



---

# The Solari Report

March 28, 2019

---

## The Solari Report Copenhagen with Thomas Meyer and Niels Harrit





The Solari Food Series  
The Godfather of Grass-Fed  
with  
Thomas Meyer and Niels Harrit

March 28, 2019

---

**Thomas Meyer:** Niels Harrit, I am very pleased to have met you today. We want to discuss shortly about the thing that we all ought to have on our hearts, which is a great concern, and that is 9/11 and its effects here today.

If I may, I would like to ask you what the first reaction was for you after that.

**Niels Harrit:** This happened to me in 2006 when, by accident, I saw a video presentation by an American physics professor by the name of Steven E. Jones from Brigham Young University in Utah. During that presentation he showed very shortly a clip of World Trade Center Building 7 collapsing. That was a shock to me. I remember I yelled at my wife, “Come look at this!” for two reasons.

First of all, if this was the World Trade Center, it meant that there were three skyscrapers but two airlines, and I didn’t know that until that point. I had accepted the official story more or less, and I didn’t think too much about it.



The fact that there were three skyscrapers revealed that those who have decided what I am supposed to know have decided that I was not supposed to know this, which made me angry. I read in newspapers since I was ten years old, and I am paying my TV license which we have in Denmark, and still with all of these journalists, nobody has cared to tell me about this. That was one thing. I was offended by the fact that they hadn't showed me this.

**Meyer:** What is 'this'?

**Harrit:** The collapse of the World Trade Center 7 – the fact that there were three skyscrapers. Nobody knew that at that time. Still, believe me, in the general population most people do not know about it still today.

This is a footnote, so we are going a little off-topic here. I have given many presentations on the physics and chemistry of the World Trade Center destruction. I am usually asking people the question when I show people Building 7 for the first time, “How many of you are seeing this for the first time?”

Five or ten years ago, it would be at least two-thirds of the audience who had never seen this before. This has changed now. Sometimes it's only one-fourth of the audience who has never seen it or one-half. So there is definitely an enlightenment going on. People know now, but they didn't know at the time.



That was one thing. The other thing is that I, as a natural scientist, am a chemist and a retired associate professor of chemistry from the University of Copenhagen. I've had 40 years of teaching and researching science. So I have spent my professional life understanding what is going on around me in the physical world. I believe that I have reached a point where I do understand most.

This phenomenon I just couldn't understand. I didn't know what was going on here. Why does this building collapse vertically into its own footprint?

I pushed the button ten times, and then I got the feeling that here is something that I do not want to know more about because the path that it is leading me down would be painful.

Then it happened to me as it happens to most. The latency time is about four, five, or six weeks. Then you realize that there is no way back. Once you have seen this, there is no way back. It's a one-way street.

This is the bend of my nature. I had to go back and take a closer nature, and I did. The story from then is a long one.

One peak culmination is that I was involved in some research with the same Professor Steven E. Jones on the World Trade Center dust. Actually, the scientific paper which came out of it was published on April 3<sup>rd</sup> in 2009. So this coming Wednesday, we have the ten-year anniversary on the publication of that paper, and nobody has challenged it yet.



**Meyer:** Where was it published?

**Harrit:** It was published in a journal called *Open Journal of Chemical Physics* or something of that nature. I haven't read it for years. It was the usual scientific process for publications.

From one day to the next, I was catapulted into worldwide conscience, and I have used that platform to say some things which are more fundamental. Contrary to most other people, I consider our work to be an academic footnote only. You don't need it. But many people think that we have identified explosives in the World Trade Center dust, and that is a very primitive way of viewing it.

Nevertheless, I got involved with many good people on the global scene. I am still doing presentations. I'm approaching the number 400.

I think that this is my duty. I'm a Dane. This is a rather peaceful, prosperous corner of the world. So I think that my duty is to address my fellow citizens here, and I am not preaching for the saved. I'm trying to bring in the uninitiated and the freshmen. It's a big work to bring in people who do not know anything because they don't want to go.

This is what I am spending most of my time doing, addressing ordinary people. I believe that we have to bring in the mainstream.

**Meyer:** I totally agree. Let me ask you a question. The explosives, which you think is not important, but it is realistic, they have proved that there was dynamite and that there were explosives in the buildings.



**Harrit:** Yes, but I just don't believe that it served the purpose of a genuine explosive. Now it's getting technical. It's a nano-technological material, and the key here is that these materials you can tune on a scale from incendiary to explosives. Incendiary is a substance which can destroy things by means of heat while explosives are actually mechanical, and you are knocking things over mechanically.

In between you have rocket fuel. It's called a 'propellant' in English. Rocket fuel is not as fast as an explosive. An incendiary is very slow, and an explosive is very fast, but rocket fuel is in between.

Like an explosive, you have to release a gas in order to produce a pressure which can lift the rocket. This is getting very technical, but you are asking me and I am trying to explain. The only time that I have ever revealed this was during a presentation in Toronto where we had a tribunal. It was not certified as a 'Bertrand Russell' tribunal because at the same time they actually had a Bertrand Russell tribunal running on the Palestine issue, but it operated according to the same rules and procedures in 2017 where I announced this model for the action of the nanothermite.

I believe that this will require that you attend my presentation one day because it takes you two hours to bring a freshman to the point where you can get a consistent, coherent collapse scenario for the World Trade Center Twin Towers. It will take two hours to reach that point.



But let me confine myself to directing your attention. Everybody has watched the collapse of the Twin Towers. Everybody had seen steel beams and girders being thrown up and out. There are huge fragments from four to 15 tons being thrown laterally 100 meters to 200 meters out.

The official narrative from the collapse of these high-rises is that the only forces acting on the skyscrapers in the moment of collapse is gravity. It is completely irrelevant whatever is preceding the collapse, but when it happens, the only force acting on the skyscraper is gravity.

According to experience, gravity is vertical. According to Newton's second law of motion, an object moves in the direction of the force.

So if you see something moving laterally out, you know that it is not gravity acting on this building. Game over! We're finished. It means that the official narrative is wrong, and it can only be wrong once. Please notice that you cannot be wrong twice.

With the nanothermite, you will see all of these fragments..... This has been viewed by billions of people billions of times. All of these fragments are being trailed by a completely homogenous white smoke tail. You see, the beams are being thrown out, and they all have a white homogenous white smoke trail following them.

My suggestion is that this white smoke trail is aluminum oxide, which is the other product from the thermite reaction. The classical thermite reaction produces molten iron at a temperature of 2,500 degrees centigrade, and aluminum oxide is the other product of a thermite reaction. My suggestion is that the white smoke trails consist of aluminum oxide.





They are virtually rocket objects or rocket projectiles. This has been verified by David Chandler, who has done brilliant work on the videos. You can see objects coming out of the South Tower that are actually accelerating to the ground faster than freefall at 11 meters per second squared. This can only be explained if it has a thrust, that it is being accelerated.

You will see objects coming out of the South Tower and changing direction 90 degrees, and then the object still has the white smoke trail.

You will see fragments exploding in the air after it has been ejected from the towers. So there is something going on. This is where the nanothermite fits in. I do not believe that the nanothermite has been cutting the steel columns; this is a different kind of thermite called 'thermate' which is military-grade.

The thermite reaction was invented by a German chemist, Hans Goldschmidt, in 1893. Nowadays it comes in hundreds of different varieties. It's a very energetic reaction. You can use many metals.

In the military if you want to cut steel beams, what you do is you mix sulfur into the thermite mixture. That makes the reaction capable of cutting through steel beams like a hot knife through butter. There is a different investigation into this from the University of Worcester where they have found sulfidation of the steel. They have actually detected the metal cuts where you see sulfur in the chemical called iron sulfide. It is a chemical compound with iron which is an indication that this beam has been cut by 'thermate', which is a variety of the thermite where you add sulfur.





I'm getting too technical, but my point is that I do not believe that the nanothermite has been used for cutting the steel columns. It is still thermite, but it is another variety of thermite.

Third, explosives were definitely used. You can see that. The fact is that we do not know the chemical composition of these explosives.

**Meyer:** But that is the third factor.

**Harrit:** There are three 'energetic materials' used for the demolition of the World Trade Center. So it gets a bit complicated.

**Meyer:** I once spoke to the warden of the North Tower, who you might know. His name is Rodriguez.

**Harrit:** I have not met him, but I am certainly aware of him.

**Meyer:** He has openly spoken several times in Vienna where I attended a conference. He said that he heard an explosion underneath, and then someone came up and had a burned arm. Do you know this story?

**Harrit:** Absolutely.

**Meyer:** According to your opinion, what did he hear? What kind of explosions did he hear?

**Harrit:** I don't know what kind of explosion, but explosions were going on abundantly prior to the collapse. As to what was happening, we don't know.



The lobby was completely wasted prior to the collapse. So there were many things going on, and we should not suppose that everything was on purpose. Probably many things went wrong that day.

Graham McQueen has done a brilliant job of actually going through all of the testimonies of the firemen. It is a total of 123 who were referring to explosions prior to the collapse.

**Meyer:** That is important. The ‘Omission Report’ as Griffin calls it has never gone into any of these things that you now mention in their official report.

**Harrit:** Right, the 9/11 Commission Report. Of course not. They don’t talk about explosions.

What I was referring to before is the key argument because we all know gravity. Gravity is vertical. So if you see something going outward that is not vertical, the game is over. I can make anyone the crown witness to the falsity of the official narrative in five minutes.

**Meyer:** That is important. Now let me tell you a little story of when I was first seeing a volcano. I was in Sicily, and I saw the Etna. The Etna was friendly enough to be active. It was not very dangerous.

I went up, and first you see it from a distance. Then when you approach, you hear it. Then I was reminded on what we saw on 9/11 when the ejections came. This was a volcanic eruption.



**Harrit:** May I add a footnote here? There is a very important observation here because what you were watching when you saw the volcano was hot dust clouds. They expand in a certain way, which is obvious to volcanic scientists. They recognize immediately that hot dust clouds expand in a certain way. I understand it as chemistry because as something gets hot it is expanding. You see the same phenomenon in the World Trade Center. The way that the dust is expanding means that it is pyroclastic clouds, and you only see that in volcanoes.

It is wonderful that you can bring up that observation because it's spot-on.

**Meyer:** I was writing about it, and I said, "If I would have doubted so far, this changes it."

Even the photographs of that day of the clouds, you could have seen a volcanic eruption.

**Harrit:** And people got burned from the fallout. So there was still a chemical reaction going on. And this is nanothermite.

You will see the roof of the cars being corroded without the seats inside being touched at all. This is falling, still-reacting nanothermite.

**Meyer:** That is what Judy Wood said probably what caused the dust on the cars. What do you call it? She said that the paper was not burned next to the cars. What do you think about her?

**Harrit:** She's misinformed. It is ridiculous in so many ways. She is talking about 'directed energy weapons'. Nobody knows what she is talking about.



The point is that energy is not a thing; energy is a quality you ascribe to an object. It's a concept that you use in calculations. Energy is not a thing, so you cannot direct a concept.

When you are talking about directed energy weapons, you may talk about it as a beam. It may be this infrared light or ultraviolet light, or you can talk about x-rays or gamma rays or particle beams. Please tell us exactly what you are talking about.

When they say, "It's electromagnetic radiation," fine. Give us the frequency and the wavelengths so that we know what we are talking about here. Is this microwaves, or is this ultraviolet light? In that case, we know very well – and this is my scientific field – how such a beam interacts with matter. So we could easily start talking about it.

The point is that nobody knows what Judy Wood is talking about, and I'm pretty sure that she doesn't know herself.

**Meyer:** Thank you. That is important because we are asked about that. Maybe a more general question would be: What makes you not only follow the research as an individual, as you obviously do, but spread it? What is your expectation or hope, and why is it so important? So there are really two questions there. Why is the clarity about this lied-about event so important to bring clarity to people to the world?

**Harrit:** Because all wars are based on deception. It's as simple as that.

**Meyer:** Right, and that is a key example.



**Harrit:** Basically all wars. In the medieval times, the king didn't have to lie; he just declared war to the neighbor king. But these days, and that is a positive thing, you have to fool the people to get them into war. It seems that the threshold for activating the American people is about 3,000 casualties. This is the number of servicemen killed at Pearl Harbor, and this is roughly the same number of people who died on the day of 9/11. So this is the threshold for taking the American people into war.

**Meyer:** Pearl Harbor was the model, and it worked. This misinformation literature was popularly accepted, whereas the good things you already had in the 1940's were already clear that it was a deception that only Roosevelt and his crew knew and the people in Hawaii.

When I personally heard 'The new Pearl Harbor', I knew that it had the same recipe that worked the first time, and it will work this time.

What is your experience of your lecturing? Do you illuminate some people and wake them up? And what are the consequences of that?

**Harrit:** It definitely varies. I believe in the decency of ordinary people. Ordinary people do not want to be lied to, and they don't want to be fooled. Many people – maybe a majority – don't want to know that we are being fooled. An unknowing slave is a good slave, and they would rather live in peace. And God bless them.



If you have children and you have a mortgage on your house and you have a job, and you are trying to make ends meet in your daily life, try to take care of your children. But I am retired, and most of us fighting here are retirees. You should go down the list of scientists who are involved with this. We are all retired.

**Meyer:** Kevin Barrett is an example. Was he ousted?

**Harrit:** I don't know his story, but Kevin Ryan was fired from his company. I don't know what kind of agreement Steven Jones struck with his university. He is younger than I am.

**Meyer:** **Daniele Ganser** lost his job.

**Harrit:** He lost his job. I don't know if he had tenure, but he was definitely expelled. \_\_\_\_\_.

There are professors at ZTR which has done a good job on the voice analysis of Osama Bin Laden and some videotapes. There are good people still working within the institutions.

Now we are in the process of establishing a group of academics. We have about 45, and the initiative is being taken by Piers Robinson from the University of Sheffield, and he is in his peak. He is not old, and he is still there.

So there are people in permanent positions.

**Meyer:** You are in contact with them. That is interesting to know. Are these 45 people international academics?



**Harrit:** Absolutely. I was brought in by Graham McQueen.

**Meyer:** And have you got a corporation with Richard Gage?

**Harrit:** I know Richard very well.

**Meyer:** He seems to have a kind of a pedagogical task to really bring the doubt with Building 7.

**Harrit:** Considering what he has been subjected to in terms of cognitive infiltration, it's amazing that they are still standing.

**Meyer:** But they seemed to have made an impact, even on the official list people who had suddenly admitted that for a certain short period of time there was freefall speed on Building 7. They believed that was a result of Richard.

**Harrit:** Not Richard. The funny thing was that when the list report came out, there was a preliminary version coming out in August. We were all reading it. I was six hours ahead of the Americans because of the time difference. So I said, "Hey, did you see this on page such-and-such?"

Then two or three hours later, "Yes, that's right."

They made genuine mistakes, and then there was a hearing. It was at the end of August. It was August 27<sup>th</sup>, I believe, in 2008 where you could actually submit questions. By accident David Chandler, who at that time was a high school teacher of mathematics and physics, was allowed.





I believe it was a slip because he was introduced as a representative of the Association of American College Teachers. – which he was not. But nevertheless, he submitted this question, “How can you bypass this?” This was not in the first version of the NIST report. “How can you not acknowledge this very simple observation? The building is coming down in that and that actual way.”

Really, John Gross got into serious trouble. He was an engineer in charge of the Building 7 investigation. He holds a Ph.D. from Cornell University, and he got into deep trouble. He was actually saved by his deputy, sitting next to him. At some point he interrupted and came in and said, “Well, maybe we should take a look at this.”

As a consequence, we believe, in the final report there appeared a figure where they are cheating. I can explain it to you. They were cheating a little bit on the first part of the collapse, but then they have a completely different piece of the collapse. They are depicting the velocity as a function of time, which is completely linear. They are admitting a linear increase in velocity means constant acceleration. You can very easily derive the acceleration from the slope of this line, and they come out of freefall for 2.3 seconds.

So they admitted, indirectly, in this figure, but it has no consequence for the collapsed buildings, and they are cheating on the first part of it because they are measuring on the midpoint of the roofline. You have seen that there is a kink in the roofline.



If you watch the video that they are using, the roofline is going down. This is because they are watching from below.

If you watch the roofline at level, it's straight. What does that mean? There is no downward kink; it's an inward kink. So they are cheating when they are using that video.

But they admit indirectly that the freefall acceleration has no consequence for their collapsed model.

**Meyer:** I want to remind us that Alex told me that you also now have new research with this paper. Our readers would like to hear something about that.

**Harrit:** I told you – and it is a well-known truth – that all wars are based on deception. This is a wonderful example of that. We are talking about NATO here.

I can make this long or short. Maybe I'll try to make it intermediate. On September 11<sup>th</sup>, the NATO headquarters in Brussels at that time the Secretary General was Lord George Robertson, previously a British Defense Secretary. He was a labor politician from Scotland. He also has some skeletons in his closet, but that is another thing; everybody has those.

They were having lunch on Tuesday, September 11<sup>th</sup>. All of the permanent ambassadors at their headquarters were having lunch on Tuesday afternoon. It was a very informal lunch. So there were no secretaries or aids there.



His aid was coming in with a message that said, “The World Trade Center has been hit by an airliner.”

He said, “What a sloppy pilot!”

When the next message came in that said that the second tower had been hit, everybody realized that something was going on, and they were breaking up.

They can make an assembly within half an hour because all of the ambassadors are there. So they are having a meeting in the evening where everything is passing. Lord Robertson says that maybe he should invoke Article 5 of the Washington Treaty.

I don't know if you are aware of what this is, but this is the famous Musketeer oath. Article 5 of the Washington Treaty is the ‘One for all and all for one’. If one country is being attacked by an outside enemy, it is considered as an attack on the whole area. Article 5 of the Washington Treaty was immediately used then. It had never been used up until that time, and NATO was founded in 1949. It had never been activated before then.

Robertson was considering this in the evening. This is what he was telling his diary and his reporter.

On the morning of Wednesday, September 12<sup>th</sup>, there were meetings all over. There were meetings also in Copenhagen. We have a Committee for Foreign Affairs. They were having a meeting at 8:00am.



Then our Foreign Minister at that time was going to Brussels because there was supposed to be a meeting in the European Union for foreign secretaries, and it turns out that that was a common meeting with the NATO general assembly.

This is very unusual and unheard of that the European Union, which has nothing to do with NATO, the foreign ministers are holding a joint meeting with the North Atlantic Council.

You may say that many of the countries are overlapping because they are members of both organizations, but nevertheless it had never happened.

During the afternoon Lord Robertson suggested that we are activating Article 5. This decision has to be unanimous. That means that everybody has to agree on this, and this is governments. The ambassadors cannot do that.

Late in the afternoon and in the early evening, all of the governments at that time – 19 NATO members – were holding meetings, and he got the approval at 9:20 that evening. At 9:20 the last country came in and said, “Yes, we can agree on the activation of Article 5 provided that the attack was directed from abroad.”

This is happening the evening of September 12<sup>th</sup>. They activated NATO Article 5, “Provided the attack was directed from abroad.” They had a suspect, but they were waiting for the hard evidence.



So was Article 5 activated? It can be discussed, but with a provision. And the proof for the attack was directed from abroad. There were many stories, and actually both Deputy Foreign Minister Richard Armitage was in Brussels and Wolfowitz was in Brussels as well. Still, they did not come up with any evidence.

Colin Powell promised to come with a white book, but the President said, “No, we cannot publish the evidence because it’s classified.”

The key date is October 2<sup>nd</sup> where an American diplomat by the name of Frank Taylor was coming to Brussels and was submitting the proof – the evidence – that this attack was directed from abroad. It came on October 2<sup>nd</sup>. It was a very famous meeting.

While Frank Taylor was submitting his evidence for the General Counsel, is Article 5 now invoked? It still has to be considered by the governments.

The proceedings from this meeting was classified. Frank Taylor’s report was classified for 30 years. So in principle, we do not know what is going on.

While Robertson was giving a press conference, he was saying, “Now we have seen the evidence. The facts are clear and compelling.” Those were his words. He said, “There will be briefings in the respective capitals of the NATO headquarters.”



We know that there was a briefing in Copenhagen the same day, on October 2<sup>nd</sup> for the government by the American military advisor from the embassy here in Copenhagen. This evidence is accepted by the government, and on October 4<sup>th</sup> there is a meeting again in the North Atlantic Council. They said, “We have seen the evidence, and we accept it.”

So now Article 5 is formally invoked and implemented on October 4<sup>th</sup>. At that time, the Americans were not really interested in European troops. What they were doing was institutionalizing Article 5. There were eight missions which the countries were supposed to take as a consequence of Article 5. The European troops were not brought in until December. The European troops were taking off at Christmas time.

The point here is that 18 years of wars all depend on Frank Taylor’s report. It all depends on that. But it was classified.

**Meyer:** I have a quick question. To be quite clear, Robertson’s function at Brussels was what?

**Harrit:** He was the Secretary General of NATO.

**Meyer:** And what was his relation to Brussels?

**Harrit:** The NATO headquarters is in Brussels.

**Meyer:** Thank you.



**Harrit:** So it all depends on Frank Taylor's report. Eighteen years of NATO in wars and bombing in the Middle East, and it all depends on the evidence presented by Frank Taylor on October 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Fitts:** Do you know my story?

**Harrit:** The strange thing is that there is no 'Frank Taylor report. There is a talking paper for Frank Taylor and for all of the briefings being given in the respective headquarters and the councils.

**Fitts:** The Article 5 was illegally originated.

**Harrit:** Definitely. Read it yourself. There is nothing there. There is no evidence there.

**Meyer:** They were activating it on no basis just to get the NATO members into their war. It is good that this getting cleared. There is no report.

**Harrit:** You have to connect the dots because this document is dated October 1<sup>st</sup>, the day before. It went out to all ambassadors of the United States. In there, the recipient of this document is instructed to tell the local high officials, and you can read it all there.

The funny thing is that I got this in 2009, not realizing what it was until recently. I totally understood the plot.





I have realized that it was actually a Norwegian who sent it to me in 2009, but at that time I did not know the story of what had happened in Brussels. This was two papers of Michel Chossudovsky, and it opened my eyes to how NATO got into all of these wars. It was all based on that one.

I gave this report to James Corbett when he was in Copenhagen about a year and a half ago. I had Frank Taylor's report. He didn't move on this. He said that he would give it to Chossudovsky, and neither of them have published it.

**Fitts:** Michel hasn't published it?

**Harrit:** Yes, because I wrote an essay for Rlobal research which was written about a year ago, which prompted James Corbett to make a brilliant documentary which was released on September 11<sup>th</sup>, six months ago. It has had 200,000 views now.

So you have to connect the dots. Quite recently in Denmark we had an investigation into the wars. In that, it is said in footnote 257 that the briefing of the Danish government on October 2<sup>nd</sup> is based on this paper. So it's in a footnote that this is the basis, but Denmark doesn't decide anything. We have been aggrieved that we are at war. This is my point. Denmark is not a sovereign country.

**Meyer:** You had a very problematic, influential General Secretary. Was he already there and involved, this Robertson?



**Harrit:** No, he became Prime Minister in Denmark on November 20<sup>th</sup>. He was not Prime Minister at that time. But our Prime Minister made the mistake that he called an election. He was riding on a wave, he thought, but he lost. So Anders Fogh Rasmussen took over, and he was actively Prime Minister when Danish soldiers were sent to Afghanistan on December 14<sup>th</sup>.

This is a decision in parliament. Where the parliament makes a law or a decision, they are the foundation and the background for taking this decision along with the parliamentary decision. In that background, they are referring to this document – to Frank Taylor’s document. It’s not to this specific document because at that time it was still classified. It was declassified in 2008 without anyone noticing.

I was connecting the dots, and I suddenly realized that this was Frank Taylor. It is not a report; it is a talking paper. That is my point: There is no report.

Everybody has been talking about ‘Frank Taylor’s report’, but there is none. This is a talking paper.

**Meyer:** That is a wonderful Danish story. That is *The Emperor’s New Clothes*.

**Harrit:** Exactly, and that is the forward of the book that I am releasing on Saturday in Austria.



**Harrit:** But what is the point of *The Emperor's New Clothes* fairytale? Many people think that the point of *The Emperor's New Clothes* by Hans Christian Andersen is that the emperor is naked and that he had thin legs. No. The point is what happened afterwards. Everything continues. The procession is continuing on to the palace, and the two tailors are gone with the money. The Military-Industrial Complex is gone.

Then everything continues, and nothing happens. Everybody knows that everybody knows that everybody knows that everybody knows that the emperor has no clothes on, but nothing actually happens.

**Fitts:** Everybody is in love with war, and some people are dead.

**Harrit:** Absolutely, but the press is silent.

**Meyer:** This was sent out to the ambassadors all over, and the press hadn't read it yet.

This is the basis for activating Article 5.

**Harrit:** It's the talking paper from Frank Taylor, and they all voted for invoking Article 5, and they accepted the evidence, even though there is no evidence.

**Meyer:** It was interpreted as being evidence for justly activating Article 5.

**Harrit:** If you go and watch Robertson's press conference, he is reading from this document. This is all hot air and dead meat.



Lord Robertson is reading from this, “The facts are clear and compelling. We know that the individuals who carried out these attacks were part of the world-wide terrorist network known as Al-Qaeda, headed by Osama bin Laden and his key lieutenant and protected by Afghanistan’s Taliban.”

He is reading a section from this document.

**Meyer:** I made a little discovery. It’s not related, but either you know it or you don’t.

On September 25<sup>th</sup> I found on the official Pentagon website – and we have included this in the interview – that President Bush went to Langley and gave an address. It was like a birthday party. He congratulated everyone. Did you know of that?

**Harrit:** This is part of the article that I read the other day.

**Meyer:** Of course, it was taken down. I never found it later. I think that it was a mistake that they put it out. I quickly downloaded it, and that was it.

**Harrit:** That was nice, wasn’t it?

**Meyer:** Very nice.

**Harrit:** Do you remember Mathias Rust? He was a German student who was 23 years old. He went to Finland and took a Cessna – a one-engine plane – and flew it from Finland to the Red Square in Moscow. The Russians didn’t like that.



**Meyer:** That is an overreaction.

**Harrit:** Of course! If you go down the list of all of the people who accidentally were in the bathroom or were in a different place, he fired them. Then he praised their good work, and they got fat jobs. They were promoted.

**Meyer:** That fits very well with the story that Catherine Austin Fitts has had with government.

**Harrit:** Exactly.

**Meyer:** I will ask my last question, and then we will have some other things.

You said that all wars have to do with deceptions. Why do you choose this war? Why do you choose the beginning of 9/11? What is special about it? Why do you think that it is especially important to demonstrate this principle?

**Harrit:** The presentation that I am giving is solely based on science. This is a torch which was handed me, and I have to carry it. I understand Newton, and I got involved in some quite sophisticated chemistry on the nanothermite thing. So it's destiny.

**Meyer:** Were you still in your career when you did these things?

**Harrit:** I was.



**Meyer:** Did you have any reactions?

**Harrit:** I did. I am reluctant to speak about it. It was a hidden affair the way that I got out. I was not fired, but I knew later on that they wanted to fire me.

Some of my colleagues intervened without my knowledge, and I am very grateful for that because I am the kind of person who would have made a lot of noise, and it would not have been very useful at that time.

We struck a deal, and this was done before the nanothermite paper came out. I knew and my boss at that time didn't. So I got out. I went formally into retirement at the age of 65.

I kept my office for a couple of years, as you usually do as emeritus. Then sometimes they say, "Hey, we need the space," so I had to move around a little bit. That was how it ended, and it was fine.

In hindsight, I am actually grateful. I guess that is the course of retirement. All of the things that you know go with you, and that is sad. But so is life.

I was not 'sacked'. It was not like that.

The European universities of the Western world have been destroyed. They have been gagged. I can only account for the Danish version of events, but the key here is 2003 when they changed the constitution for the universities.



The University of Copenhagen is from 1488. It's one of the oldest universities in Europe. I think that Bologna is older, and the University of Basel.

**Meyer:** The University of Basel is 1460.

**Harrit:** Of course, these were priest seminars. We have been self-ruling through 500 years until 2003 when they changed. So now it's a completely tucked-down government-run organization.

**Meyer:** Is this throughout Europe?

**Harrit:** This is in Copenhagen. I don't know about all European universities. I know that in France it is even worse. They also changed the ways of funding.

When I left, all of my younger colleagues were basically applying for their own salary all of the time. When you have to apply for your salary, you are quiet, and you don't talk about 9/11 at the lunch table. That would be a very bad career move. That is the state of events. It is very sad.

If you would have told me that this would happen 20 years ago, I wouldn't believe it. I wouldn't believe that the university could have been killed so rapidly. And this is the "Humboldt-University" of Europe, which has worked fine for 200 years as a free haven for thought. It's bad business; it's stupid.

**Meyer:** What one thing has to do with another. That is a big thing – the European going down. I call it the Titanic project. It must not function. That was Churchill's vision to erect the free union as an indispensable preview for all powerful world government. He stated that in a public speech.





The last question that I have brings us back to the first question. I got the impression that you had a wake up in 2005 or 2006. What was your initial personal reaction on the day that it happened? Were you accepting their views?

**Harrit:** No. Up until that time I had never submitted anything for a newspaper, but it takes time. It's not a revelation that you can do in a split second. It takes time to let it sink in and actually think about.

After six months, I realized that I had to write something about this. So I submitted something for a newspaper which was rejected and circulated around by accident. Whenever I've been to the mainstream press, it has always been a slip.

A journalist who we know – Copenhagen is rather small – said, “If you enlarge it, we will take it as an essay,” so I did. I actually got into the newspaper. It was called *The Seventh Tower*. This journalist was the one who came up with the title, *The Seventh Tower*, which I liked.

I was naïve then. I thought that all that you had to do was stand up on a soap box and speak on the corner in Regent's Park and tell the truth out in the open air, and it would go and sell itself from then on. No. Absolutely nothing happened.

When I realized that over the summer of 2007, I said, “What can I do? I can talk. I can give presentations. So this is what I'm going to do,” and this is what I've done ever since.



How I got in with Steven Jones is another story. A friend of mine translated this essay and put it on a website, so it went. I was invited to speak and things like that. But it doesn't go that fast. You feel as though something is wrong, and then you realize, "As a scientist, I have an obligation. I am committed here."

I understand Newton, and this is a part of my nature. That is all that there is into it.

**Meyer:** Do you have a relation to Kierkegaard?

**Harrit:** Not really. I have read him in school, and I may disagree with him on a couple of points. I think that he should have shoved his teeth down into Regine, his girlfriend.

**Meyer:** But he had a true sense of non-compromise.

**Harrit:** That is true. And, of course I go along with that. I am very ethical and Christian as we all are around here, but I think that you can do both. I think that he should have enjoyed life.

Maybe if he would have taken her, he never would have written the books that he had written. So maybe it goes together.

**Meyer:** Thank you very much. That was very interesting.

**Harrit:** Do you want to add anything?



**Fitts:** As you've been going around and making these presentations, what has your experience been? What have you learned from the process of doing the presentations?

**Harrit:** I understand it much better now, and it is being refined very much on the way. My presentation now is two and a half hours, but there is no dead meat. I could easily make five hours, and still there would be no dead meat. I have to cut down because two and a half hours is too much.

**Fitts:** Have you videotaped it?

**Harrit:** I have never done it myself, but many people have done it. I do not know where it is. It is out there many times.

The earlier ones are not as good as the last ones. It gets very much refined.

Regarding addressing people – maybe that is what your question was – as I said in the beginning, I believe in the decency of what the Germans call *Der Burger*. You don't have a very fitting English word for it. You call it 'petit bourgeois' in French, but it's not exactly the same thing. A decent Burger is honest and decent and they want to make things right. They want to live a decent life.

My experience both in Switzerland and in Germany supports that. I was very impressed by the Swiss because they accept facts very fast.



They understand, and then they sit down and talk very civilized. There are no interruptions – you speak and then I speak. They keep on doing that.

With Griffin there was a discussion afterwards, and Griffin and I had jet lag. I'm an old man. At some point we had to say to our host, "Please take us to the hotel because we are too tired."

We know that the good Swiss will continue discussing, and the key point here is the Kanton'ese near democracy – that you are actually involved on a local basis. I think that is a key. I believe in that. And there is Germany decency at the core as well.

Another thing is that the Germans have been ruled by "Beamten" (that is German for "public servants") until 1945. So it is a very young democracy.

I was living in Germany in 1970. As a Dane, I had to find out if the Germans really wanted that war. I was born in 1945. I was born during the war. My obvious conclusion was, "No, but they were fooled into it by deception."

Now we are back again. World War II was started as a false flag. He shot some person and put Polish uniforms on them. This is how they start wars.

I also understand that if you can prevent,..... this is what Hitler did. He used terror organizations. If you can prevent or interrupt the conversation on a personal level between people, if you can sell that by the secret police, you can take the people anywhere.



I believe that maybe the Germans were especially vulnerable to that trick because it is a very young democracy.

I understood that as well because the moment that Hitler got into power, he killed all of them; he didn't need them anymore. Then they just showed up at every occasion and were beating people. It didn't matter which side. They were just showing up and beating people up. Terror was their way.

**Fitts:** You've made 400 presentations. How has this process of trying to communicate with people about this issue changed you? What has been the impact on you?

**Harrit:** Socially it's a curse. There are sacrifices I am sad to say. You pay a price.

People come up to me and say, "I have a problem with my father." Let it be. Don't sacrifice your personal relationships on this.

I still say that. I don't bring it up with my family or my children or my good friends. I have an alternative identity as a musician. I don't bring it up with other musicians.

**Meyer:** You are a musician?

**Harrit:** I am. I was playing last night at a job. I play the saxophone.

**Fitts:** Wonderful!



**Harrit:** Twelve hours ago, we were sitting there after the gig in the room. There were ten or twelve people. Some of them said, “Should we bring up the issue of the towers?” and the other ones said, “No!”

This made me quite sad actually. I’m a heretic. You are as well.

**Meyer:** We all are. Once we see that we have to learn to penetrate the facades and the appearances, there is no way back. Once you see why this is important, this is an event. It is good to exercise this quality, but I see all of us as paying the price, of course.

Some people have heard of the new word association.

**Harrit:** Guilt by association?

**Meyer:** If you were being seen with this lady on the street or with me, it is dangerous. I can accuse you under the basis of your contacts. That is in Germany. There is a strong sense of it there.

**Harrit:** I have had many of those experiences, especially when I give presentations for young people in schools – which I don’t like but I have to.

Many years ago there was a girl who was 16 or 17. She came up to me with tears in her eyes. She said, “Who can we trust now?”

I said, “Don’t worry. We will win in the end.”



There was another girl who came up to me and said, “Would you rather be stupid and happy?”

I said, “Yes!” But I’m not.

**Meyer:** If you go to a certain point, there is no return if you don’t want to lose your own integrity.

**Harrit:** And we are back to 9/11.

**Meyer:** What I find is an experience that the people who care about facts and truths and have certain courage of being not popular, there is a hated community in the world. Whenever I meet someone like that – that is how Catherine and I met, and that is how I met you – that is such a great value. That can give a force or give trust.

**Fitts:** We have fun.

**Meyer:** We have fun, yes.

I think that is important for meeting other people who are from a different angle who are really concerned to get the truth out. They do not have the fear and so on.

**Fitts:** You should come to his salons; you will have fun.



**Meyer:** I will invite you next time. I invited **Daniele Ganser**. He was not able to come, but next time we have one we can inform you. Especially when Catherine is there. To hear what she has gone through, this is incredible.

**Fitts:** Can I tell him the story of the senator?

**Meyer:** Please.

**Fitts:** I just have to tell you this story. At one time for me it was unhappy; it was sad.

**Harrit:** Where are you living?

**Fitts:** I live in Tennessee, but I travel a great deal.

I publish a media called 'The Solari Report'. This interview will be on The Solari Report.

I was visiting a colleague in Washington who used to be a congressman. We were having breakfast, and it was too loud so we walked to the other side of Union Station. As we were walking to the other restaurant, a senator came in by train and was walking across. He stopped to say hello to my friend.

My friend was talking to the senator. I used to work in the government, but I had left before he became a senator so I didn't know him.





My friend introduced him to me. He asked me what I do. I said, “I have a group of subscribers, and they pay me to go where I want and talk about what I want and interview who I want and review what I want.”

I meant to be funny. He looked at me with this huge look of sadness. A wave of grief came over his face. He said, “How can I get that job?”

I said, “Senator, the apprenticeship is a little rough.”

When I saw the grief on his face, I realized that I was in a much better place.

**Harrit:** Because you are honest.

**Fitts:** Because just following integrity leads you to a pathway. One of our famous quotes from Thomas is, “We have to pierce the tunnels of loneliness to find others.”

Once you pierce those tunnels and you are out, now I travel a great deal every year. I am on the road about half of the year. But I always associate with people who want to know what is going on.

In our network, we want to know what is going on, but we also want to build something positive. We want to enjoy our lives. Playing the saxophone is very big.



**Harrit:** Survival.

**Meyer:** Thank you very much. When I come again, may I contact you?

**Harrit:** Yes.

**Meyer:** Wonderful!

## MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

## DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.