

YOUR KINDLE NOTES FOR:

America's Betrayal Confirmed: 9/11: Purpose, Cover-Up and Impunity

Elias Davidsson

Last accessed on Monday, November 18, 2024

155 Highlights | 0 Notes

Yellow highlight | Location: 330

> Robert W. Tucker, pointed out in Foreign Affairs, flagship publication of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), that to maintain the Western alliance, “a new adversary must be assumed.”{21} Paul Wolfowitz, at the time Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, warned in 1991 that slashing military expenditures would require to send home people “who had planned to make a career in the military, [thereby throwing] away that strategic asset that’s represented by the quality of our officer corps and the quality of our enlisted people.”{22}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 362

> Krauthammer’s view was endorsed by Thomas Friedman, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and former advisor to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. Friedman expressed his view in an unusually frank manner in the New York Times: For globalism to work, America cannot be afraid to act like the almighty superpower that it is… The hidden hand of the market will never work without the hidden fist - McDonald’s cannot flourish without McDonald-Douglas, the designer of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley technologies is called the United States Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps. {26} General Alfred M. Gray, who served as the 29th commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps between 1987 and 1991, offered further justifications for asserting U.S. global hegemony: The Underdeveloped World’s growing dissatisfaction over the gap between rich and poor nations will create a fertile breeding ground for insurgencies. These insurgencies have the potential to jeopardize […] our access to vital economic and military resources. This situation will become more critical as our nation and allies, as well as potential adversaries, become more and more dependent on these strategic resources. If we are to have stability in these regions, maintain access to their resources, protect our citizens abroad, defend our vital installations and deter conflict, we must maintain within our active force structure a credible military power projection capability with flexibility to respond to conflicts across the spectrum of violence throughout the globe.{27} Such views were crystallized in an official, but classified, document leaked to the New York Times, which published excerpts thereof in 1992.{28} The document was drafted by Dick Cheney, then Defense Secretary, and Paul Wolfowitz, his Under Secretary for

Policy. The policy statements in this document were developed “in conjunction with the National Security Council and in consultation with the President.” The document is known in Pentagon parlance as the “Defense Planning Guidance” and is also known as “The Wolfowitz Doctrine.” America’s first objective in the post-cold-war era, as defined by the authors of this document, was “to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival, either on the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere, that poses a threat on the order of that posed formerly by the Soviet Union.” They mentioned, however, three additional aspects to this objective: (1) Establishing and protecting a new international order; (2) Discouraging advanced industrial nations from challenging U.S. leadership; and (3) Maintaining mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from “even aspiring to a larger regional or global role.”

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 417

When President Bush Sr. highlighted the opportunities opened by the demise of the Soviet bloc, he unwittingly revealed that the purpose of America’s security strategy — the theme of his talk — was not, as one would expect, to ensure the defense of the homeland, but to “shape a new world,” by which he meant a global order run by multinational corporations and global investors. A year later, President Bush Sr. transmitted to Congress his report on the “national security strategy,” which reflected the “dramatic changes in the international environment” and observed that the United States had reached a “moment of historic opportunity.”{30} Dick Cheney acknowledged at the time the unique window of opportunity that the U.S. could seize: We

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 441

But was the U.S. really wasting opportunities? In 1990, the United States had already availed itself of its newly gained supremacy to secure the adoption by the U.N. Security Council of a series of resolutions that imposed on the Iraqi people the most draconian economic sanctions in modern history, and authorized any willing State to use “all means” to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. It was clearly understood by the U.N. membership that the innocuous expression “all means” was not a figure of speech. It was promptly translated by the United States and its allies into a devastating bombing campaign against Iraq’s civilian infrastructure that brought the country back to the pre-industrial age.{34} When the representative of Yemen announced that he would oppose the resolution, the United States immediately retaliated by withholding desperately needed financial aid to that country.{35} The United States thus was already demonstrating that it would not permit any challenge to its supremacy.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 503

Robert W. Tucker, writing already in 1990 in Foreign Affairs, pointed out that to maintain the Western alliance, “a new adversary must be assumed.”{43} Foreign policy and military experts identified in the early 90s a garden-variety of potential threats to perceived U.S. interests – so-called rogue states, the drug trade, threats to sources of raw materials, access to Mid-East oil, terrorism and more – none of which could have provided a focus for American foreign policy. The communiqué of the North Atlantic Council of 6-7 June 1991 stressed that NATO members prepare to address “other unpredictable developments that are beyond the focus of traditional Alliance concerns, but that can have direct implications on our security” and the “need to address broader issues and new global challenges.”{44} The Council did not specify any global challenges that could in the future have direct implications on NATO members’ security.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 518

Both NATO hesitations and the Defense Planning Guidance suggest a frantic search for justifications to maintain or even extend the role of the Western Alliance. Yet the threats listed in official documents appear surprisingly vague, as discussed earlier with relation to the Defense Planning

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 520

Guidance. Some even appear puzzlingly implausible.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 599

Shaheen discovered parallels between the depiction of Arabs by Hollywood and that of Jews in Nazi films: both project images of hook-nosed, scheming and lecherous persons lurking in the shadows to prey upon innocent Christians.{57} Regarding the depiction of Muslims, who are widely regarded in the West as “Arabs,” Shaheen writes: Islam, particularly, comes in for unjust treatment. Today’s imagemakers regularly link the Islamic faith with male supremacy, holy war, and acts of terror, depicting Arab Muslims as hostile alien intruders, and as lecherous, oily sheikhs intent on using nuclear weapons. When mosques are displayed onscreen, the camera inevitably cuts to Arabs praying, and then gunning down civilians. Such scenarios are common fare.{58} Shaheen discusses more than 900 feature films displaying Arab characters, the majority as villains. Western audiences, fed on Hollywood fare, have no difficulty conceiving of Arabs and Muslims as potential terrorists. No other group of people could better fulfill that role.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 622

> Some Muslim countries are regularly accused by the United States and its allies of sponsoring international terrorism.{60} Such accusations are leveled in order to justify threats, economic sanctions and military interventions. Among those accused of supporting terrorism are countries named by Wesley Clark in a speech he held in 2007 at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco. According to him the following seven countries were targeted by the U.S. government for regime change after 9/11: Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Iran.{61} For unexplained reasons Afghanistan, the first country attacked after 9/11, was not on the list.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 657

> In the three years leading to 9/11, I found Osama bin Laden mentioned in more than 600 English-language news reports every month on the average. According to one study, CBS and NBC News published significantly more stories mentioning Bin Laden in 2000 than those mentioning Britain's Prime Minister Tony Blair and Germany's Prime Minister Gerhard Schröder. Shortly after 9/11, Osama bin Laden was mentioned more often in American media than the U.S. President himself. Yet, after 9/11 the U.S. leadership lost interest in the man. At a press conference held on 19 September 2001, President George W. Bush was asked: "Do you to your mind have irrefutable evidence that links al Qaeda, and specifically Osama bin Laden to these attacks?" He answered: "When we take action, we will take action because we believe -- because we know we'll be on the right. And I want to remind people that there have been terrorist activities on America in the past, as well [...] This is a war not against a specific individual, nor will it be a war against solely one organization." In President Bush's Address to the Nation of 7 October 2001, he did not even mention Bin Laden or any nexus between Afghanistan and 9/11. In President Bush's Press Conference of 13 March 2002, a journalist asked: "Mr. President, in your speeches now you rarely talk or mention Osama bin Laden. Why is that?" The President's answer: "Deep in my heart I know the man is on the run, if he's alive at all. Who knows if he's hiding in some cave or not; we haven't heard from him in a long time [...] So I don't know where he is. You know, I just don't spend that much time on him, Kelly, to be honest with you."{62}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 688

> In the 1950s the CIA conducted psychological experiments on unsuspecting citizens designed to control their behavior through exotic drugs, electro-shock, radiation and other means.{66} Eighty institutions were involved in the program, dubbed MKUltra, including forty-four universities and twelve hospitals."{67} The effect of these experiments was to cause among the subjects a state of dis- orientation, regression and dependency upon the examiner. A general shock doctrine was later developed by

economist Milton Friedman and applied on an entire nation, Chile, in 1973. The economic shock doctrine included a drastic reduction of living standards accompanied by overt and ruthless political repression against anyone resisting this shock doctrine. The extent and brutality of this repression led to their designation as crimes against humanity. The method was later copied to other countries, including Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay and Indonesia, in order to serve corporate interests. In Indonesia the killings reached genocidal proportions.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 706

Philip D. Zelikow, who later became the Executive Director of the 9/11 Commission, and his co-authors Ash Carter and John M. Deutsch, designated catastrophic terrorism in a paper they published in 1998 as the “new danger” facing America. They also spelled out its implications and consequences, as if they already had it all planned:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 715

Not only did catastrophic terrorism occur on 11 September 2001, but it was followed by precisely those measures the above authors had described in 1998: 9/11 was immediately described by U.S. leaders as a watershed event in American history, allowed wider surveillance of citizens, the erosion of civil liberties and the use of deadly force. The event also caused the American people to rally around the flag and support war, as they did after Pearl Harbor. Did Osama bin Laden heed the desires of U.S. strategists by presenting the United States with a new Pearl Harbor on a silver platter? Or were Zelikow and his co-authors merely prescient?

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 738

Anchors and journalists of Fox News, one of the main, arch-conservative, U.S. TV networks, spawned five central memes of the official 9/11 account within minutes of a reported plane crash on the World Trade Center, i.e. before that account was imposed by the U.S. government.{71} At 08:57:34a.m. Jon Scott took over as news anchor at Fox News. At this point Scott was told that a plane had crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center in New York. What did he say? That an army bomber had smashed by accident into Empire State Building in WWII. Fifty seconds later, Scott dismisses the theory of an accident. Thirty five seconds later – at 08:58:55 – Scott launched casually two memes that would underpin the official account of 9/11 for years to come: One, that the attacks were the work of Islamic fanatics and two, that they were executed by suicide pilots. He first reminded viewers of “the bombing back in 1989 [sic] of the World Trade Center”, attributed to Islamic terrorists, then added that the current attack “may have been simply a suicidal pilot who wanted to make a point.” Was Scott merely

improvising? At that point in time, he had no apparent reason to suspect foul play. Only three minutes later, at 09:02:58a.m. Scott says with some hesitation: "We just saw another one... Another plane just flew into the second tower. This has to be deliberate, folks...Now, given what has been going on around the world, some of the key suspects come to mind, Osama bin Laden...Who knows what." Designating the suspect of a mass murder living 5000 miles away within 33 seconds of the first overt signs of an ongoing crime, must have been a world record. Scott's reaction to the horrendous sight of a plane plunging into the South Tower is remarkable. His voice does not express emotion. He reports his observations matter-of-factly. By mentioning Osama bin Laden as a suspect, Scott launched the third meme of the official account. To consolidate the above memes, Scott brought in at 09:07:39a.m. his colleague Eric Shawm whom he asked rhetorically: "Now, Eric, I am reminded again of what happened back in 1989 [sic]. The intent of those terrorists back then was to actually bring down the tower, wasn't it?" With this statement Scott launched the fourth meme, namely that of an Islamic plan to "bring down the towers." Eric Shawn confirms in turn some of these memes, saying two minutes later – at 09:09:31a.m. – "What we've long feared and many of worried about and thought could never happen would be a terrorist attack, a deliberate, terrorist attack on the World Trade Center as we are witnessing right now", adding half a minute later that this an attack "on the very soul in the very heart of our nation". Shawm thereby introduced the fifth meme, namely that of a war against the United States. He did so twenty minutes before President George W. Bush made this claim when speaking from a primary school in Florida. The focus on Osama bin Laden was soon given a sort of…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 770

Approximately 20 minutes after being informed that an aircraft had crashed into the South Tower of the WTC, President George W. Bush announced to the nation that an "apparent terrorist attack on our country" had taken place.{72} Such wording was not self-evident, for at the time neither President Bush nor his aides possessed any evidence that the country had been attacked from the outside. The TV networks did not, however, miss the cue: they and numerous print media headlined their news reports almost immediately, 'America Under Attack,' suggesting that a war had been declared against the country. This message was followed up by the adoption of numerous federal, regional and local measures that are normally only taken in times of war. Such a definitive message from the most authoritative sources repeated continuously over several days ensured that any lingering doubt about this (unsubstantiated) claim would be treated as unpatriotic or even treasonous.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 783

The official explanation for the demise of both Twin Towers of the WTC in New York was established within just four hours. When asked in a press conference on 11 September 2001 at 2:30p.m. (EST), whether the disintegration of the skyscrapers had been caused by the planes "or by something else," New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani, answered, muttering: We believe, we believe that it was caused by the after-effects of the, of the planes hitting the...buildings. We don't know, we don't know if there were additional explosions.{73} Experts invited by national television networks to comment felt surprisingly confident in explaining - within hours - why the Twin Towers disintegrated, although they had no precedent to rely upon. Jim DeStefano from the National Council of Structural Engineers, for example, explained to CNN at approximately 4:20 P.M (EST) – relying exclusively on what he saw on television - that the impact [of the aircraft] was sufficient to cause damage to the columns and the (...) systems supporting the building. That couples with the fire raging and the high temperatures softening the structural steel that precipitated a destabilization of the columns and clearly the columns buckled at the lower floors causing the building to collapse.{74}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 831

In the debate that ensued, Senator Trent Lott revealed that the Draft Resolution had already been discussed on the very day of the attack with Senator Daschle, in which “tough decisions” were made, but did not elaborate.{75} That the Congress condemned the mass murder of 9/11, expressed its sympathy to the victims and their families and commended the valiant efforts of rescue teams and first responders was normal and to be expected. Numerous governments and international bodies did so in the following days without suggesting how, by whom and why the mass murder was executed. What distinguished the congressional resolution was the specificity of the factual allegations it included, specifically the premise that the United States had been the subject of an attack from outside its borders (“attacks against the United States”, “the United States is entitled to respond under international law”, “war against international terrorism”), for which no evidence was adduced. Congressional resolutions do not emerge in a void. Each resolution has a drafting history and is adopted to serve a purpose. The drafting history of the above resolution is not known. It was only alluded to in Senator Lott's address. One must, therefore, presume that the inclusion of specific allegations in the above resolution had a purpose. The most plausible explanation for including these factual allegations is, that the U.S. government wanted to cast in stone the foundations of the 9/11 account. Securing a Congressional imprimatur to that account and linking it to the ensuing war, ensured that questioning the official account would be regarded as a betrayal of the victims and as unpatriotic. Indeed, despite ample time for debates on 12 September 2001, members of Congress displayed a surprising lack of curiosity about the actual events of the previous day: No member of Congress demanded concrete evidence in support of the factual determinations he or she was asked to vote

for. Instead, one after the other rose to pledge his or her allegiance to the flag, invoked the grace of God and expressed unreserved loyalty to the President, a scene reminiscent of a religious ritual.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 850

On 14 September 2001, the FBI released the names of 19 individuals whom it “identified” as hijackers aboard the four airliners that allegedly crashed on 11 September 2001 into the North and South Towers of the WTC, into the Pentagon, and on a field at Stony Creek Township, Pennsylvania.{76} While the 19 "hijackers" are listed there as "identified", for many of them no birth date is indicated, giving rise to the question what was meant by “identified.”

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 856

On 27 September 2001, the FBI released photographs alleged to be of the 19 individuals mentioned in the September 14 press release. These individuals were no longer designated as "identified" on the FBI website but merely as "believed to be the hijackers of the four airliners that crashed on 11 September 2001."{77}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 899

In the wake of the war of aggression against Afghanistan, Congressman Lee H. Hamilton said that fighting terrorism had become “the organizing principle for U.S. foreign policy.” Stopping short of calling 9/11 an opportunity, he added: “If we act with foresight and resolve we can transform this moment, as we transformed Pearl Harbor, from one of our greatest tragedies to one of our finest hours.”{79}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 938

The bombing campaign against Afghanistan constituted a crime of aggression under customary international law and should have triggered punitive action by the Security Council of the United Nations against the aggressors.{86} NATO members and other governments were undoubtedly aware that the U.S. had failed to prove a link between Afghanistan and 9/11 and that it was acting unlawfully, but they kept silent.{87}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 945

On 5 June 2006, Ed Haas, a U.S. journalist, contacted the FBI after having noticed that the Most Wanted poster for Osama bin Laden on the FBI website did not mention any suspected links to 9/11.{88} Haas asked for an explanation. Rex Tomb, Chief of Investigative Publicity for the FBI responded, "The reason why 9/11 is not mentioned on Osama bin Laden's Most Wanted page is because the FBI has no hard evidence connecting bin Laden to 9/11."{89} This admission by the FBI, five years after bombing Afghanistan and killing thousands of people, should have prompted worldwide coverage. Yet the mainstream media concealed this admission from the public. Conclusion

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,013

The primary source used by airlines to identify the victims of aircraft crashes is the flight manifest. A flight manifest is a legal document proving — also for insurance purposes — that particular individuals boarded an aircraft. To ensure the reliability of flight manifests airlines check the identities of passengers who board the aircraft. In order to serve as legal documents, flight manifests must be duly authenticated by those responsible for their accuracy, including by their signature. With regard to the four 9/11 flights, American and United Airlines have consistently refused to demonstrate that they possess authenticated manifests of these flights. Surprisingly, neither the corporate media nor the 9/11 Commission demanded the release of these authenticated documents. Between 11 and 14 September 2001, the mainstream media published names of the alleged hijackers and passengers. Some of these names were then deleted and replaced by other names. These irregularities are examined below.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,026

the same day FBI Director Robert Mueller said that a “preliminary investigation indicated 18 hijackers were on the four planes -- five on each of the two planes that crashed into the World Trade Center, and four each on the planes that crashed into the Pentagon and in Pennsylvania.”{103} A day later the number grew to 19.{104} On 14 September 2001, the name of Mosear Caned (phon.) was released by CNN as one of the suspected hijackers on "a list of names (...) that is supposed to be officially released by [the Justice Department] sometime later today".{105} His name disappeared a few hours later from the list of suspects and replaced with that of Hani Hanjour when CNN posted a new list of suspects released by the FBI.{106} It was never revealed where Caned's name came from in the first place, who this person was supposed to be, or why the name was later replaced by “Hani Hanjour.”{107}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,038

The Washington Post reported, however, that the original flight manifest did not include the name of Hani Hanjour, later named as the pilot of flight AA77. In its final edition of 16 September 2001 the Post explained that Hanjour's name "was not on the American Airlines manifest for [flight 77] because he may not have had a ticket."{108} This report fits with the declaration by Attorney General Ashcroft of 13 September 2001 that only four "hijackers" had been on flight AA77.{109} The counsel for American Airlines, in a letter to the 9/11 Commission of 15 March 2004, also appears to confirm the absence of Hanjour from that flight, writing, "We have not been able to determine if Hani Hanjour checked in at the main ticket counter."{110} Yet Hanjour's name appears later on an unauthenticated passenger list of flight AA77. According to CNN on 14 September 2001, "federal sources initially identified [Adnan] Bukhari and Ameer Bukhari as possible hijackers who boarded one of the planes that originated in Boston." (emphasis added). Yet, a few hours later, CNN issued the following correction: "Based on information from multiple law enforcement sources, CNN reported that Adnan Bukhari and Ameer Bukhari of Vero Beach Florida, were suspected to be two of the pilots who crashed planes into the World Trade Center. CNN later learned that Adnan Bukhari is still in Florida, where he was questioned by the FBI...Ameer Bukhari died in a small plane crash" on 11 September 2000. CNN attributed this information to "federal sources." These names disappeared from unauthenticated passenger lists published later and replaced by new names. On 12 September 2001, various newspapers published partial passenger lists of the crashed flights. These reports included the names of Jude Larson, 31, and his wife, Natalie, 24, referred to as passengers aboard flight AA11.{111} A person who claimed to be a friend of Jude's father, Steve Jocelyn of Lahaina on Hawaii, told the Honolulu Advertiser that Jude "was an amazing guy, a cool kid. He was a fun-loving, happy-go-lucky guy with a good heart."{112} He said that Jude had visited Maui often, was working as a horticulturist in Washington State but decided to enter medical school a few years ago. A week later, the same newspaper reported that it had been "unable to confirm the identity of (...) Steve Jocelyn," and was unable to locate him.{113}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,075

According to the Boston Globe, one of the passengers on flight AA11, suspected to have been a hijacker and sitting next to 'Mohamed Atta', was Abdulrahman Alomari. In the list of alleged hijackers released on 14 September 2001 by the FBI, Alomari's first name is spelled Abdulaziz. Unnamed federal investigators "said they could not explain the discrepancy between the American Airlines passenger list and their list."{117} The name Abdulrahman Alomari was also mentioned by the Washington Post on 14 September 2001, as one of the "five hijackers who took over American Airlines flight 11 (…) according to a source familiar with FBI's list of the hijackers."{118} As early as 12 September 2001, the TV network NBC displayed a photograph of 'Mohamed Atta' and mentioned his name, but of no other suspects.{119} In the late afternoon of 13

September 2001, various American TV networks displayed photographs of ‘Mohamed Atta’ and ‘Marwan al-Shehhi,’ designated as suspects in the mass-murder of 9/11. Surprisingly, ABC News (13 September 2001, 7:02p.m. EST) captioned the photograph of ‘Atta’ with the name ‘Amanullah Atta Mohammed.’{120} It was not explained from where the network got ‘Amanullah.’ Was there someone impersonating Mohamed Atta, using Amanullah as a first name? On 22 September 2001, T.A. Badger of Associated Press reported that one of the alleged hijackers whom he named Ziad Jarrahi (with a final “i”) had been seen in San Antonio, California, in mid-June 2001.{121} Who was the Jarrahi who was repeatedly{122} mentioned by the American media? Was he someone else, distinct from Ziad Jarrah (without final “i”) who is alleged to have piloted flight UA93? Perhaps, if we believe the testimony of Charles Lisa, the landlord of an apartment he rented to a certain Jarrahi and who told The Miami Herald that this Jarrahi and his friend Alhaznawi had “German passports.”{123} Ziad Jarrah, who had studied in Germany, was, however, a Lebanese citizen and is not known to have obtained a German passport. Was Jarrahi perhaps the name of someone whose role was to impersonate Ziad Jarrah? According to Elizabeth Neuffer, whose detailed report on Ziad Jarrah and his family was published in the Boston Globe of 25 September 2001 “FBI agents, reviewing flight manifests, found a Ziad Jarrahi – the ‘i’ in the last name a possible misspelling – on United Airlines Flight 93.”{124} Yet, the unauthenticated passenger lists circulating on the internet spelled his name without final “i”. Elizabeth Neuffer, incidentally, died on 9 May 2003, in Iraq in what was reported as a car accident. The fluctuations in the number and names of the alleged “hijackers” could not have occurred if the names had been based on authentic flight manifests. (c) Releasing bogus passenger lists five years later In 2006 a seven-page set of faxes, purporting to represent the original flight manifests, was published in a book by Terry McDermott.{125} These released images are of bad quality and cannot…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,142

As the names of all victims and alleged hijackers were publicized within days after 9/11, there could be no plausible reason for refusing to confirm the accuracy and authenticity of information that already exists in the public domain. Authenticated flight manifests were neither provided to the Congressional Joint Inquiry of 2002 nor to the 9/11 Commission. It must therefore be presumed that no genuine flight manifests for the four 9/11 flights exist or that whatever the airlines and the FBI do possess does not correspond with the official allegations. To sum up: No document has been produced by the airlines or the U.S. government proving that anyone, let alone the alleged terrorists, had boarded any of the four flights that were allegedly hijacked on 9/11.{131} (2)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,151

As for flights AA11 and UA175, which reportedly left from Logan Airport, Boston, the 9/11 Commission found that "[n]one of the [security] checkpoint supervisors recalled the hijackers or reported anything suspicious regarding their screening."{132} Carter Bibbey, a manager for Globe Aviation Services Corp., who was supervising screeners at the American Airlines terminal in Boston, told the Boston Globe on 10 October 2001 that his five screeners didn't detect any weapons — either legal or illegal on the morning of 9/11.{133} As for flight AA77, which reportedly left from Dulles Airport, Washington, D.C., the 9/11 Commission wrote that "[w]hen the local civil aviation security office of the FAA later investigated these security screening operations, the screeners recalled nothing unusual. They could not recall that any of the passengers they screened were CAPPS selectees."{134} As for flight UA93, which reportedly left from Newark Liberty International Airport, the 9/11 Commission indicated that the "FAA interviewed the screeners later; none recalled anything unusual or suspicious."{135} According to an undated FBI report, the ""FBI collected 14 knives or portions of knives at the Flight 93 crash site."{136} Yet no screener mentioned coming across a single knife that morning.{137} A seasoned Israeli security expert, Rafi Ron, President of New Age Security Solutions, with thirty years' experience in security, intelligence and counterterrorism for the government of Israel and formerly Director of Security at Tel-Aviv Ben-Gurion International airport, addressed the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs on 21 September 2005. He said: I

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,175

In the light of the above testimony, it is significant that no security employee noted anything suspicious in the behavior of the 19 persons who allegedly were intending to commit an extreme act of violence and to terminate their own life within the next hour.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,181

The 9/11 Commission does not mention the existence of any deposition or testimony by airline personnel who saw the "hijackers" or any other passenger board the aircraft. As a response to my request to interview American Airlines gate agents of flight AA77, the airline responded that their identities cannot be revealed for privacy reasons.{139} Among the FBI documents released in 2009, I found interviews with Liset Frometa (conducted on 11 September 2001){140} and Maria Jackson (conducted on 22 September 2001),{141} who testified to have worked at gate 32 for flight AA11, and one FBI 302-form recording an interview with an unidentified female employee of American Airlines who testified on 11 September 2001 that she "worked the gate for AA flight 11" and "boarded the passengers for this flight" but did not mention the gate number.{142} Neither of these ladies mentioned having seen any of the alleged hijackers. Maria Jackson was shown a "photo spread of subjects" but did not recognize

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,194

> Apparently, none of the three airports from which the four 9/11 aircraft reportedly departed (Boston Logan, Newark International and Dulles Airport, Washington, D.C.) possessed surveillance cameras at the boarding gates. There exists thus neither eyewitness testimony nor a visual documentation of the boarding process.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,215

> Kenneth R. Anderson, the pilot of Colgan Air flight 5930, which carried the two men from Portland to Boston on the morning of 9/11, said he remembered two Arabic or Mid-Eastern males who were passengers on that flight. They were the last to board the aircraft and the last to exit the aircraft and sat in the last row of the plane. He described one of the individuals as wearing glasses.{149} Yet neither 'Alomari' nor 'Atta' are known to have worn glasses. Anderson also said that one of them was 5'9" and the other 5'11" tall. According to an FAA certified copy of Atta's airman file, Atta's height was 5'7."{150} No information is available on 'Alomari's height. But even if the video recording from Portland were authentic,{151} in the sense of depicting two persons resembling 'Atta' and 'Alomari', it does not tell us what they did after they arriving in Boston.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,227

> The other footage shown on TV and found on internet sites,{152} purports to depict the alleged hijackers of flight AA77 as they pass through the security checkpoint at Dulles Airport in Washington, D.C. This recording was not released voluntarily by the U.S. government, but was forced out in 2004 by the Motley Rice law firm representing some survivors' families.{153} According to the 9/11 Commission, the video "recorded all passengers, including the hijackers, as they were screened."{154} Yet none of the publicly available versions of this recording shows the passengers from flight AA77, some of whom were well known nationally. Another version of this video emerged years later from somewhere. It was not either authenticated by official sources. Jay Kolar, who published a critical analysis of this footage,{155} made an important point: He pointed out that the recording lacks a camera identification number and a time stamp (date:time clock). Joe Vialls, who also analyzed this video recording in 2004, elaborated: "Just this single terminal at Dulles Airport has well over 100 such cameras, everyone of them with an individual camera identification number and date-time clock of its own."{156} He explained: "On-film data [such as camera number and date-time stamp] is essential, of course, because it would be extremely difficult to track a target around the airport without these basic tools, and absolutely impossible to sort out the

precise time and date of an event that occurred more than two years before, which is exactly what the 9-11 Commission now claims to have done."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,265

Unidentified officials spoken to by The Times (U.K.) in October 2001 said they expected that the bodies of the 9/11 suspects would be identified "by a process of elimination."{159} They did not explain why they did not expect the bodies to be positively identified, one by one.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,298

According to the AFIP, bodily remains from virtually all passengers of flight AA77 which allegedly crashed at the Pentagon could be identified by their DNA which miraculously survived the inferno (except the "hijackers"). At the same time, representatives of the Department of Justice and the FBI told the staff of the 9/11 Commission that the contents of the cockpit voice recorder (CVR) for that flight "were destroyed by the intense heat it had been subjected to."{169} Such devices are, however, constructed to resist far greater impact and temperatures than human DNA. Among documents transmitted to the 9/11 Commission and released in 2009, one document contains the claim by the FBI that DNA profiles of Ziad Jarrah provided by the German Federal Police (BKA) to the FBI "matched the sample of one of the sets of unknown human remains."{170} The aforementioned FBI document is not signed, dated or otherwise authenticated. The U.S. authorities have not, in any case, relied on this document to claim that Ziad Jarrah's remains had been positively identified.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,315

In an essay entitled "Who They Were," Robert Shaler of the forensic unit in New York City, set down his inside account of the identification effort: "No names, just a K code, which is how the FBI designates 'knowns,' or specimens it knows the origins of," he wrote, adding, "we had no direct knowledge of how the FBI obtained the terrorists' DNA."{173} His statement was echoed in 2009 by his deputy, Howard Baum, in a Newsweek interview: "We had no idea where the profiles came from or how they were developed."{174} The lack of positive identification of the alleged hijackers' bodily remains, compounded by the glaring absence of chain-of-custody reports regarding these remains, means that the U.S. authorities have failed to produce concrete evidence that the alleged hijackers died on 11 September 2001, let alone at the reported crash sites. Conclusions

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,355

> Shuckum's is a restaurant and oyster bar in Hollywood, Florida. According to numerous news reports, 'Atta' and 'al-Shehhi' spent hours at that bar a few days before 9/11, heavily drinking alcohol. (a) When did this episode took place? • On 5 or 6 September 2001 (FBI 302 reports){177} • On 6 September (NBC News, 12 September 2001){178} • On 7 September (Associated Press{179} and The New York Times{180}, 12 September 2001) • On 8 September (Boston Globe, 23 September 2001; Time Magazine,{181} 24 September 2001). (b)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,369

> Tony Amos, Shuckums' manager, declared to Ken Thomas of the Associated Press on 12 September 2001 that "two men" had each consumed several drinks and had given the bartender a hard time. Amos said: "The guy Mohamed was drunk, his voice was slurred and he had a thick accent."{182} Bartender Patricia Idrissi said to a journalist of the St. Petersburg Times that the men were "wasted" (drunk) when they entered the bar. She said she directed them to a nearby Chinese restaurant. They later returned and "each ordered five drinks," she said.{183} According to the New York Times of 12 September 2001, the "man (…) drank Stolichnaya vodka for three hours."{184} Patricia Idrissi said that the men argued about their bill. Then one of the men pulled a wad of $100 and $50 bills, paid the tab and left her a $3 tip. The bar employees said FBI agents had told them that at least one of the men was from Pakistan and that the passenger manifests of one of the hijacked airliners showed they were registered as passengers on one of the hijacked planes that took off from Boston.{185} Patricia Idrissi told journalists, "Mohamed said he worked for American Airlines and he could pay his bill."{186}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,389

> According to the St. Petersburg Times of 13 September 2001, FBI agents arrived at Shuckum's "soon after the attack," but not later than in the late afternoon of September 11.{189} The Associated Press of 12 September 2001 reported that FBI came to Shuckum's "Tuesday night."{190} It was never explained how the FBI knew by that time that 'Atta' and 'al-Shehhi' had frequented bars, let alone a particular bar among the approximately 48,000 bars that operate in the United States or the roughly 4,000 bars that exist in Florida. How did the FBI know exactly where to go only a few hours after the attacks? How did they know which neighborhoods, which flight schools and which restaurants to investigate so soon in the case? These were questions asked by Kristen Breitweiser, a 9/11 victim's relative at a hearing before the 9/11 Congressional Inquiry."{191} She never received an answer. (d)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,411

As religious Muslims do not drink alcohol, the initial story of the Shuckum's spree was toxic to the official legend of fanatic Muslims. But on 16 September The Washington Post reported from Shuckum's that "Atta played video Trivial Pursuit and blackjack with great determination," –- another atypical occupation of religious Muslims – while "al-Shehhi and the other man had about five drinks each."{196} Six days later, alcohol disappeared completely from the story. According to the September 22 issue of the Washington Post, the manager on duty that night said that he didn't recall seeing 'Atta' drink alcohol.{197} On 27 September another "newspaper of record," the Los Angeles Times, reported Shuckum's owner saying that "Atta sat quietly by himself and drank cranberry juice and played a video game, while al-Shehhi and the other customer tossed back mixed drinks and argued."{198} Tony Amos may have been induced to retract his original testimony. Author Daniel Hopsicker discovered weeks after 9/11 that Tony Amos and Patricia Idrissi, the sources of the above reports, had vanished. {199} Almost ten years later, the Miami Herald discovered Tony Amos as the owner of El Sloppy Taco in Brunswick, Maryland. He confirmed to the Miami Herald that, at the time, FBI agents had indeed shown him photos of 'Atta' and 'al-Shehhi' and told him that "they were on the [flight] manifests."{200}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,430

Several of the alleged 9/11 hijackers made trips to Las Vegas, the City of Sin, and were seen in the local Strip clubs. 'Al-Shehhi' was reportedly seen by stripper Samantha in Las Vegas. Samantha remembers him settling into a crushed red velvet chair, staring blankly up at her while she undulated her hips inches from his face. He didn't look evil, she said. Not even interesting. Certainly not like a man who would, just three months later, hijack a jet and smash it into the World Trade Center. To the 29-year-old stripper 'al-Shehhi' simply looked "cheap." "He spent about $20 for a quick dance and didn't tip more," she said.{201}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,438

While staying at the Ramada Inn Hotel in Jacksonville for a week starting 25 February 2001, Ziad Jarrah reportedly frequented Wacko's strip club. A worker there said later that the FBI came to the club after 9/11 to ask questions and show pictures "of the 9/11 terrorists," and a dancer recognized Jarrah from a photo line-up.{203} First Coast News commented, "Questions still remain as to what Jarrah was doing in Jacksonville."{204} 'Atta' and 'al-Shehhi' were also seen (on an unknown date) at Sunrise 251, a bar in Palm Beach, Florida, where they spent $1,000 in 45 minutes on Krug and Perrier-Jouet champagne. 'Atta' complained about the bill. "It's outrageous," he said. "Why are you arguing?" said 'al-Shehhi,' "We have plenty of money and we are

not going to need it." 'Atta' was entertained by a tall busty brunette in her late twenties while 'al-Shehhi' went with a shortish blonde. Both women were known locally as regular companions of high-rollers.{205} On 7 September 2001 – four days before their alleged entry into paradise – alleged hijackers 'Alomari' and Satam al-Suqami reportedly employed "the services of two prostitutes from the Sweet Temptations escort service in Boston."{206} Subsequent interviews of the "escorts" determined that they "serviced two Arab…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,463

On 7 June 2002, a Las Vegas blackjack dealer by the name of Gerd Sternberg reported that Ziad Jarrah and 'Atta' had been playing at his table in Caesar's palace in Las Vegas. According to Sternberg, both of them were cash players and he did not know if they were hotel guests.{210} Good Muslims know that their religion prohibits gambling. {211} Sun Cruz Casinos turned over photographs

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,492

Ziad Jarrah's uncle, Jamal Jarrah, said in a telephone interview with the Boston Globe from the village of al-Marj, Lebanon, that two days before 9/11, his nephew called and told the family that he intends to come home (to Lebanon) for a cousin's wedding in mid-September. "He [Ziad] said he had even bought a new suit for the occasion."{219} The FBI timeline confirms that Jarrah made telephone calls to Lebanon on 8 September 2001.{220} The FBI even found out that Ziad purchased a pair of trousers on 10 September from Joe Fischman Sportswear and Clothing (no location given), paying cash.{221} On 1 September 2001, Waleed al-Shehri purchased for $116 with a credit card a "silk shirt and khaki pants" at Burdines, Pompano Beach.{222} On 4 September 2001, Satam al-Suqami and Waleed al-Shehri purchased an Emerson Walkman, Philips headphones, batteries, pens, razors, a notebook, a pencil pouch and a travel accessory kit for $73.64.{223} On 5 September 2001, Khalid al-Mihdhar "changed his address on the First Union account to 14625 Baltimore Avenue, Laurel, Maryland (mailboxes, etc.). He also requested a change in address to 14800 Fourth Street, Laurel, Maryland."{224} On 8 September 2001, Majed Moqed bought himself a handbag at the Burlington Coat Factory, Greenbelt, Maryland.{225} According to Janet Padilla, Regional Reservations Manager of United Airlines in Chicago, interviewed by the FBI on 11 September 2001, 'al-Shehhi' checked one bag on Flight UA175 through to Las Vegas.{226} According to an FBI timeline, however, 'al-Shehhi' booked his flight to Los Angeles with a continuation flight to San Diego, not to Las Vegas.{227} Fayez Ahmed Banihammad purchased by telephone on 24 August 2001 two tickets with United Airlines flight UA175 from Boston to Los Angeles with a connecting flight to San Francisco.{228} Salem Al-Hazmi and Nawaf Al-Hazmi booked on 27 August 2001 reservations with

American Airlines flight AA77 from Dulles Airport (Washington) to Los Angeles with a connecting flight to San Francisco.{229} Ahmed Alhaznawi booked on 29 August 2001 an airline ticket with United Airlines flight UA93 from Newark, NJ to San Francisco with a connecting flight to San Diego.{230}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,521

On 30 August 2001, Ziad Jarrah purchased an airline ticket from Newark on flight UA93 to San Francisco with a connecting flight to Las Vegas.{231} According to the FBI timeline, Hamza al-Ghamdi was scheduled to depart Casablanca (Morocco) for Riyadh (Saudi Arabia) on Royal Air Maroc Flight #264 on 20 September 2001, 12:30 p.m., i.e., after he returned safely from paradise!{232}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,547

Genuine terrorists who conspire to commit mass murder normally try to avoid the police. This rule does not apparently apply to Islamic terrorists operating in the United States. (a) Hani Hanjour Hani Hanjour, the alleged super-pilot of flight AA77, was fined by the police on 1 August 2001 for driving 55 mph in a 30 mph zone in Arlington, Virginia. Two weeks before 9/11, Hanjour dutifully mailed to the authorities a money order to pay the $70 fine and $30 in court costs.{235} One could term him a "law-abiding terrorist." (b) Ziad Jarrah Ziad Jarrah was pulled over by Maryland state troopers around midnight on 9 September 2001 for exceeding the speed limit. Superintendent of State Police David B. Mitchell described Jarrah as "extremely calm and cooperative" when speaking to Joseph Catalano, the trooper who stopped him for speeding. (c) Nawaf al-Hazmi Alleged hijacker Al-Hazmi was stopped by a police officer for speeding while traveling east on interstate highway 40, near Clinton, Oklahoma.{236} Al-Hazmi's license information was run through a computer to determine whether there were any warrants for his arrest. As there were none, he was issued a ticket and sent on his way. Al-Hazmi later complained to the police about being mugged outside of his apartment in Alexandria, Virginia, by an "unknown black male." He said he had seen his alleged assailant outside of his apartment almost every day for the previous two weeks. A police officer took a statement from al-Hazmi in his apartment, but al-Hazmi decided finally to drop the case. He signed a release indicating he does not want the incident investigated.{237} (d) Mohamed Atta On 26 April 2001, police reportedly stopped 'Atta' at a random inspection near Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and discovered that he was driving without a driver's license. He was given a citation. On 1 May 2001, 'Atta' received a parking ticket in Hollywood, Florida.{238} The next day he obtained a Florida driver license.{239} 'Atta' did not show up for his court hearing on 28 May 2001, and a warrant was issued for his arrest on the 4th of June. No attempt was made to arrest him. The official explanation for this negligence: "The local

backlog of unpaid traffic fines goes back to 1977, and is not on computer networks."{240} This did not prevent him from continuing to drive and rent cars in Florida. He was obviously unconcerned about being stopped by police or arrested. On 23 August 2001, the state of Florida suspended 'Atta's driver's license, which he had obtained in May, for failure to appear in court regarding the traffic citation.{241} On 10 September 2001 — one day before 9/11 — 'Atta' was again stopped, now at a toll booth at Exit 13 of the Massachusetts Turnpike. He apparently 'boiled in anger when the operator demanded that he pay the [$3.10] toll. When 'Atta' refused and sped away, the operator wrote down the license plate number of his rented white Mitsubishi. {242} The point here is not the apparent negligence of…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,586

In August 2001, 'Atta' allegedly drove to the Kendall-Tamiami Executive Airport near Miami to visit the Federal Aviation Administration's flight service station, reported the Palm Beach Post.{243} It's apparently not unusual for pilots to call the station for weather and flight information but a personal visit is unusual, said Gerald Davies, owner of Chandelle Aviation in Lantana. 'Atta' may have been examining the station's radar installations, Davies said. Another potential target to be cased? Or was this just one of 'Atta's numerous courtesy calls aimed at leaving as widely as possible his terrorist "signature"?

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,594

According to media reports, 'Atta' made repeated visits to a crop-dusting airfield in Belle Glade, Florida. James Lester, who loads chemicals on crop-dusters at the Belle Glade Airport, recognized 'Atta' from an FBI photo. Lester said 'Atta' visited the airport with two other Middle Eastern men. 'Atta' asked a lot of questions, Lester said, and mentioned that he was a student pilot. Willie Lee, 62, Lester's boss, said the men came to the airport just about every weekend in July and August 2001, and as late as on 8, September 2001, three days before 9/11. Lee said the visitors were pushy and arrogant.{244} Lee also said that the visitor arrived in rented vans and carried video equipment. FBI agents have made eight visits to the airport to gather information about the terrorists' visits, and the facility was put under 24-hour guard.{245} An Associated Press report of 25 September 2001 cites Lester saying: "I recognized [Atta] because he stayed on my feet all the time. I just about had to push him away from me."{246} But it gets still more bizarre.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,609

most remarkable performance by 'Atta' was his encounter with Johnelle Bryant, Farm Loan Manager at the Department of Agriculture in Florida (USDA). This visit was reported in a timeline issued by FBI Miami, transmitted to the 9/11 Commission and released in 2009 to the U.S. National Archives (NARA).{247} 'Atta' visited Ms. Bryant in April or May 2000, i.e., before he officially entered the United States for the first time. {248} His declared purpose was to obtain a loan, so he could buy a six-passenger, twin-engine airplane that he wanted to convert into a crop-dusting plane. Bryant told him that he did not qualify for the loan because he was not a U.S. citizen. Although he got angry, he did not leave. As we will discover, "Atta's" desire to apply for a loan was merely a pretext for his visit. Ms. Bryant related in detail to Brian Ross of ABC News what 'Atta' had told her. Ms. Bryant's interview by Brian Ross was broadcast on ABC News in June 2002.{249} She said her visitor told her he was an engineer, originally from Egypt, but had moved to Afghanistan for political reasons. He told her he had studied in Germany and had come to the United States to go to a flight school. How did she know the man was Mohamed

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,659

Several USDA employees in Florida identified 'Atta' to the FBI, and recalled that he wore Tommy Hilfiger clothes and a lot of cologne, according to the FBI version of events provided to Robert Epling, president of the Community Bank of Florida.{251} Do Islamists wear perfume? Was the "Mohamed Atta" who visited Johnelle Bryant in Florida in April or May 2000 the same person who entered the United States for the first time in June 2000? And if not, who was the man who resembled the original Atta and knew personal details about the Hamburg student? What was the purpose of Johnelle Bryant's guest in talking about his interest in a flight school, the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda? This extraordinary interview was mentioned by the BBC at the time but never again.{252} After the ABC interview, Ms. Bryant vanished. Conclusions

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,709

According to the official account, Hani Hanjour steered a Boeing 757 (Flight AA77) into Wedge 1 of the west side of the Pentagon, more precisely between the first and second floor. According to official reports, the aircraft entered the building horizontally at 530 mph and pierced through a number of walls. This means that the pilot would have had to level the aircraft and fly horizontally for a substantial distance about 10 feet above the ground at this speed before impacting the building.{257} Maintaining a fixed-wing passenger aircraft steady in the air so near the ground at such speed is considered by professional pilots as very difficult, if not impossible. Several professional pilots with combat experience, including Ted Muga, Russ Wittenberg,

Ralph Omholt and Ralph Kolstad, said they could not imagine that an amateur pilot could fly that “tight spiral coming down out of 7,000 feet” and then “crash into the Pentagon’s first floor wall without touching the lawn.” Kolstad: “I have 6,000 hours of flight time in Boeing 757’s and 767’s and I could not have flown it the way the flight path was described.”{258} The New York Times devoted an entire article to Hani Hanjour in 2002.{259} Here is what the “newspaper of record” wrote about him: Hanjour “was reported to the [Federal Aviation Administration — FAA] in February 2001 after instructors at his flight school in Phoenix had found his piloting skills so shoddy and his grasp of English so inadequate that they questioned whether his pilot’s license was genuine.”{260} According to CBS News, the staff of the Phoenix flight school was so appalled at Hanjour’s lack of skills that they contacted the FAA not fewer than five times and asked them to investigate how he got a pilot’s license.{261} Peggy Chevrette, the manager of the flight school, said: “I couldn’t believe he had a commercial license of any kind with the skills that he had.” The FAA finally sent Inspector John Anthony to verify whether Hanjour’s 1999 license was legitimate. The inspector suggested that the school provide Hanjour with an interpreter during his flight lessons! Hanjour appears to have had protectors in high places.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,732

According to the official account, ‘Atta’ and his companion ‘Alomari’ rented a car in Boston and drove on 10 September 2001 to Portland, Maine, where they stayed overnight and flew back to Boston on the morning of September 11 before allegedly boarding the flight they intended to hijack (Flight AA11). By this detour, they risked botching their grand operation, should their connecting flight from Portland to Boston be delayed. This risk did not escape the sharp eyes of the Wall Street Journal. The paper noted that “investigators say they don’t know why two of the Boston hijackers drove to Portland a day before the attack, risking a missed connection.”{262} This was a good question begging for an answer that never came. In

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,744

At the 12th Public Hearing of the 9/11 Commission on 16 June 2004, Commission staff member Dieter Snell confirmed that the Portland detour almost prevented ‘Atta’ and ‘Alomari’ from making Flight 11 out of Boston.{263} Snell did not explain the reason for this detour either. From the perspective of ‘Atta the terrorist’, the detour via Portland was certainly not a sign of a “flawlessly planned” operation. It was rather reckless. Why? Had he missed flight AA11 in Boston, none of the other “terrorists” could have replaced him as a pilot and the aircraft would not have impacted the North Tower of the World Trade Center. In that case nothing would have attracted the TV networks to focus their cameras on the WTC and no network could have shown in real

time the second plane impacting the South Tower. The huge psychological impact of their carefully planned attack — showing the valiant Muslims crashing the second plane into the South Tower — would have been lost. For the planners of the operation, it would have been a historical disaster. So why did 'Atta' and 'Alomari' take this risk? Let us now consider the consequences of this mysterious detour via Portland. Its main consequence was that 'Atta's and 'Alomari's bags were not loaded on flight AA11 but were calmly waiting at Logan Airport in Boston for the FBI to be found. According to a Memorandum compiled by the staff of the 9/11 Commission, the following items were found in 'Atta's suitcase (also based on FBI document 302-1306).

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,768

Author McDermott, commenting upon the paraphernalia allegedly found in 'Atta's bags, said what many thought: "Atta's bag contained nearly every important document in his life…If you wanted to leave a roadmap for investigators to follow, the suitcase was a pretty good place to start."{265} The Guardian wrote, with tongue in cheek, "The finds are certainly very fortunate, though some might think them a little too fortunate."{266} For years, men wondered why 'Atta' would fill his bags with incriminating evidence rather than burn his papers in a safe place before perpetrating his grand operation. The answer came only in 2009.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,776

An FBI document released in 2009 informs us that 'Atta's luggage carried a "covert marking that indicated that the suitcases belonged to a passenger, [who] was a security issue."{267} A "covert marking"? Quinn John Tamm, Jr., a 9/11 Commission's staffer, acknowledged this observation made by baggage expediter Philip A. DePasquale ("The two suitcases had a covert tag from U.S. Airways to warn that Atta and his luggage were a security issue") but did not attempt to discover when, for what reason and by whom 'Atta' was regarded a "security issue" before the attacks.{268} The bags were thus not held in Boston by mistake or because of a delayed connecting flight, but by design. And this intent was meant to remain secret, as manifested by this "covert marking." The mysterious Portland detour was thus not reckless after all. It was a sophisticated move, even if it was not conceived by 'Atta' but by those who filled his bags with incriminating evidence.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,787

Several of the alleged hijackers contacted at various times government offices in the United States, even going there in person, to obtain duplicates for their driver's licenses and for their pilot licenses, that they sometimes claimed to have lost. • 'Atta' applied

on 29 December 2000 for a replacement of his Airman Certificate, which he received on 21 December.{269} He reapplied for “replacement of lost or destroyed Airman Certificate and Knowledge Test Report” on 4 June 2001.{270} FAA issued on 19 June 2001 a duplicate replacement of the commercial pilot license to ‘Atta.’{271} • ‘Al-Shehhi’ got his Florida driver’s license on 12 April 2001. He asked for a duplicate license two months later.{272} On 3 June 2001, he applied for a replacement of his Commercial Pilot’s License, saying it was lost. He received a duplicate license on 19 June 2001.{273} • Alleged hijacker Waleed al-Shehri got his Florida driver’s license on 4 May 2001 and a duplicate the next day.{274} • Alleged hijacker Hamza al-Ghamdi got his Florida driver’s license on 27 June 2001 and two duplicates in August.{275} • Ziad Jarrah was issued a duplicate Florida license on 10 July 2001.{276} • Alleged hijacker Hamza Saleh al-Ghamdi obtained a duplicate Florida driver’s license on 27 August 2001.{277} •…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,819

Apparently, “al-Qaeda’s Terrorist Manual” has no chapter how to correctly order airline tickets. On 16 August 2001, alleged hijacker Khalid al-Mihdhar made three attempts to purchase United Airlines airplane tickets using a VISA credit card. The payment attempts were rejected because he exceeded the limit on the card.{279} On 25 August he and his friend Majed Moqed booked tickets for American Airlines flight 77 using the AA.com website. Unfortunately, the tickets were not mailed to them, because the shipping address did not match the credit card address.{280} So they had to collect these tickets in person from the American Airlines counter at Baltimore Washington International Airport on 5 September 2001. On 13 September 2001, Michelle Erb, Service Director at United Airlines, advised the FBI that on August 27, an individual identifying himself as “Sajarah” had booked a reservation for alleged hijackers Ahmed Abdullah Alnami and Saeed al-Ghamdi through United Airlines’ Honolulu reservation office. The credit card was declined and attempts to contact al-Ghamdi failed.{281} Alnami then called United Airlines’ Bloomington office on September 5 to check on the status of the two tickets he had ordered earlier, at which time he was advised that they were declined. Approximately 38 minutes later, al-Ghamdi contacted United’s Burbank office and provided a new Visa credit card number. On that occasion it was approved. E-tickets were issued for both…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,840

On 8 September 2001 – three days before 9/11 – ‘Alomari’ went to the American Airlines ticket counter at Boston’s Logan Airport. He claimed that he has lost his ticket, originally mailed to him in Florida. He was asked to fill out a form for a lost paper ticket and was reissued a new ticket. ‘Alomari’ also filled a claim that American Airlines had

not mailed the ticket to him, allegedly to avoid the $100 charge for replacing the lost ticket. 'Alomari' was told that he would have to return the following day for the replacement ticket.{285} 'Alomari' was not the only 'hijacker' to lose his ticket. On 23 July 2001, Ziad Jarrah went to the STA Travel agency in Miami, Florida, to…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,880

Numerous pundits have told us that the 9/11 hijackers were extremely well organized, coordinated, sophisticated. Their best pilot, Hani Hanjour, emerged to be a hopeless bungler. In the present chapter we focused on the conduct of the "hijackers" before 9/11, as documented mainly by the FBI. We discover bunglers who lose their driver's licenses and their airline tickets, need a translator at the airport, and do not not know what they hold in their hand. These are the klutzes – so we are told by eminent personalities – who defeated U.S. air defenses on 9/11. This chapter reveals for the first time why the person going under the name "Mohamed Atta" was tasked to go to Portland, Maine, on September 10, 2001 and return to Boston on the morning of September 11 with a connecting flight.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,911

Flight numbers have no physical existence. They merely refer to a particular route scheduled to be flown at a particular time by a particular airline. The official killing tools on 9/11 were not flight numbers but concrete physical aircraft designated by their tail or registration numbers [sometimes also named call numbers or in the United States N-Numbers]. These numbers are usually displayed on the aircraft's fuselage or tail. In the United States, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) maintains a register of all licensed aircraft.{299}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,929

As we proceed, we will discover that investigators as well the 9/11 Commission have throughout, and for unexplained reasons, used the flight numbers rather than tail numbers to designate the tools of the crime. In order to prove that passengers who boarded aircraft designated by their flight numbers had died at the three crash sites (Ground Zero, the Pentagon and Shanksville, Pennsylvania), investigators should have (a) determined the registration numbers of the aircraft onto which the passengers boarded; and (b) positively linked the debris from the crash sites to the aircraft onto which the passengers had boarded. This is actually not as simple a procedure as it appears. To understand the complexity of this task, we must remember that physical aircraft are continuously assigned to different flight numbers, even several times during a single day. Most ground personnel and even flight crew members do not need to

know the registration (or tail) number of the aircraft they service. They usually designate their aircraft by the departing or arriving flight number. Someone within each airline, obviously, determines which physical aircraft is to be assigned to a particular flight number, verifies that this assignment was accomplished and maintains records documenting the continuously changing locations of the airline's physical fleet.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,953

We note first the convoluted language used to acknowledge that the FBI did not undertake a formal identification of the wreckage. By deconstructing this statement, its contrived nature can be revealed. Far from having been "never in question," the evidence presented later in this report demonstrates that air traffic controllers, the FAA and even the military were so confused about the identities and the locations of the aircraft that as many as 29 aircraft were at one point suspected of having been hijacked.{304} The refusal to forensically (formally) link the debris from the crash sites to concrete aircraft was apparently unprecedented in the U.S. history of aircraft crashes. It constituted a blatant violation of criminal investigation standards and could only make sense if the wreckage did not belong to the alleged civilian airliners. Conclusions

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,962

The main findings of this chapter are: No crash investigations were carried out by the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) regarding the four aircraft that allegedly crashed on 11 September 2001. The FBI, responsible for the investigation of 9/11, did not carry out an investigation to determine whether the four aircraft allegedly hijacked on 9/11 had actually crashed. The FBI did not carry out a formal identification of the aircraft debris found at the three locations where aircraft allegedly crashed on 11 September 2001. In legal parlance, we say that the U.S. authorities failed to formally identify the tools of the crime that resulted in the deaths of approximately 3,000 people on 11 September 2001.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,991

The only official document containing photographs of debris attributed to the aircraft that allegedly crashed into the Twin Towers of the WTC is FEMA's WTC Building Performance Study (BPAT).{306} One photograph depicts an alleged "piece of Flight 11 landing gear" and one depicts an alleged "piece of Flight 175 fuselage." That is all. Note that only physical aircraft, designated by their registration (call) number, can have gear and fuselage. Flight numbers do not refer to physical aircraft. These two photographs do not permit the determination of the origin of the photographed

objects, the type of aircraft to which they belonged, the aircraft's identity, or the circumstances that brought these objects to the location where they were photographed. It is furthermore inconceivable that the depicted parts are all that remained from two Boeing 767-200 aircraft, who combined weight exceeds 200,000 lbs. According to the Final Report of the 9/11 Commission, the four "black boxes" of the aircraft assigned to flights AA11 and UA175 (two in each aircraft) were not found. This may appear plausible at first due to the complete destruction of the buildings. Yet Ted Lopatkiewicz, spokesman for the National Transportation Safety Board, said, "It's extremely rare that we don't get the recorders back. I can't recall another domestic case in which we did not recover the recorders."{307} The claim by the FBI that the "black boxes" were not found stretches credulity because numerous computer hard disks were reportedly found in the WTC rubble with information that could later be recovered. {308} In addition, the rubble was later sifted in order to look for far smaller objects, including human nails and teeth. What motive could the authorities have for claiming that these devices were not found, other than their reluctance to reveal that flights AA11 and UA175 did not crash in New York? As of the spring of 2002, no passenger remains from flights AA11 and UA175 had been found at Ground Zero.{309}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,033

Note that the contents of the cockpit voice recorder (CVR) from the object that crashed at the Pentagon were reportedly destroyed "by the intense heat it had been subjected to,"{314} while virtually all bodily remains of those who died there could be identified. Most incredibly, two pieces of a Virginia Driver's License were reportedly recovered from the Pentagon site, bearing the following readable information about one of the alleged hijackers:{315} Name: Majed M GH Moqed Address: 5913 Leesburg Pike, Apartment #08 Falls Church, Virginia 22041-2210 Customer Number: A69-60-0405 Height: 5'7" Was this driver's license made out of steel more fire-resistant than the two huge Boeing engines? (b) Video footage of an aircraft impact The Pentagon is surrounded by dozens of security cameras, but the Department of Defense has not been able (or willing) to produce credible footage that would document an approaching airborne object. The single video sequence released by the Pentagon after much prodding does not show anything resembling an aircraft. Above are the first two frames of this sequence. The experts who created these stills claimed that due to a software bug, the computer stamped the date and time when the stills were extracted from the footage rather than the actual time of impact.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,095

According to the above account, those responsible for security at the Pentagon authorized the disconnection of video surveillance of that side of the building for an

entire month.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,097

Since this episode at the Pentagon, surveillance cameras have repeatedly become dysfunctional when terrorists approach. This happened also during the London attacks of 7 July 2005{321} and the Mumbai attacks of 26 November 2008.{322} It is a mysterious phenomenon begging for a scientific explanation.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,122

As an aside, she reminds readers that FBI's investigation of the 9/11 events was dubbed PENTTBOM (Pentagon, Twin Towers, Bombings). This designation corresponds with the acronym chosen by the FBI for its investigation of the Oklahoma Bombings of 1995, namely OKBOM, equally caused by explosives. The author makes the cogent observation, that it was particularly the claim of an enemy attack on the Pentagon that allowed the Bush administration to describe 9/11 as an "attack upon the United States" and introduce war-time measures.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,132

Many of those who rushed to the reported crash site of flight UA93 at Somerset County near Shanksville were surprised to see no plane wreckage, nothing but a hole in the ground. Here are a series of observations from local people and journalists who arrived at the scene shortly after what they were told was a plane crash: • Mark Stahl of Somerset, a salesman, arrived at the site 15 minutes after an explosion. He told the Tribune-Review that he didn't realize a passenger jet had crashed until a firefighter told him. "It's unbelievable" he said.{331} To CNN he said, "the plane is pretty much disintegrated. There's nothing left but scorched trees."{332} Yet, on 12 September 2001, the Wall Street Journal claimed that Mark had "snapped pictures of the downed plane [and] showed color photos of wreckage surrounded by a crater and flames."{333} No one apparently has ever seen these pictures. • Homer Barron, a worker at Stoystown Auto Wreckers, told the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette that he and his coworker, Jeff Phillips, drove to the "crash scene" and found there a smoky hole in the ground: "It didn't look like a plane crash because there was nothing that looked like a plane," he said. His colleague, however, said, "There was one part of a seat burning up there. That was something you could recognize."{334} • Scott Spangler, a photographer with a local newspaper, was quoted in the book Running Toward Danger: Stories Behind the Breaking News of 9/11: "I didn't think I was in the right place. I was looking for a wing or a tail. There was nothing, just this pit.... I was looking for anything that said tail, wing, plane, metal. There was nothing."{335} • Frank Monaco of the Pennsylvania State

Police commented, "If you would go down there, it would look like a trash heap. There's nothing but tiny pieces of debris. It's just littered with small pieces."{336} • Jon Meyer, a reporter with WJAC-TV, said, "I was able to get right up to the edge of the crater.... All I saw was a crater filled with small, charred plane parts. Nothing that would even tell you that it was the plane.... There were no suitcases, no recognizable plane parts, no body parts. The crater was about 30 to 35 feet deep."{337} • Ron Delano, a local who rushed to the scene after hearing about the crash, said, "If they hadn't told us a plane had wrecked, you wouldn't have known. It looked like it hit and disintegrated."{338} • Gabrielle DeRose, a news anchor with KDKA-TV, viewed the crash site from a hill overlooking it and said, "It was very disturbing to think all the remains just disintegrated.... There were no large pieces of airplane, no human remains, no baggage."{339} • Rick King, a local assistant volunteer fire chief, who saw the crater at the crash site, said, "Never in my wildest dreams did I think half the plane was down there." King sent his men into the woods to search for the plane's fuselage, but they kept coming back, telling him, "Rick. There's nothing."{340} • Wells Morrison, a…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,219

Blogger Killtown compiled an archive of reports that included the claim that most of the aircraft assigned to flight UA93 had been buried in the ground.{356} This compilation includes only a few eyewitness testimonies in support of that claim and are either couched in indirect language or attributed to unnamed sources. Killtown then made the following perceptive observation: There is absolutely no logical reason for the news not to have reported right away that most of the 155 ft-long, 60 tons [sic] Boeing 757 was found. Contents of the plane that would have been found down in the ground along with the black boxes and engine that were reported would be: 44 passengers, their luggage, hundreds of passenger seats, 3 huge landing gears, 10 huge tires and rime, and possibly sections of the tail (since both black boxes located in the tail section supposedly burrowed far underground and there is no evidence of the tail section above ground), among tons and tons of other plane debris.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,250

Wallace Miller, the coroner of Somerset County, was among the first to arrive at the site. He gave numerous interviews in which he expressed his surprise at seeing no bodies and no blood at the site. In one of the earliest interviews with the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, he said, “It was as if the plane had stopped and let the passengers off before it crashed.”{364} He repeated this comment in an interview with CNN on 11 March 2002.{365} He said he was stunned at how small the smoking crater looked, saying, “like someone took a scrap truck, dug a 10-foot ditch and dumped all this trash into it.” Once he was able to absorb the scene, Miller said, “I stopped being a coroner

after about 20 minutes, because there were no bodies there."{366} A year after the event, he told the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review, "I have not, to this day, seen a single drop of blood [at the crash site]. Not a drop." To David McCall he said, "I got to the actual crash site and could not believe what I saw… Usually you see much debris, wreckage, and much noise and commotion. This crash was different. There was no wreckage, no bodies, and no noise… It appeared as though there were no passengers or crew on this plane."{367} We are told that somehow, approximately 600 pounds of bodily remains was collected from the crash site, where 44 people allegedly died, under the supervision of the FBI. Of these remains, 200 pounds were said to be linked to specific individuals.{368} This represents approximately 3.1 percent of the body weight of the 44 passengers.{369} German criminal pathologist Prof. Wolfgang Eisenmenger says that he "cannot imagine such a consequence" from a plane crash.{370} In theory such total fragmentation might be conceivable had the plane crashed against solid rock, but in the case of flight UA93, the aircraft is said to have sunk into soft ground.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,281

Michael Renz of the German public television station ZDF tried to film the wreckage of the aircraft that allegedly crashed at Somerset County for a documentary. After asking for permission from United Airlines, he and his team were told that an insurance company had custody of the wreckage.{373} The insurance company said it could not provide any information: The responsible individual was in a meeting, then on a three-day business trip, then on intercontinental trip that would take weeks. During this time he could not be reached by email or cell phone, or "so we were told by the secretary of one of the largest airline-insurance companies in the United States."{374} After weeks and countless phone calls, a brief answer came: "We do not have the wreckage. The FBI in Washington is in charge." The FBI press officer refused an interview but said he would certainly give permission to film the wreckage, though not immediately. But alas! The FBI no longer had the wreckage. It has been returned to United Airlines. Back to square one! The producer returned to Germany without any evidence of the wreckage.{375} The film producer described similar difficulties when he tried to obtain permission to film inside a Boeing flight simulator or when he approached New York officials to ask them about the fireproofing in the WTC. "But when we talk with officials off-the-record, many say a gag order has been handed from the top."{376} In 2006, after the trial of Zacarias Moussaoui, the U.S. Government released a set of photographs purporting to depict items found at the Pennsylvania crash site.{377} These mostly low-quality photographs do not permit us to determine whether they relate to a Boeing 757, or whether they were found at the alleged crash site. In addition, no chain-of-custody reports accompanied these photographs.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,326

As mentioned previously, eyewitnesses who came immediately to the site did not see anything there that reminded them of the wreckage of an aircraft. Yet the FBI claimed later to have found there an amazing collection of recognizable personal items that belonged to passengers, crew members and alleged hijackers, some of them in mint condition. According to the FBI, the following items were recovered from the alleged crash site of flight UA 93 at Somerset County: • Kingdom of Saudi Arabia ID card of alleged hijacker Ahmed Alnami (item Q1) • Saudi Arabian Youth Hostels Association ID Card for same (item Q2) • Three small color photographs, two strips of negatives and an enlarged photocopy of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia ID Card (items Q3) • Handwritten letter with possible Arabic writing (item Q45) • A "five page Arabic document [with] details regarding the strategy and preparation required to conduct a hijacking."{384} • Personal effects belonging to passengers Christian Adams, Lorraine Bay, Todd Beamer, Alan Beaven, Mark Bingham, Deora Bodley, Sandra Bradshaw, Marion Britton, Thomas Burnett, Bill Cashman, Georgine Corrigan, Patricia Cushing, Donald Greene, Linda Grondlund, Richard Guadagno, Jason Dahl, Patrick Driscoll, Edward Felt, Jane Folger, Colleen Fraser, Andrew Garcia, Jeremy Glick, Louis Nacke, Nicole Miller, John Talignani and Leroy Homer.{385}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,354

The above FBI documents do not mention CeeCee Lyles' driving license,{387} the passport of alleged hijacker Al-Ghamdi,{388} alleged hijacker Alnami's Florida Driver's License{389} and a visa page from alleged hijacker Ziad Jarrah's passport,{390} all of which were also allegedly found at the site. The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of 30 December 2001 reported that the following personal items were found at the Shanksville site: Jewelry, photos, credit cards, purses and their contents, shoes, a wallet and currency.{391} Craig Hendrix, a funeral coordinator and personal effects administrator with Douglass Air Disaster Funeral Coordinators, said to the paper: "We have some property for most passengers."{392} He said that United Airlines underwriter hired Douglass on 12 September 2001, to handle not only funeral arrangements for the victims but also the return of personal effects. Jerry and Beatrice Guadagno of Ewing,

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,381

This plan, seriously considered by the U.S. military, demonstrates that planting incriminating evidence to fake an aircraft crash has been previously considered by U.S. public officials in support of what they regarded as overriding foreign policy objectives. The nature, number and condition of the items found at the alleged crash site of flight UA93 — as reported above — especially in the light of Operation Northwoods, suggest

that the aforementioned personal items have been planted to fake the crash of flight UA93.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,405

Whichever of these above versions of the engine story is true, if any, the following facts should be retained from what is known: (a) There is no photographic evidence of this item; (b) No person actually testified to have seen this item; (c) The location where the item was found remains unsettled; (d) No mention is made why the other engine was not found; (e) The engine fan that was allegedly found, has not been confirmed as belonging to an engine bearing one of the above serial numbers; (f) No official document can be located, which confirms that an engine, or part thereof, bearing one the aforementioned engine serial numbers, had been found. The story above may either be a legend or refers to the finding of an object resembling an engine or a fan but not belonging to the aircraft designated as flight UA93 (tail N591UA). (i)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,469

(a) No evidence of Boeing 767 wreckage The absence of visible wreckage, the failure of the authorities to formally identify the debris, the lack of photographic and video evidence of recovery operations and the secrecy surrounding the site and the recovery, have been covered in previous chapters. (b) ACARS Edward Ballinger was the flight dispatcher in command for all 16 United Airlines' East Coast to West Coast flights, including flights UA175 and UA93 on 11 September 2001.{409} A document from the 9/11 Commission released in 2009 contains the log of so-called ACARS messages sent on the morning of 9/11 by Ballinger to numerous United Airlines aircraft, warning the pilots of cockpit intrusion.{410} ACARS, the acronym for Aircraft Communications Addressing and Reporting System, is a digital data link system for transmission of short, relatively simple messages between air controllers and aircraft via ground stations.{411} A network of VHF ground radio stations ensure that aircraft can communicate with ground end systems in real time. VHF communication is line-of-sight, and provides communication with ground-based transceivers (often referred to as Remote Ground Stations or RGSs). The typical range is dependent on altitude, with a maximal 200-mile transmission range common at high altitudes. Remote ground stations are located throughout the United States.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,515

In an interview, Michael Winter confirmed that ACARS messages were transmitted to flight UA93 in the above sequence via these ground stations.{417} David Knerr, Manager, Dispatch Automation at United Airlines, attended the interview. The above

timeline indicates that the last successful ACARS transmission to flight UA93 occurred at 10:10 via the remote ground station CMI located at Willard Airport near Champaign (Illinois), i.e. seven minutes after that aircraft had allegedly crashed near Shanksville, Pennsylvania, nearly 500 miles away![418]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,522

NEADS commander Colonel Robert Marr told the 9/11 Commission Staff in 2003 that "his focus [on 9/11] was on [flight] UA93, which was circling over Chicago."[419] Robert Marr did not specify when exactly the flight circled over Chicago. There appears no way to reconcile the presence of the aircraft near Chicago with that flight's crash at Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,527

A third source independently confirms that flight UA93 was proceeding westwards toward Indiana and did not crash at Shanksville, Pennsylvania. This document lists the Radio Base Stations (RBS) which transmitted phone calls from flight UA93 to ground recipients. This document is comprised of a set of fifty pages which were forwarded by the Department of Justice to the 9/11 Commission. These pages "describe cell phone and air phone calls placed by passengers and crew aboard American Airlines Flight No. 11, American Airlines Flight No. 77, United Airlines Flight No. 175, and United Airlines Flight No. 93 on 11 September 2001."[420] The list of phone calls from flight UA93 found in this document includes the codes of the Radio Base Stations (RBS) through which these calls were transmitted. The calls are listed in chronological order, beginning with a call by Thomas Burnett made at 8:30:32 (Indiana Standard Time), i.e., at 9:30:32 (EST). His call and a subsequent call by an unidentified flight attendant at 8:32:39 were transmitted through a Radio Base Station (RBS) located at Fort Wayne (Indiana). Most subsequent calls — until 9:53:43 — were transmitted through the RBS's located at Belleville (Michigan) and Columbus (Illinois). For the last two calls made by flight attendant CeeCee Lyles and passenger Edward Felt, no RBS's are provided. No explanation is given for this omission.[421] The software of the network operating the RBS's determines on the base of the aircraft's heading and other parameters the ground station that would establish the connection and allow the longest connect time with that particular station before handing the call to the next station.[422] That the aircraft assigned to flight UA93 reached Illinois or Indiana…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,554

Similarly to flight UA175, flight UA93 had also two take-off times. The existence of two take-off times suggests that two flights designated as UA93 took off from Newark and

served different purposes.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,586

According to the NTSB flight path study, flight UA175 effectuated a radical change of flight path between 8:51 and 8:56, essentially a 180° turn;{430} and the aircraft descended from 25,000 feet at 8:58 to 1,000 feet at 9:03 (crash time), with the last 8,000 feet descended in one minute (see the following two diagrams).{431} According to these diagrams, the last 60 miles of the flight were flown in approximately 4'40" minutes, putting the average speed for this segment at 774 mph. (1245 kmh), a supersonic speed.{432} We note that none of the phone callers from flight UA175 mentioned the radical turn made between 8:51 and 8:56 a.m. or the steep, supersonic, descent of the aircraft. Passengers Peter Hanson and Brian Sweeney talked to their families from flight UA175 at 9:00a.m. without mentioning any detour or rapid descent (see above diagram showing the estimated altitude of flight UA175 along the time axis).

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,615

Betty Ong (AA11) Her "emergency call" lasted approximately 25 minutes, "as Ong calmly and professionally relayed information" about the murder of a passenger and the contemporaneous stabbing of her colleagues. (9/11 Commission Final Report, p. 5) Madeline Sweeney (AA11) Sweeney "calmly reported on her line that … a man in first class had his throat slashed [and that] two flight attendants had been stabbed…" (9/11 Commission Final Report, p. 6). In an internal report issued by the FBI, Madeline Sweeney reportedly "described the atmosphere in the aircraft as calm while the hijacking was carried out."{434} Robert Fangman (UA175) According to Marc R. Policastro of United Airlines (SAMC), Robert Fangman, a flight attendant, called him and said that "both pilots had been murdered and a flight attendant had been stabbed." He added, though, that "he was reluctant to believe him because [he] was calm and there was no background noise."{435} Todd Beamer (UA93) According to telephone operator Lisa Jefferson, passenger Todd Beamer reported to her that the pilot and copilot were lying on the floor of first class, injured or dead.{436} She said his voice "was devoid of any stress. In fact, he sounded so tranquil it made me begin to doubt the authenticity and urgency of his call."{437} According to the transcript of Jefferson's conversation with Lisa, Beamer's wife, Jefferson told Beamer's wife that Todd Beamer was "calm, very calm. You wouldn't have thought it was a real call … because he was, um, he wasn't nervous at all. He was speaking in a normal tone of voice, he never got upset, not once."{438} Sandra Bradshaw (UA93) Richard Belme, the UAL manager who took the call of flight attendant Bradshaw, said she was "shockingly calm" while she was telling him that "two hijackers … had attacked and

killed" her colleague.{439} Thomas Burnett (UA93) In his first call to his wife, Tom Burnett told her that "they just knifed a guy." In the second call, he told her that the "guy they knifed is dead." Deena Burnett later described his third call: "[I]t was as if he was at Thoratec [the company he worked for], sitting at his desk, and we were having a regular conversation. It was the strangest thing because he was using the same tone of voice I had heard a thousand times. It calmed me to know he was so confident."{440} According to journalist and author Jere Longman, in his fourth call, Tom was also "speaking in a normal voice, calm."{441} Jeremy Glick (UA93) Jeremy Glick called his wife, Lyz, and told her his plane had been hijacked by three "Iranian-looking" males who told passengers that they intended to blow up the plane.{442} She recalled that "he was so calm, the plane sounded so calm, that if I hadn't seen what was going on on the TV, I wouldn't have believed it."{443} What he meant by "Iranian-looking" could have been, for all we know, Americans of Italian, Greek, Turkish, Israeli, Arab or Latin American descent.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,706

The alleged success of the alleged 9/11 hijackers in taking over the aircraft without opposition was commented on with surprise by 9/11 Commission staffer Dieter Snell. On 1 December 2003, 9/11 Commission's Vice-Chairman Lee Hamilton interviewed him on the progress of Commission's Team 1a.{455} According to the Notes of this interview taken by Ben Rhodes, "Dieter [found] it remarkable that [the hijackers] gained cockpit entry and controlled passengers even though none were physically imposing — the tallest was probably 5'8", and weight averaged 120-130 lbs."{456} But Snell did not pursue this line of inquiry. The passivity of flight AA11 passengers and those of Flights UA175 and AA77 suggests that no violent action –and thus no real hijacking — had taken place aboard these flights, contrary to what some flight attendants said in their calls. c.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,716

Betty Ong and Madeline Sweeney (AA11) spent 27 and 13 minutes respectively on the phone relaying information about murderous events allegedly occurring aboard their plane.{457} Presuming that both were veteran, conscientious and compassionate flight attendants, it is inconceivable that had their colleagues been really attacked and stabbed a few feet away, they would sit quietly and chat on the phone so long. The only explanation for their conduct is that they were not relating real events. We also note that neither Ong nor Sweeney attempted to find out how the alleged hijackers entered the cockpit. This cannot be attributed - as in some of the other calls - to the short duration of their phone calls. During the nearly half an hour Ong chatted on the telephone, she had ample time to find someone on the aircraft who might have told

her how the “hijackers” entered the cockpit, how many they were and who they might be. Assuming their sense of responsibility, these omissions are totally implausible and suggest, therefore, that the story of “hijackers” committing murder and entering the cockpit was fictitious. Renee May, a flight attendant on flight AA77, instead of calling the airline to report the hijacking, called her parents asking them to call the airline. {458} She even had to ask “someone” on the aircraft for the airlines telephone numbers. Yet she was a veteran flight attendant with American Airlines and should have known which numbers to call in case of an emergency. Flight attendants are trained how to proceed when experiencing an incident or a hijacking aboard the aircraft. This can hardly include calling dad and mom. The fact that she called her parents instead of the airlines indicates that there was no need to follow a hijacking procedure.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,731

Passengers Beamer and Glick (UA93) spent an inordinate time to chat on the telephone{459} while reporting alleged attacks in the plane. Beamer even indulged in telling a telephone operator about his wife and children and then they recited in common the Lord’s Prayer on the phone, as if there was no more urgent things to do on the plane.{460} Some other callers, apparently, also spent most of the time on the phone talking about private matters while only providing…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,739

In her call, Madeline Sweeney (AA11) said the “hijackers” had a bomb with yellow wires. {461} According to another report she reported to have observed “two boxes connected with red and yellow wire.“{462} According to a third report the men merely “said they had a bomb.”{463} According to a fourth report, she said: “There is a bomb in the cockpit.”{464} Whichever of these stories is true, Sweeney, as a responsible flight attendant would try and find out what this box or these boxes were, and whether there was…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,748

Officially, the number of passengers (excluding the crew and the alleged hijackers) on flights AA11, UA175 and AA77 was 76, 51, and 53, respectively, of which many were known to take initiatives in their private and professional lives. Yet no passenger from flight AA11, only two from flight…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,755

It should be recalled that in each of the four aircraft, passengers sat in close proximity to the cockpit door and could observe all movements to and from the cockpit.{466} Some of these passengers made phone calls but did not mention that anybody entered the cockpit, let alone by force. None of the flight attendants, either, reported in their phone calls having observed anyone enter the cockpit. These glaring omissions suggest that no “hijacker” entered the cockpit and certainly not by violent means.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,765

Four of the flight attendants who made phone calls to the ground — Betty Ong (AA11), Robert Fangman (UA175), Renee May (AA77) and CeeCee Lyles (UA93) — did not describe the “hijackers” in any way. Moreover, they displayed no apparent curiosity to find out who the “hijackers” were. Winston Sadler of the American Airlines Southeast Reservation Center twice asked Flight attendant Betty Ong (AA11) to describe the “hijackers”, but she ignored his questions. It is of significance that his questions only appear on the first, and largely unknown, transcript of Betty Ong’s call.{468} Passenger Mark Bingham (UA93) likewise did not respond to the direct question “Who are they?”{469} Passenger Thomas Burnett (UA93) called his wife four times, yet he never described the “hijackers.”{470} Joseph DeLuca and Linda Gronlund traveled together on flight UA93 in First Class. They had seats 2A and 2B. According to FBI documents, they were “sandwiched” between three “hijackers” who had seats 1B, 3C and 3D. Both DeLuca and Gronlund made phone calls, yet neither of them described the “hijackers.”{471} The mother of flight UA175 passenger Brian Sweeney, Louise, was interviewed by the FBI in 2001. She said she had asked her son, “Who are the hijackers?” to which he answered “I don’t know who they are” and did not mention their appearance.{472} According to Michael Woodward, a ground employee of American Airlines, Madeline Sweeney, a flight attendant on flight AA11 told him, however, that the “hijackers” appear Middle Eastern.{473} Jeremy Glick of flight UA93 told his wife Elizabeth, too, that the “hijackers” looked Arab or Iranian.{474} He was the only caller from that flight (from 12 callers) who made this observation, but as suggested in the analysis of his phone call in my book Hijacking America’s Mind on 9/11 (Chapters 7-10), he reported bogus events. If conspicuously looking Middle Eastern hijackers had been present in the aircraft, surely more callers would have mentioned this fact.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,789

Numerous callers said that the alleged hijackers had made some kind of announcement. Yet no caller mentioned their foreign accent. Jeremy Glick (UA93) said to his wife that “the hijackers had herded the passengers into the rear of the plane and

told them that if they did not crash into the World Trade Center, they were going to blow up the plane," yet he also said to his wife that they "did not speak English",{475} so how did he understand them? Peter Hanson, a passenger on flight 175, claimed in his call to his father to have "overheard" the alleged hijackers "talking about eight planes being hijacked."{476} He did not mention the language in which they spoke. The fact that none of the callers mentioned the foreign accent or language of the "hijackers" suggests that the "hijackers" were not foreigners or that they did not make the alleged announcements. j.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,799

When an incident occurs aboard an aircraft, flight attendants must immediately contact the pilot, for he carries the primary responsibility for the safety of the plane and its passengers. Except for the flight attendants aboard flight AA11, no other flight attendant mentioned any attempt to contact the pilots and report to them hijackings. This…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,804

Some of the callers said that one passenger and two flight attendants had been stabbed and even killed on flight UA93. Tom Burnett told his wife Deena in his first call at 9:27 that "they already knifed a guy" (not indicating who "they" were). Burnett's seat number was 4B. As all four "hijackers" had, according to the FBI, booked seats in First Class and all male First Class passengers from this flight made phone calls,{477} the knifed guy could only have been Mark Rothenberg (seat 5B). Yet none of the other callers from First Class (Mark Bingham, 4D; Joseph DeLuca, 2B; Edward Felt, 2D; and Linda Gronlund, 2A) mentioned a stabbing. It is thus probable that Thomas Burnett did not report a real event but was merely told by someone about this real or fictive event. The same reasoning applies to other callers who claimed that a passenger or a flight attendant had been stabbed. Jeremy Glick (UA93), who had a long phone conversation with his wife from the plane{478}, did not mention any violent activity aboard the aircraft. CeeCee Lyles, a flight…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,817

According to flight attendants Betty Ong and Madeline Sweeney who called from flight AA11, a former officer in an elite unit of the Israeli army, Daniel Lewin, had been fatally slashed on that flight.{480} No passenger, including those sitting near him, is known to have witnessed the attack on Lewin. According to Brad Rephen, a New York lawyer and a childhood friend of Lewin, "with his training, [Lewin] would have killed [his attackers] with his bare hands." He added: "I can tell you, their knives would not have stopped

him. He would have taken their knives or their box cutters and used them against them...He knows how to fight with knives."{481} According to flight attendant Ong, passengers believed that a “medical emergency” had occurred in the plane. How could passengers believe that a fatal stabbing was a medical emergency? Were the passengers blind? Or was nobody actually stabbed? Reporting a bogus attack on Daniel Lewin could, however, be useful.…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,843

Flight attendant Madeline Sweeney (AA11) reportedly said in her call that “three men were in the cockpit and in control of the plane.”{483} As no pilot would voluntarily relinquish control over passenger aircraft to a stranger, it would follow that the “hijackers” had removed the pilots by force from their seats or even killed them. This could not, however, have happened without the risk of disturbing the instrument settings and endangering the flight. That the alleged removal of the pilots and copilots of flight AA11 (and of the other three flights) occurred without a hitch is inconceivable, especially if the door of the cockpit had been locked. One must not forget that the “hijackers” had to simultaneously overpower two people in the cockpit. No one, and least of all the 9/11 Commission, has yet proposed a plausible scenario that could explain how the “hijackers” succeeded in entering the cockpits and overpowering the pilots and copilots of the four airliners without anyone noticing a struggle. p.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,852

According to the official account, flight AA11 made a “dramatic turn to the south,” i.e. diverged radically from its planned route, between 8:26 and 8:28a.m.{484} Neither Betty Ong nor Madeline Sweeney, both veteran flight attendants who used to fly this route, reported, however, this turn. This suggests that no such turn was made by that aircraft towards New York City.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,857

According to Ted Olson, the husband of flight AA77 passenger Barbara Olson, his wife told him that the “pilot had announced that the plane had been hijacked.”{485} She asked her husband what she should tell the pilot. This was a rather surprising question. Assuming that Barbara actually asked that question, this would mean either that the pilot had made the above announcement, thereby raising the question why he did not “squawk” the hijack code 7500, as required, or was she told by someone to make this statement, regardless of the facts. In that case, her statement would have been deliberately deceptive. Barbara’s message is one of the most significant statements

made by any of the callers because however one looks it, it undermines the official legend of the hijacking.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,876

Betty Ong (AA11) said that passengers from First Class on the same flight had been moved to Coach. This was not mentioned by her colleague Sweeney. On flight UA93, two callers (Bradshaw and Glick) said that the passengers had been moved to the back of the plane. Yet no other caller mentioned this glaring fact, not even Burnett who called four times his wife and Beamer, who had a long conversation with Lisa Jefferson.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,887

The FAA subsequently changed its report, removing the reference to a gun. Peter Hanson (UA175) said to his father Lee, that he had seen a stewardess being shot in the head.{489} His comment was ignored in the "official" Hanson interview. Mercy Lorenzo, an employee of AT&T called the FBI on the morning of 9/11 after she received a phone call from a caller, later identified as Barbara Olson (AA77). Barbara reportedly told Lorenzo that the "hijackers" were armed with guns and knives.{490} The comment was disregarded by the FBI. A gun was reported by Tom Burnett (UA93), calling his wife Deena. Deena said to the London Times, "[Tom] told me one of the hijackers had a gun. He wouldn't have made it up. Tom grew up around guns. He was an avid hunter and we have guns in our home. If he said there was a gun on board, there was."{491} The comment was ignored by the FBI.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,916

Before their disintegration on 9/11, the Twin Towers rose to the height of 1,368 and 1,362 feet, respectively (or 417 and 415 meters), comprising 110 floors each. Their width and depth was 208 feet each (or 63 m). They were at the time the highest buildings in the United States. On the morning of 9/11, no firefighter expected any of the World Trade buildings to undergo a complete structural failure. For example, the battalion chief of the New York Fire Department stated in a transcribed testimony that "there was never a thought that this whole thing is coming down.'{492} At

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,926

The reason no one anticipated a total collapse was simple: No modern, steel-reinforced high-rise building had previously disintegrated as a result of an uncontrolled office fire.

{494} Indeed, none of the institutions tasked with investigating the disintegration of the buildings cited any precedent.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,931

At around 11:55 a.m. on 11 September 2001, the official theory about the disintegration of the Twin Towers was launched by Fox News' Rick Leventhal interview with Mark Walsh, who appeared to have been selected randomly on the street. Walsh described the events to viewers on camera with great fluency, a description that would become the official explanation for the disintegration of the Twin Towers: I was [unintelligible] the 43d floor of the building, which is five blocks from the World Trade Center itself. I witnessed the entire thing, from beginning to end… I was watching with my roommate, it was approximately several minutes after the first plane hit, I saw this plane come out from nowhere, and just rammed [indicating the aircraft's movement with a hand gesture] right into the side of the Twin Tower, exploding through the other side. And then I witnessed both towers collapse, one first and then the second, mostly due to structural failure because the fire was just too intense.{495} Those who have watched the interview with Mark Walsh could not fail to notice the fluency with which he was able to describe and explain the disintegration of the Twin Towers ninety minutes after the events. His use of the technical expression "structural failure" and the formal vocabulary "witnessed" and "due" (rather than "saw" and "because of") suggests that he had been coached for the interview. The comments of Jerome (Jerry) Hauer, at the time head of Mayor Giuliani's New York Office of Emergency Management (OEM), also anticipated early on the official theory of the disintegration of the Twin Towers. Asked by Dan Rather on CBS News just hours after the disintegration of the buildings whether it is possible that a plane crash could have caused the collapse of these buildings, or whether "it [would] have required the, sort of, prior positioning of other explosives in the…buildings?" Hauer stammered: No, I, uh, my sense is just the velocity of the plane and the fact that you have a plane filled with fuel hitting that building, uh, that burned, uh, the velocity of that plane, uh, certainly, uh, uh, had an impact on the structure itself, and then the fact that it burned and you had that intense heat, uh, probably weakened the structure as well, uh, and I think it, uh, was, uh, simply the, uh, the planes hitting the buildings and, and causing the collapse.{496} How could Hauer be so certain that no explosives were used to demolish the buildings, having no evidence to build on, except what he saw on television? It is not surprising that the interview was not shown again.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,963

By September 28, 2001, 130,000 tons of debris had already been removed from Ground Zero,{499} in what one journalist with unrestricted access to the site called,

“the most aggressive possible schedule of demolition and debris removal.”{500}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,980

The illegal removal and destruction of the steel evidence was equally addressed by the Committee on Science of the U.S. House of Representatives. In its report of 6 March 2002, it states:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,069

It appears that the FEMA-BPAT study did not satisfy anyone. It left many questions unanswered and the official theory regarding the disintegration of the Twin Towers vulnerable to critique. Apparently, FEMA asked the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) already in January 2002 to “take over the next phase of the investigation of the collapse essentially to build upon the BPAT recommendations and conduct a more thorough investigation of the events leading to the collapse.”{532} The disintegration itself was not to be investigated. Under the heading “Purpose and Scope”, NIST’s final report similarly indicates that “[o]ne of the four objectives of the investigation” was to “develop and evaluate failure hypotheses, resulting in the probable sequence of structural events leading to collapse for each WTC tower.”{533} While the WTC investigation by NIST was funded by the government and was promoted as a scientific effort, no part of any report resulting from NIST’s investigation was allowed to be admitted as evidence in a court or used in any suit or action for damages. Additionally, NIST employees involved with these investigations were not permitted to serve as expert witnesses.{534}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,107

The BBC felt confident enough to claim by 13 September 2001 that the “steel cores inside [the towers] reached temperatures of 800 °C” and quoted structural engineer Chris Wise to the effect that “nothing on Earth could survive those temperatures with that amount of fuel burning.”{539} The building’s construction manager, Hyman Brown, also quoted by the BBC, even claimed that the “24,000 gallons of aviation fluid melted the steel. Nothing is designed or will be designed to withstand that fire.”{540} Apart from the absurd claim that burning aviation fuel can melt steel, it is odd that the named experts would feel sufficiently confident to provide a definitive explanation for the disintegration of the Twin Towers just two days after the event. Giving these experts the benefit of the doubt and reinterpreting their statements as meaning that the fire was hot enough to “weaken” the steel structure rather than to melt it, let us examine what evidence there is for the claim that this was the case.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,156

NIST acknowledged that the “performance of the steel within the structures played a key role in how the buildings performed, from impact to final collapse.” Yet of a total of 200,000 tons of structural steel used in the construction of the Twin Towers, NIST was only provided with about 230 steel samples from the Twin Towers on which to base its analysis.{551} In sum, neither the FEMA-BPAT team nor NIST presented evidence that any portions of the steel structures of the Twin Towers had been subjected long enough to temperatures high enough to cause a complete structural failure.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,229

Testimonies of explosions in the World Trade Center were reported on mainstream television on the very day of 11 September 2001.{564} On 12 September 2001, two U.S. Senators referred to explosions and blasts in the World Trade Center: Senator Mary Landrieu (Louisiana) referred to “explosions which brought down skyscrapers”{565} and Senator Olympia Snowe (Maine) referred to the “sounds of blasts [which] echoed across Manhattan and our Nation’s Capital.”{566} Thereafter, however, evidence of explosions was not mentioned again in the mainstream media. Between October 2001 and January 2002, five hundred and three firefighters, paramedics, and emergency medical technicians involved at the World Trade Center on 9/11 were interviewed about their experience. Their transcribed testimonies, comprising more than 12,000 pages, were released in 2005 under the title The Oral Histories, after The New York Times went to court and obtained their release. They are posted on the website of the newspaper. {567} Over one hundred interviewees said they heard, saw or felt explosions before and during the buildings’ disintegration.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,292

Graeme MacQueen examined the Oral Histories and compiled a rigorous study entitled “118 Witnesses: Firefighters’ Testimony to Explosions in the Twin Towers.” This study was published in the Journal of 9/11 Studies, August 2006.{579} While not every testimony can be taken at face value, cumulatively these testimonies constitute an impressive body of evidence in support of the view that explosives were used to destroy the Twin Towers. In an email I received from Professor Jonathan Barnett, who participated in the FEMA-BPAT team and was one of the five key authors of the team’s final report,{580} he wrote that in the team’s view the explosions had been “local events, not demolitions but rather the sound of structural failures.” He did not offer any evidence to support this claim and ignored the fact that some witnesses did not

only hear, but also saw and felt explosions. NIST for its part completely ignored these testimonies.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,344

How did the purveyors of the official account explain the presence of molten steel at Ground Zero? One explanation, given by Mark Loiseaux, president of Controlled Demolition Inc., was that continuing fires were fueled by “paper, carpet and other combustibles packed down the elevator shafts by the tower floors as they ‘pancaked’ into the basement.”{590} Another explanation, by Manuel Garcia, a physicist, was that cars left in parking garages under the Twin Towers contained gasoline that may have fueled the fires.{591} But the fact remains that none of these materials, nor any other fuels that are known to have been present in the World Trade Center, had sufficient potential energy to generate the heat necessary to melt construction grade steel beams (2,800 F). For this reason the observed discovery of molten steel under the pile suggests an energy source that has not yet been determined. NIST did not address at all the issue of molten steel in its 10,000-page report. After being subjected to heavy criticism for numerous omissions, including that of ignoring the molten steel, NIST issued in 2006 a set of answers to “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQs) on its website, including the following: Why did the NIST investigation not consider reports of molten steel in the wreckage from the WTC towers? Answer: … The condition of the steel in the wreckage of the WTC towers (i.e., whether it was in a molten state or not) was irrelevant to the investigation

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,388

Fireman Al Lynch, 41, said, “It looked like an atom bomb hit it. There was white ash everywhere. Everything was covered in white. There were five or six inches of powder. You look at the place where the buildings were, and they’ve just disintegrated.”{599} The New York Times of 13 September 2001 cited prominent journalists who compared the disintegration of the Twin Towers to “Mount St. Helen’s” (Brian William, MSNBC), to a “nuclear winter” (Tom Brokaw, NBC) and as standing “on the edge of a crater of a volcano” (Diane Sawyer, ABC).{600} Such comparisons were never repeated. The extent of “dustification” could not be accurately determined but can be estimated by the size of the dust clouds, the surprisingly small height of the pile at Ground Zero and the nearly total absence of broken furniture, computers, telephones and other such artifacts in the rubble. Mike Finnerty, San Diego Fire-Rescue Department battalion chief, who spent 10 days at Ground Zero, recalled that the “only (solid) thing that was left was steel. Everything else had been ground up. There was no concrete; there were no desks; there were no phones. There was no discernible office furniture at all.”{601} A video documentary provides further testimonies of eyewitnesses who corroborate the

puzzling absence of office equipment, furniture and other human artifacts from the rubble of Ground Zero.{602} Thomas Von Essen, New York's Fire Commissioner at the time, and former firefighter, described the puzzling sight in his book Strong of Heart:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,410

Residents of Lower Manhattan spent months ridding their residences of ultra-fine and toxic dust.{604} Thousands of workers at Ground Zero and residents of Lower Manhattan suffered and continue to suffer severe health impairment from that dust. Some died prematurely and numerous workers had to quit their jobs as a result. Entire organizations were established to care for the victims of this dust and demand compensation.{605}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,426

The FEMA-BPAT team and NIST investigators totally ignored the massive "dustification" of the buildings and the puzzling absence of broken or crushed office furniture and artifacts on the ground. The most sinister aspect of the "dustification" is that more than 1,100 victims at the World Trade Center have literally vanished. As of 11 September 2011 — exactly ten years after 9/11 - 1,120 families{607} "have never received a trace of remains, not even a fragment of bone" of their loved ones from the World Trade Center.{608} The mother of Michael Ragusa, a victim at Ground Zero, could not fathom that there is "no trace of so many people. It can't happen that way… People don't just disappear." According to Dr. Michael Baden, New York state's chief forensic pathologist and an expert in pathology, most of the victims' bodies should have been identifiable, because the fires had not reached 3200 °F for 30 minutes, the temperature and time necessary to incinerate a body.{609} So, what happened to the bodies of 1,120 people?

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,449

Fire Commissioner Thomas von Essen, however, said his deputy Ray Downey warned him in advance of the impending demise of the buildings.{615} Other witnesses, too, were advised about the impeding "collapse": • Fire Chief Joseph Pfeifer said: "Right before the South Tower collapsed, I noticed a lot of people just left the lobby, and I heard we had a crew of all different people, high-level people in government, everybody was gone, almost like they had information that we didn't have."{616} • EMS Division Chief John Peruggia said: "It was brought to my attention [...] that the structural damage [...] was quite significant and they felt that the North Tower was in danger of a near imminent collapse."{617} He did not say who warned him. • EMT Richard Zarrillo said: "I was just with John at OEM [at WTC-7]. OEM says the buildings

are going to collapse; we need to get out." He was then brought to Chief Ganci. [...] I said, listen, I was just at OEM. The message I was given was that the buildings are going to collapse; we need to get our people out. At that moment [...] the first tower came down."{618} The identity of "John" remains shrouded in mystery. The evacuation of WTC Nr. 7 and of the OEM occurred before the disintegration of the South Tower.{619} Mayor Rudy Giuliani told to ABC News on 11 September at 12:59p.m.: "We were told the WTC was gonna' to collapse."{620} The above information suggests that some people had advance knowledge about the impending disintegration of the Twin Towers and warned high officials, but not the hundreds of 300 firefighters who died as a result.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,563

The first explanation given by Giuliani for locating the OEM at the WTC-7 was that he wanted a command center in walking distance of City Hall.{637} A further explanation was that the Secret Service had offices in the building.{638} After 9/11 he claimed that he had chosen the site because of the WTC 1993 bombing.{639} While the first two explanations were tenuous, the third was an outright lie. As reported below, none of the exercises organized by the OEM since its establishment were conducted to prepare for an attack on the WTC complex.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,571

The command center needed sufficient space for representatives of all City agencies who might participate in a multi-agency response to a major calamity. But what was the rationale for building a bunker with "food and beds" for 30 high officials and for Giuliani's family on the 23rd floor of a building near a terrorist target? Originally, in 1996, the space needed for the OEM was estimated 15,000 to 17,000 square feet, including a private office for the mayor, a press room, 10 other small offices, and room for up to 40 agencies in the center itself. A year later, when the first meetings about the renovation of WTC-7 began, the city's plan called for 46,000 square feet, eventually hitting over 50,000.{640} No explanation was given for tripling the space allocated to the center. (c)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,579

The placement of fuel tanks in WTC-7 above the ground was crucial for Giuliani, who absolutely refused to place these underground. A real dispute ensued in which arms were twisted in order to force Giuliani's will, although such placement was not only a violation of New York building codes but actually dangerous.{641} Why was it so

important for Giuliani to locate fuel tanks above ground, an issue that he should have normally left to experts? (d)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,585

Was the command center used at all prior to 9/11 and if so, for what purpose? According to authors Wayne Barrett and Dan Collins, the OEM "orchestrated 10 major drills and exercises [before 9/11] but none of them involved the targeted WTC complex or even replicated the 1993 attack elsewhere."{642} According to OEM's Jerry Hauer, Steven Kuhr, and Kevin Culley, the agency never even had a tabletop exercise about a high-rise fire, terrorist-connected or otherwise.{643} Asked by authors Barrett and Collins if Mayor Giuliani was truthful when he depicted himself as someone who understood the terrorist threat prior to 9/11, ABC News commentator John Miller, at that time a top aide to Police Commissioner Bill Bratton,{644} told them, "Hello, history. Get me rewrite." None of a dozen former Giuliani aides, including Deputy Mayor Fran Reiter and Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications Commissioner Ralph Balzano, could remember a single example of any expression of interest in the security of the World Trade Center on Giuliani's part.{645} The OEM never developed a response plan for a high-rise fire, said Steven Kuhr, Director of Emergency Management for New York City.{646}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,625

Giuliani's statement was deceptive because it implied that the OEM was functional on 9/11. As will be seen in the next subsection, the OEM was not used at all on 9/11. It was evacuated within 40 minutes of the reported impact of a second plane. Mayor Giuliani never set foot in his OEM on 9/11.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,670

As NIST did not possess steel beams from WTC-7, NIST investigators estimated the probable temperatures to which particular columns were heated through a computer model. By tweaking variables, any result could be achieved. Thus on p. 53 of their Final Report the authors state that "the simulated fires on floors 7, 12 and 13 heated portions of the tops of the floor slabs to over 900 C (1650 F) … The temperatures of some sections of the beams supporting floors 8, 12, 13 and 14 exceeded 600 C (1100 F)."{659} Apart of being the result of simulations, NIST did not and could not determine how long structural elements were subjected to such temperatures.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,690

On 15 September 2008 a group of scientists, scholars, engineers and building professionals called on NIST “to publicly release its models and modeling data so that members of the scientific community can test whether other, more reasonable, assumptions will also result in global collapse of the structure. After all, a scientific hypothesis cannot be widely accepted unless it is repeatable by others.”{661} NIST ignored this request and refused to release its modeling data.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,699

Let us consider what NIST said about these efforts. Due to the focus on rescuing people trapped in the debris field, providing aid to the injured, and the loss of water in the hydrant system, FDNY (the Fire Department of New York) was not able to consider the possibility of fighting the fires in WTC 7 until approximately 1:00 p.m. At approximately 2:30 p.m., FDNY gave the order to forego firefighting activity and for personnel to withdraw to a safe distance from the building.{663} According to interviews with members of the FDNY, water was never an issue at WTC-7 since firefighting was never started in the building.{664} At another place in the report, NIST attempts again to create the impression that firefighting activities took place for a limited time in WTC-7: As early as 11:30 a.m., FDNY found that there was no water supplied by the hydrant system to fight the fires that were visible. With the collapses of the towers fresh in their minds, there was concern that WTC 7 too might collapse, risking the lives of additional firefighters. Within the next two hours, serious discussions were underway regarding the cessation of any efforts to save WTC 7, and the final order to cease was given at about 2:30 p.m.{665} I found no evidence for any firefighting efforts in WTC-7 on 9/11. The reference to “cessation of efforts” remains unsubstantiated.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,746

The unusually detailed explanation of why explosions could not have occurred reveals the weight given to such reasoning. By setting an artificially high threshold of sound level (130 dB to 140), below which explosions would be automatically excluded, NIST could ignore a recording of explosions accompanying the collapse of WTC-7 and presented by David Chandler.{670} First Responder Craig Bartmer, who witnessed the collapse of WTC-7 said that during the collapse he heard a constant “thum, thum, thum, thum, thum” and added: “I think I know an explosion when I hear it.”{671} Barry Jennings told ABC 7 on 9/11 that he and Michael Hess experienced an explosion inside WTC-7 in the morning and became trapped in the building: We made it to the eighth floor [of WTC 7]. Big explosion. Blew us back into the eighth floor. And I turned to Hess and said: “This is it. We’re dead. We’re not gonna to make it out of here.” I took a fire

extinguisher and busted a window out. This gentleman here heard my cry for help. {672} Associated Press reported about Jennings' testimony on the day of the attacks, attempting to impute what he felt and heard to the collapse of another building, although the destruction of the lobby of WTC-7 was far more probably the result of explosions inside WTC-7: Housing Authority worker Barry Jennings, 46, reported to a command center on the 23rd floor of 7 World Trade Center. He

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,767

In 2007 Jennings was interviewed by Dylan Avery, one of the producers of the film Loose Change. In this interview, Jennings provided detailed information about his ordeal in WTC-7. The complete interview was released in 2008 after the BBC interviewed Jennings and attempted to misrepresent what he said.{674} In the interview with Dylan Avery, Jennings confirmed what he had already mentioned in the interview with ABC 7 on 11 September 2001 and added the following details, including having heard several explosions in WTC-7: When

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,782

According to Jennings' account, the explosion he and Mr. Hess experienced occurred before the disintegration of WTC-1 (the North Tower). It follows that what he experienced could not have been caused by falling debris from WTC-1 but originated from within building WTC-7. Later in the interview, he was asked to specify exactly when he entered WTC-7. He answered: "I had to be inside on the 23rd floor when the 2nd plane hit," that is, at 9:03 a.m.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,801

In his interview with Dylan Avery, Jennings mentioned that he had to step over people while being rescued. In his BBC interview, he did not retract what he told Dylan Avery, but merely stated that he did not "see" the bodies over which he had stepped. He carefully avoided contradicting himself, indicating that he stood by his erstwhile interview that at the time had not yet been released. Jennings was also interviewed by NIST. The agency, however, denied a FOIA request to release the transcript of that interview conducted in the spring of 2004.{680} The explanation for its denial is worth mentioning. NIST invoked a legal provision allowing the denial of information "not directly related to the building failure."{681} NIST did not mention in its final report on WTC-7 the explosions and the destruction of the lobby mentioned by Jennings. NIST did not mention that they were trapped for at least 90 minutes but attempted to imply that their rescue began immediately after firefighters became aware of their presence in the building.{682} Michael Hess, who was trapped in WTC-7 with Barry Jennings, was

interviewed by Frank Ucciardo of UPN9 TV on 11 September 2001 at 12:33 a.m. Eastern Time (11:33 Central Time).{683} The interview was conducted “on Broadway about a block from City Hall,” i.e., almost a half mile from WTC-7. He confirmed that he, too, went to the OEM on the 23rd floor. “When all the power went out in the building, another gentleman [Jennings] and I walked down to the eighth floor where there was an explosion and we were trapped on the 8th floor. There was thick smoke around us for an hour and a half, but the New York Fire Department came and got us out.” Hess did not elaborate further.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,828

Barry Jennings died unexpectedly on 19 August 2008 at the age of 53,{685} two days before the release of the Draft Final Report on the collapse of WTC-7 by NIST. He could no longer challenge NIST’s account. Dylan Avery expressed his concern that Jennings’ death may have been the result of foul play. Michael Hess survived. He became Giuliani Partners senior managing director.{686} (9)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,872

According to NIST, the fire alarm system in WTC-7 was placed on TEST for a period of 8 hours beginning at 6:47:03a.m. on 11 September 2001. It sent only one signal (at 10:00:52a.m.) to the monitoring company indicating a fire condition. The signal did not contain any specific information about the location of the fire within the building.{692} It was not revealed who set the fire alarm system on TEST on the morning of 9/11 or for what purpose. Nor has anyone explained what effect this setting might have had on the development of fires in the building, or why the single signal was sent at 10:00:52.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,924

Blogger shoestring provided an interesting explanation for the multiple premature reports of that collapse. He wrote: “Perhaps the real reason we heard these premature reports was that this information had somehow been passed to the media by the 9/11 perpetrators, as a cautious attempt at preventing speculation that WTC-7 was brought down with explosives. This was clearly what the collapse resembled.”{698} Another explanation would be that WTC-7 was scheduled to be demolished in the morning, together with the North Tower, but that somehow that attempt had failed. The purpose would have been to create the impression that its demise was caused by that of the North Tower.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,946

This explanation is false, as no firefighting at all took place in WTC-7. Therefore, “pull it” can only have meant “pull down the building,” i.e., demolish it. The problem here is that it takes weeks, if not months, to prepare such a large building for demolition. It was not possible to do so on the spur of the moment, as implied by Silverstein’s answer. One possible explanation for his comment is that Silverstein knew about the demolition plan and tried to present it as an ad hoc decision. Another possibility is that he did not know about the demolition plan and was asked for his permission for the demolition to create the impression that he possessed foreknowledge in order to frame him in the suspected conspiracy. Whatever the truth is, Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth provide a reasonable summary of this matter:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,164

Daniel Marcus, General Counsel of the 9/11 Commission, requested in the name of the commission that the United States Secret Service provide the Commission with “all documents related to threats to the President and/or Air Force One on September 11, 2001.”{713} There is no evidence that the Commission ever received these documents. While mass media have long buried this story, it has never been revealed who initiated this threat and what was its purpose. The overt effects of this threat were that President Bush did not return to Washington, D.C. for the entire day of 9/11. Was President Bush threatened with a shoot-down in order to force him to agree to some undisclosed demands? The story also incidentally served to construe the incidents of 9/11 as an act of war in which the President himself was targeted. (b)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,172

On 26 September 2001, Shay Sullivan of the Longboat Observer, a newspaper published in Longboat Key, Florida, reported what may have occurred at the Colony Beach and Tennis Report on Longboat Key, where President Bush dwelt overnight before visiting a school class on 11 September 2001. Fire Marshal Carroll Mooneyhan was at the front desk of the resort had overheard a strange exchange between a receptionist and a security guard. As related by Mooneyhan, a van occupied by men of Middle Eastern descent had pulled up to the Colony about 6 a.m. on 11 September 2001 and said they had a “pool side” interview with the President.{714} Who were the men who claimed to have an appointment with the President at this time and location? And what was their intention? Or, if that story was invented, what was the purpose of promoting it? In 2004, journalist Susan Taylor Martin of the St. Petersburg Times, claimed that Mooneyhan denies he ever told the Longboat Observer about any men seeking an interview with President Bush in the morning of 9/11.{715} She did not attempt to find out the origin of that bizarre story. According to author Daniel

Hopsicker, Carroll Mooneyhan told him years later: “I was visited by the CIA and the Secret Service after 9/11. I have a career to think about. I have to be careful what I say.”{716} If the story was true, it would suggest an attempt to scare President Bush. If the story was false, its purpose would have been to exacerbate the public fear of Islamic terrorism.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,319

A team of volunteers from the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) was established in the very afternoon of 11 September 2001 to examine the structural damage of the Pentagon building. It is not known how the team was so rapidly assembled and who selected its members. The team published its findings in January 2003 under the title “The Pentagon Building Performance Report.”{742} The six-member core team was headed by Paul F. Mlakar, and included Mete A. Sozen.{743} The report’s authors indicated that their study would follow ”a similar examination [to that] of the 19 April 1995, bombing of the Murrah Federal Office Building in Oklahoma City,”{744} in which they jointly participated, along with Gene Corley, the head of the FEMA-BPAT study team of the World Trade Center (see above). The declared purpose of the ASCE investigation was “to examine the performance of the structure in the crash and the subsequent fire for the benefit of the building professions and the public.”{745} One is entitled to wonder why structural engineers previously involved in examining the effects of terrorist bombings would be called upon to study the effects of an aircraft crash. Were terrorist motives or the use of explosives — presumably common to both cases — relevant in assessing structural performance, or were these persons chosen for their political loyalty? Equally disturbing as this surprising and swift choice of experts was the lack of thoroughness of their investigation. The team obtained only limited access to the crime site at the Pentagon. The team leader alone, Paul Mlakar, obtained “limited access” to the Pentagon site between 14 and 21 September 2001.{746} On 4 October 2001, the entire team “inspected the interior and exterior of the damaged area of the Pentagon for approximately 4 hours.” By that time “all debris from the aircraft and structural collapse had been removed.”{747} Most of their analysis was based on photographs they obtained from the Pentagon, some of which they presented in their report. The team admitted that the “volume of information concerning the aircraft crash into the Pentagon on September 11 is rather limited,”{748} yet did not hesitate to assert that “a Boeing 757-200 aircraft, originally delivered in 1991” had crashed into the Pentagon with 64 persons on board.{749} To support its claim, the report cites three eyewitnesses interviewed by team leader Mlakar on 8 January 2002.{750} None of these witnesses, however, claimed that the impacting aircraft had been a Boeing 757-200, which was delivered in 1991 and that it had carried 64 persons on board. They could obviously not determine these facts by sight. Due to its preconceived assumptions, the ASCE team excluded any alternative causes for the structural damage they observed at the Pentagon (and the causes for

the deaths of over 190 persons). It appears, therefore, that the team's main task had been to provide a scientific garb to the official account, namely that flight…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,418

The Commission was initially allocated a derisory budget of $3 million,{769} compared with the $40 million price tag of the Ken Starr investigation{770} or the $112 million spent by NASA investigating the Columbia space shuttle tragedy in which seven people died.{771} When asked for an additional $8 million for the 9/11 Commission's work, President Bush initially balked.{772} Or compare the sums allocated to the investigation with the estimated cost — $56 million — of a memorial at the alleged crash site of flight UA93, proposed under another legislation and signed by the same George W. Bush in 2002.{773} By drastically limiting the funds allocated to the 9/11 Commission, the White House further ensured that its investigation could not be thorough. (7)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,430

The White House did not deem it sufficient to restrict the scope, prerogatives and budget of the 9/11 Commission and to appoint an insider as Executive Director. After the Commission finally started its work, the White House made significant efforts to thwart the work of the Commission. It did so by denying the Commission access to critical documents, preventing witnesses from testifying before the Commission, and responding with inordinate delays. It was reported toward the end of March 2003 that "most members [of the 9/11 Commission] have yet to receive the security clearances needed before they can review classified material."{774} The Bush administration insisted that when any member of any federal agency testified before the 9/11 commission, at least one or more other members of that agency be present. At an 8 July 2003 news conference, 9/11 Commission Chairman Thomas Kean publicly complained about the use of such "minders" during interviews of federal employees. He called it intimidation to have "somebody sitting behind you all the time who you either work for or works for your agency."{775} Detailed insight into White House efforts to thwart the work of the 9/11 Commission are contained in an email from Dana Hyde, a commission staffer, to the Commission's Front Office, dated 2 March 2004.{776} On 25 February 2004, President George W. Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney agreed to meet with the chair and vice-chair of the 9/11 Commission but preferred not to meet with all members.{777} Bush initially demanded that he submit to only a single hour of questioning{778} but dropped that demand after being allowed to testify jointly with Dick Cheney.{779} When asked in a press conference about the rationale for the joint appearance of the President and the Vice President, Commission Chairman Thomas Kean quipped: "Well, we recognize that Mr. Bush may

help Mr. Cheney with some of the answers." Kean's remark sparked laughter among the assembled reporters. They all knew that the White House requested the joint appearance so Cheney could coach Bush on his answers. Bush himself declined to explain the rationale for the joint meeting.{780} Bush insisted, however, successfully, that there be no formal transcript or recording made of their testimony and that they would not have to testify under oath.{781} President Bush told reporters in the White House Rose Garden, shortly after the closed-door session ended that "it was just a good discussion… Commissioners had a lot of good questions. I enjoyed it."{782} Occasionally, government agencies refused to let their employees testify before the Commission. In one notorious case, the Department of Defense forbade a military intelligence officer to testify that "Mohamed Atta" and other alleged hijackers had been known to the authorities long before 9/11.{783} Such refusals were not numerous, however. Far more serious was the Commission's deliberate neglect of numerous persons whom the Commission should have…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,463

The Commission held 12 public hearings between 31 March 2003 and 16-17 June 2004. The Commission left its examination of what happened on 9/11 to the last hearing, with no eyewitnesses or victims testifying. Philip Shenon reported that Executive Director Zelikow not only threatened to fire Commission staffers who talked to journalists but ordered his staffers not to return calls by Commission members. He required all contacts between his staff and members of the Commission to go through him personally.{784} On 1 December 2003, a meeting of Commission's Team 1a was held and attended by Dieter Snell, Chris Kojm and 9/11 Commission's Vice-Chairman Lee Hamilton. The notes of the meeting were taken by Ben Rhodes. While no verbatim transcript of the meeting exists, the notes were released in the form of a Memorandum For the Record.{785} It provides a glimpse into the approach of the Commission's staff to their task. Hamilton asked about the team's focus. Dieter Snell said that "they were focused specifically on the plot: if the case was being prosecuted and he was representing the government, how would he write a summation?" By his answer, Snell revealed that his team saw its role as prosecuting a case and not as an impartial investigation. Hamilton then diplomatically reminded Snell that "many people are looking to the Commission to tell the story — there is a heavy burden to get it straight, and to be forthright about the conflict."…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,514

Normally, murder cases are solved by bringing the perpetrators to justice. The trial of the suspects allows to establish the facts, provides the suspects an opportunity to explain their deeds or refute the charges. They are then punished, if guilty, in

accordance with the law. When suspects cannot be brought to justice due to their absence or death, no trial takes place. The respective authorities are thus relieved of the burden to prove the suspects' guilt. The suspects are then simply declared guilty without due process. The lack of a trial robs victims and their families as well society at large from the right to the truth about the circumstances of crime, which only and adversarial setting of an open criminal trial can ensure. As most suspects of alleged islamic terrorism die in dubious circumstances during or after their alleged crime, their guilt is established by state bureaucrats on the base of secret evidence. This is exactly what happened after 9/11, as the alleged hijackers vanished, including their bodies. But how about their helpers? An effective criminal investigation would normally result in the identification of the offender(s) and their prosecution. Yet not a single person has been prosecuted and punished by the U.S. authorities for planning, funding, abetting or executing the mass murder of 9/11.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,550

All signs suggest that they never will be brought to trial. CIA Director George Tenet announced in December 2002 that since 9/11, "more than 3,000 al-Qaeda operatives or associates have been arrested in more than 100 countries."{801} Yet none of them have been charged and sentenced in relation to 9/11. After 9/11, more than 1,200 people within the United States, mostly Muslims, were arrested, allegedly in relation to the 9/11 attacks.{802} Most were released without charge. Others were prosecuted mainly for visa violations and other unrelated infractions.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,770

Alice Hoaglan, Mark Bingham's mother, has been interviewed numerous times by leading U.S. media. What she told the SF Examiner at the 10th anniversary of 9/11, illustrates the effects of the government's approach to the 9/11 families: I'm so grateful to America for remembering the sacrifice of the guys on board United Flight 93. It means a lot to me and I'm so grateful that Mark is remembered as a hero and as a gay man who stood shoulder to shoulder with a handful of other guys - straight guys - and died on their feet fighting to save lives on the ground." [SF Examiner on the 10th anniversary of 9/11] She then emphasizes how the conduct of her son prompted her to become "a spokesperson for competitive sports and rugby for school kids" and calls on the public to "remember the courage and spirit of unity that first showed itself on the original Sept. 11."{844} (c) Lisa Beamer (wife of Todd Beamer, Flight UA93) Lisa Beamer, invited to the White House, enjoyed a standing ovation of Congress after George W. Bush singled out her husband for praise in his Address to the Joint Session of the Congress.{845} Lisa Beamer was later photographed unveiling a decal of the "Let's Roll" catchphrase on the side of an F-16 fighter jet.

Examples of how Mrs. Beamer was emotionally affected by being feted are laid bare in her book Let's Roll.{846} Her book reveals concerted government efforts to give the families of UA93 victims a thrilling sensation of being related to heroes; and use some of these families as icons of U.S. patriotism, unity of purpose and anti-terrorist determination. (d)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,789

When the families of flight UA93 victims met with President Bush at the White House two weeks after 9/11, the President spoke with Deena Burnett and kissed her on both cheeks.{847} Later, she received a certificate signed by the President, stating that the United States honored her husband and that the document was "awarded by a grateful nation in recognition of devoted and selfless consecration to the service of our country in the Armed Forces of the United States."{848} On 26 May 2002, Thomas Burnett received a military funeral, given to him based on his actions on flight UA93. He was buried at Fort Snelling in Bloomington, Minnesota.{849} Did Thomas Burnett die in a military operation in the morning of 9/11? If so, what was the nature of that military operation? In her book Fighting Back, Deena Burnett describes the thrill she felt meeting the President and his wife: "I shook hands with

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,799

[the President Bush and his wife]. Each one placed their free hand on top of mine, and the President kissed me on the cheek."{850} Shortly after Mrs. Burnett's daughters left for school on the morning of 9/11, she remained alone in her California home with police officer Chris Stangle (p. 71). After having to cope with several FBI agents who came to her home and pestered her one after the other with repeated questions (p. 75), a paramedic who wanted to take her blood pressure (p. 69), a police…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,832

As mentioned above, Ellen Tauscher told Mrs. Burnett that she will be asked to do things she never did before. Indeed, she was soon called on to do unusual things. In November 2001 she asked Ronald Motley, a South Carolina lawyer, to sue Saudi Arabia on behalf of 9/11 victims, because 15 of the alleged 9/11 hijackers came from there. {851}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,837

On 15 August 2002, standing with Deena Burnett and other 9/11 family members by his side, Ronald Motley announced to the press, that he had filed on their behalf a trillion-dollar lawsuit - Burnett et al v. Al Baraka Investment and Development Corporation et al - against Saudi banks, charities, and even members of the Saudi royal family for facilitating 9/11.{852} Motley Rice now claims to represent 6,600 family members and survivors "who comprise the [Association] 9/11 Families & Survivors United Justice Against Terrorism."{853} In 2003, the The Washington Group, partly funded by Motley Rice, was hired by 9-11 Families United to "monitor" Congressional hearings and activities related to the financing of terrorism. The Washington Group team included Carlos Bonilla, who served as President Bush's assistant secretary for economic policy; David Crane, a former aide to Sen. Trent Lott; Missy Edwards, ex-director of development for the National Republican Senatorial Committee, and William Burke, an aide to Rep. Patrick Kennedy.{854} In parallel, Motley Rice and others established a company by the name of Rosetta Research and Consulting LLC (hereafter Rosetta). Its declared purpose was to attract "outside investors to help finance the investigation" and "provide Motley Rice with an opportunity to capitalize on the massive database of information it had been collecting by selling it to commercial customers through Rosetta."{855} Documents obtained by the Washington Post confirm that the aim of Rosetta's principals was indeed "to turn a profit by developing a database of terrorist financial information that could be sold to banks, securities firms and the government."{856} Rosetta was run by shady intelligence operatives working for the CIA, the Pentagon, the FBI, and the DIA. Its greatest accomplishment was to lure a top Afghan heroin trafficker to the United States in order to be arrested. Harry Huge, one of Motley's co-counsels, said he befriended Walter Hemberger, the prosecutor who presided over the ill-famed trial of Mounir el-Motassadeq in Hamburg, Germany (see Chapter 14(9)). Hemberger agreed to give Huge and Motley Rice all of the documents that the German police had obtained in the case, demonstrating thereby once more Germany's subservience to the imperial system.{857} James Risen devotes an entire chapter to the Rosetta's scam in his book Pay Any Price: Greed, Power and Endless War. According to Risen, Ron Motley had in 2005 already invested $18 million in investigations for the future 9/11 lawsuit against Saudi Arabia, an amount exceeding the entire budget of the 9/11 Commission of Inquiry. Risen wrote: "Motley Rice and the [unnamed] private investors in Rosetta were potentially victimized by the scheme, since their money was largely being used to finance Rosetta's operations."{858} In 2011, Motley Rice got from somewhere the idea to sue Iran for 9/11. According to Robert Haefele of Motley Rice LLC, who represents the plaintiffs, "a New…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,880

It appears that air traffic controllers had to contend with far more than four suspected hijackings on the morning of 9/11. According to the 9/11 Commission, there were

"multiple erroneous reports of hijacked aircraft in the system" over the course of the morning of 9/11.{860} Alan Scott of NORAD told the 9/11 Commission that Delta Flight 89 was first reported missing, then that it had been hijacked and finally that it had not been hijacked but had landed safely in Cleveland. Scott described the flight as "the first red herring of the day, because there were a number of reported possible hijackings that unfolded over the hours immediately following the operation."{861} Other sources refer to that flight as Delta Flight 1989.{862} Was this the same flight? Other flights suspected of having been hijacked included American Airlines flight 43, which left Newark International Airport shortly after 8 a.m. bound for Los Angeles and made an emergency landing in Cincinnati, and American Airlines flight 1729 from Newark to San Antonio, departing at 8:50a.m. and forced to land at St. Louis.{863} According to the BBC, however, flight AA43 was scheduled to fly from Boston, not Newark, and was "grounded due to a mechanical problem."{864} According to the Chicago Tribune, flight AA43 "was cancelled just minutes before its scheduled 8:10a.m. departure from Boston due to a mechanical problem."{865} I found no explanation for these conflicting reports. According to the Daily Telegraph, "[A]s many as nine aircraft may have been part of the original plot."{866} At approximately 9:09a.m., the FAA Command Center reported that 11 aircraft were either not communicating with FAA facilities or flying unexpected routes.{867} NORAD Major General Larry Arnold claimed that, on the morning of 9/11, a total of 21 planes had been identified as possible hijackings.{868} He added that, "We were receiving many reports of hijacked aircraft. When we received those calls, we might not know from where the aircraft had departed. We also didn't know the location of the airplane." In a statement made to Leslie Filson, author of Air War Over America: Sept. 11 Alters Face Of Air Defense Mission, General Arnold again explained that there were at one time 21 suspected hijacks in the system and that there was "a lot of confusion, as you can imagine."{869} Colonel Robert Marr, the NEADS battle commander, was informed that "across the nation there were some 29 different reports of hijackings."{870} Apart from the four aircraft designated as the "death flights"—AA11, AA77, UA175 and UA93—and those mentioned above, the following flight numbers were considered possible hijackings at some point during 11 September 2001: AAL2247, USA41, DAL89, DAL1989, NWA197, UAL641, UAL57, USA633{871}, UAL163{872}, UAL177{873}, Continental 321{874}, AA189{875} and KAL85{876}. This list is far from exhaustive.{877}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,931

Another unexplained source of confusion were multiple ELT signals intercepted in various locations on 9/11.{880} ELT signals are broadcast by radio transmitters carried aboard the aircraft and are supposed to activate only in the event the aircraft crashes, their function being to facilitate searches for the aircraft wreckage. According to Paul Thumser, an operations supervisor at the FAA's New York Center, ELTs on Boeing 767 aircraft cannot be activated by a pilot and only activate if there is a serious impact.

{881} According to the official account two Boeing 767 aircraft crashed at the North and South Towers, respectively, of the WTC. Yet no ELT was triggered by the alleged impact of the aircraft.{882}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,939

Staff members at NORAD's Northeast Air Defense Sector (NEADS) had difficulty locating flight AA11 and other aircraft on their radar screens. Lieutenant Colonel Dawne Deskins of NEADS said that when the FAA first called to report a hijacking, the FAA "gave me the latitude and longitude of that track … [but] there was nothing there."{883} Master Sergeant Kevin Foster and Staff Sergeant Mark Rose, both of NEADS, voiced similar complaints about their inability to locate planes they had been told had been hijacked.{884} Author and pilot Lynn Spencer explained

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,956

In sum, there was a huge confusion on 9/11 regarding the identities and locations of dozens of aircraft, some of which were believed to have been hijacked. It is, at this point, useful to note that this confusion remained mostly unreported.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,960

The reason for the above confusion was not reported at the time. On the morning of 9/11, the U.S. military had been scheduled to conduct multiple war-games (or exercises or drills) in the very air space where the 9/11 attacks took place. At least one of these exercises included simulated "real-world" hijackings.{886} As part of these exercises, electronic blips representing simulated hijacked aircraft were inserted onto the radar scopes of air traffic controllers, leading them to wonder whether the blips they saw moving on their screens belonged to bogus, simulated aircraft or to real aircraft. Considering the confusion prevailing on 9/11, it is understandable that air traffic controllers could not realistically determine the identities of supposedly hijacked aircraft and their locations after the pilots in several aircraft turned off transponders or had their codes changed. They were thus unable to reliably track the four aircraft alleged to have been hijacked on 9/11. It was therefore similarly difficult to determine, based on observations made by air traffic controllers, which aircraft had actually crashed and if so, where. NEADS Battle Commander Colonel Robert Marr briefed the staff of the 9/11 Commission on 27 October 2003.{887} During his briefing he acknowledged that when the attack unfolded, NEADS "was preparing for the day's NORAD exercise."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,974

> One feature of the war-games conducted on 9/11 was the scenario of simulated aircraft hijackings. Similar exercises had been conducted just days before 9/11, all working with the scenario of terrorists hijacking a London to New York flight with plans to detonate explosives over New York.{888} Air traffic controllers and others responsible for flight security in the Eastern part of the United States thus had good reasons to believe that at least some input on their screens on 9/11 was part of a similar if not identical exercise.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,987

> Upon receiving notification from Boston regarding the possible hijacking of flight AA11, NEADS commander Colonel Robert Marr asked if the notification was part of the exercise. Lieutenant Colonel Dawne Deskins also received word of the possible hijacking from Boston. She, too, initially assumed it must have been part of the exercise. Major Kevin Nasypany, the NEADS mission crew commander, said he had helped design the day's exercise. Thinking the reported hijacking was part of the exercise, he reportedly said, "The hijack's not supposed to be for another hour."{890} Three NEADS technicians who were following the news — Stacia Rountree, Shelley Watson and Maureen Dooley — looked forward to an exciting exercise: 08:37:56 Watson: What? Dooley: Whoa! Watson: What was that? Rountree: Is that real-world? Dooley: Real-world hijack. Watson: Cool!{891} The above conversation is excerpted from recordings made in the control room of NORAD's Northeast headquarters and obtained by the magazine Vanity Fair.{892} Did the expression "real-world" denote a live-fly exercise (exercise with real aircraft), as opposed to a real attack? The response of Major James Fox, leader of the NEADS weapons team, suggests so. He reacted at 8:43 a.m. in the following way, after the information began circulating within the system that flight AA11 had been hijacked: "I've never seen so much real-world stuff happen during an exercise."{893}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 5,013

> Major General Larry Arnold later said that when he first heard of the hijacking, his first thought was to ask, "Is this part of the exercise?"{895} When United Airlines Chief Operating Officer Andy Studdert arrived at the airline's System Operations Control (SOC) center on the morning of 9/11, at around 9:00 a.m., he had to repeatedly emphasize to employees that the unfolding crisis was not a training exercise: "This is not a drill!"{896} Ten days earlier he had surprised his staff with a crisis-training exercise, where he had told them a flight over the Pacific had broken radio contact and suffered a potentially disastrous engine failure. The staff believed the story for 30 minutes before he told them the that it was merely an exercise.{897} As late as 9:04:50, after both WTC towers

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 5,034

> In a detailed analysis, the blogger Shoestring included evidence that some locations carried the exercises past the alleged crash times of the four aircraft.{899} NORAD officials acknowledged that “scriptwriters” for the drills had in past exercises included the idea of hijacked aircraft being used as weapons.{900} As Vanity Fair reported, audio recordings from the operations floor at NEADS reveal that “there was no sense that the attack was over with the crash of United 93.” Instead, “the alarms go on and on. False reports of hijackings, and real responses, continue well into the afternoon [of 9/11].” The fighter pilots over New York and [Washington] D.C. (and later Boston and Chicago) would spend hours darting around their respective skylines intercepting hundreds of aircraft they deemed suspicious … No one at NEADS would go home until late on the night of the 11th.”{901}

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 5,077

> The National Reconnaissance Office (NRO),{906} one of the least-publicized U.S. intelligence agencies, had scheduled a crisis exercise for the morning of 11 September 2001. The scenario of that exercise revolved surprisingly around a corporate jet crashing into one of the four towers of the NRO Headquarters in Chantilly, Virginia, just four miles from Dulles International Airport.{907} The scenario was meant to test the evacuation procedures of NRO’s headquarters after such a crash. Participants — in that case, NRO employees — were given cards with simple tasks to be carried out, including making phone calls to various recipients and telling them about the bogus crash and ensuing fire. To lend the exercise as much realism as was possible, a smoke generator was planned to fake the burning wreckage of the downed aircraft.{908} According to the head of the NRO, the exercise was canceled at the last minute due to the attacks. Most NRO employees were sent home. NRO spokesman Art Haubold said, “It was just an incredible coincidence that this happened to involve an aircraft crashing into our facility.”{909} The NRO account does not prove that the 9/11 phone calls were fake. It does show, however, that having participants in an exercise report fake acts had been envisioned by a U.S. government agency, and is therefore a plausible theory that must be seriously considered regarding the 9/11 phone calls. In chapter 10, I demonstrated that the callers from the aircraft did not report real events. This conduct would fit well into the hypothesis of a hijacking exercise. The callers would either report what they were told or improvise based on a summary script. It is likely that such actors would be selected in advance according to their loyalty and discretion. There exists additional supporting evidence for this theory. (a)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 5,095

The calm demeanor of callers reporting stabbings and killings that occurred within their lines of sight is incompatible with ordinary human behavior. Even battle-hardened persons would express fear if they were to witness a murder a few feet away in an environment where person-to-person violence would be so unexpected. The calm tone used by several callers in reporting dreadful events surprised even those who knew them. Their conduct would be plausible, however, if the callers were reporting fictitious events from a script. In such a case, they would actually have to exert themselves to fake their own fear. Not all callers were good actors or attempted to fake fear. (b) Puzzling conduct by crew members Air carrier responsibilities for security and anti-hijacking training for flight crews were laid out in the Air Carrier Standard Security Program prior to 9/11. In addition to specifying several hours of security training, it provided an outline of in-flight hijacking tactics for both the cockpit and cabin crews. Among other things, this outline advised air crews to land the aircraft as soon as possible, to communicate with authorities, and to try delaying tactics.{910} According to the official narrative, crew members initially had every reason to presume that this was a classic case of hijacking. From that perspective, it is puzzling as to why none of the flight attendants aboard flights UA175, AA77 and UA93 attempted to contact the pilots, or why they or the pilots did not attempt to contact the appropriate authorities. Betty Ong (AA11) called the AA Southeastern Reservation Office in Cary, North Carolina. Madeline Sweeney (AA11) called the AA administrative office at Logan. Robert Fangman (UA175) called SAMC, a UAL maintenance center in San Francisco. Renee May (AA77) called her parents. Sandra Bradshaw (UA93) first called SAMC in San Francisco and then her husband. CeeCee Lyles (UA93) called her husband. None of them called security personnel.. It is also puzzling, that none of the flight attendants tried “delaying tactics” towards the alleged hijackers, such as engaging them in small talk or trying to find out whether the alleged hijackers actually held a bomb. Such a dereliction of duty would be incomprehensible had there been real hijackers and something resembling a bomb. From the perspective of a real hijacking and stabbings, it is puzzling that both Betty Ong and Madeline Sweeney (AA11) would sit for a long time and chat on the telephone while their colleagues were being stabbed. This is certainly not normal conduct of a responsible flight attendant. From the perspective of a real hijacking, it is puzzling, too, that the pilot of flight AA77 would announce to passengers that the flight had been hijacked, yet not report that fact by radio to the ground. All of the above puzzling conduct would, however, be plausible within the framework of a hijacking drill. (c) The secretive conduct by American Airlines officials American Airlines…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 5,249

Indeed, some prominent leftist publications did not content themselves with simply ignoring 9/11. The Nation (U.S.){924}, CounterPunch (U.S.){925}, The Progressive (U.S.) {926} and Le Monde Diplomatique (France){927} have slandered respectable citizens

who question the official account of 9/11 as loonies or conspiracists. Among the methods used to slander the 9/11 truth movement, are attempts to link 9/11 skepticism with Holocaust Denial, when in fact the opposite would be nearer the truth. The overwhelming majority of those who reject the official narrative of 9/11 are known to oppose war and racism and support justice. They investigate 9/11 because of their sense of civic responsibility. Among these are hundreds, if not thousands, of personalities from the fields of the humanities, science and government. Some are pilots and former military and intelligence officials.{928} The attacks on 9/11 truth research by leftist organizations and publications is an outright betrayal of solidarity with victims of state terrorism. The probable reason for the Left to avoid dealing with 9/11 appears to be the hope of leftists to join the fold of “the Establishment” and enjoy the material and psychological benefits of being tolerated by the ruling class. Some organizations bearing leftist titles are already among recipients of foundation grants or of government largesse that might be endangered if they questioned the official account of 9/11.{929} (4)

Note: