



*This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.*

## KNOW YOUR STUFF

### **The two 9/11s - 1973 Chilean coup d'état and 2001 World Trade Center Attacks**

**Peter Kuznick** is Professor of History and Director of the Nuclear Studies Institute at American University in Washington, D.C. He's the co-author of the book "The Untold History of the United States", written together with Hollywood film director and producer Oliver Stone. He was active in the Civil Rights and anti-Vietnam War movements and remains active in antiwar and nuclear abolition efforts.

#### **actVism (acTV):**

Thank you for your time Peter!

When the date 9/11 comes around media coverage is devoted to the 2001 terrorist attacks in New York. Little to no coverage is devoted to the 1973 Chilean coup d'état that was initiated by the U.S. government. Could you provide some context to this coup and talk about its implications?

#### **Peter Kuznick (PK):**

The United States was very concerned about Salvador Allende who got elected President of Chile in 1970. Allende had run earlier in 1964 against Eduardo Frei (Montalva) and in that election the CIA was heavily involved in supporting Frei. When Allende ran again in 1970 the CIA pulled out all the stops. They did everything they could to prevent Allende from winning the elections in 1970 but they failed.

They had a 2-track (track 1/track 2) strategy. Track 1 was to use whatever propaganda they could to prevent Allende from winning the election and then prevent him from being seated. So they used their foreign agents in the press, they had many people in the press. They used their disinformation campaign in order to try to block Allende. After Allende won the election anyway, despite the CIA efforts, then the U.S. really went to work.

Allende was inaugurated (took office) on November 3rd 1970. Two days later President Richard Nixon began his campaign against Allende. He basically had Richard Helms, the director of the CIA, run the operation. Helms ran it through Atlee Phillips who was the station chief for the CIA in Brazil. He worked with the station chief in Chile. First, they ran an economic campaign to destroy the Chilean economy. Chile's economy was dominated by the copper interests, especially Anaconda Copper and Kennecott copper. But another major player was ITT. So working with them they made every effort they could to destabilise the Chilean economy – much like they do now with Iran, much like they do with Russia or North Korea. They pull out all the stops when it comes to the economy, thinking that's going to create pressure inside the country for forces to rise up to overthrow the elected

governments in those countries – not all those countries have elected governments by our standards – but certainly Chile did in 1970.

Allende was a socialist. They considered him a Marxist. He was an ally of Fidel Castro. He talked about nationalizing ITT and the copper industry in Chile. And so, the US with its Chilean allies and its assets decided to overthrow Allende; they destabilized the economy. When that didn't work they decided they would have to go to Track 2 and assassinate him. But Allende fought back. And in late 1972, he made a very impassioned speech to the United Nations and the place was in an uproar – it was an amazing speech. People were on their feet yelling "Viva Allende! Viva Allende!" and he got a standing ovation. The U.S. ambassador at that moment was George H. W. Bush, he was so taken with the moment that he also joined the standing ovation. And he later said, oh the United States is not imperialist, I disagree with what he's saying. But Allende made this scathing indictment of the U.S. and the U.S. effort to overthrow him. That might have been the end for Allende.

Nixon and Kissinger – Kissinger was really the mastermind who ran this from the White House. Kissinger who won the Nobel Peace Prize, Kissinger should be in the dock [court] in the Hague, not getting the Nobel Peace Prize. Kissinger ran this operation with Helms and Nixon. They bypassed the usual channels in the State Department and others who they knew would be opposed to this. In fact, the U.S. ambassador in Chile was opposed to this operation; it was so heavy handed, so [ham-fisted](#). Some of the CIA personnel were opposed to this operation, but that didn't stop Nixon, and it didn't stop Kissinger.

And when Helms's people were not going along with that. First, Helms went along with Nixon's demand, and he fired four of his six deputies. But that wasn't enough for Nixon. Nixon went ahead and fired Helms and he blamed them for allowing Allende to win the election in the first place. And so in 1972 and 1973, working with David Attlee Phillips, they ran this operation. First they assassinated General René Schneider, who was the head of the Chilean military; who was a constitutionalist and could not be bribed. But they had a lot of other military assets. In fact, the U.S. had trained more than 4000 Chilean officers in the School of the Americas and in the United States. So the U.S. had created this network in Chile already that they were able to call upon in '73 and exploit.

The operation was run by General Augusto Pinochet. He and his bloodthirsty henchmen killed thousands of people, incarcerated, tortured a hundred thousand more. And on September 11th 1973, the United States began the coup attempt against Allende. Allende took to the national radio. He exposed what was happening. He said that his own death would not be in vain. He killed himself as the troops were approaching. He killed himself with a rifle that had been given to him by his friend, Fidel Castro. There is actually a plaque from Castro to his friend Allende on the rifle that Allende used to kill himself.

So that was the US-inspired coup (overthrow) of a democratically elected, incredibly popular, President Salvador Allende in Chile. So that's the 9/11 in Chile; what happened to the United States, actually as terrible as it was, pales by comparison with what happened in Chile. Democracy in Chile went back to 1932. But that democracy could not outlast Nixon and Kissinger. And the exchanges – we have the transcripts of what they said to each other when they took credit for overthrowing Allende. And I could read some of it because it's really outrageous. But Kissinger's bloody fingers were all over this along with Nixon's.

And then after that [overthrow of Allende], they supported Operation Condor, which was run by the head of a Chilean intelligence with other right-wing governments across Latin America. And Operation Condor, with the caravan of death, killed thousands and thousands and thousands of dissidents all over Latin America. Tens of thousands outside of their own country, and put scores of

thousands in prison who were tortured and abused. More than 10,000 were killed in Project Condor that the U.S., at least facilitated, if not was directly implicated [for]. And there was pressure on Kissinger to intervene to get these right wing governments in Latin America to stop this assassination program across Latin America. And Kissinger refused to do so. He actually had an order out to these countries to stop this and then he withdrew the order.

So Kissinger is up to his eyeballs in blood and murder and assassination, and the fact that son of a bitch would get the Nobel Peace Prize is an obscenity. And the Nobel committee is never going to live that one down. The year was before or after, Sato, the Japanese prime minister got it also, which was also an outrage. And then Obama getting it was another outrage. But Kissinger is a murderer; he cannot travel in much of the world because he knows he will get arrested and brought before the international tribunal. As should be the case.

**acTV:**

Let us move forward to the terrorist attacks that happened on September 11, 2001 in New York. Could you provide some context to these attacks and also talk about the implications it had on American society as well as internationally?

**PK:**

The context that I would provide for 9/11 is much more focused on the U.S. policy and U.S. response rather than what happened with Al Qaeda and Afghanistan. From the U.S. perspective, it really begins with 1992 and the U.S. drawing up the defense planning guidance. In 1990, Charles Krauthammer, leading neocon strategist, writes a piece and gives a speech for what was then the “budding neocons of their day” at the Scoop Jackson dinner for American Enterprise Institute, in which he says that, [paraphrasing] now with the collapse of the Russian Soviet Union and the falling of the Berlin Wall, the United States has become the world's unipolar force. He says this is the unipolar moment. He says it's likely to last 30 or 40 years before anybody can challenge the United States for global hegemony. The U.S. can dominate the world call the shots and run roughshod over the rest of the planet. He says, this could last for 30-40 years. Then they could they actually put this out in writing in the Defense Planning Guidance, which was overseen by Cheney and Wolfowitz, Zalmay Khalilzad – who we see is in the press now – was instrumental in this; Libby, Feith. The whole crew. And so they put forth this plan. They have to withdraw it, they have to deny it, because when this leaked to the press, people were horrified. But this was their strategy.

In 1997, they organized an organization to actually carry this out. It's called the **Project for the New American Century**. It's actually going to be proposed and run by Robert Kagan and Bill Kristol. Bill Kristol and Robert Kagan are the masterminds behind this, and it puts together a list of all the leading neocon thinkers. So their vision is for a new American Century. The United States is going to dominate the 21st century the way the United States dominated the second half of the 20th century. That's their vision, and no force anywhere is going to be allowed to emerge. No nation or group of nations that can challenge U.S. hegemony in any region of the world should be allowed to emerge, and nobody should be allowed to develop weapons of mass destruction that can challenge the United States. So this is in 1997.

In 2000 they put forth a program for Rebuilding America's Defenses and they call for a massive increase in American military spending, but they say that the United States is not going to go along with this. They're going to have to slow walk this massive rebuilding of America's defenses unless there's some “*catalyzing and catastrophic event like a new Pearl Harbor*”. That's the word. They say [adding emphasis] “*unless we have a new Pearl Harbor*” – this is in 2000. The election in 2000: some

of the neocons supported John McCain instead of George W. Bush. In fact, I think you've got Kagan and some of the others supporting McCain; they said, he's a real war hero and a real militarist, a hawk who wants a fight everywhere. Others said, no, George W. Bush would be our man. He's more pliable, he'll go along and do anything we want. They ended up simply throwing their support behind Bush, but during the campaign Bush disavowed the neocon agenda. He says, we're not in favor of nation building, we're not going to go around the world doing these things.

It's interesting, because on 9/11/2001, when the U.S. gets hit, Bush changes. Some of the neocons said, Bush was fundamentally transformed by 9/11. And so what happened then, Bush now says, we have to run a global campaign, "*a crusade*" he calls it, then he draws back (withdraws) that language because crusade has such a meaning in the rest of the world. But he says a crusade against evil. We're going to wipe out evil around the planet. Others had a real sense of what they wanted to do. It's amazing that on 9/11 when Bush was off flying around somewhere, or reading this children's book in Florida to this class of second-graders, Cheney and Wolfowitz and Perle and Libby and Rumsfeld immediately knew what they wanted to do.

On 9/11, and then again on 9/12, when Bush is back in the Oval Office, they're saying to Richard Clarke who is in charge of America's counterintelligence at the time, they're saying see what Saddam Hussein's role was in this. And Richard Clarke says, What are you talking about? This was al-Qaeda. This was not Saddam Hussein. He says, in fact Saddam Hussein hates al-Qaeda. Saddam Hussein is opposed to these things. And they say, well find out what he did. Rumsfeld says, Oh but there's no good targets in Afghanistan. Iraq has all the good targets. They're saying to Tenet and to the CIA and to Richard Clarke, find out what Iraq's role was in all this. Clarke couldn't believe what he was hearing and nor could his deputies, and they said that they couldn't believe that they were going to use this. He said they wanted to use this as an excuse for invading Iraq, for overthrowing Saddam Hussein.

And that's what the **Project for the New American Century** had been saying from the very beginning. The **Project for the New American Century** had been targeting Iraq. Afghanistan was not of real importance to these people, it was a minor player. But Iraq had defied the United States in the first Gulf War. And now they were saying, we have our chance to get rid of Saddam Hussein. But that was not all.

So on September 20th, the **Project for the New American Century** puts out another paper signed by all these leading neocons. Many of whom were already in the Bush administration. Eleven leading members of the **Project for the New American Century** had top positions within the Bush administration and other neocons were in there as well. Cheney was in there as Vice President. Rumsfeld was in there as Secretary of Defense but they were in there across the board. Perle and Wolfowitz as Deputy Secretary of Defense. They were all in there or many of them were in there already. What they say in the September 20th paper that they wrote or the letter they wrote to Bush was, even if Iraq is not involved in 9/11, we've got to go after and overthrow the government of Iraq.

But that was just the beginning. So then the United States in October 7, 2001, they decide to start Operation Enduring Freedom and the invasion of Afghanistan. So al Qaeda did operate out of Afghanistan. We know that. The United States had met with Taliban leaders more than 20 times, discussing turning over Osama bin Laden to the United States. In fact, the Taliban was ready to turn over Osama bin Laden. The Taliban foreign minister actually proposed turning bin Laden over to the Organization of the Islamic Conference; the Taliban foreign minister said that he would turn bin Laden over to this organization and put him on trial.

The United States said, no, no, we want you to turn him over to the United States directly. Milton Bearden was the former station chief. He had run the operation in Afghanistan against the Soviet

Union from Pakistan in the 1980s. Milton Bearden said that the Taliban was begging the United States to give them an excuse, a face-saving measure, to turn bin Laden over to the United States for trial like the United States was demanding. But the United States, he says, blew it and did not give them [Taliban] that, and so they couldn't turn bin Laden over, which is what they [Taliban] actually wanted to do.

So the United States begins the invasion of Afghanistan. It seemed exhilarating in the beginning, even though Rumsfeld did not want boots on the ground because he did not want American casualties. So we did his bombing campaign. We had the al Qaeda leaders trapped in Tora Bora but we allowed them to escape. So even that was inept. But according to Krauthammer this was exhilarating. He said, we have proven how powerful the United States is. Nothing like this has ever existed before in the history of mankind.

So in 2002, Krauthammer says, I was wrong in 1990 when I said this was the "unilateral moment". He said, this is actually the unilateral era. He said, when I said 30 or 40 years [back in 1990] I underestimated how powerful the United States really was. He said, this could last indefinitely, that the U.S. will control the world. And this was the vision that these clowns had.

Well then things didn't go so well, really, in Afghanistan or in Iraq. And by 2000, or soon thereafter, as the head of the Arab League says, the gates of hell are open in Iraq now and the jihadis from all over the world saw that as their opportunity, and they flooded into Iraq, they flooded into Afghanistan. And then by 2006 even Krauthammer finally got it and he said, well I exaggerated, I overestimated our strength. And he said, the unilateral era is over, even the unilateral moment is now threatened.

And what we see: the United States has been in Afghanistan for 18 years now. And who won in Iraq? Not the United States. You've got a government in Iraq that's beholden to Iran. The Iranians were the big winner from these geniuses, these idiots, who went in there and thought the United States could impose its will through the barrel of a gun. And that didn't happen. and it hasn't happened overall.

But what they did have was this fantasy, their wet dream was this American empire. And so you have the neocons, all of them coming out; Kristol in his publication talks about American Empire; Max Boot, you want to see Max Boot? You turn on CNN now in the United States, and you see this idiot. Now he's a big wise man. Here he's talking about, oh we need to have an American empire. The New York Times fell for this. Not surprisingly. And on January 5, 2003 The New York Times headline, the Sunday magazine section cover story, "The American Empire (Get Used To It.)" And so they started to talk about the United States taking over various parts of the world.

So you've got John Bolton, and Bolton says well we've got to overthrow the government in Syria. We've got to overthrow the government in North Korea. We've got to overthrow the government in Iran. General Wesley Clark, former head of NATO military mission, Clark goes to the Pentagon and talks to some commanding officers there and they tell them we've got a five year plan to overthrow seven governments and so we're talking about remaking the map of the world. These neocon strategists. This was their fantasy. We're going to remake the map of the world. And so we're going to begin with Afghanistan. Then we're going into Iraq, and then we're going to do Syria, and then we're going to do Iran. And they've got this list of all these countries. Libya was high on everybody's list also. And this was the fantasy, and the fantasy becomes not a reality in terms of its results, but it becomes a reality in terms of what they actually tried to do.

And what has this done ?

The United States has spent trillions and trillions of dollars. We've killed more than a million people. Probably, we don't know exact numbers. We don't keep track of the numbers of Arabs who and

Middle Easterners who we kill. Muslims, you know? Muslim lives are cheap in the United States. But we also change the United States. And so, in addition to these forever wars that we embark on, we tear up the U.S. Constitution, we passed the **Patriot Act**. In fact, the only one who voted against the Patriot Act in the Senate was Russ Feingold. To his everlasting glory, he voted against it. They rushed it through in the House. They rushed through even faster in the Senate. The senators didn't even have time to read it. And the patriotic fools, they thought of themselves as patriots. The opposite of real patriots. They blindly went along with this and basically shredded the U.S. Constitution. Then we have this massive surveillance program, this massive militarization of the United States. This intelligence operation. Then we have this five-color intelligence scheme, this warning to make Americans paranoid, play on American fear. And then you've got the chicken hawks taking over: the George W. Bushes, the Cheneys – how many (draft) deferments did Cheney have – five? And then they've got to start this massive campaign of lies. We know what a liar Trump is. But the Bush administration was only a few steps behind them, and when they did this the American public was not supporting the war and invasion of Iraq. Only a third of the American people were supporting the invasion of Iraq.

So what does Bush do? His brilliant move is to pick Colin Powell. Colin Powell was the only one in that administration who had real credibility. So Bush says, you go before the United Nations, maybe they'll believe you. Because they certainly didn't believe him and they didn't believe Cheney, and they didn't believe Rumsfeld, they didn't believe Wolfowitz. The New York Times called these plotters the Wolfowitz cabal. So they pick Colin Powell, and Colin Powell on February 5th 2003 goes before the United Nations and he shows his vial of white powder, and he says, this little bit of anthrax can kill thousands of people. He says, "we've got the best intelligence, we're not guessing at this. This is not speculation. These are cold hard facts." And Powell did have credibility sadly and he talked about these mobile biological laboratories that there are in Iraq and it was all nonsense and lies, and Powell later admitted that this was the low point in his career. He had some other low points that he didn't get to that we could talk about.

It didn't work globally around the world. People knew that this was a pack of lies that were spread by the United States and its lapdog Tony Blair in Britain, and the stuff that he said. So you know Bush gives his State of the Union address in 2003, and he talks about the British intelligence about this uranium that was being sent over to Iraq from Africa. Again lies, lies, lies, lies, which Joe Wilson exposed very clearly so people knew they were lies, but approval for the US invasion of Iraq jumped from a third to 50 % after Powell's address. But around Europe and other parts of the world: in Europe, 84% of people who were polled said that the United States was the main threat to world peace; 7% or 9% said Iraq was the main threat to world peace. Around the planet people knew this and so the United States calls for inspections of Iraq to find the weapons of mass destruction. And we can't find them anywhere.

Hans Blix, the chief U.N. weapons inspector says, How can you be 100% sure that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction and have 0% accuracy in telling us where they are? The U.N. weapons inspectors had access well over Iraq, and they couldn't find anything. In fact Iraq released a dossier 11,800 pages long detailing their destruction of weapons of mass destruction after the first Gulf War. One of the main defector to the United States was Saddam Hussein's son-in-law who had overseen Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program. And he gave such detailed evidence to the United States about the destruction, that Ralph Ickes said that it was embarrassing that detail he gave us, and according to Scott Ritter, the U.N. weapons inspector, who said there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Scott Ritter said that biological weapons have a shelf life of three years and chemical weapons have a shelf life of five years, but they were all destroyed and they didn't have time to rebuild this. So we knew that there were no weapons of mass destruction, but it was lies. The same lies you see coming out of Donald Trump's mouth every single day were coming out of George Bush's mouth every single day. And not just Bush, it was also Cheney, it was also Condoleezza Rice. And what was their scare

tactic? We don't want to see the smoking gun be a mushroom cloud. That Iraq was developing nuclear weapons also: nonsense! And the same kind of lies that we see about Iran, you know, the weapons of mass destruction. We have to overthrow the government in Iran. We've seen this game plan before. We've seen the playbook. As Larry Wilkerson said very clearly, we saw this. Wilkerson was Colin Powell Chief of Staff. Larry's a friend of mine. He was a colonel, he was Chief of Staff. And he's warned that the same game plan they used in Iraq, they're using now in Iran. Exact same thing but people have such a short memory.

Then they go ahead and they invade Iraq and it turns out to be an absolute effing disaster, for the Iraqis, for the Americans, for U.S. foreign policy, for the world. Millions of people are out in the street protesting that: 3 million people showed up in Rome. And around all of the world, some of the estimates are as high as 20 million people protested the US invasion of Iraq (but that figure is probably exaggerated). This is what the aftermath of 9/11 was in the United States.

And the United States begins this program around the world. Extraordinary rendition: we started kidnapping people around the world. We put them into black sites. One of the countries that took these people that the United States rounded up was Bassar al-Assad's Syria, Hosni Mubarak's Egypt took them. But Syria took them. That's where we were sending these people. We sent more than 700, almost 800, to Guantanamo where they were tortured. We sent them to Abu Ghraib where they were raped. You know the exposé there.

This was so embarrassing the United States had always prided itself on its treatment of prisoners. What we were doing now. We were torturing them. We were raping them. We were waterboarding them. We were putting electrodes on their genitals. We were stripping them naked and making them stay like that for days, weeks, at a time. We know the horrible things the United States was doing under this torture program. And most of them [Prisoners] were innocent. Most of the people they sent to Guantanamo were released, because there was no evidence. We were giving rewards to people who capture people on the battlefields. And so people would go around and capture innocent [people], turn them into the United States for the reward money. And the United States became a lawless country on a global scale. The American reputation, if it had ever existed in a positive way, it was totally torn to shreds by the Bush administration, and many of those policies were continued by Obama, and then they were continued by Trump. The United States was a very imperfect democracy to begin with but a lot of what was positive was ruined after 9/11 and the surveillance on a massive scale, now it still continues.

***END***