

Synopsizing Sibel Edmonds: The Evolution of Operation Gladio -- Part Two

Robert Paulsen

American Judas

March 13, 2013

http://americanjudas.blogspot.jp/2013/03/synopsizing-sibel-edmonds-evolution-of_13.html

In this continuing series of synopsizing the Sibel Edmonds interviews on [The Corbett Report](#) and providing my own analysis as I did in last week's [blog post](#), I think it's important to provide a link to an analysis by Sibel herself at her website, [Boiling Frogs Post](#). She provides the connections linking Afghan heroin business with "cargo" transportation through Azerbaijan and the Balkans in an informative and entertaining way. I also want to encourage everyone interested to read [Classified Woman](#), just written last year, where Sibel tells her whole story.

Part Two Synopsis:

In the second part of this interview, James Corbett starts out mentioning a couple recent news reports to provide a starting point. First, he points out a story regarding the recent US Embassy bombing in Ankara, Turkey from the Times of Israel where they describe the bombers as leftist radicals who "didn't get the memo" that the Cold War ended. Sibel Edmonds responds to this by saying that whenever Turkish media or the Turkish government use the word "leftist", that's kind of a code word for Russia, who has been demonized specifically for their aid to Assad in Syria. She then directs the conversation to another recent event, the arrest of Osama bin Laden's son-in-law, Suleyman Abu Ghaith. Reputed to be one of the top five al-Qaeda leaders and number two spokesperson, the rumor was that he had been located in Iran. But Edmonds reminds us that Iran has never had any relations with al-Qaeda. She refers to certain geographical areas that have activity, but not state sanction, they are kind of a "no-man's land" where al-Qaeda has operated, specifically Baluchistan. This region of Baluchistan has also been very important for the United States, like Xinjiang mentioned in Part One, we really don't hear too much in the media, but there is quite a lot of terror activity. But while rumors circulated for years about Abu Ghaith and Zawahiri being imprisoned in Iran, he officially resurfaced in February of this year with his arrest in Turkey, where he had been "hiding" in a penthouse suite of a 5 star hotel just blocks from the Presidential Palace. Supposedly notified about this development by the CIA, he was held and interrogated, but the Turkish police could find no evidence he had done anything to Turkey, so initially they refused to extradite him and the CIA was OK with this! At this point, Corbett interjects that this is the same CIA that has no problem kidnapping other terror suspects, flying them to other countries to be tortured, but not bin Laden's son-in-law!

Edmonds points out that this is similar to the pattern established with [Yassin al-Qadi](#), associated with the [Ptech scandal](#). Just after 9/11, he left the US and spent 6-8 months in Albania, then went to Turkey. The US asked for him to be extradited because he was on their terror blacklist connected with 9/11, but Turkey refused because they had no evidence he had done anything wrong to *them*. He currently resides in the UK and has cleared himself from terror blacklists there, as well as in Switzerland and the EU. Corbett points out how the US originally tried to prosecute him during the late 90's with the FBI investigation called Operation Vulgar Betrayal. Edmonds relates how both Robert Wright and John Vincent, FBI agents connected with this case, are now members of her organization National Security Whistle Blowers Coalition

(NSWBC). She explains how the US government (CIA, State Department and White House) forced this investigation that Wright and Vincent were spearheading to shut down. In fact, as a direct result from this pressure, the FBI said the 9/11 Commission was not allowed to interview Wright! Vincent went directly to the 9/11 Commission to present their investigation that would have lead to 9/11.

This investigation had been centered in Chicago, which Edmonds points out she keeps mentioning Chicago because where Gladio B is concerned, a lot of the operational and logistics were done from Chicago. She describes it as the "easiest" city for money laundering. The United States actually has an office in the Pentagon for Gladio operations. It isn't called Gladio B, but it is a designated section in the Pentagon, the physical office also dealt with the previous Gladio operations. Starting a few days after 9/11 when she was hired by the FBI, Edmonds goes into the tasks she was assigned tracking terror suspects, meeting a quota of how many terror arrests they could publicize, yet Qadi was not detained prior to his departure in October 2001. But a lot of Qadi's operations spill over to white collar crime investigations in Chicago. Because Edmonds was asked by FBI agent Joel Roberts to translate documents pertaining to these investigations as well as crimes involving the Chicago network of Abdullah Çatlı, who was covered in Part One, she was in a unique position to connect the dots with the Operation Vulgar Betrayal investigation.

Getting back to Qadi's Albanian connection, Edmonds explains that the biggest focus of the Gladio B operatives from the early to late 90's was the Balkans. This includes not only Qadi and Çatlı's networks, but also the Fethullah Gulen network discussed in Part One. At this time, many Albanians coming into Chicago were some of the "most ferocious and strongest" mafia operators in the US. Even Italians wouldn't mess with these guys. The FBI set up major arrests that would consistently be thwarted because the State Department would tell them these guys had *diplomatic immunity*! Why did they do this? *Time* magazine's 2002 person of the year, FBI whistleblower Colleen Rowley believes that it's because there were too many moles in the FBI, that the CIA had penetrated the FBI on behalf of the State Department. The CIA-State Department would "tip off informants" in cases known to the NSWBC of impending sting operations by the FBI. This was really the big underlying problem that Edmonds had to deal with during her employment as an FBI translator. It was not the bureaucratic nobody Mike Feghali that she mentions in her book, it was the CIA-State Department moles within the FBI.

After her termination from the FBI, Edmonds put the pieces of the puzzle together with her NSWBC organization. She knew the 9/11 Commission was "bull" because of all the facts that were intentionally omitted from their report. *Time* person of the year Colleen Rowley was not even going to be *interviewed* by the Commission. Rowley, Wright, Vincent; these were all agents 20+ years on the force. Edmonds then went to the media to protest this oversight. She was able to tell her story to the Commission through a SCIF (Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility) so that no operatives identities would be compromised. All of these agents she mentioned, as well as [Tony Shaffer of Operation Able Danger](#) went on record saying there was a huge 9/11 cover-up! While this may seem like a clear case of Bush administration malfeasance to many, Edmonds clarifies that many of these investigations were stymied during the late 90's, which would implicate the Clinton administration as well.

It is this last point that Americans find especially hard to digest because we are conditioned to think along the lines of a black hat/white hat mentality. It's so much easier to be partisan rather than dig deeper to find the darker truth that intersects across party lines. The classic example is the story of Watergate and how it was covered by Bob Woodward and the Washington Post. That story seems pretty clear-cut, but if they really got Watergate, why didn't they get Iran/contra? Or did they really get Watergate? It seems from Sibel Edmonds perspective that when you really get the story, the way Gary Webb did with Iran/contra, you don't become a multi-millionaire entrenched in the system like Woodward, you get marginalized like Webb. Corbett concurs, noting that the Watergate burglary was purposely screwed up and Woodward had the story handed to him on a silver platter.

Corbett wraps up Part Two addressing some viewers questions. Were the Gladio B transition plans in existence before Susurluk? Edmonds says yes, pointing out how our relationship with the Mujahadeen started in the 1980's in Afghanistan. These religious relationships existed, but were on the periphery and not the focal point of Operation Gladio. They were operating through CIA and British intelligence, but it was not until after Susurluk that it became part of NATO and Gladio operations. Another question: how do we know Grossman and Dickerson being pulled from Turkey was connected with Susurluk? While so much is classified where proof is concerned, Edmonds was part of an FBI investigation directly focused on Grossman. While his high profile job was the #3 guy (at the time she investigated him at FBI) at the State Department, his real job was always with NATO/Gladio operations. Same thing with Dickerson: NATO got him out of US into Brussels. FBI Counter-Intelligence has established this; their file on Grey Wolves (Turkish paramilitary) was turned to Gladio B. That's why these operations had to be stopped by the State Department and Pentagon: it steps on their operations through NATO! The final question concerns Ergenekon trials in Turkey: are they a US backed operation to replace secular government with more compliant capitalists? Edmonds says yes, 100%, the Turkish military "can't even pee" without permission from the United States. It's that way everywhere, even Iran, why did the Shah fall? The US felt it was time, he was "fair game". (Edmonds hates the Shah BTW, he tortured her father!) So what is happening in Turkey is all with a US green light. Edmonds concludes Part Two by saying the worst, self-destructive element of the 9/11 Truth movement is this divisiveness over LIHOP (Let It Happen On Purpose) vs. MIHOP (Made It Happen On Purpose). She doesn't know how much is caused by planted elements or just naturally misguided viewpoints. But we must stop the semantics. You've got to get rid of the old conditioning, the black hat/white hat mentality, and do your own research!

Part Two Analysis:

Lots of new characters and relationships revealed in this part! There's a lot that's familiar to me through my previous research, but some that I hadn't heard yet. Working backwards, I had not heard about Ergenekon, wouldn't even know how to spell it if not for the diligent research of Wombaticus Rex at [Rigorous Intuition](#) (RI) who provided this [link](#) detailing this part of Turkish history and how it relates to Operation Gladio. The RI forum discussion is worth following on this topic. My contribution so far has been finding out about the Grey Wolves referred to in the Q and A section of this interview. I thought it sounded familiar. Turns out this is the organization that Mehmet Ali Agca was part of. That's the guy who tried to assassinate Pope John Paul II in 1981. Grey Wolves, according to this [link](#) on their history, were ideologically

neo-fascist. This goes against the rumor at the time that Agca was working with Bulgarian Communists at the behest of the Soviet Union. Who was responsible for this phoney rumor? That would be Michael Ledeen, of P2, Iran/contra and Niger forgery infamy.

If I could ask Sibel Edmonds one question in regard to this part of the interview, I would ask what is the name the Pentagon gave their designated section she refers to as Gladio B? We know these "stay-behind" armies existed, page 7 of the link above states the State Department finally admitted the existence in 2006. Finding out what the official name is could help researchers like me immensely! I'm sure Sibel knows what it is, but I'm not sure if the States Secret gag order prevents her from disclosing the exact name on the grounds of "national security", of course.

There are two sections of this interview that I believe deserve deeper analysis: Ptech and Able Danger. I put a couple links into the synopsis on Yassin al-Qadi and Ptech. In addition to the investigation Edmonds refers to that Robert Wright and John Vincent were conducting for the FBI, there was a whistleblower who really helped shine the light on this scandal named Indira Singh. History Commons has neatly [condensed](#) the beginnings of her story:

May-December 5, 2002: US Investigators Pressed to Look Into Ptech

In October 2001, Ptech insiders attempted to warn the FBI that suspected terrorist financier Yassin al-Qadi had funded Ptech (see Shortly After October 12, 2001). Then Indira Singh, an employee at JP Morgan Chase bank, develops her own suspicions about Ptech after her bank assigned her to investigate Ptech for a potential business deal. In May 2002, she speaks with the FBI about her concerns. Weeks later, she learns the FBI still has not told any other government agencies about the potential Ptech security threat. She later will recall, "the language, the kind of language law enforcement, counterterrorism, and the FBI agents themselves were using basically indicated to me that absolutely no investigation was going on, that it was totally at a standstill, at which point my hair stood on end." She contacts a Boston CBS television station, WBZ-TV, and a reporter for the station named Joe Bergantino begins investigating Ptech. [[Boston Globe, 12/7/2002](#); [National Public Radio, 12/8/2002](#); [WBZ 4 \(Boston\), 12/9/2002](#)] Around the same time, a former government official with contacts in the Bush administration tells officials at the National Security Council about the Ptech allegations. By late August, Operation Greenquest then opens its own Ptech investigation. The FBI then tries "to muscle its way back into the probe once it [becomes] clear that [Greenquest is] taking the case seriously." [[Newsweek, 12/6/2002](#); [WBZ 4 \(Boston\), 12/9/2002](#)] Beginning in late November, US agents begin calling Ptech officials and asking them if they have ties to money laundering, thus tipping them off. Ptech will also be notified when a December raid will be occurring before it happens. [[Associated Press, 1/3/2003](#)] WBZ-TV prepared a story on Ptech, but withheld it from the public for more than three months after receiving "calls from federal law enforcement agencies, some at the highest levels." The station claims the government launched its Ptech probe in August 2002, after they "got wind of our investigation" and "asked us to hold the story so they could come out and do their raid and look like they're ahead of the game." [[Boston Globe, 12/7/2002](#); [WBZ 4 \(Boston\), 12/9/2002](#)]

Entity Tags: [Operation Greenquest](#), [Federal Bureau of Investigation](#), [Ptech Inc.](#), [National](#)

[Security Council, Indira Singh](#)

Timeline Tags: [Complete 911 Timeline](#), [9/11 Timeline](#)

How much damage could Ptech have potentially done? In an interview with [From the Wilderness](#), Singh gives a pretty dark indication by answering a scary question:

*FTW: You said at the 9/11 Citizens' Commission hearings, you mentioned - it's on page 139 of transcript - **that Ptech was with Mitre Corporation in the basement of the FAA for 2 years prior to 9/11 and their specific job was to look at interoperability issues the FAA had with NORAD and the Air Force, in case of an emergency.***

Indira Singh: Yes, I have a good diagram for that.

FTW: And that relationship had been going on mediated by Ptech for 2 years prior to 9/11. You elsewhere say that the Secret Service is among the government entities that had a contract with Ptech. Mike Ruppert's thesis in Crossing the Rubicon, as you know, is that the software that was running information between FAA & NORAD was superseded by a parallel, subsuming, version of itself that was being run by the Secret Service on state of the art parallel equipment in the PEOC with a nucleus of Secret Service personnel around Cheney. In your view, might it have been the case that Cheney was using Ptech to surveil the function of the people in FAA & NORAD who wanted to do their jobs on 9/11, and then intervene to turn off the legitimate response?

*Indira Singh: Is it possible from a software point of view? Absolutely it's possible. Did he (Cheney) have such a capability? I don't know. But that's the ideal risk scenario - to have an overarching view of what's going on in data. That's exactly what I wanted for JP Morgan. **You know what's ironic about this - I wanted to take my operational risk blueprint which is for an operational event going wrong and I wanted to make it generic for extreme event risk to surveil across intelligence networks. What you're describing is something that I said, 'boy if we had this in place maybe 9/11 wouldn't have happened.'** When I was going down to DARPA and getting these guys excited about creating an extreme event risk blueprint to do this, I'm thinking of doing exactly what you're saying Cheney might have already had!*

As disturbing as the revelations of Ptech are, I think the information regarding Able Danger could be even more explosive in the context of what Edmonds is talking about regarding our "black hat/white hat" mentality. When I first found out about Able Danger in 2005, I wrote about it on [Democratic Underground](#), quoting from a [Daily Kos](#) entry to buttress my point:

Able Danger is a Pandora's Box that will blow up in the RW's face.

Re-open the 9/11 investigation? BRING IT ON! Here's why:

So the responsibility for stopping DIA program Able Danger, which had Identified Atta and 3 other hijackers and linked them to 56 other al-Queda terrorists overseas, has been laid at the feet of Bill Clinton--**except he and**

Richard Clarke were never told about it at all.

That's right. Bill Clinton was never told about Able Danger and the ID of Atta because Richard Clarke was never told about AD. How do I know? He never wrote about it in his book, nor did he testify about it's existence before the 9-11 Commission!

You see Richard Clarke was known for being obsessed with Osama Bin Laden and HE was the guy the neo-con moles did not want to find out about Atta and the gang. Schoomaker and the neo-cons knew telling the FBI would inform Clarke and then Mr. Laser Beam himself, President of the United State William Jefferson Clinton, would have gotten involved--and the Pearl Harbor-type attack would never take place (the neo-cons talked about the need for a Pearl Harbor-type attack before the PNAC Plan would be accepted by the American people--so when one presented itself, they let it happen).

General Pete Schoomaker, who were later heavily rewarded by the neo-cons in the Bush Administration, blocked the upward motion of the DIA information by having Shaffer and Philpott meet with Pentagon lawyers opinions--lawyers who were rubberstamping ridiculous legal opinions to carry out the neo-con plan. These certain people were neo-cons in the Clinton Administration, covertly carrying out the PNAC plan to let a Pearl Harbor-type attack occur so Iraq and 6 other countries could be invaded.

This may very well be the case. But what if it isn't? Should that prevent a proper investigation from bringing all guilty parties, be they Democrat or Republican, to justice? Absolutely not. On this point, I am in complete agreement with Sibel Edmonds, as I wrote in my post on [wedge issues](#) in December. We need to move beyond the Cartesian Dualism of binary logic to understand that until we unlearn this conditioning, we're never going to pull the curtain away from these wizards, because we'll be too afraid to see that some of the faces on the other side will be ones we thought were wearing "white hats" the whole time. I think it's an appropriate time to quote [Edward Murrow](#) to understand where our real responsibility lies:

"We will not walk in fear, one of another, we will not be driven by fear into an age of unreason. If we dig deep into our history and our doctrine, we will remember we are not descended from fearful men. Not from men who feared to write, to speak, to associate, and to defend causes that were, for the moment, unpopular... We can deny our heritage and our history but we cannot escape responsibility for the result. There is no way for a citizen of the republic to abdicate his responsibilities. As a nation we have come into our full inheritance at a tender age. We proclaim ourselves as indeed we are, the defenders of freedom where ever it still exists in the world. But we cannot defend freedom abroad by deserting it at home."

Stop being Good Republicans. Stop being Good Democrats. Start being Good Americans.

"Good night, and good luck".