The Report of the Citizens Commission on 9/11

An updated non-partisan analysis of events before, during and after the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001 and how the War on Terror is changing America

Who planned the attacks?
What was their intended result?
When did planning begin?
Where will the next attack take place?
Why did national security fail?
How were the attacks carried out?
What do you think about 9/11?

Was 9/11 the work of Osama’s al Qaeda terrorists or were they merely the cover story of a deeper conspiracy?

Network news has shown those planes crashing into the Twin Towers and the towers’ subsequent collapse thousands of times. The official explanation for these tragic events is that 19 of Osama bin Laden’s al Qaeda terrorists hijacked four commercial airliners and crashed them into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and a field in Pennsylvania.

In this way, the images of destruction on 9/11 have been married to bin Laden, Arab terrorists and al Qaeda in the minds of many Americans.

Outlined below are three categories of 9/11 belief systems that cover a full-spectrum of post-9/11 thinking in America. They are arranged numerically from the most conventional to the most controversial. Each thought is followed by a sampling of logical extensions to the basic belief system.

1. Beliefs based solely on the official explanation for 9/11:
   
   Unexpectedly and without provocation, America was attacked on Sept. 11, 2001, by 19 Arab terrorists. According to the Bush administration, the plan was masterminded by Islamic fundamentalist Osama bin Laden and his al Qaeda terrorist network because “they hate Americans” and “they hate our freedom.”

   This scenario implies the belief that:
   
   a. all 19 hijackers bypassed airline and airport security undetected and without incident at three different airports.
   b. all four commercial airliners turned off their transponders, dramatically deviated from their registered flight plans and “disappeared” in U.S. airspace for up to 46 minutes without being located and intercepted by U.S. air defenses.
   c. one of the hijacked airplanes crashed into the World Trade Center (WTC) North Tower and resultant fires caused that building’s collapse 103 minutes later; a second hijacked airplane crashed into the WTC South Tower and resultant fires caused that building’s collapse 56 minutes later; a third hijacked airplane crashed into the Pentagon and; heroic passengers overcame hijackers of a fourth commercial airliner, forcing it to crash in a field near Shanksville, PA.
   d. Islamic fundamentalists who hate the U.S. are planning future attacks on American soil. In order to disrupt those plans, the U.S. must preemptively strike them first.
   e. Congress and the Bush administration have been passing laws making it easier for the government to protect Americans by broadening their authority to identify, investigate and detain suspected terrorists.

2. Beliefs based partially on interpretation of official explanation:

   The Bush administration could have prevented the 9/11 attacks but did not, then used the attacks as justification to begin waging premeditated war in the Middle East.

   This scenario implies belief that:
   
   a. airport security was relaxed allowing terrorists the opportunity to devise ways to exploit weaknesses.
   b. national air defenses were ordered to “stand down” to give all four hijacked commercial airliners time to hit their targets.
   c. within hours of the attacks, 19 terrorists and their al Qaeda affiliations were accurately identified.
   d. the Bush administration used the attacks to justify mobilizing for pre-planned wars in Afghanistan, Iraq and a preplanned, global “war on terror.”
   e. the 9/11 attacks were allowed to happen so the U.S. could accomplish military control of oil supplies while weapons and reparations contractors could realize war and reconstruction profits.

3. Beliefs based on explanations derived from independent research

   Persons at the highest levels of U.S. government planned, ordered and executed the events of 9/11 to secure control of dwindling oil reserves, to assure the oil resource remains exclusively monetized in U.S. dollars, help war industry manufacturers/reparations contractors reap billions of dollars in wartime profits and keep Americans fearful of another attack.

   This scenario implies belief that:
   
   b. the war in Afghanistan was waged to establish a military stronghold in the undeveloped, oil-rich Caspian Basin.
   c. the war in Iraq was commenced to gain control of Iraqi oil.
   d. anti-terror legislation (such as the Patriot Act) passed after 9/11 restricts Americans’ civil liberties under the guise of protecting America from future attacks.
   e. the president’s 9/11 Commission concluded that human error allowed U.S. national defenses to fail Sept. 11, 2001, by intentionally concealing evidence that would expose high-level complicity in the attacks.

Note: This report has been compiled to help us all better understand what really happen on 9/11.
Flight timelines raise questions not answered by government claims of widespread human error

The 9/11 Commission found that standard air defense protocols were not observed on 9/11. Not addressed by the Commission, however, is how, or why, our national airspace defense systems experienced seemingly coordinated failures of standard operating procedures (SOP) that fateful morning.

The first clue of hijacking came at 8:14 a.m.; the second at 8:19. SOP would dictate immediate alert of air defenses, scrambling fighters from McGuire AFB by no later than 8:29 with intercept by 8:33—13 minutes before AA-11 struck WTC North Tower. Timelines offered by North American Aerospace Command Defense (NORAD) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) indicate they were not notified of hijackings until it was too late. Senator Mark Dayton (D-Minn.), on the Senate floor and before the 9/11 Commission, accused NORAD and the FAA of lying about why military fighter planes weren’t able to intercept the commercial airliners that eventually crashed into the Twin Towers, the Pentagon and into a field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Senator Dayton’s accusations are supported by analyses from numerous aviation experts, both civilian and military, who have dedicated countless hours studying, second-by-second, 9/11 flight patterns and the military’s late response to what should have been seen as a national emergency of the highest order. NORAD admits to running attack simulation drills on 9/11. The following are timelines of events involving flights AA-11, UA-175, AA-77 and UA-93 on the morning of 9/11 as established by the president’s 9/11 Commission. Indicated by large dots are approximate locations of each ill-fated plane when air defense commanders were notified they had been hijacked.

**American Airlines Flight 11**

- 7:59 am: Takeoff, AA-11
- 8:14 am: Last routine communication; likely hijacking (1)
- 8:19 am: Flight attendant reported the aircraft hijacked (2)
- 8:21 am: Transponder turned off (3)
- 8:25 am: Boston Center (BC) aware of hijacking
- 8:38 am: BC reports hijacking to Northeast Air Defense Sector (NEADS)
- 8:46 am: NEADS scrambles fighters from Otis AFB to search for AA-11—presumed to be headed for New York City
- 8:46:40 am: AA-11 strikes World Trade Center (WTC) North Tower
- 8:53 am: Otis AFB fighters airborne
- 9:16 am: AA aware that AA-11 struck WTC
- 9:21 am: Boston Center advises NEADS that AA-11 is headed for Washington, D.C.

**American Airlines Flight 77**

- 7:59 am: Takeoff, AA-77
- 8:51 am: Last routine communication; likely hijacking (1)
- 8:54 am: AA-77 turns south
- 8:56 am: Transponder turned off (2)
- 9:05 am: AA aware AA-77 has been hijacked (3)
- 9:25 am: Nationwide air traffic grounded by order of Herndon Command Center
- 9:32 am: Dulles Tower observes high-speed approach of aircraft later identified as AA-77
- 9:34 am: FAA advises NEADS that AA-77 is missing
- 9:37:46 am: AA-77 strikes Pentagon
- 10:30 am: AA confirms AA-77 struck Pentagon

**United Airlines Flight 175**

- 8:14 am: Takeoff, UA-175
- 8:42 am: Last routine communication; likely hijacking (1)
- 8:47 am: Transponder code changes (2)
- 8:52 am: Flight attendant reported the aircraft hijacked (3)
- 8:55 am: New York Center (NYC) suspects hijacking
- 9:03:11 am: UA-175 strikes WTC South Tower
- 9:15 am: NYC informs NEADS that UA-175 is second plane to strike WTC
- 9:20 am: UA aware UA-175 had crashed into WTC South Tower

**United Airlines Flight 93**

- 8:42 am: Takeoff, UA-93
- 9:24 am: UA control alerts UA-93 of possible cockpit intrusion
- 9:27 am: Last routine communication; likely hijacking (1)
- 9:34 am: Herndon Command Center advises FAA that UA-93 has been hijacked
- 9:36 am: Flight attendant notifies UA of hijacking; UA attempts to contact cockpit (2)
- 9:41 am: Transponder turned off (3)
- 9:57 am: Passenger revolt begins
- 10:03:11 am: UA-93 crashes in a field near Shanksville, PA
- 10:07 am: Cleveland Center advises NEADS of UA-93 hijacking
- 10:15 am: UA control aware UA-93 crashed in PA; Washington Center informs NEADS that UA-93 has crashed in PA

**Immediate concerns**

According to the 9/11 Commission:

1. AA-11 crashed into WTC North Tower 32 minutes after it was known to have been hijacked.
2. UA-175 crashed into WTC South Tower 21 minutes after it was known to have been hijacked.
3. AA-77 crashed into the Pentagon 46 minutes after it was known to have been hijacked.
4. UA-93 crashed near Shanksville, PA, 36 minutes after it was known to have been hijacked.

After disappearing from radar, all four planes could have been intercepted had SOP been observed that day. NORAD admits to running attack simulation drills such as “Vigilant Guardian” on 9/11. The 9/11 Commission did not investigate how said drills may have caused national air defenses to stand down on 9/11—or prove these were the planes that crashed.
Political realities reshape 9/11 timeline
Official conclusions influenced by agendas, not evidence

Investigators have been reconstructing the events of 9/11 by attempting to arrange known facts within timelines that make chronological sense. The media, airlines, and the Bush administration have compiled timelines built from “facts” collected largely from the same sources. By looking at them we can infer that the different reporting agencies colored the record to upstage or downplay certain events in an attempt to minimize their culpability for actions taken (or not taken) on 9/11.

The government’s 9/11 Commission analyzed these timelines and came up with its own timeline. Its official timeline reflects shortened military response times and casts a shadow of negligence on the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). For example, the original official timeline shows the FAA informed NORAD of the UA-93 hijacking at 9:16 a.m.; the government’s new official timeline claims the FAA informed NORAD of the hijacking at 10:07 a.m.—after UA-93 had crashed near Shanksville. The original official time of the crash was 10:06 a.m.; the new official time is 10:03 a.m.

No matter which timeline an official or unofficial 9/11 investigator uses, one critical factor remains: Within one hour on the morning of September 11, 2001, four commercial airplanes went way off course and officially “disappeared” in U.S. airspace for up to 46 minutes.

Though official sources claim to know the routes taken by the four planes before crashing into their final destinations, there is no evidence at our disposal to confirm or deny these routes (see page 3); all we have is faith in official investigators.

To take official investigators on faith requires an admission that hijackers need merely turn off transponders to fly airplanes anywhere in North America they desire.

The 9/11 timeline is very important. Each event caused other events to happen in an order that is strictly governed by time. The 9/11 timeline, therefore, becomes the foundation for understanding what really happened the morning of Sept. 11, 2001.

It is prudent to question the motives of anyone who attempts to change the timeline by even one minute. Why? Because those seeking to preserve the truth would never consider altering it by so much as one second.

Who’s in what seats?

Even prior to 9/11, every airline ticket purchaser had an identity and a seat assignment. Before takeoff, flight attendants procedurally counted passengers and, if the count did not come out right, departure was delayed until the correct names were attached to the correct seat assignments and everyone was accounted for. It would seem that, if four commercial, transcontinental flights were suddenly and unexpectedly hijacked, identifying the passengers and crew on board would be simple. Not so for these four ill-fated flights on 9/11.

To this day crew and passenger lists have never been fully reconciled with official death records. Though the 19 alleged hijackers are included as “fatalities,” there is no evidence to suggest that they were given seat assignments after going through the ticketing process that requires showing positive ID. So, we must ask, “If these hijackers were on the plane, how did they get on, what seats were they assigned—and by whom?”

Where was everybody?

AA-11 (Boeing 767-223ER): Seating Capacity, 181—Fatalities, 92
UA-175 (Boeing 767-222): Seating Capacity, 181—Fatalities, 65
AA-77: (Boeing 757-223): Seating Capacity, 200—Fatalities, 64
UA-93: (Boeing 757-222): Seating Capacity, 200—Fatalities, 44

Only 265 (about 30 percent) of the 765 seats available for the four intercontinental flights noted above were occupied when the planes crashed in their respective locations in New York, Washington, D.C. and Pennsylvania. Both American Airlines and United Airlines have declined to provide data showing historical occupancy averages for the flights in question. However, most intercontinental flights have a seat occupancy average of 70-90 percent.

Similarly, soon after the Twin Towers collapsed, it was estimated that as many as 50,000 people may have been trapped in those buildings. Yet the final death toll of 3,056, tragic as it may be, is less than 17 percent of the number we would expect to have perished had Sept. 11, 2001, been a normal business day.
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A brief history of presidential commissions

by Don Harkins

The president periodically exercises executive authority to commission “independent” investigations into significant events of domestic concern.

An overview of several such commissions, The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (9/11 Commission) being the most recent, reveals a pattern and process that consistently achieves the same result.

1. An event occurs.
2. The public demands an inquiry.
3. In response to public demand, the president appoints a commissioner to investigate and the commissioner chooses a staff.
4. Throughout the lifetime of the commission, corporate media helps create an impression that the investigation is independent.
5. The commission issues subpoenas, takes testimony and generates headlines.
6. A huge body of evidence accumulates while many possible avenues of investigation are not considered by the commission.
7. The commission then reviews the evidence it chose to consider, arrives at conclusions, makes recommendations and publishes them in a final report.
8. Most people are satisfied with commission conclusions and recommendations while a minority is outspokenly dissatisfied with the commission’s conclusions/recommendations.
9. The final report becomes government’s final word, the case officially closes and the event becomes buried in history; life goes on.

The Roberts Commission

On January 23, 1942, FDR appointed Supreme Court Justice Owen Roberts to head a commission to investigate events that led to the “surprise” attack on Pearl Harbor, Dec. 7, 1941.

The Roberts Commission concluded that neither Pacific Fleet Commander Admiral Kimmel or his subordinate commanders were at fault for not being prepared to defend against the Japanese air attack that day.

The commission did not publicly consider the myriad of political and economic pressures FDR placed on Japan prior to the attack. In the months preceding Dec., 1941, FDR was politically provoking Japan into attacking U.S. interests while Japan was doing everything in its diplomatic power to avoid war with the U.S. As late as October, 1941, Japanese diplomats had travelled to Washington, D.C., in an attempt to reconcile these issues.

Since the publishing of the Roberts Commission Report and the end of WWII, documents have been declassified and witnesses have come forward. It is now known that FDR had prior knowledge of the attack and chose not to inform Pacific fleet commanders of the plan to attack their command.

The attack on Pearl Harbor resulted in an immediate declaration of war on Japan and, two days later, FDR implicated the Nazis in the attack and declared war on Germany.

Americans, who had re-elected FDR in 1940 largely based on his campaign promise to avoid involving the U.S. in another European war, were suddenly ready to fight the Germans and the Japanese.

The Warren Commission

On November 29, 1963, LBJ appointed U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren to chair the commission which would investigate the assassination of JFK. The Warren Commission concluded that President Kennedy was killed by communist sympathizer Lee Harvey Oswald and there was no conspiracy involved (either foreign or domestic). The Warren Commission also concluded that Oswald fired three shots from his position behind the president’s motorcade through a third-story window at the book depository building. According to the Warren Commission, one shot missed, one struck the president in the back of the head and the third shot, “a magic bullet,” entered below JFK’s collar, exited his throat, took a left hand turn, hit Texas Governor John Connally in the right shoulder, continued on to shatter his right wrist and changed directions one last time to lodge in his left thigh.

This conclusion defies common sense, the laws of natural science, basic ballistics, witness accounts, expert testimony, forensic evidence and film footage taken immediately before, during and after the event. Since the movie JFK was released in 1994, most Americans no longer believe in the Warren Commission’s “lone-nut/magic-bullet” theory.


Iran/Contra

On October 5, 1986, a U.S. cargo plane was shot down over southern Nicaragua. Two crew members died but CIA operative Eugene Hasenfus was captured by the Sandinista army. Hasenfus’ capture set in motion what we know today as the “Iran/Contra scandal.”

Eight different investigations uncovered a bizarre web of intrigue among State Department officials, members of Congress, known drug traffickers, international arms dealers, mercenaries and military intelligence operatives. Revealed was a botched attempt on the part of the Reagan administration to secure the release of U.S. prisoners held in Lebanon by supplying arms to Iranians at war with Iraq while raising money to support Contras attempting to overthrow the socialist Sandanista government in Nicaragua.

The first Iran/Contra investigation was led by former U.S. Senator John Tower who was appointed by President Reagan. The Tower Commission’s final report of February 26, 1987, criticized President Reagan for improperly managing the affairs of state but barely scratched the surface of the scandal.

Congress began televising hearings for its own investigation on May 5, 1987. Out of the hearings came several indictments (which centered on lying to Congress and destroying evidence) and a few convictions, most of which were quietly overturned on appeal.

Later investigations revealed the large-scale trafficking of cocaine conducted with the assistance of the CIA. A few scapegoats were convicted and sent to prison.

The real scandal has never been acknowledged by the government: Tons of Contra cocaine was smuggled into this country, fueling the crack cocaine epidemic of the 80s.

The Starr Commission

Independent Prosecutor Kenneth Starr led the investigation into the activities of former governor and sitting President Bill Clinton. Starr’s commission led to the impeachment (but not conviction) of Clinton.

Though public perception was that Starr was independently investigating the president for a laundry list of, professional and public transgressions, hindsight shows that Starr was prosecuting smoke screens—Clinton’s sexual escapades and the Whitewater land investment scam.

The investigation, which lasted nearly two years and cost some $49 million, resulted in a few convictions and Clinton’s disbarment.

Not investigated was Clinton’s role in Iran/Contra (Mena, Arkansas, was the central smuggling point for Contra cocaine while he was governor); not investigated was his relationship with known drug traffickers; not investigated were the deaths of some 60 people close to him, including White House Chief Counsel Vince Foster.

Conclusions

Each of these federally-commissioned investigations resulted in the publishing of reports meant to be the government’s final word on the events investigated. Each commission avoided legitimate avenues of inquiry that would likely reveal high-level incompetence or complicity. If no one questions the deficiencies when they are published, posterity will regard them as history.
Independent investigators not satisfied with official 9/11 investigation conclusions

Before the dust settled after the Twin Towers collapsed, President Bush told the American people the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were the direct result of a “colossal intelligence blunder.” The president also stated, “Your government had no advance warning of this attack.”

By early afternoon of Sept. 11, the FBI released the identities of 19 suspected hijackers, all Arabic men with alleged ties to Osama bin Laden’s militantly anti-western, pro-Islamic al-Qaeda terrorist group.

Within days people began questioning the explanations coming from the White House. Rather than comforting the traumatized American people with facts to support its “whodunit” allegations, the Bush administration insisted the “unprovoked and unexpected” attacks on the United States were conducted by Islamic terrorists who “hate our freedom.”

In an internationally publicized address to the United Nations Nov. 10, 2001, President Bush stated, “We must speak the truth about terror. Let us never tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories concerning the attacks of September the 11th; malicious lies that attempt to shift the blame away from the terrorists themselves, away from the guilty.”

The president’s statement foreshadowed what is now self-evident: That his administration will not consider any evidence or interview any witnesses that challenge its version of 9/11 events. It was also a statement calculated to support the official position that everyone in the world is either “with the U.S.—or with the terrorists.”

Tens of millions of Americans depended on their president and the national news media for clues on how they should perceive this historic event. By simply dividing the world into two camps—those who are for us and those who are against us—it was easy to decide which camp to be in.

However, a vocal minority insisted upon relying on their own experiences and expertise to independently investigate the 9/11 tragedy. By refusing to provide these independent investigators with evidence-based answers to fact-based questions, the government has effectively fueled the intellectual fires of 9/11 truth seekers.

The following questions demand answers:

1. How could four commercial airplanes be hijacked and fly around in U.S. airspace for up to 46 minutes without military involvement?
2. How could two commercial airplanes cause the world’s tallest, steel-framed buildings to implode like planned demolitions?
3. How did the FBI identify the 19 Arab hijackers if no Arabic names appeared on passenger or crew lists for any of the airplanes?
4. Doesn’t the FBI’s quick work in identifying the 19 hijackers and Osama bin Laden’s al Qaeda network (without evidence) suggest government prior knowledge of an attack?
5. How did the fires start in WTC Building 7 and why did the government conclude that fire was the primary cause of its collapse in 2008 when WTC 7 owner Larry Silverstein admitted in 2002 that he and the New York Fire Department decided to demolish the building at about 5 p.m. on Sept. 11, 2001?
6. Why did contractors begin hauling rubble away from “Ground Zero” before investigators could study the crime scene?
7. If a Boeing 757 of known dimensions struck the Pentagon, why was the hole in the building smaller than a 757?
8. Why were no Boeing-757 parts (wings, fuselage, landing gear, engines) found at the Pentagon? Why were no remains of passengers or their luggage found?
9. Dozens of surveillance cameras inside and outside the Pentagon would have recorded high-quality images of what happened. Why have none of them been used as evidence to support the government’s Boeing 757 theory?

Only question #1 of these nine, basic questions has been answered: Everyone “goofed” that day, according to the Bush administration and the 9/11 Commission. The Citizens Commission finds the president’s 9/11 Commission conclusion that everyone “goofed” trivializes the epidemic of gross incompetence that swept through and completely immobilized our national security apparatus that day.

In the span of 90 minutes, “goofing” racked up billions of dollars in property damages and over 3,000 Americans were killed; due to the 90-minute goof, wars in Afghanistan and Iraq commenced reportedly killing over 4,000 U.S. soldiers and an estimated 1.2 million innocent civilians to date while destroying billions of dollars in private property. It should also be noted that the international community sees post-9/11 U.S. foreign policy as an inexcusable display of bad manners.

Because “everyone goofed” that day, 305 million Americans are trading their essential liberties for safety promised by the very politicians whose war-on-terror response to 9/11 is making enemies of our former European and Asian allies.

Qualified answers to pertinent questions would aid investigators in their search for the truth. Official silence where answers to legitimate questions are obligatory obstructs those efforts.

“Boom, boom, boom—all the way down”

The most honest and unadulterated truths can often be seen when on-site cameras capture a moment as it’s happening. There are several such cases with 9/11 and many of them are reproduced in the documentary listing on page 30.

In Plane Site shows two New York firemen being interviewed right after one of the Twin Towers collapsed. One fireman, who appeared very aware of what had just happened all around him, was using his hands to help describe how the building came down. Holding his arms up and making right angles inward with his hands, he said, “Boom, boom, boom—all the way down—as if they had planted detonators.”

The fireman next to him, who had seen the same thing, agreed, stating, “Floor by floor started poppin’ out—I was watchin’ and runnin’.”

These men were there. What they described had happened only minutes before. To see them, you would know they were not lying.
9/11 Commission omits known facts to rubber stamp Bush administration’s original 9/11 story

by David Ray Griffin

The government’s 9/11 Commission Report prefaces itself as an “impartial” effort to “provide the fullest possible account of the events surrounding 9/11.”

In reality, however, the Commission restricted itself to information that can be used to support the official conspiracy theory that the attacks were planned and carried out solely by al Qaeda.

Evidence supporting the alternative conspiracy theory—according to which the attacks succeeded only because of complicity by members of the U.S. government—was summarized in my previous book, “The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions about 9/11.”

This information was provided to the Commission. In the Commission’s final report, however, all this information is either distorted or simply omitted.

To give a few examples:

The Report simply repeats the official story about the 19 Arab hijackers, failing to mention that at least six of the named men have shown up alive.

It even suggests that Waleed al-Shehri stabbed a flight attendant on AA-11 before it hit the North Tower—even though he visited the U.S. embassy in Morocco after 9/11.

With regard to the World Trade Center, the Report fails to mention that fire had never caused steel-frame, high-rise buildings to collapse; it says that the core of each of the Twin Towers consisted of “a hollow steel shaft” (thereby denying the existence of 47 massive steel columns, the collapse of which cannot be explained by the accepted “ Pancake” Theory); the Report fails to mention the fact that the collapses manifested 10 standard features of controlled demolitions; and it simply omits any mention of the otherwise inexplicable collapse of Building 7.

With regard to the Pentagon, the Report fails to mention that the West Wing would have been the least likely target for terrorists, that its facade did not collapse until 30 minutes after the strike, and that there are several other facts in conflict with the idea that the Pentagon was struck by Flight 77. And while claiming that al Qaeda operatives did not strike a nuclear plant for fear that their plane would be shot down, the Report fails to point out that the Pentagon is even better protected, so that any aircraft without a military transponder would have been automatically shot down.

With regard to the FBI, the Report simply omits all the stories about its behavior that are in conflict with the official account of 9/11, including the damning allegations made by former FBI translator Sibel Edmonds in her 3.5-hour testimony before the government’s 9/11 Commission.

With regard to why jet fighters failed to intercept any of the flights, the Report handles the problems created by NORAD’s previously announced timeline by simply creating a radically revised timeline, according to which the FAA never notified the military about Flights 175, 77, and 93 until after they crashed.

This new timeline also changes all previous statements about when the teleconferences between the FAA and the military began, thereby seeking to show that the military could not have learned about the flights from these teleconferences.

Perhaps most outrageous is the Report’s attempt to bolster the claim that the shoot-down order was not given until after Flight 93 had crashed, contradicting by 45 minutes all prior testimony—including Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta’s eyewitness testimony to the Commission itself—as to when Vice-President Cheney descended to the Presidential Emergency Operations Center.

I have documented these and dozens of other problems in my book The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions, which shows that the Report is a 567-page lie.

David Ray Griffin has written several highly-respected works on subjects that demand intensive research. Griffin applied his research talents to 9/11 and has published six books providing critical insight into key events that took place prior to and on Sept. 11. (see references page 30)

Exercising our sense of logic

Most everyone, whether they agree with it or not, knows that the government has insisted—since about noon EST on Sept. 11, 2001, to present—that 19 Arab terrorists, armed with boxcutters, hijacked four large passenger planes and flew them into the Twin Towers, the Pentagon and a field in rural Pennsylvania. Though new information has surfaced almost daily since Sept. 12, 2001, the government has not deviated substantively from its original explanation of what happened that day. The only difference between the government’s story on Sept. 11, 2001, and now is its admission that widespread defense system failure on 9/11 was largely due to professional incompetence and human error.

As a matter of logic can we arrive at true conclusions based on false premises?

As a matter of justice can anyone sitting in judgment establish guilt or innocence beyond a reasonable doubt without first hearing all the facts of a case?

As a matter of historical record can we trust conclusions published in a presidentially-commissioned report while knowing that only a few selected facts brought forward on false premises were considered?
Who were the 19 terrorists?

by Thomas Fowler

Within hours of the Sept. 11 attacks, the identities of those suspected of hijacking four commercial airliners and then crashing them into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and a field near Shanksville, PA, were broadcast all over the world.

The FBI has never explained how it was able to quickly identify these men and determine which planes they were on when not one of their names was included in passenger lists or any other lists associated with those airplanes.

Compounding the mystery of how the FBI was able to identify these 19 men is the agency’s claim that they used false names and identification. How could the FBI compile the real names and photos of these men so soon after the event without any clues?

And then there were 10

Since 9/11, media and government sources have reported that suspected hijackers Atta, Alnami, Aghlamdi, Alhazmi, Wail and Waleed Alshehri, Alomari, Almihdhar and Alshehri (9 of 19) have been positively identified as still living. Nearly half of the FBI’s original cast of terrorist characters are no longer suspects in the hijackings, yet the faces of the still-living Arabic men remain attached to the planes they were blamed for hijacking. The FBI has made no effort to remove their faces, apologize for the inconvenience or advance a new “whodunit” theory.

(Note: The number of “positively identified” alleged hijackers still living ranges from 6 to 9—a curious situation in its own right).

The competence factor

None of the four alleged pilots were capable of performing the maneuvers accomplished before the alleged crashes. Several long-time commercial pilots were interviewed on radio and TV in the days following 9/11. The common theme among these experienced pilots was they themselves could not have manually performed the tight turns and steep descents required to hit targets with such precision.

These maneuvers simply were not performed by inexperienced pilots deemed incompetent, or barely competent by their supposed flight instructors in Venice, Florida.

Not one of the men charged with hijacking AA-77—Hanjour, Almihdhar, Nawaf and Salem Alhazmi and Moqed—had an instrument rating or any other rating that would qualify them to perform the maneuvers that allegedly caused their 757 to strike the Pentagon.

The hijackers were able to turn off emergency transponders, reprogram the computers and/or override the computers and subdue cockpit personnel on four planes without a single crewman hitting the cockpit distress button. Not one of the 19 (or the 10-13 remaining) alleged hijackers had the wide range of knowledge and expertise necessary to flawlessly perform these tasks.

Lack of evidence

There is not one shred of real or circumstantial evidence to support the 19-boxcutter-wielding-Arab-terrorist-hijacker story. Not even one of hundreds of security cameras strategically positioned at three different airports show anyone identifiable as one of the 19 being ticketed, checking luggage or boarding the planes. And, again, none of the passenger manifests show that men with Arabic-sounding names boarded any of the planes in question.

How does the seemingly baseless 19-Arab-hijacker story survive when 6 or more hijackers have been found alive and no evidence exists to support charging the others? The answer is in our subconscious.

The backstory

The passport of Mohammed Atta (who is reported still alive) was “found” totally intact on a street in Lower Manhattan the day after and; luggage, flight manuals and other incriminating documents were reportedly found in a car rented in Atta’s name and parked at Boston’s Logan Airport.

It would appear that the 19-Arab-hijacker story survives because nonsensical anecdotes, woven into the story by the media, live in the subconscious minds of Americans.

It was also reported that several of the suspected hijackers attended flight schools near Venice, Florida and that they behaved more like partying playboys than devout Muslim fanatics preparing to martyr themselves for Allah.

Soon after the planes crashed on 9/11, a Koran was reportedly found in a Florida bar where the alleged hijackers used credit cards to party heavily their last few nights on earth.

If these reports are true, it would appear that the suspects were intentionally drawing attention to themselves.

False Oswalds

This technique of creating a “backstory” is extremely effective. In the last several years we have discovered that “false Oswalds” were deliberately drawing attention to themselves in New Orleans, Mexico City and Texas in early 1963 to create an Oswald backstory before setting him up as a patsy for the assassination of JFK.

False photos and inaccurate newspaper and magazine stories were published after Oswald’s death to emotionally cement his guilt in the collective American mind. To this day the Lee Harvey Oswald myth has such powerful roots in the American subconscious that we can know Oswald was a patsy while still associating him with JFK’s assassination.

Interesting parallels

The same mechanism used to mold our image of Oswald was used to mold our images of 19 Arab terrorists. In both cases the “patsies” were almost immediately identified and not available to defend themselves. Also consistent is the government’s refusal to consider any evidence that would undermine the official version of events.

Now we know

In the weeks following Sept. 11, we knew very little about the 19 Arab hijackers framed for 9/11. Since that time, investigators have discovered a lot about these men. An entire Chapter in Webster Tarpley’s book “Synthetic Terror” is dedicated to their memory and many of the newer 9/11 truth DVDs go into detail about the lives of the alleged terrorists. Once you read about them, you find these people were not just patsies, but were operatives working with and for U.S. intelligence.
What caused UA-93 to crash in Shanksville, PA?

What most Americans remember of Flight 93 is that valiant passengers struggled with the hijackers causing the 757 to crash in a field somewhere in Pennsylvania. The details, however, are much more interesting.

“Pennsylvania state police officials said on Thursday debris from the plane had been found up to 8 miles away [from the crash site] in a residential community where local media have quoted residents as speaking of a second plane in the area and burning debris falling from the sky.”

The quote above was from a Reuters report of September 13, 2001. The report, published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, also stated that the FBI could not rule out that hijacked Flight 93 was shot down by a U.S. fighter jet before it crashed in Pennsylvania.

Immediately after release of the story, Idaho Observer reporter Bill Walter contacted the Post-Gazette editor who stated that the FBI had confirmed to him that the debris (see image above) was from UA-93.

The story was soon buried by claims that heroic passengers overcame the hijackers and forced the plane down in a field, selflessly sparing the lives of more innocents had the suicidal terrorists reached their unknown target in the nation’s capital—or maybe WTC 7.

The position that UA-93 was not shot down has been accepted by the 9/11 Commission. Also accepted by the 9/11 Commission is the “heroic-passenger” theory.

The debris field

One-hundred years of investigating airplane crashes shows that debris fields of planes that break apart on impact with the ground is limited to the immediate area and subject to the laws of inertia and gravity. Debris, such as “clothing, books, papers and what appeared to be human remains” were found up to eight miles from the crash site.

The FBI now claims that UA-93 debris was spread by the 10 mph winds blowing that morning. However, Somerset County Coroner Wally Miller confirmed that a 1,000-pound piece of a UA-93 engine was found 2,000 yards away from the crash site. This suggests the plane was shot down and disintegrating in the air before crashing to the ground. It also accommodates the testimony of at least a dozen unconnected witnesses who similarly described a white plane they saw in the area before—and after—UA-93 hit the ground.

“It was white with no markings but it was definitely military, it just had that look. It had two rear engines, a big fin on the back like a spoiler on the back of a car and with two upright fins at the side. It definitely wasn’t one of those executive jets,” area resident McIlwain stated for the London Daily Mirror Sept. 13, 2001.

McIlwain also commented that on one pass the white plane was 40-50 feet above her head.

The FBI, after recanting its earlier theory that it must have been an executive’s private jet, told McIlwain that she did not see what she saw. The FBI told her what she saw right above her head was actually a plane taking pictures of the crash from about 3,000 feet.

“Yes”

The Washington Post reported January 27, 2002, that vice-President Dick Cheney gave the order for UA-93 to be shot down by military fighters but that the ill-fated plane crashed before the order could be carried out.

“In the White House bunker, a military aide approached the vice president. ‘There is a plane 80 miles out. There is a fighter in the area. Should we engage?’

“Yes,’ Cheney replied without hesitation,” reported the Post.

The aid reportedly asked Cheney two more times if the order still stood and then it was reported that UA-93, Newark to Los Angeles, had crashed in Somerset county, PA.

The Post also reported that President Bush called from Air Force One to ask, “Did we shoot it down or did it crash?”

Heroes

Several reports show that it took the Pentagon almost two hours to confirm that the plane had not been shot down. By then the act-of-heroism story was being formulated.

“I think an act of heroism occurred on board that plane,” Cheney said.

Hours later reports of cell phone conversations and cockpit voice recordings surfaced, indicating the passengers had overcome the hijackers. These recordings all stop at 10:03—the official time of impact according to the 9/11 Commission. Two seismology reports pinpoint the time of impact at 10:06:05. The 9/11 Commission was unable to explain this critical, three-minute discrepancy.

Freudian slip?

U.S. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld spent Christmas ’04 in Iraq. The transcript of a CNN report of Dec. 24, 2004, shows that Rumsfeld stated: “And I think all of us have a sense of if we can imagine the kind of world we would face if the people who bombed the mess hall in Mosul, or the people who did the bombing in Spain, or the people who attacked the United States in New York, shot down the plane over Pennsylvania and attacked the Pentagon…” [emphasis added].

Aftermath

Within two weeks, the FBI had filled the crater in with dirt and a layer of topsoil; had cut down, shredded and converted into mulch the trees scorched by the event. Later, the FBI announced recovery of the cockpit voice recorder. Portions of the tape were played for family members at Princeton University April 18, 2002—after they agreed to waive the right to sue the federal government over what they may hear. Some who heard the tape commented that it raised more questions than it answered.
Foundational witness testimony, taken secretly by 9/11 Commission, omitted from final report

On the morning of Sept. 11, 2001, William Rodriguez, journeyman WTC janitor, helped rescue over 200 people before the North Tower collapsed. He was honored by President Bush as a national hero for selflessly saving so many lives that tragic day. But, rather than admit to evidence what Rodriguez and at least 14 others saw, felt and heard before the first airplane hit, their testimony has been omitted from the record because it does not fit the official explanation for 9/11.

Rodriguez and 14 other witnesses can’t be wrong

On the morning of 9/11 William Rodriguez, 44, was with 14 other people in a sub level 1 WTC basement office preparing for a day’s work just like he had done everyday for 20 years. Without warning the group felt a tremendous explosion emanating from somewhere below them in one of the five WTC sub levels.

Not only did the group hear the explosion, all 15 people felt the floor tremble and saw the walls crack just seconds before hearing another distant explosion coming from high above. Although unaware of the cause, Rodriguez later learned that the second explosion, occurring seconds after the first basement blast, turned out to be the jetliner strike.

Further evidence of a tremendous basement blast came moments later when WTC janitor Felipe David, burnt on his face, arms and hands, entered the office yelling, “explosion, explosion, explosion!”

David had been standing at a nearby sub level 1 freight elevator shaft when he was severely burned from fire coming up the shaft from the basement explosion. Rodriguez pulled David to safety outside the WTC.

There is absolutely 100 percent agreement and no one contradiction among these 15 people as to exactly what happened in those moments immediately before and immediately after the jetliner strike on the morning of 9/11.

For the next hour, until the South Tower collapsed, Rodriguez repeatedly reentered the building to rescue people and lead (or in some cases carry) them to safety.

After the dust had settled, Rodriguez was honored for his selfless acts of heroism that day. He even met with President Bush who thanked him for saving so many lives on the morning of Sept. 11.

But neither the president nor government investigators were interested in the explosion he and the 14 others felt and witnessed before the first alleged airplane strike.

Finally, on Nov. 14, 2002, the White House conceded to a congressional compromise to create an “independent” panel to investigate the Sept. 11 attacks. The “National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (more commonly referred to as The 9/11 Commission)” was formed. The 9/11 Commission claims to have interviewed over 1,200 witnesses before publishing its final report July 22, 2004. Rodriguez was one of those interviewed, however, his testimony was taken behind closed doors and no mention of his foundational testimony, or that of the other 14 people with him that morning, was included in the final report.

“No, what really upsets me is that my story never appeared in the 9/11 Commission report after I told it to them behind closed doors,” said Rodriguez about his meeting with commission members in 2004. “They never followed up with verifying my testimony and basically, when the report came out, there was no mention of my statements and the other evidence of a basement explosion when they decided only airliners brought down the towers.

“This is totally unacceptable and shows they are trying to cover-up something. How could anybody not believe there was a massive explosion below ground level after talking with me and the other 14 people who witnessed the very same thing? It refutes the government story point blank and that’s why they wanted me behind closed doors and why they never mentioned my name or my story in their final report.

“I am asking the American people right now to demand another open and fair investigation—not for my sake, but for the memory of all those good, innocent people who died. We can’t allow the real perpetrators of this crime to get away. I believe my testimony, if allowed to be heard, will help bring the guilty parties to justice once and for all.”

Though Rodriguez has been interviewed by countless mainstream news reporters, he claims that his words have either been deleted, manipulated or made to fit the official government account. “Since I was pulled from the rubble after saving hundreds of lives (I had the only master key available on that day, see my documentary at 911keymaster.com), I realized that my original story was being changed constantly by the national networks. It was edited, manipulated, completely deleted, etc. Never once have I had my complete story told by a major news outlet in this country.”

In June, 2004, an NBC production crew, in preparation for a 9/11 miniseries, came to Rodriguez’ home to conduct a several-hour, in-camera interview. The miniseries idea was scuttled and not one second of that footage has ever been aired.

Greg Szymanski contacted NBC investigative unit head Doug Pasternak to ask why the network chose to bury the Rodriguez story. “It simply didn’t add anything new,” Pasternak told Szymanski. “The part about the basement explosion wasn’t the focus of our story. We were concerned about his statements of a hijacker he supposedly encountered several months prior to 9/11 in the World Trade Center. Again, it wasn’t the focus of our story and, like I said, his story didn’t add anything new.”

Rodriguez said that he lost 200 friends on Sept. 11. It is in their memory, and the memories of the other 3,000 or so people who died that day, that the truth must be told. “They deserve nothing less than the full truth,” Rodriguez said.

Neither government investigators nor the mainstream media seem interested in 9/11 truth. That leaves ordinary people and the alternative presses with the responsibility of honoring our dead countrymen with the truth about 9/11 so their murderers may be brought to justice.
Black boxes found but not admitted by 9/11 Commission

Witnesses and photos reveal presence of critical evidence authorities claim has never been found

by Greg Szymanski

Three of the four airline “black boxes,” officially never found in the WTC wreckage, have been under FBI control since January, 2002, claims New York Fireman Nicholas DeMasi in a book entitled “Behind The Scenes: Ground Zero—a Collection of Personal Accounts,” by Gail Swanson.

DeMasi was attached to Engine Company 261, Queens, NY, during the rescue and cleanup phase of 9/11. DeMasi’s statements contradict government claims, including those testified to under oath before the president’s 9/11 Commission. Buried in Chapter 1, footnote 76, of the 9/11 Commission Report is the sole but definitive reference: “The CVRs [cockpit voice recorders] and FDRs [flight data recorders] from American 11 and United 175 were not found.”

Al Felzenberg, an official spokesman for the 9/11 Commission, said about DeMasi and the book published well-before the hearings: “I can’t tell you if he is one of the 1,200 people we interviewed or if his book was one of the countless ones we researched. We explored every lead, but I will try to find if we talked to him.”

DeMasi has remained unavailable for comment since his account appeared in the August, 2003 book, featuring numerous heroic efforts, personal accounts of Ground Zero and over 200 color photographs.

The book was dedicated to the memory of the 343 New York firefighters, 37 Port Authority officers and 23 NYPD officers who died on 9/11.

Besides several Internet accounts, the black box story has surfaced in only one mainstream publication, an October, 2004 edition of the Philadelphia Daily News. The story, by reporter William Bunch, essentially recaps DeMasi’s published statements along with the usual official denials, including those by New York Fire Department and FBI spokesmen. Bureau and fire officials continue to deny finding any trace of the black boxes.

The implications of this story are huge and the clues contained in the CDRs and FDRs would provide investigators with tremendous insight into what was really happening inside both airplanes before they crashed. Yet state and federal investigators and the mainstream media have failed to follow well-supported claims that the FBI is in possession of at least three of the four black boxes and the clues they would hold have failed to turn-up so far in the 1.25 million tons of steel, concrete and other material taken from Ground Zero,” CBS reported.

The CVR uses a pair of microphones to capture cockpit sounds for at least the last 30 minutes of a crashing aircraft. The FDR is also significant since it records heading, altitude and airspeed. Both recorders are designed to withstand enormous impact and force of at least 3,400 Gs and fires of 1,100 degrees Celsius.

Neither of these limits were exceeded using official estimates made at the WTC.

Confirming 9/11, the recorder should have copied any conversations and radio transmissions relative to what really happened to the flight crew, the hijackers and possibly even the passengers. Also, these recorders are designed to transmit “loud pinging or ringing noises” so they can be located in crashes occurring over large bodies of water.

It’s happened before

The FBI has a history of obstructing investigations by not releasing potentially-revealing evidence known to be in its possession. According to Oklahoma State Rep. Charles Key, head of the OK City Bombing Investigation Committee, the FBI held in its possession 22 high-resolution surveillance tapes of the Murrah Building from the morning of April 19, 1995, but refused to release them to his officially-sanctioned committee—even under court order.

Rep. Key also claims that the FBI has the fingerprints of the infamous John Doe #2, but has never made them available to OK City bombing investigators or the court.

WTC black box issue demands investigation

Just as release of Murrah Federal Building surveillance tapes and the identity of John Doe #2 would shed light on what really happened before and during the OK City bombing, the contents of AA-11 and UA-175’s missing black boxes would illuminate the shadows of the Twin Towers investigation. Brian Sacks and Nicholas Levis, two 9/11 truth movement representatives, have passed out free copies of DeMasi’s book while encouraging journalists to start investigating the black box story.

“If DeMasi’s story is true, then there has to be others at Ground Zero who may have witnessed the recovery of the black boxes,” commented Sacks and Levis.

Since FEMA and OSHA monitored the entire crash site, other photos or video evidence showing the recovery of the black boxes must exist but have yet to be discovered.

There is enough evidence here to justify an investigation to locate any possible on-or-off-the-scene witnesses—including other firefighters, rescue workers, civilians, FBI officials, 9/11 commissioners and FAA authorities—who may have vital information leading to the whereabouts of the black boxes.

The PDP lists the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations among the philanthropic organizations that helped to finance its post-9/11 Commission activities.

During its 16-month lifespan, the PDP published a phenomenal number of in-depth analyses on national security-related issues ranging from domestic preparedness to international diplomacy and foreign relations (www.9-11pdp.org). While acknowledging that current U.S. foreign policy should be reformed to diminish (rather than increase) the likelihood of future terrorist attacks, PDP recommendations focus on dramatically increasing domestic government spending to finance the erection of a seamless, multi-jurisdictionally-cooperative and militarized system of law enforcement and cradle-to-grave surveillance of the citizenry.

The 9/11, Inc., roadshow

PDP representatives were also featured speakers at various locations throughout 2005 to promote its “nationwide public education campaign for the purpose of making America safer and more secure” and “enhancing the understanding of American citizens of the nature of the terrorist threat; examining key policy issues contained in the 9/11 Commission’s final report.”

The PDP, or “9/11, Inc.,” tailored its public relations efforts to “a variety of audiences, including the following: general public; national and local news media; think tank scholars; academic experts; former policymakers with national security interest; state and local policymakers; relevant trade groups and associations.”


Bad report card


On the four-point grade scale, the government scored a 1.5 (D) average under Homeland Security/Preparedness and Response (in other words, government needs to spend more money to secure the homeland).

Under Reforming the Institutions of Government, the PDP gave government a score of 1.5 (D). The PDP gave the Bush administration an “F” for failing to remedy its globally-criticized treatment of terror war “detainees.”

The incorporated version of The 9/11 Commission gave the government a “D” average for its efforts thus far. In essence, the president’s 9/11 Commission determined that, in order to overcome the institutionalized inability of existing law enforcement, intelligence and national defense to work cooperatively with one another, the people must pay whatever it takes to finance new layers of government to oversee the coordination of public safety and national security.

The commission also recommended the passage of laws broadening the scope of government’s investigative authority and the resources to monitor movement, communication and financial activities of citizens living in the U.S.

Note: On Dec. 15, 2007, former members of The 9/11 Commission publicly admitted that there was “no question” that the CIA intentionally acted to “impede our investigation.”

In the private sector, people are fired if their incompetence results in lost revenue, property damage, injury or death. In the case of 9/11, public sector incompetence was rewarded with promotions.

USAF General Richard Myers was promoted to vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) August 24, 2001 and was the highest ranking military official at the Pentagon on 9/11. Three days after 9/11, Gen. Myers was promoted to chairman of the JCS. USAF General Ralph Eberhart, in charge of NORAD when the colossal national defense system failed utterly on 9/11, was appointed by President Bush to become the first commander of the U.S. Northern Command established in Oct, 2002, for U.S. military deployment in case of domestic emergency.

USN Captain Charles J. Leidig, acting National Military Command Center Director (NMCC) responsible for coordinating what was determined to be hopelessly botched communications between command leaders on 9/11, was never reprimanded for incompetence but was promoted to admiral in 2004.


Ben Sliney assumed the position of FAA National Operations Manager in Herndon, VA, on 9/11. Sliney failed to implement routine airplane hijack protocols on the morning of 9/11 but flawlessly coordinated the emergency landing of about 4,500 aircraft in the U.S. later the same day. Sliney was promoted and transferred to Long Island and is now retired. Sliney served as a consultant for and played himself in the Hollywood movie, “Flight 93” (2006).

Admiral Steven Abbot, coordinator of vice-President Cheney’s task force on problems of national preparedness, was promoted to deputy director of Homeland Security under Tom Ridge in October, 2001.

And the list goes on to include several ranking FBI and CIA officials who failed to act on intelligence that would have prevented 9/11. Whistleblowers both inside and outside U.S. military and intelligence circles, such as FBI linguist Sibel Edmonds and Underwriter Laboratories Manager Kevin Ryan, however, are demoted or fired.
9/11 communications:
Fantasies and fictions; complications and controversies

We live in an age of advanced communications technologies where we take for granted the ability to instantly be in contact with whomever we desire no matter where they are. We also take for granted that telephonic and electronic communications can be traced and monitored on demand. Upon reflection we can see how communications played a key role in the unfolding of events the morning of Sept. 11, 2001: Where critical, failsafe communications capabilities failed, allowing the events to take place, other communications magically succeeded to color our beliefs about 9/11. Following is an analysis of key communications points surrounding 9/11 and their role in shaping the actual events and our impressions of them.

Radio silence
How the four distinct but obviously related terrorist attacks of 9/11 were secretly coordinated among so many operatives is a bit of a mystery. If there are any communications—radio, telephonic or electronic—between the alleged hijackers or attack commanders in preparation for 9/11 or on the day their plans went into motion, they have not been released to the public.

It is difficult to conceive how such an intricate plan could have been executed incommunicado. Because the FBI almost immediately publicized a list of 19 hijacker suspects led by Osama bin Laden, one would assume they had been under surveillance and had demonstrated probable cause implicating them in premeditating what turned out to be a very complex and terrible plot. It is nearly impossible to believe that there is no record of communications that must have occurred between the attackers during the event’s planning stages and/or while the plot was unfolding that morning.

EAS never activated
The Emergency Alert System (EAS) replaced the outdated Emergency Broadcast System in 1997. The EAS, administrated by the Federal Communication Commission (FCC), is networked through the nation’s TV, cable and radio stations which are required to have on site EAS encoder and/or decoder equipment. Though 9/11 was, by all definitions an emergency, the EAS never activated on 9/11.

Cell phones at Ground Zero
Shortly after the first airplane hit the North Tower, cell phone traffic doubled in the area. The volume of calls reportedly overloaded the network causing it to crash. It was widely reported that “cell phones were not working.” Networks all along the east coast reportedly overloaded and also crashed. It has been noted, however, that at least some satellite phone services were operative at Ground Zero.

Land lines at Ground Zero
Land lines in the building were working and approximately 94 calls were placed from inside the buildings to 911 during the period which began shortly after the first attack and ended moments before the North Tower collapsed nearly two hours later.

Rendered into nearly 2,000 pages of transcripts, the city of New York resisted releasing the 911 calls to the public until The New York Times obtained them by court order August 28, 2004. The City even defied The 9/11 Commission’s desire to review the tapes and transcripts, reluctantly turning them over upon being threatened with subpoena.

Newspapers from all over the world reported on the release of the transcripts and how they revealed the “terror” being experienced by those trapped in the buildings. Curiously, they all quote from the same five or six calls that were probably made within the first hour. The calls are commenting on the horrible deaths, the people throwing themselves out of the buildings and feeling trapped by the intense smoke. The callers were also questioning whether they should stay put, try to escape, break a window for fresh air or if they could expect to be rescued.

There is no mention of the other 90 or so phone calls that may give us a more complete picture of what was happening in the buildings just before they collapsed.

(Note: Toby Usnik, executive director of public relations at The New York Times, returned a call in Feb., 2006, requesting information about the 911 transcripts. With a NYT attorney also on the line, he downplayed the relevance of the material. He explained that 2/3 of it is police, fire department and port authority communications was already available. The remaining material was being cleaned up and redacted by the New York Fire Department in preparation for being posted to the NYT website—DWH).

William Rodriguez (see story page 11) called family in Puerto Rico from a phone on the 20th floor—an indication that hundreds of other personal calls may have also been made from the towers before collapsing.

First responder communications at Ground Zero
Due to a mixup on a certain emergency communications system, NYPD and NYFD were not in communication. When the NYPD gave the order to pull its men out of the South Tower, the NYFD did not get the message and, as a result, many firefighters died.

The main emergency communications system for first responders was sited on the 23rd floor of WTC 7—a high tech, well-fortified and provisioned command and control center for the NY Office of Emergency Management (OEM). The $multi-billion bunker, built to preserve the continuity of government in such emergencies, was allegedly evacuated when a few fires mysteriously started and the OEM communications center was abandoned.

Cell phones in airplanes
The alleged cell phone calls serve to make Americans proud that their brave countrymen fought the Arab hijackers and were used by The 9/11 Commission to recreate what must have happened on the four ill-fated Sept. 11 flights. The key question is, “Could 2001 technology connect cell phone calls from hijacked airplanes?”

Michel Chossudovsky of Global Research (www.globalresearch.ca) asked the right questions; the answers to which represent the closest we will likely ever get to the truth about alleged cell phone calls on 9/11. He determined from wireless experts that cell phones were not designed for air-to-ground communications. If a call could connect at all, the caller would have to be below 8,000 feet. Even then, the quality would be poor and the call would probably “drop” quickly. Contrary to the technology available on Sept. 11, 2001, The 9/11 Commission accepted the premise that lengthy transmissions from airborne cell phones clearly told the story of what happened after three of the four planes were hijacked.

However, on July 27, 2004, Qualcomm and American Airlines announced that it was developing technology that would allow passengers to talk to people on the ground using their cell phones “...as early as 2006.”

The majority of calls were from Flight 93 before it crashed near Shanksville, PA. Curiously, the only flight data recorder “officially” recovered from 9/11 wreckage was from this flight and it contained (with a three-minute discrepancy) a recording of the alleged struggle between hijackers and passengers.

Federal communications breakdown
The 9/11 Commission Report goes into great detail of how the various components of the most expensive and technologically advanced national security apparatus in world history failed completely on 9/11. To read the most comprehensive analysis of this tragic comedy of human errors, start at page one of the “official” 9/11 Commission Report. (see page 7)
Tales of an amateur blacksmith

by Sven Holmgaard

Many 9/11 investigators cite the numbers at which jet fuel burns and steel melts. These numbers are irrelevant in determining what caused the Twin Towers and Building 7 to collapse. These seemingly certain “facts” are quite variable in the real world of welding and blacksmithing. In considering what could have caused these steel-framed buildings to be the first ever of their kind to collapse from fire, it is much more revealing to discuss the conditions that must have been present to achieve the temperatures necessary to soften, liquefy or burn the beams in controversy.

The expensive equipment used to determine how hot “very hot” is (and thereby come up with scientifically-axiomatic numbers for text books) is neither affordable nor useful to the amateur blacksmith. Color has been used to guide the steel working business since the Celts first took hammer and anvil to hot, carbonized iron. As steel heats up it begins with a dull red, which becomes brighter, turning orange, then bright yellow, into a white-hot and soon thereafter it “thaws” turning from solid into liquid and possibly even into a gaseous state, melting or burning away.

The required heat is created by forced combustion of purified fuels. Wood is reduced to charcoal, coal is purified into coke and, in some modern forges, propane is used. At the heart of the process is forcing air into the fuel to intensify the burning rate. Pumping the bellows or turning the crank on the forge blower creates and controls the conditions necessary to heat steel to a working temperature—or beyond if you’re not careful.

Another forge system that I’ve seen drawings of, but not used, is a draft forge. It uses the draft of a chimney and regulatable intake ports to “blow” on the coals and create working heat. This passive system may not work as well for forge welding at white-hot heats, but smaller knives and tools can be forged to orange and yellow heats with the draft system.

Another important factor is material mass. Nails can be hammered out from wire and small, thin knives can be forged in the coals of an open wood fire, but thicker steel will be difficult (or impossible) to work with, melt or burn in an open, un-forced combustion environment. A one-eighth to one-quarter-inch-thick stock of steel will heat to a working orange or yellow quickly in a forced air forge, but half-inch or thicker stock takes considerably longer to heat. What would it take to heat the massive girders and beams of a 110-story building to a “working heat?” It’s beyond my experience, but I imagine it would be somewhere on the order of hours in an insulated, forced-air furnace.

And this brings us to the last vital consideration in the forging process: Most forges have some insulating medium such as firebrick or a wall of upcoming fuel to insulate and reradiate the heat back to the work. Propane forges must be lined with firebrick because, unlike coal or charcoal, a gaseous fuel offers no insulative qualities. The jet fuel which is claimed to have melted steel in the WTC Towers is a gaseous fuel.

So what are the necessary components to melt steel in the real world? 1: A controlled fuel delivery system, in this case, a steady stream of jet fuel; 2: Forced air to intensify the burning rate; 3: An insulated combustion chamber to contain and reradiate the heat and; 4: One through three must be maintained constantly over sufficient time to heat the given mass of steel.

None of these conditions were present in the WTC Towers. 1: The jet fuel burned up quickly, much of it immediately after impact in fireballs emitting from the far side of the buildings. 2: There was no forced air to intensify combustion. The lateral hole from the jet’s entry would tend to suppress combustion since it would have to serve as both intake and exhaust. The passive draft forge system requires a vertical chimney and a regulatable intake. The black smoke from the towers indicates incomplete combustion; it does not indicate intensified, forced air combustion.

3: Insufficient insulating materials were present to contain and reradiate the heat to the steel substructure. If anything, the sheet rock interior walls would have insulated the steel substructure from heat.

Even if we had the three necessary components of constant fuel, forced air and an insulated environment, there was not sufficient time to heat the massive steel in the buildings’ structure. The fires were going out. Steel cools even quicker than it heats up. And we have a picture to prove the falsity of the jet-fuel-melted-steel theory (see above).

Small amounts of hot steel can easily be handled by a blacksmith using hand tools. But massive girders and beams, heated up to a working heat would melt the clothes or skin off anyone in close proximity to them. The picture of the woman standing in the hole where the jet crashed into the building, the primary intake and exhaust of the “WTC forge,” shows it was not at a “working heat” where steel is malleable or even malleable.

I can’t cite from memory the relative temperatures to prove or disprove the government’s jet-fuel-melted-steel theory, but I have burned steel. The conditions necessary to melt steel were not present before the WTC collapse. Therefore, it did not happen. Anyone who tells you otherwise is either a liar or has never generated heat to fabricate useful implements from metal stock.
Structure, physics and the law of falling bodies

We know that for something to be true it must fit within a framework of known facts. Even in our personal lives, we are “tipped off” that people are not telling the truth when what they say is inconsistent with known facts. The following four pages by Eric Hufschmid will test the official version of what happened to the Twin Towers, the Pentagon and collapse of WTC Building 7 against known facts. With known facts in mind, we will be better qualified to determine what really happened that tragic day.

by Eric Hufschmid

We all agree that America was attacked on September 11, 2001, but there is a controversy over some of the details of that attack. The reason for the controversy is that most of the photos, video, seismic data and eyewitness reports conflict with many portions of the official story. In other words, the evidence repeatedly conflicts with the official story.

Such a conflict exists between the laws of natural science and the official explanation for why the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center collapsed.

The Pancake Theory

The official story is that the collapse of the towers began when fire caused steel beams to expand, which then caused the joints to break.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has two diagrams in its May, 2002 report to explain this theory (see figures A and B above). The first diagram shows the fire heating the floor above it, and the expansion of that floor is pushing against the exterior and core columns, causing them to deflect.

FEMA’s second diagram shows a floor falling down. This diagram makes it appear as if the floor was held to the columns at only two locations, but the floors were grids of steel. In order for a floor to fall, hundreds of joints had to break almost simultaneously on 236 exterior columns and 47 core columns.

FEMA omits an explanation as to how this could occur.

FEMA claims the breaking of the first floor started a chain-reaction when it hit the floor below it by breaking the joints holding that floor. This resulted in two floors falling, which then broke the floor below them, and so on. FEMA refers to this as “a pancake-type collapse of successive floors.”

Professor Zdenek Bazant of Northwestern University promoted this Pancake Theory a few days after the September 11 attack, so FEMA may have picked up this theory from the professor.

The top of the South Tower cracks and tips

Photographs of the collapse of the South Tower do not support the Pancake Theory. The first visible event in the collapse of the South Tower was the tipping of the top section towards the crash zone. This top section is about 300 feet tall. This enormous section begins falling over. Why would FEMA claim the floors fell like pancakes when photos show otherwise?

The photos in the book Painful Questions—An Analysis of the September 11th Attack, were not available to the public until September, 2002, which was several months after FEMA had produced its report on the collapse of the Twin Towers.

It is possible that the FEMA investigators had never seen the photos published in Painful Questions and this could explain why FEMA assumed that the floors in the tower fell down like pancakes. However, the FEMA report is discredited in the presence of new evidence and a new investigation should take place.

Unfortunately, mainstream news reporters have not yet mentioned that this book—and the evidence it contains—exists; most people, therefore, are oblivious to it.

It is possible that the people at FEMA do not know that Painful Questions exists, which would explain why they seem oblivious to the fact that their Pancake Theory is a structural impossibility.

Clouds of concrete

Prior to the collapse, wisps of black smoke were seeping from the tower and rising upward. When the top section began to tip (see photo above), enormous clouds were expelled horizontally out of the tower. These
clouds were not the smoke of a fire. Rather, something was occurring inside the tower to create large amounts of powder, which was then expelled at high velocity.

What could the powder be?
The U.S. Geological Survey analyzed the powder on the streets of Manhattan after these buildings collapsed. Their analysis showed the powder to be primarily concrete and gypsum. Gypsum is a soft material so it is easy to believe that the gypsum was crushed to powder during the collisions of such massive pieces of building, especially the gypsum that was roasted in the fire. However, concrete does not turn to powder very easily, even after it has been roasted in a fire. What was occurring at the crash zone to convert the concrete and gypsum to powder?

Before we try to answer that question, we must study the photos of the rubble of the World Trade Center.

Only steel survived

Every photo of the rubble shows nothing but steel remained. One of the firemen searching for survivors told a reporter that the largest item he found, aside from the steel beams, was a small piece of a telephone keypad.

How can buildings fall down without at least some of the flooring, computers, office furniture, plumbing fixtures and concrete surviving? How is such total annihilation possible?

We are supposed to believe that the people who designed the World Trade Center towers never provided enough of a safety margin to handle a rise in temperature caused by a serious fire. This could be true, but that does not explain why the entire building turned into powder and small pieces of steel.

Rather, it would only explain why some of the steel beams buckled under the stress and it could explain why some of the joints broke. It would not explain why every concrete floor disintegrated into tiny particles before hitting the ground.

The enormous clouds of concrete dust that flew out of the building at high velocity and the pulverization of every object inside the towers is evidence that explosives had been placed in these towers before the attack.

Building 7 collapses

At about 5:20 p.m. on Sept. 11, 2001, WTC Building 7 suddenly collapsed. Video of the WTC 7 collapse shows that it came down much differently than the towers.

The Twin Towers shattered into huge clouds of powder starting near the crash zone and working downward to the ground, rather resembling a fireworks display. But WTC 7 collapsed at its bottom much like a typical demolition of an old building.

Most people assume that fires in WTC 7 caused the building to collapse. In May, 2002, FEMA released its report on the collapse of the buildings. Unfortunately, the report doesn’t explain what happened to WTC 7.

Rather than explain how the fires caused...
WTC 7 to collapse, the FEMA report says this: “The specifics of the fires in Building 7 and how they caused the building to collapse remain unknown at this time.” [Emphasis added]

Various government agencies spent seven months investigating the collapse of the World Trade Center buildings. Not one of them advanced a plausible theory as to what caused the collapse of Building 7.

[Note: The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) released the results of its “extensive three-year” investigation into the collapse of WTC 7 on August 21, 2008 (see page 30). NIST concluded that WTC 7 was the first steel-framed building to ever collapse from fire alone. Curiously, WTC 7 never erupted into flame but a few small, inefficient fires were burning when the building suddenly collapsed.]

Incredible fires should be visible
Most people have never seen photos or video of WTC 7 because the conventional news reporters have not provided much information about this building. As a result, most people jump to the assumption that WTC 7 had extreme fires burning inside it and that the horrendous fires caused the building to crumble. However, the photos and video show only a few tiny fires in only a few of the hundreds of windows and only small amounts of smoke were produced. A fire of the magnitude necessary to collapse a 47-story, steel-framed building would have set fire to a lot of office furniture, carpeting and other flammable objects. This in turn would have caused a lot of flames to be visible in many windows. Also, a large fire of this type would produce a lot of smoke and would likely cause many windows to shatter.

How could such a massive fire burn in the building without any photos showing evidence of large flames or plumes of smoke?

Somebody knew WTC 7 would collapse
Tom Franklin, the photographer who took the famous “Iwo Jima flag raising” photo on Sept. 11, was near WTC 7 at about 4 p.m. In his description of how that photograph came about, he makes an interesting remark about WTC 7: “Firemen evacuated the area as they prepared for the collapse of Building Seven. We were catching our breath, drinking water and juice, when I decided to walk back toward the debris. It was between 4 and 5 p.m. I would say I was 150 yards away when I saw the firefighters raising the flag.”

Franklin’s remarks show that somebody told the firemen by about 4 to 5 p.m. to stay away from WTC 7 because it was going to collapse. Franklin obeyed and walked away from the area, but he did not bother to take photos of the raging fires. How could he walk away from a 47-story building that was engulfed in flames and about to collapse on him without taking a few photos? He should have been able to feel the heat on his head. How could he ignore the first fire ever to destroy a steel building? Or did Franklin look at WTC7 but not see any flames?

Several people took photos of the side and rear of the building because they saw a few flames, but apparently nobody took a photo of the building that was engulfed in flames and about to collapse? Since a steel building had never before collapsed from fire, why would anyone believe WTC 7 was about to collapse from a few tiny fires? Who told the firemen to evacuate the area?

The law of falling bodies
Still universally accepted by scientists and engineers throughout the world is “The Law of Falling Bodies” first advanced by Galileo in the early 1600s. According to the scientists who analyzed the seismic data, the North Tower collapsed in 8.1 seconds. The collapse started at about the 94th floor, near the woman seen in the photo on page 14.

If that woman had tossed a steel beam off the edge, it would have hit the ground about 8.4 seconds later. The formula to figure this out is very simple: Time in seconds = the square root of distance in feet divided by 16.

Example:
94 floors at 12 ft. per floor is 1,128 feet.
1,128 divided by 16 = 70.5
The square root of 70.5 is 8.4. The amount of time it would take for an object to freefall 1,128 feet is 8.4 seconds.
The rubble was extremely hot

NASA and the U.S. Geological Survey created a thermal map of the surface of the rubble five days after the attack. Obviously, the rubble would be cooler after five days than it was on Sept. 11. Also, firemen sprayed water on the rubble during those five days. However, one location in the rubble of WTC 7 was above the melting point of aluminum, and so was one location in the rubble of the South Tower.

When the rubble had finally been removed from the basements of WTC 7 and the towers, news reports claim that workers found steel that had previously melted. These incredible temperatures are more evidence that explosives were used.

Where is the airplane that crashed into the Pentagon?

The government tells us it was AA-77—a Boeing 757 with 64 people on board—that crashed into the Pentagon.

A Boeing 757 is 60 tons when empty and has two large engines that are nearly 8,000 pounds each. The landing gear of this aircraft is also massive.

Photos taken after the crash show only one small engine and a few other small scraps—evidence indicating that the aircraft credited with crashing into the Pentagon was much smaller than a Boeing 757.

Photos taken before the Pentagon offices collapsed do not show a hole in the Pentagon large enough for a Boeing 757; there are no large airplane scraps in front of the Pentagon. These photos are more evidence that the aircraft was much smaller than AA-77.

The towers fell at free-fall speed

Scientists who analyzed the seismic data tell us that the towers collapsed in 8 to 10 seconds. Considering that the towers were 1,300 feet tall, this means that the pieces were falling at free-fall speeds without any type of resistance.

The official story is that one floor fell down and hit the floor below it, then those floors fell to the floor below them, and so on. However, every time the rubble crashed into the floor below, there should be a slight delay from the “resistance” it would encounter from the floor below.

Rubble cannot crash through a hundred steel and concrete floors without slowing down every time it crashed into another floor.

Since the seismic data and video footage show that the rubble was falling down at free-fall speeds, the logical conclusion is that the floors were being shattered with explosives just before the rubble from above crashed into it.

Explosives can also explain why enormous clouds of dust were blown hundreds of feet outward, and why everything inside the buildings was pulverized to dust.

If not a 757, then what?

It is apparent from video and photographic footage, physical evidence and witness testimony (reproduced in Painful Questions and other documents noted on page 30) that a Boeing 757 did not crash into the Pentagon.

The question then becomes, “What did crash into the Pentagon?”

Eric Hufschmid published Painful Questions (full-color book) in Sept., 2002 and subsequently released Painful Deceptions (DVD). Hufschmid’s original analyses have served as a foundation for 9/11 truth to build upon. Information and evidence that has surfaced since the release of Painful Questions and Painful Deceptions tend to support Hufschmid’s foundational work.

Note: For sure there was no wreckage from a Boeing 757 at the Pentagon crash site nor was the resultant damage consistent with what one would expect from a large commercial airliner. But, many people claim they saw a large airplane flying low over the Pentagon. Evidence is surfacing to suggest that a large plane did approach the Pentagon then pulled up at the last moment, disappearing from view behind a fireball (go to www.pentacon.com).
Where did all the Saudis go?

A compilation of newspaper articles, witness reports and official documents obtained by Judicial Watch indicate that a total of about 300 Saudis were allowed to leave the U.S. between Sept. 11 and Sept. 15, 2001. Among those allowed to leave were members of the bin Laden family, the Saudi royal family and others who should have been identified by the FBI as “persons of interest.”

Judicial Watch, a Washington, D.C.-advocacy for justice and civil oversight of government affairs, issued a press release April 20, 2005, stating that it obtained documents through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) in which the FBI invoked privacy right protections on behalf of Osama bin Laden—the man identified by the Bush administration as masterminding the Sept. 11 attacks.

Under the provisions of FOIA’s Exemption 6, as memorialized in a declassified “secret” FBI report dated Sept., 24, 2003, the government was authorized to withhold all information it had about Osama bin Laden. Exemption 6 (5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6) (2000)) states that the government may withhold from public inspection information on U.S. persons in “personnel and medical files and similar files” when the disclosure of such information “would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.”

“It is dumbfounding that the United States government has placed a higher priority on the supposed privacy rights of Osama bin Laden than the public’s right to know what happened in the days following the September 11 terrorist attacks,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “It is difficult for me to imagine a greater insult to the American people, especially those whose loved ones were [allegedly] murdered by bin Laden on that day.”

The government’s 9/11 Commission Report acknowledges that 10 flights—one Saudi flight and nine chartered flights—“with 160 people, mostly Saudi nationals, departed the United States between Sept. 14 and 24.”

Another document obtained by Judicial Watch under FOIA from the Department of Homeland Security showed that, between Sept. 11 and Sept. 15, another 160 Saudis were allowed to leave the country on 55 mostly commercial flights originating from over 20 cities. Many of these flights were airborne while all U.S. flights were grounded.

In his book “House of Bush, House of Saud,” Craig Unger effectively illuminated the Bush/bin Laden family connection and the rapid departure of “many Saudis who may have been able to shed light on the greatest crime in American history.”

Numerous individuals, including former FBI agent Manny Perez, have been cited as claiming they witnessed the order to allow the Saudis to leave that the order to allow the Saudis to leave the country came from the highest levels of government.

In The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions, David Ray Griffin closed his chapter on the officially-sanctioned Saudi exodus by noting that The 9/11 Commission failed to attach the appropriate amount of significance to the Bush administration’s intent to obstruct the questioning of persons with known ties to Osama bin Laden. “...here, as with most other issues, [The 9/11 Commission] seemed more concerned with defending the White House than in giving the American people ‘the fullest possible account of the events surrounding 9/11,’” Griffin stated.

Eighty-four percent of Americans now reject the government’s “official” explanation for 9/11.

An Anderson Cooper/CNN poll from 11/14/04 revealed that 89 percent of over 10,000 people polled believed there is a 9/11 cover-up. About the same time, a Zogby poll revealed that 66% of New York city residents and 60% of the state’s citizens believed the 9/11 investigation should be reopened; 49% of New York City residents and 41% of New York citizens overall said that some U.S. leaders “knew in advance that attacks were planned on or around September 11, 2001, and that they consciously failed to act.”

By Dec. 16, 2005, the war in Iraq had officially become “unpopular” and President Bush admitted that the FBI routinely spies on Americans. These developments caused new waves of people to look deeper into the events of 9/11.

Then gas prices began to soar, the FBI admitted it had no evidence linking Osama bin Laden to 9/11 and 9/11 truth was broadcast on C-SPAN July 30, 31 and August 1, 2006.

By fall, 2006, Congress passed a bill authorizing the torture of terror war detainees and the 9/11 Commission chair and co-chair published “Without Precedent,” a book detailing official lies and obstructions.

On October 16, 2006, the results of a “scientific” New York Times/CBS poll were released. According to the poll, only 16 percent of Americans still believed the government was “telling the truth” about 9/11. The poll also noted that 53 percent of Americans felt the government was “hiding something,” 28 percent believed the government is “mostly lying” about 9/11 and 3 percent were “not sure.”

Informally, we can safely state that over half of all Americans now suspect that the 9/11 attacks were “an inside job.”

Global opinion. A global 9/11 opinion poll from World Public Opinion.org was released on Sept. 12, 2008. According to the poll of over 16,000 participants from 17 nations, 46 percent still blame al Qaeda, 15 percent blame the U.S. government and 7 percent believe Israel masterminded the 9/11 attacks.
“We are under attack, Mr. President”

To accept official explanations for the events of 9/11 we must believe that several hundred persons manning duty stations created to prevent attacks such as the ones that occurred Sept. 11, 2001, chose, of their own free will, to ignore their duties and training that day. The epidemic of unusual behavior was not confined to air traffic and national security personnel on that memorable morning.

During an interview at a town hall meeting dated December 4, 2001, President Bush candidly described his personal thoughts and official actions after being told that the first plane had hit the WTC North Tower. Though the president’s comments describe behavior that is not becoming of a commander-in-chief, they are still posted to the official White House website at www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/12/20011204-17.html

In response to the question, “…how did you feel when you heard about the terrorist attack?” President Bush said, “Thank you, Jordan. Well, Jordan, you’re not going to believe what state I was in when I heard about the terrorist attack. I was in Florida. And my Chief of Staff, Andy Card—actually, I was in a classroom talking about a reading program that works. I was sitting outside the classroom waiting to go in, and I saw an airplane hit the tower—the TV was obviously on. And I used to fly, myself, and I said, well, there’s one terrible pilot. I said, it must have been a horrible accident.”

The only known footage of a plane hitting the first tower was taken by French videographers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York firemen—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York fireman—phers Gedeon and Jules Naudet while filming a documentary about a New York firem...
The Bush/bin Laden family connection

Official investigations into 9/11 avoid considering aspects of the event that may involve President Bush’s personal life. The most significant officially-non-considered issue is the well-documented, multi-generational business and social relationships between the Bush and bin Laden families.

Though there are decades of public records, photos, newspaper articles and anecdotes memorializing an uncommonly intimate relationship between the two families, Congress, the 9/11 Commission and the mainstream press have all remained curiously silent on the issue.

The most notorious attempt to bring awareness to the Bush/bin Laden connection was the controversial documentary “Fahrenheit 9/11” produced and directed by Michael Moore.

The film enjoyed tremendous box office success and contained many irrefutable facts. But, it was not successful in compelling full public disclosure of the two families’ business dealings and how they may have benefitted financially from 9/11. Rather, the messenger, a flamboyant, liberal socialist, was easily discredited as a shill for the Democrats and the Kerry presidential campaign.

But many other sources have confirmed the Bush/bin Laden connection to such an extent that we can trace the billions of dollars in joint ventures, mutual interests and commerce that have been flowing between the two families for decades.

“That the CIA, the Bush family and Osama bin Laden have been cooperating and doing business for decades is now extremely well documented and part of the 9/11 ‘cover-up’ being alluded to by [Senator] Bob Graham, the former chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, in his public remarks,” wrote former LAPD narcotics investigator Michael Ruppert in “Crossing the Rubicon: Decline of the American Empire at the End of the Age of Oil,” a 674-page book documenting numerous 9/11 anomalies.

The Citizens Commission finds there is ample documentation available to link the Bushes and the bin Ladens as international business partners. Official investigators and mainstream media refusal to publicly acknowledge the link infers intentional omission of facts pertinent to an impartial investigation of 9/11.

See suggestions for additional reading page 30.

from previous page

Compiled from reports is the following timeline of what President Bush was later to describe as “An interesting day.”

8:00 a.m.—National Security briefing with National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice.

8:30 a.m.—President and motorcade leave The Colony Resort.

8:46 a.m.—First plane hits North Tower; within minutes Navy Captain Deborah Loewer receives word of first WTC impact from a White House Situation Room staffer. By this time it is known that three airplanes have been hijacked.

8:55 a.m.—President and entourage arrive at Booker Elementary.

9:00 a.m.—Chief of Staff Andy Card officially notifies president of the first WTC impact—12 minutes after the event had made international news. President Bush is taken to a secure room and briefed by National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice.

9:01 a.m.—According to the president’s comments, this is when he sees the first impact on TV and thought at the time that whoever did it must have been “a terrible pilot.” No footage of the first impact was known to exist at this time.

9:03 a.m.—President Bush enters the classroom and begins reading “My Pet Goat” to Booker Elementary second graders.

9:07 a.m.—Card informs Bush of the second impact. About this time vice-President Dick Cheney is escorted from his office in the White House to a safe location by Secret Service agents. No moves are made to protect the president and rush him to a safe bunker.

9:16 a.m.—President Bush continues reading to children and is unavailable as commander-in-chief to a nation under attack.

9:24 a.m.—NORAD still has not scrambled fighters to intercept flights 93 and 77, which are known to be heading toward Washington, D.C.

9:27 a.m.—Still at Booker, President Bush talks to Cheney, who is in a secure location.

9:29 a.m.—President and motorcade leave Booker Elementary. The president stops to keep a prearranged appointment with the press. No precautions are taken to deviate from his publicly-announced schedule.

9:40 a.m.—AA 77 crashes into Pentagon.

9:43 a.m.—President and entourage arrive safely at the Sarasota airport. It is confirmed that President Bush is now fully informed of the situation; does not order that Flight 93 be engaged.

9:55 a.m.—Aide informs vice-President Cheney that Flight 93 is 80 miles out and headed for Washington, D.C. Asked if fighters should engage the commercial airliner and shoot it down, Cheney says, “Yes” and confirms the order twice.

9:57 a.m.—Air Force One leaves Sarasota airport, shoots high up above normal airplane traffic and circles the area for approximately 40 minutes while White House and Secret Service decide what to do. Air Force One pilots take evasive action in response to threats that the plane may also be an attack target. Threats turn out to be false.

10:06 a.m.—Flight 93 “crashes” in a field near Shanksville, PA.

11:45 a.m.—Air Force One lands at Barksdale AFB in Louisiana. Though there is much controversy as to what all happened between takeoff in Sarasota and landing at Barksdale, fighter escort for the president’s plane was not accomplished until sometime between 11:00 and 11:30.

1:30 p.m.—Air Force One leaves Barksdale.

3:00 p.m.—Air Force One arrives at Offutt AFB, NE Nebraska.

4:30 p.m.—Air Force One leaves Offutt after a thorough briefing in which President Bush is informed that Osama bin Laden is suspected to have masterminded the attacks.

6:34 p.m.—Air Force One, escorted by two fighters, arrives at Andrews AFB in Washington, D.C.

8:30 p.m.—President Bush addresses the nation for five minutes. He states, “We will no make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them.” He also stated, “Immediately following the first attack, I implemented our government’s emergency response plans.”

There is no evidence that any such emergency plans were implemented and this statement has never been repeated.

9:00 p.m.—National security briefing.

The Washington Post reported January 27, 2002, that before going to sleep around 11:30 p.m. the night of Sept. 11, President Bush “…wrote in his diary, ‘The Pearl Harbor of the 21st century took place today...We think it’s Osama bin Laden.’”

Note: A complete reconstruction of the president’s Sept. 11, 2001 words, actions and travels was compiled by Allen Wood of 911citizenswatch.org. Wood gleaned clues from official sources and press reports to uncover a strange maze of contradictions, inconsistencies and untruths. It would appear from available data that there have been several instances where times were adjusted, details omitted and vague explanations given regarding the president’s activities that morning in Florida. It is apparent that the president’s timeline for Sept. 11 has become fluid so it can be adjusted to fit with other timelines as they evolve while being consistent with evidence as it surfaces.
Tangled in the webs they’ve weaved

From the moment an airplane hit the North Tower to present, there is not one claim uttered or published in support of the Bush administration’s 19-boxcutter-wielding-Arab-terrorist theory for 9/11 that cannot be challenged by another claim of equal or greater merit. Perhaps the strongest evidence that the “official story” is a complete fabrication is the litany of “untruths” that surround the president’s pretext for a global war on terror and his domestic war on American civil liberties. Following are just a few of the hundreds of lies that have been spun around 9/11:

“This don’t anybody could have predicted that they would try to use an airplane as a missile, a hijacked airplane as a missile.”

~National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice, 5/16/02

On August 6, 2001, the president personally “received a one-and-a-half page briefing advising him that Osama bin Laden was capable of a major strike against the U.S. and that the plot could include the hijacking of an American airplane.” In July 2001, the Bush administration was also told that terrorists had explored using airplanes as missiles. [Source: NBC, 9/10/02; LA Times, 9/27/01]

“...we didn’t know they [the 19 al Qaeda terrorist hijackers] were here plotting until it was too late.” ~Vice-President Dick Cheney to the Heritage Foundation Jan. 4, 2006, in support of warrantless NSA spying

The vice-president claims that, had the Bush administration been empowered to secretly eavesdrop on the U.S.-to-overseas conversations of two 9/11 hijackers, the Sept. 11 attacks may have been prevented. He did not mention that the FBI had extensive dossiers on alleged hijackers Almihdhar and Alhazmi and that The 9/11 Commission had concluded that bureaucratic ineptitude, not lack of intelligence, facilitated the 9/11 tragedy. Besides, the U.S. has been secretly monitoring U.S.-to-overseas communications since WWI. [Source: The Washington Times, 1/5/06]

“Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies, and against us.” ~Vice President Dick Cheney to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, 103rd National Convention, Aug. 26, 2002

The “WMD” claim was the cornerstone of Bush administration justification for invading Iraq. It has since been proven to be a globally scandalous falsehood. The costs of this blatant lie in dollars: nearly $600 billion (and counting). The cost in human lives: Somewhere between 1 million and 1.5 million (depending on who is counting and who gets counted).

“The reason I keep insisting that there was a relationship between Iraq and Saddam and al-Qaeda is because there was a relationship between Iraq and al-Qaeda.”

~President George Bush, Oct, 2004

This comment was made nearly four months after his 9/11 Commission had published its final report which contained the observation that it had found no “collaborative relationship” between Iraq President Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda. In other words, the president was still publicly “insisting” that Saddam Hussein had collaborated with al Qaeda on 9/11 when his own commission had published its findings that the Iraqi president had nothing to do with the Sept. 11 attacks.

“Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons and other plans—this time armed by Saddam Hussein.” ~President George Bush, State of Union Address, Jan 28, 2003

Aside from there being no evidence linking Iraq President Saddam Hussein to the 9/11 tragedy, by this time, six to nine of the 19 alleged hijackers are reportedly alive and living legally in other countries.

“I said, ‘You know, we’ve had such terrible loss of life, maybe the smartest thing to do is, is pull it. And they made that decision to pull and then we watched the building collapse.” ~Larry Silverstein, PBS documentary “America Rebuilds,” Sept., 2002

On Sept. 9, 2005, Silverstein Properties spokesman Dara McQuillan stated, after nearly three years of silence regarding his boss’ initial “pull it” comment, that by “it,” Silverstein meant the contingent of firefighters remaining in the building.

He could not have meant that they should “pull” the firefighters from the building because there weren’t any firefighters in the building, at least according to FEMA, NIST, and Frank Fellini, the FDNY Assistant Chief responsible for WTC 7 at that time.

“Our tests show that it is safe for New Yorkers to go back to work in New York’s financial district.” ~EPA press release from Sept. 16, 2001, upon instructions from the White House to downplay the potential health effects of Ground Zero air quality so that Wall Street could reopen for business.

On this recommendation, rescue and cleanup crews stowed their breathing apparatus and continued their work. Severe respiratory complications began appearing almost immediately; chronic and fatal respiratory symptoms have since plagued people working and living around Ground Zero in proportions well beyond pre-9/11 averages for the area (see pages 24, 25).
Lawsuits filed in wake of 9/11 terrorist attacks prove futile

By 2003 several lawsuits had been filed in federal court in an effort to make public alleged crimes committed by various officials and agencies within the federal government for their roles in the events of 9/11. All of them, with one exception (see page 25) seem to have been dropped or dismissed for one reason or another.

WTC Janitor Wilam Rodríguez’s RICO suit with Attorney Phil Berg fizzled in 2007. Ellen Mariani whose husband died when Flight 77 allegedly hit the Pentagon, also represented by Berg, withdrew her suit for a variety of reasons that were publicly categorized as “health.”

A $7 billion class action lawsuit filed by attorney Stanley Hilton on behalf of the families of some 400 9/11 victims was thrown out of court in early 2005 on the “sovereign immunity doctrine”; the judge chose to grant the president, et al, immunity from prosecution without considering the evidence.

The whistleblower lawsuit filed by Sibel Edmonds seems to have gone nowhere. Edmonds was a translator working at the FBI’s language division after 9/11. Edmonds claims she can prove that officials ignored highly sensitive information heard on wiretaps which would have alerted the government to potential terrorist attacks in advance of the Sept. 11 tragedies. Edmonds’ original 2004 lawsuit was quietly dismissed. The former FBI linguist filed a more detailed complaint in 2005 which was also dismissed. Edmond’s appeal was denied without reason or opinion May 6, 2005.

Anyone who has been involved in civil action in federal court knows that the system can be slow, frustrating and expensive. Those who have attempted to sue the federal government in a federal court can attest to the federal court’s partiality in favor of agents and agencies of the federal government.

To read the respectfully submitted and well-supported pleadings filed on behalf of the people of this country by those close to 9/11 is to know beyond a shadow of a doubt they have merit; to know that not one of them has been able to move forward in a court of law is a sign that the federal courts are preventing—not facilitating—the hearing of legitimate citizen claims of official wrongdoing with regard to 9/11.

Lucky Larry’s $2+ billion bonus

Just six weeks before 9/11, Larry Silverstein had secured privately leased control of the WTC complex. The WTC had been public property since opening its doors in 1972.

On July 24, 2001, a $3.2 billion, 99-year lease agreement for the Twin Towers and WTC buildings 4, 5 and two nine-story office buildings was finalized between the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PA) and Silverstein Properties, Inc. Upon consecration of the complex, multi-billion dollar deal, Silverstein took out a full-coverage insurance policy that specifically protected the Twin Towers from losses due to acts of terrorism.

On December 6, 2004, a federal jury decided that the attacks on the Twin Towers were two different events, awarding Silverstein and the PA a total insurance policy recovery of $4.55 billion. The nine insurance companies involved appealed the decision but settled for the $4.55 billion on May 24, 2007 (Silverstein’s “award” was reported at about $2 billion).

Building 7

The 47-story office building known as Building 7 belonged to Silverstein. On the morning of 9/11, a few small fires started on two floors of Building 7. It is not clear how the fires began. Hours after the Twin Towers collapsed, Building 7 came down. The Federal Emergency Management Agency’s report of May, 2002, states, “The specifics of the fires in Building 7 and how they caused the building to collapse remain unknown at this time.”

Four months later, Silverstein told the world what happened to Building 7. The Public Broadcasting System (PBS) aired the documentary “America Rebuilds” in September, 2002. The show contains an interview with Silverstein in which he stated, “I remember getting a call from the, er, fire department commander, telling me that they were not sure they were gonna be able to contain the fire, and I said, ‘We’ve had such terrible loss of life, maybe the smartest thing to do is pull it.’ And they made that decision to pull and we watched the building collapse.”

The term “pull” in this case means to initiate a controlled demolition. According to Silverstein, he and the New York Fire Department decided to “pull” Building 7 and, at approximately 5:20 p.m. on Sept. 11, 2001, the building was “pulled.”

It takes weeks to plan a demolition of this type, set the charges in precise locations and time their detonation. Silverstein’s admission infers prior planning of Building 7’s collapse.

In February, 2002, Industrial Risk Insurers paid Silverstein Properties, Inc., $861 million to rebuild on the WTC 7 site. It is estimated that Silverstein had invested about $386 million in Building 7. In raw numbers, Building 7’s demolition netted Silverstein almost $500 million.

Even though Silverstein admitted Building 7 had been demolished, FEMA has not revised its May, 2002 report, the 9/11 Commission did not address it (see page 22 for an interesting twist to this story) and NIST concluded that Building 7 was the first steel-framed building in history to collapse from fire (see story page 31).

What a day it was

The 9/11 Commission never investigated the possibility that Silverstein’s pre-9/11 land management activities were influenced by prior knowledge of an attack on the WTC. In economic terms, one could safely say that Sept. 11, 2001, was the luckiest day of Larry Silverstein’s life.

Insider trading and 9/11

The first rule of investigation is to follow the money. The CIA knows this rule which is why one of its duties is to monitor, in real time, large financial transactions in the interest of national security. What may be one of the largest insider trading scams in history took place during the weeks before 9/11. Insider trading is facilitated by investment activities known as “shorts” and “puts.” Incidence of such trading increased dramatically with regard to American Airlines and United Airlines stock, reported the Chicago Board Options Exchange. $Millions were made by a few investors when these airlines’ stock crashed after the attacks. No investigation has commenced to determine if the lucky speculators had prior knowledge of 9/11. As an aside, “Buzzy” Krongard was investment bank A.B. Brown’s chairman until 1997. Brown managed United Airline’s pre-9/11 “puts.” Krongard is now—and was during 9/11—CIA executive director.

In Crossing the Rubicon, Michael Ruppert provides evidence proving Smithies were made from curiously-timed investments that capitalized on the 9/11 tragedy. Because it could not tie one of its duties is to monitor, in real time, large financial transactions in the interest of national security. What may be one of the largest insider trading scams in history took place during the weeks before 9/11. Insider trading is facilitated by investment activities known as “shorts” and “puts.” Incidence of such trading increased dramatically with regard to American Airlines and United Airlines stock, reported the Chicago Board Options Exchange. $Millions were made by a few investors when these airlines’ stock crashed after the attacks. No investigation has commenced to determine if the lucky speculators had prior knowledge of 9/11. As an aside, “Buzzy” Krongard was investment bank A.B. Brown’s chairman until 1997. Brown managed United Airline’s pre-9/11 “puts.” Krongard is now—and was during 9/11—CIA executive director.

In Crossing the Rubicon, Michael Ruppert provides evidence proving Smithies were made from curiously-timed investments that capitalized on the 9/11 tragedy. Because it could not tie one of its duties is to monitor, in real time, large financial transactions in the interest of national security. What may be one of the largest insider trading scams in history took place during the weeks before 9/11. Insider trading is facilitated by investment activities known as “shorts” and “puts.” Incidence of such trading increased dramatically with regard to American Airlines and United Airlines stock, reported the Chicago Board Options Exchange. $Millions were made by a few investors when these airlines’ stock crashed after the attacks. No investigation has commenced to determine if the lucky speculators had prior knowledge of 9/11. As an aside, “Buzzy” Krongard was investment bank A.B. Brown’s chairman until 1997. Brown managed United Airline’s pre-9/11 “puts.” Krongard is now—and was during 9/11—CIA executive director.
Messages in the dust

When the Twin Towers collapsed, all that remained intact were lengths of steel; all else had been reduced to particles of dust. That means we can inventory the buildings, assess quantities of inventoried items and add the relative weights of their various elemental components. From there we can calculate dust cloud composition. The results of this mathematical exercise—astounding; the official response to the WTC dustcloud prior to an analysis being conducted—curious; the official silence after the analysis—disturbing.

compiled from WTCEO reports

Before the dust began settling after the collapse of the Twin Towers, video cameras were recording trained rescue workers and selfless citizens engaging in activities best described as acts of heroism. With little regard for their own safety, hundreds of people selflessly pitched in to help those at Ground Zero who needed them.

On Sept. 13, 2001, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Director Christine Todd Whitman declared that the air at and around Ground Zero was safe to breathe, prompting rescue workers to continue their efforts without the aid of breathing apparatus.

Regardless that the government had declared Ground Zero air safe to breathe, large percentages of workers began experiencing moderate to severe respiratory problems and related health complications. Scientists such as Dr. Cate Jenkins, Dr. Marjorie Clarke, Paul Bartlett and others warned of the consequences of inhaling the toxic dust and fumes but were unheeded by the agencies in charge.

Recipe for a toxic cloud

Each 110-floor tower weighed approximately 500,000 tons and contained 100,000 tons of steel and 213,000 cubic yards of concrete. Each tower had approximately 6,000 miles of electrical wire and 198 miles of heating ducts.

Aside from the tons of toxic components of pulverized concrete, aluminum, copper, rubber/plastic and sheet metal, the Twin Towers also housed approximately 100,000 computers—each one of which contained four to 12 pounds of lead.

Each of the tens of thousands of fluorescent light bulbs contained measurable amounts of mercury—the most toxic non-radioactive substance on earth. Mercury is heavily regulated by the EPA from the moment it is mined to the moment it’s discarded as waste.

Levels of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) were measured at 75,000 times the previous record for the area. PCBs are primarily used as insulating fluids for heavy-duty electrical systems such as those found in power plants and large buildings. Due to their extreme toxicity PCBs are heavily regulated by the EPA and their use scheduled to be phased out.

The smoke detectors found throughout the Twin Towers contained radioactive americium-241. The EPA cautions against inhalation exposure to americium-241 and that inhaled particles of the radioactive substance may become lodged in the lungs.

In early October, 2001, Dr. Thomas Cahill of the University of Davis at California found levels of very fine and ultrafine particulates in the Ground Zero breathing mixture that were the highest he’d seen of 7,000 samples taken around the world—including those he took while Kuwaiti oil fields were burning at the end of the first Gulf War.

Months after the disaster the EPA recorded unprecedented levels of dioxin in the breathing mixture near Ground Zero. Dioxin, is an extremely persistent toxin that is heavily regulated by the EPA. Toxic quantities of dioxin were released when plastics, resins and bleaches in the towers were incinerated.

Frustrated that the government refused to acknowledge the ongoing ecological disaster caused by the Twin Towers’ collapse, scientists and laypersons formed the World Trade Center Environmental Organization (WTCEO).

The group has staged protests attempting to bring national attention to the environmental issues that have lingered around Ground Zero since 9/11. On March 11, 2002, WTCEO member Dr. Marjorie Clarke, Ph.D., from the City College of New York, testified before a Senate investigation committee on 9/11. She described for the record the toxins and pollutants at Ground Zero and the effect they have had on people in the area:

- Over 400,000 pounds of lead
- Over 200,000 pounds of asbestos
- More than enough mercury to contaminate 2,500 city blocks
- Radioactive americium 241 from thousands of smoke detectors
- Highest levels of vanadium ever recorded
- Children in nearby schools have developed serious respiratory problems
- Half of those who cleaned ground zero have serious health problems
- Hundreds of firefighters can no longer work
- 14 rescue dogs have died

It is odd that the government prefers not to investigate or cleanup the toxic legacy of the Twin Towers collapse when it has a mandate, the authority and an obligation to do so. (See update next page)
Citizens 9/11 Commission Report

**BBC reported WTC 7 collapse—23 minutes before it happened**

On Feb. 27, 2007, a video clip from the BBC appeared on YouTube and was instantly made available to the world—over and over again. The clip, which only aired once and, according to the BBC, was “lost” shows BBC correspondent Jane Standley talking about how the Saloman Brothers Building (WTC 7) had just collapsed. The report was broadcast approximately 23 minutes before WTC 7 actually collapsed.

The still at right, taken from the live BBC broadcast, clearly shows WTC 7 still standing in the background (see circle to the right of her ear). The source of the clip claims the spot was originally aired at 4:54 (21:54 GMT) p.m. WTC 7 collapsed at 5:20 p.m.

The BBC clip indicates it had prior knowledge that WTC 7 was to collapse, though Standley made no mention that the collapse was preplanned.

Both Standley and the BBC have thus far refused to intelligently comment on the clip.

On September 9, 2006, 9/11 victims’ advocate Robert McPadden told an audience at the Community Church in New York City how, while stationed at a Red Cross operations center, he was told that WTC 7 was going to be brought down.

We have known since WTC complex leaseholder Larry Silverstein stated on the PBS documentary “America Rebuilds” (see page 23) that the decision had been made to “pull” WTC 7 and it collapsed as a result of a planned demolition. But now we have an overwhelming body of mutually corroborating evidence to prove the fact. It would be prudent to find out who planned the demolition and why.

At a 9/11 “Confronting the Evidence” conference at the Manhattan Center on Sept. 11, 2004, Jenna Orkin of the World Trade Center Environmental Organization announced that,...

Legacies in the dust

The sheer volume of 9/11-related breathing problems among Ground Zero workers is finally forcing the media to acknowledge the growing problem. Associated Press writer Amy Westfeldt noted in her Jan. 13, 2006 article, “Sept. 11 workers die of health problems; direct link to ground zero unclear,” that three men who worked Ground Zero in the 9/11 aftermath have died of respiratory illnesses in the last seven months. Though the friends and families of James Zardoga, Timothy Keller and Felix Hernandez are convinced that these men died of complications directly associated with their work at Ground Zero, the NYC Dept. of Health and Mental Hygiene says it’s too early blame the post-9/11 air quality in lower Manhattan for widespread respiratory ailments in the area.

Robin Herbert is the director of a post 9/11 health monitoring program of over 14,000 workers exposed to “Sept. 11 dust and debris” that is being administrated through Mt. Sinai Hospital. Westfeldt quoted Herbert as stating, “Certainly it is not inconceivable that a person could die of respiratory disease related to Sept. 11.”

At this time, attorneys for the City of New York deny any direct medical link between exposure to WTC toxic debris and respiratory illnesses.

Attorney David Worby is representing more than 10,000 plaintiffs who are alleging government officials and construction contractors exposed workers to toxic cleanup conditions without providing proper protective gear.

Worby claims that, since the middle of 2004, more than 100 of his clients have died from Sept. 11-related illnesses. “This is just the tip of the iceberg. Many, many more people are going to die from the aftermath of this toxicity,” Worby said.

Worby claims that plaintiffs’ attorneys have done about $110 million in pro bono legal work to date. The case is before Federal Judge Alvin Hel-...
The not-so grand inquisition

On November 27, 2002, over a year after the Sept. 11 attacks, President Bush announced his signing of an act of Congress to create “...a national commission to investigate the events of Sept. 11, 2001 and the years that led up to that event.” He also stated that “[t]he investigation should carefully examine all the evidence and follow the fact [sic] wherever they lead. We must uncover every detail and learn every lesson of Sept. the 11th... It’s our most solemn duty.” Since that day, the Bush administration has faced broad-spectrum accusations describing its ongoing attempts to obstruct a full investigation of 9/11. Two years after publication of The 9/11 Commission Report, about half of all Americans are now convinced Bush administration officials have actively participated in a “cover-up” with regard to 9/11.

It took 441 days for President Bush to announce the formation of The 9/11 Commission to investigate the deadliest and most destructive attacks ever perpetrated on American soil. That is the first clue that the Bush White House was in no hurry to investigate the events of 9/11. Following is an overview of “evidence” suggesting that the Bush administration has frustrated efforts to fully investigate 9/11 and make details publicly available.

“As soon as we began looking for answers, we were blocked... The White House is just blocking everything.”
~Monica Gabrielle, wife of 9/11 victim

1. The City of New York accepted a bid by Demolitions, Inc., to remove WTC rubble 11 days after the attacks. Amid many objections by citizens and investigators, the crime scene debris/evidence was quickly cut up and removed—much of it sold to China as scrap.

2. Bush/Cheney contacted then Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) expressing their desire for House and Senate intelligence committees to confine a 9/11 investigation to intelligence apparatus failures that day. They felt that a broader investigation would take valuable resources away from the “war on terror.”

3. Bush’s first choice for the 9/11 Commission chairman was Henry Kissinger who resigned a month later due to “conflicts of interest.”

4. The 9/11 Commission was given $3 million and 18 months to complete its investigation. The White House resisted giving the commission additional funds to complete its investigation.

5. The White House opposed giving the 9/11 Commission a two-month extension to complete its work and finally relented due to a lot of bad press. Ironically, the delays were largely due to lack of cooperation from the White House.

6. For months, the White House denied The 9/11 Commission access to 360 presidents’ daily intelligence briefs (PDFs) dating back to 1998. After lengthy negotiations, only four commissioners were allowed to see just 24 of the 360 PDFs that were germane to the investigation.

7. The four commissioners were denied access to their own notes regarding the 24 PDFs. On March 14, 2004, the White House provided The 9/11 Commission with a 17-page summary of al-Qaeda-related PDFs.

“I am going to assume the White House is stonewalling the investigation.”
~Stephen Push, director, Families of September 11

8. Prior to a March 4, 2004 9/11 Commission hearing to take the testimony of former counterterrorism chief Richard C. Clarke, U.S. Attorney General Alberto Gonzales gave the commission information intended to discredit Clarke and, therefore, his testimony.


10. The 9/11 Commission was “allowed” to take the testimony of Bush and Cheney April 29, 2004, provided their testimonies were taken together, not under oath, behind closed doors and their comments remain classified.

11. On April 1, 2004, it was widely reported that the Bush White House had refused to turn over 75 percent of 11,000 pages of Clinton administration records pertinent to the 9/11 investigation.

12. It’s now 2009: We still don’t know what happened.

9/11 and facts on the ground

• Internationally-organized crime—trafficking of contraband and human misery, graft, larceny and extortion— is a multi-trillion-dollar-a-year industry.

• This money is circulating throughout the international banking system.

• International banking is about 80 percent government regulation—accounting, reporting, tracking and taxing.

• International banking regulations are enforced by international law enforcement and international intelligence communities.

The inescapable facts on the ground in our world of today is that organized criminals, organized bankers, organized governments, organized law enforcement and organized intelligence are all key components of internationally-organized crime.

Think of the human misery, cultural devastation and environmental degradation attributed to this one industry.

Now ask yourself, “Is it so unlikely that 9/11 was perpetrated to further the interests of organized criminals?”

Whodunnit? The widely read newspaper Corriere della Sera quoted former Italian Prime Minister Francesco Cossiga on Nov. 30, 2007, as stating that 9/11 was a false flag operation planned and executed by the CIA and the Mossad. Cossiga’s opinion of intelligentsia is qualified: He was the former head of the Italian secret service and his 1990 testimony ended NATO’s “Operation Gladio.” Gladio’s operatives, among other subversive activities, staged murderous false flag attacks and blamed them on leftist groups.
Global war on terror: The domestic front

Shortly after 9/11, the Bush administration declared a global “war on terror.” Military operations that commenced almost immediately in Afghanistan and then in Iraq are expected to spread into Syria and Iran. Here at home Congress has been passing “anti-terror” laws that represent, in very real terms, a legislative war on American civil liberties. Beginning with enforcement of Patriot Act (2002) provisions, we are now living in a nation where the government routinely conducts warrantless surveillance operations and authorizes itself to arrest, detain and torture its enemies.

Since Sept. 11, 2001, the laws have been changing in America. Under the pretext of protecting Americans from terrorists, civil liberties that we tend to take for granted—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right to privacy in our persons, papers and effects; our right to peaceably assemble, the right to keep and bear arms and other “rights” are being legislated away.

Perhaps the most significant civil liberty or constitutionally-guaranteed right that has been undone by new legislation (and recently upheld in the U.S. Supreme Court) is that Americans are no longer protected against unwarranted searches and seizures. City, county, state and federal police now have the authority to, on hearsay or with self-determined probable cause, enter and search anyone’s home or secretly monitor their communications.

Following is an overview of what the “Patriot” and other acts of Congress actually do to increase police powers across the country:

- Expands terrorism laws to include “domestic terrorism” which could subject lawful political organizations unpopular to the present administration to unlawful surveillance, wiretapping, harassment and criminal penalties—simply for advocating unpopular political viewpoints.
- Allows FBI agents to investigate American citizens for criminal matters, no matter how trivial, without probable cause if an agent deems the activity is warranted for “intelligence purposes.”
- Greatly expands law enforcement’s ability to conduct secret searches, giving it broad and unfettered access to phone and Internet usage, as well as access to highly personal information such as medical, financial, mental health and education records. Such scrutiny can now be made with minimal judicial oversight, leaving surveillance to the arbitrary discretion of law enforcement agents.
- Permits citizens to be detained and questioned without counsel on mere suspicion of terrorist activity, which could include political dissent.
- Permits non-citizens to be jailed based on mere suspicion and denied re-entry to the United States for expressing views not appreciated by authorities. Suspects convicted of no crime may now be detained indefinitely in six-month increments without judicial review.

Bill of Rights violations

- 1st Amendment: Freedom of religion, speech, assembly and the press.
- 4th Amendment: Freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures.
- 5th Amendment: No person is to be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.
- 6th Amendment: Right to a speedy public trial by an impartial jury, right to be informed of the facts of the accusation, right to confront witnesses and have the assistance of legal counsel.
- 8th Amendment: No excessive bail or cruel and unusual punishment.
- 14th Amendment: All persons, whether citizens or not, while within the borders of the United States, are entitled to due process and the equal protection of the laws.

Federal Actions Taken in Violation of Civil Rights But Now Allowed Under the “Patriot Act”

- More than 8,000 South Asian and Arab immigrants have been interrogated because of their religion or ethnic background and not because of actual wrongdoing or terrorist activity.
- American citizens suspected of terrorism are being held indefinitely in military custody without being charged, without legal counsel and without speedy trial protections.
- Thousands of men, mostly of Arab and South Asian origin, have been held in secretive federal custody for weeks, even months—and sometimes without being told why they are being held.
- The public and the press have been banned from immigration court hearings of those detained after 9/11. Courts have been ordered to keep the proceedings secret and to not provide public notice of future hearings.
- The government is now allowed to monitor communications between federal detainees and their lawyers, destroying the attorney/client privilege and right to fair and impartial counsel.
- The new attorney general guidelines allow FBI spying on religious and political organizations, including individual members, without direct evidence of wrongdoing.
- President Bush, in violation of the separation of powers doctrine, has ordered military commissions to try suspected terrorists who are not citizens. These tribunals can enter a conviction on hearsay evidence by only a two-thirds vote.

What lessons in history apply?

History tells us that once government is allowed to unilaterally invade and indiscriminately kill foreigners, the next step is to persecute and subjugate its own people. Welcome to post-9/11 America.

The fall of Athens and Rome came after police authority had expanded to allow warrantless searches and seizures and due process had devolved to the point that citizens were tried by secret tribunals authorized to arbitrarily sentence them to hard labor or death.

FBI refusal to answer petition—revealing; the implications—disturbing

The FBI’s Pentagon/Twin Towers Bombing (PENTTBOM) investigation is allegedly ongoing. Over 200 people recently petitioned PENTTBOM investigation Director Justin Tolomeo to respond to the following allegations: 1) The contract termination date for WTC security company Stratosec was Sept. 10, 2001; 2) seismographs detected explosions in the basements of the Twin Towers before being struck by airplanes; and 3) all three WTC towers fell at free-fall speed, disproving the government’s pancake collapse theory; WTC 7 was not struck by an airplane. The PENTTBOM investigation office has refused to respond to the petition (POGO Petition 200701 at www.voicesofsafety.com). Petition originator Don Meserlian of New Jersey, while pressing the FBI to answer the petition, claims an NYC FBI legal affairs attorney agreed with him when he commented telephonically, “The right to petition the government for grievances implies an obligation to respond, otherwise, the right to petition is a meaningless right.”
The cost of 9/11 not measured in dollars alone

Within hours of the Twin Towers collapsing the Bush administration responded by committing the reputation and resources of America in a costly direction. That direction? Waging global war on terror and claiming the “right” to preemptively strike anyone who is perceived as posing a threat to the interests of the U.S. or its allies.

We can mathematically qualify property damage and reconstruction costs in terms of dollars; we can inventory the guns, bombs and other items purchased for war; we can also estimate the price of administering wartime policies at home and abroad.

Following are some astounding numbers that are important to consider as the White House uses 9/11 to justify leading Americans into an era of armed global conflict. Note that we have kept the figures reported as of 1/31/05 and updated them as of 11/8/08.

### The Financial Costs of Conflict

As you can see from this chart, the U.S. has been at war almost perpetually since The Revolution. Note the steady increase in the costs of war: War is not a down payment on peace; it is a balloon payment for more war.

#### Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Cost in $Billions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td><strong>1990s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revolution (1775-1783)</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War of 1812 (1812-1815)</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican War (1846-1848)</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War (1861-1865): Union</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: Confederate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: Combined</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish American War (1898)</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War I (1917-1918)</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War II (1941-1945)</td>
<td>288.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea (1950-1953)</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam (1964-1972)</td>
<td>111.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf War (1990-1991)</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Current denotes actual dollars spent during the war **1990s denotes expenditures adjusted in terms of 1990s dollars

#### Other costs

- The U.S. dollar is decreasing in value as foreigners lose confidence in its stability due to increasing public debt.
- America’s reputation as defender of freedom has been replaced with a reputation as an aggressor nation; global opposition to U.S. foreign policy is having a chilling effect in areas of commerce and diplomacy.
- Thousands of our sons and daughters are coming home with severe injuries and chemical exposures that will likely result in lifetime disabilities ranging from 10 percent to 100 percent; an epidemic of about 17 U.S. military veterans are committing suicide each day.
- Indefinite military presence as an occupying force in the Middle East is providing the breeding ground for mounting opposition to U.S. foreign policies; the number of “terrorist attacks” against the U.S. and its allies have at least tripled since 2001.
- President Bush has admitted to ordering the National Security Agency to spy on American civilians. He even claims that such surveillance is “legal” under the Constitution.
- On Sept. 7, 2006, Congress passed a bill that “legalizes” unwarranted surveillance and searches of terror war “suspects.” Those identified as enemies of the state may be detained without being charged with crimes and tortured while in custody.

### National debt as of 1/31/05

$7,630,852,511,764.70 (7.63 trillion)

The estimated population of the United States was 295,464,494; each citizen’s share of this debt—including newborns—is $25,826.63.

The National Debt continued to increase an average of $2.05 billion per day since September 30, 2004.

### National debt as of 11/8/08

$10,637,751,504,416 ($10.6 trillion)

The estimated population of the United States is 305,066,912; each citizen’s share of this debt—including newborns—is $34,870.31.

The National Debt has continued to increase an average of $3.99 billion per day since September 28, 2007. (http://brillig.com/debt_clock/)

### Homeland security

2007: $59.8 billion
2008: $64.9 billion
2009: $66.3 billion
(www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/)

### Cost of Iraq war as of 1/31/05

$152.4 billion

### Cost of Iraq war as of 11/8/08

$570 billion
(www.nationalpriorities.org)

The Congressional Budget Office projected last September that the wars would cost $1.4 trillion over 10 years at current levels of operations, and $400 billion less if they were gradually reduced.

Congress approved $25 billion for Iraq and Afghanistan military operations in August ‘04, and had signed off on $180 billion before that—$120 billion for Iraq and $60 billion for Afghanistan.

Some of the money might be designated for a new embassy in Baghdad, which has been projected to cost as much as $1.5 billion. (CNN, 1/24/05)

Estimates as recent as January 10, 2006, place the cost of the Iraq war at $2 trillion on a model that maintains troop presence in that country until 2010 (www.csmonitor.com).

Pallets of fresh $100 bills have been sent to Iraq since the war began. Of an estimated $14 billion in cash sent into the war zone, at least $8.8 billion was unaccounted for as of January, 2005, according to a report from Iraq reconstruction Inspector General Stewart Bowen. CBS reported Dec. 6, 2007, that about $1 billion in military equipment is “lost” and contracts totaling $643 million have an audit trail of only $83 million.

### Iraq body count as of 1/31/05

Americans: 1,435; Iraqi civilians: 3,029 (reported).

### Iraq body count as of 11/8/08

Americans: 4,193
Iraqi civilians: 6,655,000

The Department of Defense does not count enemy casualties or noncombatant deaths. Such figures are obtained by humanitarian organizations. In Oct., 2006, a team of American and Iraqi epidemiologists published a report estimating that 655,000 Iraqi civilians have been killed since March, 2003. Current estimates of Iraqi civilian deaths as of November, 2008, range between 1 million and 1.3 million.

### Afghani civilian deaths

While the U.S. occupation of Iraq drags on, the fact that U.S.-led hostilities in Afghanistan are still killing innocent civilians is rarely in the news. Though the U.S. is no longer actively “looking” for Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan, the estimated number of civilians killed to date is nearing 5,000, up from an estimated 3,800 by mid-2006.
Phase 3: Divided we fall

“When a man who is honestly mistaken hears the truth, he will either quit being mistaken or he will cease being honest.”

~Anonymous

by Dave Von Kleist

Many Americans and people around the world believe that the U.S. government not only had prior knowledge, but was actually involved with the planning of the events that unfolded on 9/11.

If we dare to explore this line of thought, then we must consider the following: The events of 9/11 were the carrying out of a clandestine black operation with an unlimited black budget. Planning for this event would be divided into three phases:

The first would be planning the events themselves, which would itself be a mammoth undertaking requiring much preparation and tremendous funding.

The second phase would be the creation of “rabbit trails” and “patsies.” It would be necessary to have individuals or groups to blame for the attacks; the planting of evidence to support charges of responsibility would require years of planning.

Phase three would unleash legions of “investigators” whose sole purpose is to keep us focused on the patsies and rabbit trails. Phase three has been in operation since Sept. 11, 2001, and will continue until 9/11 has been lost in time or the plot is exposed.

The plan has succeeded thus far. The events came off (apparently) without a hitch; the patsies and rabbit trails have kept trusting Americans fearful and confused; independent 9/11 researchers are always wondering who among them is real, what information is real while the truth of what really happened that day remains just beyond our collective comprehension.

As public awareness increases in regard to the events of 9/11, those with cognitive skills are recognizing the rabbit trails and are warning others of their existence. 9/11 In Plane Site is a perfect example of what we can prove about 9/11 and pass on to others. It is a video/DVD compilation of unaltered footage from the news networks and photographs gathered from magazines that have been put to the music of common sense questions that arise from their examination.

At no time are conspiracy “theories” proposed. Assumptions are made based on historical records, the photographic evidence, eyewitness statements and common sense.

The pieces of evidence found In Plane Site are, in reality, rocks of inarguable truth upon which we can accurately proceed in our efforts to recreate the events of 9/11.

If all those truly seeking 9/11 truth would come together prepared to share what they know and disregard what proves to be false or unprovable and work together filling in the blanks, then we will find who was truly behind the attacks.

Until then, divided we fall—but that was undoubtedly the ultimate intention of those who planned phase three of 9/11.

Tips for spreading 9/11

Building 7?

Among those who believe the government story about 9/11—or are not aware of the growing 9/11 truth movement—there is a common thread: They have never heard about the steel-framed, 47-story WTC Building 7 that collapsed in its own footprint at 5:20 p.m. on Sept. 11. Tell them about Building 7: The 9/11 Commission ignored it and no theory as to the cause of its collapse has ever been advanced—even though its lease holder Larry Silverstein admitted it was intentionally demolished. Building 7 is the smoking gun for 9/11 truth—we just have to show people the smoke.

9/11 logic: Checkmate

If you come across someone who is not convinced that the Twin Towers collapsed as a result of a controlled demolition, engage them in the following line of reasoning:

Q: Do you believe that burning jet fuel caused the Twin Towers to collapse in their footprints because that is what your government told you?
A: Yes.

Q: If your government told you that the Twin Towers collapsed in their own footprints due to controlled demolitions, would you believe it?
A: Yes. I guess so.

Q: Would you agree, then, that your opinion on the Twin Towers’ collapse is based upon your belief in government?
A: (Getting nervous) Yes.

Q: How does the same-day collapse of the 47-story, steel-beam-constructed Building 7—which was not affected by jet fuel—factor into your government-formed belief that jet fuel caused the Twin Towers to collapse?
A: ___________

Questioner: Checkmate.

By now your argumentative adversary will either want to punch you in the nose or is finally open to suggestion. At this time ask if he is interested in seeing the evidence of controlled demolitions. We suggest showing them a lecture by BYU Professor Steven Jones or 9/11 Mysteries.

“Everyone goofed” on 9/11 but no one was fired. Some were promoted, though, and Congress rewarded others with new agencies and bigger budgets.
New evidence supports independent 9/11 investigations; further discredits government’s official 9/11 “theory”

The first edition of The Report of the Citizens Commission on 9/11 was released in Feb., 2005. The original research still stands and has been supported in the ongoing work of independent 9/11 truth researchers. Even in the face of new evidence, the government’s story has not changed. It even continues to list the same 19 hijackers even though as many as 10 are reportedly still alive.

1. Osama not wanted in connection with 9/11

On June 6, 2006, the FBI admitted that the reason why Osama bin Laden’s wanted poster does not indicate he is wanted in connection with the Sept. 11 attacks is because the agency has no evidence linking him to them.

2. Twin Towers collapse caused by controlled demolition

Forensic evidence analyzed by BYU Physics Professor Steven Jones reveals traces of thermate—a patented thermite analogue only available from the military. Jones’ thermate analysis is supported by Ground Zero photos that reveal steel support columns that were perfectly “cut” at angles that could not have occurred naturally. Though not discussed in this report, it is even difficult to use conventional demolition explosives and techniques as a model to fully explain the collapse of WTC towers 1, 2 and 7. This suggests that unconventional (nuclear, scalar) and possibly top secret technologies were used to bring the towers down.

3. Bone fragments

On June 16, 2006, it was reported that some 600 human bone fragments were discovered, mostly on the roof of a skyscraper adjacent to the Twin Tower site, since workers began prepping the building for demolition in fall, 2005. The pancake theory does not explain how bone fragments could end up on the rooftop of an adjacent building.

4. Body count

Photo evidence shows at least 3,000 people on the street near the Twin Towers prior to collapse. All of them were killed when the South Tower came down. Even the “official” death toll of 3,000 is suspect.

5. CIA lied to 9/11 Commission

The CIA announced Dec. 6, 2007, that it destroyed hundreds of hours of al Qaeda suspect interrogation tapes in 2005. On Dec. 10, 2007, former commission co-chair Thomas Keane announced the CIA had told his commission in 2003 and 2004 that such tapes did not exist. Keane indicated that the CIA intentionally obstructed the 9/11 investigation.

Final Report: NIST claims computer models prove fire caused WTC 7 collapse

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) concluded that fire was the primary cause of the WTC 7 collapse in its 115-page final report published August 21, 2008. NIST abandoned previous claims that burning debris from the Twin Towers and diesel fuel stored on the 23rd floor contributed to the building’s collapse. NIST now claims that several apparently spontaneous office fires on multiple floors heated and weakened insulated floor beams and girders to at least 600 degrees C causing a core column to collapse, precipitating the building’s failure. NIST never consulted with qualified professionals who had considered different collapse theories. NIST reportedly performed no physical tests and its conclusions are almost entirely based on computer models wherein steel can be “programmed” to lengthen or shorten under various conditions. It is estimated that NIST spent $20 million investigating the WTC 7 collapse.

Resources for old guard and new waves alike

By Sept. 12, 2001, many people—the first wave—began questioning official explanations for 9/11. As the resultant wars expand, public debt deepens and civil liberties disappear, new waves of Americans are beginning to question what really happened that day. Independent 9/11 investigators have uncovered thousands of details that render the official 9/11 story unbelievable. For further research we list the following resources:

Books
Webster G. Tarpley—9/11 Synthetic Terror
George Humphrey—The Great Illusion
Michael Ruppert—Crossing the Rubicon
William Engdahl—A Century of War
David Griffin—The New Pearl Harbor
—The 9/11 Commission Report
—Christian Faith and the Truth Behind 9/11
—Debunking 9/11 Debunking
—The New Pearl Harbor Revisited
Nafeez Ahmed—The War on Freedom
Barry Zuckwer—Towers of Deception
James Bamford—A Pretext for War
Jim Marrs—The Terror Conspiracy
Joel Andreas—Addicted to War
Paul Thompson—Terror Timeline:
Year by Year, Day by Day, Minute by Minute

Videos/DVDs
Sofia Smallstorm—9/11 Mysteries
Dave vonKleist—In Plane Site
Richard Gage—9/11 Blueprint for Truth
Jersey Girls—Press for Truth
David Griffin—9/11: The Myth and the Reality
Citizens Investigation Team—The PentaCon
Jason Berman—Fabled Enemies
Steven Jones, Ph.D—9/11 Revisited
Barry Zuckwer—The Great Conspiracy
Dylan Avery—Loose Change Final Cut
Dean Puckett—Elephant in the Room
Francesco Tre—Zero

Periodicals
The Idaho Observer
The American Free Press
The Rock Creek Free Press

Weblinks
There are at least 100,000 websites containing information about 9/11. The following sites will lead you anywhere your 9/11 curiosity wants to go.
911blogger.com
911truth.org
911sharethetruth.com
911research.wtc7.net
journals911studies.com
911inquiry.org
letsroll911.org
wtceo.org
911timeline.net
informationclearinghouse.info
physics911.net
911proof.com

Note: The truth about 9/11 has, thus far, been confined to those who consult “alternative” sources. Thousands died that day and thousands more have died since the subsequent “war on terror” was declared—but we still haven’t captured and tried those accused of masterminding the Sept. 11 attacks. As honorable, free-thinking people, Americans owe the world an explanation for 9/11 that fits the evidence. In honor of those who have died, their killers must be brought to justice.
Next stop: Critical mass of public opinion

On or about Sept. 12, 2001, the 9/11 truth movement was born. Once the smoke over Manhattan began to clear and the initial shock of what had happened wore off, the implausibility of the government’s explanation came into view.

Within weeks 9/11 “conspiracy” theories were beginning to light up the Internet and, within a year, well-researched books and DVDs challenging the government’s official explanation for 9/11 were being published.

But this work was largely being devoured by that peculiar demographic of Americans (and internationals) who believe we never landed on the moon and the assassination of JFK was an inside job.

To 9/11 truth movement investigators and activists, evidence of government complicity in 9/11 continued to increase while general public interest in the subject was fading into memory.

As time passed and new information did not change the government’s original explanation for 9/11, increasing numbers of Americans began suspecting the Bush administration was hiding something.

Then Alex Jones interviewed actor Charlie Sheen on March 20, 2006. Sheen stated his concerns about what appeared to be a government coverup of 9/11. Some of his comments were picked up by CNN’s Showbiz Tonight, which did a three-part series quoting Sheen with on-camera support from Synthetic Terror author/historian Webster Tarpley, 9/11truth.org spokesman Mike Berger and Hollywood personalities Sharon Stone and Erica Jong. The Sheen 9/11 truth phenomenon ended with his appearance on ABC’s Jimmy Kimmel Live show a few weeks later when his comments prompted a genuine round of applause from the studio audience.

Suddenly, it was hip to publicly question 9/11. Summer, 2006, became the summer of 9/11 truth; press coverage of 9/11 truth events and comments was generally positive (or at least not negative).

The next boost came when CSPAN aired a live broadcast of “9/11 and the Neocon Agenda National Education and Research Conference” from Los Angeles June 24-25, 2006. The conference panel, hosted by Alex Jones, consisted of BYU Physics Professor Steven Jones, Webster Tarpley, philosophy professor Jim Fetzer and Col. Bob Bowman (USAF, ret.), former head of the Star Wars program. The panel discussion was aired on CSPAN July 29, 2006 and rebroadcast July 30 and August 1, 2006.

On August 10, 2006, CNN financial correspondent Lou Dobbs, responding to revelations in the book, “Without Precedent: Inside the 9/11 Commission” by former 9/11 Commission heads Lee Hamilton and Thomas Keane, observed: “...the fact that they [Bush administration officials] continue to perpetuate the lie, suggests that we need a full investigation of what is going on and what is demonstrably an incompetent and, at worst, deceitful federal government.”

As of Sept. 11, 2006, the general feeling among dedicated 9/11 truthers was that, after five years, public pressure and high-profile media attention was on the verge of compelling an objective investigation into events surrounding the Sept. 11 attacks.

Then the momentum fizzled. By early 2007, the national media had dropped 9/11 truth for 2008 election coverage where 9/11 was evidently off limits as a campaign issue.

At this time, polls show that about 84 percent of Americans believe the government is not telling the truth about 9/11. But the global economic crisis, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and rumors of coming wars in Iran and elsewhere, along with the eternally-springing hope that a new administration will fix the damage done by the previous one, are overshadowing the urgency of a real, objective and public investigation of 9/11.

Overshadowed or not, the urgency of a real 9/11 investigation, the indictments of real perpetrators and public trials cannot be overstated. For several months now, leaders of the 9/11 truth movement have been holding conference calls, sharing information and coordinating “projects” intended to bring about the critical mass of public opinion necessary to reopen the 9/11 mass murder mystery.

There is a lot of new information out there and a new generation of internationally-circulating books and documentary DVDs are available. But our main focus is to engage proactive plans to keep working toward the day that those who really planned and executed the events of 9/11 are held accountable.

The three main projects at this time are as follows:

1. NYC 9/11 Ballot Initiative

The New York City 9/11 Truth group has collected nearly 45,000 petition signatures. The plan is to ask New York voters if they want an honest, independent investigation of the events surrounding 9/11 to be conducted. Though NYC 9/11 Truth has enough signatures to get on the ballot, the group plans to continue collecting signatures and be on the ballot for the mayoral election in 2009 after collecting 100,000 signatures.

All NYC residents can participate by gathering signatures and talking 9/11 truth to more people. If you know any New Yorkers, call them up and ask them to get involved—this is working. Go to www.nycinitiative.org

2. Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth

Architect Richard Gage and his group is bringing architects and engineers from all over the world onboard with 9/11 truth. The group is actively seeking architects and engineers to sign a petition that points out the impossibility of the government’s explanations for how the Twin Towers and Building 7 collapsed. So far there are 538 licensed professionals and 2,823 laypeople and architecture/engineering students who have signed the petition. Go to www.ae911truth.org

3. 9/11 Truth Proclamation Campaign

Voices of Safety International has produced a proclamation and cover letter that people can take to their mayors in an effort to convince them to stand for 9/11 truth because the government’s own evidence proves jet fuel did not bring down the Twin Towers. Go to www.voicesofsafety.com

Confucious say: “He who orders the scrubbing of a crime scene contributed to making it.”
It’s official: “Everyone goofed”

The above comment, attributed to Joint Chiefs Chairman General Benjamin Myers, USAF, describes the findings of the president’s 9/11 Commission. The official explanation for what happened in New York City, Washington, D.C., and Shanksville, PA, on Sept. 11, 2001, is that a multitude of human errors, precipitated by interagency rivalries and crossed lines of intelligence communications, resulted in the series of tragedies known today as 9/11.

The “human-error/everyone-goofed” conclusion satisfied Congress, which, per recommendations of the president’s 9/11 Commission, passed the sweeping, $multi-billion National Intelligence Reform Act—case closed.

But are you satisfied? More than 3,000 people are dead; American airspace, including our nation’s capital, was left undefended and, in the span of less than two hours, damage to private property was tallied in billions of dollars.

The editors of the Report of the Citizens’ Commission on 9/11 have sifted through the wreckage of this American disaster and found that human error does not adequately explain what happened Sept. 11. Even if it were true that the “everyone-goofed” scenario describes the failure of our national defenses that fateful day, how does epidemic government employee incompetence lead to mobilizing the U.S. war machine to bomb the villages of innocent civilians in Afghanistan and Iraq?

And, wouldn’t it be more prudent for Congress to punish a handful of “goofers” rather than punish millions of innocent Americans by encroaching on their civil liberties?

The Report of the Citizens Commission on 9/11 is an analysis of key issues that people must consider before determining who planned and executed the Sept. 11 attacks. Once Americans have a clearer picture of events as they unfolded, they will be more qualified to assess whether or not they can support the president’s post-9/11 foreign and domestic policies.

The Report of the Citizens Commission on 9/11 was produced in loving memory of those who perished that tragic day and in honor of the men and women who risked their own lives coming to the aid of those injured in the attacks.