

Dear Robert:

Looks like Mark Shea takes the opportunity of your review of Mike's new book to attack you. I would doubt if he'd ever read the book itself. All the best.

Tom

### **Sungenis Continues his Transition to Complete and Utter Kookdom**

First, a glowing review ("one of the greatest [books] of all time") of Jones' *The Revolutionary Jew*, in which we discover (I am not making this up) that Milton Berle and Irving Berlin were part of the Vast Conspiracy. Along with these amusing facts you will also read a not-so-amusing defense of Hitler that is stomach-turning (he was a bulwark against Bolshevism, doncha know).

Yes, the crimes of the Commies were monstrous. But Sungenis' easy and simplistic acceptance of a claim attributed to Hitler that "I have nothing against the Jews qua Jews. But the Jews are all communists, and these are my enemies, and it is against them that I am fighting" shows the astonishing ease and willingness with which Sungenis is now ready to accept any excuse for anti-semitism--and to exonerate mass murder directed at them. The thing is so disgusting to read that I came away saying to myself, "I hope his bishop finally shuts him up."

Speaking of his bishop, Sungenis continues his little war against good Bp. Rhoades, archly [noting](#) that he spoke to some Jew on Yom HaShoah (we all know what *\*that\** means). Also, like a cloud the size of a man's hand, he notes that Benedict (gasp) said something nice about charismatics--and cites Catholic Family News. I wonder how long it will take before the revolt against his bishop metastasizes into revolt against the Holy Father? If he refuses to repent, I think the train wreck is inevitable.

Finally, (and there's a strange sense inevitability here) Sungenis ices the cake by revealing himself to be (wait for it) a [9-11 Truther](#). Drawing on his encyclopedic knowledge of stuff he remembers hearing somewhere, Sungenis offers his expertise on the collapse of WTC building 7 and concludes that it was dynamite by a man of guess-what-ethnic background? If you guessed "Jewish" you'd be right.

**R. Sungenis:** Tom, unfortunately, Mr. Shea seems very reticent to remove himself from the Neanderthal traits of the uneducated and the bellicose. The first glaring stupidity Shea foists upon us is his unmitigated gall to write a critique of a book and its message that he hasn't even read yet. I know, because the book hasn't been released and Shea wasn't sent a preliminary copy. For the record, the last time E. Michael Jones sent Shea a note to respond to his charges of antisemitism many years ago, Shea returned the favor with a short, curt reply saying that he "wouldn't give space on his blog to anti-Semites." As Jones said to me, "But isn't this begging the question? Isn't this precisely the issue that is at dispute?" It

certainly is. Shea has become the Jesse James of Catholic blog world, shooting his antisemitic bullets at anyone who is unfortunate enough to expose the Judaized Catholicism that Shea lives and breathes each day. The only difference between Shea and Jesse James is that the latter would be polite enough to walk ten paces opposite you before he shot his gun. In essence, instead of patient and reflective reading of the subject material, we are once again exposed to Mr. Shea's typical knee-jerk reaction: "OMG, you are actually pointing out bad things that the Jews did in history?! How dare you, you antisemite!," the posture that he and his cronies continue to use in an attempt to hide the truth from the rest of the world.

As I pointed out in my January 2008 essay in *Culture Wars*, Mark Shea is the kind of Neo-con ideologue who, in an *Op Ed* column titled "Apostate University" appearing in *Catholic World Report* for October 2007, complains about Catholics who fraternize with Muslims who "deny the deity of Christ," but never once from the pen of Mark Shea are the Jews saddled with that same heresy and never once are we told to shun them because of it. But these kinds of contradictions are common in Shea's world. Additionally, Shea, in his latest article for *Catholic Exchange* (<http://www.catholicexchange.com/2008/04/30/107415/>) is still preaching the heresy that the Jewish Old Covenant is not revoked, in spite of the repeated admonishments he's received. He just doesn't get it, and I'm becoming convinced that Shea simply doesn't have the intellectual acumen to understand his mistake.

With that, let's look at some of the sound bites that the illustrious Mr. Shea extracts from my review in his typical demagogic fashion to draw on your sympathies and create a monster out of me and Dr. Jones for merely telling the truth of history. Shea writes:

"In the Revolutionary Jew...we discover (I am not making this up) that Milton Berle and Irving Berlin were part of the Vast Conspiracy."

That's it. No context, no analysis, no question of why E. Michael Jones said it, just one Sheaism snippet to make you think of that lovely song "White Christmas" by Irving Berlin and force you to wonder: "Gee, what could be wrong with such a sweet song about snowfall?" Well, here is what's wrong with it, and it appears in the very context that Mr. Shea decided to hide from you. And please note that the analysis of why Irving Berlin wrote "White Christmas" is from none other than a fellow Jew:

Philip Roth inadvertently pulling away the curtain so that we can see clearly who and what is behind the commercialization of Christmas and Easter. Read it carefully. This is one of those "ah!" moments you experience in Jones' book. Jones writes: "In *Operation Shylock*, Philip Roth claims he got his program for cultural subversion by listening to Irving Berlin: "The radio was playing "Easter Parade" and I thought...this is Jewish genius on a par with the Ten Commandments...God gave Moses the Ten Commandments, and then he gave Berlin "Easter Parade" and "White Christmas." The two holidays celebrate the

divinity of Christ – the divinity that’s at the very heart of the Jewish rejection of Christianity – and what does Irving Berlin brilliantly do? He de-Christians them. Easter he turns into a fashion show and Christmas into a holiday about snow...[this] schlockified Christianity is Christianity cleansed of Jew hatred” (p. 984). After reading the above, it should come as no surprise that “Milton Berle competed head to head with Bishop Fulton Sheen on prime time TV and lost. Fifty years later, Bloom says laconically, ‘shows like Sheen’s no longer air in network prime time or even on the national cable spectrum.’ They have been replaced by ‘the Shticks of numerous funny Jews, such as Seinfeld, Paul Reiser, Fran Drescher, Richard Lewis, and Jenna Elfman,’ not to mention the ineffable Howard Stern, whose ‘conquest of cable and radio, of movie theaters and bookstores, marks for better or worse the unequivocal arrival of Jewish funniness’ as well as the triumph of Jewish sexual degeneracy....The average American could choose Hollywood pornography or neoconservative wars in the Middle East for his nightly entertainment” (p. 985).

For Jewish ideologues like Shea, the above information isn’t worth your attention. After all, it may really make you start to think about how Judaized our whole nation has become and how the Catholic Church has been reduced to little more than a sideline participator in the ongoing culture war. If Shea can’t see the writing on the wall when the above information is pointed out to him (let alone the 1000-pages of similar information in Jones’ book that Shea didn’t even read yet) then he has just exposed himself as a biased, ignorant, ill-informed, and incompetent person – a person who has one goal in mind – to exonerate the Jew from any semblance of anti-Christian counter-culture motivations or implementation. It’s the pink elephant in the middle of the room that everyone knows is there but is oh so afraid to mention for fear of reprisal. Mr. Shea’s bias for the Jews simply will not allow him to accept or discern the ostensible facts of history, much less the hidden messages in slick Jewish entertainment. Mr. Shea prefers the “schlockified Christianity” that the Jewish moguls and madams give Americans as their daily diet of news and entertainment.

Here another of Mr. Shea’s twisted doozies:

“Along with these amusing facts you will also read a not-so-amusing defense of Hitler that is stomach-turning (he was a bulwark against Bolshevism, doncha know).... Yes, the crimes of the Commies were monstrous. But Sungenis’ easy and simplistic acceptance of a claim attributed to Hitler that “I have nothing against the Jews qua Jews. But the Jews are all communists, and these are my enemies, and it is against them that I am fighting” shows the astonishing ease and willingness with which Sungenis is now ready to accept

any excuse for anti-semitism--and to exonerate mass murder directed at them.”

Defense of Hitler?? What an outrage! This is the typical malevolent antics of Mark Shea – twisting words to demonize his opponent so that he can win the argument. Fact is, there is not one word in either Dr. Jones’ book or my review that “defends” Adolf Hitler, or any suggestion that we would “exonerate mass murder,” of anyone, much less Jews. Not one. This ploy of Shea’s is just part of the hit-and-run game that he and his Jewish sympathizers play all the time. Let’s look at the context of the passage that Dr. Jones provides for his reader that Shea fails to suggest even exists. Notice how Jones makes the proper distinctions about the good Jews and bad Jews, and even cites Adolf Hitler as an anti-semite. All Shea needed to do to find this out was read the book, but obviously it’s much easier to shoot first and ask questions later. Jones writes:

The triumph of Bolshevism in the revolution of 1917 increased the fear and the animus against the Jews once again. And once again it was the most visible Jews, which is to say the ethnic, religious Jews who bore the brunt of that animus when the reaction came. “The Trotskys make the revolution, but the Bronsteins pay for it,” is how one Jew formulated the phenomenon. Hitler, far from being sui generis, was simply a manifestation of the same sort of anti-Semitism which followed the assassination of the Czar in Russia in the 1880s. Those who felt that Jews were in the forefront of revolutionary activity then felt confirmed by subsequent events, by the triumph of Bolshevism not only in Russia but in Germany and throughout eastern Europe in the chaotic years following the end of World War I. The fears of Bolshevism combined with traditional animus against Jews helped to create a reaction that brought Hitler to power and would have terrible consequences for Jews, especially for religious Jews, who were least responsible for the revolutionary excesses of people like Trotsky, ne "Bronstein," who in addition to changing their names didn’t consider themselves Jews.

The widely publicized case of Grigorii Goldenberg only fueled the fires of anti-Semitism and confirmed the average Russian in his belief that a Jew was behind every terrorist plot. After plotting the assassination of the Czar and being convicted of actually assassinating the Governor General of Kharkov, Goldenberg turned state's evidence and revealed in writing up his terrorist connections, a list full of Jewish names, which “confirmed the government’s suspicions that the Jews were the principal agents of terrorism.” Looking at the Jews from a position outside their group, the average Russian failed to see the ideological fissures dividing Jews. Since they saw Jews as possessing “complete unity and solidarity,” they held the Jewish community responsible

for the actions of Jewish terrorists claiming that its leaders “willingly if not purposefully, failed to exercise their authority over Jews who conspired against the state.” As a result, the myth of a Jewish revolutionary conspiracy against ‘Holy Russia’ was readily available as a new weapon in the arsenal of Russian anti-Semitism. (p. 665).

By rejecting their Jewish heritage, Bolsheviks like Trotsky felt that they had become models for the Jew of the future. They felt that their fellow Jews should emulate them by becoming “Jews by family origin only” and as a result should feel “no special ties to other Jews or any interest in specific Jewish problems.” According to this view, anti-Semitism was “a disease of capitalism which would disappear with the destruction of capitalism.” Solzhenitsyn, however, claims that Trotsky became an idol to the American Jews “not for no reason but precisely because he was a Jew.” Trotsky was “the Prometheus of October” not because he belonged “as such” but because “he was a child of this promethean people, who could have done much more for humanity if he hadn’t been chained to the rock of stupid evil.” Trotsky’s Jewishness brings up the issue of collective responsibility. If Jews can disclaim responsibility for communism by claiming that Trotsky wasn’t a “real Jew,” can’t the Germans do the same thing, by disowning Hitler? Hitler, after all, had been born in Austria, not Germany. Couldn’t the Germans just as easily say, “these weren’t real Germans, they were just the scum.” (p. 735).

Now watch here as Jones pulls the cover off of the anti-Catholic Jewish author, Daniel Goldhagen, the author who insists that Pius XII was an anti-semite:

Frustrated by his inability to make his case, Goldhagen thus makes up in invective and innuendo what he lacks in documentation. But in doing this, he unwittingly leads the reader to truth. “Implicit in Pacelli’s letter,” Goldhagen continues, “is the notion of Judeo-Bolshevism—the virtually axiomatic conviction among Nazis, modern anti-Semites in general and within the Church itself that Jews were the principle bearers and even the authors of Bolshevism.” Behind the equivalence between Nazism and Catholicism which Goldhagen tries to prove, another equivalence suddenly emerges, namely, the relationship between Jews and Bolshevism. In the heat of his passion to convict Pius XII, Goldhagen inadvertently introduces the issue that contextualizes Pacelli’s letter in precisely the way Goldhagen does not want to contextualize it. As more than one commentator has noted, the main reason people were concerned about Jews during the 1920s is because they saw them, rightly or wrongly, as the forefront of the communist menace threatening Europe. Writing in Outlook, Mordecai Briemberg notes

“numerous historians ... have been struck by the fact that hatred of Jews is almost always coupled with hatred of communism.”<sup>18</sup> Hitler realized early on that attacks on Jews alone reaped him no political benefits. The Jews had to be linked to Bolshevism precisely because German Jews had been so successful in assimilating.

The perception that they were assimilated Germans meant they would only be perceived as a threat if they were linked with a menacing foreign ideology and a menacing foreign power, something like Russian Communism. By mentioning Bolshevism Goldhagen undermines his argument. Anti-Semitism during the 1920s in Europe was not directed against the existence of the Jews but rather against the behavior of Jews, who were widely seen as the force behind Bolshevism. Ignoring this, Goldhagen turns his guns on the Catholic Church, claiming, “For centuries the Catholic Church ... harbored anti-Semitism at its core, as an integral part of its doctrine, its theology and its liturgy.” In other words, responsibility for the Holocaust is to be laid ultimately, not at the feet of the Bolsheviks and not even at the feet of the Nazis, but at the feet of the Catholic Church that supposedly made the Nazis possible. Goldhagen made similar claims in *Hitler’s Willing Executioners*, which he later contradicted in *A Moral Reckoning*. Both subtly exculpate the Nazis as the perpetrators of Jewish genocide and propose other candidates for that role—in the first instance, “ordinary Germans,” in the second, “ordinary Catholics,” but Pius XII in particular. Were the Jews murdered by “ordinary Germans” because they were German or by “ordinary Catholics” because they were Catholic? He can’t have it both ways. Goldhagen is trapped by the extreme nature of his thesis in *Hitler’s Willing Executioners* and put into a bind whereby he must repudiate the thesis of his first book in order to propose the thesis of his second book.

There are other problems. If Germans qua Germans were responsible for the Holocaust, Goldhagen has no way to explain why so many non-Germans in eastern Europe joined avidly in the killing of Jews once the Germans occupied their territory. Ruth Birn mentions the Araj commandos in Latvia as one example of a local, non-German ethnic group that was more avid to kill Jews than the Nazis who ostensibly commanded them. If ordinary Catholics qua Catholics were responsible for the Holocaust, Goldhagen has no way to explain why Hitler persecuted Catholics, in particular Catholic clergy, from the moment he took power. The concentration camp at Dachau was full of German Catholic clergy, so much so that it evolved its own liturgical life,

which, since bishops were interned there, included the ordination to the priesthood of Karl Leisner. (p. 742).

Jones continues to show the contradictions in Goldhagen's revisionist approach to Jewish history. Of course, these historical realities don't matter to a biased Neo-con like Mark Shea because, as much as Shea and his cronies like to label any objection to their Jewish idealism as anti-semitic, they have clearly shown themselves to be anti-history. They don't care what history has to say about the Jews, no matter how sordid it is. All they care about is that the Jew is exonerated from any wrongdoing and that the world subsequently pay homage to them *via* the holocaust. Jones writes:

Goldhagen first indicates anti-Semitism has nothing to do with Jewish behavior. Then he says Pius XII was an anti-Semite because he drew a connection between Jews and Bolshevism, which is to say he was upset by the connection between Jewish behavior and Communist behavior. But Goldhagen never says whether Jews were, in fact, involved in Bolshevism, much less whether they played "a disproportionate role" in its history. We thus arrive at the heart of the political role the Holocaust plays in contemporary discourse. The Holocaust was a unique historical event—so unique, according to Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, that it was "a radical break with everything known in human history ... completely at odds with the intellectual foundations of modern western civilization ... as well as the ... ethical and behavioral norms that had governed modern western societies." Since the Holocaust had no prior history, the behavior of Jews could have no connection to the way Jews were perceived in Europe during the '20s or at any other time. So, nothing Jews do or don't do can cause people to either like or dislike them. Their behavior has no effect on other people's behavior because the fundamental fact of life is irrational anti-Semitism based on "a millennium old urge that powerfully infected and shaped European history," to give Charles Krauthammer's formulation. So, Palestinian animus toward Jews has nothing to do with how the Israelis have treated them for five decades. And the pogroms in Russia in the 1880s following the assassination of the czar had nothing to do with the perception that Jews were in the forefront of revolutionary terrorism there. And the specter of Bolshevism that haunted Europe during the '20 had nothing to do with Hitler's rise to power, because nothing causes anti-Semitism. It just is. The historical record tells a different story. The feeling that Bolshevism was a Jewish phenomenon was hardly confined to German anti-Semites. Bolshevism was a major concern in Europe, and Jews were seen, rightly or

wrongly, as the driving force behind it. In the February 8, 1920 Illustrated Sunday Herald, Winston Churchill wrote... (pp. 742-743).

Jones goes on for pages giving us the documented facts of the godless and atheistic Jewish connection to Bolshevism, but that is enough for now. If you want to know the truth and want to avoid the shoddy and revisionist reviews of the Jewish ideologue named Mark Shea, then do yourself a favor and buy Jones' book. It will be one of the best investments you've ever made.

For the record, Dr. Jones and I both believe that Hitler was a mass murderer, one of the worst humankind has witnessed in all its history. Hitler was an anti-semitic, an anti-Catholic, an anti-mankind, except, of course, for his Aryan race. But the main purpose for which Dr. Jones mentioned Hitler's war against the Jewish Bolsheviks is what you won't be told in Stephen Spielberg's movie *Sophie's Choice* or be taught in a history class at Berkeley or Hebrew University, that the Jews who led Russian Bolshevism were more murderous than Hitler! That the Jews sent Christians and Muslims by the trainload to the Gulag to suffer and die is just part of their nefarious history that polite Judaic society would prefer not to hear, much less publicize. If there ever was a "holocaust," the Gulag was it, but we simply don't hear about how the Jews were knee-deep in this atrocity in our American history classes or from the pen of Mark Shea. But thank goodness for the honesty and courageousness of Dr. Jones to reveal this much needed information to set the record straight, otherwise, as he says in his book, events like World War II become "incomprehensible." As the old saying goes, "it takes two to Tango." Unfortunately, Mr. Shea and his Jewish idealism doesn't want you to know who the other dance partner is in this ongoing culture war. He just refers to them as "commies" but refuses to face the historical fact that they were Jews who stated quite plainly that they hated Christianity and intended on subjugating everyone to Jewish rule. Did a Gentile write the "Communist Manifesto"? Hardly. It was written, directed and produced by one of the world's most staunchest Christian-hating Jews of all time, Karl Marx. But the literature major from the University of Washington, Mark Shea, refuses to enlighten you to the world's literature on this subject. He would rather twist the words of his opponent and make it look like we idolize Hitler! This in itself is the very reason Shea should be ignored. You will never get the truth out of Mr. Shea. You will only get the sanitized version that his Jewish supporters will allow him to write to keep his blog operating in cyberspace. Talk about "disgusting" and "stomach-turning"! Mr. Shea wins the award hands down.

Continuing his Sheaisms, he writes:

Speaking of his bishop, Sungenis continues his little war against good Bp. Rhoades, archly noting that he spoke to some Jew on Yom HaShoah (we all know what \*that\* means).

**R. Sungenis:** Correction for the record: Bishop Rhoades started a war against me. I'm only defending myself against his unwarranted attacks and double speak against me. Last year bishop Rhoades found himself to be so astute at theological doctrine when it involved denying my book an imprimatur by claiming that I did not follow the precepts written on page 131 of the United States Catholic Catechism for Adults. But when it comes time to admitting that the very catechism in question contains a heretical statement ("Thus the covenant that God made with the Jewish people through Moses remains eternally valid for them") suddenly Bishop Rhoades decides to look at it with the new byword in Catholic apologetics today - "let's interpret it charitably." So instead of admitting that the catechism is teaching that the Old Covenant is not revoked, Rhoades twists the words and says that it only means the "Jews are special to God because of the Old Covenant," which is a total whitewash. Unfortunately, our so-called "Catholic apologists" today either agree with Rhoades' whitewash, or, like CUF's Leon Suprenant, realize that the US catechism has made a gross error in Catholic doctrine but simply won't do anything about it. As for Rhoades, his mentor, William Cardinal Keeler, wrote the infamous and heretical "Reflections on Covenant and Missions" document with Jewish rabbis in 2002, which concluded that Catholic programs that targeted Jews for conversion were theologically obsolete! Can you believe it? Rhoades' own vicar general, Fr. William King, declared to me: "We don't believe in supersessionism any longer." Rhoades himself has never admitted anywhere that he believes the Old Covenant is revoked. Yet to even report on a BTF news item without any BTF commentary that Rhoades gave a speech to a gathering of Jews to commemorate their internment in World War II, Mr. Shea spares no opportunity to turn that into my supposed "war against Rhoades." What about the war Rhoades is apparently still having with Catholic doctrine, Mr. Shea? Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Shea doesn't regard it as a departure from Catholic doctrine because he believes the same heresy that Bishop Rhoades has not clearly renounced and so presumably still believes, even after the Holy Father promulgated the new Good Friday prayer - namely, that the Old (Mosaic) Covenant isn't superseded and remains "eternally valid" for the Jews. How silly of me to forget."

Second, when is Bishop Rhoades going to visit all the other ethnic groups that were interned in Nazi concentration camps, whose numbers dwarf those of the Jews who were interned? Why is it that Bishop Rhoades only commemorates Jewish suffering by Nazis when, in fact, there were more Catholics, Protestants and Muslims killed by Hitler than Jews? Why doesn't Bishop Rhoades make a pilgrimage to Nagasaki and Hiroshima, or even Iraq, to commemorate all the Catholics who have been killed by American intervention that has been condemned by our two last popes? How is it that the Jews have garnered such a market on suffering that Bishop Rhoades finds it necessary to pay homage to them? Is it because they own the mortgages on the Catholic buildings erected in his and other dioceses? This is an outrage - a Catholic bishop sympathizing with one ethnic group and ignoring all the rest; and the one ethnic group he panders to is the very one that denies the

very God-Man, Jesus Christ, that Rhoades is supposed to be serving, while the other ethnic groups killed in Europe don't seem to get the bishop's attention. Even Jews recognize that this sickening ploy for sympathy has gone too far and much too long, as the Jewish author Norman Finklestein reveals for us in his book "The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering" (NY, Verso, 2000). I am one Catholic who is sick and tired of this charade, and also sick of people like Mark Shea who perpetuate this myth. It's time for people to wake up and stop being corralled by the Jewish slave masters.

Mr. Shea continues:

Also, like a cloud the size of a man's hand, he notes that Benedict (gasp) said something nice about charismatics--and cites Catholic Family News. I wonder how long it will take before the revolt against his bishop metastasizes into revolt against the Holy Father? If he refuses to repent, I think the train wreck is inevitable.

**R. Sungenis:** Now Mr. Shea fancies us with his dubious powers of prognostication. Mr. Shea is always predicting my demise, and, of course, it's always been wrong. Leaving aside Mr. Shea's pope worship as his guiding principle (oh, I forgot, Mr. Shea deliberately disobeyed Pope John Paul II's and Pope Benedict XVI's express statement that the war in Iraq is immoral and those who are engaging in it are in sin), all one need do is read our BTF website which is filled with little more than praise for Pope Benedict XVI and his attempts at restoring Catholic faith and morals, not to mention the voluminous essays and debates we have had on our site for the last 5 years against sedevacantism, and, not to mention the fact that I stated quite clearly that if Bishop Rhoades continues to ostracize me, I will take it to the Vatican to adjudicate. How could I do so if I believe the Vatican doesn't possess legitimate powers of authority over me and Bishop Rhoades? Suffice it to say, Mr. Shea is just using his typical search and destroy mission techniques by his favorite game – innuendo.

As for charismatics, I don't have anything against them, but I do warn them that barking like dogs and rolling around on the floor in an attempt to convince us that they have received a special manifestation of the Holy Spirit is, shall we say, a bit much. If anything, it's a sign that some of them are possessed by the devil, not the Holy Spirit. Mr. Vennari's article is for the express purpose of exposing these excesses and bringing some sanity back to an already battered movement. But Mr. Shea, since he has never really studied the issue, has written no books or papers on the issue, has received no theological degrees that would even suggest he's made a prior investigation, doesn't have the wherewithal to make an intelligent comment, so he resorts to his usual guilt by implication routine.

Mr. Shea graces us with his last futile comment:

Finally, (and there's a strange sense inevitability here) Sungenis ices the cake by revealing himself to be (wait for it) a [9-11 Truther](#). Drawing on his encyclopedic knowledge of stuff he remembers hearing somewhere, Sungenis offers his expertise on the collapse of WTC building 7 and concludes that it was dynamite by a man of guess-what-ethnic background? If you guessed "Jewish" you'd be right.

**R. Sungenis:** That's funny. In the article to which Shea refers I didn't mention one word about Larry Silverstein being a Jew. He could have been Donald Trump for all I care about ethnicity. So why did Mr. Shea make it a point to mention that racist piece of information? I'll leave that to you to decide. I mentioned Larry Silverstein only because he was the sole lease-holder for the Twin Towers and Building 7 who just happened to take out a multi-billion dollar casualty policy for those three buildings only six months prior to 9-11, and which included a special clause absent from the previous policies that included casualty "by means of terrorism." Moreover, Larry's buildings are the only three steel-structure buildings in the history of the world ever to collapse because of fire damage. Imagine that. But, of course, none of these facts are of interest to the Neo-con brainwashed Mark Shea. He's only interested in seeing if he can pin an anti-Semitic label on me for even suggesting that someone other than an Arab or Muslim might have perpetrated the crime.

For the record, in case any of you have been convinced by the Neo-cons to ostracize patriotic Americans who have a suspicion that greater powers than Osama bin Ladin were behind 9-11, I would suggest you take a good hard look at the evidence and stop insulting your own intelligence. Shea, being a Catholic Neo-con who flicked his finger into the air at two popes who told him the war in Iraq was immoral, and who is constantly belittling Muslims and Arabs, has a vested interest in denouncing any theory that takes the spotlight off of the usual suspects paraded around by our Jewish-owned newspapers. Other Jewish ideologues, like Ben Douglass, do the same. In a recent issue of *Culture Wars*, Mr. Douglass pooh-poohed every attempt to even suspect a US-Israel conspiracy behind 9-11. But the fact is, the suspicion won't go away because the evidence is just too overwhelming for patriotic Americans to accept, and it wouldn't be the first time that US-Israel perpetrators collaborated on such a mission. Below is my response to Mr. Douglas, and now to Mr. Shea, on the 9-11 incident, which will be published in the June issues of *Culture Wars*.

### **Reflections on 9-11**

Whether 9-11 was a government conspiracy, I don't know. Considering all the unanswered and poorly answered questions by the supposed "experts," patriotic Americans certainly have the right to be suspicious. I hope to God Mr. Douglass is right, because if he isn't and we in America have become our own terrorists, then there is little hope left for this country. Its corruption will be its demise. Be that as it may, Building 7 remains one of the

weakest links in the government's official story, and, in fact, the 9-11 commission has still not published an official report on Building 7. If it came down by fire, it would be the only steel building in history, besides the Twin Towers, to have done so. In all other cases, the fire destroys the combustible parts of the building, but the steel frame is left standing (e.g., 31-story building in Madrid, 2005). *Popular Mechanics* claims that Building 7 collapsed because the steel was weakened by the fire. Not only is that supposition in dispute, it doesn't explain why there was molten steel that glowed for days at the base of Building 7 after it collapsed, the same phenomenon that occurred at the Twin Towers. Fire, by itself, cannot melt steel, but it is well known that demolition chemicals such as Thermite can melt steel within seconds.

Other anomalies also persist. For example, Mr. Douglass says "pull it" is not demolition jargon, rather, "The only time 'pull it' is used...to denote attaching cables to a building and literally pulling it down. And this is manifestly not the mechanism by which WTC7 was destroyed." Yes, we don't actually pull them down by ropes anymore, but "pull it" still survives as jargon for bringing down a building. At [http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/silverstein\\_pullit.html](http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/silverstein_pullit.html) for example, they record one of the firefighters saying: "We're getting ready to pull Building 6...We had to be very careful how we demolished Building 6..." (Of course, this also raises the question how Building 6 was "demolished," since there were no wrecking balls swinging on 9-11). Regarding Silverstein's words to Nigro to "pull it," Mr. Douglass says: "Notice that Silverstein merely offered the fire department the suggestion that they 'pull it.'" But if, as Mr. Douglass insists, "pull it" merely means "to clear the area and create a collapse zone," why would Nigro need Silverstein's approval or suggestion to move people back or out of Building 7? Isn't that standard procedure if the fire chief believes a building is going to collapse? Hence, my sense leads me to suspect that Silverstein was contacted because building owners are often consulted before the fire department makes the final decision to bring down a very expensive building. Mr. Douglass defends Silverstein's odd language saying: "The reason Silverstein referred to fire-fighters with the singular 'it' is because he referred to the team or contingent of fire-fighters." Perhaps. Yet Douglass quotes Nigro as saying: "I issued the order to pull back the firefighters and define the collapse zone," or "it took a lot of time to pull everyone out." Obviously Nigro never refers to people as "it." This issue is significant in light of the fact that Silverstein later says: "And they made the decision to pull and then we watched the building collapse." Here he uses the pronoun "they" in reference to a group as opposed to using "it" in the previous sentence.

In any case, for Silverstein and Nigro to share a common understanding that "it" referred to pulling the firefighters out of Building 7 requires, of course, for firefighters to be in and around Building 7 between 4:00-5:20pm. But according to the official reports, no firefighters were in Building 7 as early as 11:30am. The FEMA report stated in reference to

Building 7: "No manual firefighting actions were taken by FDNY." *Popular Mechanics*, which is thoroughly against such conspiracy theories, stated: "There was no firefighting in WTC 7." The *New York Times* stated: "By 11:30 a.m., the fire commander in charge of that area, Assistant Chief Frank Fellini, ordered firefighters away from [WTC 7] for safety reasons." Hence, if "it" referred to firefighters, Nigro should have at least told Silverstein: "No problem, Larry, the firefighters were pulled out several hours ago." But no such clarification is offered by either Silverstein or Nigro. Rather, Silverstein says precisely what we would expect if "it" referred to bringing the building down manually: "And they made the decision to pull and then we watched the building collapse."

Lo and behold, there is eyewitness testimony to that effect. For example, Ground Zero emergency worker, Indira Singh, states in an interview: "What happened with that particular triage site is that pretty soon afternoon, after mid-day on 9/11 we had to evacuate that because they told us Building 7 was coming down... I do believe that they brought Building 7 down... By noon or one o'clock they told us we had to move from that triage site up to Pace University a little further away because Building 7 was going to come down or being brought down." Bonnie: "Did they actually use the word 'brought down' and who was it that was telling you this?" Indira: "The fire department...the fire department, and they did use the word 'we're going to have to bring it down.'" Another emergency worker said much the same: "We were watching the building [WTC7] actually cause it was on fire... the bottom floors of the building were on fire and... we heard this sound that sounded like a clap of thunder...turned around - we were shocked to see that the building was ah well it looked like there was a shockwave ripping through the building and the windows all busted out...it was horrifying...about a second later the bottom floor caved out and the building followed after that...we saw the building crash down all the way to the ground...we were in shock" (1010 WINS NYC News Radio.) Former NYPD Officer and 9/11 First Responder, Craig Bartmer, confirms these accounts: "I was real close to Building 7 when it fell down...That didn't sound like just a building falling down to me while I was running away from it. There's a lot of eyewitness testimony down there of hearing explosions. I didn't see any reason for that building to fall down the way it did - and a lot of guys should be saying the same thing. I don't know what the fear is coming out and talking about it? I don't know - but it's the truth." So, at the least, we have credible evidence that the US government should rightfully be under grave suspicion.

As for Mr. Douglass' assertion that Osama bin Laden "had the means, motive and opportunity to commit this crime," perhaps, but there are other possibilities. Many experts have concluded that Osama simply didn't have the capability to organize and send four US planes simultaneously into four buildings, and neither did he have the power to stall the entire US air-defense for two hours while 9-11 was occurring. Osama didn't own the major news outlets in the US that have a vested interest in blaming Arabs and Muslims for 9-11.

For these and many other reasons, Osama might make a better patsy than he does a terrorist. Perhaps there is a logical reason why the vaunted US spy agencies haven't apprehended him, for if he was set up to take the blame, the US wouldn't want him to testify, otherwise he would implicate them instead of himself. This leads me to answer Mr. Douglass' final question: "it remains for Sungenis to explain why it is more logical to believe instead that it was committed by a conspiracy of government officials and elderly landlords." Again, I wish it was Osama. I would sleep easier at night. Unfortunately, it is a fact that some of the war-mongering Necons now in power in the US government had just as much incentive as Osama bin Laden. Their PNAC think-tank, which included such dignitaries as Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Condelezza Rice, George Weigel, William Bennett, Jeb Bush and known Zionists such as Norman Podheretz, Midge Decter, Elliot Abrams, Paul Wolfowitz and Donald Kagan, published a paper in 1993 titled: "Rebuilding America's Defenses" and in it stated: "...the process of transformation, even if it bring revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor." The actual drafter of the document, Thomas Donnally, stated on national television: "The idea was that the US should seize the moment of the post Cold-war period to promote its principles and exercise its power vigorously" (*History Channel*, August 2007). I can't think of a better "Pearl Harbor" than 9-11, can you?

Granted, this doesn't prove they conspired to create 9-11, but it certainly doesn't make Osama the lone suspect. I find it highly suspicious that shortly after 9-11, Bush took full advantage of American sentiment against the Arab-Islamic world and declared war on Iraq claiming that Hussein was both harboring Osama and that he had weapons of mass destruction, both of which turned out to be utterly false. The unadmitted reasons for toppling Iraq were to gain access to more oil and to protect Israel. In fact, on April 16, 2008, Benjamin Netanyahu, former prime minister of Israel, let loose a political bombshell to an Israeli audience, stating: "We are benefiting from one thing, and that is the attack on the Twin Towers and Pentagon, and the American struggle in Iraq," adding, "these events swung American public opinion in our favor" (reported by Ma'ariv: "Netanyahu says 9/11 terror attacks good for Israel" to Haaretz Service and Reuters, <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/975574.html>). At the least, any intelligent person will have suspicions that the US government – and more specifically its clandestine agencies such as the CIA or NSA and its allies such as the Mossad – were involved in 9-11 and are now engaged in a massive coverup, just as at other times in recent history (Gulf of Tonkin, CIA Cuba project, USS Liberty, Watergate, Iran-Contra, JFK assassination, and many others).

Regarding such incidents, Ben Bradlee, former editor-in-chief of the *Washington Post* and a man who was about as close to the 'inside story' as any American could be, wrote a scathing article against the US government's unlawful conspiracies which he had experienced in his

tenure at the *Post*. In the opening paragraphs he writes: "I would like to talk about government lying. Calculated lies. The willful deception of the public for political end, especially under the disguise of national security, and what an awful price we pay for such lies under any name: misinformation, disinformation, deceit, deception, or just plain dishonesty. In America, the press is curiously shy, even embarrassed when faced with the need to use some form of the verb 'to lie' even now when public tolerance for the unexplained and for the unbelievable explanation is wearing thin. We seem to drop quickly into a defensive crouch, when even, as now, we are accused of abusing our power by not accepting explanations which often defy acceptance...." (James Cameron Memorial Lecture, 1987). I rest my case.

Robert Sungenis