

Intelligence and the 9/11/2001 Events

by Servando Gonzalez



September 10, 2022

We are approaching another anniversary of an event that transformed America: the 9/11. It justified the creation of Office of Homeland Security, an aberration typical of totalitarian regimes that, under the pretext of protecting us from terrorism, curtailed many of the freedoms guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. Moreover, it created the state of mind that justified the acceptance of losing even more freedoms allegedly to protect us from an invisible virus.

So, in this new anniversary of the event that changed America it is appropriate to study it from the rational, non-emotional perspective of intelligence.

According to the Joint Chiefs of Staff's *Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, *intelligence* is the final product resulting from the collection, processing, integration, analysis, and interpretation of available information.[1] So, even though the term intelligence comprises something much more complex, we may safely accept the shorter definition that intelligence is just information after it has been properly evaluated.

In its advisory report to the U.S. Government, the 1955 task force on Intelligence Activities of the second Herbert Hoover Commission stated that: "Intelligence deals with all the

things which should be known in advance of initiating a course of action.”[2] A true expert in the subject gave a similar definition more than 2000 years ago. According to Sun Tzu, “the reason why the enlightened prince and the wise general conquer the enemy whenever they move and their achievement surpass those of ordinary men is foreknowledge [intelligence].”[3]

Though the definition of intelligence is very simple and straightforward, most authors dealing with the subject confuse it. Some of them use the terms information and intelligence as synonyms, when it is obvious that they are not. Others even have used the term “raw intelligence” as a synonym for information, but, as we will see below, contrary to information (which might contain misinformation and disinformation), intelligence is a very elaborated product; there is nothing raw in it.

The evaluation of information, also known as appraisal or assessment, has to do with the analysis of a piece of information in terms of credibility, reliability, pertinence and accuracy, to change it into intelligence. The evaluation of information is accomplished at several stages within the intelligence cycle [4] with progressively different contexts.

The evaluation or appraisal of a particular item of information is indicated by a conventional letter-number system.

Reliability of the Source

- A, Completely reliable
- B, Usually reliable
- C, Fairly reliable
- D, Not usually reliable
- E, Unreliable
- F, Reliability cannot be judged

Accuracy of the Information

- 1, Confirmed by other reliable sources
- 2, Probably true
- 3, Possibly true
- 4, Doubtful
- 5, Improbable
- 6, Accuracy cannot be judged

The evaluation of information simultaneously takes into consideration both the reliability of the source based on its previous performance and the credibility of the information itself. The process involves a check against intelligence already in hand and an educated guess as to the accuracy of the new information based on how well it dovetails with previous intelligence.

Though independent, the two aspects cannot be totally separated from each other. The authoritativeness of the source, which may not necessarily coincide with its reliability, can never be ignored, though it is sometimes overrated in the light of the credibility of the information—something that has to do with the expectations of the people involved in the evaluation process. But people, including intelligence analysts, tend to believe what they suspect or expect to be true, or what better fits their personal needs, so there is always an element of bias in any evaluation of information.

It must be emphasized that both evaluations must be entirely independent of each other, and they are indicated in accordance with the system shown above. Thus, information judged to be “probably true” received from a source considered to be “usually reliable” is designated as “B2”.

One must keep in mind that the question of what is authoritative and what is not is very relative. A highly authoritative source may produce credible information, but the intelligence officer must always ask himself the question “Why?” The higher the authoritativeness of the source, the higher the possibility that it may be biased or had been compromised and, therefore, the higher the danger of disinformation. Highly authoritative sources from totalitarian governments may not always tell the truth, to say the least, but highly authoritative sources from democratic countries may not be very reliable either. There is evidence that the CIA has been involved in recruiting scholars at the most

prestigious American universities and journalists in the most influential American media. Also, there is suspicion that the KGB, the Mossad, and even the Cuban intelligence services, among others, have done a good job penetrating American universities and media.

Bias in evaluation can never be fully eliminated in an intelligence service and, more importantly, in high government circles. Moreover, creating evaluators to evaluate the evaluators can only compound it. Within the intelligence establishment, the only effective safeguard lies in the individual competence and quality of its members. Even more important is their intellectual honesty and personal courage to face pressures from above.

One must always bear in mind that no source can ever be regarded as infallible and no single bit of information can ever be regarded as totally accurate. Whatever the case, the chances for error, misinterpretation, misunderstanding and deceit are too high to blindly trust any information. Super patriots, doctrinaire partisans, court historians, bureaucratic climbers, people of provincial outlook, enemy moles –all of them are potential dangers to sound information evaluation. Perspective, perspicacity, worldliness, a soundly philosophical outlook, the knowledge and sense of history, and perhaps a bit of skepticism and a sense of humor – these are the qualities of an intelligence analyst that minimizes error in the interpretation and evaluation of information.

The 9/11, 2001, Events

All the initial information the American people received about the 9/11 events came from a single source: the American government. With the single exception of Congresswoman Cynthia MacKinney, who since the very beginning dared to question the U.S. Government's version of the events, nobody in the two branches of the Republican Party questioned it. The American mainstream media as a whole accepted the Government's version

of the events and became an obedient mouth-piece parroting it over and over *ad nauseam*, and is still doing it.

Actually, the only dissenting source of information about 9/11 has been the Internet and books published by minor independent presses. But the U.S. Government, like all governments around the world, is made out of politicians, and politicians have never been a source of truthful information.[5] Moreover, the current U.S. Government is fully under the control of the CFR conspirators, whose openly expressed goal is to destroy the U.S. and implement a totalitarian New World Order. Consequently, I will qualify the only source of the 9/11 information, that is, CFR secret agents in the US Government, with a D: Not usually reliable. Now I will take a look at the accuracy of the information itself.

Probably the main characteristic of truthful information is that fits with past similar information that has proved to be true. Of course, there is a first time for everything, and the fact that a similar event has never happened prior to the present event is no sure indication that it cannot happen. But, in the analysis of historical events, we have the added advantage that we can add to the evaluation of the information the occurrence of similar events in which the information has proved to be true or not, after the one in question.

Consequently, the evaluation of the information itself in the case of historical events is a process involving a check against intelligence already in hand about similar events before and after the event in question. It also involves an educated guess as to the accuracy of the information related to the event based on how well it fits with this intelligence.

In the case of the 9/11 events, the evidence shows that, never before or 30 years after 9/11/2001, has a skyscraper with a steel structure collapsed due to a fire. It also shows that, never before or after 9/11/2001, a skyscraper has collapsed on its own footprint except as the result of controlled

demolition.

This is why companies who do controlled demolition are paid large amounts of money to do their job.

Examples abound:

July 28, 1945: A B-25 bomber crashed against the Empire State Building in Manhattan, destroying most of the 79th floor. Flames consumed most of three floors down to the 75th. But the building, the tallest New York skyscraper at the time, did not collapse.

August 5, 1970: 1 New York Plaza, a 50-story office tower, suffered a severe fire and explosion. But it didn't collapse.

October 26, 1986: 15-story Alexis Hihon Plaza, Montreal, Canada. After an 18 hour fire only the 11th floor partially collapsed.

May 4, 1988: The First Interstate Bank Building is a 62-story skyscraper in Los Angeles that suffered the worst high-rise fire in the city's history. But the building didn't collapse.

February 23, 1991: One Meridian Plaza, a 38-floor skyscraper in Philadelphia, suffered a severe fire. Philadelphia officials later described it as "the most significant fire in this century." But the building did not collapse.

October 17, 2004: The tallest skyscraper in Caracas, Venezuela experienced a severe fire. The building did not collapse.

February 12, 2005: A violent fire started in the Windsor building in Madrid, Spain, a 32-story tower. At its peak, the fire, which burned for almost a day, completely engulfed the upper ten stories of the building. During the night the building shredded large pieces, which crashed to the ground, but the building did not collapse.

February 9, 2009: a fire destroyed the nearly completed

structure of the Beijing Mandarin Oriental Hotel. But, despite the fact that the fire extended across all of the floors for a period of time and burned out of control for hours, no large portion of the 520-foot-tall building collapsed.

November, 2010: An apartment building in Shanghai caught fire and 53 people died. It burned for more than four hours. The building did not collapse.

April 2, 2012: A violent fire engulfed the still under construction Russian Federation tower, the tallest-to-be building in Moscow. After many hours, the firefighters extinguished it. The building did not collapse.

April 3, 2013: A 40-story skyscraper in Grozny, Chechnya caught fire. Flames engulfed the building for many hours, but it didn't collapse.

February 20, 2015: A fire ripped through the 86-floor Torch tower in Dubai – one of the tallest residential buildings in the world. The building did not collapse.

January 19, 2017: The 17-store Plasco Building in Tehran collapsed after burning for several hours, but it fell to one side, not straight down on its own footprint as controlled demolitions do.

July 30, 2017: The Grenfell Tower, a 47-floor skyscraper in London caught fire. The fire burned for 12 hours, about four times longer than the WTC towers and was totally destroyed, but the building didn't collapse.

Moreover, according to Newton's third law, "For every action there is an equal and opposite reaction." This means that as a hammer descending on a nail slows down, so also the crashing upper floors of the twin towers would have slowed as they hit the floors below that were structurally sound. But, surprisingly, this didn't happen.

Even more difficult to explain is the mysterious collapse of World Trade Center Building 7, because no plane had crashed against it. But the building collapsed as the result of what looked like a typical example of a controlled demolition.

If buildings, particularly buildings with a steel structure, could normally fall on their own footprint when demolished, the companies that do controlled demolition would be superfluous –but they are not. But CFR agents in the US Government want us to believe that, exceptionally, on September 11 2001, not one, nor two, but three skyscrapers with steel structure collapsed on their own footprint as the result of fires.

Therefore, extrapolating from other verifiable information, any serious intelligence analyst would conclude that the accuracy of the information itself provided by CFR agents in the U.S. Government could be fairly qualified as a 5, that is, improbable.

Consequently, an intelligence appraisal of the 9/11 events will produce a D5: that is, source not usually reliable, accuracy of the information improbable. For the same reasons, based on the evaluation of the information about the 9/11 events provided by the CFR agents in the U.S. Government any intelligence service in the world can easily decode it as a sloppy, disingenuous attempt to pass disinformation disguised as true intelligence.

Moreover, the fact that the 9/11 events served as a God-given pretext to carry out policies decided way in advance is a true index that perhaps it actually was not a God-given but a CFR-given event. As some conspirators' agents have shamelessly declared, never put a good crisis to waste –particularly an artificially created crisis.

When I watched on tv the free fall of the first tower it took me just a few minutes to reach the conclusion that the

building had fallen as the result of a controlled demolition. I am not an architect or engineer, much less a specialist on controlled demolition, but the fact was so evident that it was the only logical conclusion. Now, why most members of the Repucratic party didn't see it? Because Repucrats are Americans who love their party more than their country, which explains why they fully accepted the official explanation that started the so-called "War on Terror," as well as the lies that justified the disastrous "mandates" allegedly imposed to protect us from the Coronavirus.

Biden's recent speech [6] in which he called Republicans "semi-fascists"[7] is nothing but the logical continuation of Bush's speech after 9/11 in which he stated: "You are with us or against us" [8] and later added, "Let us never tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories concerning the attacks of September the 11th." [9] The circle of treason that began with Bush has been finally closed by Biden. From now on, for the real Communo-Fascists in this country the sky is the limit. The fight against true American patriots is now in the open.

In the meantime, disinformers of both branches of the Repucratic Party will keep talking about the danger of communism and blaming China and Russia [10] for all the evil in the world. As expected, most of the Repucratic sheeple will keep believing them while ignoring that America's worst enemies have always been inside the gates.

So, if after Biden's clear and to the point threatening speech –which actually means that the so-called "semi-fascists"[11] will eventually lose all citizen's rights, particularly their right to vote– you still think that just by electing members of the Repucratic Party [12] approved by the Permanent Regime you will solve America's problems, you are a very gullible person ... or worse!

My book: [Psychological Warfare and the New World Order: The Secret War Against the American People](#), censored by Amazon, is

still available at the NWV store.

© 2022 Servando Gonzales – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Servando Gonzales: servandoglez05@yahoo.com

FootNotes:

[1]. Quoted in Michael Warner, "Wanted: A Definition of 'Intelligence.' Understanding Our Craft," [CIA's Center for the Study of Intelligence](#). But the author of the article reminds that intelligence is an elusive concept, and there are many different definitions of the term. In the same fashion, the concept of information, the raw material out of which intelligence is produced, is even more elusive, to the point that there is no agreement among scientists about its true nature. The fact explains why Claude Shannon, the creator of the information theory, decided to call it "communication theory" instead. See, Claude Shannon, "A Mathematical Theory of Communication," *Bell System Technical Journal* No. 27 (July and October, 1948)

[2]. Quoted in Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence* (New York: Signet, 1965), p. 11.

[3]. Sun Tzu, *The Art of War* -translated by Samuel B. Griffin-(London: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 144.

[4]. Intelligence Cycle: The process by which information is acquired, converted into intelligence, and made available to policymakers. There are usually five steps which constitute the intelligence cycle: planning and direction, collection, processing, analysis and evaluation, and dissemination.

[5]. See, i.e, David Wise, *The Politics of Lying* (New York: Random House, 1973).

[6]. See "[Biden Calls Trump Philosophy 'semi-fascism,'](#)" *Politico*, January 15, 2022.

[7]. Contrary to common belief, fascism began as a political movement of the left. Benito Mussolini, the Italian Fascist dictator, always saw himself as a man of the left, working to defend the working class and opposed to capitalism and free

markets. Even the Nazis saw themselves as leftists. Don't forget that the Nazi party was an offshoot of the German Workers Party, a leftist organization. See Servando Gonzalez, [*Psychological Warfare and the new World Order*](#), pp. 269-271.

[8]. Bush words were "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists." See "[Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American people](#)," United States Capitol, Washington, D.C., September 20, 2001.

[9]. [President Bush Speech to the United Nations, November 10, 2001](#).

[10]. Currently, I'd bet you can find more Communists in Berkeley than in Moscow.

[11]. A typical fascist technique consists in dehumanizing the opponents. Hitler called them "vermin," Castro called them "gusanos" (worms), Hillary called them "deplorables," and now Fascist leader Joe is calling us "semi-fascists." The derogatory name changes, but the technique is the same.

[12]. Voting again and again and expecting different results is a clear symptom of insanity. As P.J. O'Rourke, used to say, "Don't vote, it just encourages the bastards."