

LATEST NEWS FROM MOSCOW

[Latest News Index](#)
[Page](#)

[Profindpages](#)
[Homepage](#)

[Videos/Movies](#)
[Gifts](#)
[Personals](#)
[Holidays](#)

[Hypnosis Downloads](#)
[Party Costumes and](#)
[Things](#)
[Games](#)
[Family](#)

[Entertainment](#)
[Perfume/Jewelry](#)

The Profindpages News section is designed to bring you the latest news from Russia, America, Britain and the rest of the world, which include opinions based on our views.

FO
GE



Pl
Pr
He

Al-Qaeda, Iran and the next 9/11 (16.06.2005)



**BUY A
PROPERTY IN
SPAIN!**

Cheap Villas,
Apartments, Plots,
Commercial
Property. Click the
image to search from
a database of more
than 6000 properties.



The propaganda from the U.S. has been growing at an increasing rate against Iran, with attempts to tie them to al-Zarqawi, Osama bin Laden, other terrorists that hide there and of

course nuclear weapons.

Most people have come to accept that the Bush administration will be involved in an attack on Iran, the only question is when?

We have seen for some time the so called "growing evidence" that the administration have provided, that is designed to convince others that Iran is a country





that must be "dealt with"


Like the situation with Saddam Hussein and Iraq, the U.S. are supplying information in preparation for an attack. In the case of Iraq, the excuse was "weapons of mass destruction", but as we have seen in the "Downing Street Memo", plans for the invasion were being created before the subject of WMD arose, this was simply the best excuse they could find at the time.

Even though the WMD were never found in Iraq, a number of different reasons for Hussein's removal were offered afterwards to justify the invasion. An attack plotted between the Bush administration and the British Prime Minister, Tony Blair.



Holiday Savings for UK visitors!

Whilst the Bush administration would love to use the same routine on Iran, even they realize that this might be just a little too obvious. They have of course pushed the "nuclear" aspect hard and this much is the same as the WMD angle used on Iraq.



This alone would not be sufficient to gain backing for an attack and they have therefore added the ingredient of terrorists hiding in Iran. Reports issued at the beginning of this month claimed that terrorists were hiding in Iran and that maybe al-Zarqawi was one of them. In the last couple of days news reports have been promoting the idea that Osama bin Laden may also be there! But of course these reports can not be verified, however the information comes from sources that we are supposed to believe.

But would the presence of bin Laden and al-Zarqawi in Iran be enough to support an attack? We think not.

We believe that there will be one more step before the Bush administration feel that they have "sold" the idea sufficiently, another 9/11.

In our earlier articles on this subject (which were kept out of the main headlines), we suggested that the next 9/11 would come in the form of an attack on an Aircraft Carrier in the Persian Gulf (next to Iran).

You will no doubt

[Si](#)
[A](#)

recall that the USS America (an old Aircraft Carrier) was sunk in the Atlantic on the 14th May 2005, after 25 days of explosions. The Navy said that the explosive tests would provide valuable data on survivability for the next generation of Aircraft Carriers, which are now in development.

This could of course be true, but it could also be a test to see what it takes to sink an Aircraft Carrier of this size. It is also difficult to understand how using "explosives" would help the design of future carriers, unless the Navy expect the enemy to place these on the ship somehow. Surely, a better test would be achieved by using weapons that are more likely to be used (like missiles for example?).

But let's assume for a moment that the test had more "sinister" reasons and somebody wanted to know what it would need to sink a carrier currently on duty (say in the Persian Gulf?). It may surprise some people to know that the USS Carl Vinson is almost exactly the same size as the USS America. They were both built by the same company, are about the same length (30 foot difference), same flight deck area (4.5 acres), have a 5 foot difference in Beam, approximately 2 foot difference in Draft, similar displacement with a full load, both can carry 85 planes and require similar crew levels.

Let's continue to speculate and imagine what would happen if the USS Carl Vinson was "attacked" and sunk, perhaps with the loss of most of its crew (which totals around 5,500). After a very short investigation (like in the WTC attack), the Bush administration announce that the attack was carried out by al-Zarqawi or Osama bin Laden (or maybe both?) and that these "terrorists" had fled to Iran!

The United States would naturally demand that Iran hand over the "culprits", but this will be impossible to do, as they are not hiding there at all. This would be followed by threats and eventually an attack.

The important question is whether anyone would

really believe that al-Zarqawi or Osama bin Laden were responsible, or that they were "hiding" in Iran.

Surely, that would be too much of a coincidence, wouldn't it?

As we have already stated (see our previous article), [Osama bin Laden](#) is stuck in a place near Chitral in Pakistan, and would find it almost impossible to move anywhere (let alone Iran). That's not to say that bin Laden would not have a hand in any attack, but only because of his "connections" and under instruction from those higher up (we think you know who?)

It is important to mention that Osama bin Laden's "al Qaeda" network was set up with funding from the CIA, to fight the left-wing government of Afghanistan after it came to power in 1978 (this also included assistance from Pakistan). Many are led to believe that the US fell out with bin Laden in 1990, but did they?

George Bush was not in power at the time and this relationship (with people that are now classed as terrorists), was created by the real power behind the US government. The politician's are merely a public face to the powerful business people that are really controlling the country.

Some will remember that "Naval targets" are not new to the game. The USS Cole was "attacked" on the 12th of October, 2000

by what were believed to be terrorists. However, the evidence to support this is not that clear and three terrorist groups claimed



responsibility. Some believe that the explosion was from within the ship and not caused by a bomb carried in a boat used by two suicide bombers.

Whilst US officials seemed capable of carrying out DNA tests on the remains of alleged terrorists bodies

(incredibly small pieces), they were unable to decide whether the boat was an inflatable, or made from fibreglass! And that old villian, Osama bin Laden, was once again tied into this attack.

As we have said earlier about an attack on Iran, it is not a case of if, but when. Perhaps, if we publicize our fears widely enough, those responsible may think twice about using such tactics. But somehow we think not and it is therefore up to the rest of the world to see, and uncover, the real truth and punish the culprits who are really to blame this time.

In the meantime, the crew of the USS Carl Vinson would be wise to keep a close eye on any unusual "items" placed on the ship near structural areas of importance (either recently, or in the near future), to avoid any surprises. We could be wrong about this, but we would rather be safe than sorry!



Search

Advanced search

JOINING OUR SEARCH ENGINE CAN GET YOU NOTICED AND MAKE YOU MONEY! CLICK ON OUR LOGO FOR DETAILS





**OVERCOME
YOUR FEARS
WITH HYPNOSIS!**