

**SAMPLE CHAPTER FROM PAUL JOSEPH WATSON'S
ORDER OUT OF CHAOS
-- ELITE SPONSORED TERRORISM AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER**

TO ORDER THE COMPLETE BOOK, PLEASE VISIT:

WWW.INFOWARS.COM

WWW.PRISONPLANET.COM

British Intelligence: Her Majesty's Terrorist Network

Shaylergate

MI5, Military Intelligence 5, looks for spies and subversives within the UK. MI6, Military Intelligence 6, operates under Foreign Office control and is involved in spying on 'enemies' of the British state abroad.

David Shayler worked for MI5 for over six years before quitting in 1997. Amongst other departments he primarily worked for G branch, the international terrorism desk. Shayler headed the agency's Libyan section for around two years. During this period he developed a good working relationship with his opposite number in MI6. In 1995 Shayler gained access to secret MI6 documents concerning a plot to assassinate Colonel Mu'ammar Gaddafi, the Libyan Head of State.

[INSERT FIG 3.1] [CAPTION: Former MI5 agent David Shayler pictured here with his girlfriend, Annie Machon. Shayler was arrested for revealing British intelligence links to international terrorist organizations.]

Mu'ammar Gaddafi was born in the desert near Sirte in 1942. He overthrew the Libyan monarchy in 1969 and launched a cultural revolution to remove traces of imported ideology. He has supported a broad range of militant groups including the IRA and the Palestine Liberation Organization. Alleged Libyan involvement in attacks in Europe in 1986 led to US military strikes against Tripoli. For several decades Gaddafi tried to portray himself as leader of the Arab world, and has now taken up the mission of uniting Africa.

A document released on the Internet by Shayler confirms MI6 had foreknowledge of the Gaddafi assassination plot. Shayler insists he has further information to prove MI6 paid a Libyan member of the Al-Qaeda terrorist network at least £100,000 (\$156,000) to lead a 20 man team in carrying out the operation. This agent was code named TUNWORTH, his MI6 handler was code named PT16. In a press release Shayler stated,

We need a statement from the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary clarifying the facts of this

matter. In particular, we need to know how around £100,000 of taxpayers' money was used to fund the sort of Islamic Extremists who have connections to Osama Bin Laden's Al Qaeda network. Did ministers give MI6 permission for this? By the time MI6 paid the group in late 1995 or early 1996, US investigators had already established that Bin Laden was implicated in the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center. Given the timing and the close connections between Libyan and Egyptian Islamic Extremists, it may even have been used to fund the murder of British citizens in Luxor, Egypt in 1996.¹

The assassination attempt was carried out in early 1996 but failed with tragic consequences. 'TUNWORTH' was to place a bomb under Gaddafi's convoy. However, he foolishly placed the bomb under the wrong car, killing six innocent bystanders.

Despite former British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook describing the allegation as 'fantasy,' a 2001 Metropolitan Police investigation sought no charges against David Shayler for perjury or wasting police time, confirming that his detailed sworn statement was honest, reliable and true.

How can it be that the foreign intelligence agency of the British government was colluding with Al-Qaeda terrorists who had already been charged with the 1993 World Trade Center bombing? Several of these individuals are still at large, appearing on the FBI's most wanted terrorists list.

The 1994 bombing of the Israeli Embassy was one of the worst terrorist bombings London has seen. A 50-pound (22 kg) car bomb injured 13 and almost destroyed the embassy. Later that night a second bomb injured six people at the London offices of Britain's main Jewish charities and pro-Israel institutions.

A previously unknown group, the Palestinian Resistance Jaffa Group, claimed credit for the attacks. Two Palestinians were later convicted for the attacks. The presiding judge said it was only "providence" that more people were not seriously injured or killed.

Shayler alleges that the British intelligence service MI5 was warned in advance of the bombing, yet it took no action, failing even to tip off the police or the Israeli government.

The warning, a written report from a highly trusted source, was sent for assessment to a desk officer in MI5's international terrorism section. After she failed to act on the report, it was later found buried in the filing cupboard of another officer, leading to speculation of a bungled cover up. Neither officer was disciplined and MI5 management failed to institute procedures to prevent the recurrence of such an incident.

Shayler would have obviously been in a position to learn of the cover up. He also worked at G branch, the international terrorism desk.

¹ Press release by David Shayler – November 11 2001 – available at <http://cryptome.org/shayler-gaddafi.htm>

Responding to the revelations, Israel's ambassador to Britain Moshe Raviv said,

"This story is completely new to me. The Embassy had passed on to the Foreign Office general warnings based on information from Jerusalem. These warnings had been sent to a number of our embassies and as a consequence we had asked the Foreign Office to step up security and vigilance at the Embassy in London. If this information is correct, it is amazing that greater efforts were not made to prevent the attacks."²

Shayler also made the allegation that MI5 had prior knowledge of numerous IRA bombings in London, most notably the 1993 Bishopsgate bombing, in which an IRA truck bomb devastated the Bishopsgate area of London's financial district, killing one and injuring 44.

Shayler's July 2000 *Punch Magazine* article entitled 'MI5 could have stopped the bomb going off' detailed how MI5, the police anti-terrorist branch and GCHQ - the government's electronic eavesdropping center, had tracked the bombers for six months before the operation and were fully aware of the specifics of the plot before it was carried out.

Punch was fined £5,000 for contempt of court but the charge was later reversed on appeal. However, the back issue containing the article cannot be sold in Britain. I personally ordered a copy but ended up with a refund after being told that particular issue was unavailable. The article in full is available on the Internet.³

As I will later document, the Bishopsgate case is just one example of MI5's link to Irish Republican terrorism.

The Gag

Shayler's revelations were first published in a series of reports for the *Mail on Sunday* in August 1997. From this point onwards, all articles by or about David Shayler had to be passed through a special branch of the Ministry of Defence, whereupon the attorney general, Lord Williams, scanned them for any details that would breach the 1989 Official Secrets Act. The publishers were then told whether or not they were allowed to print the report. The British government had appointed itself as state censor. Their argument that publishing Shayler's information would breach national security can be debunked by the very fact that their own intelligence agencies are a threat to national security by way of their treasonous behavior.

Following the *Mail on Sunday* expose, Shayler fled to France in an attempt to avoid arrest. The British government were so desperate to extradite him, Shayler even half joked that MI5 fixed the 1998 Coca Cola Cup soccer tournament in

² Mail on Sunday – November 2 1997

³ 'MI5 could have stopped the bomb going off' – David Shayler – *Punch Magazine* – Issue 111 July 26-August 28 – available at <http://www.bilderberg.org/sis.htm#Punch>

England so that Shayler's team, Middlesbrough, would reach the final, tempting him to return to attend the game. Shayler resisted the urge but was subsequently arrested by the French authorities.

Shayler was released from prison in November of 1998 and from that point on fought a war of brinkmanship with Tony Blair's government, threatening to release more damaging information while they tried to either lure him back to the country or have the French extradite him. This exchange continued up until Shayler's return to the UK when his trial for violating the Official Secrets Act commenced in October 2002.

On Monday October 7th 2002, numerous articles appeared in British newspapers specifying how top Labour cabinet members were intimidating the judge of the Shayler case, Justice Alan Moses. MP's such as Foreign Secretary Jack Straw and Home Secretary David Blunkett were trying to force Moses to accept Public Interest Immunity Certificates that would make part of the case, i.e. the £100,000 bin Laden transfer, secret. Upon mention of this material, media and public would have to leave the courtroom.

By the evening of October 7th, the British newspaper reports had either been removed from their respective web sites or completely amended. The original *London Guardian* report that was later erased stated,

Ministers have demanded that part of the trial of David Shayler, the former MI5 officer, which starts at the Old Bailey today, be held in secret in what lawyers say is an unprecedented attempt to influence the course of criminal proceedings. The home secretary, David Blunkett, and the foreign secretary, Jack Straw, have signed public interest immunity certificates - a device designed to gag a court - insisting that the media and the public leave if activities of the security and intelligence agencies are raised by the defence

Government officials and lawyers persuaded the two cabinet ministers to sign the PII certificates after they learned that Mr Shayler intended to defend himself at the trial. They appear to be worried that he will make further allegations about MI5 and MI6 knowledge of a plot to assassinate the Libyan leader, Muammar Gadafy, in 1996. A book, *Forbidden Truth*, published this summer claims that British intelligence was in contact with "Osama bin Laden's main allies" who were opposed to Colonel Gadafy.⁴

By the late evening of October 7th, the *London Evening Standard* and the *Scotsman* had also removed their original reports concerning the trial. The *London Evening Standard* were forced to censor the following,

Shayler will be defending himself during the trial. He is expected to claim that British secret service agents paid up to £100,000 to al Qaeda terrorists for an assassination attempt on Libyan leader Colonel Gadaffy in 1996. He is seeking permission to plead a defence of "necessity" - that he acted for the greater good by revealing wrongdoing by the security service.⁵

⁴ 'Ministers issue gag orders for MI5 trial' - Richard Norton-Taylor - *London Guardian* - October 7 2002 - available at www.propagandamatrix.com/ministers_issue_gag_orders_for_mi5_trial.htm

⁵ 'Calls for secret Shayler trial' - Patrick McGowan - *London Evening Standard* - October 7 2002 - <http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/news/articles/1488303>

Whereas the *Scotsman*, before completely changing the nature of the article, stated,

The renegade agent, who faces six years imprisonment for breaching the Official Secrets Act after making a number of sensational revelations about MI5 to a national newspaper in 1997, will represent himself for part of the landmark case. The trial will centre around a number of allegations made by Shayler about MI5 holding files on prominent politicians, including former cabinet minister Peter Mandelson and Jack Straw, the Foreign Secretary. He also claimed the secret services ignored warnings that might have prevented bombings in the London in 1993 and 1994.⁶

It became apparent that a D-Notice had been issued to gag the story. A D-Notice is a mandate emanating from an office of the Ministry of Defence called the Defence Advisory Committee, effectively silencing any media report that is considered harmful to national security implications. Luckily, I had already saved and printed these deleted stories, which enabled me to use them as a basis for an article I would subsequently write for my web site, entitled 'ShaylerGate.'

After I advised my readers to mass E mail the British media, asking them why they had deleted these stories, the *London Guardian* was forced to print a small blurb in its October 8 edition which read,

An Old Bailey court yesterday heard legal arguments relating to the trial of David Shayler, the former MI5 officer charged with breaking the Official Secrets Act. The judge ruled that they cannot be reported.⁷

So in effect, using the analogy of Russian dolls, the British government had gagged the gag. They had ensured parts of the Shayler trial remain secret and at the same time, prevented the mainstream British press from reporting on the very debate of whether that was in the public interest. An Australian newspaper later confirmed this,

The British media have been gagged from reporting sensational courtroom evidence of former MI5 spy David Shayler, including his alleged proof that the British secret service paid \$270,000 for al Qaeda terrorists to assassinate Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi in 1996. In its efforts to contain Mr Shayler's allegations to the privacy of the court, the government has even stopped the media from reporting its successful attempt to win a gag order.

The British media widely reported on Monday that lawyers acting for Mr Shayler had accused the government of trying to "intimidate" Justice Moses. But on Tuesday the newspapers - many of which had mounted their own legal case against the application of the certificates - reported simply that the court had heard legal arguments relating to Mr Shayler's trial. "The judge ruled that they (the legal arguments) cannot be reported," The Guardian reported.

Although Mr Shayler's jury trial is expected to begin next week in the Old Bailey, any evidence

⁶ 'Renegade MI5 agent ready to face jury' – Karen McVeigh – *The Scotsman* – October 7 2002 – available at http://www.propagandamatrix.com/renegade_mi5_agent_to_face_jury.htm

⁷ 'Shayler Hearing' – Richard Norton-Taylor – *London Guardian* – October 8 2002 - http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,3604,806640,00.html

relating to sensitive security or intelligence matters will be kept private. After the judge's ruling on Monday, several articles detailing Mr Shayler's anticipated evidence - and the government's efforts to keep it secret - were withdrawn from newspaper websites across the country.⁸

Note that according to *The Age*, the Al-Qaeda payoff was even greater, standing at £170,000.

Why bury the story?

It is common knowledge amongst journalists that MI5 has a very close relationship with London's Fleet Street hacks. The Security Service has at least two agents working in every major newspaper office. MI5 frequently issue their officers with false National Union Of Journalist cards denoting them as reporters, standard cover for clandestine stage management of the media.

The argument that the story was gagged because it contravened the Official Secrets Act and was a threat to national security does not hold sway. Recall, this was the same Labour government that before it came to power argued vigorously to amend the Official Secrets Act to protect whistleblowers.

The story was gagged because at that time its implications would severely undermine both the validity of the war on terrorism and the rhetoric behind the impending invasion of Iraq.

Jack Straw, the British Foreign Secretary who issued one of the PII gag certificates, was involved in soliciting illegal weapons transfers to numerous countries, deals that directly contravene international protocol. As I document elsewhere in this book, Britain has been caught shipping arms to India, Pakistan, Israel and Iran – directly fomenting instability in those regions.

In addition, Shayler insists he has more revelations concerning the British tool company Matrix Churchill and the arms to Iraq scandal, which originally broke under the former Tory government. Again, this is covered in detail elsewhere in this book.

I have no doubt, and the man himself has publicly stated so, that Shayler has even more damaging information concerning British intelligence collusion with the very organizations we are told are our supposed enemies. A £100,000+ Al-Qaeda payoff, after they had bombed the World Trade Center in 1993, may only be scratching the surface.

The paranoid and authoritarian reaction of the British government in censoring both the Gadaffi plot and David Shayler's trial begs the question - what else do they have to hide?

⁸ 'Media gag on alleged plot to kill Gaddafi' – Paul Daley – *The Age* – October 10 2002 - <http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2002/10/09/1034061258269.html>

Protecting bin Laden's Lieutenants

In September of 2002, one year after the attacks on New York and Washington, French intelligence officials angrily accused MI5 of failing to cooperate in stifling Islamic terrorist groups. The level of assistance received from British intelligence was described as being "worse than before" September 11th.

The French specifically referred to the case of Abu Qatada, a 43-year-old militant Muslim cleric born in Jordan. Qatada is described by many as the leader and mastermind of Al-Qaeda's European network. Videos of Mr Qatada's speeches were found in the Hamburg flat of Mohamed Atta, who is believed to have been the leader of the September 11 hijackers.⁹ Qatada has links with terror suspects in Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Britain and Spain. Baltasar Garzon, a Spanish National High Court judge charged with leading Spain's Al-Qaeda crackdown, named Qatada as the "spiritual head of the mujahideen in Britain."¹⁰

In 1993 Qatada was sentenced to life imprisonment, in his absence, by a court in Jordan for his involvement in a terrorist bombing campaign. He escaped jail by fleeing to West London and bought a house in Acton. Claiming political refugee status, he avoided extradition.

After September 11th, Qatada was identified as a 'specially designated global terrorist' by a US executive order.¹¹ He was also categorized by the British Treasury as 'believed to have committed, or pose, a significant risk of committing or providing material support for acts of terrorism.'¹² Qatada disappeared from his London home in December 2001, just before the implementation of new anti-terrorism legislation would have finally paved the way for him to be deported.

In the summer of 2002 a sensational *Time Magazine* report revealed where exactly Qatada had gone,

Senior European intelligence officials tell TIME that Abu Qatada is tucked away in a safe house in the north of England, where he and his family are being lodged, fed and clothed by British intelligence services. "The deal is that Abu Qatada is deprived of contact with extremists in London and Europe but can't be arrested or expelled because no one officially knows where he is," says the source, whose claims were corroborated by French authorities. "The British win because the last thing they want is a hot potato they can't extradite for fear of al-Qaeda reprisals but whose presence contradicts London's support of the war on terror."¹³

⁹ 'Al-Qaida suspect hidden by UK agents' – Vikram Dodd – *London Guardian* – July 8 2002 - <http://www.guardian.co.uk/ukresponse/story/0,11017,751102,00.html>

¹⁰ 'Britain sheltering al-Qaeda leader' – *BBC* – July 8 2002 - <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/2115371.stm>

¹¹ 'West London Terror Suspect' – *BBC Radio Four* – October 19 2001 - <http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/today/reports/politics/qatada.shtml>

¹² 'Terrorist Financing: List of Suspects' – British Treasury, Bank of England – October 12 2001 - <http://www.bankofengland.co.uk/sanctions/sanctionsconlistoct01a.pdf>

¹³ 'Sheltering a Puppet Master' – Helen Gibson - *Time Magazine* – July 7 2002 - <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,300609,00.html>

Despite official denial French anti-terrorist officers stated on the record that they were certain MI5 were protecting Qatada, and in addition believed they had actually colluded in his disappearance. A senior French intelligence agent stated, "British intelligence is saying they have no idea where he is but we know where he is and, if we know, I'm quite sure they do."¹⁴

[INSERT FIG 3.2] [CAPTION: Abu Qatada – the Al-Qaeda leader given protection by MI5.]

Why on earth were MI5 protecting Osama bin Laden's European ambassador while at the same time claiming ignorance of his whereabouts? If they wanted to interrogate him in secret then why did they wait three months after 9/11 before coming into contact with him? The leaders of the 'war on terrorism' seem to treat high-level Al-Qaeda members with reverence, even recruiting them as agents.

Why wasn't Qatada sent to be held in U.S. military custody at Guantanamo Bay? He is a known Al-Qaeda terrorist, expresses support to Osama bin Laden's ideals and is named, in British government documents, as highly likely to be involved in future acts of terrorism.

Qatada wasn't transferred to Guantanamo because he actually was a terrorist, unlike the other 'residents' of the naval brig. A Guantanamo official, quoted in the *Los Angeles Times*, stated, "some of these guys literally don't know the world is round."¹⁵ The same report detailed how U.S. authorities had yet to identify any senior Al Qaeda leaders among the nearly 600 terror suspects from 43 countries being held at Guantanamo Bay. The torture camp consisted of nothing more than a group of goat herders that had been given a gun and thrown onto the front line by the Taliban.

As the Qatada case highlights, the real Al-Qaeda and Taliban leadership were whisked away to safety by orders of U.S. and British intelligence. This contradicts the entire scope of the 'war on terrorism' and leads us to question who precisely is giving comfort to terrorists – rogue states or our own governments?

The Real IRA: MI5

For more than 30 years, Catholics and Protestants have fought bitterly over whether Northern Ireland should belong to Ireland or to Britain. The conflict has left 3,600 people dead on both sides and more than 30,000 injured. There was hope in 1998, when the landmark Good Friday peace agreement was reached. The agreement created a government in which both Protestant and Catholic

¹⁴ 'French accuse MI5 of failing to help terror hunt' - Kim Willsher and David Bamber – *London Telegraph* – September 15 2002 –

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.ihtml?xml=/news/2002/09/15/nspies15.xml&sSheet=/news/2002/09/15/ixhome.html>

¹⁵ 'U.S. has found no Qaeda leaders among captives at Guantanamo' – Bob Drogin – *Los Angeles Times* – August 19 2002 - <http://www.ihl.com/articles/68054.html>

representatives could share power in Northern Ireland. But tensions continued to grow between Catholics and Protestants, especially after the IRA refused to destroy or surrender its weapons.

The Real IRA is a hard line group of between 70 and 170 members dedicated to an armed campaign aimed at driving the British out of Ireland. Its members see themselves as Irish republican purists, accusing the Provisional IRA of selling short republican ideals.

Since its founding in 1997, the Real IRA has been fully infiltrated by British intelligence - MI5. The first double agent to infiltrate the Real IRA on behalf of the British government was David Gary Rupert, an elusive loner born in Madrid, New York State. Rupert first surfaced at an Irish Freedom Committee meeting in Chicago in 1997. *Eye Spy Magazine* reported,

He was a well-known figure at meetings and became the talk of the IFC. Many believed he had contacts that wended their way to the very top of organisations like Sinn Fein and the IRA.

MI5 had successfully tracked US fund-raising efforts to certain US citizens and groups through bank accounts. But they needed more information. Together with the FBI and Irish security police, they spoke to Mr Rupert who agreed to work for them as a double agent. It was a major coup.

Throughout the last four years he has supplied intelligence on fundraising, bank accounts, and recruiting campaigns. He "networked" between various rival factions and was so trusted he eventually befriended members of the Real IRA and several political organisations, such as the 32 County Sovereignty Committee. Similarly, he was befriended by Martin Galvin, a New York lawyer and the head of Noraid, the American fundraising arm of the Provisional IRA. Rupert was given codes and access to various associated groups and learned of leading personnel on both sides of the Atlantic. As Rupert forwarded donations to Ireland and elsewhere, MI5, the FBI and the Garda were carefully following the transactions, collecting details of every bank account the money was channelled through. In 1999 Rupert met with Michael McKeivitt, who MI5 believe is the head of the Real IRA. Mr McKeivitt is said to have introduced Rupert to other leading players in the group. And, according to sources, he handed over a £10,000 donation to 'cement relations'. Rupert told the Garda that the organisation was planning a series of top-level meetings at a certain location. The Irish security services planted listening devices and surveillance equipment in the room. Much evidence was apparently acquired and then the Garda asked MI5 and the FBI if it was time to act. The agencies mind was made up for them when Rupert said McKeivitt had allegedly asked him to participate in a terrorist act. The Garda said that if they arrested McKeivitt, Rupert would have to testify and this meant blowing his cover. MI5 knew they were about to lose one of their most important agents, but the prize they believed was worth it. Rupert agreed to testify for a massive sum of money and a new identity. He was also relocated.¹⁶

Twenty-nine people were killed and 200 badly injured, when a 500 lb bomb exploded in a busy shopping street in Omagh, Northern Ireland, on 15 August 1998. The bomb was planted by the dissident republican group, the Real IRA, although at the time of writing only one individual, Colm Murphy, has been formally charged. The tragedy claimed nine children as victims.

MI5, along with the Royal Ulster Constabulary, knew at least two days before the

¹⁶ 'MI5 Infiltrate the Real IRA' – *Eye Spy Magazine* – August 31 2001 - <http://www.eyespymag.com/features/mi5ira.html>

attack not only that an attack would take place, but also the name of the bomb maker and his car registration. If they had placed this terrorist under surveillance, the horror of Omagh would have been prevented. British intelligence had a reason for allowing the bombing to go forward. One of the terrorists in the bombing team was a double agent. He was working for MI5.

[INSERT FIG 3.3] [CAPTION: The *Sunday Herald* report on MI5 involvement in the 1998 Omagh bombing should have led to arrests and reprimands but it was just calmly reported in the back of the newspaper.]

This damning information was released by Kevin Fulton (a pseudonym), another British double agent in the IRA. Fulton was an ex-British army soldier and one-time member of the army's covert Force Research Unit. Fulton says he was recruited by the secret service to inform on the activities of the IRA in the 1980s. He claims to have been an informer up until the IRA cease-fire in 1996. Included in a whole raft of separate allegations is Fulton's contention that MI5 and the FBI helped him travel to the United States and buy state of the art infra-red equipment for the IRA so that they could trigger bombs from over a mile away.¹⁷

Fulton was also involved in the process of actually mixing explosives to make new types of bombs. He also coordinated political assassinations and robberies to help finance the IRA. This policy came directly from the very top; then-Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher received a weekly briefing on Fulton's activities. Fulton states,

"I was told 'there'll be no medals for this, and no recognition, but this goes the whole way to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister knows what you are doing."¹⁸

Fulton had to slip into the role of a terrorist to prevent his cover from being blown. He helped plan murders and torture innocent people with the backing and encouragement of the Prime Minister and MI5. When Fulton had outlived his usefulness he realized that MI5 and military intelligence were fully prepared to leave him to be killed. It was at that point that he distanced himself from both the IRA and British intelligence and began a whistle-blowing campaign.

Fulton alleges that 48 hours before the Omagh bombing he met with a senior member of the Real IRA in a pub in Dundalk. The man was covered in dust and gave off a strong odor of fertilizer sediment. He had obviously been making a bomb. The man told Fulton "there's something big on."

Within hours, Fulton informed his handler, telling him the name of the man and

¹⁷ 'Ulster spies to blow MI5 cover' – Rosie Cowan – *London Guardian* – July 6 2002 - <http://www.guardian.co.uk/military/story/0,11816,750427,00.html>

¹⁸ 'The army asked me to make bombs for the IRA, told me I had the Prime Minister's blessing ... then tried to kill me' – Neil McKay – *Sunday Herald* – June 23 2002 - <http://www.sundayherald.com/25646>

his car registration number, along with a description of the vehicle. The sensitivity of the information would have meant that Fulton's RUC handler immediately pass it on to higher authorities. Any information portending to an immediate threat to British national security is subject to a 'FLASH' classification of urgency, meaning it instantaneously receives the attention of MI5 and MI6 counter terrorism agents. Another ex-informer, Willy Carlin, said of the Fulton allegations,

"I would believe that the officer put it in the system, and it would have immediately been shared by the security services, by MI5 and MI6. It would definitely been shared with the Chief Constable, no doubt about it. And it would have been shared with the Garda [the police in the Irish Republic]. And the question is, if it was shared, what happened? And why didn't someone turn up in Dundalk and watch this man for 48 hours?"¹⁹

British intelligence sat back and did nothing as the bomb traveled from Dundalk to Omagh in a vehicle they could easily have identified and apprehended. It has now been confirmed by the *Sunday Herald* that MI5 allowed the bombing to take place because one of its own double agents had successfully infiltrated the Real IRA and his cover would have been blown if the bomb plot had been exposed. Of course, this in itself is a whitewash. The agent, code named 'Stakeknife' had managed to tap the upper echelons of the terrorist group and MI5 valued the continued position of him as a key informer over and above the 29 lives that were suddenly ended on that hot August afternoon. The *Sunday Herald* source stated,

"The only reason the RUC would not act on a tip-off which stated a bomb was in the offing is if a member of the bombing team was a highly-placed agent and they needed to keep him in place. If the operation was allowed to go ahead then the agent would be seen as a good guy by the Real IRA; but if it failed, he could have come under suspicion of being an informer and been killed."²⁰

How can the MI5 and the RUC justify allowing a terrorist bombing to proceed to simply keep an agent in place? An informant is supposed to have the rationale of warning his superiors so that they can take action to avert such a catastrophe, as mentioned earlier in the circumstances surrounding the infiltration of the Real IRA by David Rupert. This wasn't the case in Omagh. So why did the British government authorize the bombing?

[INSERT FIG 3.4] [CAPTION: The Omagh bombing – MI5 had an agent within the actual bomb squad carrying out the terrorist attack.]

Just weeks after the bombing, the Irish and British parliaments were recalled early to pass anti-terrorism legislation openly described as "draconian."²¹ Despite Prime Minister Tony Blair's assertion that the Criminal Justice (Terrorism and

¹⁹ 'Northern Ireland: Allegations of British collusion in Omagh bombing' – Robert Stevens - *World Socialist Web Site* – September 4 2001 - <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2001/sep2001/ire-a04.shtml>

²⁰ 'British double-agent was in Real IRA's Omagh bomb team' – Neil Mackay – *Sunday Herald* – August 19 2001 - <http://www.sundayherald.com/17827>

²¹ 'Irish anti-terror measures become law' – *BBC* – September 3 1998 - http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/events/northern_ireland/latest_news/164405.stm

Conspiracy) Bill was not a 'knee jerk reaction' – MP's were not even given time to thoroughly read it. The bill was passed within 24 hours of its proposal. Former Prime Minister John Major gleefully admitted that the new laws were a response to "the public mood for action following the atrocity at Omagh" without consideration of how the wider legal implications could effect that very same emotionally manipulated public who had just been bombarded for two weeks with horror stories about blood soaked babies and missing limbs.²²

The new legislation enabled the government to prosecute any group they defined as an 'active paramilitary' as a terrorist organization and deny them the right to legal counsel. The mandate of the bill, 'intended to catch the Omagh bombers' can only be considered to have been a complete failure, as to this day the individuals responsible for the Omagh bombing are still at large.

Again we see the Hegelian dialectic at work. Create the problem (allow the bombing to take place), apportion blame (the Real IRA), get the desired reaction (shock, revulsion and a desire for vengeance) and then hurriedly offer the solution (draconian police state laws) that do nothing to stop real terrorists and only strip innocent people of fundamental human rights.

The final word on Omagh will be left to Lawrence Rush, the husband of one of the victims,

"Tell me, are you a completely incompetent force, that in Great Britain they can pick up lone murderers out of a population of 59m? Do you recognise that we have a population of 4m and you cannot pick up over 100-odd people? My dear sir, this is a conspiracy. This will come out like the Derry Thirteen (a reference to the Bloody Sunday massacre by the British army in 1972). Why did Sinn Fein close their office the day before the bomb? Why was the army confined to barracks? Why sir, did the RUC have only three men on the streets of Omagh and 24 men in surrounding areas? Tell me that. This is a conspiracy by the British government and by everyone involved in the administration. This is an example of administrative terrorism."²³

Mr. Rush's wife died in the blast. Victims of both the bombing and the suffocating legislation introduced shortly afterwards were the only victims of Omagh. The perpetrators in both cases were the British government, MI5 and MI6, Her Majesty's terrorist network.

²² 'Commons passes anti-terrorism bill' – BBC – September 3 1998 - http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/events/northern_ireland/latest_news/163686.stm

²³ 'Revealed: the evidence that forced a new Omagh inquiry' – Nick Hopkins – *London Guardian* – August 17 2001 - http://www.guardian.co.uk/Northern_Ireland/Story/0,2763,538098,00.html

