

Bio Terror Bible

EXPOSING THE COMING BIO-TERROR PANDEMIC

BIO TERROR BIBLE.COM: The 9/11 Anthrax attacks were allegedly committed by Army scientist Bruce Ivins shortly after 9/11. Although it is not yet clear if Ivins was truly responsible or just an unfortunate scapegoat, the strain of Anthrax was confirmed to be from the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Disease (USAMRIID) in Fort Detrick, Maryland. Speculation currently exists that Army [biological weapons researcher Steven J. Hatfill was the rouge Anthrax scientist](#) who coincidentally and suspiciously had authored a book (unfinished and unpublished) in 1998 which describes a paralyzing bio-terror attack against the White House and Congress in which dozens of people sicken or die. It is quite possible that [Hatfill's book "Emergence"](#) was a clever alibi which provided future political cover in the aftermath of the attacks.

The [9/11 Anthrax attacks](#) are a great case study of why the government and its minions should always be the first suspect in any terror case, especially one involving bio-terrorism. Aside from having the means, the motive and the opportunity to conduct a major bio-terror attack, they have an unlimited supply of willing, able and blackmailable rouge scientists to choose from. In order to organize, plan, drill and execute a major bio-terror false-flag operation, millions if not hundreds of millions of dollars are needed to blackmail scientists, steal or develop the virus or agent, weaponize it, deliver it, and execute the operation without getting arrested or properly investigated. The sheer logistics, security, communication and cover-up needed before and after the bio-terror attack is so daunting, there is only one suspect (government) even capable of carrying it out.

Title: [Hatfill Novel Depicts Terror Attack](#)

Date: 2012

Source: [Wikipedia](#)

Abstract: Steven Jay Hatfill (born October 24, 1953) is an American [physician](#), [virologist](#) and [bio-weapons](#) expert who underwent what was considered by many to be a [trial by media](#) with great toll on his personal and professional life. After eight months of pressure from the media and amateur detectives, the [US Department of Justice](#) identified the former government scientist as a "[person of interest](#)" in its investigation of the [2001 anthrax attacks](#). [FBI](#) searches of his apartment in July and August 2002 were well-attended by [journalists](#), many of whom had been pointing at Dr. Hatfill for months. Dr. Hatfill later sued the government for ruining his reputation, a case which the government settled for. He also filed lawsuits against several periodicals that had pointed to him as a figure warranting further investigation. Dr. Hatfill's lawsuit against [The New York Times](#) was dismissed on the grounds that he was a "public figure" and malice had not been proven. Dr. Hatfill's lawsuit against [Vanity Fair](#) and [Readers' Digest](#) was settled out of court, and the details were not disclosed. [FBI](#) and [DOJ](#) officials later blamed another government scientist, [Bruce Edwards Ivins](#), whom they concluded had acted alone.

Biography

Youth and Education

Hatfill was born in [Saint Louis, Missouri](#), and graduated from Mattoon Senior High School, [Mattoon, Illinois](#) (1971), and [Southwestern College](#) in [Winfield, Kansas](#) (1975), where he studied [biology](#).

Hatfill was enlisted as a [private](#) in the [U.S. Army](#) from 1975 to 1977. (In 1999, he would tell a journalist during an interview that he had been a "captain in the [U.S. Special Forces](#)", but in a subsequent investigation the Army stated that he had never served with the Special Forces.^[3]) Following his Army discharge, Hatfill qualified and worked as a [medical laboratory technician](#), but soon resolved to become a doctor.

Hatfill then settled in [Rhodesia](#) (now [Zimbabwe](#)) entering the [Godfrey Huggins Medical School \[4\]](#) in Salisbury (now [Harare](#)) in 1978. (His claimed military associations during this period included assistance as a medic with the [Selous Scouts](#) and membership in the [Rhodesian SAS](#), but according to one journalist the regimental association of the latter is "adamant Hatfill never belonged to the unit".) He graduated (after failing in 1983) with a [M ChB](#) degree in 1984 and then completed a one year [internship](#) (1984–85) at a small rural hospital in [South Africa's North West Province](#). The South African government recruited him to be medical officer on a 14 month (1986–88) tour of duty in Antarctica with the [South African National Antarctic Expedition](#) (SANAE). He then completed (1988) a [master's degree](#) in [microbiology](#) at the [University of Cape Town](#). He worked toward a second master's (1990; medical biochemistry and radiation biology) at the [University of Stellenbosch](#), while working again as a paid med tech in the University's clinical hematology lab. A 3-year [hematological pathology](#) residency (1991–93) at Stellenbosch followed, during which time Hatfill conducted research on the treatment of [leukemia](#) with [thalidomide](#). This research, toward an anticipated PhD degree, was conducted (1992–95) under the supervision of Professor Ralph Kirby at [Rhodes University](#).

Hatfill submitted his PhD thesis for examination to Rhodes in January 1995, but it was failed in November and no degree was ever granted. Hatfill later claimed a Ph.D. degree in "[molecular cell biology](#)" from Rhodes, as well as completion of a post-doctoral fellowship (1994–95) at the [University of Oxford](#) in [England](#) and three [master's degrees](#) (in [microbial genetics](#), [medical biochemistry](#), and [experimental pathology](#)). Some of these credentials have been questioned. During a later investigation, officials at Rhodes insisted that he had never been awarded a Ph.D. from their institution. (In 2007, Hatfill's lawyer Tom Connolly — in his lawsuit against former [U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft](#) and the [FBI](#) — admitted that his client had "Puffed on his resume. Absolutely. Forged a diploma. Yes, that's true.")

Back in the U.S., another of Hatfill's post-doctoral appointments commenced at the [National Institute of Child Health and Human Development](#) (NICHD), one of the [National Institutes of Health](#) (NIH) in [Bethesda, Maryland](#), in 1995. He subsequently worked (1997–99) as a civilian researcher at the [United States Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases](#) (USAMRIID), the [U.S. Department of Defense's](#) medical research institute for [biological warfare](#) (BW) defense at [Fort Detrick](#), Frederick, [MD](#). There he studied, under a [National Research Council](#) fellowship, new drug treatments for the [Ebola virus](#) and became a specialist in [virology](#) and BW defense.

The Anthrax Attacks

In January 1999 Hatfill transferred to a "consulting job" at [Science Applications International Corporation](#) (SAIC), which has a "sprawling campus" in nearby [McLean, Virginia](#). The corporation did work for a multitude of federal agencies. Many projects were classified.

By this time there had been a number of [hoax anthrax mailings](#) in the United States. Hatfill and his collaborator, SAIC vice president Joseph Soukup, now commissioned [William C. Patrick](#), retired head of the old US bioweapons program (who had also been a mentor of Hatfill) to write a report on the possibilities of terrorist anthrax mailing attacks. Barbara Hatch Rosenberg (director of the [Federation of American Scientists'](#) biochem weapons working group in 2002) said that the report was commissioned "under a [CIA](#) contract to SAIC". However, SAIC said Hatfill and Soukup commissioned it internally — there was no outside client.

The resulting report, dated February 1999, was subsequently seen by some as a "blueprint" for the [2001 anthrax attacks](#). Amongst other things, it suggested the maximum amount of anthrax powder - 2.5 grams - that could be put in an envelope without making a suspicious bulge. The quantity in the envelope sent to Senator Patrick Leahy in October 2001 was .871 grams. After the attacks, the report drew the attention of the media and others, and led to their investigation of Patrick and Hatfill.

Rosenberg Theory

In October 2001, as soon as it became known that the [Ames strain](#) of anthrax had been used in the attacks, Dr. Barbara Hatch Rosenberg and others began suggesting that the attack might be the work of a "rogue CIA agent," and they provided the name of the "most likely" person to the FBI. On November 21, 2001, Dr. Rosenberg made similar statements to the Biological and Toxic Weapons convention in Geneva. In December 2001, she published "A Compilation of Evidence and Comments on the Source of the Mailed Anthrax" via the web site of The Federation of American Scientists (FAS) suggesting the attacks were "perpetrated with the unwitting assistance of a sophisticated government

program."

Rosenberg discussed the case with reporters from the New York Times. On January 4, 2002, Nicholas Kristof of the New York Times published a column titled "Profile of a Killer" stating "I think I know who sent out the anthrax last fall." For months, Dr. Rosenberg gave speeches and stated her beliefs to many reporters from around the world. She posted "Analysis of the Anthrax Attacks" to the FAS web site on January 17, 2002. On February 5, 2002 she published "Is the FBI Dragging Its Feet?" In response, the FBI stated, "There is no prime suspect in this case at this time." The Washington Post reported, "FBI officials over the last week have flatly discounted Dr. Rosenberg's claims."

On June 13, 2002, Dr. Rosenberg posted "The Anthrax Case: What the FBI Knows" to the FAS site. On June 18, 2002, Dr. Rosenberg presented her theories to senate staffers working for Senators Daschle and Leahy. One week later, on June 25, the FBI publicly searched Dr. Hatfill's apartment, turning him into a household name. "The FBI also pointed out that Hatfill had agreed to the search and is not considered a suspect." Both [The American Prospect](#) and [Salon.com](#) report that "Hatfill is not a suspect in the anthrax case, the FBI says." On August 3, 2002, Dr. Rosenberg told the media that the FBI asked her if "a team of government scientists could be trying to frame Steven J. Hatfill."

Person of Interest

In August 2002, [Attorney General John Ashcroft](#) labeled Dr. Steven Hatfill a "[person of interest](#)" in a press conference, no charges were brought against him. Hatfill, a [virologist](#), vehemently denied he had anything to do with the anthrax (bacteria) mailings and sued the FBI, the Justice Department, John Ashcroft, [Alberto Gonzales](#), and others for violating his [constitutional](#) rights and for violating the [Privacy Act](#). On June 27, 2008, the Department of Justice announced it would settle Hatfill's case for \$5.8 million.

Hatfill later went to work at [Pennington Biomedical Research Center](#) in [Baton Rouge, LA](#). In September 2001 SAIC was commissioned by the Pentagon to create a replica of a mobile WMD "laboratory", alleged to have been used by Saddam. The Pentagon claimed the trailer was to be used as a training aide for teams seeking weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

His lawyer, Victor M. Glasberg, stated: "Steve's life has been devastated by a drumbeat of innuendo, implication and speculation. We have a frightening public attack on an individual who, guilty or not, should not be exposed to this type of public opprobrium based on speculation."

In an embarrassing incident, FBI agents trailing Hatfill in a motor vehicle ran over his foot when he attempted to approach them in May 2003. Police responding to the incident did not cite the driver, but issued Hatfill a citation for "walking to create a hazard." He and his attorneys fought the ticket, but a hearing officer upheld the ticket and ordered Hatfill to pay the requisite \$5 fine.

While the media and others focused on Dr. Hatfill, the FBI had focused their attention on another suspect—[USAMRIID bacteriologist Bruce Ivins](#). Considerable questions have been raised, however, about the credibility of the case against Bruce Ivins as well.

60 Minutes Interview

Hatfill's lawyer, Tom Connolly, was featured in a [CBS News 60 Minutes](#) interview about the anthrax incidents on March 11, 2007. In the interview it was revealed that Hatfill forged a Ph.D. degree certificate. "It is true. It is true that he has puffed on his resume. Absolutely," Connolly acknowledged. "Forged a diploma. Yes, that's true." He went on to state, "Listen, if puffing on your resume made you the anthrax killer, then half this town should be suspect."

[The New York Times](#) stated in their paper that Hatfill had obtained an anti-anthrax medicine ([ciprofloxacin](#)) immediately prior to the anthrax mailings. Connolly explained, "Before the attacks he had surgery. So yes, he's on [Cipro](#). But the fuller truth is in fact he was on Cipro because a doctor gave it to him after sinus surgery". Hatfill had previously said the antibiotic was for a lingering sinus infection. The omission in the Times' article, of the reason why he had been taking Cipro, is one reason Hatfill sued the newspaper. The newspaper won a summary judgment ruling, in early 2007, squelching the libel suit that had been filed by Steven Hatfill against it and columnist Nicholas Kristof.

Hatfill's Plans for the Future

Using money collected from the lawsuits against the government and against Vanity Fair and Readers' Digest, Hatfill has committed \$1.5 million to building a floating genetic laboratory, a futuristic-looking vessel replete with a helicopter, an operating room to treat rural indigenous peoples, and a Cordon Bleu-trained chef. Hatfill intends to assemble a scientific team and cruise the Amazon for undiscovered or little-known plants and animals. From these organisms, he hopes to develop new medications for leukemia, and for tuberculosis and other diseases that have been growing increasingly resistant to existing antibiotics. Any useful treatments, he says, will be licensed to pharmaceutical companies on the condition that developing nations receive them at cost.

Lawsuits

Hatfill v. John Ashcroft, Et Al.

On the 26th of August 2003, Hatfill filed a [lawsuit](#) against the [Attorney General of the United States John Ashcroft](#), the [United States Department of Justice](#), DOJ employees Timothy Beres and Daryl Darnell, the [Federal Bureau of Investigation](#), FBI Supervisory Special Agent Van Harp and an unknown number of FBI agents.

On March 30, 2007, US District Judge [Reggie Walton](#) issued an order warning Hatfill that he could lose his civil lawsuit over the leaks if he did not compel journalists to name their sources. He gave Hatfill until April 16 to decide whether to press the journalists to give up their sources.

On April 16, Hatfill gave notice that he would "proceed with discovery to attempt to obtain the identity of the alleged source or sources at the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation who allegedly provided information to news reporters concerning the criminal investigation of Dr. Hatfill."

On April 27, 2007, in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, federal prosecutors [[clarification needed](#)] wrote that Steven Hatfill had overstepped court orders allowing him to compel testimony from reporters whom he had already questioned and had instead "served a new round of subpoenas" on organizations "that he failed to question during the discovery period."

During the first round of depositions, Hatfill subpoenaed six reporters: [Michael Isikoff](#) and Daniel Klaidman of [Newsweek](#), [Brian Ross](#) of [ABC](#), Allan Lengel of [The Washington Post](#), Jim Stewart of [CBS](#), and Toni Locy of [USA Today](#).

Hatfill now has subpoenaed eight news organizations, including three that he didn't name before: The [New York Times](#) ([Nicolas Kristof](#), David Johnson, [William Broad](#), Kate Zernike, [Judith Miller](#), Scott Shane, and Frank D. Roylance), [The Baltimore Sun](#) (Gretchen Parker and Curt Anderson), and the [Associated Press](#). Subpoenas for [Washington Post](#) writers Marilyn W. Thompson, David Snyder, Guy Gugliotta, Tom Jackman, Dan Eggen and Carol D. Loenning, and for Mark Miller of [Newsweek](#), are now included.

The Justice Department responded to Hatfill's subpoenas, saying that they went too far. "The court should reject this attempt to expand discovery," prosecutors wrote. In a status conference on Friday 11 January 2008, U.S. District Judge Reggie B. Walton ordered the attorneys for the government and for Hatfill to seek mediation over the next two months. According to the Scheduling Order, the parties will be in mediation from January 14 until May 14, 2008. The prospects of a mediated settlement notwithstanding, Walton said he expected that a trial on the lawsuit could begin in December. Afterward, Hatfill's attorney Mark A. Grannis said: "The court has set a schedule for bringing this case to trial this year, and we're very pleased at the prospect that Dr. Hatfill will finally have his day in court."

On March 7, 2008, Toni Locy of USA Today was ordered to personally pay contempt of court fines of up to \$5,000 a day which begin the following Tuesday, until she identifies her sources.

On June 27, 2008 Hatfill was exonerated by the government and a settlement was announced in which the Justice Department has agreed to pay \$4.6 million (consisting of \$2.825 million in cash and an annuity paying \$150,000 a year for 20 years) to settle the lawsuit in which Hatfill claimed the Justice Department violated his privacy rights by speaking with reporters about the case.

Hatfill v. The New York Times

In July 2004, Hatfill filed a [lawsuit](#) against [The New York Times Company](#) and [Nicholas D. Kristof](#).

In a sealed motion on December 29, 2006, The New York Times argued that the classification restrictions imposed on the case were tantamount to an assertion of the [state secrets privilege](#). Times attorneys cited the case law on state secrets to support their argument that the case should be dismissed. The "state secrets" doctrine, they said, "precludes a case from proceeding to trial when national security precludes a party from obtaining evidence that is... necessary to support a valid defense. Dismissal is warranted in this case because the Times has been denied access to such evidence, specifically documents and testimony concerning the work done by plaintiff [Hatfill] on classified government projects relating to bioweapons, including anthrax."[\[citation needed\]](#)

A redacted copy of the December 29, 2006 New York Times Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant's Motion for an Order Dismissing the Complaint Under the "State Secrets" Doctrine was obtained by Secrecy News.

Attorneys for Hatfill filed a sealed response on January 12, 2007 in opposition to the motion for dismissal on state secrets grounds. A redacted copy of their opposition has been made available by Secrecy News.

On January 12, 2007, a judge dismissed a [lawsuit](#) filed by Hatfill against The New York Times.

On January 30, 2007, Judge Hilton's order dismissing the Hatfill v. The New York Times was made public, along with a Memorandum Opinion explaining his ruling.

Kenneth A. Richieri, Vice President and General Counsel of The New York Times scored what he called a "very satisfying win" at the beginning of 2007 in the Eastern District of Virginia. The newspaper won a summary judgment ruling squelching a libel suit that had been filed by anthrax poisoning "person of interest" Steven Hatfill against it and columnist Nicholas Kristof.

The US Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit reversed the trial court, ruling that a jury should decide that issue. In March 2008, the Supreme Court refused to grant certiorari in the case, effectively leaving the appeals court decision in place.

The case was dismissed in a Summary Judgment on January 12, 2007. The appeals were heard on March 21, 2008, and the dismissal was upheld by the appeals court on July 14, 2008. The case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court and was rejected by the Supreme Court on Dec. 15, 2008. The basis for the dismissal was that Dr. Hatfill was a "public figure," and he had not proved malice on the part of The New York Times.

Hatfill v. Foster

[Donald Foster](#), an expert in [forensic linguistics](#), advised the FBI during the investigation of the anthrax attacks. He later wrote an article for [Vanity Fair](#) about his investigation of Hatfill. In the October 2003 article Foster described how he had tried to match up Hatfill's travels with the postmarks on the anthrax letters, and analyzed old interviews and an unpublished novel by Hatfill about a bioterror attack on the United States. Foster wrote that "When I lined up Hatfill's known movements with the postmark locations of reported biotreats, those hoax anthrax attacks appeared to trail him like a vapor cloud,"

Hatfill subsequently sued Donald Foster, [Condé Nast Publications](#), [Vassar College](#), and [The Reader's Digest Association](#). The suit sought \$10 million in damages, claiming [defamation](#).[\[58\]](#) The Reader's Digest published a condensed version of the article in December 2003.

The lawyers delayed bringing the Hatfill v. Foster lawsuit to court because "the parties are close to finalizing the settlement".

On February 27, 2007, The [New York Sun](#) reported that he settled without a trial ([Wikipedia, 2012](#)).

Title: Hatfill Novel Depicts Terror Attack

Date: August 14, 2002

Source: [UCLA](#)

Abstract: An unfinished novel by a scientist being scrutinized in last fall's [anthrax-by-mail attacks](#) centers on a terror scheme to spread deadly bacteria in Washington, but the story written in 1998 differs in important ways from recent real-world events.

The 198-page novel, mostly finished, describes a paralyzing attack against the White House and Congress in which dozens of people sicken or die, including the fictional president and top congressional leaders. But the unpublished book, on file at the U.S. Copyright Office, does not involve anthrax or mailings.

The co-author, former Army biological weapons researcher Steven J. Hatfill, is one of about 30 scientists who have drawn the attention of law enforcement officials investigating in the attacks, although only Hatfill's name has become public.

Hatfill, 48, has denied any role and criticized the FBI and news media for engaging in what he described as personally damaging speculation and innuendo.

Hatfill's novel, "Emergence," has raised suspicions at the FBI. A U.S. law enforcement official on Tuesday characterized the work as an "interesting coincidence at this point." The FBI found a copy of the novel on Hatfill's seized computer.

It was registered for a copyright in 1998 by Roger Akers, a friend of Hatfill's who said Tuesday that he had proofread it for Hatfill and, with his permission, copyrighted it in both their names.

Hatfill's fictional villain is a Palestinian terrorist, Ismail Abu Asifa, paid by Iraq to launch a biological attack against Washington. The novel opens in Antarctica, where 10 members of a South African research team die from a strange sickness.

"Eight years later, a similar disease sweeps with explosive effect through the members of the U.S. congressional House and Senate," Hatfill wrote in the opening synopsis. "The nation's leadership is paralyzed and panic ensues as members of the executive office begin to show symptoms."

Asifa flies from England to Washington Dulles International Airport planning "to strike terror deep into the heart of the most powerful nation on Earth."

Once in Washington, Asifa buys supplies for \$387 to grow bubonic plague bacteria -- "not a high price to strike terror in the government of a country this large." The bacteria in the attacks is yersinia, not anthrax.

Hatfill's villain infects the White House using a sprayer hidden inside a wheelchair during a public tour. The president is sickened before he departs for a trip to Moscow, and within days the illness spreads to top congressional leaders.

In his plot, the White House becomes the "House of Death."

But Asifa also accidentally infects himself and ultimately stumbles into the path of a car, dying six days later in a hospital.

"For all its wealth and power, the United States ... was actually an incredibly easy target for biological terrorism," Hatfill wrote. But Hatfill noted that U.S. experts were sufficiently well trained to detect attacks that his villain "would probably have only enough time to perform one attack and observe its early effects."

"It was unlikely with his present resources, that he would be able to kill more than a few hundred people at most," Hatfill added.

Also Tuesday, the FBI in New Jersey showed merchants near a mailbox that tested positive for anthrax exposure the photograph of a man and asked if they had seen him in the area last fall. An FBI spokesman would not identify the man in the photo, but several published reports said it was Hatfill.

The idea for the novel was hatched several years ago at a dinner party where a group of journalists and former military men got to talking about bioterrorism, said Pat Clawson, a friend of Hatfill's who was there.

"We started kicking it around, that would be a cool novel to write -- let's have a bioterrorism attack on Washington and Congress," said Clawson, who is serving as Hatfill's spokesman.

The FBI has searched Hatfill's apartment in Frederick, Md., twice, as well as his car, a storage locker in Florida and the home of his girlfriend.

Law enforcement officials have described Hatfill as a "person of interest," not a criminal suspect.

While declaring his innocence publicly this week, Hatfill emphasized that his background is in the study of viral diseases such as Ebola, not bacterial diseases such as anthrax.

Hatfill previously worked at the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute at Fort Detrick, Md., once home to the U.S. biological warfare program and repository for the Ames strain of anthrax that was used in the attacks ([UCLA, 2002](#)).