

THE CONTROVERSY OVER "AMERICAN CONSPIRACIES"

The new book that I collaborated on with Jesse Ventura, "American Conspiracies," was published this week by Skyhorse. Following Ventura's appearances on Larry King Live, The Today Show, and The View, along with other media, the book rose to No. 4 on the Amazon list yesterday. At the same time, there was a disturbing development with a series of articles that had been requested by the Huffington Post, which led me to question whether even the alternative Internet press is really "free" - as chronicled below by NYU Professor and author Mark Crispin Miller:

BY MARK CRISPIN MILLER, "News from Underground":

As I noted in an item yesterday, Jesse Ventura has a new book out, co-authored with Dick Russell, called *American Conspiracies*, which includes an excellent chapter on election fraud and its connection to the likely murder of Mike Connell.

Well, this morning, Jesse had a front-page piece on 9/11 up at HuffPost: a front-page piece that quickly slipped *off* that front page--and then completely disappeared.

Here's what you'll find there now (or will, until they take *that* down as well):

Jesse Ventura

Author, *American Conspiracies*
Posted: March 9, 2010 11:00 AM

Editor's Note: The Huffington Post's editorial policy, laid out in our blogger guidelines, prohibits the promotion and promulgation of conspiracy theories -- including those about 9/11. As such, we have removed this post.

All that's up there now are the comments left by 65 of HuffPost's readers.

It's worth noting that HuffPost already ran an excerpt from another chapter of *American Conspiracies*, about the US "war on drugs," and they had no problem with *that* subject.

But *this* one is, as we all know, taboo. Clearly, *even to question the official story of 9/11* is to engage in "conspiracy theories" (as if the official story weren't *itself* a "conspiracy theory," and a preposterous one at that). Such is *always* the response of the US mainstream media (the foreign media tends to be more open-minded)--and it's also the response of our left/liberal media, as this amazing act of censorship makes clear.

So here is the offending piece. Please read it; and let's all try to locate the particular points that are so obviously wild and baseless that HuffPost had to kill the whole piece instantly.

MCM

Huffington Post/Jesse Ventura - Article #2 ("American Conspiracies")

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED ON SEPTEMBER 11TH?

You didn't see anything about it in the mainstream media, but two weeks ago at a conference in San Francisco, more than one thousand architects and engineers signed a petition demanding that Congress begin a new investigation into the destruction of the three World Trade Center skyscrapers on 9/11.

That's right, these people put their reputations in potential jeopardy - because they don't buy the government's version of events. They want to know how 200,000 tons of steel disintegrated and fell to the ground in 11 seconds. They question whether the hijacked planes were responsible - or whether it could have been a controlled demolition from inside that brought down the Twin Towers and Building 7.

Richard Gage, a member of the American Institute of Architects and the founder of Architects and Engineers for 9-11 Truth, put it like this: "The official Federal Emergency Management [Agency] and National Institute of Standards and Technology reports provide insufficient, contradictory and fraudulent accounts of the circumstances of the towers' destruction." He's especially disturbed by Building 7, whose 47 stories came down in "pure free-fall acceleration" that afternoon - even though it was never hit by an aircraft.

This is a subject I take up in my new book, *American Conspiracies*, published this week by Skyhorse. An excerpt follows:

Some people have argued that the twin towers went down, within a half hour of one another, because of the way they were constructed. Well, those 425,000 cubic yards of concrete and 200,000 tons of steel were designed to hold up against a Boeing 707, the largest plane built at the time the towers were completed in 1973. Analysis had shown that a 707 traveling at 600 miles an hour (and those had four engines) would not cause major damage. The twin-engine Boeing 757s that hit on 9/11 were going 440 and 550 miles an hour. Still, we are told that a molten, highly intense fuel mixture from the planes brought down these two steel-framed skyscrapers. Keep in mind that no other such skyscraper in history had ever been known to collapse completely due to fire damage. So could it actually have been the result of a controlled demolition from inside the buildings? I don't claim expertise about this, but I did work four years as part of the Navy's underwater demolition teams, where we were trained to blow things to hell and high water. And my staff talked at some length with a prominent physicist, Steven E. Jones, who says that a "gravity driven collapse" without demolition charges defies the laws of physics. These buildings fell, at nearly the rate of free-fall, straight down into their own footprint, in approximately ten seconds. An object dropped from the roof of the 110-story-tall towers would reach the ground in about 9.2 seconds. Then there's the fact that steel beams that weighed as much as 200,000 pounds got tossed laterally as far as 500 feet.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) started its investigation on August 21, 2002. When their 10,000-page-long report came out three years later, the spokesman said there was no evidence to suggest a controlled demolition. But Steven E. Jones also says that molten metal found underground weeks later is proof that jet fuel couldn't have been all that was responsible. I visited the site about three weeks after 9/11, with Governor Pataki and my wife Terry. It didn't mean anything to me at the time, but they had to suspend digging that day because they were running into heat pockets of huge temperatures. These fires kept burning for more than three months, the longest-burning structure blaze ever. And this was all due to jet fuel? We're talking molten metal more than 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit.

Probably the most conclusive evidence about a controlled demolition is a research paper (two years, nine authors) published in the peer-reviewed *Open Chemical Physics Journal*, in April 2009. In studying dust samples from the site, these scientists found chips of nano-thermite, which is a high-tech incendiary/explosive. Here's what the paper's lead author, Dr. Niels Harrit of the University of Copenhagen's chemistry department, had to say about the explosive that he's convinced brought down the Twin Towers and the nearby Building 7:

"Thermite itself dates back to 1893. It is a mixture of aluminum and rust-powder, which react to create intense heat. The reaction produces iron, heated to 2500 degrees Centigrade. This can be used to do welding. It can also be used to melt other iron. So in nano-thermite, this powder from 1893 is reduced to tiny particles, perfectly mixed. When these react, the intense heat develops much more quickly. Nano-thermite can be mixed with additives to give off intense heat, or serve as a very effective explosive. It contains more energy than dynamite, and can be used as rocket fuel."^[1]

Richard Gage is one of hundreds of credentialed architects and structural engineers who have put their careers on the line to point out the detailed anomalies and many implications of controlled demolition in the building collapses. As he puts it bluntly: "Once you get to the science, it's indisputable."

Later, Miller posted a response from David Ray Griffin, a well-known professor of religion and the author of eight books on 9/11:

Mark,

It's good to have the Huffington Post's policy on "conspiracy theories" in black and white.

So now someone needs to inform them that they cannot accept any posts that state, or imply, that al-Qaeda was responsible for the 9/11 attacks, for that is a conspiracy theory.

That has been acknowledged by Cass Sunstein, the Chicago-and-then-Harvard professor of law who was tapped by President Obama to direct OIRA, the executive branch's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (which is under the Office of Management and Budget).

In a 2009 article entitled "Conspiracy Theories," he and his Harvard co-author wrote: "The theory that Al-Qaeda was responsible for 9/11 is . . . a . . . conspiracy theory." (The complete statement is: "The theory that Al-Qaeda was responsible for 9/11 is thus a justified and true conspiracy theory.") See Cass R. Sunstein and Adrian Vermeule, "Conspiracy Theories: Causes and Cures," *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 17/2 (June 2009), 202-27, at 208.

In pointing out that there are true as well as false conspiracy theories, Sunstein refers readers to philosopher Charles Pigden, who gave this definition: "[A] conspiracy theory is simply a theory that posits a conspiracy - a secret plan on the part of some group to influence events by partly secret means." (Charles Pigden, "Conspiracy Theories and the Conventional Wisdom," *Episteme*, 4 (2007), 219-32, Sect. 2.)

So, in telling us that the 9/11 attacks resulted from a conspiracy between Osama bin Laden and 19 members of his al-Qaeda organization, Bush and Cheney clearly articulated a conspiracy theory. They and Sunstein, of course, call it a true theory; but all conspiracy theorists claim that their theories are true.

In any case, the HP did not say that it accepted true conspiracy theories and excluded only false ones (and to do this, they would need to do an enormous amount of research). They said they avoid "lending credibility to any conspiracy theories."

This means, for example, that they cannot allow President Obama say that we are in Afghanistan to "get the people who attacked us on 9/11," because he's thereby endorsing the Bush-Cheney conspiracy theory about 9/11.

What the HP policy amounts to is excluding any allegations that our own government has orchestrated any conspiracy. So they would have had to exclude all allegations about Tonkin Gulf being a hoax; ditto about the Watergate break in; ditto for WMD in Iraq (recall "the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy"?); ditto for the claim that Saddam helped al-Qaeda with the 9/11 attacks; and so on.

One would hope that the people at HP, being reasonable people, will see that they need to rethink their policy. Reading Charles Pigden's essay would be an excellent place to start.

David Ray Griffin
Santa Barbara, CA

Finally, I am grateful to Mark Crispin Miller for publishing the following review on Amazon.com today:

★★★★★ **A brave and necessary book**, March 10, 2010

By Mark Crispin Miller, New York:

It's a good thing that Jesse Ventura (along with Dick Russell, his meticulous co-author) came out with this book. First of all, he has the guts to do it--a sort of courage that is all too rare among the types (i.e., journalists and academics) who should be rigorously questioning official lies as he's done here. And it's also lucky that Ventura co-authored **AMERICAN CONSPIRACIES** because he has the sort of star power that ensures a fair amount of mainstream media exposure (although he'd certainly get plenty more if he'd come out with, say, a tell-all about other wrestlers and/or politicians). So many good Americans will hear a lot of things that they should know.

And that's precisely why this book provokes the sort of snide and sweeping put-down that we see in some of these Amazon reviews (although so far just a few), and that we're sure to hear from mainstream voices, both far-right and "liberal." The point of such derision certainly is not to help us grasp some truth: on the contrary. Its point is to discourage you, and everybody else, from even bothering to read **AMERICAN CONSPIRACIES**.

So I would urge you to get hold of it, and read it--and, most important, look into all these matters for yourself. I doubt that the book's authors would want anyone just to swallow everything they say (unlike rabble-rousers like Glenn Beck and Rush Limbaugh, who do promote "conspiracy theories" without any basis in reality). Read it, and then follow up, both by looking into these forbidden stories, and by urging others to look into them as well.