Pink Floyd’s Roger Waters on 9/11, JFK, Gaza, and Why the Israel Lobby Is Trying to Destroy Him

Izvor: https://minbarlive.com/videos/pink-floyd-s-roger-waters-on-9-11-jfk-gaza-and-why-the-israel-lobby-is-trying-to

> Roger Waters discusses his concerns about the 9/11 attacks, the lack of proper judicial inquiry, and supports Matt Campbell's legal effort to obtain an inquest into his brother's death in the Twin Towers. Waters also addresses his activism against Israeli apartheid, media blacklisting, and calls for global cooperation and kindness instead of war.

SAŽETAK

In this extensive interview, Roger Waters reflects on his experience witnessing 9/11 in real time and his decades-long questioning of the official narrative. He discusses the 9/11 Commission's inadequacy, the physical impossibility of the buildings collapsing from plane impacts alone, and the lack of any proper judicial inquiry into the attacks. Waters highlights the case of Matt Campbell, whose brother Jeffrey was killed in the Twin Towers, and Campbell's ongoing legal battle in the UK Supreme Court to secure a proper inquest—something that has never occurred in any court of law worldwide. Waters also discusses his activism against Israeli apartheid policies in Palestine, the coordinated campaign by pro-Israeli lobbies to blacklist him from performances and charities, and venue cancellations across the globe. Throughout, he emphasizes the need for ordinary people to unite across borders, resist oligarchic control, and pursue kindness and empathy rather than war, drawing connections between military interventions, financial control through usury, and the silencing of dissenting voices by mainstream media.

KLJUČNE PORUKE

> The 9/11 Commission, headed by Philip Zelikow, produced an inadequate investigation that failed to examine evidence properly; no genuine judicial inquiry into 9/11 has ever occurred in any court of law worldwide.

> Building Seven's collapse was announced by the BBC half an hour before it actually fell, suggesting foreknowledge and raising questions about the official narrative.

> Physical engineers and architects worldwide agree that the Twin Towers and Building Seven could not have collapsed from aircraft impacts and resulting fires alone; the structural physics make this impossible.

> Matt Campbell, whose brother Jeffrey was killed in the Twin Towers, has fought for 25 years to obtain a proper inquest into his brother's death under UK law, with a Supreme Court hearing scheduled for October 14-15.

> The Israeli state operates as an apartheid system in the West Bank, with separate roads, rights, and restrictions for Jewish and Palestinian populations, which Waters witnessed firsthand during visits to the region.

> Pro-Israeli lobbies have orchestrated a coordinated blacklist campaign against Waters, preventing him from performing at charity benefits for wounded veterans, refusing hotel accommodations in South America, and cancelling concert venues across Europe.

> The United States, Israel, and Western financial systems are structured around usury and lending money at interest as mechanisms of political control, which is why Iran's prohibition on usury makes it a target for Western military and economic hostility.

> Ordinary people must organize collectively and raise their voices to resist oligarchic control; the enemy is a small group of 1,000-2,000 ultra-wealthy oligarchs who benefit from war and perpetual conflict.

> Western mainstream media actively silences dissenting voices on issues including 9/11, Palestine, and war with Russia, creating an information environment dominated by pro-war narratives.

ČLANAK

September 11th, 2001: An Immediate Reaction

I was in Island Studios in London making a record when 9/11 happened. What did I think? I thought, fuck me. Someone turned the TV on, so we stopped working almost immediately. I almost immediately called my then wife, Laurie, who was in New York at the time, and I was on the phone with her for the next two hours, sort of watching it develop and unfold before our very eyes in a state of shock, like everyone all over the world.

What did I think? That's a very long and complicated answer to that because I haven't stopped thinking ever since. It was 25 years ago. I wrote something down, and part of what I thought was this: I said to myself, if this is an attack by foreign people on the

United States of America, will the American people notice that some people are pissed off with American foreign policy and that this is a result of it? And I did think that. In a way that was the only positive thing I could think—maybe now the wars come home. Now something has happened on American soil, maybe people will understand. But it didn't happen. And I was surprised, which shows how naive I was. Nobody even started to think that or to allow that to color what happened afterwards.

The 9/11 Commission and Lack of Proper Investigation

Then there was the investigation into 9/11, the 9/11 Commission, which was impaneled by President George W. Bush and headed by a guy called Philip Zelikow. It produced a report which was then bound into a book that you could buy at the bookstore. I did not read that book. I confess, I did wonder why there wasn't a more thorough investigation or any real investigation into what had actually happened.

In the aftermath, we all watched the same images again and again and again. It became evident, or at least it looked likely, that there was more to the whole story than met the eye. The whole story of controlled demolitions of buildings came up very quickly, not least because building seven, which was obviously a controlled demolition when it collapsed, was announced on the BBC in England half an hour before it happened. That's a sign that it's not entirely organic, what you're watching.

From the very beginning it was clear that there was more to it than just the simple narrative that bin Laden got together with some terrorist Arabs and did this. But I, to my eternal shame, had misgivings that I didn't immediately express about what had actually happened, because the atmosphere was appalling at the time. If you did express any misgivings at all about the result of the 9/11 inquiry, you were labeled a madman, and you would lose any voice that you had about any subject on earth forever just by questioning it. As we all know now, the people who did start to ask the questions were correct to do so.

Matt Campbell and the Fight for a Proper Inquest

I'm part of this conversation today because of my friend Matt Campbell. It was a terrible mistake that the questions never got to any court of law or to any place where you could actually listen to the evidence and look at the evidence and try to figure out what actually happened.

Matt Campbell is an Englishman who has been involved since the day it happened. His brother, Jeffrey Campbell, was in one of the Twin Towers and was killed on that day. Eventually there was a cursory inquest into his death, which listened to no evidence about anything and didn't come up with any answers. The inquest simply said that he was killed by terrorists on the 11th of September in 2001, and that's the end of the story. There are no more questions to be answered.

Matt Campbell, to his eternal credit, has for the past 25 years tried to get a proper inquest into his brother's death. It is law in the UK, where I'm from, that a citizen is allowed to demand an inquest—a judicial inquiry into why the person died and who was responsible—if there's anything unusual at all about the death of any person. He is still trying to get that right for his brother Jeff.

He's managed to get it all the way to the Supreme Court. It's been turned down by several British attorney generals who've said, "We're not reopening any inquest. You can't do it." But that's unlawful. This is completely against all the laws of the land in England. You don't have inquests in North America, I'm told, but we do, and they're kind of important.

He's managed to get a hearing in the Supreme Court in England on October the 14th and 15th to try and persuade the Supreme Court to countermand the Attorney General's decision not to allow an inquest. This will mean that evidence can be heard for the first time in a court of law, anywhere in the world. There hasn't been one in America, and there hasn't been one anywhere else. How can it be that 3,000 people die and the investigation, the official investigation into it, is revealed as false, and yet there's been no legal inquiry into it since then? None.

Supporting the Legal Challenge

This is why I'm supporting Matt Campbell. There is a crowdfunder, and I've given him a lot of money in order to fight this case. We need about twice what I've already given. I've given him $100,000, and we need about that much again. His name is Matt Campbell, and it can be found easily—Matt Campbell 911. I've given him this money in order to pay the lawyers who are representing him and his brother before the Supreme Court in England on the 14th and 15th of October. If they are successful and the Supreme Court overturns the decision by the Attorney General not to proceed, then there will be an inquest, which will give you and me and all the people all over the world who are interested to know what actually happened on September the 11th, 2001 in New York.

Why an Inquest Was Denied

I think the powers that be have decided that it would be inconvenient for them to allow an inquest. The 9/11 Commission report was written before any inquest into what happened on 9/11, so in a sense it's fake. Philip Zelikow did that, and we know that.

The Case for Controlled Demolition

Buildings one and two—the World Trade Centers one and two—and building seven. Given all the evidence that exists, and there's an awful lot of it, not just eyewitness testimony but the films themselves: if you look at the film of the North Tower

collapsing, you can see all the explosions in the controlled demolition of that building happening right in front of your eyes. There is no other explanation as to how the North Tower of the World Trade Center fell down. It didn't fall down because it was burning aircraft fluid or because an airplane flew into it. It fell down because it was demolished.

The questions are: who placed the explosives in it? Who pressed the button? Who demolished the World Trade Center and Building Seven and the South Tower? Who did it and why? Those are the questions that we need a proper judicial inquiry to find answers to. It'll be very inconvenient to lots of people, not least the security company—I think they were called Securacom or something—who did all the security in the building. If it's true that they were controlled demolitions, that must have meant there were people working in there putting nano thermite or whatever the explosives were that brought the buildings down in the evenings when the workers weren't there, behind everybody's back surreptitiously. It's a huge, huge operation that must have been known by hundreds and hundreds of people.

If there is a proper judicial inquiry, people might start coming out of the woodwork and say, "Actually, it's funny you should say that, because..." We, the public, have a right to know what happened. That's all we're asking. What happened? And nobody has given us an answer.

Theories About Prior Knowledge

I haven't the faintest idea who specifically was behind it, but I think it's very obvious that elements of the American security services knew that there was a plot. Obviously they did know there was a plot. The evidence shows that conclusively. The Atta and the other 18 who were in the United States were being followed around by American government—the CIA and the FBI—and also by the Israelis. The Israelis knew they were there. And a bunch of Israelis who knew it was going to happen got arrested, actually. They were dancing around, congratulating themselves or whatever it was they were doing.

So the question is: did the Americans and the Israelis have a hand in doing it? Did they allow it to happen? Did they have a complex sting operation that went wrong and it happened despite their best efforts? This does happen—the FBI, for example, will be following somebody and everyone around him will be an informant, to gather evidence on him, and then he goes and shoots somebody and the FBI says, well, we didn't want that. I don't know the answer, but I also know or I believe that the building seven story doesn't make any sense at all. And I don't know why you would attack people who raise questions about something that doesn't make any sense, but they have. That's not a sign of innocence at all.

Intelligence and Government Planning

I've heard that a couple of the floors in building seven were CIA offices. I think that's true. I've certainly heard that. There was an FBI field office, and I think a bunch of different government agencies. What we do know certain things because there is evidence. For instance, General Wesley Clark talked about visiting the Pentagon and his meetings in the offices of Paul Wolfowitz or somebody close to Wolfowitz at the time where they described the American plan—the Pentagon plan, the government plan—to destroy seven countries in the five years that followed. Of those seven countries, five have gone. There's only Lebanon and Iran left standing out of those seven countries.

Wesley Clark and Questions About 9/11

Wesley Clark comes across as a fairly down-to-earth, straightforward kind of person and a very fine professional soldier—someone unlikely to fabricate information. In order to fulfill the ambitions for the new American century, as it was known by the neocons, they needed a Pearl Harbor event. But the question becomes: who is "they"? The speaker suggests it could be Israel, or possibly certain elements within the United States government. It's a significant undertaking to pull off something of this magnitude.

When pressed on what exactly was "pulled off," the speaker clarifies that the official account—that planes flew in and buildings fell—is not what happened. What we know for absolute certain, according to the speaker, is that every single physicist, engineer, and architect in the world agrees there is no way the North and South Towers and Building Seven came down because of airplanes hitting them. It's simply not possible from a structural standpoint.

Structural Engineers and the Official Narrative

The first person the speaker ever heard raise these structural concerns was Donald Trump, who called into a morning show on the morning of September 11th and said he was there, that he's a builder and knows how those buildings were constructed—and that the official explanation doesn't make structural sense. This observation from Trump has largely been lost over the years, even though structural engineers have consistently maintained that what happened was impossible.

These structural engineers still exist, the speaker notes. They are all still alive, still perplexed, and still wondering why nobody took them seriously. The speaker emphasizes that this isn't about a handful of cranks or conspiracy theorists—there are thousands of professional engineers and architects, almost everyone with expert knowledge of steel frame buildings and how they react to fire, who pointed out that

the officially accepted narrative was physically impossible and defied the laws of physics.

A Personal Statement from January 2, 2019

The speaker references a note he wrote to himself on January 2, 2019, after spending three days in Switzerland beginning December 29, 2018. In those three days, something crystallized for him. He had been thinking about a forthcoming event in New York City—the convening by U.S. Attorney Geoffrey Berman of a special grand jury in the Southern Circuit of New York City to consider the events of September 11, 2001. This special grand jury was being convened at the instigation of the Lawyers Committee for 9/11 Inquiry.

The speaker notes that he received documentation showing that the U.S. Attorney's office would comply with provisions relating to the Lawyers Committee's submissions. In his note, he wrote about how his heart was beating almost out of his chest, thinking of all the families, all the victims, all the brothers and sisters who might finally see justice. He expressed tears staining his eyes as he reflected on September 11, 2001—that terrible day when America was attacked and the whole world recoiled in horror.

On that day, the speaker was in London making a record and watched it all unfold on television, transfixed and recoiling in horror. Almost immediately, he found himself wondering why anyone from another land would want to do this to America. According to the American mainstream media, the American people didn't ask themselves that question. Instead, they accepted the received wisdom of the narrative that "they hate our freedom," and despite massive and commendable protests, America invaded Iraq.

The Physical Impossibility and Media Silence

However, within days, sensible and concerned American citizens started to question the narrative that 19 young Arab terrorists had hijacked three American airplane flights and attacked the Twin Towers at the World Trade Center, leveling three multi-story steel frame buildings. Informed architects and civil engineers, backed by decades of professional experience, pointed out that the officially accepted narrative was physically impossible—it defied the laws of physics. The Twin Towers could not possibly have been razed to the ground by fires caused by the impact of two airplanes. Something else must have brought them down.

Within a week or two, the evidence that the Twin Towers were not downed by Mohamed Atta and his associates was unassailable to anyone with basic intelligence. Yet the mainstream media decided to look the other way. The speaker criticizes the mainstream media's decision to allow the 19 young Arab terrorists narrative to proceed unchallenged through the charade of the official investigation—the 9/11 Commission—where no real evidence was heard and the official government narrative was simply rubber-stamped with no genuine investigation.

An Apology and a Challenge

On January 2, 2019, the speaker felt compelled to make an apology. He had known what was happening; he had an IQ above room temperature; but he had been cowed by the suffocating weight of society's pressure to pretend that the Emperor was wearing clothes and to keep his misgivings to himself. He expresses shame at his silence over all these years and challenges the United States government to conduct a real investigation. The convening of the special grand jury in New York City was, for him, a start. While the victims cannot be brought back, the speaker invokes the principle of "nunca mas"—never again—and insists that there must be a full, open judicial inquiry into the events of September 11, 2001, owed to all the victims and their families.

However, the speaker notes that the U.S. Attorney Geoffrey Berman, who was going to bring the matter before a grand jury, was later fired by Trump. Nothing happened, and the investigation disappeared. Similarly, the investigation suggested by the fire chief from Queens—who was a commissioner of police from Queens, New York, and lost brothers and firemen in 9/11—also disappeared. According to the speaker, anybody who makes any suggestion that challenges the official narrative quietly disappears, loses the next election, loses their job, or gets fired.

Congressional Pressure and Silencing

The only member of Congress the speaker is aware of who said anything like this was Curt Weldon from Pennsylvania, a committee chairman and powerful incumbent who began asking questions about 9/11. Right before the election, the FBI raided his daughter's business, never filed charges against her, but the raid was conducted to influence the election outcome—and Weldon lost.

Why Speak Out Despite the Consequences

When asked why a famous, successful person would weigh in on this issue knowing what will happen, the speaker responds that he sincerely cares about right and wrong. He sincerely cares about human rights for all people all over the world. Whoever perpetrated this crime didn't care for the human right to life of the 3,000 people murdered in the Twin Towers that day. For this crime to never be investigated is, for him, beyond the pale.

The speaker mentions Matt Campbell and his dead brother Jeff, their parents, and their family. Matt has put 26 years of effort into pursuing this matter. The speaker also acknowledges others like Piers Robinson and others who have put time and energy into this work for all these years, doing the right thing. He contrasts them with anybody who tries to stand in the way of a judicial inquiry with evidence.

The JFK Parallel

The speaker draws a parallel to the assassination of John F. Kennedy. He questions whether Lee Harvey Oswald, firing from 200 yards away, somehow blew Kennedy's head off the back of his neck—a claim the speaker considers nonsense. The Warren Commission, headed by one of the Dulles brothers, is dismissed as equally nonsensical. The speaker notes that 63 years later, not every JFK assassination-related file has been released; the CIA still holds them.

The speaker reflects on Kennedy's commencement speech at the University of Massachusetts, in which Kennedy said they must make peace with the Russians—that they are our brothers and sisters. The speaker notes the irony that now, those in power seem desperate to have a war with Russia, describing the Ukraine situation as part of this agenda. Kennedy was right, the speaker concludes, and they killed him. It doesn't suit whoever makes the profit out of war. Those who profit from war want wars to happen and couldn't care less about the human rights of ordinary people anywhere—whether American, Russian, Chinese, Indian, or English.

A Common Humanity

The speaker emphasizes that those pushing for conflict only care about profit and power, not human rights. In contrast, the speaker and those who think like him care about one another. They try to develop capacity for empathy with brothers and sisters in other countries, across national borders, religious differences, or whatever divides exist. He stresses that there is only one race—the human race—and everyone is part of it. There is an absolute responsibility to try and help one another.

Final Reflection on the Investigation

When asked what the response has been to raising these questions in public, the speaker acknowledges that the conversation itself—happening in real time in this interview—is itself a form of inquiry. As he says, "Hey, Tucker, we're doing it. This is us doing it today. We're doing it together."

Conversation on 9/11 and Independent Inquiry

I appreciate having a sympathetic ear on this question. I understand that not everyone agrees, but that's precisely why I'm here and why I'm grateful for this conversation with you. You have a huge audience, and when they hear this, maybe they'll think: why don't we have an investigation? I even made a whole documentary on the subject—a multi-part one. What shocked me is that I didn't know until right now that there had never been an independent criminal inquiry, never in court, into 9/11. Isn't that bizarre? The eyewitnesses and firefighters all reported the same thing—boom, boom, boom, boom. They all heard it. They all know it. Everybody knows it. And then there's

the story of the BBC and Building Seven—they reported it had fallen down half an hour before they actually demolished it. It's bizarre.

This conversation between you and me could be a turning point for the whole human race. I often say this in other contexts, but we're right in it now. You and I are right in the middle of a battle—an existential battle for the soul of the human race. The question is: can we empathize with one another, or will we allow the oligarchs and people in our governments to keep us at each other's throats over dimes and groats when we should be giving one another a helping hand, communicating and cooperating across national boundaries, particularly with the Russians, the Chinese, and the Iranians?

On Proposed War with Russia and the Cost of Conflict

I wrote another piece—I won't read it to you now—but on the same day I responded to suggestions that we should invade Iran. This was eight and a half years ago. My response was simple: are you insane? Do you know who the Russian people are? Do you not know that they won the Second World War before you lot got involved in it? Twenty million Russians died saving this planet from the Nazis. Twenty million. And we want to have a fight with them? It's just madness.

I've been there, and they're lovely people. I saw your piece about the underground station—it was very moving. It surprised me because there's such propaganda in the West that Russians are monsters, communist monsters who would destroy us all. But Russia is a civilized country. If there's a definition of civilization, it's that. And it's many, many different groups—ethnic groups from the Chinese borders all the way to Ukraine. So it's all very difficult.

Are you worried that the West is moving toward an actual war with Russia, not just Ukraine against Russia, but Western Europe and the US against Russia? I'm worried that some people in the governments of the United States, the UK, and the European Union are making blood-curdling, bloodthirsty noises about the possibility of fighting—particularly in Germany, where they're trying now to get five percent of the GNP of all European countries put into a big piggy bank in order to fight the Russians. But the Russians don't want to invade Europe. Why are they talking about it?

They're saying it publicly, and they do it. Who knows why? Maybe they're asked to say those things by whoever is paying them. Politics in Europe and definitely in the United States is still very much a business. There's a ruling elite with a lot of money, and they pay politicians to do their bidding because it suits them—because they make money. Basically, it's greed. They're greedy. That's my view, and I don't think there's any question about it. When you push an entire continent into a war that it cannot win by definition, you risk the lives of millions of people. That's a big step. It's crazy.

We have to be cooperating with the Russians, particularly because they're good people. I've worked there a lot in my life and do interviews with them whenever I can. It half breaks my heart that I can't watch Russia Today anymore because it's been banned. We used to be able to watch it in America until 2022, when the special military operation, as the Russians call it, started—because the Minsk Accords were not adhered to. But that's another conversation.

Growing Up in Post-War Britain and Lost Ideals

You grew up in England, and your father was killed fighting the Nazis in the Second World War. You grew up in a victor country that congratulated itself on its freedoms—we always said that if we hadn't sacrificed, we'd all be speaking German and marching in rows. Is it strange to live in a world where you're not allowed to watch a certain TV channel?

Yes, of course it is. I did grow up in post-war England, and we suddenly had a National Health Service because we had a Labour government after the Second World War. And then, weirdly enough, it all turned to ratshit with Tony Blair and Margaret Thatcher and all that right-wing stuff coming back in again. But interestingly enough, I wrote The Wall in 1979, and I wrote a song in that called "Goodbye Blue Sky." It's a beautiful song, but it goes: "Did you hear the frightened ones? Did you see the falling bombs? Did you ever wonder why we had to run for shelter when the promise of a brave new world unfurled beneath a clear blue sky?"

That is a lament for the fact that the Second World War was not the war to end all wars, like the First World War was meant to be. We certainly realized that this idea—that we could live in a socialist future where we looked after one another and a future without wars, nation against nation—was a pipe dream. It didn't suit the oligarchs, who in 1948, when the Declaration of Human Rights was written, had their fingers crossed behind their backs because they never believed in human rights at all. They believe in profit, and that's all there is to it.

We live in a very difficult time. Unless you, with your audience, or me with my tiny voice, can join with our brothers and sisters and pull altogether—all the ordinary working people all over the globe—and make the voice of the choir so loud that we can drown out the propaganda of the ruling class, particularly in the United States, we'll remain hoodwinked. People believe "we're the greatest country in the world." No, you're not. And anyway, even if there was a great country and a not-great country, it's not important. What's important is: are you kind? Can you be kind to people? That's what's important, because that's what brings joy to your life.

Charlie Mackesy, an artist I know in England, wrote a great book—a sort of cartoon book called The Boy, the Mole, the Fox and the Horse. Check it out. On page three—I know this because I knew him and he gave me a signed copy—the mole and the boy

who became friends were sitting on a branch of a tree. The mole says to the boy, "What do you want to be when you grow up?" And the boy says, "Kind." I get sentimental about that. Oh my goodness, yeah, that's what I want to be too. That's what I want for all my brothers and sisters—be kind to one another. Then you can't have a war. War is a really, really bad idea. It's a terrible idea for everyone.

Speaking Out on Gaza and the Apartheid System

You have been vocal in your criticism of the killing in Gaza and of the treatment of the Palestinians over a number of years, probably the last twenty years. Exactly twenty. Why did you decide to speak about it, knowing that you were going to forfeit some of your hard-earned rockstar privileges?

I went to a place called Neve Shalom Wahat Assalam—which is "Oasis of Peace" in Arabic—a peace village halfway between Tel Aviv and Jerusalem where they grew chickpeas. I did an open-air gig there, after I'd cancelled a gig in Tel Aviv in a football stadium called Hayarkon Park, which is built on the ruins of a destroyed Palestinian village. I'd never been anywhere near Israel before, and I believed all the propaganda about the socialist Israelis with their democratic ways, rolling their sleeves up and creating a wonderful country. And then I went there and I saw the apartheid. I saw what was happening.

I went back two years later and drove all over the West Bank with UNRWA and a woman from UNRWA called Allegra Pacchio. I'll never forget—we were driving north towards Jenin one day, and I said, "Well, at least they have nice roads. It's a nice two-lane blacktop." Allegra looked at me like I was daft and said, "Yeah, if you're Jewish." I said, "What are you talking about?" She said, "You're not allowed to drive on this road unless you're Jewish." I thought she was joking. I said, "Don't be silly. Can you imagine if you wanted to drive to Pennsylvania, to Philadelphia, and you go to get on the I-95 and they say, 'You're a Christian, aren't you? Because if you're not, you can't go on the road'? Don't be daft." Well, that's it. It's a completely apartheid society. If you're an Arab, you're not allowed on the road. I didn't believe it at first, but I did after a bit, and I saw it. It was just hell on earth. They've created hell on earth.

In those visits, I decided that I would be vocal and do anything I could to help my Palestinian brothers and sisters achieve equal human rights with their Jewish brothers and sisters between the Jordan River and the sea. I'm not asking anyone to kill anyone, right. But you have to have equal rights. You can't have apartheid. You cannot allow apartheid societies to spring up in the world. That is not a way to encourage one another to be kind. In my view, when you see this, when you're stunned by it, moved by it, outraged by it, you immediately decide to talk about it. That's what I did. Immediately.

Response from the Israel Lobby

And what was the response you got? Well, the Israeli lobby in America, particularly, were not best pleased. And they have ever since done everything they can to destroy my career. They have failed. I fight back.

One thing they did—and it's almost the most criminal thing, in my view—was this: I used to work for an organization called Stand Up for Heroes, which helps wounded American servicemen who've lost limbs and suffered various injuries. Someone asked me to participate. Bob Woodruff is the name of the person who runs the Woodruff Foundation. He called me up one day, and I said, "Who's this? Bob Woodruff? I've never heard of you." He said there's this thing called Stand Up for Heroes where comics perform, Springsteen comes and sings a song and auctions a guitar, and they raise money for these wounded men. Would I come and sing a song?

I thought about it, and he said, "We're doing a thing at the National History Museum in a week's time. Would you come? It's just a glass of champagne and meet some of the men and see what you think." So I went. I was wandering around with my glass of champagne, and there were a number of men in uniform around. One was in a wheelchair—he had no legs and only one arm, and he was in his dress blues with all the kit on, sitting on his own. So I thought, well, in for a penny, and I went over and started talking to him. I'm smiling now because he's a friend of mine now. This was in 2013, so that's thirteen years ago.

He looked up at me to be polite, and then his eyes opened wide. I realized he recognized me. He made a gesture, and then he said, "I play the guitar too." He was a Latino guy. I looked at him—no legs, only one arm—and I was thinking that's a bit of a stretch to play the guitar. He could see the look in my eye, and bless him, his name's Dom. He looked at me and said, "Ah, yeah, well, I don't play the guitar anymore. Now I play the drums." And he does. He's a bloody good drummer as well. But that's how it started.

The Walter Reed Benefit and the Israeli Lobby's Intervention

Waters initially approached Bob and Lee Woodruff with concerns about performing at a benefit concert. He felt uncomfortable getting up on stage with all his arms and legs while singing, however worthy the cause. Instead, he went down to Walter Reed—or Bethesda Naval Hospital as it was called then—where he found Arthur Bloom running a therapeutic rehabilitation music program. Waters proposed starting a band to perform for the veterans there, and despite initial skepticism, the project moved forward. They performed in 2013 at the Beacon Theatre, in 2014 at Madison Square Garden, and continued for several years.

In 2015, while in the Hamptons in the summer, Waters realized he hadn't received the usual phone call about the annual benefit show that would have taken place in

November. He called the producer, Andrew Fox, and asked directly what was happening. After some hesitation, Fox revealed that the Israeli lobby had decided Waters could no longer participate in the benefit. When Waters protested, saying the veterans needed help, Fox explained that the men couldn't perform either—because if they did without Waters present, people would ask questions. The message was clear: Waters was not allowed to help veterans if he criticized Israel.

Expanding Blacklist and Pressure on Charities

Waters was also involved with City Harvest, a charity distributing food from upscale restaurants in New York. The organization received the same directive: they could not accept help from Roger Waters or anyone associated with him. Not a single cent from any of his supporters could be used. The pressure was unrelenting and, as Waters describes it, disgusting beyond imagination.

Waters emphasizes that his criticism has been directed at the state of Israel as an apartheid state, not at Jewish people. He has nothing against Jewish people and does not care what religion anybody practices. His criticism is purely political, aimed at the state's actions and policies.

Hotel Bans and Venue Cancellations Across the Globe

The blacklist intensified during Waters' 2023 tour. In South America and Europe, he found it nearly impossible to find hotels willing to house him. In Buenos Aires, Colombia, and Ecuador, hotel after hotel refused him. In Ecuador, where the government had just come under the control of Noboa—described as a gangster from Miami—the restrictions were particularly severe. Waters couldn't stay in hotels in Ecuador, Colombia, or Argentina simply because he criticized Israel. The same applied to Montevideo, Uruguay. In Quito, Ecuador, one hotel did allow him to stay, but they had to pretend he wasn't there.

Waters notes the absurdity: what do Quito, Montevideo, or Buenos Aires have to do with Israel? Yet there is an organized Israeli lobby operating in all those places and potentially many others around the world. In Europe, venue cancellations followed the same pattern. His concert in Frankfurt was targeted for cancellation. In Krakow, Poland, his 2023 show was cancelled outright on the grounds that his criticism of genocide made him undesirable. Waters observes that the silence from others in the industry is deafening—they fear the same treatment he receives if they speak out.

The Broader Geopolitical Strategy

Waters argues that there is a very powerful lobby working to ensure Israel continues as a genocidal apartheid state and expands to take over Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and beyond in pursuit of a "greater Israel." This is not a secret, he insists. Netanyahu, Ben-Gvir, and U.S. Ambassador Mike Huckabee are all part of this framework. Huckabee, a

self-described Christian Zionist, represents a strand of American policy rooted in apocalyptic Christian theology—waiting for the coming of the Messiah and the end times. The irony, Waters notes, is that someone like Mike Huckabee hopes it will be Jesus, so he can go to heaven with Mike Pence and other Christian Zionists.

Waters contrasts this with genuine Christianity, pointing out that Jesus threw the moneylenders out of the temple—an act that perhaps contributed to his crucifixion. He expresses admiration for this act of defiance against usury and financial exploitation.

Iran, Usury, and the Architecture of Financial Control

Waters brings up Iran's legal prohibition on usury—lending money for profit is illegal under Islamic law in the Islamic Republic. He speculates that this is a core reason why the U.S. and Israeli governments are hostile toward Iran. The entire architecture of Western financial control depends on lending money at interest and using debt as a mechanism of political control. Once a government has been lent money, it becomes beholden to its creditors. Waters points to Congress and the cash flowing through it as an obvious example of how this system works in America.

The U.S. attack on Iran—described as despicable—has no legitimate justification. Iran poses no threat to the United States or Israel. They simply have a different system, one that prohibits usury whether based on Islamic principles or socialist economics. This goes against the grain of Western financial interests.

The Neoconservative Plan and American Foreign Policy

Waters references General Wesley Clark's famous prediction about the neoconservative plan for the Middle East—a list of countries to be destroyed that included Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Somalia, Sudan, and others. Iran and Lebanon remain on that list because they have not yet been completely overthrown. This plan, formulated by the architects of the Project for a New American Century, has driven decades of American military intervention.

Waters recalls his mother's observations when she came to America before the war. She found American people to be very nice, kind, and hospitable, but she would lower her voice and say they were very naive. The United States has been suckered into a state of perpetual warfare, waging war ferociously to line its own pockets in ways the rest of the world finds despicable. Venezuela is cited as a current example, where there is no pretense made about American intentions to simply steal the oil and anything else of value. This has become the model.

The same logic could apply to war with Russia—to steal whatever is under the ground that the U.S. lacks. China poses an even greater target, with rare minerals needed for computer manufacturing and other technologies. Waters acknowledges drifting from the original subject but finds the conversation too important to abandon.

Media Portrayal versus Reality

Waters notes that he is described in the media as a hater and a dangerous man. Yet, over the course of his interview, he has argued against war and in favor of kindness, stated that he does not recognize ethnic or religious distinctions and simply loves people. These are not words of hate but their opposite.

The media's characterization is fundamentally dishonest. In England over the past year, pro-Palestinian marches—which are demonstrations against genocide—have been labeled hate marches by the British media. Yet there is no hatred in those marches; they are expressions of pure love and compassion, exactly what Waters has advocated for throughout his life.

The Core of Waters' Message

Every word Waters has written in his rock and roll career has been about encouraging empathy for others. This is what he cares about—it is what his parents instilled in him. His father was killed by the Nazis; his mother believed with every bone in her body in the inherent goodness of the human race and the possibility of a brave new world where people love and help one another.

Waters recalls a poem he wrote years ago about neighbors helping to rebuild a barn. Driving through the countryside and seeing houses dotted across Maine, he imagined people living in them and imagined neighbors coming together to help each other rebuild what had fallen. That is what society needs—not war, which is the absolute worst possible thing. Yet war has become one of the biggest industries in developed Western countries and is the most zealously defended.

The Media's Role in War

Over fifty years of doing media interviews, Waters has observed that the Western media is now essentially saying "more war." The media is not calling for people to stand outside Raytheon and stop weapons manufacturing, nor calling for demonstrations in Washington, D.C. against bombing campaigns in Iran or Latin America. Instead, there is silence or active cheerleading for military action.

Waters describes recent American military interventions as despicable—from attempts to kidnap Nicolas Maduro and Cilia Flores from Caracas using helicopters and armed personnel, to broader policies that have become progressively worse. The current trajectory is more destructive than the Biden, Bush, or previous administrations. The Iran situation in particular feels self-destructive and deeply harmful to both America and the world.

Exclusion from Mainstream Media

When asked how the media responds to him, Waters explains that the mainstream media does not speak to him at all. He is persona non grata in mainstream media land. The closest he comes to mainstream coverage is Piers Morgan, who shouts at him for half an hour, and independent interviewers like the one conducting this conversation—who, Waters notes with appreciation, were nice enough to even offer him a sandwich.

Waters does not appear on morning shows or network television because no one asks him. He has sent numerous articles to major newspapers around the world, but nothing gets printed. Not a single word. He is verboten—a forbidden voice—and he says he is proud of it, because what he is preaching is kindness.

Waters concludes by referencing Charlie Mackesy's book The Boy, the Mole, the Fox and the Horse, which asks: "What do you want to be when you grow up?" The answer, simply, is "Kind."

The Urgency of Global Conflict

We stand on the precipice of a deepening Iran war and a total explosion in Russia. When asked whether there is any hope that these two conflicts can be resolved peacefully, the response points to the concept of collective human action as the only viable path forward.

Sumud: The Meaning of Steadfast Perseverance

Sumud is an Arabic word that means perseverance—steadfast perseverance in resistance, particularly to the occupation of one's homeland. It is a well-worn and deeply meaningful Arabic word. This concept moved the speaker profoundly upon first hearing it, and inspired him to write a song called Sumud. While he cannot recall all the lyrics precisely, he knows how the song finishes. It ends with him talking about all the ordinary people all over the world, standing shoulder to shoulder from the river to the sea, from every river to every sea, everywhere. They raise their voices together as one, and through Sumud—through steadfast perseverance—together they can turn this ship around. But it will take them to do it. The people standing shoulder to shoulder, arm in arm, must provide the kind of force necessary to turn this ship around from its path toward the ultimate and imminent destruction of the human race. This could end in a nuclear conflagration at any moment, very easily.

The Power of Ordinary People

The speaker finds encouragement in knowing that ordinary people hear his voice and connect with his message. Organizations like USB, the dockworkers' union in Italy, revere him and make him a hero in their eyes. This brings him tremendous joy—the

thought that ordinary people might listen and think, "You know what? He makes a lot of sense. That's how I feel, too." His message to all is simple: you must come together and raise your voices whenever you get the chance. We are many and they are few.

The True Nature of Opposition

The enemy is a very small group—probably only 1,000 or 2,000 very rich oligarchs in the whole world. They run everything and keep wars going because they are greedy. Examples of this right-wing political shift can be seen across South America: Noboa in Ecuador, the new woman who has stolen the election in Peru, and someone new who has just come to power in Chile. There is unfortunately a big move to the right politically in South America, which the speaker follows closely. People must stand up and organize. As Malcolm X said back in the 1960s, we have to organize. We have been outorganized—not outnumbered, not outthought, not out-felt—but we have been out-organized.

Hope Through History and Human Connection

When asked directly if there is any hope, the answer is yes. The speaker wrote an opera about the French Revolution called Sara, which is the future tense of Sava. Sava means "that's it," while Sara means "that will be." The libretto was written mainly by a Frenchman named Etienne Roda-gil. One early morning, while walking down 54th Street, the speaker asked Roda-gil what gives him hope. Roda-gil, who was an alcoholic and had stopped for a couple of large scotches while the speaker had an espresso, thought for a moment, lit another Benson and Hedges cigarette, had another whiskey, and then began to speak. What he said was simple but profound: "I was here. I felt something. And perhaps I was not alone." The speaker wrote those words on a piece of paper and has kept them in his back pocket ever since.

Those words give him hope too. They can be used to describe any meaningful conversation or moment of human connection: "I was here. I felt something, and perhaps I was not alone." The speaker does not think we are alone in this struggle.

#9/11 conspiracy theories and judicial inquiry #Building Seven controlled demolition claims #Israeli-Palestinian conflict and apartheid allegations #Media blacklisting and censorship #Anti-war activism and geopolitical strategy #Financial systems and usury #Oligarchy and corporate control

Generated by MinbarLive — Knowledge Library · https://minbarlive.com/videos/pink-floyd-s-roger-waters-on-9-11-jfk-gaza-and-why-the-israel-lobby-is-trying-to