

Scenario 29

Gen Musharraf Trapped in 9/11 Event (2001):

Unlike Gen Ziaul Haq, who used to speak very often that:

'After 90 days he would hold general elections and quit'.

Gen Musharraf usually proclaimed, referring to his televised speech of October 1999, saying that:

'I am a soldier, I don't believe in sharing power. I believe in the unity of command'.

He had rarely disguised his desire to exercise absolute control over state power. In August 2001, he had named himself President in 'the national interest'. Episode of 'Nine Eleven' in America provided him an opportunity to strengthen his grip over political affairs in Pakistan. Gen Musharraf, sensing an opportunity to secure international acceptance for his coup (of October 1999), quickly agreed to place Pakistan in the lap of American sponsored 'war on terror' coalition.

The US Congress waived democracy sanctions imposed under Section 508 of the US Foreign Operations Appropriations Act after the military coup of 12th October 1999 as well as those which were thrust upon Pakistan after its nuclear tests of 28th May 1998.

Japan and European donors followed America, rescheduling loans and extending grants in aid. International support boosted Gen Musharraf's domestic standing, providing him the chance to win confidence of the general populace within the country. He gained more strength; thus on 6th October 2001, the day America launched its first military attack on Afghanistan, Gen Musharraf extended his tenure as Chief of the Army Staff (COAS) for an indefinite period pushing aside all the prevailing rules, norms and traditions of army.

In Pakistan military interventions have usually been undertaken in response to notions of perceived national crises, therefore, to overcome the problems associated with legitimacy the military rulers *'tend to look for institutional mechanisms that can prolong their rule and give it a stable and permanent legitimate foundation'*. The constitutional manipulators and twisters like Sharifuddin Pirzada were always available to them suggesting legal and constitutional instruments for *'neutralization of [existing] political arena and subordination of the state to the military hierarchy'*.

For Gen Musharraf, the judiciary functioned as a subsumed institution for military; it was a general perception available on record.

The judiciary, instead of dragging those so called legal experts associated with proactive Generals to face treason charges under Article 6 of the Constitution, used to seek 'guidance' from them in issuing legitimacy in favour of their own manufactured charters of coercion like Legal Framework Order (LFO). By putting guns on the shoulders of such legal 'Mir Jaffers' and their brother judges sitting on rostrums to approve their suggestions, the military rulers like Gen Musharraf used to feel honour to dismiss the elected government, dissolve the national assembly, appoint military services chiefs and approve appointments to the judiciary.

On 20th June 2001, Irshad Hassan Khan, Chief Justice of Pakistan, the principal keeper of law and the supreme provider of justice in the country, administered the oath of office swearing

in Gen Musharraf as President of Pakistan while he was in the uniform of an Army Chief. Both had walked over the Constitutional provisions.

General Justice is now a sixty-two years story where the legislative pillar of the state has been a consistent loser. Justice Muhammad Munir decided in favour of a General. Justice Anwarul Haq decided in favour of a General and Justice Irshad Hassan Khan decided in favour of a General and more to come perhaps.

After 9/11, Gen Musharraf was conveyed a threat that:

'If you want to live in 21st century come with America otherwise you would be pushed into the stone age.'

Those were all threats. The discussion broke down in media that what was the other option available. The subsequent events proved that the whole game was fabricated to target and take control of the Islamic world through Iraq and Pakistan. The attack on Twin Towers was the starting point of the wholesome game. Pakistan had faced such situations before but handled in a fine way conveying correct message for its enemies of international stature.

Compare that threat with that similar kind of situation which Pakistan had faced earlier. In mid 1980s Pakistan got information that certain Israeli pilots were performing rehearsals in remote areas of Rajasthan (India) using Indian Air Force planes probably aiming at Kahuta Nuclear Plant. Pakistan had to convey very clear messages to both India and Israel to correct their thinking and wind up all such practices otherwise 'would be dealt with relentlessly'.

Though Pakistan was not a proclaimed nuclear power then but a lucid communication was made that:

*'Pakistan keeps **that thing** and we would not hesitate to use it wherever needed'.*

Rajiv Gandhi, the Indian Prime Minister then, went so embarrassed that he not only called off the Rajasthan exercises and despatched the Israeli pilots back immediately but during the next SAARC Conference himself offered Gen Ziaul Haq to mutually sign a bilateral agreement for not attacking each other's nuclear arsenals.

Similarly Israel was loudly told that:

*'Pakistan would not bother that from which side planes are coming, from east or west, but we'll teach you a lesson **lest Pakistan should do that job for first and last time but we'll do.** Pakistan should not be taken as Iraq. We have enough material to destroy your whole country at least.'*

It was an excessively harsh message for a country which itself had surfaced on globe as a result of 'terror' phenomenon but their Indian friends had read in between the lines.

The nations have to take such ultimate decisions at times to keep its survival intact. There are no two opinions that Gen Musharraf had to take that decision to neutralize the threats after 9/11 episode and to divert the first possible American attack on Pakistan but should not have taken it as a permanent policy for all times to come. Otherwise, in army there exists a standing rule that while formulating a policy or plan an operation, the commander has to mark a line which is not to be crossed at any cost. If you cross that line or limit you sometimes go 180 angles opposite to the determined goals and objectives.

The same happened with Pakistan in the contemporary Afghan War on Terror (WOT) in which due to Gen Musharraf's short sightedness, we lost every thing. It was not our war and there were no soviet in Afghanistan to be expelled away.

Gen Musharraf in fact could not understand the hidden American plans behind the WOT slogans through which the US wanted to swallow Iraq and Pakistan; nothing doing with Afghanistan. We went too far against the normal terms of relationship between two independent states.

There was no logic in obeying any American order blindly which was not implemented in their own states. We handed them over Yousaf Ramzi, Amil Kanshi, Eqbal Beg, Ayub Afridi and Anwar Khatak like people for what; just to get few thousand dollars that too through recommendations of Rehman Malik, the CIA's paid and planted person in Pakistan's bureaucracy since 1995. The said acts were not done through any acceptable rule, law or procedure of Pakistan nor of America even.

We imported every kind of terrorism, bomb blasts, suicidal bombers and terrorists in our country amidst loss of lives and economy for nothing. What kind of decisions we had made and what commitments we are sticking to, that too with historical liars.

Exactly a decade back, on **19th September 2001**, Gen Musharraf addressed the nation, acknowledging that many Pakistanis were bitterly opposed to his policy of support for the US in its efforts to track down Osama Bin Laden and dealing with his Al-Qaeda. He made it clear that:

'The US plans are not an attack on Afghanistan or Islam'.

In fact it was an attack on both.

Gen Musharraf had told the utter lies in his televised address that:

"Thousands of lives have been lost in the wake of terrorism in America on which I, my government, and the whole Pakistani nation are deeply grieved. This terrorist incident has sent a wave of profound grief, indignation and a sense of revenge in the United States. Their target is Osama, the al-Qaeda and the Taliban. They also intend to launch a prolonged war against international terrorism.

There are three important things in which the United States is seeking our support. First, the exchange of intelligence and information; second, the use of our airspace; and third, they are asking for logistic support from us. I want to apprise you of our internal situation. In my opinion, it is the most delicate phase since 1971 and God forbid, [any miscalculation] may endanger our territorial integrity and our survival. Our nuclear strength and our Kashmir cause may be harmed. This is the worst case scenario.

The better side of it would be that we could emerge as a responsible and honourable nation and all our problems could diminish.

Our neighbouring country India has readily offered all their bases, facilities, and logistic support to the US and in turn wants from US to declare Pakistan a terrorist state. I only want to tell them in English: Lay off. Now in my view there are four critical concerns: Firstly, ensuring the country's security and stability from external threat; secondly our economy; thirdly our nuclear assets and fourthly the Kashmir cause. Pakistan comes first, everything else is secondary.

On this occasion, we have to make a strategic decision. Leaving aside questions of weakness of faith or cowardice, we should not invite trouble for nothing. The future of 140 million people cannot be jeopardized. What have I not done for Afghanistan and Taliban? Even now, we are trying our best to hold negotiations with them; I sent DG ISI with my personal letter to Mullah Omar. We are also telling the US to show restraint and balance in their intentions. We can influence decisions of the world community by standing with them.

I am only concerned about Pakistan but some people; some elements are trying to take advantage of this occasion to carry forward their personal agenda, their parties' agenda. I appeal to all the Pakistanis to show unity and solidarity and to protect the interests of the country. In conclusion, I would like to take leave after quoting this prayer of Moses as cited in the Taha chapter of the Holy Kora'an:

'My Lord! Expand my chest, make my work easy, and open the knot of my tongue, so that the people can understand what I say.' Long live Pakistan!"

The government of Pakistan faced intense American pressure, while being threatened by a potentially violent domestic backlash from Islamic groups which opposed any form of assistance to US military retaliation against neighbouring Afghanistan's ruling Taliban militia and Osama who was taken as the prime suspect for terrorist attacks on New York and Washington on 11th September 2001.

Gen Musharraf in the 35-minute televised address to the nation also said that America had not completed its operational plan for a proposed attack on Afghanistan till then. To this extent the General was true because the first US attack on Afghanistan was launched on 6th October after full assurance of our ISI.

The world media forums had noted that most Pakistanis were deeply uncomfortable with the idea of allowing American forces on to their soil. Gen Musharraf also said he was asking America to provide evidence against Osama but admitted that Washington had not provided any detailed evidence of his involvement in the attack.

Here comes two versions: The western media (referring to daily **'the Telegraph' dated 20th September 2001**) had held that Osama had denied responsibility and the Taliban government of Afghanistan had stripped him of all communications equipment necessary to organise complex terrorist activities after America blamed him for the destruction of two American embassies in Africa three years ago.

The spokesmen of the Islamic groups in Pakistan had told the media that:

'The Taliban government in Afghanistan had held Osama with them but urged that the US authorities should convince them through international jurists that why Osama be handed over to America just against an allegation. The Taliban wanted cogent proof of Osama's involvement in 9/11 affairs. Osama was Taliban's guest; by virtue of Afghan traditions dear to them.' What was the actual truth, still unknown'.
(Ref: **Jernailon Ki Syasat by Sohail Warroich P-182**)

Gen Musharraf received only muted support from Pakistan's mainstream politicians, intellectuals, editors and the armed forces but one Islamic group had vowed 'holy war' if Pakistan aided America. Gen Musharraf was in hot waters even before that crisis of 9/11. He had seized power in a bloodless coup two years ago, with the pledge that he would end Pakistan's endemic and crippling corruption but, instead of holding elections, he transformed himself from the 'Chief Executive' to a President in June 2001. However, the American President Bush had welcomed Gen Musharraf's speech, saying:

'It was an indication of the strong relationship between the United States and Pakistan to counter terrorism'.

Though there have been tens of movies, documentaries and books written in this context that the 9/11 event was not an actual tragedy; it was a fabricated act allegedly of some keenly fundamentalist Jews which did not even form a part of mainstream American stake holders in politics or economy. No concerted investigation has surfaced yet nor have the American governments ever seriously tried to answer hundreds of simple questions from the American intelligentsia.

Lt Gen Hamid Gul, once added some more points in that long list during an interview published in **'Jang' of 19th November 2001**, urging:

- When the first plane collided with Twin towers, why the US Air Force could not get alert through its own 'watch system'?
- Why the world's best Air Force could only move after 75 minutes of getting 'Alert Signal' despite the fact on record that President Bush had issued that signal for American Forces just ten minutes after the first attack on Twin Towers [it was not laziness].

- Despite such a grave failure, President Bush went to CIA HQ to pat 'certain people'[who were they actually].
- For complete one hour, three planes were changing directions in air, why the Air Traffic Control Tower could not take notice of it.
- During routine enquiries of 9/11 episode, what explanation came from Air Traffic Control people in this respect; were they thoroughly examined.
- Still there is no enquiry on record that why the 'Warning Switch' of Pentagon was turned off and who had done so and for what purpose and on whose ultimate instructions.
- Who got benefited from the 9/11 episode; Muslims or Jews or Afghans or Al-Qaeda or America itself?
- What conclusive evidence had come up that the Muslims were responsible for it and if so, the Pakistanis or Afghans.
- The named culprits were from Middle Eastern origin then why Afghanistan and Pakistan were selected for punishment.
- Where lies that Air Training School in the world where a pilot of Boeing 757 becomes so expert within six months that he could fly so accurately through sky-high buildings of New York and collides with Twin Towers such precisely without Air Traffic Control's guidance as per practice.

The above observations and many more had come on media record during the first week of 9/11 event. Gen Musharraf had also realised that and that was why he had conveyed through his speech of 19th September that Pakistan would not follow the US blindly. Later he swirled away from his promise with the nation and fell in America's lap like a broken feather. In those moments of distress he should have behaved like a statesman and:

- Gen Musharraf should have pressed Americans through diplomatic means to forward proof of involvement of Osama or Taliban in 9/11 disaster.
- Gen Musharraf should have called the expert jurists to guide him under international obligations to counteract or deal with those baseless accusations whatsoever.
- Gen Musharraf should have consulted China first for having their confidence to counter the American pressure on issues in which Pakistan was not directly involved.

[Pakistan approached China but much after making commitment with America. Then the Chinese government had refused to give consent for Pakistan Delegation's visit to Beijing. They politely told Gen Musharraf to see the Chinese Ambassador in Islamabad.]

- Gen Musharraf could also request the international Jurist's body at Geneva for opinion and guidance amidst such allegations for which Pakistan was not a party.
- Gen Musharraf should have called a meeting of OIC (organisation of Islamic Countries) to agitate them in the name of Islam which was being targeted then.

[The tragedy: that there was an OIC meeting in routine those days but, instead of asking for their diplomatic help, Gen Musharraf's delegation conveyed them, just 36 hours before meeting, that Pakistan had got enough evidence of Osama & Taliban's involvement.]

Instead of raising hue & cry that some people are with me and some against me in Pakistan, Gen Musharraf should have sent a delegation to pope for want of interference. He should have told Americans bluntly that he was not even an elected representative of the nation; so if the people came out in streets against his un-realistic decisions, he would not find a place to hide [rather take him to gallows].

Referring to [Washington Blogs borrowed by] 'A True Pakistani' placed at www.Pakspectator.com dated 21st September 2011; it is the truth that 'war on terrorism' produced more terrorists. Intelligent persons could think that American treatment of the Muslim world could have produced violent and vengeful anti-Americanism.

For over 50 years the successive American administrations, for the sake of geopolitical hegemony and preferential access to resources, have backed brutal dictators, subverted governments, and invaded and occupied countries as it suited their agenda of 'world leadership'. Power and oil were the major reasons [rather goals].

The 9/11 event was also a step towards intensifying of American lust for more, but the facts ultimately surfaced with odd stories. 1500 Architects and Engineers have already disproved US official claims. 48% of Americans want a fresh investigation and they do not buy their own government's state lies at all. See some glimpses what the Americans themselves believe:

- The 9/11 Commission's Co-Chairs said: *'they knew that military officials misrepresented the facts to the Commission, and the Commission considered recommending criminal charges for such false statements'*.
- The 9/11 Commission's Co-Chair Lee Hamilton said: *'I don't believe for a minute we got everything right; the people should keep asking questions about 9/11, and that the debate should continue'*.
- The 9/11 Commission's Member Timothy Roemer said: *'we were extremely frustrated with the false statements we were getting'*.
- The 9/11 Commission's Member Max Cleland resigned from the Commission, stating: *'It is a national scandal; this investigation is now compromised; and one of these days we will have to get the full story because the 9/11 issue is so important to America. But this White House wants to cover it up'*.
- The 9/11 Commission's Member Bob Kerrey said: *'there are ample reasons to suspect that there may be some alternative to what we outlined in our version; we didn't have access; the investigation depended too heavily on the accounts of Al Qaeda detainees who were physically coerced into talking and making false admissions'*.
- The Senior Counsel to the 9/11 Commission, John Farmer, said:

'At some level of the government, at some point in time...there was an agreement not to tell the truth about what happened.

I was shocked at how different the truth was from the way it was described The tapes told a radically different story from what had been told to us and the public for two years....

This is not spin. This is not true. It's almost a culture of concealment, for lack of a better word. There were interviews made at the FAA's New York Centre the night of 9/11 and those tapes were destroyed; CIA tapes of the interrogations were destroyed.

The story of 9/11 itself, to put it mildly, was distorted and was completely different from the way things happened'.

- Former military analyst Daniel Ellsberg said:

'The case of a certain 9/11 whistleblower is far more explosive than the Pentagon Papers. The government is ordering the media to cover up her allegations about 9/11.

Some of the claims concerning government involvement in 9/11 are credible, that very serious questions have been raised about what they [US government officials]

knew beforehand and how much involvement there might have been, that engineering 9/11 would not be humanly or psychologically beyond the scope of the current administration, and that there's enough evidence to justify a new, 'hard-hitting' investigation into 9/11 with testimony taken under oath.'

- A 27-year CIA veteran, Raymond McGovern, who chaired National Intelligence Estimates and personally delivered intelligence briefings to Presidents Reagan and George Bush, their Vice Presidents, Secretaries of State, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and many other senior government officials said: *'I think at simplest terms, there's a cover-up. The 9/11 Report is a joke'*. Mostly Americans believed him.
- A 29-year CIA veteran, former National Intelligence Officer (NIO) and former Director of the CIA's Office of Regional and Political Analysis, William Bill Christison said: *'I now think there is persuasive evidence that the events of September did not unfold as the Bush administration and 9/11 Commission would have us believe.'*
- A number of intelligence officials, including a CIA Operations Officer who co-chaired a CIA multi-agency task force, named Lynne Larkin, sent a joint letter to Congress expressing their concerns about *'serious shortcomings, omissions and major flaws'* in the 9/11 Commission Report and offering their services for a new investigation; however, ignored.
- A decorated 20-year CIA veteran and prize winning investigative reporter Seymour Hersh, called the best on-ground field officer in the Middle East and whose astounding career formed the script for the Academy Award winning motion picture *Syriana*, Robert Baer said: *'the evidence points at 9/11 having had aspects of being an inside job'*.
- The Division Chief of the CIA's Office of Soviet Affairs, who served as Senior Analyst from 1966 – 1990, served as Professor of International Security at the National War College from 1986 – 2004, Melvin Goodman said: *'the final [9/11 Commission] report is ultimately a cover-up'*.
- The Co-Chair of the Congressional Inquiry into 9/11 event and former Head of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Bob Graham, told: *'an FBI informant had hosted and rented a room to two hijackers in 2000 and that, when the Inquiry sought to interview the informant, the FBI refused outright, and then sent him to an unknown location, and that a high-level FBI official stated these blocking manoeuvres were undertaken under orders from the White House'*.
- Democratic US Senator Patrick Leahy said: *'the two questions that the congress will not ask . . . is why 9/11 happened on George Bush's watch when he had clear warnings that it was going to happen? Why did they allow it to happen?'*
- Republican Congressman Ron Paul called for a new 9/11 investigation stating: *'we see the [9/11] investigations that have been done so far as more or less cover-up and no real explanation of what went on'*.
- Democratic Congressman Dennis Kucinich hinted: *'we aren't being told the truth about 9/11'*.
- Republican Congressman Jason Chafetz said: *'we need to be vigilant and continue to investigate 9/11'*.
- Democratic Senator Mike Gravel stated: *'he supports a new 9/11 investigation and that we don't know the truth about 9/11'*.
- Republican Senator Lincoln Chaffee endorsed a new 9/11 investigation.
- Democratic Congressman Dan Hamburg did not believe the official version of events.

- Republican Congressman and senior member of the House Armed Services Committee, who had also served for six years as the Chairman of the Military Research and Development Subcommittee, Curt Weldon, had explicitly shown that:

'The US tracked hijackers before 9/11, is open to hearing information about explosives in the Twin Towers, and is open to the possibility that 9/11 was an inside job.'

- The Commanding General of US European Command and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, decorated with the Bronze Star, Silver Star and Purple Heart, General Wesley Clark, said:

'We've never finished the investigation of 9/11 and whether the administration actually misused the intelligence information it had. The evidence seems pretty clear to me. I've seen that for a long time.'

- Former Deputy Secretary for Intelligence and Warning under Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Carter, Morton Goulder; the former Deputy Director to the White House Task Force on Terrorism, Edward L. Peck and former US Department of State Foreign Service Officer, J. Michael Springmann, had jointly called for a new investigation into 9/11.
- Former Federal Prosecutor, Office of Special Investigations, US Department of Justice under Presidents Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan; former US Army Intelligence officer and celebrated media commentator on terrorism and intelligence services, John Loftus said:

'The information provided by European intelligence services prior to 9/11 was so extensive that it is no longer possible for either the CIA or FBI to assert a defence of incompetence.'

- The Group Director on matters of the national security in the US Government Accountability Office said that President Bush did not respond to unprecedented warnings of the 9/11 disaster and conducted a massive cover-up instead of accepting responsibility.
- Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defence under President Ronald Reagan, Col. Ronald D. Ray, said: *'the official story of 9/11 is of the dog that doesn't hunt'*.
- Several key employees for the Defence Department said that the government covered up their testimony about tracking Mohammed Atta before 9/11.
- The former director of the FBI, Louis Freeh, said: *'there was a cover up by the 9/11 Commission'*.

Numerous other politicians, judges, legal scholars, and attorneys also question at least some aspects of the government's version of 9/11. *'It was all drama and will remain a drama'*; Beyond doubt! Gen Musharraf was trapped in 9/11 accusation knowingly or due to his in-built cowardice for which the whole nation suffered.

It was all drama and will remain a drama, no difference if America replays a tape of it every year at Zero Point New York or through media campaigns.

[Part of this essay was published at www.Pakspectator.com dated 21st September 2011]