

# maðkur í mysunni

ni spørsmål til Elias Davidsson

Når og hvor ante du ugler i mosen rundt World Trade Center? Hva gjorde du da, og hva gjør du nå?

I only became aware of anomalies in the official account after coming across Thierry Meyssan's books, about one year after 9/11. Until then I did not suspect anything wrong in the official account and shared many Leftists' belief that the attacks of 9/11 were a violent response to US foreign policies.

Du mener den offisielle fortellingen er en myte? Sett at den er det, hvordan kan det ha seg at media ikke avslørte myten, eller at Det hvite hus fikk med seg både NATO og FN på krigene mot Afghanistan og Irak?

Yes, the official account is a myth. The question why the media did not expose the myth and how the US could obtain the approval of NATO for the war against Afghanistan (the UN did not explicitly approve the war but condoned it), is very complex. Various authors have attempted to shed light on this question. A number of concepts have been invoked in this respect, such as denial, «willful blindness», and «group mind». Two important facts must be borne in mind: The events of 9/11 were designed to become dramatic media events. From the first moment, media were fed with insinuations about the responsibility of Osama bin Laden and discoveries of items pointing to that direction, such as a Qur'an in an abandoned rental car, flight manuals in Arabic and a will in Arabic. The propaganda machine worked day and night from the first moment to exclude any other perspective of the events. Facts that might have undermined the official story were not allowed to blur the clear image people had.

At the decision centers, such a policy was certainly willful. Most media were, however, only relays to the few main news agencies. Their complicity in maintaining the official story was not intentional, at least not shortly after 9/11. The other fact is Western journalists had no difficulty in believing that Osama bin Laden and Arabs would commit the 9/11 atrocities. Belief in alleged Arab/Muslim violence has been part and parcel of Western culture for decades.

Journalists did not find it necessary to ask questions about the evidence. Unsubstantiated and unattributed reports emanating from US intelligence and law-enforcement were

published as truths. Both facts contributed to the creation and consolidation of the 9/11 myth.

Later, when contrary information was discovered, it became difficult for those who had already committed themselves in writing to the official story and actually served as powerful relays for that story, to back down and admit that they had been deceived and deceiving. It requires substantial courage to admit having misled a whole population, even if such deception can be attributed to external causes. To this psychological factor must be added the group-psychology which developed after 9/11, which made it difficult for any person to stand up, rather lonely, and challenge the official view. Finally, journalists would speedily find that straying from the official line might hurt their career or even risk their jobs.

This happened even to tenured professors.

As for NATO (and the UN), certainly some of the above psychological forces were active. However, it is my opinion that other considerations were equally at work, particularly the benefit they considered accruing from attributing terrorism to Al Qaeda. This was evident in the case of Russia, China and other countries where Muslim minorities were struggling for rights and the government relished to have an opportunity to declare such struggle as terrorism. In the case of NATO, the story of 9/11 permitted the establishment of a new, common, enemy which would justify the maintenance of the Atlantic Alliance and increased military and security spending. This was an urgent need after the demise of the Soviet bloc. NATO states had no incentive to question the official account, whatever the private beliefs of individual NATO leaders.

The myth was beneficial for the maintenance of the Atlantic Alliance, for the military establishment in the various NATO countries, for arms and hi-tech industries and permitted liberticides policies.

Da jeg var på Island i 1999, kjøpte jeg en bok om Islands historie. Her fant jeg at Tyskland først overtok herredømmet etter danskene, før amerikanerne så overtok voldsmakta og militærbasene etter tyskerne.

Da islendingene ville kaste alle ut og være selvstendige etter dette eventyret, gikk USA først med på dette. Det som overrasket meg mest i denne boken, var at det sto at USA så brukte Korea-krigen i 1950 som argument for å beholde basene på Island...

Hvordan er Islands forhold til USA idag? Har dere fx soldater med i «Terrorkrigen»? Og stemmer det at US Army nå har forlatt sagaøya?

The attitude of Icelandic governments to the United States has been more or less constant since World War II. They have considered the US as an important friend and

ally and supported US policies on most (though not all) issues. Such support was directly related to that of NATO. In other words when NATO had a common position on an issue, Iceland supported the US. Sometimes Iceland would support the US even when no common NATO position had been taken. Even when center-left governments were in power, such attitudes continued. The current Icelandic government supports US wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in spite of wide public opposition to the Iraq war (the war on Afghanistan has not been a real public issue).

Yes, the US military has left Iceland, after more than half a century. The US base at Keflavik is now empty.

Does that mean that Iceland has actual troops in those countries? And thus have you formed or are you now forming your own Icelandic army, after not having had Icelandic soldiers for how many years? Surely, such a transition must have been followed by some sort of public debate?

No. Iceland has no army, and thus no troops. I wonder what have these questions to do with 9/11, which I thought was the theme of your inquiries.

Simple. The Afghan and Iraqi adventures are clearly a part of the ongoing Operation Terrorstorm, aka WWII, and I think most of the readers do not know that it so far has resulted in the full demilitarization of Iceland, whilst Norway for the first time since 1111 is invading another country. With this background, what has the public debate on 9/11 been like in Iceland, and what reaction has your writing on the subject brought?

There has been no debate in Iceland on 9/11. In the discussion about the demilitarization of Iceland the 9/11 issue has not entered. I have had about 3-4 opportunities to address 9/11 in the media during the last 2-3 years. The reactions have been rather positive. I believe that a substantial segment of the public is aware that the official account on 9/11 is dubious. I have encountered a number of people who claim to have suspected this fact from the first moment. In spite of such wide awareness, which transcends political affiliations, most people have remained in total disconnect, as if the US which masterminded 9/11 is another US with which Iceland continues to cooperate intensively, namely a totally different state. The political class, from right to left, has avoided a debate on 9/11 like the pest. I suspect that their fear to discuss 9/11 is related to the political consequences that the truth might entail. Even the Green-Left Party, which officially stands for Iceland's exit from NATO, has refused to address 9/11, let alone connect it to NATO. Yet, taking firmly up this issue might lead the Party to become the main party in Iceland, when people will realize that all other parties are covering up a crime. The Green-Left are just not courageous enough and do not realize the political capital they can earn by espousing this issue.

Kan du se inn i krystallkulen og se hvilke konsekvenser avsløringen av 9/11 vil få for NATO-landene, eller for en militærallianse som NATO?

This is a tough question. There are various possibilities. One is that NATO states will find some way of isolating 9/11 and its perpetrators in order to dissociate themselves from this crime (claim that they were deceived by the perpetrators). This would be the way to save NATO. Much depends on the readiness of mass media to follow. Another possibility is that the movement which brought 9/11 to light would continue its struggle against those who covered up the crime, including NATO, the media and established politicians. I do not feel in a position to foresee the consequences. However, I find it desirable that the exposure of 9/11 would lead to a wide public awareness of the nature and extent of the cover-up, and to a strong movement for democratic renewal. This depends very much on the readiness of civil society, the trade union movement, the Left, human rights movements, the peace movement, the churches, to join in rebuilding a democratic society and an accountable political leadership.

Her i Oslo sa Condoleezza Rice på torsdag (26/4) at Putins bekymring for rakettskjoldet i Polen og Tsjekkia var latterlig, men er det ikke mer latterlig at hun påstår skjoldet er rettet mot angrep fra Iran og Nord-Korea? Jeg kan vanskelig se for meg at Korea vil angripe USA via polsk og tsjekkisk luftrom...

Er det ikke etter din mening rimelig åpenbart at NATOs satsing på Star Wars-rakettskjold i Russlands naboland retter seg mot Russland, snarere enn Iran og Korea? Rakettskjoldet og stjernekrigen sto jo øverst på USA-militærets dagsorden også før 9/11.

Webster Tarpley mener i alle fall (i [World Report 26. april](#)) dette er en del av implementeringen av USAs *nuclear first-strike*-strategi overfor Russland.

My answer is an obvious yes.

Let's jump back to 9/11 itself and US (and possibly NATO) media complicity. Don't you think some kind of mafia-tactics were involved here, some form of rough pressure on media moguls, maybe involving threats to their life or family if they did not comply? Or how do you figure the media were brought into the big plot?

Well, first I believe that threats to life are extremely rare. Media moguls do not act because of threats to life or even to their jobs. They have been chosen because they have internalized the ideology of the ruling class. They are paid handsomely and they have learned to keep unpleasant stimuli away. Most media workers know what is expected from them. They need not to be ordered around or threatened. If a journalist strays a bit too far from the given line, it requires only a small reminder from the boss to bring him to the line. A fine documentary on how the media functions was shown on PBS and made by

Bill Moyers in the US. He interviewed numerous media people in the US who explained why the media collaborated in preparing the Iraq war. There was certainly pressure but this pressure was mostly subtle, not overt. I know quite a few journalists in Iceland and have talked to them. They made it clear to me what awaits them if they stray from the imposed line: They would perhaps be transferred to less interesting jobs; they would not be asked to interview ministers; they would not be sent abroad for reportages; etc. Often this occurs without the journalist even aware of why he is being sidelined.

It is a fact of life that most people are careful not to endanger their source of income. Only those who have little to lose can afford to be courageous. This explains why students are traditionally the most radical group in society and family people become much more conservative and cautious. This fact explains why few people in rich societies are willing to stand up against the system and expose injustice in their own society. However, it is easy to denounce injustice overseas.

Du bidrar jo i den nye boken til James Fetzer, «The 9/11 Conspiracy». Hva er det du kaller «the double fraud» mot menneskeheten? Hvordan mener du terrorkrigen er en «double fraud»?

As I explain in the book, we have two frauds, one inside the other. The outer fraud is that pertaining to the «terror threat». In fact terror was never a threat except when the State used terror (as under Robespierre, Stalin, Hitler, etc). Small-scale terrorists are certainly causing individual victims harm and a personal tragedy. Attacking innocent human beings is irresponsible, unethical and criminal. However, terrorism is only a minuscule part of crime. In Europe alone about 20,000 people are murdered annually. Of those only a few dozens die from terrorism (if at all). Last year, 2006, for example, not a single person died in Europe from terrorism. To maintain - as NATO and its members do - that terrorism is a serious threat to Europe or to world peace, is a blatant lie. It is fraud.

The second fraud is the story that 9/11 was a massive act of international terrorism, i.e. an act planned and perpetrated by an organisation named Al Qaeda fighting in the name of Islam against the West. This story enabled the launching of the fraudulent «war on terror». The reasons why I consider the official story on 9/11 a fraud, are partly included in the text of the chapter to which you refer. Actually, these reasons are today common knowledge among all serious researchers and need not be elaborated upon here.

Mange takk for intervjuet!

It's my pleasure, Torstein.