

"If Your Mother Tells You She Loves You, Check It Out"

Sean Hawkey

This is the first challenge for journalists, to make scepticism their profession, to question everything they are told, to probe, corroborate and verify everything, whoever the source. That's what journalists are meant to do, to reveal secrets, lies and deceptions, to expose the truths that hold the powerful to account and control corruption and exploitation. Scepticism is the basis of justice.



Watergate...check it out. Enron...check it out. The Iraq dossier...check it out. But what about 9/11? It remains unquestioned in mainstream media with one notable exception. Canadian media critic and TV producer Barrie Zwicker claims to be the only journalist anywhere in the world to broadcast a refutation of the official explanation for 9/11 on national television. I met him recently at a media conference on 'Truth and Trust' in Vancouver, Canada.

"Picture this" says Zwicker, "two planes have crashed into the world trade centre and a third hijacked plane is speeding to Washington. The airspace over Washington, over the White House and the Pentagon, must be the most heavily guarded airspace in the world. Everyone - and I mean everyone - now knows these planes are very bad news. Even if you believe that the intelligence services didn't know beforehand, at this stage it's been reported on all TV networks for more than half an hour that this is a terrorist attack. But no military planes are scrambled, not one. Think about it."

As Zwicker is saying this I begin to think through possible explanations like lack of procedures for such unique events, or incompetence. He goes on to compare what happened on September 11 to the standard response for deviating aircraft: "just to take one example, look at the day the Learjet carrying golfer Payne Stewart crashed" he starts reading: "this from the official National Transportation Safety Board crash report:

9:19 a.m. the flight departs;

9:24: The Learjet's pilot responds to an instruction from air traffic control;

9:33: The controller radios another instruction.

No response from the pilot. For 4 1/2 minutes the controller tries to establish contact.

9:38: Having failed, the controller calls in the military...

It's standard procedure, followed routinely, to call in the Air Force when radio contact with a commercial passenger jet is lost, or the plane departs from its flight path

9:54 - 16 minutes later - the F-16 reaches the Learjet at 46,000 feet and conducts a visual inspection.

Total elapsed time: 21 minutes.

So what does this prove? Well, it proves that all personnel in the air and on the ground are trained to follow routines, which have been fine-tuned over decades, as the Learjet incident illustrates. For large scheduled aircraft, which are tracked on radar, to depart extravagantly from their flight

paths would trigger numerous calls to the military, especially after two have hit the World Trade Centre and now one is speeding toward Washington, D.C."

I'm forced to admit that this doesn't seem to fit with the official narrative of events that day. "OK, so now the media need to ask if there were 'stand down' orders".

He throws up his hands and laughs: "this isn't just an unanswered question, it's still an unasked question".

Before burying me with a volley of other troubling questions, Zwicker tells me there are 500 other unresolved questions that all seem to point in the same direction, he told me to read at these at www.unansweredquestions.org where growing numbers of people, ranging from aeronautical industry experts to the members of the security services, add their own detailed professional analyses and evidence.

Working for Vision TV, a multi-faith public service broadcaster in Canada, Zwicker has aired these big questions on a series called "The Great Deception" exposing inconsistencies in the official story, and going on to ask the burning questions that arise.

"Incompetence?" he asks rhetorically, then presents an array of evidence, quoting dozens of sources in detail and concluding that it cannot be, he goes on: "Collusion, complicity, actual involvement?... Did American military forces sweep the way clear for suicide bombers?... What was and what is the relationship between the CIA, Bin Laden and Al Qaeda?"

Zwicker announces that this is the "Achilles heel of the Empire, this is the foundation of the so-called War on Terror... it is all based on us believing the official and incredible line on 9/11" .

If this breaks as a true story, and Zwicker believes it eventually will, he will be the new Woodward and Bernstein of Watergate fame rolled into one, more than just a hero in journalism. But for the moment his hypothesis and conclusions have made him a pariah, questioning the official version is still a taboo subject largely un-investigated by journalists, despite the surprising near unanimity at the conference that elements of the official version were just unbelievable.

As the credibility of politics declines, so does that of journalism if it fails to resolve issues we know don't make sense. If it seems to us that we are not being told the truth about the Iraq dossier for example, then we cannot be satisfied by the media unless they relentlessly pursue the issue and expose the lies. The credibility of the media depends on it. If the media don't ask these questions, whatever the answers, then we can't trust them any more.

Zwicker makes a final appeal: "fellow journalists, the dots exist. For goodness' sake, connect them, while you can".

9/11...check it out.

A video of 'The Great Deception' is available from Vision TV
<http://www.visiontv.ca/>

Other sites of interest:

www.911-strike.com www.911pi.com
www.globalresearch.ca
www.truth-now.com
www.copvcia.com

www.whatreallyhappened.com
www.unansweredquestions.org
www.communitycurrency.org/9-11.html
www.americanfreepress.net
www.cooperativeresearch.org
www.ratical.org/ratville/CAH
www.globalresearch.ca
www.gnn.tv
www.thewaronfreedom.com
www.deceptiondollar.com
www.falloutshelternews.com
www.tenc.net
www.onlinejournal.com