

# Who were Responsible for 7/7?

## The Events on 7/7

We know what happened on July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2005: four bombs went off, 3 in the Underground and one upon a bus. Some Muslim terror was suspected and the four young men, who brought the bomb along, were the first to go. In total, 56 persons died and approx. 700 were more or less severely injured. However, in order to fully comprehend what really happened, to which evil doing the state-directed terror is able, it is recommended to read first "Who were Responsible for 9/11?"

"The bombings come just a day after London was selected to host the 2012 Olympic games, and after a world focus on London as part of the Live 8 concert events," and "The timing was very fine. It did not ruin the British Olympic bid, as the British plutocrats dearly wanted the Olympics, but it needed to happen before the G-8 Summit started" (in Scotland). These two quotations from alternative sources claims that the time selected had something to do with these two events. Possibly it does, but then rather with the last one, indeed the bombings were reported to cause faster agreement at the G-8 Summit. However, there are always some similar events that could be linked.

## Timeline of 7/7

This timeline (with exception of the text in *italics*) could be found the day after in several Internet Medias:

- 7.40am: *The four bombers leave Luton, employing that*
- 8.05am: *They arrive at Kings Cross Station.*
- 8.30am: *Start of Peter Power's terror drill.*
- 8.49 am: *Later all three train explosions were determined to have occurred simultaneously or at least within 50 seconds.*
- 8.50am (GMT): An incident on the train line between Liverpool Street and Aldgate is reported to British Transport Police.
- 9.15am: Media reports emergency services called to London's Liverpool Street station after an explosion.
- 9.24am: Police say the incident was possibly caused by a collision between two trains, a power cut or a power cable exploding. Police report "walking wounded".
- 9.33am: Passengers told that all underground train services are being suspended because of a power fault across the network.
- 9.33am: Reports of another incident at Edgware Road station.
- 9.40am: Police say power surge incidents have occurred on Aldgate, Edgware Road, King's Cross, Old Street and Russell Square stations.
- 9.47am: *Later determined time of bus explosion.*
- 10.02am: Scotland Yard says it is dealing with a "major incident".
- 10.09am: Witness Christina Lawrence, who was on a train leaving King's Cross, tells BBC: "There was a loud bang in the tunnel and the train just stopped and all of a sudden it was filled with black, gassy smoke and we couldn't breathe."

- 10.14am: A witness says that a bus has been ripped apart in an explosion in central London.
- 10.21am: Scotland Yard reports [= recognizes?] "multiple explosions".
- 10.23am: Police confirm an explosion on a bus in Tavistock Place.
- 10.25am: The BBC's Andrew Marr, with Prime Minister Tony Blair in Scotland, says the PM is "still unsure" whether the explosions are a terrorist attack.
- 10.53am: Home Secretary Charles Clarke makes a statement outside Downing Street about "dreadful incidents" causing "terrible injuries". He says Mr Blair has been informed and advises the public not to make unnecessary journeys.
- 11.18am: London's Metropolitan Police Commissioner Sir Ian Blair tells the BBC he knows of "about six explosions", one on a bus and the others at train stations.
- 11.26am: The president of the European Parliament, Josep Borrell, blames terrorism for a "co-ordinated series of attacks".

If confirmed, it lasted 26 minutes before emergency services were alerted to the 1<sup>st</sup> site of explosion, 43 for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 51 for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Underground station. Above ground was not much better according to this timetable: 27 min for aid to the bus victims. It took 1½ hour for Scotland Yard to realize that they were dealing with multiple explosions. Is this the normal sleepiness of metropolitan police and emergency services or were they influenced by expectancies to phoney alarms in consequence of the terror drill? Difficult to say but it is in itself a matter worthy investigation.

It is best to regard the news that were given by the media in the first few days, before they were given the parading direction and failed to pose important questions.

In particular, there are two items of information that soon disappeared, although they are essential for an understanding, how this could happen. The one is the *simultaneous security drill*, the other the *Israeli connection*.

## The Terror Drill

ICTS, the Israeli-owned company that handled security at the 9-11 airports, moved into railroad security only 2 months before the assault and landed a contract for the London tube (How did they get the contract? It may be a coincidence but the Commissioner of London Transport is ex-CIA [1]).

In September 2004, Another Israeli company, **Verint Systems**, a subsidiary of Israel's **Comverse Technology** announced that Metronet Rail has selected Verint's networked video solution to enhance security of the London Underground, according to an Israeli report [2]. "After extensive testing of Verint's networked video system, including pilot installation on selected rail lines, Metronet Rail selected it to be installed on the entire Underground. The system will enable security personnel to monitor passenger platforms and certain remote portions of the track," it was then reported. The British firm, **Metronet Rail**, is under a 30 year contract with the UK government and responsible for maintaining parts of the London Underground's infrastructure. This includes ensuring security in trains, stations, tunnels and bridges.

Most impressive was the interview with Peter Power, managing director of Visor Consultants [3], who were running an exercise for *an unnamed company* [it is still officially unnamed! Aug. 26, 2005] that revolved around the London Underground being bombed at the exact same times and locations as happened in real life on the morning of July 7<sup>th</sup> [4]. Peter Power is a former Scotland Yard official, working at one time with the Anti Terrorist Branch. The transcript from a BBC Radio 5 interview is as follows:

POWER: "At half past nine [8:30 ?] this morning we were actually running an

---

1 <http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/july2005/090705bombingexercises.htm>

2 <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/news.php3?id=69208>

3 <http://www.visorconsultants.com/index.html>

4 <http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/july2005/110705bombingexercises.htm>

exercise for a company of over a thousand people in London based on simultaneous bombs going off precisely at the railway stations where it happened this morning, so I still have the hairs on the back of my neck standing up right now.”

HOST: “To get this quite straight, you were running an exercise to see how you would cope with this and it happened while you were running the exercise?”

POWER: “Precisely, and it was about half past nine this morning, we planned this for a company and for obvious reasons I don't want to reveal their name but they're listening and they'll know it. And we had a room full of crisis managers for the first time they'd met and so within five minutes we made a pretty rapid decision that this is the real one and so we went through the correct drills of activating crisis management procedures to jump from slow time to quick time thinking and so on. Which bills itself as a 'crisis management' advice company, better known to you and I as a PR firm.”

This interview was interpreted as “his company was running a 1,000 person strong exercise which drilled the London Underground being bombed at the exact same locations, at the exact same times, as happened in real life.” It gave rise to another (and last) clarifying note, saying: “In short, our exercise (which involved just a few people as crisis managers actually responding to a simulated series of activities involving, on paper, 1000 staff) quickly became the real thing and the players that morning responded very well indeed to the sudden reality of events.” However, in the secrecy covering the events on 7/7 it still remains to be demonstrated, what exactly the exercise was involving and for which firm it was carried out. Roomers [5] will know that it was the Israeli-owned firm ICTS, which had recently gained the contract of taking care of security in the Underground. In the absence of truthful information, we are forced not to disregard roomers.

Looking at the timeline above, you get another impression: The enormous delay in alarm can be explained in that some sort of exercise was being expected, for which you should not bother the emergency services unless these were also involved. “The exercise fulfils several different goals. It acts as a cover for the small compartmentalized government terrorists to carry out their operation without the larger security services becoming aware of what they're doing, and, more importantly, if they get caught during the attack or after with any incriminating evidence they can just claim that they were just taking part in the exercise” [6].

Terror exercises do take place from time to time and are generally warned about in the media. This drill was not covered in advance, and after a few days, the mainstream media ceased to mention it.

## Israeli Warning

The Israeli minister of finance Benjamin Netanyahu stayed in London and was going to give a keynote address at a conference. Around the time of the train blasts – although he was not attempting to use the tube – he was given a warning of terror attacks. There is some confusion about if he was warned a few minutes before or after 08:50 – an AP story, repeated by (among many others [7]) Yahoo [8] and Haaretz, claims it given before and a subsequent AP-report [9] contained the Israeli's government's denial of a prior warning; however, given the immense delay in the public recognition what was running, this is not essential (on July 17, Mossad-Chief Meir Dagan again confirmed that Netanyahu was warned minutes *before* the first blast). This information must be weighted against the claim of suicide-bombers. The warning let him stay in the hotel. There he was called by his prime minister Ariel Sharon a little later, exactly when is not clear. We are talking about minutes, not hours as the British needed for their revelation.

On July 11, Mossad admitted to have been warned 6 minutes in advance of the blasts. They first claimed that British Police had provided the warnings of a possible terror attack, (the police denied). Seeing with how big an interest the alternative Medias grasped the warnings, the Israeli closed any discussion. In a way, the importance of

---

5 <http://engforum.pravda.ru/printthread.php3?threadid=135879>

6 <http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/july2005/090705bombingexercises.htm>

7 <http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/july2005/080705seenoevil.htm>

8 [http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20050707/ap\\_on\\_re\\_mi\\_ea/israel\\_britain\\_explosions\\_1](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20050707/ap_on_re_mi_ea/israel_britain_explosions_1)

9 <http://www.sploid.com/news/2005/07/07/story-keeps-changing-on-netanyahu-warning-111603.php>

these warnings should not be over exaggerated, the resulting confusion of public information is perhaps 'evidence of innocence,' at least what Netanyahu is concerned.

Not so innocent was the tale of Efraim Halewi, former chief of Mossad, in Jerusalem Post online edition the same day, giving details that were only made public days later, such as that the bombs exploded simultaneously [10] (they should have, all four).

## Other Warnings

As for the 9/11, although to a much smaller degree, there were financial speculations in the days before the assault, which might have some connection, although currently very speculative. The British £ fell 6% in the preceding 10 days [11]. Also the stock market showed interesting movements: on the day of the attack, the London stock market exchanged 4.75 bio. shares (av. 3.1); Mainly BP and Vodafone bought their own shares.

## The Framed 'Suicide' Bombers

There were four bombs. Four young men were killed while carrying them. They were soon described as 'suicide bombers,' a term somewhat in fashion nowadays. Were they really prepared to give their life or were they framed? And did they really know how dangerous their load was?

The police were alerted to the existence of **Hasib Hussain** when his distressed family in Leeds called the casualty bureau hotline shortly after 10pm on 7/7. Their son had been travelling to London "with his mates" and had not returned. A driving licence and credit cards belonging to the 22-year-old man were found on the bus that blew up in Tavistock Square.

Five days later, we were told that the four attackers had been identified. Identity papers had been found, so the police told that there was no need for a DNA-analysis, which, different from 9/11, would have been possible. Strangely enough, for the 30-year-old bomber from Edgware Road Station, some of his documents were found at Aldgate. One week later, we were informed that the identity of 11 of the (ultimately 56) victims had been identified, including the most blown-up four bombers. The day after, on July 15<sup>th</sup>, the Mirror informs that the four men had bought return tickets to Luton and had paid for and displayed tickets for their car. The police and MI5 thought that they were tricked by the timers, i.e. Al Qaida back wanted them killed so that they could not betray who guided them. The police stopped talking of suicide bombers [12] but the press, stimulated by the expectations and short memory of their audience, resumed characterizing them as such.

Three weeks later, the police tried to convince us that they had found 16 nail-bombs in the car, parked in Luton. Why they were found – or at least made public – so late is worth a speculation (who was involved in framing them?). Therefore, the media remained silent to the original information (seen in the Guardian on July 8<sup>th</sup>) that two unexploded bomb with mechanical timer also had been found in London.

Were the bombs brought to explosion remotely or was there a timer in each of them? Mostly we are informed about the timer (rather atypical for suicide bombers). The three train bombers all exploded within 50 seconds (as informed of on the 9<sup>th</sup>). Why the bus was blown up 58 minutes later is not explained, not even considered. If, however, you are playing with timers, it is rather easy to imagine that one of them by mistake was set up almost exactly one hour late. Or did the responsible discover that one bomb, possibly also meant for a train, was missing?

Our bus-bomber had chosen a seat on the upper floor, rather far behind – not the

---

10 <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost/JPArticle/Printer&cid=1120702711778&p=1074657885918>

11 [http://worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=45312](http://worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=45312)

12 [http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/tm\\_objectid=15742951%26method=full%26siteid=94762%26headline=was%2dit%2dsuicide%2d%2d-name\\_page.html](http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/tm_objectid=15742951%26method=full%26siteid=94762%26headline=was%2dit%2dsuicide%2d%2d-name_page.html)

ideal place to kill as many as possible, as a suicide bomber would attempt. No doubt, he did not expect the bomb to go off. He was decapitated by the blast. There was something strange with the bus as well, while it had been in the garage the preceding evening. This bus [Route 30] was tested for security for two hours by new inspectors. A brief inspection by the routine staff would be normal.

On the 11<sup>th</sup>, the police found that the monitoring video [CCTV] at King's Cross showed the four young men setting off in different directions. One of them was found mounting the stairs at Luton station before taking the 7.40am train to King's Cross. And shortly before their departure, we see all four, in a joyful mood in strange pictures outside Luton [published 17<sup>th</sup>]. Strange, because there are some indications that the fourth bomber, who was not a friend of the others and of Jamaican origin, was pasted into it [13]. Quite unnecessary, what is the difference if they met on King's Cross?

Still, the picture may prove to be an evidence (among many) which delivers the official side. Should the following note turn out to be a hard fact, one must ask why somebody took the trouble to falsify a picture and then brought it as 'proof of the act' – isn't this very act then proof of the opposite?

Here are the first few bytes from the image posted by MET police:

ÿØÿà #JFIF ## d d ÿì #Ducky # # # ÿì #Adobe dÀ #ÿÛ „ #

And here are the first few from a Panasonic NM-100 camera:

ÿØÿà #JFIF ### H H ÿá NM-100 ÿÝ #

Also note the odd size: 800x606 pixels **Conclusion:** this is not an original camera image, it has been processed (cropped and/or resized) in Photoshop before posting. This invalidates any possible proof of tampering ... Note: Ctrl- characters replaced by "#" [14]

The train 7:40 was indeed cancelled, see later. We have not seen many pictures from the monitoring cameras. Times informed that Britons (probably they are just referring to Londoners) are caught daily by 300 such cameras. What is the reason for this discretion? Has it something to do with the terror drill and possible control that the four were really taking their place in the vehicles?

The most probable explanation, why there was reason to fake this 'evidence' (see later the information that the four could not have reached King's Cross from Luton at the time indicated here) is that the car was parked in Luton to enable the return but the alleged bombers, then without their fatal rucksacks, were from there picked up by another car – and the one who hired them for the 'exercise.'

One bomb was stinking: Lindsay had bought abundant perfume and aftershave and filled it into the rucksack 'to augment the effect' as the police said on 18<sup>th</sup>. Simultaneously, they denied having found remnants of a timer at any of the explosion sites.

The three friends of Pakistani origin were told to have been jointly travelling to Pakistan in 2004 where one of them had spent 5 days at a Koran school [18<sup>th</sup>]. Later [21<sup>st</sup>] one of the three was revealed as a 16-year-old boy who was scared seeing his papers in the papers. The last I saw was a reporting from Pakistan, where a Koran school invited British diplomats to show them what was really taught there – and even if, what can you learn in five days? However, Pakistan decided to take serious

---

13 <http://www.libertyforum.org/showflat.php?Number=293817308>

14 <http://wagnews.blogspot.com/2005/07/evidence-luton-cctv-image-is-fake.html>

consequences, all foreigners in the Koran schools were expelled and these are now strictly reserved for Pakistani, who want to learn about Allah and Mohammed (and not about how to meet them prematurely). None of the four left behind any message about their intentions, and none of them were known to the police, MI5 or MI6 [15]

## Portraits [16]

**Hasib Hussain**, 18, died on the No 30 bus, which exploded at 9.47am. British citizen of Pakistani origin. Despite becoming devoutly religious, he was arrested for shoplifting during 2004. Hasib Hussain had told his family he was going on a trip to London to visit friends, but when he failed to return, the family noticed the police the same day. His family later said they were "devastated" by what had happened. In a statement they described Hussain as "a loving and normal young man who gave us no concern".

**Shahzad Tanweer**, 22, died in the wreckage of the Aldgate train. British citizen of Pakistani origin. He was a sports science graduate whose interests included cricket and ju-jitsu. In November 2004, he travelled to the Pakistani city of Karachi along with Mohammed Sidique Khan. Newspapers quoted friends who said Tanweer was quiet and very religious but did not express an interest in politics. "He was proud to be British," his uncle said, "he had everything to live for. His parents were loving and supportive." Neighbours described the graduate, who studied at Leeds Metropolitan University, as a "good Muslim". Others said he was a "nice lad" who could "get on with anyone".

**Mohammed Sidique Khan**, 30, died on Edgware Road Station. British citizen of Pakistani origin. He had been a teaching assistant at Hillside Primary School in Leeds since 2002. Parents at the school told the BBC the teaching assistant had been highly regarded by both children and parents. He had a daughter of only eight months age. Neighbours told how Khan was not well known in the Dewsbury Muslim community, but they believed he was a "very pleasant" person. One neighbour said: "He didn't seem to be an extremist. He was not one to talk about religion.

**Germaine Lindsay**, 18, died between King's Cross and Russell Square. He was a British citizen of born on Jamaica and he had converted to Islam some years ago. He was the father of a 15 months old child and his wife was pregnant with their second baby. His widow said that she "never predicted or imagined that he was involved in such horrific activities. ... He was a loving husband and father."

## The Eye-Witnesses

Fortunately, witnesses had registered the suicide-bombers – that is, we forgot to notice their names. To be frank, only one witness is known who, therefore, gave interviews to many media. Mark Faulk has analysed Mr. Jones' inconsistent stories in his web-forum [17]. It is perhaps not very important for the identity of the bus bomber but it reflects the quality of the available information:

First of all there's this guy.....Richard Jones, 61, of Berkshire. And then there's.....um, there's.....well, there's these two girls who told someone at some hospital that they saw a guy "blow up". Names? NO, we didn't get THEIR names, or their stories, and we don't actually HAVE any other witnesses.....but we've got Richard Jones!

Luckily, Jones' story is so detailed, and his account is so reliable, that we don't NEED any other witnesses. I mean, everybody has heard his saga by now.....haven't they? Well, if you haven't, don't worry, we'll tell you his story right now. Because Jones SAW THE BOMBER!

Let's start with what we know "for certain" (Why? Because Richard Jones told us!): He was on the bus just seconds before it blew up, saw the bomber with the bomb, and miraculously, got off just in the nick of time. First, let's hear what Jones had to say about the bomber:

The UK's Sunday Mail [18] said that Jones "revealed how he came face-to-face with one of the London bombers" and that Jones said that the bombing suspect "was right in my face." Then, in the same interview, Jones also said that "He was standing with his back to me downstairs at the driver's side."

The Associated Press version [19] quotes Jones from the BBC interviews as saying,

---

15 <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/politics/article301010.ece>

16 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4678837.stm>

17 <http://www.faulkingtruth.com/Articles/CommentaryToo/1037.html>

18 [http://www.sundaymail.co.uk/news/tm\\_objectid=15721018&method=full&siteid=86024&headline=7-7-london-the-witness--i-thought-bomber-on-my-bus-was-only-playing-with-ipod--name\\_page.html](http://www.sundaymail.co.uk/news/tm_objectid=15721018&method=full&siteid=86024&headline=7-7-london-the-witness--i-thought-bomber-on-my-bus-was-only-playing-with-ipod--name_page.html)

19

[http://breakingnews.nypost.com/dynamic/stories/B/BITAIN\\_BOMBINGS\\_WITNESS?SITE=NYNYP&SECTION=BUSINESS&TEMPLATE=DEFAULT&CTIME=2005-07-13-10-47-05](http://breakingnews.nypost.com/dynamic/stories/B/BITAIN_BOMBINGS_WITNESS?SITE=NYNYP&SECTION=BUSINESS&TEMPLATE=DEFAULT&CTIME=2005-07-13-10-47-05)

""Everybody is standing face-to-face and this guy kept dipping into this bag."

But then, in an article in the UK's Sun, [20] Jones had this to say: "I did not see his face because he was constantly looking down."

And in another interview [21] he said it this way: "I didn't actually see his face but he was becoming more and more anxious."

Then, in an interview with ABC News [22] anchor Charles Gibson, Jones said: "he kept pushing almost his bottom into, into my, my, my face."

"Face-to-face with the bomber"....."right in my face"....."I did not see his face"...."Standing with his back to me"...."pushing his bottom into my face." Huh? Well, at least his description of the bomb was accurate:

From the BBC News [23]: "He was standing next to me with a bag at his feet and he kept dipping into this bag and fiddling about with something."

Yahoo News [24]: " an agitated man fiddling suspiciously with a paper sack."

In the Sunday Mail: "he only got off because he was so annoyed by the man next to him fiddling with a rucksack"

The interview with ABC's Charles Gibson: Jones: " It was a, obviously, a small bag. It didn't go beyond the width of his ankles." Gibson: "The police have said that they have seen these fellows arriving at King Cross Station (sic) in a closed-circuit television, one of those security cameras, and that they had knapsacks, rucksacks, backpacks on. Is that what this looked like?" (Editor's note: Is that what they call "leading the witness?") Jones: "That's correct, well, it, it would be something, it wasn't like a large sports bag which protruded beyond his ankles. So that would be consistent."

"A paper sack"....."a small bag"....."fiddling with a rucksack"...."knapsack, rucksack, backpack"....."it wasn't like a large sports bag." This is not looking good for the prosecution. Be honest with me here. How many of you out there wouldn't be able to tell the difference between a paper sack and a backpack? That's what I thought. Okay, let's move on to the bomber's appearance:

In the News Observer: [25]: "He described the man as being about 6 feet tall, olive-skinned and clean-shaven, wearing light brown trousers and a light brown top."

The Sunday Mail: "The man was wearing hipster-style fawn checked trousers, with exposed designer underwear, and a matching jersey-style top. Richard said: 'The pants looked very expensive, they were white with a red band on top.'"

Associated Press: "He described the man as being about 6 feet tall, olive-skinned and clean-shaven, wearing light brown trousers and a light brown top."

But then, on July 15, newspapers and TV stations around the world carried pictures of 18 year old Hasib Hussain....the bus suicide bomber, taken by closed circuit television cameras just two and half hours before he allegedly blew up London Bus No. 30. [The Age](#) online newspaper ran a picture of Hussain, and said that "The image is grainy but stubble is visible on his face. He is wearing a dark jacket and dark trousers and his carrying a backpack."

"Hipster-style fawn checked trousers and a matching jersey-style top"...."olive-skinned and clean-shaven, wearing light brown trousers and a light brown top".... And the real bombing suspect? "stubble visible on his face.....wearing a dark jacket and dark trousers." And correct me if I'm wrong, but in the picture, his dark jacket, dark trousers, and shirt all appear to be blue....not "fawn checkered....not "light brown". Oh.....and he's "carrying a backpack"....not a "paper sack"....not a "small bag".

Moving on....Our expert eyewitness then got off of the bus because.....well, we'll let him tell you why he got off of the bus:

Remember the Sunday Mail? "he only got off because he was so annoyed by the man next to him fiddling with a rucksack."

From the Reuters version [26]: "Richard Jones jumped off his bus when he realised it wasn't following the usual route."

Associated Press: "Jones decided to join another passenger who said he was going to walk instead."

Back to the ABC News interview: Gibson: "Now, I understand you got off just before the explosion because the bus had been re-routed and, and really wasn't getting anywhere." Jones: "Correct. I was then able to go out the back door, the rear door of the bus."

---

20 <http://www.thesun.co.uk/article/0,,2-2005310442,00.html>

21 <http://smh.com.au/handheld/articles/2005/07/08/1120704565004.html?oneclick=true>

22

<http://www6.lexisnexis.com/publisher/EndUser?Action=UserDisplayFullDocument&orgId=574&topicId=100007216&docId=1:295395745&start=5>

23 [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/england/berkshire/4663853.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/berkshire/4663853.stm)

24 [http://news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/nm/20050709/ts\\_nm/security\\_britain\\_bus\\_dc](http://news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/nm/20050709/ts_nm/security_britain_bus_dc)

25 <http://66.102.7.104/search?q=cache:XG4Tnn7doeEJ:www.newsobserver.com/24hour/world/story/2556038p-10959128c.html>

26 <http://go.reuters.co.uk/newsArticle.jhtml?type=topNews&storyID=783378&section=news&src=rss/uk/topNews>

And finally, lets go back to the UK Sun article: "Richard stepped off the bus at his destination."

Wait, there's one more. From the Independent: "Mr Jones got off the bus - he did not know why - and started walking."

"Wasn't following the usual route"...."decided to walk"...."wasn't getting anywhere"...."annoyed by the man with the rucksack"...."reached his destination"...."got off the bus-he did not know why." And that's not all. In several versions, Jones said that he exited out "the back door, the rear door", (ABC interview), and that "we banged the back of the bus and the driver then let us off," (Associated Press), but then, in the Sunday Mail version, he said, "I had to bang on the front door and shouted something like, 'Come on, Jimmy, we want off.' About half a dozen got out the back door just before us and the same number, including me, left by the front." "Banged the back of the bus"...."banged on the front door"....went out "the back door, the rear door"...."left by the front."

While Richard Jones "expert testimony" was used to supposedly "identify" Hasib Hussain as the London Bus bomber, and whose story, excuse me.....stories.....have been repeated around the world, ad nauseam, a [witness](#) who was on one of the London train carriages has been largely ignored. 32 year-old dance instructor Bruce Lait, who was in the carriage where the bomb went off (and has the injuries to prove it), said that "the metal was pushed upwards as if the bomb was underneath the train," and "they seem to think the bomb was left in a bag, but I don't remember anybody being where the bomb was, or any bag."

Whether Richard Jones is a sick publicity hound who is trying to cash in on the tragedies of the London bombings, a pathological liar who has either gradually embellished his story or cut it out of whole cloth, or was in fact planted by "someone" to corroborate the official story, one thing is certain. His story is not credible, and is so full of holes that anything he says should be discounted as unreliable. And other than Jones, authorities have singled out NO EYEWITNESSES WHATSOEVER to the bus bombing, and public officials and the media have once again perpetuated a story that just doesn't hold up to close examination.

## Explosives Used

Immediately after July 7<sup>th</sup>, it was prominently reported that the explosions "bore all the hallmarks" of the use of a type of high-grade military explosive whose presence would indicate a sophisticated international dimension to the bombings. We were alerted to a likely al-Qaida link. China was at one time suspected of having delivered the explosives and denied it sourly [Guardian 22<sup>nd</sup>]. The amount of explosives was estimated to approx. 4.5 kg – a weight to be reported again in the pseudo-bombing two weeks later.

The police later raided another house in the Burley district after evacuating 500 residents from homes nearby and blasting down the door in a controlled explosion. That, of course, also produced some traces of explosives.

An Egyptian biochemist, Magdy el-Nashar, who had left Leeds a week before the blasts, spent three weeks in jail in his homeland because of the British accusations (many more were arrested in Britain).

Later the explosive was reported to be of the same kind as British suicide-bombers had been using in Israel. Then it was announced that tests showed the explosive to be of a home-made (or home-make able) kind that Al-Qaida were known to instruct about in the Internet (also similar Al-Qaida-free instructions can easily be found there). Then that story, too, seemed to fizzle out.

I have seen no explanation of how the initial assessment of the type of explosive could have been the reverse of the truth, and no acknowledgement of error from those who made it. Nor has the al-Qaida/internet angle been followed up. The bomb that destroyed the bus was notable for not producing fire, which is a hallmark of high-grade explosives.

Suddenly, almost three weeks later, it was reported that 16 nail bombs had been found in the red Nissan car parked at the station of Luton [27]. The car, which was rented in Leeds by Shehzad Tanweer, must have been examined very superficially at first. The late finding (at least, the late publication) was swallowed by the mainstream media without any criticism or question, why the suicide bombers had left them there and why the finding was published only after 20 days.



## Evidence that does not fit

Given the overwhelming probability that the bombers did not intend to commit suicide and the possibility that they did not know they were carrying a dangerous load, the evidences leading in that direction can be ignored here.

The information of the bus possibly being prepared and being especially diverted on its route hardly is difficult to understand. One possibility is, however, that the four 'test-persons' should meet for a joint ride on a special bus for a destination to receive their money, this being the real terrorist's chance to catch up any, should their load fail to explode, as was the case for Hasib Hussein.

What is also difficult to bring into a general concept is the isolated statement of the dancer from Cambridge, who survived the Liverpool-Station Attack: "The policeman said 'mind that hole, that's where the bomb was'. The metal was pushed upwards as if the bomb was underneath the train. They seem to think the bomb was left in a bag, but I don't remember anybody being where the bomb was, or any bag," he said [28].

## Missing Video-Evidence

In the timeline, we see that the four arrived at Kings Cross station more than 20 minutes before the drill started and more than 40 minutes before the first bombs went off. Lindsays appear at least to have utilized the time to somehow acquire perfume and aftershave. What else did they do in this time, were they greeted by somebody? We are waiting for the answer. The Guardian reported on July 13<sup>th</sup>: "The police are going through 2,500 tapes and evaluating more than 2,000 calls from the public. They have more than 100 witness statements."

On the 28<sup>th</sup>, the fair question was asked: was there "no video of the 3 bombers inside the London subway cars before they blew up?" [29]. The absence of such trails is strange since EVERY London bus and Underground train car has multiple Video Cameras (that is how Verint earn their money). If the officials continue to reject publishing any video trails, it can be understood as a confession of complicity (as FBI and other American institutions to a much larger degree have admitted complicity to 9/11 through their obvious manipulation and destruction of evidence). After all, it should be possible to show some videos without 'endangering' the mission. Only several months later, some scarce pictures were indeed shown, to distract from other crimes.

## Assumed Co-Responsibility

The police soon admitted (and the press soon forgot) that the four pals had not intended to be on a suicide mission but were framed by an early explosion – the possibility that they had no idea of their dangerous load has not been mentioned in the mainstream media I have read [see addition about the later released 'confession-video']. The strange fact that 3 bombs exploded simultaneously and the fourth nearly one hour later above the ground has not given reason to speculations in the media. At least, it was recognized that someone bigger had been involved. Of course, the arch-villain al-Qaida (without considering the Western or Israeli roots), was immediately given responsibility, whoever also joined the occasion to claim being behind.

At the medium level, two persons were suspected: The above-mentioned Egyptian 'chemist' (he is a *biochemist*), who left UK one week before for holidays at home, should have helped creating the explosives. Another man, Haroon Rashid Aswat (of Indian origin), who left for Pakistan/Zambia the day before, was suspected of being involved. So far, both men had a good alibi for not having 'pulled the trigger,' if the bombs were indeed remotely ignited.

## Cui Bono?

The old Roman clue to the origin of a crime is to ask the question, "Who benefited from it?" (*Cui bono*). It is no proof, but it often leads in the right direction. Who did not benefit

---

28 [http://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/news/region\\_wide/2005/07/11/83e33146-09af-4421-b2f4-1779a86926f9.lpf](http://www.cambridge-news.co.uk/news/region_wide/2005/07/11/83e33146-09af-4421-b2f4-1779a86926f9.lpf)

29 <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=FOJ20050725&articleId=734>

from it were the Muslims worldwide, and exactly that is the reason why the Israeli must have a prominent place among the suspects. Indeed, Netanyahu murmured a remark like 'then you can see what we are exposed to regularly.' So who profits when the Christian societies fears the Muslim ones? And which other recent actions can be seen in the same light? *That* consideration may lead towards the true criminals.

But there were also others, who rode on the same wave: in many states, anti-terror laws were further strengthened with the loss of civil liberties as a consequence. The G8-summit reached a fast conclusion and in the USA, the unconstitutional 'Patriot Act' was renewed in a sweep decision by the Congress. Since 7/7, Great Britain has been swept in 'Terroritis' and civil rights are regularly attacked by the government.

## Is there Any Connection to the Events of July 21<sup>st</sup>?

Two weeks later, three Underground trains and a bus were targets of minor explosions. What actually happened is covered in smoke – in contrast to early 7/7, the media coverage of 21/7 was more disciplined. The description of the occurrences vary from 'minor undangerous detonations' to 'highly dangerous explosives with the weight of 4.5 kg, meant to kill' but failing 4 times. Considering who were not behind 21/7 can be deduced from the fact that the explosives (if there were any) failed all four times.

Three of the new bombers were caught in Britain, one in Rome, Hussein Osman. What the other three said is currently unknown, but from Italy comes the current confession, published on 7/31 in Guardian: "I hardly know anything. **They** only gave me a rucksack of explosives to carry on the tube in London. We wanted to stage an attack, but only as a show. Who gave me the explosives? I don't know **him**. I don't remember. We didn't want to kill, we just wanted to scare people." I wonder who are '**They**,' but I do not expect any revelation of it. Unfortunately, there are also conflicting versions to this early confession.

There is some connection, but it may be as small as 4 amateurs wanting to indicate the persistent threat, or it may be an action to blur the events of 7/7. It may be both: once it occurred, it was utilized with false information for whichever reason, and given the considerable uncertainties, I prefer not to pay further attention to it.

## Wanted: Dead or Alive

With this headline [30], the Times (and with it several other papers) protested against the rude and unlawful execution of the Brazilian student Jean Charles de Menezes on Stockwell Tube Station, July 22<sup>nd</sup>. A more appropriate description is, "First we kill you, then we give you a fair trial" [31]. At least, the police soon admitted that they had killed an innocent man but also added that they would do it again by appropriate suspicion. How did it come to that?

The story changed considerably. At first (he was then called an Asian man), the suspect had jumped over the barrier to the station, was persecuted by the (civil) police, escaped into a train, where he was thrown on the floor with some policemen above him and then executed with five bullets in the head, before he could release his explosive device – in 'Operation Kratos,' Policemen were trained in Israel for exactly that purpose (Rivero from WRH that day: "His only crime was to run away from plainclothes cops, one approaching with raised gun. What would you have done?"). He should have made himself suspicious by wearing a '**bulky jacket**' on a hot day.

The story changed slightly as 8 bullets were found by the autopsy. Then the bulky jacket, potentially covering explosives, was replaced by a jeans jacket and the man did not leap the tube station barrier [Guardian, July 27]. On August 16, a British television station, citing security footage, reported that Menezes entered the Stockwell subway station at a normal walking pace, stopping to pick up a newspaper before boarding a train and taking a seat. Menezes was wearing a light denim jacket when he was shot seven times in the head and once in the shoulder [Yahoo News]. Menezes was slim – what if they misinterpreted my bulky stomach?

Currently, the murder (and the witness statement leading to it) has not resulted in

---

30 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-1706462,00.html>

31 Film: Marx Brothers Go West.

anybody being charged for the crime. On the contrary, the Independent wrote 8 months later "Police tactics for dealing with suspected suicide bombers were backed by senior officers today, despite the fatal shooting of innocent de Menezes" [32]. 'License to kill' is not restricted to James Bond.

## Mainstream Medias Cover and the Public's Short Memory

Different from 9/11, which I was only starting to dismantle half a year later, this report seeks to utilize the early information of the first few days after 7/7, before the media were disciplined. That occurred within 7-10 days. Look, e.g. on the schizophrenic description of the explosives:

Immediately after July 7 it was prominently reported that the explosions "bore all the hallmarks" of the use of a type of high-grade military explosive whose presence would indicate a sophisticated international dimension to the bombings. Then the news went silent. Then it was announced that tests showed the explosive to be of a home-made (or home-make able) kind that al-Qaida were known to know about from the Internet. How did they make that 180° turn and why were no questions raised? What happened to the two other bombs with the timer found that day (were there more bombers to be employed?) and why was it suddenly, with a great delay, reported that the Luton car contained 16 nail-bombs? The latter event points at still active forces within the British detectives, but also the altered attitude of the press gives reason for concern.

The panic news (including various arrests) was given a large presentation but their less-speculative relief were difficult to find. After it was clear to the police that we are not dealing with suicide bombers, this recognition was rapidly lost. Now, The Times, BBC and Guardian, who inspired with fresh journalism in the days after the assault, have reinvented the suicide-bombers. The short memory of the public makes any version possible; and if you repeat a lie often enough, it slowly emerges to becoming the truth.

## Responsibility Sought

As mentioned, the arch-villain Al-Qaida was instantly given credit for the bombings, for which only a simple confirmation was needed: 'Abu Haifs al Masr,' a phony Al-Qaida group, soon took responsibility for London bombings; similarly, they had also claimed responsibility for Madrid bombings and a lot of other terrorist action. There is no proof if the group exists outside the Internet.

In a videotaped message [33], Zawahiri, possibly the successor to the late Osama bin Laden, said: "You shed rivers of blood in our land so we exploded volcanoes of anger in your land." He chided the British for rejecting the "truce" offered by bin Laden in 2004 and broadened al-Qaida's agenda to demand that the West give up all political and economic interests in the Muslim world. The tape is probably a fake, bin Laden has almost certainly died at Tora Bora in Afghanistan on Dec. 16, 2001 [34].

More interesting is who did not claim responsibility. From an interesting web page, 'Prime Terror Suspects: Israeli Security Companies Have the Means, Motive and Opportunity' [35], the following is excerpted:

They have the **opportunity**. They have unsupervised access to trains and tracks at all times. They also control the CCTV. They have the **means**. Israeli security companies are usually manned by Shin-Beth and Mossad (ex-) agents and access to military explosives is no problem for them. And they have the **motive**: Israel benefits from a conflict between the West and Islam. This is especially true since Muslims are [consistently] the ones who are being accused of (or framed for) the bombings.

The Mossad agents are smart and if they were more than present at the scene,

---

32 <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/crime/article349977.ece>

33 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,22989-1722053,00.html>

34 ['Who were responsible for 9/11?'](#)

35

[http://www.libertyforum.org/showflat.php?Cat=&Board=news\\_members&Number=293829444&page=0&view=collapsed&sb=5&o=7&vc=1&t=-1#Post293829444](http://www.libertyforum.org/showflat.php?Cat=&Board=news_members&Number=293829444&page=0&view=collapsed&sb=5&o=7&vc=1&t=-1#Post293829444)

they are not to be expected to leave a clear trail behind. Where you may find some help is where non-Mossad agents were involved. Most practically, the four framed bombers died at the scene. But then, who hired the four bombers?

There were rumours in London that *somebody had tried to hire Muslim men to participate in a terror drill*. Easy to imagine the continuation: They should only carry some rucksacks with harmless explosives around in certain trains (and then a bus?). Suspected of this hiring action was Haroon Rashid Aswat, who left for Pakistan the day before 7/7. Here he was arrested but liberated within 24 hours and immediately left for Zimbabwe. He was arrested in Zambia on July 27<sup>th</sup>. The same source (Fox News), which presents Aswat as the "mastermind", also points to Aswat's relationship to British and US 'intelligence' (what a confusing name), through a British based Islamic organization Al-Muhajiroun. In an interview with Fox News (29 July 2005), intelligence expert John Loftus revealed that Haroon Rashid Aswat had connections to the British Secret Service MI-6: "*The entire British police are out chasing him, and one wing of the British government, MI-6 or the British Secret Service, has been hiding him...*" The whole of this interview is highly explosive [36].

Needless to say that his life is in utter danger. So, will Mr. Aswat live to face extradition to Great Britain and then give any further details? I don't think he will – not if he has the crucial importance indicated here. In this dense connection, there is no happy end and crimes are not punished.

### **Similarities between 7/7, 3/11 and 9/11**

There are obvious similarities between 7/7 and 3/11 (the bombing of four trains in Madrid on March 11, 2004, claiming the lives of 192 persons). Not just the usual false-trail to Al-Qaida and the identical, rapid claims from the 'Brigades of Abú Hafs al Masri' are here meant, but the strange behaviour of the secret services in both cases. In Spain, the Moroccan suspects fell victims of a bomb, reportedly a suicide action, as they were discovered by the police – how practical.

The fatal action of 9/11 (on September 11, 2001) was obviously a state-sponsored entertainment – this recognition may be crucial for setting 7/7 in the right perspective. Read for that the corresponding, much larger report 'Who were Responsible for 9/11?' Although this crime was predominantly carried out by the American government towards their own people, the presence of ICTS on both scenes, among other evidences, may also indicate Israeli active participation in 9/11 beyond the simple purpose of 'documenting' the crime for blackmailing the American government to absolute obedience of Israel.

Two quotations of identical content give the essence of this comparison: "The evidence is consistently clear that large scale terrorism is always state sponsored" [37] and "If there is anything positive [of 7/7], it is the widespread recognition ... that the terrorists and those who claim to fight the war on terrorism are one and the same people" [38]. And a final quotation seems appropriate in the End: "I do not mean to downplay the horrors that have hit London: death and destruction are death and destruction, whoever causes them" [39].

### **Later recognitions**

How to evaluate later information? At least part of them can be considered a fake produced by those who are directly complicit in the blasts – and that those have been active after July 7<sup>th</sup> is best illustrated by the obviously fake 'discovery' of the nail bombs. But then there may be reports that are basically correct, though possibly wrongly evaluated by the now prejudiced press. The first two reports may reflect these two types:

On August 24, Guardian reported [40] that "The 4 terrorists who killed 56 people in

London on July 7 triggered the bombs themselves by pressing a device similar to a button." Notice the previous disturbing information about timers and remote ignition. This information is best evaluated in connection with the public demand for an inquest in the murder of Jean Charles de Menezes by the secret service, in which the police could not resist to declare their own innocence by leaking further details. Besides, even pressing a button could be part of the game, the four framed bombers were chased into.

The same day, one could read in 'This is London' [41] that "Hasib Hussain, 18, tried to call his accomplices around 9am, but was met with silence because they had already killed themselves and dozens of innocent people in a near simultaneous attack at 8.50am." This was evaluated as proof that the bombers tried to act simultaneously. Otherwise, and to my sense more appropriately, this can be evaluated as an evidence of Hussain's innocence. For that we need the strangely secret information, what he was doing all the time since parting from the others at Kings Cross Station. Did he enter the bus instantly (most easily proved by the bus' surveillance video) or did he drive around in another train (other videos)? In fact, even if the videos stopped recording at the impact of explosion, they should show the sequences up to the bombers rising and pushing the button, as the police and most of the public wants to see.

Failure to release these videos can only be understood as admission of complicity in the assault from public sources (in analogy to FBI's failure to release the videos from Pentagon and the many confiscated pictures and videos showing what hit the WTC). Some hope can be set to this report from BBC [42]: 'The Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) ... won an important victory for its independence in overcoming initial resistance to its investigation from the Met Police. "The Metropolitan Police Service initially resisted us taking on the investigation but we overcame that. ... This dispute has caused delay in us taking over the investigation but we have worked hard to recover the lost ground".'

The hope has already been diminished. The Guardian reported on August 26 that "Mr de Menezes's immediate family are expected to visit London in the next few weeks ... The IPCC has promised that the family will be the first to see much of the evidence they have uncovered about his shooting. However, .. "There will be some material that cannot be disclosed for reasons of national security and because we do not want to prejudice any future action." It was also not very comforting to read in Times [43] that "Police watchdogs investigating the death of Jean Charles de Menezes [IPCC] believe that they have all the relevant closed-circuit television film relating to his shooting but admit that there are gaps. ... would not say whether the CCTV footage included that from the platform ... or whether there was any film from the carriage where he died." The proof that nothing is left out is now left for this investigation to deliver!

On August 25, The Independent brought the laconic message that the bus bomber stopped for a Big Mac before killing started [44]. Not the typical attitude for a suicide bomber, I should say.

The same day, the strange information appeared [45]: "The London Police claim the bombers were photographed at the Luton station, then rode the 7:40 train to King's Cross, where they were photographed again. But according to the actual train timetable, the 7:40 train was cancelled that day and even had it not been cancelled, would not have arrived in time for the men to be photographed at King's Cross at 8:26." This was a real detective work, first bringing the crucial timetable [46].

But perhaps the police was wrong and they took an earlier train? Then there are some other obstacles: The official police picture of the 4 'supposed' bombers at Luton Station shows the time 7:21:54 AM. It took our detectives 3 Minutes 35 Seconds to walk from the ground floor entrance, up and over to the ticket office, and back down to the London Platforms 1 & 3, without even including any time to purchase a ticket. The train of 7:24 left on time, so that was too close, since our framed bombers bought return

---

41 [http://www.thisislondon.com/news/articles/PA\\_NEWA1372281124907094A000?source=PA%20Feed](http://www.thisislondon.com/news/articles/PA_NEWA1372281124907094A000?source=PA%20Feed)

42 [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/4186250.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4186250.stm)

43 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,22989-1749529,00.html>

44 <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/crime/article307981.ece>

45 [http://www.financialoutrage.org.uk/trains\\_luton\\_to\\_kings\\_cross.htm](http://www.financialoutrage.org.uk/trains_luton_to_kings_cross.htm)

46 [http://www.financialoutrage.org.uk/Thameslink\\_info.htm](http://www.financialoutrage.org.uk/Thameslink_info.htm)

tickets first. The next one is possible. It was scheduled for 7:30 but arriving 8 minutes late at Luton and even more delayed, at 8:40 in Kings Cross. The train arrived, however, at Platform 4, which for the normal traveller was usually reserved for the opposite direction. The point is, however, that the police claim that our bombers were photographed at Kings Cross at 8.26 am. So, even if we forget the small mistake with the cancelled train at 7:40 am, this is really physically impossible. Perhaps that is why this video-footage will not be released?

## The Quality of the Above Informations

The problem is, that the above informations are largely given by journalists, who are totally uncritical to their sources, often cited as "anonymous sources inside the police investigation." One example of the weak evidence delivered is the information of *The Independent* [cited above from *This is London*], that Hussain made "a number" of phone calls "at least one to one of his fellow bombers" and that "he may also have spoken to the other two bombers" – to which flop is commented: "if they're talking about phone records – the only certain way of knowing – either he called or he didn't" [47]. The contribution commences with "Where does the British media find the "journalists" who write this crap? People who'll accept whatever lame garbage their "trusted" anonymous source tells them and whatever dumb spin he puts on it; people who never ask the most basic and obvious questions?" These informations are often contradictory, major evidences are withheld and the police has been openly shown to be lying to the public, as all shown above, we must be cautious. Having stressed that, I do not figure we must accept the attitude of the British police and intelligence (we are here talking of at least three different institutions, the police, MI5 and MI6, to which must be added Metrorail security authorities and politicians of different honesty and tongue). On the contrary, I believe it is possible on the current basis to consider the following, demanding the proof that it did not occur that way:

## Rewriting the Story

*Autumn 2004:* An Israeli firm, Verint Systems, get a contract with Metrorail to install their security system on all underground and urban trains in London. At this point, no decision of 7/7 was made. Remaining entries are from 2005.

*March-April:* A subsidiary of ICTS, another Israeli-owned firm, gets the contract of taking care of the security for Metrorail.

*May:* The Downing Street Memo is first published by Michael Smith in Times [48] a few days before the election. These documents proves that Blair and Bush lied their countries into war and that the decision of that was made up by the British in July 2002 (the Americans had wanted it even before 9/11). In spite of that, Blair's government is confirmed at the succeeding election. The unrest remains and may have sped up the drafted plans for the coming assault – but the decision for committing the crime was made already.

*May-June:* The unknown firm, possibly the above-mentioned subsidiary of ICTS, agrees upon the details of an exercise with Peter Power, managing director of Visor Consultants and former Scotland Yard official. Should any roomers penetrate, you can always refer to this exercise. Mr. Power is kept ignorant of the real purpose of the drill.

*June:* An intermediate person hires some moslem to participate in the terror-drill. They will get richly awarded, provided they keep absolutely tight about this job, also towards their families, and complete their participation – only then shall be paid. They shall carry some harmless bags of explosives, to be identified by search dogs, at various underground lines, starting at a given time. These shall be identified by novel devices or sniffing dogs. At least four persons agree.

*June 28:* An exercise is made, by which the four appears for several ICTV cameras. This provides footage for the later faked picture from Luton station.

*July 6:* The G8-summit starts in Edinburgh. The participants show disagreement on some important matters.

---

47 [http://www.brushtail.com.au/july\\_05\\_on/last\\_big\\_mac.html](http://www.brushtail.com.au/july_05_on/last_big_mac.html)

48 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-1650822,00.html>

*July 7, 6+ am:* The four park their car at Luton for their expected return and are picked up by the crucial fifth person and with him driven to Kings Cross Station. There they receive the fatal rucksacks, the same which had been used at the previous exercise.

*July:* An intermediate person hires some moslem to participate in the terror-drill. They will get richly awarded, provided they keep absolutely tight about this job, also towards their families, and complete their participation – only then shall be paid. They shall carry some harmless bags of explosives, to be identified by search dogs, at various underground lines, starting at a given time. These shall be identified by novel devices or sniffing dogs. At least four persons agree.

*July 6:* The G8-summit starts in Edinburgh. The participants show disagreement on some important matters.

*July 7, 8.43 am:* The London Mossad office warns Netanjahu to stay in his hotel. The claim of a previous call to Mossad cannot be confirmed.

*July 7, 8.49 am:* Three of the 'harmless' rucksacks explode, ignited by timers. The fourth, in the Northern line, fails.

*July 7, 9.20 + am:* Hasib Hussain is expelled from the Underground as the Northern Line stops. He is confused and sees his payment endangered.

*July 7, 9.30 + am:* Hussain eats a Big Mac and tries to reach his pals on mobile phones. He slowly realizes that mobile phones are not working on the underground. He then decides to take a bus to the meeting place, in order to get at least some of the reward he was promised. Nothing is known above the ground of the nature of the explosions, except to a small group of persons, and they are not interested to step forward.

*July 7, 9.47 am:* The organizers of the assault realizes that only three of their bombs have gone off. In Hussein's rucksack, there is also a device for remote ignition (another mobile phone). This is released as the boy is sitting on a full bus No. 30 at Tavistock Square.

*July 7, around noon:* Peter Power is instructed that any mention of the firm, hiring him for the terror drill, will be understood as an act of antisemitism, potentially punishable by law – at least American and Israeli. The organizers of 7/7 leaves Britain in an orderly fashion (part of them may have done so before).

*July 8:* The G8 summit closes in unprecedented agreement.

### **The confession tape:**

Almost two months did it last somebody to produce a **video**, where Muhammed Khan claimed to have caused the assaults as suicide attacks. In it, aired from Al-Jazeera on September 1<sup>st</sup>, the alleged present Al Qaida chief, Ayman al-Zawahiri, confirms his organization to be behind the bombing. If you have not read the preceding pages you may find this confession overwhelming, as it was (predictably) echoed in the mainstream media. Being selective for the weak items in this story (admitted: selectivity is also a weak point), I shall cover these here. BBC [49] (where the film can be partly seen) mentioned that "it is not clear when or where the tape was filmed." Comparing the picture in it with the one produced in school, you instantly understand what one friend did mean with "it showed him looking significantly different than he did immediately before 7 July" and one acquaintance, Irshad Hussain, with "it could have been recorded as long as a year ago ...he looks much younger there [in the video]." In The Guardian [50] you could read 'Friends claim Khan's statement was faked - "It's a fake," said one. "Look at the way his lips were moving" ... Many older men ... believe Khan ... is the victim of a conspiracy. "It's crap," said Mohammed Afsal ... member of the Hardy Street mosque. "I know people can change in a second, but I can't say he is one of them.'" The Times on Sept. 2 [51]: "He was seen in Palestinian headdress and traditional Muslim clothes. He was sitting in front of a rug or patterned wallpaper, making it impossible for police immediately to determine whether the video was made in Britain or on one of Khan's recent trips to Pakistan."

From the Times [52] we suddenly learn that "Scotland Yard knew about the

---

49 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4206708.stm>

50 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/attackonlondon/story/0,16132,1561938,00.html>

51 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,22989-1761688,00.html>

52 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,22989-1762654,00.html>

existence of Khan's video testament before it was publicly known that Al-Jazeera had been sent the tape by unidentified militants." Reversibly interpreted, the tape was in the hand of British officials for possible manipulation of the sound track. Imagine the underground is a holiday video from his travel to Pakistan and confiscated from his home after 7/7. In another article of September 3, The Guardian [53] refers "British counter-terrorism officials were yesterday sceptical of a direct al-Qaida link, insisting there was nothing in the video to suggest that al-Qaida was more closely linked to the attacks than officials previously believed." Then silence prevailed in the media, the case seemed closed with this confession, regardless of the many facts pointing against a suicidal action. In its final report [referred later], however, the Home Office "believes the tape was edited after the suicide attacks and dismisses it as evidence of al-Qaeda's involvement in the attack"

The case is far from closed but made more crooked. The tape is obviously a fraud. That conclusion does, however, leave open, if only the sound track of an earlier video (perhaps from the mentioned holiday in Pakistan) was replaced, or if another actor was involved. Speculative makes the late appearance and the knowledge of Scotland Yard of the tape before its appearance in Al-Jazeera – or shall we call *that* a confession?

## The Exercise

It came on a day (September 20) where the public needed some distraction from sad news from Iraq: Two suicide-bombers, no, I mean, soldiers on a suicide mission – no not even that: Two soldiers, disguised as Arabs, were driving in a car full of explosives; Iraqi police tried to stop them, upon which the soldiers shot two, one of whom soon after died. Later that day, there were riots in front of the prison, leaving other Iraqi civilians killed. The British officers tried to persuade the Iraqis that they had no right to arrest their soldiers, whatever crimes they had committed, but the Iraqis did not understand their arguments. Then the British forces came back in the night and liberated their two comrades (on which occasion also 150 other prisoners could enjoy freedom). Ignoring all the sad details, and in the best colonial style, the British force proudly announced that they had saved the two soldiers. This event, however, does point in a strange direction, from where the brutal terror in Iraq may come – and then it is good to have a story ready, which may bring the thoughts in another direction.

From Guardian [54] we read: "Metropolitan police released CCTV images and footage showing three of the four men believed to have been responsible for the July 7 attack on London. The images show the trio visiting London on the morning of June 28 in what police believe was a dummy run for the attack 10 days later ... Detectives found the images after discovering train tickets and receipts during searches of some the suicide bombers' homes." All papers brought this story (which does not prove anything), and BBC even adds further details [55]: "Police revealed that two bombs were found in a car left by the attackers at Luton train station on 7 July." That would perhaps be the two bombs about which Guardian told the day after, but it disturbs the finding of the 16 nail bombs. After all, this reporting proves something: the miserable quality of this information. And let us hurry back to the suicide-bombers from Al-Qaida's Western brigade. This report is not outstanding but I thought the British were not directly involved in this terror – until yesterday (written Sept. 20, 05).

## Further Development

On October 1, it is reported that the police chief of London, Sir Ian Blair, wrote a letter to the ministry of internal affairs, suggesting that the police itself performed an investigation of the murder of Mr. Menezes [56]. The victim was at that time suspected of being a terrorist and such are, as we now know, deprived of all civil rights (suspicion suffices). The independent research committee, IPPV, which after all performed the investigation, complained that the attitude of the police caused several important clues to

---

53 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/attackonlondon/story/0,16132,1561986,00.html>

54 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/attackonlondon/story/0,16132,1574256,00.html>

55 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4263176.stm>

56 <http://www.berlingske.dk/grid/udland/artikel:aid=635450>



get lost, as you can deduct from the slowly released recognitions.

On October 2, BBC reported [57] that a new CCTV picture had been released, showing Hasib Hussain leaving King's Cross station at 09:00. The picture published has no time sequence (but maybe that was cut off). Considering the amount of cameras available, we still have a number of such 'revelations' to expect, being slowly released as appropriate.

On Oct. 31, the Independent reports [58] from a seminar where the psychological structure of terrorists causes wonder. Strangely enough, the observations do not cause wonder if the three young men were indeed intended terrorists. It is mentioned that Tanweer argued with a cashier that he had been short changed, after stopping off at a petrol station on his way to London; that he also played a game of cricket the night before – a new way of preparing the meeting with Allah? The apparent confusion and disorientation of the youngest bomber, Hussain, follows the disclosure that he left the Underground system and wandered around the King's Cross area - at one point he was filmed going into a McDonald's take-away. The seminar leader concludes, "I've seen the CCTV footage of these people. They do not appear to be on their way to commit any crime at all." Start considering the possibility that they had no intention to do so either!

On Dec. 4, the same source reviewed the shooting of Mr. De Menezes [59]. Surprisingly, the police had questioned no witnesses. The responsible for the killing was named, along with other details in a comprehensible review.

On Dec. 13, it was finally revealed, that there would be no public investigation into the attacks [60]. The Government will instead publish "a definitive narrative of events."

On Jan. 29, the Independence could reveal why Mr. Menezes had been killed – and why we did not know about it before. Special Branch officers had deliberately falsified vital evidence to hide mistakes, which led to the killing of Jean Charles de Menezes. Surveillance officers had wrongly identified Mr de Menezes as terror suspect Hussein Osman. Alterations were hastily made to amend the wording of the official log once the shocking truth emerged that the dead man was not, in fact, the extremist wanted in connection with the failed 21 July Tube bombings [61]. In the meantime, criminal charges has been raised against the police officers, not for the murder but for faking the evidence after the shooting.

The official inquiry into [7/7] say the attack was planned on a shoestring budget from information on the internet, that there was no 'fifth-bomber' and no direct support from al-Qaeda ... it found nothing to support the theory that an al-Qaeda fixer .. was instrumental in planning the attacks [62]. The suicide-bombers should have been motivated by the Iraq-War [63] – to which you may ask, why they forgot to mention it themselves. In the final release of the committee on May 10 [64], it was revealed that 'the bus bomber Hasib Hussain' after his visit to McDonald stopped to buy batteries before boarding the vehicle. This detail was taken as evidence that he was trying to repair the ignition mechanism; unfortunately, the articles of Independence and Guardian do not reveal, what kind of batteries for what kind of ignition mechanism.

The new Home Minister, John Reid, said the evidence showed that while there was no "direct verifiable" al-Qaida link, the circumstantial evidence was considerable [65]. Among others, he cite Khan's 'confession video,' which even official sources and the committee report acknowledge is a fake. The question not to be asked is why Scotland Yard claimed to have known it months before it was aired by Al-Jazeera. Here is another inconsistency: The security services have discounted the theory that a terror mastermind fled Britain shortly before the attacks. Why did the police claim that Aswat had made around 20 telephone calls to the alleged bombers, and then declare that Aswat was of no

---

57 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4301512.stm>

58 <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/crime/article323476.ece>

59 <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/crime/article331068.ece>

60 <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/legal/article333104.ece>

61 <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/crime/article341765.ece>

62 [http://observer.guardian.co.uk/uk\\_news/story/0,,1750139,00.html](http://observer.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,,1750139,00.html)

63 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/attackonlondon/comment/story/0,,1745177,00.html>

64 <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/crime/article363866.ece>

65 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/attackonlondon/story/0,,1773194,00.html>

interest in the bomb investigation? Was Aswat, after all, an MI6 agent provocateur? [66].

The intelligence sources have had weak observations of two of the bombers (because they had been in Pakistan, otherwise no hard details revealed) and they found the telephone number of Lindsay somewhere, without indicating any connection. Their conclusion is typical: If more resources had been in place sooner the chances of preventing the July 7 attacks on London could have increased. After 7/7, MI5 announced that it was suspending its work on serious crime cases to focus its resources on preventing international terrorism. You understand, we need more money and more hard Orwellian laws – but we are not interested in catching the real culprits.

### **“What we learned at school ...”**

After 11 months it was finally openly discussed that all the emergency services encountered serious communications difficulties after the blasts, receiving a disrupted or limited service from the radios and mobile phones they relied upon. The disruption of the mobile net, whenever it occurred, thus also had this undesirable effect, apart from prohibiting the confused Hussain in reaching his friends. It took 30 minutes for the first ambulance to arrive at King's Cross. So, which consequences have been taken in response? Hardly any; if there was another attack today, many of the same problems would reoccur [67].

On July 6, almost one year after 7/7, the Al Qaida (West) Studio presented a new suicider's video, as usual presented by its reliable cooperation Partner Al Jazeera (Qatar). We are made to believe that Shehzad Tanweer threat with further attacks [68].

### **New witness to the Tavistock Square Bus-Bombing**

In Alex Jones' film 'Terrorstorm' [69], published in the autumn 2006, it is mentioned that Bus number 30 usually does not drive to Tavistock Square. That observation was confirmed from independent sources. Interesting is, how it came over there (and why). A passenger of the bus, who calls himself 'Daniel' (no other name) [70] reports: *"I was aboard the lower deck of the bus that was blown up on July 7th. I rang the emergency hotline to report the 2 dark cars I saw holding the bus up and diverting it towards Tavistock Square. Instead of being asked to provide a statement what followed was 7 months of police surveillance and Harassment"* [71].

Daniel proceeds: *"Standing by the doors I see a blue BMW 5 series and black Mercedes squeal to a halt in front of the bus, halting its progress along Euston Road. 4 minutes passed then a police motorcyclist arrived at the blockage. The BMW driver said something to the cyclist who soon sped off. 90 seconds later the BMW suddenly drives off. The Mercedes waits till the bus diverts east into Upper Woburn Place towards Tavistock Square before it speeds away. After very slow progress the driver suddenly opens the buses central exit doors while keeping the front doors shut, right on the corner of Upper Woburn Place some 80 meters away from the only bus stop in Tavistock Square (seen here). Many passengers got off at this point because of the delay and it was heading in the wrong direction."*

Given this observation as true (currently a hypothesis) and ignoring the roomers that the accident bus was being treated specially (above), the question of the strangely delayed fourth bomb of 7/7 is given another dimension. The observation supports the circumstance that, with a certain delay, the true hind men realize that one bomb did not go off. Possibly they spotted Hussein by means of his mobile telephone. In order not to create an excessive carnage (what was done, was already enough), the bus was diverted from its usual route at the busy Euston Road to a more tranquil place and brought to explosion there by means of the other mobile phone, already installed in Hussein's rucksack.

---

66 <http://aangirfan.blogspot.com/2006/05/london-bombs-unanswered-questions.html>

67 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/attackonlondon/story/0,,1791239,00.html>

68 [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/5154714.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/5154714.stm)

69 <http://video.google.de/videoplay?docid=5024787479139933029>

70 <http://www.the4thbomb.com/>

71 <http://www.infowars.net/articles/december2006/111206Daniel.htm>

In that case, however, a larger organization was involved, more than just a Mossad agent hiring some patsies. Spotting a mobile phone demands access to police sources and the two cars with four agents also tell some story. Currently, however, a certain reservation to the roomers is appropriate; bearing in mind that, unfortunately, an even greater reservation to the authorities, who persistently lies to us, is also necessary.

December 16, 2006

Finally in 2007, on March 22, somebody were finally arrested for complicity in 7/7. The sombre hind characters? Independent wrote the following day: "The suspects, all [3] believed to be British born of Pakistani heritage, are understood to have been under surveillance for several months by the police and MI5. They were being investigated for either offering support, or having knowledge of the 4 British-born extremists" [72]. Now, at page 18, you should finally have understood that the four young men were tricked into their death by a state-subsidised terror-act. The rest is ... *terroritis*.

Contrary to this, the courts have done some work about 21/7, only you have to filter it out from the news. The four bomb-carriers were sentenced to life imprisonment on July 11, 2007 [73]. The judge claimed they were directed by Al-Qaida. For other two indicted, the jurors did not agree on the guilt verdict and a new process will be made (hoping for equally paranoid jurors as the above-mentioned judge). Muktar Said Ibrahim, 29, admitted having assembling the alleged bombs but thereby made sure that the device was incapable of causing an explosion [74]. He denied any conspiracy to murder – still, this event remains obscure.

August 11, 2007

In a spectacular video [<http://jforjustice.co.uk/77/>], the hypothesis is raised that the four patsies indeed took the delayed train from Luton 07:48 but were too late for the show – the three trains exploded without them. Scarce news reports are than presented, indicating that the three men were killed in South London (Canary Wharfs) later that day.

January 21, 2008

In the spring of 2008, some where finally put at court for 7/7 – but wait, it was a very thin case in which three men were accused of conducting a reconnaissance mission for the bombers 7 months before 7/7. They had known the bombers for years but there journey were simply an opportunity [interestingly, this was a result of the surveillance we are also not entitled to see; we therefore strictly do not know if the alleged bombers were strictly in the trains). Although the judge, eager for a sentence, had told the jury that he would accept a majority verdict [75], the jury, after 3 weeks of counselling, reported a deadlock [76]. Maybe a new jury in a retrial, can deliver the desired majority (normally, an unanimous decision would be required

August 2, 2008

Another video [77] gives certainty to 7/7 as an inside job. Peter Power still refuses to mention the firm behind the concomitant 'exercise,' Blair condemned Moslems before he knew any details, all CCTV-cameras from Israeli firm Verint did not function that day, the patsies were too late for their assigned trains at King's Cross. One left for the bus, first No 91 (which held on Tavistock Square), then in the opposite direction No 30 (which should not have done so). The talkative witness Jones was perhaps a conspirator. The three other patsies were killed by police near Canary Wharfs. Reference to this crime can still be found in New Zealand Herald [78] and was also shown in the Canadian Globe and

---

72 <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/crime/article2383900.ece>

73 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/terrorism/story/0,,2124215,00.html>

74 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/terrorism/story/0,,2035920,00.html>

75 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2465139/July-7-jury-offered-majority-verdict.html>

76 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2008/aug/02/july7.uksecurity>

77 <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8756795263359807776&ei=Eg-TSfajLILorgKMyNnHCw&q=7%2F7+ripple+effect>

78 [http://www.nzherald.co.nz/world/news/article.cfm?c\\_id=2&objectid=10334992](http://www.nzherald.co.nz/world/news/article.cfm?c_id=2&objectid=10334992)

Responsible for 7/7

Mail [79]. Several things become obvious from this 1 hour long video.

February 12, 2009