

PS 135 9/11 Unmasked, Part 4: Frances Shure and the Role of the Media

Frances Shure: [00:00:01] How can we find our courage to let go of the small ego that we have? The false self? The image that we project to people and come into alignment with what's real, what's true, what is love? How can we do that? So that's why, that's the answer that's come to me at this point in time about why this is so important to be able to face our fears. And I think for many of us in the 9/11 truth movement this has become a psycho spiritual journey because many others do face a lot of fear when we run into this information, and we have to figure out how to heal ourselves of that fear and how to move past it.

John Shuck: [00:00:45] Next on Progressive Spirit psychotherapist Frances Shure. She talks about the book [9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation](#). The role of the media. Don't go away.

John Shuck: [00:01:00] Progressive Spirit is produced every week. It couldn't happen without the financial support of my congregation Southminster Presbyterian Church in Beaverton Oregon. Southminster's web site is www.southmin.org. Progressive Spirit is produced in the studios of KBOO in Portland Oregon for the Pacifica Radio network and PRX the Public Radio Exchange as well as podcast. Show KBOO some love, won't you? KBOO.fm and click donate.

John Shuck: [00:01:35] For the Pacifica Radio Network and PRX the Public Radio Exchange and from the studios of KBOO in Portland Oregon. This is Progressive Spirit Progressive Spirit dot net. I'm John Shuck. This is the fourth of my four-part series on the [9/11 Consensus Panel](#) whose work was released in book form on September 11th 2018. The book is *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation* the coauthors are David Ray Griffin and Elizabeth Woodworth. In the first part of this series I explained why I was spending four episodes on one book and the reason is that this book could be the most dangerous book in America. If what this book presents is true that the official account of September 11th 2001 is false. Then we're in trouble if any one of the 51 points of evidence presented in this book is solid then the American people have been played for fools. The truth of the matter is that anyone who reads this book and considers the evidence presented likely will become skeptical of the official narrative unless of course the evidence is just too scary to consider in the first place. And that's the topic of this fourth and final episode. According to my guest psychotherapist Frances Shure, the media is the problem. She says the role of the media is the primary reason why good people become silent, or worse, about 9/11.

Frances Shure: [00:03:14] We look to the media to tell us what is discussable. What is discussable in polite company is the way I put it. And if the media totally ignores an event, totally ignores the evidence that shows that 9/11 was a false flag operation, then we don't take it seriously and we're afraid to discuss it. So media becomes an extremely crucial, becomes a critical, part of carrying off a PSYOP. If you can't cover up the event then you can't be successful with your PSYOP. The media is crucial in the cover up.

John Shuck: [00:03:57] She's written a series of articles for Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth entitled ["Why Do Good People Become Silent or Worse about 9/11."](#) She was previously to talk about the series of articles. Her latest installment in this series and the topic for today is called ["The Role of the Media: Whatever Happened to Investigative Journalists?"](#) Welcome Fran to Progressive Spirit.

Frances Shure: [00:04:23] Thank you so much, John. I'm very happy to be back with you.

John Shuck: [00:04:26] Fran you served on the Consensus panel, the 9/11 Consensus panel. Can you tell me a little bit about your experience of serving on that panel and what its purpose is and

why it's important?

Frances Shure: [00:04:37] My understanding of the purpose of the 9/11 Consensus panel is that it is a resource for people to go to find out what the 9/11 truth movement does agree on. It's a very good source for the media. For example, if the media wants to know what we do agree on in the 9/11 truth movement, this is the best source to go to. There are so many theories out there about what happened on 9/11. Some of them are theories that don't hold water at all. And so obviously these theories will not garner consensus within the 9/11 consensus panel. For example, some people will say that mini nukes hit the World Trade Center buildings. That doesn't have evidence that holds water and that's not going to be a point that we can agree on. That's one example. So the points that we can agree on--these are people who have various beliefs and have various backgrounds--and the points we can agree on, we come together with consensus.

John Shuck: [00:05:44] And it's been at work for what seven years now?

Frances Shure: [00:05:47] I believe that's correct.

John Shuck: [00:05:48] And about 50 different points have come to consensus and as I was speaking with Elizabeth Woodworth earlier the threshold for consensus is pretty high.

Frances Shure: [00:05:58] Yes, it is at least 85 percent of us have to agree.

John Shuck: [00:06:04] And so the consensus at the at the end of the day is that what happened on September 11th -- 9/11-- was some kind of deep event. And that's been covered over. Would you say that that's true?

Frances Shure: [00:06:17] Yes that's true in a nutshell. That's what's true.

John Shuck: [00:06:21] And so the question that you bring to it is, given that, why is it that people resist even looking into what happened on 9/11. The series of articles that you wrote, "Why do good people remain silent, or worse, about 9/11?" Can you tell me about how you started those series of articles?

Frances Shure: [00:06:42] Yes. Why do good people *become* silent or worse about 9/11? And that began when I first started looking into this issue of 9/11 Truth and started organizing an educational group here in Colorado. And because I have a psychology background--I have been a psychotherapist— people in the movement say, "Fran why don't you write something about this? Why is it so difficult for people?" At the beginning I said, "You know, I don't know. I'm still trying to figure it out myself." And finally one person on the Architects and Engineers [for 9/11 Truth] writing team emailed me and said, "Would you just write a few words, just write something and then we'll pick it up and write an article about the psychology of 9/11, why this is so difficult for people to accept that the official story that we were told is not true." I started writing a few words and I kept writing and I could not stop writing. And suddenly everything was coming together for me. He said, "Wow! Why don't you just write the article?" I said, "Okay." And so thinking I was gonna write an article and I just kept writing and learning more and people started giving me suggestions about things I should look into. And so it wound up becoming a very, very long serial essay that is being published on [Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#) and that's how it all started.

And another point of this was really interesting. I remember thinking in the early days, "Gosh this is so difficult for people, this issue, and yet the evidence for 9/11 being a deep event of some sort, not being what we were told, the evidence is so crystal clear, it's so easy to understand it, even for the layperson. You do not have to be a scientist or an engineer to understand this evidence. I really hope

someday the social psychologists, the psychology profession, will look into this and it will be a great study for what happens to people when they run into evidence that contradicts their worldview. And I hope someone will do that study someday and maybe write a book on it.” And it seems that I'm winding up being that person. So it's really interesting how it all evolved like that.

John Shuck: [00:09:18] You know we put the focus in many respects on the individual why do we resist what's the matter with our psychology that we might resist this but really the issue is this-- would you say this is a bigger PSYOP designed to do exactly that?

Frances Shure: [00:09:37] Yes, I would say that that it is a large PSYOP designed to do that. That is one thing I write about. I mean, I've written on many issues about the psychology of it but it is a psychological operation. And for example, it has been shown that people don't have a hard time acknowledging small lies, but it's really a huge lie that they cannot acknowledge, that goes beyond their belief that people could do something-- lie about something so huge. It boggles the mind to think that elements within our government who are supposed to be protecting U.S. Citizens are not doing that and in fact are purposefully killing and harming U.S. citizens for an excuse, a pretext to go to war. It's just boggles people's minds, they can't get it. They don't want to believe it. They don't want to listen to it. As one person said to me, “I cannot listen to what you're saying because if I listen to what you are saying, psychologically I would go downhill.”

John Shuck: [00:10:51] The level -- I don't know if you would use this word, I know David Ray Griffin does, the demonic or the evil aspect -- is that it takes advantage, in a sense, of our good nature.

Frances Shure: [00:11:03] That's right. For example, I believe it was it was actually Hitler who said this. He said people— you know, ordinary people—will tell little lies themselves but they won't tell a gigantic lie. They'd be too afraid of being caught. He was giving us an in-road to looking at our own psychology. Yeah, we tell little lies all the time, little white lies, but we would never tell big lies. So we're basically good people. We would never think of harming anybody in this way. But you know there are people who don't have a conscience, or have very little conscience, who would harm people in this terribly evil way. It boggles our mind it's like as one person said to me, “People just aren't that evil.” And yet we're learning that people are that evil. We only have to look back to our history. One of the main examples being the Nazi era in Germany to know that people can, ordinary people, very ordinary people, actually, not even psychopaths but very ordinary people, can be very evil, can do very evil things when they're ordered to.

John Shuck: [00:12:19] You mentioned earlier about the woman who says she just can't believe that can happen. That denial. That creates a cognitive dissonance. Can you talk about that?

Frances Shure: [00:12:30] Right. For example, most of us have a world view that, for example, like what she said people just aren't that evil. That's her world view. In that case, she's running into evidence now that shows that it really looks like, from all the evidence, from the evidence trail, it was elements within our United States government along with other intelligence agencies from outside of the U.S. that have actually orchestrated--the evidence really indicates this--that we orchestrated something as shocking, as horrendous, as the 9/11 attacks. So that's where she has her world view being confronted. And so that brings up what psychologists call “cognitive dissonance,” which is basically an anxiety. It is a very great discomfort that their sense of home, their worldview, is crumbling. When they run into cognitive dissonance, this difficult time, this uncomfortableness, this anxiety, they will want to do two things. First of all, they want to deny this information. They want to avoid it, for one thing. If they hear it they will want to deny that there could be anything to it, or if they cannot deny that the evidence has validity, then they will try to minimize the evidence or they could come up with a secondary cognition. One actually I have two really interesting

examples of that. There was an ardent Bush supporter that I knew. She really loved George W. Bush. She said she couldn't deny controlled demolition of the three buildings World Trade Center 1, 2 and 7 and she said, "OK, I can see that there is a controlled demolition. I think what happened," she said very proudly to me. "I think I understand it now when in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing when Clinton was in office, when they started repairing the World Trade Center, they then laced those buildings with bombs and therefore it's all Clinton's fault, you know." So she devised a secondary cognition to explain something that she could not deny--the evidence for controlled demolition of those three buildings.

But then there was another friend I had who was an ardent Obama supporter who said she couldn't deny the evidence either. The evidence was crystal clear to her that there had to be controlled demolition, which of course implies that there had to be foreknowledge of this event and preparation. She said, "Oh, I think Obama never, he never could have known about this before 9/11 happened . . . before he was president. But now that he's president he probably knows and he'd probably really like to tell us about it but he can't because if he did everything would be in chaos in our country. The stock market would plummet. And therefore he cannot tell us about it." In other words, she is seeing him as a very benign leader who really wanted us to know the truth. And we know that that's not, that's not correct. So those are two examples of how people develop secondary cognitions in order to explain evidence that they could not explain--that would challenge their worldview too much.

John Shuck: [00:16:20] Also that cognitive dissonance can turn people into just kind of attacking others who bring this news up.

Frances Shure: [00:16:26] That's correct. Exactly. And that's exactly what I mean in the title when I say why do good people become silent *or worse* about 9/11, because they may not become silent, but they will spend inordinate amounts of energy fighting us, trying their best with intellectual contortions to prove that we are wrong-- that this could not have been done by elements within the U.S. government.

John Shuck: [00:16:57] I'm speaking with Fran Shure, psychologist member of the 9/11 Consensus Panel the book has come out in September is called *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. We're talking about her series of articles on why people become silent or worse about 9/11. One of the other things is that it is scary. I know why we don't want to talk about it because I don't want to be ridiculed by my friends and I don't want to lose my friends. I don't want to lose my family members. I don't want to lose my job.

Frances Shure: [00:17:27] Right.

John Shuck: [00:17:28] I mean that's a real fear.

Frances Shure: [00:17:29] It is, and they are real fears. And it's an issue that splits families, that splits friends. You sometimes lose friends. Sometimes it splits families. Children can't talk to their parents. Parents can't talk to their children. You're afraid to talk to someone you meet, a new person and you're afraid. You're afraid to talk to your neighbor about it. And that's because you're afraid they will label you a "conspiracy theorist" and a "nut," and they don't want to be associated with you. So yes, fear plays a huge role in keeping people silent. It's a huge, huge role.

John Shuck: [00:18:09] Because if you really talk about that--that is one of our basic survival instincts, isn't it, to be able to conform?

Frances Shure: [00:18:17] Well our survival instinct is to be not ostracized--to be part of a

community, and because we are very social creatures we need community. We need a community of people to survive. We really can't survive on our own very well. Often in the past when people were banished from their society they were expected to die. Yeah, it's very, very difficult. And I think that's one of the major fears that people have is the fear of losing friends, losing their job, and it's a real fear.

John Shuck: [00:18:52] It's kind of going back to -- think of the church...and the shunning. That idea is powerful -- that is to be rejected or shunned -- ignored out of the community itself. I was thinking also in many respects it's kind of like lesbian or gay people who are coming out of the closet and the fear of that.

Frances Shure: [00:19:15] Yes.

John Shuck: [00:19:15] But on the other hand, and in fact I want to get to this because you write this series of articles not to just describe, you know, how afraid and awful it is, but there is another side to this: That actually, it ultimately is freeing to come out of the closet.

Frances Shure: [00:19:34] That's so correct. And I think we talked last time about this very important role of fear to keep us silent or to attack the movement. But we talked about when we're on a psycho-spiritual journey [that] facing our fears and not letting our fears run us, [that this] is a very, very important part of that journey. And I was actually asking myself recently, "Why is that so important to face our fears and not let fear run our lives?" And the answer that just came to me, at this point in time anyway, is that when we're on a psycho-spiritual journey we're looking to become more conscious. We are looking to align ourselves with the divine, with God, with a higher self, whatever word we use for the higher power. And when we are looking to align ourselves with the divine we need to let go of everything that is false, everything that is not true. We need to have the courage to face what is true, and we need to have the courage to let go of our small ego, of our little self and all the things we identify with, and so that we can come into more alignment with the divine and become more conscious of the underlying reality of our own divinity and the divinity of everything in creation. That's how I see it. So if we, if we cannot face our fears on these worldly issues, how can we find our courage to let go of the small ego that we have, the false self, the image that we project to people and come into alignment with what's real, what's true, what is love? How can we do that? So that's why -- that's the answer that's come to me, at this point in time, about why this is so important to be able to face our fears. And I think for many of us in the 9/11 truth movement this has become a psycho-spiritual journey, because many of us do face a lot of fear when we run into this information, and we have to figure out how to heal ourselves of that fear and how to evolve past it.

John Shuck: [00:22:11] Because the results of this deep event and the results that are ongoing still today are incredibly destructive to all of humanity. And so, this isn't just about each of us as an individual. It's also a spiritual journey to be part of healing the planet.

Frances Shure: [00:22:30] This is so correct. And when we look at this, we see when we start understanding this PSYOP of 9/11, and we see the results of it with truly millions of people being killed now in the Middle East and millions, many millions *more*, having their lives ruined, becoming refugees in the world. I think we're at a crisis, refugee crisis, that has not been surpassed since World War Two. We just have a huge amount of refugees, a huge amount of people have lost their homes, lost family members, are in another country, are in camps in their own country. And so I really firmly believe that if we are spiritual people, religious people or spiritual people, it's very important to engage with life. You know we hear about engaged Buddhism, but I think that applies to all spiritual people, it applies to Christians. We need to have engaged Christianity where we live our values and live the teachings of Jesus; where we have engaged Judaism, [in which] the Jews

would live their values. The engaged Islam. Whatever the religion is we need to apply it in our life. That becomes our spiritual practice. It is engaging with life and if we sit aside and allow these lies to persist and allow these millions of people to be killed, how can we say that we're living according to our values?

John Shuck: [00:24:15] I'm speaking with Fran Shure if you're just joining us on Progressive Spirit. Fran Shure is a licensed professional counselor. She has written a series of articles for Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth called "Why Do People Become Silent--or Worse--about 9/11?" I want to talk about the newest one. When I spoke with you before this one hadn't been written. You were writing it on the role of the media. "Whatever Happened to Investigative Journalists?" And you write here, "The role of the media is the primary reason why good people become silent or worse about 9/11." How is the PSYOP connected with the media?

Frances Shure: [00:24:56] There's an interesting term I've run into recently called "media politics" and maybe I'll get to that because that's what I'm writing about a little bit later. I'm writing about that in my next segment Part 22 on the special role of the CIA in the media. But where the media plays a role is, in our culture, we look to the media to tell us what is discussable. What is discussable in polite company is the way I put it. And if the media totally ignores an event, totally ignores the evidence that shows that 9/11 was a false flag operation, then we don't take it seriously and we're afraid to discuss it. So media becomes an extremely crucial, becomes a critical, part of carrying off a PSYOP. If you can't cover up the event then you can't be successful with your PSYOP. The media is crucial in the cover up.

As I was writing about the psychological dynamics of why people cannot face this evidence, the writing team at Architects and Engineers said, "Fran, I think you need to write about the media, too." And I really resisted because I'm not an expert in the media, not a journalist. And I resisted that, but then I decided they're really right. This is the main reason people become silent about this evidence that we're facing. I decided to do it. It took a lot of research, a lot of reading, a lot of research. This first part on the media is called, "The Role of the Media: Whatever Happened to Investigative Journalists?" So I have four examples of award winning journalists, or whistleblowers who became journalists, and who it was, and what it was that actually censored their stories in the media. I present them as though they are witnesses in a court case who are coming forth and saying, "Okay, I had this critical story to tell the public. Here is who, here is what, censored me from having this story published."

John Shuck: [00:27:15] This is Progressive Spirit Progressive Spirit Dot Net. I'm John Shuck. I'm speaking with Frances Shure of the 9/11 Consensus Panel. The book we are discussing is *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. We're examining the psychological barriers that keep people from looking at the evidence that challenges deeply held world views. More to come. Stay with us.

John Shuck: [00:27:40] You're listening to the podcast version of the Progressive Spirit. If you enjoy the show please go to iTunes, Stitcher, Google Play, Podomatic, Tune In or whatever podcast app you use, listen and give Progressive Spirit 5 stars, won't you? Contact me through Progressive Spirit dot net with your thoughts and ideas about the show and be sure to share this podcast on your social media follow on Facebook and Twitter. The web site, again, is Progressive Spirit dot net.

[00:28:11] Frances Shure is speaking with me about *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. This is Progressive Spirit Progressive Spirit. I'm John Shuck.

John Shuck: [00:28:30] I have a book in my possession that I have not read yet. But I'm thankful to your article because you highlighted it. It's called [*Into The Buzzsaw: Leading Journalists Expose the*](#)

[Myth of a Free Press](#). And I think that's part of it isn't it? The myth of--well tell me, because I think people will say, "Well, wait a second, we have the most free press in the world!"

Frances Shure: [00:28:53] Yes, ...and I've seen people's eyes glaze over when I tell them their press is not free. But it took a lot of my own research to discover that myself. It is such a sacred myth in our society, a myth that we absolutely believe. This is dogma in our society that we have a free press and there are investigative journalists who will look into these issues and we have a mainstream media, *The New York Times* will print anything that's fit to print, you know, so people believe this very much in our society. When you start digging beneath the surface you'd find it's not at all true. For example, with these four people. I'll just list their names: [Michael Levine](#) who was a drug enforcement agent detective trying to prevent drugs from coming to the U.S. The CIA would always stop him from indicting these people, from catching them in the act. There was [Kristina Borjesson](#)¹ who was trying to reveal the evidence that showed that flight TWA number 800 was shot down by a missile.

John Shuck: [00:30:03] She's the author or editor of that book, *Into the Buzzsaw*.

Frances Shure: [00:30:06] She's the editor of that anthology *Into the Buzzsaw* and she also has her own article in there about her terrible experience trying to expose this evidence about flight TWA 800. Then there was [Monica Jensen-Stevenson](#) who was exposing the evidence that we left, you know, hundreds, many hundreds of soldiers behind in Vietnam--purposefully. Purposefully left them behind and did not rescue them. And then there's [Sibel Edmonds](#) who was a translator for the FBI who has evidence to tell us...and some of it about 9/11, that would disprove the 9/11 official story. She has been labeled by the ACLU who defended her as the most gagged person ever in the U.S. -- in U.S. history. So all of these people tell their stories and when we pull the curtain back from their stories they document who censored their stories. And it came down to the CIA, the FBI, the Pentagon, military intelligence, media owners, who had conflicting political agendas, who supported -- maybe they were very connected -- with the military-industrial complex, The White House, advertisers, powerful family dynasties, extremely wealthy individuals, and they're all the ones who are documented. These are who and what censored these stories in our media. So they documented very clearly who censored their stories. I highly recommend this book to everyone. It's fascinating.

John Shuck: [00:31:49] And it connects to 9/11 in the sense that if, let's say a reporter for, oh I don't know, *The Oregonian* wanted to write an exposé on 9/11, what would happen?

Frances Shure: [00:32:01] First of all what we see is if that reporter wanted to report a story about 9/11 that disagreed with the official story, the editor would censor it. He would not allow it to be reported. That's assuming that particular newspaper is compromised like almost all of our media is compromised by the powers that be. The next time that reporter would be more careful. Then, he might go to the editor and say, "Well, can I report this story on 9/11?" The editor would then say, "No." And then the third time, if you look at what usually happens with these people, is that they would then censor themselves. They would think of an idea and they wouldn't even pursue it because they would know by then that it would not be printed or not be broadcast.

John Shuck: [00:32:51] That's the biggest deal of all isn't it, self-censorship in some respects?

Frances Shure: [00:32:55] It is a big deal. Yes, but these reporters would be censored. They would be *censored* and their work would be *censored*. You know, nevertheless, the biggest question that comes to us in the 9/11 truth movement is what about the independent media? What about Chris

¹ See <https://www.americanswhotellthetruth.org/portraits/kristina-borjesson>.

Hedges? What about Amy Goodman, Glenn Greenwald, Robert Parry who just passed away? Bill Moyers? What about these independent journalists who have done such amazing work? We don't know. All we can do is guess. All we can do is speculate.

So what I did is, I went to Kristina Borjesson, the author, the editor of, this anthology, *Into the Buzz Saw*-- And she's also written another book about the media after 9/11 [[Feet to the Fire: The Media after 9/11, Top Journalists Speak Out](#)]-- and I said, "What's your take on this? Why? Why do these very courageous journalists not report on 9/11? There's so much that could be reported on. They could have reported on the [nano-thermite](#) that was found in the dust at the World Trade Center. They could have reported all the [freefall of World Trade Center 7](#) and the implications of that. There's so much clear evidence they could have reported. Why don't they? Why did they become silent or worse about this 9/11 issue?" So she gave me a great quote, and I can read it to you if you want me to read the whole thing?

John Shuck: [00:34:22] Yes.

Frances Shure: [00:34:22] Okay so she said, "They're talented journalists and they worked hard to navigate between reporting that goes right up to the line of what is acceptable to the powers that be and reporting that goes over the line and would cost them everything. It took Robert Parry years to get over being blackballed for his Newsweek reporting on Iran-Contra. When he was at the New York Times, Hedges was reprimanded by his bosses after he criticized what was happening in Iraq while giving a commencement address in 2003. These individuals would immediately become targets for marginalization, loss of funding, and/or outlets for their work or even worse forms of retaliation if they crossed the line, because they have achieved a critical mass audience. In other words, an audience big enough to create problems for the powers that be, if used to counter official narratives on third rail issues." That's a great term third rail issue. "If they did that they would attract dangerous, if not fatal, attention from the powers that be. The fact that they are widely viewed as good journalists not beholden to the powers that be, makes them dangerous, but not too dangerous. They would only become dispensable," she said, "if they invested that credibility in scrutinizing the ultimate third rail issue, 9/11. They're doing a lot of good carefully hoeing the rows they're hoeing now. And that would all go down the tubes if they turned their attention to looking into whether or not the official narrative about 9/11 is true."

So she mentioned this word "third rail issue." And I did not know that term before. So, I ask her, "What does that mean?" Well that is a third rail on an electrified railway system. For example, the subway in New York. It's a third rail that is electrified, which if you touch it you get electrocuted. So a third rail issue. Another example of a third rail issue is the Palestinian-Israeli issue which she told me is an issue that very few people will touch. If people touch these issues, it goes beyond what the powers that be will accept. They will lose everything. And as one other investigative journalist also told me, she said, "Brave reporters know just how far they can go before risking their lives. Some have taken risks regardless, perhaps naively, perhaps not. And their suicides or their "accidents" have sent a clear message. So, [Gary Webb](#)² was who reported on the cocaine being brought into the Los Angeles black communities was a good example of that. We don't know if he committed suicide or if he was suicided by the CIA. But in any event it was a very chilling event for any other journalist." That's the quotes I got from both Christina and then another, the other last one was from a reporter who remained anonymous.

John Shuck: [00:37:43] So that is what is at stake. Fran Shure is a licensed psychotherapist. [She is writing] a series of articles called "Why Do Good People Become Silent—or Worse—About 9/11." Her most recent is regarding the media. And yet, there are people who touch the third rail and don't

² See <https://theintercept.com/2014/09/25/managing-nightmare-cia-media-destruction-gary-webb>.

die. The point is and what I also get from your article...is yes, but, [you write]: “Early in our history, similar censorship was imposed on the early opponents of slavery and on the suffragettes. But by studying these historical examples we can be encouraged that the media's mockery cannot prevent the ultimate success of those who endeavor to reverse egregious policies and practices.” So what I get from your article is, don't give up.

Frances Shure: [00:38:29] Right. If we look at history we're not the only movement that has had a very difficult time -- that has been castigated by the media. There is the suffrage movement. These women were horribly abused. There is the civil rights movement, the abolitionist movement. So we can look at history, we can see that we just need to keep pushing on. There are other people who suffered way more than we have suffered and yet they prevailed. So they just kept on -- and they were very unpopular at the time.

John Shuck: [00:39:07] And there is a bigger picture behind all of this. I mean the opposition is great. Your new article is coming out that you're working on now. You can talk a little bit about it like on the CIA and the media. In fact I'm going to lead you in on that. On my Facebook page I recently posted one of your articles and one of the first responses was from a Facebook friend that said, “Well can this learned person say why all these people who planned this are secret and we have heard nothing about it? How could they have kept all this secret?”

Frances Shure: [00:39:41] That's a very common response and a very common question that we get. First of all, people do need to know that the [CIA has put out to the media](#)³ --this is a talking point--that the media should put out to the world--that people can't keep secrets. There would have been way too many people who would have been involved. And people can't keep secrets. People have a conscience. People would have talked. And what we find is that's just not true. First of all, they're not going to ask [just any] people to plant explosives in the buildings. They're going to know who they can ask to do this. Or they [the ones who planted the explosives] may not even know what they were doing. Who knows? They could have been intelligence agents, people from another country along with the CIA. Who knows who it was?

The main fact that I want to speak about here is that big, huge events can be kept secret. One example— there's two examples I want to give. Number one is the Manhattan Project. Even Truman did not know this was happening until he became president. There was well over a hundred thousand people—I think I've read 130 thousand people who were working on this Manhattan Project. The way it was kept secret was by a strategy called compartmentalization. So every person who is working on this project only knew their piece of the project but only a very, very few people at the top knew the whole project -- what it was really about. So people were admonished to not reveal what they were doing, and then they didn't know what they were doing. Actually, they only had their piece of the puzzle. So compartmentalization is very effective in keeping secrets.

Another example is in my latest article that I'm working on now it's called, “The CIA and the Media.” There's a special role that CIA has played in our media, in censoring our media. The way this was revealed in 1975 [was]at the Church Committee hearings. The Church Committee was looking at the abuses of the CIA and the FBI in our country to see if they were going beyond their—what they were given authority to do. Part of that was to look into their role in the media. It was only a small part, [but] when they got to that, they discovered something quite astonishing: that the CIA had its tentacles in all media of any significance. This is both foreign and national media. So when the Church Committee asked for the evidence -- asked to be shown the documents

³ If you cannot open this link, paste into your browser: <https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2015-02-23/1967-he-cia-created-phrase-conspiracy-theorists-and-ways-attack-anyone-who-challenge>.

that proved that both journalists had been coopted by the CIA and the CIA had agents with journalistic coverage working within these media outlets, the CIA had a hard time finding these documents because of compartmentalization. What had happened is every reporter that was working for the CIA, or every CIA agent who was working undercover as a reporter, had its own project name and its own people looking over that project. So let's say there are 400—it looks like it was way more than 400—but there was only 400 reported. There would have been 400 projects, and they have a very hard time finding all those documents because of the lack of centralization and the compartmentalization. So even there it was another example of how this operation was kept so secret.

John Shuck: [00:43:34] We talk about Eisenhower back in 1961 talking about the military industrial complex. But it's far bigger than that now, right? We're talking about military, industrial, financial, media, intelligence.... I mean it's so packed together when you think of how much of the media is really controlled -- just a few corporations and they're connected really with the intelligence agencies.

Frances Shure: [00:43:58] Academic. Academics is very highly connected.

John Shuck: [00:44:01] Academics, publishing.

Frances Shure: [00:44:03] Yeah and publishing. Yes. Yeah the military-industrial-media-academic. What else? What[ever] else you read out--it's all it's very, very connected.

John Shuck: [00:44:13] And it doesn't necessarily have to be explicit, right? We think of censorship and we think of the old Soviet way or something like that, but that isn't how censorship really works. It really works psychologically within. We censor ourselves.

Frances Shure: [00:44:27] That's correct. And that's another aspect which I'll be writing about next after my essay segment on the special role of the CIA, because we really do need to focus on that. It's such a big part of our history of our media. But the next one is on the structure of the media itself. And that's very important. The media have become part of mega-conglomerate corporations. The corporations expect the media, part of the corporation, to be as profitable, because now they're publicly traded corporations. They expect them to be as profitable as the other parts of these corporations. In order to be as profitable, what do they do? They have to cut costs. How do they cut costs? They fire investigative journalists. They don't have people in foreign countries. They listen to their advertisers, [so] their advertisers become very powerful in what they can or cannot report.

John Shuck: [00:45:25] So was the media always like this or has it always been sort of like this and it's just gotten a great deal worse?

Frances Shure: [00:45:32] It's never been exactly like this. I'm still studying the history of it myself. I will be addressing that in future writings, but the history of the media is that in the past you would go to any city and you would have several different newspapers or perhaps radio stations. You would have several different media outlets with different viewpoints and different political agendas so you could read a very conservative media outlet, a newspaper, but in the same city you would have another newspaper that was, say, put out by the Labor contingent, and you would have a whole different viewpoint. So you got different papers, different press, different media, with different viewpoints. Now we have a monopoly and that's huge in the censorship and the structure. Now we have a monopoly. What do we have? Probably four to five to six major media outlets, all owned by mega-corporations. No matter how many means we have of learning our news, the news we're getting is pretty much the same in all of those outlets.

John Shuck: [00:46:49] Fran Shure we just have a couple of minutes left. So I want you to give us some hope here and I'm thinking it might be within this article itself, "Whatever Happened to Investigative Journalists?" You write, "Before 2004 it was common for a majority of Americans to profess at least some trust in the mass media. But since then, less than half of Americans feel that way. Now only about a third of the United States has any trust in the fourth estate. A stunning development for an institution designed to inform the public." So, is this a sign of hope, in a sense, that the American people are beginning to distrust the media? It seems a little bit of a conflict. I'm not really sure how to measure that because on one level we seem to trust the media in many ways but also there's a poll that says we are distrusting? Can you unravel that.

Frances Shure: [00:47:38] Right. It's kind of hard to unravel, but it is true. What I learned -- the fascinating part here -- is that it's actually Republicans or conservatives who distrust the media the most. And Democrats and older people tend to trust the media more. Young people are distrusting the media. So I think the message is really getting to people that the media is not trustworthy -- that they are compromised. And I don't think people are looking to the media as such an authority anymore as these polls show that less than a third are trusting the media in general. So we have the Internet. And as long as we can keep that free the Internet is really, truly educating people about the issues that the media will not touch. So that's very hopeful and I really do hope that continues and we can keep that, keep that going.

John Shuck: [00:48:41] And of course it takes people to do some work.

Frances Shure: [00:48:44] That's right.

John Shuck: [00:48:46] Not just to trust what the screens tell us.

Frances Shure: [00:48:48] Say that again?

John Shuck: [00:48:50] I'm saying not just simply to trust what the screens tell us, the television screens and stations.

Frances Shure: [00:48:57] Exactly. Think Critically. And do your own research.

John Shuck: [00:49:00] You didn't really write about this but I wonder if there's also the strategy of right versus left. We can become kind of enlightened about if we're liberals, well, we know that Fox media is crazy, or if we're conservatives we don't trust MSNBC. But I wonder if that pitting is part of a bigger puppet strings behind both of them.

Frances Shure: [00:49:22] I see that as true. I don't know how that works but I do believe that, still, even with MSNBC and Fox you're still getting the official story on many different issues. You're still getting the official story on what happened on 9/11. [It's]very rare we get anything that deviates from the mainstream. I think this [is] pitting, this [is]divide and conquer and pit people against each other. You know my liberal friends will see the Republicans as the black hats and we're the white hats, and my conservative friends will see the opposite. You know here's something that I really found very inspiring. I actually had a dinner recently with Cynthia McKinney who was a former congressperson for Georgia from Atlanta Georgia. And she actually held a congressional hearing on 9/11 and because of that she was run out of office. But anyway, at this dinner she said, "You know we all have to get out of our silos." She said, "When I was running for office in Georgia, I got in my car and I drove out to Ku Klux Klan territory." She's an Afro-American woman. "Can you imagine how scary that was for me to do that?" And I just was so impressed. She said, "Yeah I got out and knocked on their doors. And you know what? They voted for me!" And she found common ground with these people. She found compassion for their views. And I thought

that was so inspiring. And I think that's what we need to do, is we need to come together. We need to get out of our silos. We need to talk to people who have different views than we do, and learn how to talk civilly, find our compassion and find our heart with each of these people no matter what their values are.

John Shuck: [00:51:11] Fran Shure has been my guest. She is a member of the 9/11 Consensus Panel. That website is consensus 9/11 dot org. The book that's come out in September is *9/11: Unmasked an International Review Panel Investigation* by Elizabeth Woodworth and David Ray Griffin. This wraps up my series on 9/11. Fran thank you for your continued good work inviting us to be courageous and seeking the truth.

Frances Shure: [00:51:40] Thank you so much, John. And thank you for being courageous. I really, really appreciate it.

John Shuck: [00:51:45] Progressive Spirit is heard every week. On Progressive Spirit you hear interviews with cutting edge scholars, authors, and activists who have something to say about social justice, human flourishing, and things that matter. Progressive Spirit is formatted for radio and is distributed every week through the Pacifica Radio Network and PRX, the public radio exchange. You can download Progressive Spirit for free on your favorite podcast app. The web site is Progressive Spirit dot net, follow on Facebook and Twitter. Progressive Spirit is produced in the studios of KBOO in Portland Oregon. I'm John Shuck. Be Well.