

Amy Goodman and the CIA. (5/2004)

Dear Amy Goodman:

We, the undersigned, would like to state that the recent (5/26/04) appearance of David Ray Griffin on Democracy Now! (DN) repudiates every principle of press freedom that you claim to represent. It was a shameful betrayal to the movements opposing the Bush (🇺🇸) Regime around the globe.

First of all, it is very revealing that you chose to have Griffin appear on your show in a hostile "debate" format. This contrasted remarkably from the easy, non-confrontational (and extended) interviews recently given to Richard Clarke, Peter Lance and Sibel Edwards. (Richard Clarke is a "defector" from the Bush Regime. Peter Lance is an author. Edwards is a "whistle-blower". All three uniquely advocate the official story of 911.) The clear implication is that DN is biased in favor of sources who advocate the official propaganda of the State.

Second, while Chip Berlet's affiliation with the Political Research Associates (PRA) was made known, you failed to mention the controversy related to PRA's alleged ties to the Ford Foundation:
<http://tinyurl.com/yuptu>

It is also known that the Ford Foundation has a long-term connection with Democracy Now and Pacifica generally:
<http://www.questionsquestions.net/feldman/feldman01.html>

Recall that the Ford Foundation has been reportedly linked to the CIA for decades. By specifically choosing Berlet to challenge Griffin this episode of Democracy Now! strongly resembles a CIA propaganda campaign.

Third, Berlet's major contention against Griffin's book is that Griffin is relying on experts who lack the qualifications to offer opinions about basic engineering and physics. So why not have on an expert promoting the official science of the Bush Regime with one of the many researchers who dispute it? We are appalled by Democracy Now's guest Berlet demanding that Griffin defend the scientific work of researchers who have never been invited to appear on your program.

Fourth, Berlet specifically (and very crudely) dismissed the crucial research of "Holmgren" (i.e., Gerard Holmgren). If Democracy Now! does not invite Holmgren on to defend his highly significant work then it is working on behalf of no democracy that has ever existed.

Fifth, during Griffin's ordeal he made many important points concerning specific anomalies with 911 (e.g., the Pentagon, WTC 7, etc.) that were ignored by Berlet. When will these be addressed on your program?

Lastly, we'd like to emphatically state that the science which disputes the official story of 911 can be understood by almost every high school graduate in your audience. By having Berlet and Goodman both dismiss Griffin's sources because they lack some unspecified credentials Democracy Now! seemed medieval. Surely DN can no longer claim to represent "Resistance Radio" when it discourages its audience from making the most basic of inquiries about the innumerable flaws with the official story of 911.

Until Democracy Now reexamines what happened on 9/11/01 with some intellectual integrity we will regard you and your program to be speaking on behalf of the CIA. To quote the Clash, you are solidly "Working for the Clampdown."

Sincerely,

Scott Loughrey

--on behalf of 911 researchers:

Gerard Holmgren
John Kaminski
Rosalee Grable (a.k.a., the Web Fairy)
Jeffrey G Strahl

Questions for Amy Goodman (6/2004)

Dear Amy Goodman:

1. In David Ray Griffin's (5/26/2004) appearance on Democracy Now he brought up some glaring anomalies with the Bush Regime's official story about 911 that your other guest, Chip Berlet ignored. This includes the lack of debris from the Pentagon attack to confirm that a Boeing 767 really hit it. When do you plan to have someone on your show discuss the anomalies with the Pentagon hit?
2. On this program you challenged Griffin to name one structural engineer to confirm Griffin's conclusion that the Twin Towers fell from controlled demolition. Meanwhile, *Fire Engineering* magazine, a 125-year-old journal of record among fire engineers and firefighters, has published a call to action to challenge the official story regarding these strange collapses. When do you plan to invite its editor, William Manning, to appear on your program?
<http://tinyurl.com/7i3e>
3. In FEMA's report ("World Trade Center Building Performance Study") they give NO CAUSE for World Trade Center Seven's (WTC 7) bizarre collapse on about 5:20 p.m. on 9/11/01. Since it is important to you for qualified experts to confirm why buildings collapse (i.e., see question #1) when will you invite someone from FEMA (finally) explain what happened to WTC 7?
4. Video evidence strongly indicates that explosives were used to bring down the Twin Towers. When do you plan to have on experts on your program to discuss this? <http://www.911uncovered.com/twintowers.html#geyser>
5. An employee of Fiduciary Trust is claiming that on the weekend prior to 9/11/01 the power in the South Tower was shut down, ostensibly for computer upgrades. This employee reports seeing many new people coming and going into the building for most of the weekend. When do you plan to invite this person to appear on your program? <http://www.serendipity.li/wot/forbes01.htm>
6. On 9/11/01 the TV networks aired video of "Flight 175" striking the South Tower. Only, it actually enters the South Tower silently and with no pieces breaking off. When do you plan to have someone appear on your program to discuss how much metallic confetti would be produced if a Boeing 767 were really flown an estimated 450 mph into a steel building? http://www.media-criticism.com/911_Video_Movie_01_2004.html
7. In response to Thierry Meyssan's book and the website "Hunt the Boeing" the Pentagon released FIVE FRAMES purportedly of a security camera video of American Airlines Flight 77 striking the Pentagon. When do you plan to have someone on to discuss why the Pentagon only released five frames of this video?