, from an academic paper on Iraq based on the 1991 Gulf War. Glen Rangwala, a lecturer in politics at Cambridge University, affirmed that pages 6-16 of the dossier were copied almost verbatim from the 12-year-old paper by Ibrahim al-Marashi. The other two plagiarized sources, which constituted a further 6 pages of the dossier, came from the commercial publication *Jane’s Intelligence Review*, dated 1997 and 2002.

Sources: “Britain’s Intelligence Crisis,” *Jane’s Intelligence Digest*, Feb. 14, 2003, http://www.janes.com/security/international_security/news/jid/jid030214_1_n.shtml

“UK accused of lifting dossier text,” CNN, Feb. 7, 2003, <http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/meast/02/07/sprj.irq.uk.dossier/>

10) Open: Do you approve of unilateral military action by the US or do you think we should cooperate with other nations to work out non-military solutions to our international problems?

11) Were the administration’s claims that Saddam Hussein was working on buying nuclear materials from Africa based on facts?

No. According to the International Atomic Energy Agency, the claims that Iraq had attempted to buy 500 tons of uranium, known as “yellow cake,” from Niger were based on crude forgeries and falsified documents.

Source: “Who Lied To Whom?” Seymour M. Hersh, *The New Yorker*, March 31, 2003, http://newyorker.com/printable/?fact/030331fa_fact1

12) Open: President Bush in the State of Union address reported that Iraq was buying nuclear grade materials from the African nation of Niger despite a report to the contrary by the CIA and former Ambassador Wilson. When Wilson’s report became public, the White House retaliated by outing his undercover CIA agent wife in the national press, putting her and all her contacts in the area of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) at grave risk. How do you feel about this behavior on the part of this administration toward agents who risk their lives on a daily basis for the sake of our country?

Source: “Open Warfare: Bush vs. the Intelligence Community,” Ivan Eland, Senior Fellow and Director of the Center on Peace & Liberty, The Independent Institute, Sept. 30, 2003, <http://www.independent.org/tii/news/030930Eland.html>

13) How many tons of depleted uranium have we used and left in Iraq, violating the Geneva conventions?

“The Pentagon and United Nations estimate that US and British forces used 1,100 to 2,200 tons of armor-piercing shells made of depleted uranium during attacks in Iraq in March and April — far more than the estimated 375 tons used in the 1991 Gulf War.”

Source: “Use of depleted uranium weapons lingers as health concern,” Larry Johnson, *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* Foreign Desk Editor, Aug. 4, 2003, http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/national/133581_du04.html

US Foreign Policy

1) Is preemptive war legal?

Preemptive war violates Article 51 of the United Nations Charter (a treaty ratified by almost every nation in the world, including the US), which prohibits the use of force by one country against another except in two situations: where necessary for self-defense, or where approved by the UN Security Council.

The prohibition against aggressive war, like that against slavery and torture, is a fundamental international law. In clear violation of this fundamental law, the Bush Administration’s radically new “preemptive strike”

doctrine proclaims that the United States may use military force against any state it perceives to be hostile; any state which seeks to acquire biological, chemical or nuclear weapons; or any one that “aids” terrorism.

Source: “Bush’s Illegal War,” Elizabeth Haddix, http://www.nlg.org/news/articles/haddix_oped.htm

Preemptive force “is extremely dangerous and flat-out illegal,” says Jordan Paust, professor of international law at the University of Houston. “Implying a right to take out a regime that threatens us — that is quite threatening to the international legal order.”

Source: “As Attack on Iraq Begins, Question Remains: Is It Legal?” Peter Ford, March 21, 2003, <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/iraq/attack/law/2003/0321question.htm>

2) How many international security-related treaties has the Bush administration violated, refused to participate in, or withdrawn from?

At least nine. They include, but are not limited to, the following.

Violations:

- United Nations Charter — preemptive war; unauthorized invasion of Iraq; use of depleted uranium.
According to an August 2002 report by a UN subcommission, laws which are contravened by the use of depleted uranium shells include: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the Charter of the United Nations; the Genocide Convention; the Convention Against Torture; the four Geneva Conventions of 1949; the Conventional Weapons Convention of 1980; and the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, which expressly forbid employing “poison or poisoned weapons” and “arms, projectiles or materials calculated to cause unnecessary suffering.” All these laws are designed to spare civilians from unwarranted suffering in armed conflicts.
- The Geneva and Hague Conventions — treatment of prisoners; use of depleted uranium.
- Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty — refusal to engage in verified and irreversible reduction and elimination of nuclear forces; planning for maintenance and modernization of a large nuclear arsenal for the indefinite future (in violation of the obligation to negotiate nuclear disarmament in good faith).

Refused participation:

- Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty — does not support ratification.
- Verification Protocol on Biological Weapons — refused to support completion of negotiations on an agreement to verify compliance with the existing ban on biological weapons contained in the Biological Weapons Convention.
- Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court — in unprecedented action, notified the UN that the US would not ratify this treaty that was signed by President Clinton.
- Treaty Banning Antipersonnel Mines — has taken no action to move towards US participation in the ban on landmines as projected by the Clinton administration.

Withdrawn:

- Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty — withdrawal effective June 2002.

Sources: “U.S.: Geneva Conventions Apply to Guantanamo Detainees,” Human Rights Watch, New York, Jan. 11, 2002, <http://www.hrw.org/press/2002/01/us011102.htm>

“US Forces’ Use of Depleted Uranium Weapons is ‘Illegal,’” Neil Mackay, *Sunday Herald*, Scotland, March 30, 2003, <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines03/0330-02.htm>

Nicole Deller and John Burroughs, “Jus ad Bellum: Law Regulating Resort to Force,” Human Rights, winter 2002, <http://www.abanet.org/irr/hr/winter03/lawregulatingresorttoforce.html>

Rule of Power or Rule of Law? An Assessment of U.S. Policies and Actions Regarding Security-Related Treaties, Nicole Deller, Arjun Makhijani, John Burroughs, eds. (Apex Press, 2003).

“Arms Control Abandoned: The Case of Biological Weapons,” Nicole Deller and John Burroughs, *World Policy Journal*, summer 2003, <http://www.worldpolicy.org/journal/articles/wpj03-2/deller.html>

“A Call to Arms Control,” Jim Wurst, *Washington Times*, Nov. 12, 2001, <http://www.lcnp.org/disarmament/op->

Institute for Energy and Environmental Research and Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy Briefing Paper, "Multilateral Treaties Are Fundamental Tools for Protecting Global Security; United States Faces Choice of Bolstering These Regimes or Allowing Their Erosion," <http://www.lcnp.org/pubs/RuleofLawbriefing.htm>

3) How much is the US military budget for 2004?

\$401.3 billion.

Source: "Bush Signs Defense Authorization Bill," Fred Barbash, *Washington Post* staff writer, Nov. 24, 2003, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A9983-2003Nov24.html>

United States military spending is 6 times the next highest country's spending.

"For 45 years of the Cold War we were in an arms race with the Soviet Union. Now it appears we're in an arms race with ourselves." — Admiral Eugene Carroll, Jr., US Navy (Ret.), Vice President Emeritus, Center for Defense Information.

Source: "Last of the Big Time Spenders: U.S. Military Budget Still the World's Largest, and Growing," Center for Defense Information, March 19, 2003, <http://216.239.57.104/search?q=cache:vBr0wbneTQJ:www.cdi.org/budget/2004/world-military-spending.cfm+200+united+states+military+budget&hl=en&ie=UTF-8>

4) Open: How do you feel about the fact that we are spending more than all of the next 20 top-spending nations combined and 52% of the yearly discretionary budget goes to military expenses?

Source: See Federal Budget Pie Chart, <http://www.warresisters.org/piechart.htm>

5) Do you know how many nuclear weapons the US currently has stockpiled?

8,000 nuclear warheads.

Source: "Nuclear Posture Review Submitted to Congress on 31 December 2001," <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>

6) Do you know how many tons of chemical weapons the United states currently has stockpiled?

In 1997, at the signing of the Chemical Weapons Convention, the United States admitted having about 31,000 tons of chemical weapons, including 3.3 million bombs, rockets, artillery shells and cartridges and 315,682 binary munitions, in which chemicals are mixed in flight to produce deadly gas. The US missed a key deadline of the convention in which 45% of existing chemical weapons should be destroyed (we have only destroyed approximately 23%).

Sources: "U.S. Lags in Destroying Chemical Weapons: Likely won't meet deadline to be rid of chemical stores," Kathleen Kenna, *The Toronto Star*, Sept. 28, 2003, http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Article_PrintFriendly&c=Article&cid=1064700607877&call_pageid=968332188854

<http://www.commondreams.org/headlines03/0904-04.htm>

7) What is the administration's response to the international treaty called the "Chemical Weapons Convention," which is aimed at reducing and eliminating these chemical weapons?

The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, which enforces the Chemical Weapons Convention, has sought to examine facilities in the United States with the same rigor with which it examines facilities anywhere else. But, just like Iraq, the US has refused to accept weapons inspectors from countries it regards as hostile to its interests, and has told those who have been allowed in which parts of a site they may and may not inspect. It has also passed special legislation permitting the president to block unannounced inspections, and banning inspectors from removing samples of its chemicals. The United States, which is supposed to be the organization's biggest donor, has been twisting the arms of weaker nations, refusing to pay its dues unless they support its noncooperation, with the result that the OPCW could go under.

Source: "Chemical Coup D'Etat: The US Wants to Depose the Diplomat Who Could Take Away Its Pretext for War With Iraq," George Monbiot, April 16, 2002, published in *Guardian of London*, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/guardian>

Also available on <http://www.commondreams.org/views02/0416-07.htm>

8) How much military assistance is the Bush Administration asking Congress to give Israel in fiscal year

2005?

\$2.2 billion — \$60 million more than in 2004. Israel, which has nuclear capability, is already militarily more advanced than all the Arab countries combined and receives more US military aid than any other country.

Source: New York Times, Nov. 4, 2003.

9) According to the latest figures released by the Israeli Ministry of Immigration and Absorption, how many Israelis now live abroad?

760,000 — up from 550,000 in 2000, when the current Palestinian uprising began. This a 50% increase in population loss. The total Israeli population is 6,600,000.

Source: Nov. 20, 2003 article in The Independent, www.Independent.co.uk/world/middle_east/story

10) Open: With an increase of 50% of the number of Israelis living abroad since 2000, do you believe that our policy of giving billions in military aid is actually supporting the survival of the state of Israel?

11) Open: Arms sales worth \$2.86 billion are being pushed to Egypt and the United Arab Emirates, while the US is providing \$2 billion in military aid to Israel. Is the US supporting peace in the Middle East by increasing military aid and arm sales in the region?

Source: "US pushes Middle East arms sales," Sept. 6, 2002, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/2241144.stm>

9/11

1) Open: If 15 of the 19 Al-Qaeda members on the planes that crashed into the World Trade Centers were from Saudi Arabia, why did the US go after Iraq instead of Saudi Arabia? (Note: We do not advocate going to war against Saudi Arabia.)

Source [for documentation of 15 out of 19]: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=&contentId=A43079-2003Nov14¬Found=true>

2) Which elite American family does business with the Saudi royal family?

The Bush family.

Sources: "The Prince: How the Saudi Ambassador became Washington's indispensable operator," Elsa Walsh, The New Yorker, March 24, 2003.

"Saving the Saudis," Craig Unger, Vanity Fair, October 2003.

3) Members of which Saudi family were allowed to leave the US without even being interrogated by the FBI in the first days after 9/11 (when supposedly no air travel was allowed in the country)?

The bin Ladens — 24 members of the bin Laden family who had been living in the US were flown out of the country after first being flown by private jet to a secret assembly point in Texas. The FBI was not allowed to ask them more than a few cursory questions.

Sources: "Fearing Harm, bin Laden Kin Fled from US," Patrick E. Tyler, New York Times, Sept. 30, 2001.

"Saving the Saudis," Craig Unger, Vanity Fair, October 2003.

4) With which government agency did Osama bin Laden train?

Osama bin Laden, the famous CIA-trained terrorist, quickly became the prime suspect as federal authorities identified the hijackers, many of whom had been in the United States for years, learning to fly big jets in Florida.

Source: "Events Related To Central Intelligence Agency," Harper's Magazine, <http://www.harpers.org/CIA.html>

Some people trained under CIA command in the 1980s turned into loyal fighters for the Taliban. For example, a man who played a significant role in the advent and growth of the Taliban movement was Mullah Mohammed Omar, the current chief of the Taliban and former fighter under a CIA-trained commander.

Sources: "Lessons from History: US Policy Toward Afghanistan, 1978-2001," Reyko Huang, Oct. 5, 2001, Center for Defense Information, <http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/afghanistan-history.cfm>

“Anatomy of a Victory: CIA’s Covert Afghan War,” Steve Coll, *Washington Post*, July 19, 1992.

Some media outlets have reported that during Afghanistan’s conflict with the Soviet Union in the ’80s, the CIA trained bin Laden. Although the American government admits that it funded Afghanistan and assisted in training some Afghans, the official line — so far — is that it did not train bin Laden personally.

Source: “FAQs: Osama bin Laden,” Jessica Wong, CBC News Online, Sept. 2001, http://www.cbc.ca/news/indepth/background/wtc_questionbinladen.html

5) Were there warnings about the potential attack?

US intelligence officials had several warnings that terrorists might attack the United States on its home soil — even using airplanes as weapons — well before the September 11, 2001 attacks, according to a report released by two congressional committees on September 18, 2002.

Sources: “Report cites warnings before 9/11,” CNN, Sept. 19, 2002, <http://www.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/09/18/intelligence.hearings/>

“American Morning: Secrets of 9/11,” Nov. 17, 2003, <http://www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0311/17/ltm.08.html>

6) FAA regulations require immediate dispatch of supersonic fighter jets to intercept airplanes off course or out of radio contact. Why were these FAA regulations not followed immediately after the hijacked planes lost radio contact?

NORAD, the North American Aerospace Defense Command, has never explained why two routinely scrambled “anti-terror” interceptors on 15-minute strip alert at Andrews AFB just 10 miles from the Pentagon were held on the ground until after that target was struck.

Source: *San Diego Union-Tribune*, Sept. 12, 2001.

Retired Maj. Gen. Larry K. Arnold, who was in charge of NORAD on Sept. 11, told a national inquiry last May it was “physically possible” for the Langley Falcons to have intercepted the Pentagon plane had they been activated earlier. The FAA knew Flight 77 had been hijacked at 8:55 a.m. But instead of following regulations and procedures used at least once a week to scramble fighters to escort wayward civil aircraft, the FAA did not notify NORAD until 9:24 a.m.

Sources: AP Oct. 18, 2003; *Boston Globe*, Sept. 15, 2001.

The first pair of F-15s launched from Otis AFB on Cape Cod were capable of exceeding 1,875 mph. But NORAD’s official timeline shows the heavily armed “Strike Eagles” flew to defend their country at a leisurely 447 mph.

A pair of F-16s scrambled from Langley, Virginia, were also “12 minutes — 105 miles” away when Flight 77 dove into the Pentagon. NORAD did not explain why the “Fighting Falcons” flew to protect their nation’s capitol at 410 mph — instead of their top speed of over 1,500 mph.

Sources: “Air Force Says 911 Interceptors Flew Slow,” News Release, PR Newswire Europe Limited, Nov. 17, 2003, <http://www.prnewswire.co.uk/cgi/news/release?id=112242>

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/THO311B.html>

7) Given the following timeline, if you were the President of the United States would you enter a meeting at a school after you knew a plane had crashed in the WTC and stay 20 minutes longer after hearing that a second one hit another tower? Is this the behavior of a president interested in the well-being of his nation?

8:13 Flight controllers suspect that Flight 11 has been hijacked.

8:46 Flight 11 hits the WTC.

9:00 President Bush arrives at the Booker Elementary school. By this time he is aware that Flight 11 has crashed into the WTC and that Flight 175 is also hijacked. He sits with the children and listens to a story about a girl and her pet goat.

9:03 Flight 175 hits the WTC.

9:05 Chief of staff Andrew Card, whispers into the president’s ear, “A second plane has hit the World Trade Center. America is under attack.” The commander in chief of the American armed forces continues to sit with the kids.

9:25 Bush leaves school children.

9:31 Bush calls the crashes an “apparent terrorist attack on our country.”

9:43 Flight 77 hits the Pentagon.

9:55 President Bush authorizes the air force to shoot down hijacked planes.

10:06 Flight 93 crashed in Pennsylvania.

Compiled from: “September 11, 2001,” <http://pages.infinit.net/fmgoyeau/911c04a.html>

CNN, “September 11: Chronology of terror,” <http://www.cnn.com/2001/US/09/11/chronology.attack/>

“A Timeline,” *Christian Science Monitor* staff writers, Sept. 17, 2001,
http://www.csmonitor.com/lib/backgrounders/sept17_shell.html

On being told of the second impact by Andy Card, Bush simply went on with the school visit and listened to children reading about a pet goat. For twenty minutes. [Watch the video!]

Source: <http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/schoolvideo.html>

8) What are the FAA regulations concerning hijackings?

Here are the FAA regulations concerning hijackings: “The FAA hijack coordinator . . . on duty at Washington headquarters will request the military to provide an escort aircraft for a confirmed hijacked aircraft. . . . The escort service will be requested by the FAA hijack coordinator by direct contact with the National Military Command Center (NMCC).”

Here are the instructions issued by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on June 1, 2001: “In the event of a hijacking, the NMCC will be notified by the most expeditious means by the FAA. The NMCC will . . . forward requests for DOD assistance to the Secretary of Defense for approval.”

Sources: “Nothing Urgent,” George Szamuely, *New York Press*, Vol. 15, No. 2.

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/SZA202A.html>

9) Open: In light of the biggest security disaster in US history, why was there no disciplinary action, firing, or demotion taken against the agencies that are charged with protecting our domestic security?