

Catherine Herridge Reports from Langley



by Miles Mathis

August 26, 2026

[So Jon Bowne and Alex Jones](#) are still selling the old idea the Saudis were behind 911, now by revealing “newly released documents” allegedly showing Operation Encore led by two Saudis was an “advance team” prepping the hijackers back to 1999. But these FBI documents are dated 2010, so why would it take nine years to write these documents and another 16 years to finally see them? We are told it is because the government was hiding them from 911 parents ([like our old friend Bob McIlvaine](#)), but if they could hide them for 25 years they could hide them forever. So why now?

I suggest it is to answer me, as usual. After publishing an [overview of 911](#) in March of 2024, last October I blew up [Tucker Carlson's misdirection](#) on 911, and this July I toplisted my old [911 Passengers paper](#) from 2020, proving there were no passengers, and therefore no planes and no hijackers. The whole thing was a big cover story for illegal building demolition. So my guess is word came down from the top ordering more cover. Which is why we see these CIA bozos at Catherine Herridge telling these new lies.

To remind you, Herridge is an old dog from Fox and CBS, and she has been selling this fake Al Qaeda garbage for 25 years. So why would Infowars be promoting her now? Is Jones in an infowar with the mainstream story or not? Also interesting is that her full name as given at Wikipedia is Catherine Victoria Herridge V. Does that mean the fifth? As if she is some kind of queen. They admit she is from a military family from Toronto, but don't tell us any more than that. We find off-site that her husband John [Hayes](#) (Presidential name alert) is also military. But she may come from the Herridges that ran the Iraq Petroleum Company. See Sir Geoffrey Herridge, who was also head of the Ottoman Bank. Finally [I found her mother at Findagrave](#). Ruth [McKinley](#) Herridge. Catherine is listed as a daughter in her obituary. Note that McKinley is a second Presidential name. Turns out Catherine's sister Margaret married Robert [Stewart](#), so we have that as well. We also link to a [Phillips](#) in that obit.

Catherine's father is given as Bill Herridge. He is not listed in Ruth's Findagrave, but he is listed separately, as William **Bennett** Herridge, d. 2024. Ruth McKinley was from Maine, not Canada. She was an editor at Thomas Nelson and also Ryerson Press, both book publishers. [Further easy research](#) (NYT marriage announcement, 1956) finds Bill Herridge was the son of William Duncan Herridge, Canadian Minister to Washington, and nephew of the Viscount Richard Bedford Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada. In another place we find the Viscount was a "great friend" of Lord Beaverbrook. I remind you he was [William Maxwell Aitken](#), the Baron Beaverbrook, mother a Noble, owner of the largest newspaper in the world at that time, the *Daily Express* out of London. You may remember that among many other putrid things, Beaverbrook was the first Minister of Information in the UK in 1918. That was the Ministry of Propaganda, so yes, it was a very Orwellian appointment. His son-in-law was a Campbell, 11th Duke of Argyll, linking us tightly to Queen Victoria. Her daughter Louise married his great-uncle, the 9th Duke.

Bill Herridge went to Harvard and was Harvard Club, and since we are told Catherine came from a military family, he must also be military, though I couldn't pin that down. Since Catherine Herridge's mother is not also named Catherine, the "V" cannot mean "fifth", so maybe it means Viscount? Did Catherine inherit this title from her great-uncle somehow? Hopefully someone can explain this mystery to me.

But back to the matter at hand. What is this "new evidence" regarding 911? It is 1999 film of two Saudis in the US, of which Bowne shows a couple of stills. Wow, a smoking gun, right? Well, no. To start with, the guy being interviewed by Herridge telling us all this isn't even identified. But the central problem is that *even if* the two Saudis were handling a couple of the hijackers, that proves nothing. Why? Because I could argue they were just prepping a couple actors, Saudi agents tapped to play this part. Assuming this isn't just a story on paper and that they actually hired some Arab midgets to play these parts, that doesn't put them on the planes or at the Trade Center demolition. All it does it put them in the US, moving around and acting suspicious on purpose to fit the script.

Plus, FBI and CIA can fake documents after the fact in their sleep. We have caught them at it many times and sometimes they have even admitted it, or been caught by courts or Congress. This is what they do, among other things. Just because a document is dated 2010 doesn't mean it is from 2010. Just because a film is dated 1999 doesn't mean it is from 1999. You are far too trusting and gullible. Do you think CIA or FBI wouldn't lie to you? Do you think that guy being interviewed by Herridge wouldn't lie to you? He would and he is. I can tell just by looking at him.

Strangely, halfway through this Bowne video, he cuts to a short segment admitting the towers didn't fall, they were demolished in a controlled demolition that didn't require planes and couldn't have been caused by planes. Undercutting all the rest of his argument. If it was a demolition, there was no need for planes or hijackers. And yet we cut right back to Osama bin Laden, and Bowne continues to sell the Saudi connection.

Very weird. So are Bowne and Jones purposely undercutting Herridge and this new release, or accidentally undercutting her? Come to your own conclusions. For myself, I am not impressed either way. You don't counter propaganda by secretly undercutting it. That isn't much of an infowar. You counter it by doing so directly, as I do.