



7/7 Witness: Bus Was Diverted To Tavistock Sq. By Two Unmarked Cars  
Soon to be published account will detail the plot and cover up of the number 30 bus bombing

Steve Watson

[Infowars.net](http://infowars.net)

Monday, December 11, 2006

A soon to be published narrative of the number 30 bus bombing on 7/7 in London claims that the Hackney bus was diverted to Tavistock Square by two unmarked cars which then left the scene at high speed after the drivers had conversed with police in the area.

The witness, named "Daniel", has a blog [here](#) and a website [here](#). He states:

*I was aboard the lower deck of the bus that was blown up on July 7th. I rang the emergency hotline to report the 2 dark cars I saw holding the bus up and diverting it towards Tavistock Square. Instead of being asked to provide a statement what followed was 7 months of police surveillance and Harassment. My experiences are contained in a book called Statement: The 4th Bomb (as yet unpublished)*

The number 30 bus was diverted away from its usual route along Euston road on the morning of 7/7, reportedly because of road closures in the Kings Cross area (due to the earlier tube bombings). We personally visited the site of the bus bombing at Tavistock Place and verified that no number 30 bus usually travels down that road. This footage can be seen in Alex Jones' latest film Terrorstorm.



"Daniel" goes on to comment:

*Standing by the doors I see a blue BMW 5 series and black Mercedes squeal to a halt in front of the bus, halting its progress along Euston Road. 4 minutes passed then a police motorcyclist arrived at the blockage. The BMW driver said something to the cyclist who soon sped off. 90 seconds later the BMW suddenly drives off. The Mercedes waits till the bus diverts east into Upper Woburn Place towards Tavistock Square before it speeds away.*

*After very slow progress the driver suddenly opens the buses central exit doors while keeping the front doors shut, right on the corner of Upper Woburn Place some 80 meters away from the only bus stop in Tavistock Square (seen here). Many passengers got off at this point because of the delay and it was heading in the wrong direction.*

Were these cars unmarked police vehicles? If so what were they doing diverting traffic? Surely that would have been the job of the traffic police.

Daniel then states:

*A deep boom resounded. Shattered glass flew everywhere. It was followed by an eery silence. I scrambled up off the bus floor and leapt out going along the pavement at full pelt. But over the following days and weeks the relief I felt turned to exasperation at the increasingly menacing tactics the operatives' trailing and observing me employed, confirming my worst suspicions, for some reason I was embroiled in the largest criminal investigation in UK history.*

He suggests that he can be seen in video footage of the aftermath, which he has posted on his website, and also claims that in the immediate seconds after the blast, a man dressed all in black was filming him with a hand held camera.

Daniel also still has the shirt that he was wearing on the day, which was splattered with the blood of victims. He says the police have never requested it for forensics investigation, despite having questioned him.



He also states that there was never any Asian looking male on the lower deck after he bus left Euston terminal. [Reports](#) attributed to 61 year-old Richard Jones claimed there was. Investigators conveniently relocated his sighting to the upper deck in their official May 2006 report.

Daniel says "It was just me, the driver plus four females on the lower deck as it edged down Tavistock Square."

After attempting to report what he saw, Daniel was asked to call an emergency hotline, which he did. instead of asking him to go to the police station to make a statement he claims he was subjected to a program of surveillance and harassment by the police:

*By September 2005 I had began receiving a string of strange phone calls which became increasingly sinister. Friends advised me to record them where possible as evidence in case I needed to bring an IPCC complaint.*

*After the blast I was alert enough to be out of there in seconds. Yet investigators chose to rely on 4 female witnesses, one who was out cold for 15 minutes and was extracted from the wreck onto a trolley by medics (taking care not to move her neck) another one upstairs who woke up in a daze and two others who told a nurse treating them at UCH they thought I had been the bomber!"*

*6 months and 3 weeks after July 7th I'm asked to attend a police station in North London to provide a statement.*

Police questioned Daniel for 4 hours, a clip of the interview is on his website. they asked him to him mark points where he thought people were on a diagram of the bus layout that was totally wrong, which he believed would render his statement inadmissible.

He claims he was then followed around by the same three operatives from Enfield Town Police Station, North London, for the following six months, saying that the surveillance was more overt than covert, they were letting him know that he was being watched 24-7.

He also received calls from police apparently attempting to tie him to vehicles and a business in the Leeds area, the same place the alleged bomber originated from. One of these phone calls is posted on his site and can be heard by clicking [here](#).

He goes on to comment:

*I realised the magnitude of what I'd seen almost instantly. The operative's menacing tactics only made it undeniable. Over the months of surveillance and harassment they seemed intent on messing up my life, keeping me looking behind my back. I awaited the release of the 'official version' with some interest especially with regards to the 4th bomb in Tavistock Square. The report was generally vague, devoid of any facts consisting of speculation based upon what I knew to be blatant falsehoods.*

Of course the presence of unmarked cars and the claims that they stopped the bus cannot be verified because the vehicle's CCTV cameras were conveniently [not working that day](#).

One week after the attack we put out a report, after receiving an email from [an employee of Stagecoach](#), the company that owns the London Buses, stating that he believed the bus bombing to be very suspicious.

Our contact works a route roughly one mile from the site of the bus bombing, he stated:

*CCTV gets maintained at least 2 or 3 times a week and can digitally store up to 2 whole weeks worth of footage. this is done by a private contractor....So when I heard that the CCTV wasn't working on a vehicle that's no more than 2 years old since last June.....I'm sorry that's rubbish, I work for the company I know different.*

*Last Saturday a contractor came to inspect the CCTV on the buses at the depot, According to my supervisor the person spent more than 20 hours over that weekend, 20 hours to see if the CCTV is working? Also that person who came was not a regular contractor, for security reasons the same few people always come to the depot to carry out work, this time it was different.*

*Drivers in the depot already think the so called bombers had inside help because it was to organised. Some even think it had help from the company.*

Exactly why the bus would be re-routed to Tavistock Square purposefully is up for debate. Some have suggested that the location is convenient given that the British Medical Association is located there, whilst others have attempted to connect the company [Fortress GB](#), railway security management specialists who are often contracted for security projects for London Transport.



In the upcoming book, entitled *The 4th Bomb*, the witness Daniel also suggests that the follow up "failed bombings" may have been a cover operation to distract police and special investigators:

*The logic for the 'failed suicide attacks' and the authorities seemingly haphazard yet iron-fisted response didn't become apparent to me until late January 2006, some time after my interrogation with an Anti-Terrorist branch detective. It was something he alluded to in passing, that the attacks on 21:7 had thrown away a carefully laid 'operational response' to 7:7.*

*He led me to realise that although the attacks were devoid of explosions, they achieved their primary*

*objective, which was to upset the Anti-Terror investigation, mess-up MI5 and put more pressure on the unsustainable 'symbolic' levels of policing in the period of 'vigilance' following 7:7.*

*.....the intelligence services were totally UN-aware of those responsible for the 'failed suicide attacks'.*

*A term that would more accurately describe them is 'successful dummy attacks', but a dummy attack on whom exactly... London's already terrified public?*

*No, this was an attack aimed squarely at Military Intelligence themselves.  
Executed by an ad-hoc bunch of sympathisers.*

Daniel then suggests that his research and experience have led him to believe that the execution of Jean Charles De Menezes the day after the dummy attacks was carried out by **KRATOS** trained operatives in order to send a strong signal to would be copy cats.

We will continue to track this story, the publication of the book and report any further updates.

**[Related: London Bombings data page](#)**

---

Copyright © [Infowars.net](http://www.infowars.net) All rights reserved.

Printed from: <http://www.infowars.net/articles/december2006/111206Daniel.htm>