

**Prescription for American 9/11 Truth Movement:
Diversity and Civility in Discussion, Unity in Action.**

Webster Tarpley broadcasting with 9/11 Truth authors Gerhard Wisnewski and Andreas von Buelow (Germany) and Thomas Meyer (Switzerland), on his World Crisis Radio Show on RBN Live on Sept. 9, 2006, from Kandern-Holzen, Germany, near the point where France, Germany, and Switzerland come together.

Tarpley: Since we have the 5th anniversary I'd like to make a few comments of my own about the state of the movement in the US.

We've got a round table here going of the leading experts in Central Europe. You might think to yourself it might not be possible to assemble the leading experts in the United States around the same table because of the unfortunate atmosphere that has broken out in our movement....

I wanted to propose from my point of view the following formula for how we can cooperate, because I think this is obviously what we need to do. Don't be scandalized by the word cooperation.

We have to recognize that on the one side there is a sphere of theoretical discussion. In this any serious scientific hypothesis, historical, philosophical hypothesis can be discussed, should not be banned, should not be censored.

We don't want people coming talking about men from Mars or the intervention of the Holy Ghost or the equivalents in other religions, but a theoretical discussion should always go on. At the same time though, we also have now a mass organizing dimension which simply was not there in past years, when people thought that the 9/11 movement amounted to a series of list serves...

In our movement there has to be a sphere of theoretical discussion, which has to be done in a business-like and respectful manner, without slander, without defamation, without *ad hominem* attacks on every page.

And then in addition to that we've got the sphere of mass organizing. Certain tasks simply have to be done, and in order to do them you've got to join with other people, who may not have exactly your views on this or that theoretical question.

And if you make the theoretical question a reason not to join in, in united front cooperation, then your motives are perhaps not what you might think they are.

We've got to organize websites, we've got to organize large conferences, we've got to support 9/11 truth candidates, like Bob Bowman, like Carol Brouillet, and Craig Hill in Vermont.

We've got to go for the impeachment of Bush-Cheney with the 9/11 crimes as the first item on the agenda. We've got to carry out drill monitoring, we've got to expose, denounce and shut down those weapons of mass destruction drills that threaten to go live. We've also got to think about what to do if the war is widened, if there is an attempt to call off the elections, to impose some kind of dictatorship. We've got to begin bringing the American people to the point that we saw in Spain in March 2005, when that legendary general strike shut down the country and forced the neo-fascist Aznar to back down from his plan for a dictatorship.

So in other words, we have a political movement.

Now we have a movement where one guy says, I see a dot. The next guy says, No dot. I see a bulge, or a pod. No bulge or pod, says the other side. One says, I see planes. The other side says, I see no plane. One guy says, It's an atomic bomb. No, a hydrogen bomb, says the next. These are of course important questions. But again, the mystery novel is a whodunit, not how-done-it, and the question of the technical means used has to take second place to the overarching political question: Who did it? Who carried this out? And there of course, the touchstone, the basis of the movement, now I think it's fair to say, 5 years into the discussion, is MIHOP, made it happen on purpose. That the US government or parts thereof as we wish to define it – and this can be done in many ways – executed, brought out and conducted these actions, in my view through drills, maneuvers, exercises and so forth.

This is the political basis of cooperation, and once we have the political basis, the technical questions can also be handled, but within that context of broad cooperation.

Let me ask Gerhard Wisnewski: You and I were together in Berlin, with 12 or 13 people from the German movement, and it was a very business-like discussion basically among friends, and at the end, this was the foundation of *Das Netzwerk*, the German 9/11 network, including a new website, and including what warmed my heart in particular, a strong endorsement of the idea of the independent international truth commission, which is obviously one of the main mass-organizing tasks that we have – an Independent International Truth Commission modeled on the Russell-Sartre tribunal, that could provide a forum not only to amplify the work of the research community that we represent, but also to have an airing, an impartial airing, of theoretical issues inside the movement. Maybe you could say something about that meeting in Berlin, a little bit of who was there, and what came out of it.

Gerhard Wisnewski: Yes, thank you Webster. We had about 13 people here from Germany: the leading people of the German 9/11 movement, including Andreas von Bülow, Matthias Broeckers, and other people who are well-known here in Germany. We tried to establish a network, a research network about 9/11, because before we were single people, individuals who wrote their books, articles, their websites, and now we try to come together in this network. I'm very sad to hear these things about the US, and these detailed discussions, this detail war on several issues. I think it's impossible that two people are 100% of the same opinion on what happened on 9/11. There is so much information and details, and I think we should not start a war on these details because this would be exactly the thing the opposite side wants us to do now, and I totally agree with Webster that this is the second step, the technical aspects and details, and first of all, we have to do a lot of research together: Who did, and who performed this operation on 9/11? And I would be very happy if the American movement would come back also to this method of work.

Tarpley: One other person I've talked to in Europe about this, Simon Aronowitz in London, was telling me about a week ago: You have shop talk, you have a research discussion, which is your shop talk. But you've also got things like stopping the Third World War, getting the truth out to the largest possible number of people, and somehow you've got to make these things coexist.