



The Solari Report

September 21, 2017

Bush, Cheney & 911 with David Ray Griffin



Catherine Austin Fitts



David Ray Griffin



Bush, Cheney & 911 with David Ray Griffin

C. Austin Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to The Solari Report. Today we have a very distinguished guest, Dr. David Ray Griffin, who is a now-retired professor of philosophy of religion and theology. He is the co-founder of the Center for Process Studies Research Center at the Claremont School of Theology and has become one of the most distinguished leaders, publishing books on the September 11th attacks and really underscoring the lack of integrity to the official story. He talks much about what the facts are and what we know.

He has a new book called *Bush and Cheney: How They Ruined America and the World*. It starts with 9/11, but it goes much more into the policies that 9/11 justified and why it is imperative to turn things around.

Dr. Griffin, it's a pleasure to have you on The Solari Report. I want to thank you so much for your extraordinary contribution to trying to turn America in a positive direction.

David Ray Griffin: Thank you. It's good to be with you.



Fitts: I had this image of you as the bells struck on midnight at the beginning of the new century, January 1st, 2000. I dare say that the one thing you didn't think was, "I'm going to become a leader in exposing false flag attacks in America and stopping the neocon agenda from global domination."

Griffin: No, that didn't occur to me.

Fitts: I think that a reason you've been one of the most persuasive voices on 9/11 truth is because you come from a place of extraordinary integrity. However, I don't think that many people around you expected you to be doing this in the 21st century.

Tell us how you became a leader in 9/11 truth. It has to be a remarkable story.

Griffin: Do you have a few hours? Basically, I didn't pay attention to any question about 9/11 and I'm a Johnny-come-lately. Other people were there two or three years ahead of me.

I did have a person come to the school and visit the School of Theology. One of my students said, "You have to listen this to guy. He said that 9/11 was an inside job. Would you listen to him?"

I said, "Okay, I'll listen to him," and I did. Then I went home and checked on the internet, and found a number of websites. I even looked at the one that he suggested and I thought, "There is nothing here."



Several months later, another colleague sent me a website that was very, very factual. It had a history of what had happened here. Very quickly I saw, “Oh, this looks serious.”

I started studying this, and it so happened that at this time the students had asked me to give a lecture on the Iraq War, which I had just started on.

I did it, but I focused on the 9/11 as the excuse for the war. So I wrote up this outline, and I thought, “Well, I have the outline written now, so I might as well publish it.”

That took me about a week. So I started, and it kept going on and on and on. Quite soon I had this book. One publisher who looked at it said, “You ought to call it “The Related to the Nazis Taking Over,”” and I said, “No. Americans don’t know about that, but we do know about Pearl Harbor.”

So that is when I decided on the title, *The New Pearl Harbor*. It amazingly became successful.

Other people had written books about it, but no American had written a full-length book about this. Then a very popular, well-known person wrote a review, Rosemary Ruether, and it really proliferated.

At the time I wrote it, I thought: “It appears it’s an inside job, but maybe the 9/11 commission – which was just getting ready to put its report out – has answers to all of these questions that I raised in the book.” At that time, you could say that I definitely was not a conspiracy theorist; I was a conspiracy inquirer.



As soon as the book came out, I ran to the bookstore, bought it, and started reading it. Then I thought, “It’s even worse than I expected,” because every question that I dealt with, they either omitted or distorted it. So that became the title for my next book, *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions* and that’s how I got started.

Fitts: I don’t know if you are aware of this, but I founded a group called, ‘Unanswered Questions’.

Griffin: Oh, of course!

Fitts: Our idea was: We don’t have the powers of government or the resources to create an evidentiary trail, but what we can do is ask questions and collect the questions. That group, which included Scoop Media New Zealand, incubated Paul Thompson’s timeline and supported him. Of course, he put together the timeline – which was an amazing tool helping people understand why the questions were so serious. Then we took the questions to the commission.

Griffin: That’s what I was referring to when I said I discovered a very good website. It was Paul Thompson’s.

Fitts: He is a remarkable researcher, and did an outstanding job. But then we were trying to hold the space until the big guns appeared, and you, the architects, and the engineers and some other very serious intellectual capacity showed up. That’s when we were very relieved.

Griffin: Your organization was one of the ones that influenced me at the beginning.



Fitts: It was clear that we were in over our heads in terms of trying to figure out what happened, but we felt that if the right questions were asked and held government accountable; part of it was that we had to hold government accountable to answer the questions. That is why there was the push for the commission.

Of course, the families were very powerful because the difference between this and a number of false flag attacks is that you had many very powerful, intelligent, well-educated families who had been harmed. They were smart enough to know that the official story wasn't satisfying.

This book is very special. You've written several very successful books on 9/11, but tell us how you came to write *Bush and Cheney: How They Ruined America and the World* and why you wrote it.

Griffin: I had written almost a dozen books on this, and each one of them took it a step further. When we would say something, then the defenders of the official story would come out with something else. So in *Debunking 9/11 Debunking*, I responded to four major defenses of the official story. Then when I wrote *The New Pearl Harbor Revisited*, I laid out the entire case. So with the total case – with no exaggeration – we didn't need another book like that.

There are always new details, and the scientists keep coming up with new evidence that further disproves the official story, but the way that I did this was I promised my wife that I would never write another book on 9/11 because this is a serious topic.



About a year and a half ago, I started reading all these articles which – for the most part – were saying that the world has been going to hell since the attack on Iraq. Then others would say that the world has been going to hell since 9/11. Of course, that is what I thought.

I thought, “Well, if I could lay out just how much the world has gone to hell in so many areas, that might get the important people to maybe have somebody in the mainstream press get on this and say, ‘Look, we have all sorts of reasons not to support a conspiracy theory, but here things are getting so serious that they’re, not only going to destroy America, but destroy the entire world. So maybe we will risk our reputations to tell the truth.’”

That was the first part of the book and I gave those ten major reasons. Then I thought, “If people read that and thought, ‘This guy Griffin is a conspiracy theorist, so who can believe him? However, what he says in those first ten chapters is all good and all right, and it shows good research.’”

So my naïve idea was that they might say, “Okay, let’s go ahead and see what he has to say about 9/11.”

On that part of the book, I saw that there were so many arguments – the reasons to distrust or reject the official story. We’re talking about 60, 70, 80, 100, or 200 reasons and who can keep track of that?

Somebody coming into this cold could say, “This is overwhelming. I can’t get into this.” I’ve actually had people tell me that.



So I thought, “Let’s really simplify it and get down to the most obvious thing that is false, which is that the official story is based on miracles.” Using miracles, in David Hume’s sense, are things that simply can’t be true.

Fitts: Better a conspiracy theorist than a miracle theorist.

Griffin: That’s right. So quite a few of these people would accuse us of being anti-scientific. I don’t think that there is anything more unscientific than endorsing miracles. If I could talk to one of these people, I would say, “Look, do you believe in miracles?”

“Of course not.”

“Well, what about this? How could this have happened without a miracle?”

“Well, let’s talk about something else.”

That’s my strategy. We have the facts, and nobody can doubt the fact that the World Trade Center 7 came down in almost two and a half seconds in absolute freefall. If people don’t know what that means, it indicates that, with Building 7, you have 82 steel columns holding the building up. It came down in freefall in absolutely horizontal roofline. That signifies that all 82 columns had to come down simultaneously.

The official story was that it collapsed because of fire. First of all, fire couldn’t bring it down at all and it certainly could not have brought down everything simultaneously. So that is the strategy.



If they could just look at those 15 miracles and say, “Okay, we can’t buy those. What do we do?”

Of course, the normal response will be, “I’m going to deal with something else because I’ll lose my job if I tell the truth here.”

Then my next strategy is to say, “That’s true. If Rachel Maddow came out on this”- and she is smart enough to see this, and has a huge audience- “even she would be fired.” But what if she and 20 other major commentators, and 50 highly respected people say it? They couldn’t fire all of those just because they suddenly inexplicably became 9/11 conspiracy theorists.

That is the hope. It’s a long shot, but it seems like it’s worth a try.

Fitts: Another thing that I found very compelling about the book is-I once wrote an article about the black budget, and I explained that you have all these different symptoms of the black budget – whether it’s narcotic trafficking in neighborhoods or false flags or this or that. Everybody is organizing and coming at it by fighting the symptoms instead of sitting down and saying, “It’s a relatively small group of people doing all of this. We’ve all experienced a different symptom.” However, the reality is that all of our relatives are being poisoned or killed by a relatively small group of people, if you see who is doing this.

I had a friend who would walk around saying, “Who’s doing this? Who is this?”



I think you began with ‘who’. Who is doing this? Let’s look at who the neocons are. Let’s look at Bush. Let’s look at Cheney. Let’s inquire into their liability and accountability for what happened – whether it’s 9/11 or the events thereafter – that was really the shredding of the Constitution.

If we’re going to hold people accountable, we have to ask the ‘who’ question, and you started with the ‘who’ question, which I like tremendously. Without accountability, there are no real changes coming.

One of the chapters which I thought was remarkable was on the shredding of the Constitution. You do a great job of explaining how 9/11 was used to essentially compromise different aspects of our compliance with the Constitution. I would be grateful if you could discuss some of those.

Griffin: Bush and Cheney are in the title, but the book is really about ‘Cheneyism’ because it continued half-heartedly with Obama, and full-heartedly with Hillary Clinton. So when I wrote the book, of course, I assumed that Hillary would become the next President. I spent a great deal of time showing just how disastrous she has been. One good book about Hillary is called *The Queen of Chaos*. Everything that she touched ended up in chaos, most obviously Libya, and she was hot on the trail on Syria. It more or less said that if she became President, she would go back to wiping out Assad and taking over Syria.

The book is really about Cheneyism, and each of these chapters deals with something that Cheney was responsible for.



Most people realize that he was a bad guy and did some bad things, in particular the attack on Iraq, but they don't realize that he was behind all of these other things. Most clearly, one might say, he was behind the destruction of the Constitution because Cheney had always been an absolutist who believed that the power of the President in dealing with, so called 'national defense', is unlimited. He can contradict Congress, and anything that the President decides is law and cannot be questioned, even by the Supreme Court. That's the background.

Then I go through the various parts of the Constitution. Of course, central to the Constitution is the Bill of Rights. I focus primarily on the First Amendment, Fourth Amendment, and Fifth Amendment.

Fitts: One thing that I think you make clear – and it's in that chapter as well as another one – is the description of the drone program. They've created machinery where the Executive branch can fundamentally go to war and occupy anywhere in the world, and Congress is not able to say anything about it. So we've moved military throughout the world.

In fact, Senator Paul recently tried to rescind that authority, and the Senate wouldn't support him. However, we're also talking about a parallel structure where the President, and the executive branch can assassinate a US citizen or a global citizen anywhere, at any time, with no transparency or due process. We're talking about a killing machine outside of the law.

Griffin: That's right. Let's deal with these two issues in turn. One is the assassinations, but let's deal first with the power of the President.



This is not new; this goes back to Nixon having this view of the President. He said that if the President does it, it's not illegal. It was his view that a President could do anything with regard to war. Well, Congress stopped that with the Frank Church hearings.

So we brought back much of the Constitution, thanks to the Frank Church hearings, and, of course, all of the Presidents have been acting as if they had the right, but at least they would go through the motions of agreeing with the Constitution that only the Congress can start a war. However, Cheney, more clearly than Nixon, said that you don't even have to go to the Congress. So we're back to having a king. The whole point of the American Constitution was to make sure that we never have a king where the king can determine everything.

Cass Sunstein is not one of my favorite guys, but he made a good observation about John Yoo. He said that the task that Cheney gave Yoo was to create a kind of 9/11 Constitution. By that, of course, he meant one in which the President has unlimited power.

Fitts: The 4th Amendment-the right of the people to be secure in their homes, etc.- was majorly compromised when the Bush Administration authorized the NSA to essentially do complete surveillance.

One thing that we know as a result of Bill Binney and Kirk Wiebe and Tom Drake's work, which has been phenomenal, is that there was a way to achieve all of the national security objectives 1) without invasive surveillance of Americans, and 2) without turning the entire infrastructure over to private contractors who are doing who-knows-what with the data.



It's been proven that to compromise the 4th Amendment was not necessary to achieve the national security result, let alone put private contractors in charge. Yet they have done it.

There was an effort by part of the Republican group in Congress to turn that around, and that's when a Congressman was shot during the baseball practice. He was a part of that group, and I'm assuming that it was related.

Griffin: Yes, this is a long, long story and Cheney was essential. He turned to Michael Hayden, who was the Director of NSA at the time, and said, "What if the NSA were unleashed?"

By that he meant the NSA didn't have to obey any congressional laws, whatsoever. So then Cheney and his attorney, David Addington, worked out this surveillance program, which came to be known as only a 'program'. Then Snowden became so well-known for pointing out all the ways that the program violated the 4th Amendment. There was a dramatic standoff between the President and the justice department. Of course, Comey had recently arrived to the justice department and was given a hand in this. They all were ready to resign and protest about this unless it was changed. Bush did change it, but it turned out that none of that really made any difference. What Cheney wanted, ended up being the effective law.

Many, many people have commented on this, and Peter van Buren is one of my favorites. He said that the 4th Amendment has, by any practical definition, been done away with. Snowden said the same thing. He said that the NSA documents and all of that were written as if the 4th Amendment no longer existed.



Fitts: Well, I say that it does exist. I haven't given up yet.

Griffin: What this means is, of course, if somebody really wanted to push the issue- if we had a President who didn't know very much and wasn't very concerned with the Constitution and legality- and they decided to, "See what Cheney has accomplished here and how much we can put ourselves in absolute control."

Fortunately Trump has not done this – for all sorts of reasons, which we don't know. However, if he gets impeached, I'm much more nervous about the fact that Pence, who is a way more organized fellow, might carry through what could be done.

Fitts: Right. I wanted to talk about the Appropriations Clause because one of my interests in 9/11 is that I had been working with a reporter at *Insight Magazine*. Whenever *Insight Magazine* had a new publication, which came out every week, they would deliver it to every Congressman's office and every Senator's office. So everybody in Congress – both staff and principles – would get a copy. So it had a very good circulation in Washington.

We had been working on a story about money that had gone missing. Starting in fiscal 1998, massive amounts of money had started going missing from HUD and DOD and NASA, as well as some of the other agencies. I began to track the story in 1998, and started working with this reporter in 2000. She had done a series of great articles, and we were finally building up to a huge cover story on the missing money that was supposed to come out on September 15th. It was going to hit every Congressional desk on September 15th.



The day before 9/11, on Monday, Rumsfeld had a press conference confessing the \$2.3 trillion missing. In fact, at that time, it was \$4 trillion, but he only did one year.

I remember calling her and saying, “Nothing can stop this story from going mainstream now,” thinking that this was going to follow-up on September 15th.

Well, of course, 9/11 happened the next day, and then Congress was off to the races, increasing appropriations by \$48 billion. That story was postponed to October, and then was buried.

Here is what is interesting: I had been working with a professor from Michigan State University who, in fact, will be on The Solari Report next week. We are now up to \$18 trillion of undocumentable adjustments. What is interesting is, if you look at 9/11, 9/11 was instrumental in, not only getting much of that \$4 trillion covered up and off the agenda, but if you review the different securities operations that were destroyed or the offices at the Pentagon that were destroyed, it was used as an excuse for many years for not producing audited financial statements, as required by law.

Now we are up to \$18 trillion of undocumentable adjustments. In 2015 alone, DOD had \$6.5 trillion. So you saw two things happen: The \$4 trillion missing money was buried, which is clearly a violation of the Appropriations Clause, and then, despite not being in compliance with the Appropriations Clause of the Constitution, the money spending for the national security state has exploded.



The private contractors and the stock market profits have exploded, and now we are up to \$18 trillion of undocumented adjustments with no transparency and no audited financial statements.

So it is in complete violation of both sections of the Appropriations Clause. I've always believed that the money was a significant part of 9/11. Part of it was because I was focused on that and saw how 9/11 was used to basically not only cover it up, but keep the game going. Frankly, I think that they moved much of the black budget on budget because they were able to get away with so much by ignoring the financial management laws that Federal agencies are subject to.

Griffin: There is a huge dimension to this, which I have not devoted enough attention to. As a general statement, I would say that when you're dealing with these questions, there is always the political scientist who says, "What is the biggest issue?"

Is it money, or is it power?

Fitts: I think it's power.

Griffin: I think it's both. I think that with Cheney himself, the main thing was power. He had this goal that was announced for the New American Century of creating a completely unitary state where we would be in control of the entire planet, have all the planet's resources under our control, and have no government that opposed us. That was his dream and it is sometimes called 'Cheney's dream'.



He was not indifferent to money, but for other people, I think that the money is the biggest issue. So within the organization and the setting up of the 9/11 attacks, I think that money and power were just about equal in what they hoped to achieve.

Fitts: I think what Cheney and his group believes is that for them to achieve Cheney's dream, they need nontransparent, open-ended funding.

In other words, they need to be able to spend whatever they want, whenever they want. They need to be able to source it through the Federal credit mechanism so it's taxpayer/government money, and to source it from that mechanism, but they need to be able to spend it outside the law, and create assets that can then be controlled by private corporations underneath their wings.

What they want to be able to do is have the taxpayer create the most powerful technology in the world, but they want to be able to shelter that technology behind private corporations.

An independent financing mechanism, which is completely out of your control and is basically infinite, is the source of financing and the different steps that you need to create that power.

I think the money issue is a subset of political power. If you have a car, you need to put gas in the tank to get you to where you want to go. Your goal is not to accumulate as much gas as possible; your goal is simply to drive your car to where you need to go.



I am with you; I don't think that Cheney cares that much about money. It's simply a tool that he needs to put in the car to make it go where he wants. I agree with you; that is global domination.

Griffin: That's what most Americans don't realize. More and more people are seeing this, but it does not make the *New York Times* front page. In fact, you never even get it mentioned that is the goal. The *New York Times* will at no time mention that to achieve these things, we have to violate international law. They act as if international law does not exist unless we want to use international law to bash somebody else – whether it's North Korea or Iran or whomever.

Fitts: The one thing that I can contribute on this is that I worked in the first Bush Administration for a group of, what I would describe, as neocons. I will tell you two stories that describe it and makes it interesting.

The first one is about our secretary who would get very emotional. He would have psychotic episodes. At one point, I was meeting with him and ten regional administrators. One of the regional administrators had obtained a court decision and had proceeded to implement something in a program.

The secretary started screaming at him. He said, "But Mr. Secretary, I had to. It's the law."

The secretary started absolutely screaming with a bright red face at the top of his lungs, "The law! The law! I don't have to obey the law! I report to a higher moral authority!"



He was incensed that anybody would be bothered to think that they were subject to stupid things like court decisions.

Then another situation occurred when we had a decision on a program. The secretary made a decision to do something that was going to lose us a billion dollars and violate a massive number of private contracts that the agency had with different mortgage providers. It was a complete abrogation of contract, and one that was going to destroy many businesses or cause major losses.

I was arguing that there was a way that we could shut down the program that would be far less harmful, both to the taxpayers and to the private business and would respect the contracts, but they didn't think that it would get them as large of a headline as this big, abrupt decision which would lose one billion dollars.

The general counsel, who was very neocon, kept using the F-word. He kept saying, "F them! F them! They're all sewer rats. Who cares what contracts they have? By the time they win in court, we'll be gone."

Essentially he was saying that we have no obligation to obey the law; the law is irrelevant and it's not important.

What you saw when you worked with these folks is that they seemed to be on a drunk. Leonard Cohen has a wonderful song that says, "We were blinded by the beauty of our weapons." They mainly see themselves as above the law, as simply re-engineering and reorganizing history. They have this intuition that if you create chaos; everything will intuitively reorganize and come back.



You have a great chapter in the book where you literally describe the danger of a nuclear ecological holocaust from their shenanigans. The reality is that if you've ever been upfront and personal with these folks, they are crazy enough to do it.

Yes, 9/11 was an inside job, but if you look at what it's leading to, it's heading to a planetary inside job, and the human race may not survive that next inside job or that creeping inside job.

Griffin: On both of those issues, Cheney was central. Cheney hated anything to do with ecology and saving the planet and environment and all of that. He really hated it. He did everything that he could to make sure that the money got spent on military matters rather than that.

If you remember – and I'm sure you do – when the Soviet Union collapsed, the well-meaning Americans were so excited because, “Look, we're going to have such a great peace dividend. All that money we've been spending on the military – those billions of dollars – now we can use it for the environment and health and education and so on.”

Cheney deliberately started wars to make sure that couldn't happen. So he is behind that. Likewise, with regard to our confrontation with Russia, he was behind that. He had no concern that they might get to the point where they were not going to take it anymore.

Fitts: The one thing that I would say is, if you look at what Cheney has been implementing for many, many decades, in my experience he has always had the full support of the bankers.



The bankers want one-world government. No one can go into the executive branch and do these kinds of things without the New York Fed member banks and their owners being in full support.

If Cheney is doing anything, he is fronting for a ‘New World Order’. It’s not only Cheney. I believe the bankers see this, and think that unless they establish a unipolar empire globally now, they’re not going to make it.

Griffin: Cheney is clearly the front for this desire, but he is a very passionate front.

Fitts: He is a very effective front for a psychopathic; I agree. I’ve written a couple of articles, and I’ve tried to focus people on how instrumental Cheney has been to all of this. I really appreciate his efforts but don’t approve of them.

I received a call from somebody today who reminded me that she had spent \$800 long ago on a banner that said, “Impeach Cheney first.”

One thing I relished in this book was your description of the extraordinary credentials of many, many very accomplished and capable leaders who said that 9/11 was an inside job or that the official story was all bunk. Maybe you could tell us a little about the accumulation of extraordinary talent behind 9/11 truths.

Griffin: It’s something that the press goes to extremes to make it seem like ‘truthers’ – which is their term, which is also funny that they use it as a derogatory term – are preferred to the ‘liars’. It’s amazing that an organization is ridiculed because it’s trying to find the truth.



In any case, the stories that the press advances: “The 9/11 conspirators don’t really know anything, so they’re making all of these declarations. They don’t know the military things; they don’t know the economy; they don’t know this or that; and they don’t know politics.”

They never mention that the 9/11 truth organization is composed of all types of organizations of professionals. So even in the health industry, some of the leading people in those organizations have endorsed this. Of course, the big one is ‘Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth’, which Richard Gage started with a membership of one, and now it has around 3,000. This means that professionals who have degrees or licenses or whatever, who were willing to sign documents and petitions saying that the official story is false and could not possibly be true, risk losing jobs.

Employers say, “I’m not going to give this job to one of these damn truthers,” and these people went ahead and signed it in spite of that danger.

Then we have the 9/11 political leaders, religious leaders, firefighters, and on and on down the list. When people look at the list – and I laid this out in one of my earlier books, *Cognitive Infiltration* – one could read that. I have a smaller list here, which people can read. In the last part of that book I give an abbreviated version of it.

I’m glad that you were very impressed by that because it’s something that most people don’t know. When they say ‘truthers,’ nobody thinks of the people who were the leading people.



Fitts: Oh, I do because I've had so much experience with it. When you look at the group that you're describing or you look at the architects and engineers in this new video, *Experts Speak Out*, which we posted in the commentary for this Solari Report, the number of people who have fearlessly and courageously stepped up is simply amazing.

Griffin: The strategy of my book was hoping that people would look at the first part of it and see that it's done well and the issues we're talking about are serious enough that they would be willing to at least look at the evidence.

The CIA did such an effective job of trashing our organization that they will talk about 'birthers' and 'truthers' in the same breath, as if they are basically the same. "They just have a hunch, and they don't have any evidence, and so on."

That is true about the birthers, but it's exactly false about the truthers, and yet they create this impression that it's all the same sort of conspiracy. That is what they generally mean when they say 'conspiracy theory'. They mean that, first of all, you are opposing the government, and secondly, you are accusing the government of having done something wrong. Then they say you're doing it in such a way that it is going to harm the country and so on, and they have no evidence whatsoever.

They say it would be a waste of time to read a book dealing with 9/11. So I deliberately did not include '9/11' in the title of my book, hoping that some people might start reading the book and discern that it's a very good book before they realize that it's a 9/11 book.



Fitts: I think that it is a very clever strategy because 9/11 is not the core issue here; the core issue is: How is America governed, and how is it going to be governed? You have a group of people whose plan is to tear up the Constitution and affect a global totalitarian governance structure. The reality is that they can't do that inside the law. It's our job to stop them.

So let me turn to what we should do. We get the book, read it, and after we've read it, we agree. What should we do? How do we start to, either help this knowledge spread, or achieve accountability and get these policies turned around?

Griffin: Of course, that is the most difficult question. I'm certainly not one with a fount of wisdom about this, but the first thing that I would say is to have courage. There are all sorts of people in the government and in the media who would have enormous possible influence if they just had the courage to come out and speak about it.

Let's get some of the people in the media who say, "I couldn't do that; I'd lose my job."

Let's organize, and if we can get 40 of the top correspondents and journalists in America to release a statement like this and say, "Look, we want to make this statement."

They are going to say, "We are going to fire you." "Are you going to fire all 40 or 50 of us simultaneously? Why are you going to do that? You're going to have to reveal to the public that you fired us because we wanted to speak about 9/11 truth." They are not going to want to do that.



I think there are things that we could do such as that, and people who do that could make a difference.

Fitts: I also think that if people would stop listening to other people who don't understand it: "Why are we listening to anybody who is censoring this story?"

One of the reasons I now publish The Solari Report is because, in the Bush Administration, and when my company was working as a contractor during the Clinton Administration, I had experiences – one with the *New York Times* and one with the *Wall Street Journal* – where they were completely lying and breaking the law. They were so unethical and were like criminal enterprises.

After I saw it, I said, "I don't want anything to do with these folks again. Why does anybody believe a word they say? I don't believe a word they say."

If they say, "Soybean futures are up," then I will believe them, but if they say, "This happened in Washington," I would assume, "So what?" That's what made me follow the money. The government can't say, "We're going to spend \$1 trillion illegally and refuse to disclose what we're doing with your money." That is very hard to accomplish.

Griffin: You have, maybe one percent of the people in the country, or at most, five percent, who feel that strongly about it. So they're going to get away with it. They know they need their 60-70%, and they have that, and it's very hard to buck against it.



I hope that some really smart people on strategy will read my book and say, “What can we do about this?” We’re threatening, not only to destroy our country, but also to destroy our civilization and the human race. Wouldn’t it be worth taking a few risks to do this?

Fitts: I think that you’ve accomplished it. I think that you’ve made a very powerful argument as to why it definitely is worth everybody’s time and effort to pitch in.

Of course, if everybody does what they can do, a mighty army arises. If you look at the group of people currently doing it, it’s a relatively small group but there are plenty of us.

I think that what you and the other people who have been leading this effort have accomplished proves that a remarkably small group of people can do an amazing thing if they all do what they can do.

Griffin: That is true on one side, but on the other side is the CIA, and the CIA has control of most of the mainstream media. So they simply can’t publish things that the CIA says they cannot publish and we’re in a very, very difficult situation.

By the way, the book that I mentioned earlier, *Cognitive Infiltration*, dealt with Cass Sunstein, who became Obama’s person in charge of how the Administration was going to deal with questions like this. He wrote this amazing article – he and a Harvard colleague – saying that with 9/11, we can’t deal with it head on. We can’t just say, “Here are the facts. People shouldn’t believe it because of A, B, C, and D. These are all ridiculous things, and we can prove it.”



They know they can't do that, so they go this other way and say, "We are going to infiltrate these various 9/11 organizations and destroy them from within." So it returns to a previous SDI program of doing this in which the government had declared, "We would never do such a thing again."

Here Sunstein was advocating – publicly – that we do that.

Fitts: It was COINTELPRO. Cass Sunstein always impressed me as, arguably, one of the most intellectually bankrupt individual in the country.

Griffin: Yes, but he has been quoted as being one of the leaders. In fact, some people said that he was the leading intellect within the judiciary. So either he's not as smart as they say, or else he uses it for very perverse reasons.

Fitts: I couldn't agree more.

Tell us what is up for you next. Have you been speaking? Are you going to continue to promote the book? Tell us what is next for Dr. Griffin.

Griffin: I don't go out anymore because there is this thing called 'age'. Then I have some special problems other than just age, so I don't do any speaking.

For a time, I had cut back on doing any interviews because of one of my problems, but I finally got to the point where I could do it adequately. I'm not as good at doing these interviews as before, but I think that I do it adequately and I'm happy now to do interviews.



I'm going to try to deal with what I suggested at the beginning –to find somebody or some organization who would take the lead in trying to convince a group of highly respectable people to spearhead saying that we are at a point where we do not worry anymore about our reputations; we have to worry about the planet.

Fitts: That would be wonderful if you could accomplish that. I don't know if you remember when Steve Diamond got 100 people to sign a statement. When Van Jones was thrown out of the Administration, he reneged on his signature. Paul Hawken and a group of others reneged on their signature, but it was very effective when it came out.

If you could do the same thing with a group of journalists, I think that would be very effective. The more you communicate the quality of the credentials of the people, the better.

I drive throughout America a good deal, and one of the most heartwarming things I see – especially in the West – is as I drive past these ranches that have big signs on the highway saying, “9/11 was an inside job.”

Of course, the ranchers own the land; no one can make them take down the signs. So you have all these homegrown billboards announcing as you drive around the country, and you know that it is fearless of these ranchers to do it.

I think that the more people who come out and make that statement, the better off we are and the faster we can turn these things around.



My big thing is that Cheney and his group have been able to erode the Constitution, but they haven't been able to tear it up. There is a push underway now to get the states to approve a Constitutional Convention, and if they get their way, it can get torn up. These people haven't given up. They are going for the 'Full Monty' and I think your work is going to be very helpful to make sure that doesn't happen.

On behalf of everybody – whether on the planet or in the country – Dr. Griffin, I can't thank you enough for your work. Your contribution has been absolutely remarkable. You may not understand what a powerful impact you've had, but you did become the 21st Century leader in truth.

Griffin: Thank you very much. It's been great talking with you.

Fitts: Is there anything that you want to add before we close?

Griffin: One thing that I would say is that many people are buying my book, but hardly anybody is writing reviews on Amazon. I used to get between 40 and 300 reviews, and now I only have a handful.

Some of your readers will, not only get the book, but if they can write reviews, that would be very helpful.

Fitts: I will go to Amazon today and write a review, and I invite all of our subscribers to do the same.

Dr. Griffin, you have a wonderful day. Thank you for the interview and thank you for the book and for everything you are doing for all of us.

Griffin: Thank you and goodbye.



MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.