

The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition

By Dr. Anab Whitehouse

© 2008, 2011, 2018  
By Anab Whitehouse  
Bilquees Press  
Brewer, Maine  
04412

All rights are reserved. With the exception of that which is done in accordance with the fair use clause of the Copyright Act, no portion of this publication may be reproduced in any form without the express written permission of the author.

3<sup>rd</sup> Edition Published 2018  
Bilquees Press

Dedicated to those who lost their lives on 9/11 and to their families and to all those who would come to lose their lives as a result of the many ways in which the 'official' investigations into the events of 9/11 were mishandled.



Table of Contents

- 1) Starting Points – page 7
- 2) Some Introductory Comments – page 17
- 3) Snake Plissken and the Bumble Planes – page 27
- 4) Boss, Ze Planes – page 37
- 5) Case of the Mysterious Pod and Windowless Plane – page 67
- 6) I Command You To Stand Down – page 81
- 7) The Walls of Jericho – page 139
- 8) The Two Towers – page 163
- 9) Tora! Tora! Tora! – page 267
- 10) Residual Comments – page 293
- 11) Ending Points – page 313
- 12) Did You Know
- Part 1 – page 321
- Part 2 – page 333
- Part 3 – page 345
- Part 4 – page 357
- Part 5 – page 375
- 13) 'C' Is For Conspiracy – page 387
- 14) Communicating With Fearful Hearts – page 413
- 15) Explosive Questions : A Poem – page 421
- 16) Methodical Perspective – page 423
- Sources – page 443



## **1 – Starting Points**

I am not a Democrat, nor am I a Republican. I am not in favor of bipartisanship, but rather I aspire to be non-partisan in my inquiries.

I have no power except for the choices I make in relation to my day-to-day life. I have no money except that which I earn through a very small pension from the Canadian government, along with what I earn through teaching psychology on a part-time basis, as well as through the selling of a few books that, by the Grace of God, have been written and self-published.

I am a Muslim by choice, and I have been a traveler on the Sufi mystical path for more than 30 years. However, the manner in which I pursue these commitments is quite different than is the case for some who call themselves either Muslim or Sufi, and, consequently, I am often considered something of a pariah in both worlds.

There are no family or friends of mine who were among the approximately 3,000 people who were murdered on 9/11. Moreover, I didn't lose a business or any property at the World Trade Center that day, and I didn't lose any money on the stock market as a result of those events (I didn't gain anything either because I do not own any stocks).

In the aftermath of 9/11, I was reported to the FBI as a possible terrorist. I know this through other individuals and not via the FBI.

I had been described by the individual who reported me as someone who had no visible means of support (I was surviving on unemployment insurance at the time) and who had a state of the art computer (it was an 'As Seen On TV' purchase that was an upgrade of my old computer that had been a gift, but it was far from a state of the art computer). I also had been described as a Sufi who was engaged in secretive activities (because of the relative absence of Sufis and Muslims in the area, I did, to a certain degree, pray and chant various litanies by myself, plus, due to financial circumstances and a variety of life contingencies, I had moved quite a few times in the previous several years, so, I had few friends or acquaintances in the area where I had just moved prior to 9/11, and, therefore, privacy was sort of a natural aspect of my life at the time). Fortunately, I did not end up in Guantánamo.

In the late '60s, I was a draft resister. I didn't agree with the taking of life then – especially in relation to fabricated and self-serving reasons that sought

to justify the wholesale slaughter and oppression of a people who were not seeking to oppress America – and I don't agree with the taking of life now ... whether this be in the form of suicide bombers who kill thousands of innocents and, yet, have the temerity to refer to themselves as Muslim, or in the form of American military forces who have killed hundreds of thousands of innocent people in Iraq and Afghanistan and, yet, have the temerity to refer to themselves as liberators and freedom fighters.

I do not belong to any group or organization because, by inclination and experience, I do not care for the political machinations, positioning for power, and abuse of social dynamics that tend to go on in relation to almost every single organization I have come across both within Muslim and non-Muslim communities. I do not wish to seek to control others, and I do not appreciate others trying to control me.

I am not a member of the '9/11 movement for truth', but neither do I stand shoulder to shoulder with those who ascribe to the 'official' version of 9/11. However, I try to be a reflective observer of both sides.

I have stated the foregoing considerations so that a reader might have some small context within which to place that which follows. I do not have either a religious or political purpose for writing this book.

It would not surprise me if 19 people calling themselves Muslim were to have arrogated to themselves sufficient delusional justification to believe they have the right to take the lives of innocent people in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania. This would not surprise me – sad though it is to admit as much – because I have witnessed, first hand, a comparable sort of arrogance, ignorance, and delusion in many places within the Muslim world, both in North America and abroad.

On the other hand, I would not be surprised to discover that rogue elements within the US military/intelligence/political/corporate community had sought to arrogate to themselves the sort of self-serving justification needed to kill some 3,000 individuals on September 11, 2001 in order to further a pathological agenda for controlling the world's people and resources. Such a possibility would not surprise me because I have been a first-hand witness to many of the events of the last 50 years in which millions of innocent people have been murdered, oppressed, disappeared, and exploited by those in the political, military, and corporate worlds whose moral depravity, narcissism, and psychopathic pathologies seem to have no boundaries.



Nor would I be surprised if it turned out that many of the events on 9/11 were the result of a perfect storm of incompetence, confusion, and human error. Evidence for the existence of all three of these factors is an omnipresent reality in our collective, everyday life.

All but 70 of the 585 pages of *The 9/11 Commission Report* from The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States chaired by Thomas H. Kean and Lee H. Hamilton were directed at building a case for who was to blame for 9/11 (and what to do about it) rather than being directed toward fully and carefully analyzing the nature of the events that transpired on 9/11. In my opinion, the foregoing ratios should have been reversed – with 515 pages being devoted to critically analyzing the events of 9/11 and only 70 pages being devoted to matters pertaining to who did it, together with what to do about that individual or those individuals ... for it makes no sense to get carried away with the who if one does not have an adequate understanding of what might have transpired that day. In other words, one should have some understanding of, and insight into, what was done before one will be in a position to determine whether this or that individual was capable of doing that ‘what’.

Even if the 19 hijackers named by the FBI are responsible -- in some, yet to be determined way -- for the events of 9/11, one might also like to consider if there were others who could have aided and abetted those 19 individuals to do what they are alleged to have done. Possibly, if the hypothetical grand jury on which I am serving [more on this issue shortly] were to indict the aforementioned 19, there also might be a determination made by that fictional grand jury concerning the probable existence of additional, un-indicted co-conspirators.

The so-called ‘official’ version is not the only purported explanation for 9/11 that seems to be spending an inordinate amount of time on trying to determine the who of 9/11, along with what to do about this who. Indeed, an increasing amount of pages and books from the 9/11 truth movement seem to be directed at identifying possible perpetrators within the intelligence, military, political, and corporate communities in relation to the events of 9/11, along with suggestions about what people should do about this.

Whatever the merits of the foregoing respective cases might be, they undermine and detract from attempts to focus on the ‘what’ of 9/11 rather than the ‘who’ and ‘why’ of that day. Consequently, in this book, I will try

to concentrate as much as possible on the issue of ‘what’ and put aside the other matters for another day.

Within much of the following, I have decided to assume the role of someone who is on a grand jury and consider how such a person might reflect on, and think about, an array of evidence, testimony, and documents concerning the events of 9/11. In other words, I see my role to be one of, among other things, asking a lot of questions about things that don’t make sense to me or about which I wish to know more, and, as well, I would see my role as being one of trying, in relation to everything I considered, to exercise critical, independent judgment before casting a vote or making a decision.

In a grand jury, a prosecutor or district attorney brings certain evidence, documents, and testimony before the members of that jury for purposes of either investigating certain possibilities and/or seeking an indictment against one or more persons believed to have been responsible for this or that crime. However, grand jurors are not bound by the intentions of the prosecutor but can choose to go in whatever direction their individual consciences dictate with respect to either the matters being brought up by the prosecutor or any other matters of legitimate interest to the members of the grand jury.

The grand jury is a people’s court. It does not belong to the government other than in the sense that a given grand jury must be convened by the government, but once the jury is convened there is absolutely nothing to prevent that grand jury from moving in any direction it wishes with respect to the issues and problems being brought before it by the government.

The members of a grand jury might ask for whatever evidence seems relevant to any matter that is of concern to them. Moreover, they have the latitude to request the prosecutor or district attorney to subpoena witnesses or documents that are considered to be germane to the matters at hand.

For purposes of this book, I am going to treat *The 9/11 Commission Report*, as well as the book: *Debunking 9/11 Myths: Why Conspiracy Theories Can’t Stand Up To The Facts* edited by David Dunbar and Brad Reagan, along with various NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) documents as the primary evidence or testimony that is being brought forth by a hypothetical prosecutor who is investigating the events of 9/11 on behalf of an unknown governmental body. However, additional documents,

testimony, and various forms of evidence from sources other than the foregoing three works will be introduced from time to time.

My task, as a member of my hypothetical grand jury, is to try to make sense of what I am being told. In addition, my task will be to both ask questions about what is, in a manner of speaking, being presented to me as well as to try to render critical, sound judgment concerning all that is being considered and analyzed during the hypothetical grand jury deliberations.

When a district attorney or federal prosecutor convenes a grand jury, they do so with their own purposes in mind. I would like to reiterate a point made earlier – namely, as a grand juror, I am not restricted to the purposes for which a given grand jury has been convened, but, rather, I am bound by considerations of morality, critical judgment, truth, logic, evaluation of evidence, and justice that might, or might not, coincide with the interests of the government.

The contents of this book are the thoughts, ideas, questions, problems, and issues that have occurred to me while I have read a variety of materials concerning the events of 9/11. The contents of this book constitute the sort of deliberations I might make as a member of a grand jury that had been convened to inquire into the matters of 9/11.

However, as indicated earlier, I am more interested in the ‘what’ of 9/11 than the ‘who’ or ‘why’. I will leave to others in additional hypothetical grand juries to raise questions about the ‘who’ and the ‘why’ with respect to 9/11.

The questions that I have revolve about the nature of the ‘what’ of 9/11. What actually took place on 9/11; what evidence is there concerning these matters; what is the credibility of such evidence or testimony, and, what questions or problems arise in conjunction with seeking to determine this ‘what’?

In a grand jury the members do not profess to be experts about this or that subject. Their function is to consider the evidence, ask questions about that evidence, deliberate upon such evidence, and make recommendations concerning the need for having access to further information through the examination of additional witnesses and/or documents, which can be subpoenaed by the government, in order to determine whether, or not, such evidence supports the weight of an indictment.

Moreover, the last several hundred years of American history have demonstrated that people from all walks of life, economic status, racial and ethnic backgrounds have been very, very good, for the most part, in being able to arrive at decisions that often are capable of capturing the complexities and nuances of cases that explore a variety of technical issues involving science, engineering, religion, business, and politics. Jurors do not necessarily have to be able to conduct experiments or write technical papers in some given subject to competently perform as a juror. Rather, jurors have to be able to assess whether the structure of the thinking involved in such activities constitutes a coherent whole that can be accepted either beyond a reasonable doubt or that might be considered to be consistent with a preponderance of the evidence for any given case.

Jurors are often instructed by judges that the only tool necessary to be a juror is common sense. This tool is invaluable in assessing the credibility of witnesses, or the strength of an argument, or the quality of information being entered into evidence.

The only other quality needed by a juror is to enter into a case without any preconceptions about the truth of a matter. Prejudice and bias render a juror incapable of fulfilling his or her function within the jury process.

In this regard, the present book is not rooted in any presuppositions about the identity of who the guilty parties might be in the matter of 9/11. On the other hand, this book does critically examine the issue of whether, or not, there is good reason to believe that there is a fundamental need for further public inquiry into the events of 9/11.

Jurors – whether through a grand jury or traverse jury (trial jury) -- are determiners of the facts. This function of fact determination is not the function of the judge, the prosecution, expert witnesses, appellate courts, or even the Supreme Court ... this remains the province of the people, and it constitutes one of the bedrocks in which democracy is rooted.

The grand jury system was created because the people who came to the place that came to be known as the United States of America had a healthy disrespect for the sort of abuses that were inherent in the exercise of institutional power. The grand jury was intended to serve as the first and last bastion of defense against any government being able to oppress people – intellectually, socially, religiously, politically, financially, and economically.

It is all very well that the federal government has undertaken a study that resulted in the release of *The 9/11 Commission Report*. However, the ultimate moral and civic responsibility for accepting or rejecting that document, either in part or wholly, rests entirely with the people and not with the government.

Finally, in the following pages, I have no theory to offer concerning the events of 9/11. No conspiracy theory of whatever variety [whether 'official' or otherwise] is being put forth in the following pages.

My task is to consider the tenability of evidence in relation to claims being made by various individuals who seek to give expression to the 'official' version (e.g., *The 9/11 Commission Report*), along with the views of those who might wish to serve as defenders of that perspective (e.g., *Debunking 9/11 Myths* by David Dunbar and Brad Reagan or some of the NIST documents).

What is being offered in the following pages is, hopefully, a rigorous examination of a set of data. The not-so-hypothetical case before the hypothetical grand jury on which I am serving is this: Has the government made its case with respect to the events of September 11, 2001? More specifically, has the government shown that the crimes committed on 9/11 were not only perpetrated by the 19 Arab individuals who have been named by the FBI, but has the government shown that those 19 individuals were acting alone and were operating without the assistance of other people within the United States?

Of course, there is evidence – as discussed in *The 9/11 Commission Report* – which implicates other individuals beyond the 19 alleged hijackers of September 11, 2001 as also having played a role in helping to bring about the events of 9/11. However, the concern that I have as a hypothetical grand juror is the following question: Could the alleged 19 hijackers have perpetrated the crimes with which they have been charged without assistance of a person (or persons) unknown who is (are) a citizen (citizens) of the United States?

The reasons for citing *The 9/11 Commission Report* as one of the primary documents for my hypothetical grand jury hearing is obvious since that book is considered by many to be the definitive account of the events of 9/11. However, there also are several reasons why I have selected *Debunking 9/11 Myths* as a second basic document on which to focus within the following pages.

First, although there have been a number of works released to the public that do explore various aspects of the 9/11 tragedy (e.g. *Why America Slept: The Failure to Prevent 9/11* by Gerald Posner and *Against All Enemies: Inside America's War On Terror* by Richard A. Clarke) *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is an enlarged version of an article that appeared in the March 2005 issue of *Popular Mechanics*, and both the original article as well as enhanced follow-up seem to have a rather unique sort of purpose in the 9/11 literature. More specifically, each of these latter two documents purport to give expression to an attempt to examine the credibility and tenability of various ideas, questions, interpretations, and judgments concerning the events of 9/11, but – and, I think this is very important – never (not for a nanosecond) do the researchers, writers, participants, or editors of either the *Popular Mechanics* article or the subsequent book based on that article raise any questions concerning the ‘official’ story that also happens to be a conspiracy theory – allegedly, the very focus of the *Popular Mechanics* article and book.

As such, *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, along with its progenitor article, do not appear to be an attempt to look at available evidence and possibilities concerning conspiracy theories in an evenhanded manner but, rather, seem to be an attempt to critique only those approaches to the 9/11 issue that do not accept the ‘official’ version of what happened on 9/11. As such, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is akin to a witness for the prosecution who is seeking to challenge the credibility of ideas that run counter to the ‘official’ story of 9/11.

Part of the task of a grand juror is to assess the value, weight, and credibility of such witnesses. Since *Debunking 9/11 Myths* appears to be an attempt to foreclose on the possibility that the truth concerning 9/11 is anything other than what the ‘official’ story says is the case, I feel it is a worthwhile exercise to critically examine what goes on within the testimony of that ‘witness’.

Another reason for selecting *Debunking 9/11 Myths* as an appropriate subject of investigation is because there appear to me to be certain parallels between the way in which the book *Debunking 9/11 Myths* argues its case and the manner in which *The 9/11 Commission Report* presents its case concerning the events of 9/11. If one understands the character of the problems that arise in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, and if one understands the nature of the issues that are either not addressed by that book or are

addressed in problematic ways, and if one understands the nature of the errors that are made in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, and if one understands the questions that have not been raised or adequately answered by *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, and if one understands the character of the holes or lacunae that are present in the form of argumentation being used in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, then I believe one will have insight into the structural character of the nature, problems, questions, lacunae, and errors of *The 9/11 Commission Report*. Moreover, if one has insight into all of the foregoing, then one might understand why there needs to be not only a new investigation into the events of 9/11 but, as well, why there needs to be an investigation into the entire process through which *The 9/11 Commission Report* was generated.

The people who died on 9/11 deserve this. The people who lost love ones on 9/11 deserve this. The American people deserve this. The people who have died and lost loved ones in Afghanistan and Iraq deserve this -- whether these be Afghans, Iraqis, Americans, or people from other countries -- who have been caught up in the hostilities there.





## **2 - Some Introductory Comments**

After having read the document: *Debunking 9/11 Myths: Why Conspiracy Theories Can't Stand Up To The Facts* edited by David Dunbar and Brad Reagan, there are many issues with which I am concerned. First and foremost, what strikes me is the strain of intellectual dishonesty that courses persistently through the aforementioned book.

More specifically, on almost every page of that book, one reads about the 'conspiracy theorists', their wacky ideas, questionable allegiances, and their failure to identify or evaluate the available evidence in what is, according to the editors of this book, the 'proper' manner. Within the foregoing book, the term 'conspiracy theory' is used in a pejorative fashion at every turn, and, yet, the editors of that work do not ever point out or admit that what they call the 'mainstream' account of 9/11 – e.g., the one put forth by *The 9/11 Commission Report* – is, itself, a full-blooded conspiracy theory.

According to *The 9/11 Commission Report*, a group of 19-plus individuals, at the behest of 'Usama bin Laden and others within the command structure of a group called al-Qaeda, planned and cooperated over a period of many years to commit criminal acts on September 11, 2001 against passengers and crews in four commercial jets, as well as the people and buildings of the World Trade Center and, as well, employees of the Pentagon. This is the essence of a conspiracy theory.

Of course, one might wish to argue, as a fall-back position, that, well, yes, what is described above is, technically, a conspiracy theory, but it constitutes and gives expression to a perspective that is shared by the mainstream of reasoned judgment. In point of fact, one might not agree with such a contention because, as a number of polls (including Zogby) have shown, nearly half of the residents of New York City – Ground Zero for whatever conspiracy theory one wishes to adopt – do not accept the 'official' position of the U.S. government concerning many of the events of 9/11, and, if we factor in the rather sizable number of 'I'm not sure' responses, then even within the boundaries of the city where more people perished-- by a considerable margin -- on September 11, 2001 than anywhere else in the United States, the 'official' position does not necessarily constitute the 'mainstream' perspective.

The official version might be mainstream in the minds of the current administration of the federal government, or it might be considered to be

mainstream in the minds of the commissioners and researchers of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, but for a lot of people around the world, the so-called 'official' version does not constitute mainstream thinking.

Furthermore, irrespective of whether, or not, one wishes to label the 'official' version as mainstream, it is a conspiracy theory through and through.

When people start wagging a finger at other people and calling them 'conspiracy theorists' at every opportunity while not only ignoring and disowning their own roots in conspiracy theory but, as well, try to re-frame the situation and sanitize their conspiracy theory as the 'mainstream' 'official' position, I begin to wonder about their motivations for doing this ... I begin to wonder about their credibility ... I begin to want to take a very careful look at what they are saying and doing.

According to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, "The goal of this book is not to tell the complete story of what happened on September 11, 2001. There are numerous excellent sources, including *The 9/11 Commission's Report* and the *New York Times* and other newspapers, that chronicle the attacks in painful detail. Instead, this book aims only to answer the questions raised by conspiracy theorists themselves." [page xx] This statement is misleading in a number of ways.

First, as becomes painfully clear, very quickly, the editors do not have any intention of actually trying to fulfill what they claim is the purpose of their book. In other words, they do not "aim only to answer the questions raised by conspiracy theorists themselves," but, rather, they aim only to address the questions that they believe are raised by particular kinds of conspiracy theories – preferably, and especially, those conspiracy theories and theorists that make claims that the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* feel are relatively easy to ridicule and/or de-construct (and there will be more on this issue later in the book).

In my opinion, no honest, sincere effort is made within the pages of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* to take on the more considered and well-constructed facets of those positions that seek to raise important questions about the events of 9/11. But, rather, only pieces, here and there, are cherry-picked (to employ a term that the editors, themselves, use in relation to those dimensions of conspiracy theory that the editors wish to rail against), while many substantive aspects of those same theories are left unaddressed by the editors of the aforementioned book – in other words,

there is much more to the writings of, for example, David Ray Griffin, Steven Jones, Michel Chossudovsky, Eric Hufschmid, Thierry Meyssan, and others that are mentioned in pages of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, and, as a result, one gets a very distorted picture of the full position of the latter individuals noted above.

Since no one is perfect, we are all going to make mistakes. Consequently, when someone writes about any given subject, it is very likely that some mistake or other will be made, and it is very likely that not every claim that is made will necessarily be tenable.

Almost any idea can be made to appear to be spawned by the lunatic fringe if one re-frames and reconstructs such ideas in a way that renders the idea into a caricature of its original nature. When anyone takes isolated remnants and tries to reduce that understanding down to just the isolated pieces one wishes to consider rather than the fullness of the original, then there is some unfairness of presentation at the heart of what is taking place.

I have studied much, but not all, of what is available to be read on the subject of 9/11. Most of this is in book form, but I have visited quite a few web sites, and I have watched more than a few videos on this issue.

There is a certain amount of the foregoing material that I find less than compelling and quite speculative ... with no real conclusive evidence to back it up. There is other data, information, evidence, and documents associated with the foregoing books, web sites, and videos that is quite a bit more compelling because it is backed up with evidence that gives one – or it should -- pause to reflect on such matters much more carefully rather than be too quick to dismiss what is being labeled by some as ‘conspiracy bunk’.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seem to be far more preoccupied with identifying the less than rigorous or entirely speculative material that is available than, unfortunately, they are interested in engaging some of the material which is available that is rigorously advanced and which is far less speculative but which is critical of the so-called ‘mainstream’ or ‘official’ position.

For instance, the editors of the aforementioned book do not raise one single query concerning the accuracy, tenability, or credibility of *The 9/11 Commission's Report*. Yet, the Commission's report is a conspiracy theory, and one wonders why the editors have not tried to live up to their stated

goal of addressing the questions raised by conspiracy theories, themselves.

Of course, I have engaged in a little re-framing of this issue myself since the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* did not say they were going to answer the questions that are raised by conspiracy theories, but, instead, said something quite different – namely, that they were going to answer the questions that the conspiracy theorists, themselves, raised.

Since *The 9/11 Commission Report* did not raise any questions about itself, then, seemingly, questions concerning the tenability, credibility, rigor, judiciousness, and accuracy of that report need never darken the doorway of the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*. This is a clever exercise in either misdirection or, at the very least, the manner in which bias and prejudice blind one to looking at an issue honestly.

By assuming that everything that the 9/11 Commission says is true, and because that Commission did not have the integrity to question its own proceedings in a non-partisan fashion, the only miscreants who are left to be put in their place are the conspiracy nutcases ... not the official, mainstream conspiracy nutcases, but those other ones. When one assumes one's conclusions, how easy things become – unless, of course, one wishes to try to work toward the truth of things.

Before beginning to undertake an examination of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, I would like to begin with something that might seem quite shocking to many individuals who believe they know what went on in relation to 9/11.

More specifically, recently I visited the web site for the FBI and confirmed something that I had read elsewhere but wanted to verify for myself. The following is what I discovered.

Although 'Usama bin Laden is wanted by the FBI in conjunction with the embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, he is not wanted in conjunction with the events of 9/11. Indeed, Robert Mueller III, Director of the FBI, has said in this regard: "The hijackers also left no paper trail. In our investigation, we have not uncovered a single piece of paper either here in the U.S. or in the treasure trove of information that has turned up in Afghanistan and elsewhere that mentioned any aspect of the September 11<sup>th</sup> plot."

In other words, on the basis of no less an authority than the FBI, there is a complete absence of any paper evidence that ties 'Usama bin Laden to the

events of 9/11. Does this mean that he is innocent? Not necessarily, but there is one other thing to consider before pressing on with the main focus of the present book.

On December 13, 2001 a video was released through the Pentagon – but for which no single Pentagon individual wishes to claim responsibility. The video purportedly shows bin Laden claiming responsibility for the events of 9/11. Among other things, the individual on the video is reported to be saying: “We calculated in advance the number of casualties. We calculated that the floors that would be hit would be three or four floors. I was the most optimistic of them all ... due to my experience in this field. I was thinking that the fire from the gas in the plane would melt the iron structure of the building and collapse the area where the plane hit and all the floors above it only.”

This video has sometimes been referred to as ‘the smoking gun’ video due to its apparent demonstration that ‘Usama bin Laden was the ring leader for the 9/11 conspiracy. However, ‘Houston, we might have a problem’.

A facial analysis has been conducted that compares the facial features of the man in the aforementioned video against a number of ‘Usama bin Laden photographs from al-Jazeera television. This analysis claimed to show that there were substantial differences in nose width, as well as the length of the nose to ear measurement, between the individual in the video and the pictures of bin Laden – measurements whose nature, in an adult, one would expect to remain the same over time.

In addition, the person depicted in the foregoing video is photographed writing something with his right hand. Yet, on the FBI wanted poster, it clearly states, under the ‘Remarks’ section, that bin Laden is left-handed

Supposedly, the video in question was found by some soldiers who were in Afghanistan and located the video in, according to some account, Jalalabad and, according to other accounts, in Kandahar. The identity of these soldiers, or the house where the video was found, or how the video was discovered all seem to be unknown.

Apparently, not even the FBI accepts the provenance for the Pentagon video. As pointed out earlier, the Director of the FBI has gone on record to indicate there is no paper trail that has been uncovered in the

treasure trove of information acquired in the United States or Afghanistan that ties the 9/11 hijackers to, for example, 'Usama bin Laden.

In addition to the foregoing considerations, I have some questions about the words that are reportedly uttered by the individual in the 'smoking gun' video. According to the person in the video tape, he was more optimistic than were his fellow co-conspirators with respect to the potential damage that could be done by the jets crashing into the WTC twin towers. This 'smoking gun' individual makes references to his "experience" in such matters and, then goes on to talk about how he had imagined that the jet fuel in the hijacked planes would ignite and melt the iron structures of the buildings and lead to their collapse – at least on the floors where the planes hit and above.

I'm a little curious as to what 'experience' the individual in the 'smoking gun' video is referring. Although I do not profess to be on intimate terms with the life of 'Usama bin Laden, I am not familiar with any hijackings prior to 9/11 that he committed, nor am I familiar with any instances prior to 9/11 in which he had been able to use hijacked airplanes as missiles, nor am I familiar with any instances prior to 9/11 in which bin Laden was known to have participated in an operation in which jet fuel had been used to melt iron and, thereby, lead to the collapse, either partial or complete, of a steel-framed building.

To be sure, bin Laden did, for a short time, have something to do with his family's construction business. However, this is more likely to have been in relation to the business and management end of things rather than in relation to actually getting one's hands dirty with the physical construction of buildings.

Moreover, while it is possible that during his exposure to the family business he learned a little about how certain kinds of building are designed and put up and, maybe, a little about how they might be brought down, nonetheless, if one of the lessons he claims to have learned from this construction experience is how a jet fuel fire could bring down a steel-framed building, then one might have a clue as to why the family sent him to Afghanistan rather than believing him to have a bright future with the family business.

Indeed, as expressed in the 'smoking gun' video, it is obvious that the individual in that excerpt knew little or nothing about the structure of the World Trade Center tower buildings or what it would take for a jet fuel fire to cause iron to melt and bring about even the partial collapse of a

steel-framed building. Jet fuel would have been consumed in any such fires within the first 5-10 minutes of spilling into the WTC towers – and everyone (even the supporters of the ‘official’ theory) is agreed upon this point.

Consequently, jet fuel would not have been around long enough to be able to bring any of the core or peripheral steel columns of the north and south towers to the temperature of melting – in fact, during the 5- 10 minutes of their short duration, jet fuel fires, in and of themselves, would not even have generated the requisite sustained temperatures that are capable of melting steel under the most ideal of circumstances within the twin towers. Notwithstanding what has just been said, there is, to be sure, an on-going argument about whether the fires started by the jet fuel at the WTC could have created conditions via the burning of, for example, office furniture and so on which, eventually, would have led to the loss of some degree of strength (20 to 50 %) within the steel comprising the core and peripheral columns of the different buildings at the World Trade Center – but this is a quite different issue (and, there will be an extended discussion on precisely this topic later in the book).

One might also mention that during the creation of some of the cave complexes in the Tora Bora region of the mountains in Afghanistan bin Laden might have learned something about the use of explosives. On the other hand, what one learns during the sculpting out of space in rock does not necessarily have much transfer value to the bringing down of 110-storey steel-framed buildings via the burning of jet fuel – especially given that *The 9/11 Commission Report* seems to indicate on page 163 that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed learned about the drills that were “used to excavate caves in Afghanistan”, and, consequently, explosives might not have played all that big a role in those excavations

One also could make mention of the embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania that have been attributed to bin Laden and al-Qaeda. These are among the acts for which, correctly or not, the FBI has placed ‘Usama bin Laden on its wanted list – and not 9/11. In fact the actual nature of the indictment that issued forth from the grand jury proceedings in June 1998 involved “charges arising out of the Somalia attack” (Footnote 46, page 485, *The 9/11 Commission Report*).

However, the embassy tragedies were caused by car bombs. While ‘Usama bin Laden might, or might not, have had something to do with the authorization and logistics for those operations, the actual bombs for the

embassy targets are likely to have been put together by someone other than bin Laden, but even if he did have something to do with the construction of those bombs, nevertheless, this is a long way from using jet fuel to bring about the melting of steel and the partial or complete collapse of steel-framed buildings.

So, once more, I return to the mysterious ‘experience’ to which the figure in the ‘smoking gun’ video is alluding, and I wonder what that experience could have been, and I wonder how such experience would have led him to be more optimistic than the others about the extent of damage that would issue from crashing planes into the twin towers. In fact, I find it – let us say – rather remarkable that the ideas offered by the individual in the ‘smoking gun’ video would turn out to resonate so strongly with the ‘findings’ of some of the people who wrote technical papers about what caused the WTC buildings to collapse. In any event, I consider the reported statements of the individual in the ‘smoking gun’ video about “experience” to be as problematic and questionable as is the contention that the person depicted in that same video is none other than ‘Usama bin Laden.

In any event, on September 16, 2001 and again on September 28, 2001, ‘Usama bin Laden released statements that proclaimed his innocence with respect to the events of 9/11. Among other things he is reported to have said: “I stress that I have not carried out this act that appears to have been carried out by individuals with their own motivation.” In the statement of September 28, 2001 that was reported through the *Daily Ummat*, a Pakistani paper, ‘Usama bin Laden said, among other things, that he was being framed.

‘Usama bin Laden’s denials were broadcast worldwide, but they were not released in the United States. At the time of those statements, the U.S. government urged the media not to release the statements by bin Laden – apparently fearing that there might be some sort of hidden message encoded within the statement that could serve as a trigger for further attacks by terrorist groups upon the United States. However, no such fears seem to be in evidence when the so-called ‘smoking gun’ video of December 13, 2001 was given widespread release within the United States.

People have to make up their own minds about the significance of all of the foregoing considerations. Nonetheless, as far as the FBI is concerned, there is absolutely no evidence in its possession that would tie ‘Usama bin Laden to the events of 9/11, and the information on the FBI wanted poster



in relation to bin Laden reflects this by only making references to the embassy bombings as the reasons the FBI wishes to apprehend him.

Consequently, despite having been convicted again and again and again in the media frenzy that followed 9/11, perhaps, one should remember that in the American system of justice, the accused is given the presumption of innocence, and it is the task of the government to provide substantial evidence that indicates, beyond the standard set for grand jury proceeding, why that presumption of innocence should be removed in any given instance – in this case: ‘Usama bin Laden.

There is a distinction that needs to be drawn between whether, or not, someone committed a crime and whether, or not, the government has been able to demonstrate, beyond a reasonable doubt, that such and such a person is guilty of the crime with which they have been charged. The government bears the burden of proof, not the accused, and according to the FBI, at the present time, the government does not have one shred of evidence that ties ‘Usama bin Laden to 9/11.

Is it possible that ‘Usama bin Laden is guilty of having conspired to bring about the events of 9/11 even though there is no evidence to indicate his guilt? Yes, this is possible.

Nevertheless, the reason why we have a jury system is to afford people protection against a rush to judgment of either the press or public. Moreover, the reason why we have a jury system in America is to protect individuals from being found guilty in the absence of incriminating evidence.

According to the principles of American jurisprudence, it is not enough for the government to believe someone is guilty of a crime. The government must be able to show through the presentation of a substantive case that someone is evidentially culpable and not merely guilty because of reputation or public vilification quite independent from factual considerations.

When going through the material in this book, I believe the reader should try to assume the role of a juror not only with respect to what I am saying but, as well, in conjunction with the things, people, and issues about which I am talking. The reader should consider herself or himself to be one of the members of my hypothetical grand jury. As such, the reader needs to try to keep in abeyance whatever preconceptions he or she might

have about the events of 9/11 and look anew at the arguments, documents, and 'facts' that bear upon those events. The reader needs to be continually asking herself or himself whether the government has proven its case in accordance with the standard set by grand jury proceedings or whether there is good reason to conclude that there are substantial problems with the state's official story of 9/11 – either partially or wholly.

Finally, none of the foregoing should be construed to be an attempt to exonerate, defend, or apologize for 'Usama bin Laden. I am not a fan of his theology or politics, and if he is guilty of having committed terrorist acts – whether in conjunction with 9/11 or in relation to other acts where innocent lives have been taken -- I certainly am neither a supporter nor an admirer of his actions.

However, the American system of justice should not be about what we believe or suspect, nor should it be a function of our likes and dislikes, nor should justice be swayed by mere opinions. The process of justice should be tied to, and rooted in, what can be proven through a rigorously critical but impartial examination of available evidence ... presumably this all is entailed by those symbols of justice in which a woman is blindfolded while holding both a sword and weighing scales.

### **3 - Snake Plissken and The Bumble Planes**

On the opening page of the first chapter in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, the editors talk about the web site of A. K. Dewdney, a professor emeritus of computer science. While it is true that Professor Dewdney is a Professor Emeritus, 2004, at the University of Waterloo, he also is a Professor Emeritus in relation to the University of Western Ontario.

By way of full disclosure, I knew Dr. Dewdney many years ago, and I have visited with him in London, Ontario, ate meals in his house, and attended some sessions he had arranged on various topics at the University of Western Ontario. In fact, he and I belonged to the same spiritual group.

However, the editors get their facts wrong when they claim that Professor Dewdney “reports that U.S. officials ordered the first three passenger jets to land at Harrisburg International Airport in Pennsylvania, shortly after takeoff. The officials then substituted remote control aircraft to attack the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.” Professor Dewdney did not report any of the foregoing.

In his article Dr. Dewdney refers to an article by Carol Valentine that is entitled: “The Flight of the Bumble Planes”. This latter article is built around an alleged e-mail disclosure from someone who used the alias, moniker or e-mail name of Snake Plissken. In the words of Dr. Dewdney: “The informant outlined the basic hijacking method in an email message to Carol Valentine, comparing it to a flight of bumble bees. Watching bees as they buzz around among flowers, it is very difficult to follow individual bees, since they are always passing close to one another.

“The metaphor translates into the flight of two aircraft in a confined locale of airspace. If the separation between them is small enough, radar operators will see not two aircraft, but one. On the morning of September 11, 2001, according to the bumble planes scenario, all four hijacked aircraft landed at a single airport or air base, transferring passengers to one aircraft, the one that crashed in Shanksville, PA. The scenario, as presented by Valentine, consists of little more than this.”

Professor Dewdney went on to talk about something called ‘Operation Pearl’ -- an alternative variation on the ‘bumble plane’ scenario in which passengers are eliminated out at sea rather than during a crash or shoot-down in Shanksville, Pennsylvania. He, then, proceeds to discuss the

pros and cons of a variety of variations on this basic theme in terms of known data about 9/11.

After running through his analysis and attempting to match up what he felt to be a plausible hypothesis with the available facts, he stated that in his opinion the 'bumble plane/Operation Pearl' scenario was more consistent with the available data than any other hypothesis that he had come across concerning 9/11. This was his opinion at the time he wrote his article and posted it on his web site. One would need to speak with Professor Dewdney in the present to see whether, or not, there are changes that he might wish to make with respect to an article he wrote at least a year and a half ago.

Now, for a variety of reasons, I don't find the Bumble Plane/Operation Pearl scenario very compelling. I feel it possesses the same weakness of any operation that tries to get too complicated – that is, an operation that contains too many steps and has too many people involved and provides too many degrees of freedom for the unanticipated to enter into one's planning seems to me to be an operation that is asking for trouble. In other words, if one were to implement an intelligence operation of some kind, then in my opinion, it is always better to try to keep things as simple as possible because when pursued in this manner there is less likelihood of things going wrong because there is less happening that could go wrong.

My reservations concerning the thesis outlined by Professor Dewdney says nothing about the truth or falsity of his perspective, because, quite frankly, I don't know whether, or not, there is any truth entailed by either Operation Pearl or the 'bumble plane' scenario. All my criticism says is that while I might consider it an interesting idea, I do not find the argument given in Professor Dewdney's paper all that compelling.

However, I went through his paper in a manner that understood what Professor Dewdney was trying to do. He was doing what any scientist or rigorous thinker attempts to do.

He took the known facts. He reflected on those facts, and he sought a hypothesis that he felt accounts for those facts in a plausible way.

If the hypothesis which he advanced at that time is incorrect – and I emphasize 'if' – then one must distinguish between the facts which were cited in the various premises of his argument and the conclusion. To

disprove the hypothesis does not necessarily say anything about the legitimacy of one, or more, of the facts used in the argument.

I don't mind the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* disagreeing with Professor Dewdney's conclusions. I am inclined not to agree with them myself – although I might be incorrect in my assessments of his hypothesis.

Nonetheless, what I do object to – and I object to it strenuously – is when someone says that somebody did something, and that person did not do what has been ascribed to them. To state things again, Dr. Dewdney did not 'report' "that U.S. officials ordered the first three passenger jets to land at Harrisburg International Airport in Pennsylvania, shortly after takeoff. The officials then substituted remote control aircraft to attack the World Trade Center and the Pentagon." What Professor Dewdney did do is put together a number of facts and, then, theorized that someone else's hypothesis – e.g., the 'bumble plane' scenario or the Operation Pearl idea -- might be the best way to account for those facts.

Here we are, hardly two pages into *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, and the editors are batting two for two ... two things claimed and two things that are incorrect – except the claims that can't stand up to the facts are the ones being advanced by the editors. This would not appear to auger well for the quality of the rest of the book ... but let us see.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* go on to dispute the accuracy of certain facts cited by Professor Dewdney – for example, whether, or not, Flight 93 (the one that supposedly went down in Shanksville, Pennsylvania) could have accommodated all the passengers from the other flights before it was 'possibly' shot down. The editors point out that there were not enough seats on Flight 93 to accommodate the passengers, flight crews, and flight attendants from the other planes, and, therefore, the editors reject Professor Dewdney's thesis categorically as a ludicrous conspiracy theory.

Of course, while maintaining my own skepticism about the 'bumble plane' hypothesis being advanced, I don't believe that Professor Dewdney stated that everyone who was put onto Flight 93 would necessarily have a seat ... a mistaken assumption of the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*. After all, if one is planning on killing several hundred witnesses, one is probably not going to be all that concerned about whether, or not, the soon-to-be-victims will have a first class, business, or an economy seat or if they

will have to stand or squat in the aisle as they are flown to their 'final destination'.

This is the second error made by the editors in less than two pages. Now, if I use their standards of evaluation, I should automatically assume that the rest of their book is a bunch of error-ridden nonsense.

After all, this is what they have done with respect to Professor Dewdney's article. They have taken what they perceived (incorrectly, as it turns out) to be one mistake in the aforementioned article and, proceeded to treat Dr. Dewdney as someone who can't even get his facts right and who has woven his mistakes into a conspiracy fantasy

They have pointed out what seems to them to be an obvious mistake – even though their failure to take into consideration certain obvious possibilities says more about the quality of their logic than it says about the actual argument of Professor Dewdney. Moreover, based on this 'gotcha' claim, they believe they have dispensed with the first of many conspiracy theories and shown why the latter 'can't stand up to facts'.

Actually, all they really have done is to demonstrate how they have gotten some of their own facts wrong and how they have distorted what someone else has actually done. Apparently, the editors' conspiracy theory about conspiracy theories has not been able to stand up to the facts – but this is quite consistent ... although in an unexpected way ... with their stated goal for their book.

Now, a standard part of any formal point-counterpoint disagreement concerning a given hypothesis is that when someone comes along and knocks a factual hole in such a hypothesis – and let us be kind here and assume that the editors actually have discovered a problem rather than imagined it – then the person who has posited a given hypothesis should be willing to acknowledge that, yes, such and such a fact is in error and proceed from there. One can either admit that such a mistake is fatal to the argument, or one can incorporate the new fact into the argument and try to determine whether the original thesis can be maintained in its initial form or whether the hypothesis will have to be modified somewhat in order to take into account the new information.

I don't know what, if anything, Professor Dewdney might wish to reply to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*. What I do know is this: At this juncture the editors of that book are not operating in accordance

with any acceptable, rigorous method of critiquing a hypothesis ... at least any method that one is likely to learn in university (whether graduate or undergraduate) or that forms a recognizable part of formal argumentation – legal, scientific, academic, and/or philosophical.

The editors heighten the dubiousness of their methodology when they refer to the hypothesis being discussed by Professor Dewdney in the following manner:

“The theory is an advancement of the ‘Flight of the Bumble Planes,’ a hypothesis that first appeared in March 2002 on a web site at [www.public-action.com](http://www.public-action.com), that also promotes revisionist histories of the Holocaust. The person who supposedly exposed the plot writes under the pseudonym Snake Plissken, the name of the Kurt Russell character in the science fiction films *Escape from New York* and *escape from L.A.*” [page 2]

How silently the knife slips in. One moment we are talking about a hypothesis concerning 9/11 – which might be good, bad, or indifferent -- and, then all of a sudden, revisionist accounts of the Holocaust are being mentioned in almost the same breath.

Nothing overt is being said. All that is mentioned is Professor Dewdney’s name in a context that happens to allude to alleged revisionists of the Holocaust. Naturally, readers of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* are free to make up their own mind about these matters, but the implication is something akin to: ‘Folks, this is the kind of people that Professor Dewdney might be in bed with ... so, a word to the wise’.

Naturally, the editors didn’t say this in so many words. They just create an opportunity for their readers to come to that conclusion ... sort of like when the editors just assumed that all of the people who were being put onto Flight 93 were going to be assigned individual seats but had no factual basis on which to rest that assumption and didn’t even seem to consider any alternative possibilities.

In addition, further ridicule is potentially introduced through a framing technique in which the name of Professor Dewdney is entangled, in a compromising sort of way, with a pseudonym – namely Snake Plissken – that is used by a character in science fiction movies. Now we are not only dealing with conspiracy theories but science fiction ... surely, further evidence – according to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* -- about the obvious

lack of seriousness with which one should entertain the ideas contained in Professor Dewdney's article.

George Elliot is a pseudonym for Mary Anne Evans. Mark Twain is a pseudonym for Samuel Clemens. Deep Throat was a pseudonym for W. Mark Felt. There are many others who might be mentioned in this regard. All CIA field operatives have code names or pseudonyms.

Can one necessarily conclude that because someone uses a pseudonym – no matter what that name might be – that this, in and of itself, automatically discredits the ideas being discussed by the person using the pseudonym? I think the obvious answer to this question is 'no'.

Although the name 'Snake Plissken' is mentioned by Dr. Dewdney in relation to the 'bumble plane' scenario, Professor Dewdney also is quite clear about the fact that the article "Flight of the Bumble Planes" is from Carol Valentine who indicates that the alleged source for some – perhaps much -- of the information on which that article is based comes from an individual who would only identify himself or herself by the name Snake Plissken and who supposedly had forwarded some, or much, of the information in question to Carol Valentine via e-mail. The web site [[www.public-action.com](http://www.public-action.com)] that is mentioned by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is operated by Carol Valentine – a name that is, for whatever reason, not mentioned by the two editors.

I do not know what was contained in the aforementioned e-mail information, and I do not know who, or how credible, the individual is who goes by the name Snake Plissken, and I do not know how accurate that information is, and I do not know whether, or not, there is anything of Holocaust revisionism that is present on the web site run by Carol Valentine [or even what the two editors mean by this because they make this allegation without any evidence or discussion whatsoever to substantiate their charge]. What I do know is that the two editors have taken all of the foregoing information and given it their own misleading spin with respect to their criticism of Professor Dewdney.

So, why do the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* appear so eager to be giving the impression that people like Professor Dewdney are nothing more than conspiracy nuts who associate, both directly and indirectly, with those who are alleged to be Holocaust revisionists as well as with characters using names from science fiction movies? Is this really anything other than an exercise in character assassination that is far



removed from conducting rigorous, fair, humane forms of argumentation?

I might disagree with the thesis that Professor Dewdney puts forth concerning what happened in conjunction with the four hijacked flights on 9/11, but one doesn't have to resort to seeking to drag someone's name through the mud in order to accomplish this. One can state one's reasons, thinking processes, criticisms, reservations, or questions, and then one moves on, but if one hangs around to do something else beyond this, perhaps motives are present that have to do with something other than the editors' stated one of seeking to demonstrate the weakness of a given hypothesis.

There is nothing in the first several pages of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that is devoted to debunking Professor Dewdney that I find to be compelling, definitive, indisputable, or undeniable. This section of their book cites little in the way of clear facts that might contradict the hypothesis being delineated by Professor Dewdney, but those several pages do offer one argument that, while appearing to be a logical slam- dunk to the editors, is, in truth, an argument (i.e., the mismatch between the number of seats in Flight 93 and the number of passengers that allegedly were placed on board) which, as indicated earlier, might not have been thought through very rigorously by the two editors.

Finally, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* offer an ad hominem, broad-brushed attempt to paint an unflattering picture of Dr. Dewdney via innuendo. However, there is nothing in this attempt which reflects that conspiracy theories can't stand up to the facts ... although there is something in such efforts that resonates with what some people tend to do when they have no facts with which to argue and, yet, nonetheless, wish to try to discredit someone pro forma.

None of the foregoing is meant to be an apologetic of Professor Dewdney. As I said previously, I do not find the Operation Pearl scenario or the basic hypothesis of the "The Flight of the Bumble Planes" to be especially compelling because of what might be termed a corollary of Ockham's Razor in which instead of saying that one should not multiply assumptions beyond necessity, one might stipulate that operational steps should not be multiplied beyond necessity.

However, this is a principle of logic and not a statement about the truth or falsity of empirical data or a statement about the validity or invalidity of a

given hypothesis. Having four hijacked commercial airplanes fly to an airport in Pennsylvania and, then, having the passengers on those planes disembark and, then, having all these passengers board Flight 93 and, then, assuming the other three planes were previously retrofitted to permit remote controlled flying, seems to me to be complicating the situation unnecessarily.

It might be easier to assume that the planes in question were hijacked – although not necessarily by the 19 people who were identified by the FBI as the perpetrators – and, then, the different sets of hijackers went about their respective tasks. While I might have strong reservations concerning the idea that the four people identified by the FBI were the actual pilots of the hijacked 9/11 flights (more on this shortly), one does not have to be a suicide bomber to be willing to sacrifice oneself for what is perceived – rightly or wrongly – to be the ‘greater good’ ... during war many people are ordered to their death to secure a given objective, and there are many soldiers who are willing to give up their life to help secure such an end.

Did the ‘Deep Throat’ of the ‘bumble plane’ scenario know what she or he was talking about? I don’t know, but given the data that is available to me and on the basis of deliberating about that data, I have my doubts, at the present time, concerning the degree of truth that is entailed by that alleged covert operation or any of its near hypothetical relatives. At the same time, I am of the opinion that the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* have not been able to put forth an argument in the current case that either debunks the perspective of Professor Dewdney or which even demonstrates that such a perspective is a myth ... although it might be. Instead, the Operation Pearl/‘bumble plane’ hypothesis is, at the moment, an unverified hypothesis ... caveat emptor.

In fact, I would consider such a hypothesis to be another exercise of putting the cart before the horse. In other words, one should no more waste time on trying to figure out how things were done on 9/11 than one should waste time on trying to figure out who did these things ... at least not at this stage of the inquiry. Rather, in the beginning, I, as a member of my hypothetical grand jury, should be looking for evidence that goes more to the heart or essence of 9/11 ... evidence that might shed light on whether the official, mainstream story can actually account for events of 9/11 without being contradicted or brought into question by available data that is

well-founded. Hypothetical speculations concerning the 'how' and 'why' and 'who' of 9/11 might be interesting but might also carry a lot of theoretical heat devoid of any real capacity to illuminate understanding.

Moreover, while we are in the midst of talking about Kurt Russell movie characters, perhaps, in the present context, a more appropriate movie role to have been explored by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is that of David Grant (rather than Snake Plissken). Grant is a terrorist expert who is played by Kurt Russell in the 1996 film 'Executive Decision' in which a hijacked commercial jet is intended for use as a tactical weapon by its Arab captors in a terror strike against Washington, D.C. ... too bad, apparently, that Condoleezza Rice didn't get out to the movies more because if she had she might have encountered a scenario that she later claimed no one possibly could have imagined.

Interestingly enough, at the beginning of the 'Executive Decision' movie, one watches the Grant character flying a single engine plane under the guidance of a flight instructor in preparation for his first solo flight. At the end of the movie, the Kurt Russell character successfully lands the hijacked passenger plane, thereby demonstrating - supposedly - that flying large commercial jets is the next logical step up from flying single engine planes ... something that, allegedly, was demonstrated once again on September 11, 2001 - although this latter possibility will be examined much more closely in the next chapter.

-----



#### 4 – Boss, Ze Planes

A continuing refrain throughout *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is that the discussion of any new topic begins with a bold face 'CLAIM:' in which the editors of that book proceed to put forth a condensed version of someone else's claim or alleged claim concerning the events of 9/11. That overview is followed by the editor's perspective which is introduced with a bold face 'FACT:'

This is an exercise in framing the discussion. According to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, all identification, determination, and authentication of 'fact' belong solely to them, and what anyone else has to say about such matters is, according to them, merely a 'claim'.

Like those live television shows in which someone associated with the program holds up an 'APPLAUSE' sign to instruct people in the audience with respect to what is expected of them, so too, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* hold up a 'FACT:' sign for their readership to let their audience know that the territory the latter are about to enter is filled with factual, trustworthy information. It is, as some might allege, a no-spin zone.

Yet, as was clear in relation to merely the opening several pages of their book, the editors have made mistake after mistake after mistake. If the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* had any genuine respect for the people who read their book, they would not be holding up what amount to 'idiot' cards for their readers that try to shape what people think about the issues being discussed -- as if the issue were just a matter of labeling things 'facts' versus 'conspiracy claims', and, golly, we don't really even have to evaluate the data because, look, these two nice editors have done it all for us before the fact.

-----

The next section of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seeks to focus on the qualifications and abilities of the alleged hijacking pilots. In the first part of this discussion – the 'CLAIM' portion makes reference to a March 2006 appearance by movie actor Charlie Sheen on the *Alex Jones Show* in which Mr. Sheen is quoted by the editors as saying: "It seems to me like 19 amateurs with box cutters taking over four commercial airlines and hitting 75 % of their targets ... it raises a lot of questions." [page 3]

The editors wish to take critical issue with Mr. Sheen and begin to do so in the following 'FACT' portion of their discussion. However, before

entering into the details of the editors' position concerning flight qualifications, I'm a little confused about what precisely is merely a claim – rather than a factual statement – concerning the quoted excerpt from Charlie Sheen.

According to the 'official' story, 19 amateurs were actively involved in the 9/11 plot. Since there is no prior claim that these 19 individuals had ever done anything remotely similar to what they are alleged to have accomplished on September 11, 2001, they were all, indeed, amateurs as alluded to by Charlie Sheen. If one is doing something for the very first time, one can't be considered a pro.

According to the 'official' story, the aforementioned 19 individuals used box cutters in order to gain control over four commercial airplanes. Mr. Sheen, at this point, is merely giving expression to part of what *The 9/11 Commission Report* says happened.

Moreover, of the four hijacked planes, three are alleged to have hit their assigned targets. Consequently, this constitutes 75% of the indicated task that reflects what was said by Mr. Sheen.

Everything that Mr. Sheen said is accurate (or, at least, is consistent with the official story) and, yet, for some reason, he is placed on the 'CLAIM' side of the ledger rather than the 'FACT' side of the ledger. Moreover, I am trying to understand how what Mr. Sheen is saying is a conspiracy theory and how the conspiracy theory he is alleged to be putting forth can't stand up to the facts.

Mr. Sheen did say that all of the foregoing points raise a lot of questions. Apparently, to merely raise the specter of questioning with respect to the 'official' version of what went on during 9/11 is to render one a conspiracy theorist.

However, in point of fact, a lot of questions are raised by what Mr. Sheen has said in the foregoing excerpt. On the following page, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* point out that knives and not just box cutters were used by the hijackers of the four planes.

Adding knives to the mix does not contradict what Charlie Sheen said. What such an addition does do is to give renewed emphasis to an underlying question – namely, how were 19 individuals able to advance through four different screening stations at their respective airports without the fact that they were carrying (on their person and/or in their luggage) knives of unknown lengths?

If one individual got through security, one might not think much about the matter. However, if 19 people did this in different cities, with different airlines, involving different personnel, then this becomes a much, much more disturbing possibility.

I also find it curious – and this might be nothing more than that ... a curiosity – that there were passengers and flight attendants aboard a number of the hijacked planes who indicated, during phone conversations with people on the ground, that the hijackers had knives as well as box cutters (e.g., page 8, as well as pages 24-26, of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, and this seemed to be true with respect to, at least, three of the hijacked planes). I find this a curiosity, because when one reads *The 9/11 Commission Report* and goes through the various descriptions of how the hijackers purportedly planned the hijackings, the issue of knives rarely comes up. The word ‘box cutter’ is the weapon usually referred to by the would-be hijackers through most of the report – although the idea of saying that the hijackers had a bomb was mentioned, at several points, as a possible way of gaining access to the cockpit.

Thus, on pages 175-176 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, one of the alleged 9/11 plotters, Khallad (who was not among the ‘19’ individuals identified by the FBI as having carried out the actual hijackings on 9/11), indicates he has: “done what he could to ease the flight, testing security by carrying a box cutter in his toiletries kit onto the flight to Hong Kong. Khallad returned to Bangkok the following day. At the airport, the security officials searched his carry-on bag and even opened the toiletries kit, but just glanced at the contents and let him pass. On this flight, Khallad waited until most of the first class passengers were dozing, then got up and removed the kit from his carry-on. None of the flight attendants took notice.” Again, on page 262, *The 9/11 Commission Report* states: “Atta said that he, Shehhi, and Jarrah had encountered no problems carrying box cutters on cross-country surveillance flights.”

*The 9/11 Commission Report* indicates on page 236 that: “According to KSM [Khalid Sheikh Mohammed], Abu Turab even had the trainees butcher a sheep and a camel to prepare to use knives during the hijackings.” However, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is being held as an enemy combatant – someone to whom the Commission was not given direct access and also about whom, on a number of occasions, the Commission expressed reservations concerning the truthfulness of what KSM told his interrogators

(none of whom were associated with the Commission). Consequently, there is no way of corroborating what KSM did, or did not, say during those interrogations, nor what the circumstances were under which KSM made such statements, nor even whether misdirection of some kind might have motivated KSM or his interrogators in relation to such statements.

On page 247 *The 9/11 Commission Report* states that Moussaoui: “purchased two knives”. On the other hand, in footnote 158 which supposedly is intended to authenticate the foregoing statement, there is no access to the actual FBI interview with Moussaoui Zacarias, a.k.a. Shaqil, that took place on August 18, 2001 and to which the FBI report cited in the footnote alludes. Therefore, one has no way of knowing the context in which such a statement was made or whether, or not, such a purchase ever actually took place, and if it took place, what kind of knives were purchased or what the knives were to be used for – after all, many people purchase knives without necessarily having a malevolent intent.

One might also keep in mind that Moussaoui suffered from serious emotional and psychological problems. He is also someone who changed his story many times both during and after his trial, so, just how much credibility can be given to anything Moussaoui said must be judged against a somewhat complex background consisting of an indeterminate number of strands woven together from a combination of truth, lies, and delusional thinking.

Finally, on page 249 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, one discovers the following: “In Mid-August, for example, they bought small knives that might have been used in the attacks.” Nothing appears in the footnote cited at the end of the paragraph in which the foregoing sentence occurs that establishes the source or authenticity for such information.

Pages 52-57 of the February 29, 2004 FBI report entitled: “Summary of Penttbom Investigation” seems to be given as a general source for the information concerning the purchase of knives that is mentioned on page 249 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*. Nevertheless, the nature of the footnote in question is such that it does not enable anyone to determine where the information being alluded to in the named FBI investigation summary comes from or how reliable that information is or whether, or not, there is any hard evidence to back up that information. All one has is an allegation of unknown pedigree.

According to *The 9/11 Commission Report* (see pages 84 - 85), on 9/11 there were no prohibitions against taking either box cutters or knives



with less than a four-inch blade onto commercial airplanes. There were a number of reasons for this – among these being that such things were not considered all that dangerous in the pre-9/11 environment, and, furthermore, detecting such objects was often difficult to do, and the airlines did not want to inconvenience customers unnecessarily with interminable delays.

*The 9/11 Commission Report* does note that at one juncture a security specialist was brought in to analyze some of the surveillance videos that existed in relation to the screening procedures for several – but not all -- of the four hijacked planes. In the opinion of this specialist, the screening procedures that were observed on the videos for September 11, 2001 were rather sloppy and lacking in rigor. Among other things, when the metal detecting wand used by the screeners was set off, the screeners were often not very exacting about determining what it was that actually had set the instrument off in the first place.

However, sloppy or not, given the guidelines in effect on 9/11, even if the screening procedures had been perfect, the likelihood is that if the knives – as long as they had blades less than four inches – and box cutters had been discovered, nothing would have happened. Of course, it is possible that the length of the blades was longer than four inches, yet, due to problematic screening procedures, this was missed – not just once but numerous times, and if this were the case (which we might never know), this would not constitute an exercise in sloppiness but, in my opinion, would constitute a concentrated form of negligence that helped lead to the deaths of some 3,000 people.

Why were the screening procedures so sloppy on September 11, 2001? Who was on duty that day? Who was in charge of the screeners on 9/11?

What were the companies that contracted to do the screening, and how thoroughly were those companies investigated? Were these people thoroughly interviewed and, if so, by whom, and what questions were asked, and for how long were they interviewed, and how much of a background check was done on those individuals? Were comparison studies done at these same airports on other days to see whether the sloppiness was endemic or whether something anomalous happened on 9/11?

There are indications in *The 9/11 Commission Report* that the foregoing sorts of question were pursued by Commission researchers and

investigators. Unfortunately, the nature of *The 9/11 Commission Report* is such that one cannot always get access to the actual interviews that were conducted by its investigators or the list of people who were interviewed or what kinds of investigation were done.

Such interviews and documents are alluded to in the notes for *The 9/11 Commission Report* – in fact, *The 9/11 Commission Report* often makes references to a variety of interviews and documents that, for one reason or another, are inaccessible or classified. These references often serve as premises in an argument that the Commission uses to indicate that a given judgment, claim, or ‘fact’ has been verified or conclusively demonstrated, and, yet, the public has direct access to very little of such footnoted material.

In my hypothetical grand jury, I would have all of that material subpoenaed. This is not just so that I can verify, to my own satisfaction, what had been done with respect to the interviews and investigations that were conducted but, as well, to determine what might not have been done and whether further or a different kind of interview, investigation, and question might have been warranted in any given case.

If the 9/11 Commission had been up front about these things and practiced a policy of full transparency, the additional subpoenas to which I am referring might not be necessary, and, in addition, it might not be necessary to revisit ground already covered and, possibly, even covered quite thoroughly. However, unfortunately, the Commission shot itself in the foot – and, possibly, something more vital – by choosing to render all of its underlying research and investigation relatively opaque as far as the public is concerned.

The public tends to get conclusions from *The 9/11 Commission Report* and not much else. The Commission could have rendered a great public service by providing the evidence and methodology on which such conclusions are based and let everyone decide for himself or herself whether such conclusions were warranted or did justice to the available data.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, a number of individuals have sought to obtain the release of some of the aforementioned research and interviews – research and interviews that underlie the publicly released *The 9/11 Commission Report*. Yet, every request of which I am aware that has been made in conjunction with these underlying documents has been denied.

I would like to know the reasons why this information is not accessible – readily or otherwise – to the citizens of the United States. I also have to wonder about the motives of those within the Commission who, apparently, wish to keep such research and interviews secret when every American has a right to know the nature, methods, credibility, and extent of that research.

However, if various individuals wish to continue to seek to block public access to the underlying research and interviews on which *The 9/11 Commission Report* is based, then I would like to have the people convening my grand jury to subpoena every last member – some 70 or more – of the 9/11 Commission investigators and, under oath, have the opportunity to ask them detailed questions about everything that did, and did not, make it into *The 9/11 Commission Report*.

I would like to know what decisions were made, and by whom, with respect to what would and would not be investigated by the Commission’s teams of investigators, and I would like to know about what would, and would not, make it into the final Commission report. I also would like to know the reasons for such decisions.

I would like to know the nature of the decisions that determined how different issues were to be pursued and who made those decisions and on what basis. I would like to know why the Commission was not more aggressive in issuing subpoenas to the Executive Branch or to other government agencies that were resistant to the Commission’s overtures for relevant documents and information.

I would like to know why neither President Bush nor Vice President Cheney was required to testify under oath before the Commission. I would like to know why President Bush and Vice President Cheney were not vetted separately.

I would like to know why only four members of the Commission were permitted to see any of the *Presidential Daily Briefings*, and I would like to know why just those four were picked rather than others. I would like to know how the investigators were selected (or rejected), and I would like to know who was interviewed for these positions and what criteria were used in the selection process and who made the final decisions about personnel.

I would like to know why the decision was made to make the Commission effort a bipartisan one rather than a non-partisan effort. I

would like to know why only people who were mostly lawyers were picked to be Commissioners rather than scientists, technical experts, pilots, independent media people, qualified individuals from the general public, or even some of the members of the 9/11 families who lost loved ones on that day and who so valiantly and persistently lobbied the government until it agreed to undertake a further investigation into the events of 9/11.

*The 9/11 Commission Report* – the one that the public has access to -- is the end result of a lot of decisions that were made outside the framework of public access and/or awareness. The real 9/11 Commission opus consists of all the documents, interviews, decisions, methods, judgment calls, and so on to which the public does not have access.

Until one can evaluate the publicly released document about 9/11 against the full context of that document's underlying research, decisions, deals, methods, personnel, biases, interviews, and so on, *The 9/11 Commission Report* is a relatively meaningless document. One is being told by the 9/11 Commission that the public must accept whatever the *Report* says as being the best expression and compilation of the available data concerning 9/11 – that what the *Report* says is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and, yet, we have nothing but the say-so of the Commission that this is the case.

This is a form of presentation that has totally divorced its descriptions, characterizations, and conclusions from the evidence on which those descriptions, characterizations, and conclusions are based. The public is being asked to accept the former without the right to examine or question the latter.

The foregoing is comparable to a prosecutor saying to a grand jury that the members of the grand jury will not be permitted to ask questions about any of the evidence or testimony that is being presented by the prosecutor. This is akin to saying that the only function that the grand jury has is to rubber stamp the prosecutor's presentation.

As pointed out in the second chapter of the present book, it is not the government that gets to say what constitutes fact when a grand jury is convened. Rather, the members of that convened assembly are the determiners of fact, as well as the determiners of what conclusions might reasonably be drawn from those facts. Yet, in effect, the 9/11 Commission (that is, the government) has frozen the general public out of virtually every facet of investigation or critical inquiry concerning such an undertaking,

and, as a result, democracy -- which comes from two Greek words that collectively mean 'power of the people' -- has been hijacked.

*The 9/11 Commission Report* has absolutely nothing definitive to say about how hijackers were able to gain access to the cockpits of four different commercial airlines. This is especially vexing given that *The 9/11 Commission Report* does indicate that on September 11, 2001 there was an FAA regulation in effect that required all cockpits on commercial flights to be closed and locked during flight.

*The 9/11 Commission Report* merely helps to obfuscate matters somewhat when it indicates on page 85 that although the regulations cited in the previous paragraph were in effect on 9/11, those regulations were not always "observed or vigorously enforced" by the FAA. Aside from failing to spell out the evidence that justifies such a statement (e.g., documents are cited in footnote 61 for that chapter of the *Report*, but, as indicated previously, some of these documents are not available to the public), the fact of the matter is that the Commission seems to have absolutely no idea how hijackers gained access to four different cockpits on September 11, 2001.

On page 85, the *Report* does say something about the non-confrontational techniques of the FAA-approved 'Common Strategy' that were taught to flight crews as ways of handling hijacking attempts. Moreover, the *Report* indicates that if a hijacker had a noose around the neck of a flight attendant, then some pilots have indicated they would be prepared to open the cockpit door and let the hijackers in.

Moreover, on page 245 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, while outlining some of the alleged preparations that, supposedly, were made by Mohammed Atta for hijacking different planes, the author(s) of the report indicate that Atta: "had no firm contingency plan in case the cockpit door was locked. While he mentioned general ideas such as using a hostage or claiming to have a bomb, he was confident the cockpit doors would be opened and did not consider breaking them down a viable idea."

During the federal trial of Zacarias Moussaoui, Judge Leonie Brinkema permitted a portion of the cockpit voice recording from Flight 93 to be played. While refusing to publicly release the actual 31-minute tape, she did make available a transcript of that recording, complete with translations from Arabic into English when needed. This was 'Government Exhibit P200056T 01 -455-A (ID)'.

The transcript, and presumably the actual recording, starts with the following announcement: "Ladies and gentlemen, Here the captain ... please sit down ... keep remaining seating. We have a bomb on board. So sit."

The opening announcement appears to be issued from a non-native speaker of English. The transcript says: "Here the captain", but it could have been 'Here's the captain' or "Hear the captain' but meaning, in each case, that the captain is speaking and the passengers should listen to what the captain is saying. Having worked a little with audio files made during a trial, I know from personal experience that determining what, exactly, is being said or meant in a tape recording is not always easy.

The person transcribing the tape obviously made a decision to interpret what was uttered as being 'here' rather than either 'here's' or 'hear'. Taking all of these possible variations into account and placing them in context with the other words that are said in the opening several sentences of the tape recording, it appears to be fairly obvious that the person's voice on the tape is a non-native speaker of English.

For present purposes, the interesting point that arises out of the foregoing is that the court transcript document begins when the cockpit of Flight 93 already has been taken by the hijackers. So, we really don't know how the hijackers gained access to the cockpit.

One might reasonably believe that the rest of the cockpit recording is in the possession of federal authorities, including the part that indicates how the hijackers gained access to the cockpit. One is at a loss to understand why all of this information has not been made available to the public because it might help to clear up so many issues – such as how the hijackers gained access to the cockpit ... issues that, currently, are quite murky

None of the foregoing tells us anything about what actually happened on 9/11. Despite the existence of such things as the cockpit recorder from Flight 93, the general public is given no clear picture of how hijackers were able to gain access to the cockpits of four planes. Everything that the *Report* says in this respect is pure conjecture.

One might also mention in passing that, as described above, Atta's alleged plans for hijacking four planes seems rather amateurish and up in the air. Atta is said to be confident that the hijackers would find a way into the cockpits, and, yet, he has no contingency plans if the cockpit doors are

locked. Everything seems to be done on ‘a wing and a prayer’ so to speak, and this is not at all the kind of ‘sophisticated, technically astute, meticulously prepared terrorist image that often has been conveyed through the media.

Therefore, contrary to the impression that the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* attempt to give, Charlie Sheen is precisely right. There are a lot of questions raised by the ‘official’ story concerning 9/11.

One does not have to be an advocate of a conspiracy theory to observe that there are many things about which *The 9/11 Commission Report* does not enlighten us, and there are many things that are being assumed in that report without any evidential support. These are not just annoying little anomalies that are left over after an investigation – the sort of trivial puzzles or questions that are perplexing but, ultimately, of no real importance.

These are key questions. How did 19 hijackers – many of whom were identified by the CAPPs (Computer Assisted Passenger Pre- Screening System) program -- get box cutters and knives (with blades possibly longer than 4 inches) through security, and how did these same hijackers (if they were the same) get access to the cockpits of four different commercial flights, and why didn’t any of the pilots of the hijacked planes punch a ‘7500’ into the transponder that, as *The 9/11 Commission Report* points out, is “the universal code for a hijack in progress”? (page 17) In effect, *The 9/11 Commission Report* is saying something along the following lines: ‘Well, there were four hijackings, and although we don’t know how any of this was done, nonetheless, we are certain beyond any reasonable doubt that no one else but the 19 people in question are involved.’ How does one reach such a conclusion in a near total vacuum of evidence?

According to *The 9/11 Commission Report* many of the alleged hijackers were ‘selected’ by the CAPPs risk assessment program as they were being processed at the different airports. This risk assessment process had been “created to identify subjects who should be subjected to special security measures” (page 1). However, being ‘selected’ by CAPPs did not necessarily mean one’s name was on a list somewhere.

Being selected by this program might only mean that a given ‘selectee’ had enough risk factors associated with him or her (e.g., citizenship status, ethnicity, personal idiosyncrasies, travel history, etc.) that a risk score was generated that exceeded a certain threshold of concern (based on note 2, page 451 of the *Report*). For example, Nawaf al-Hazmi and

Salem al-Hazmi (who were boarding Flight 77) were selected by CAPPs because neither of them could produce appropriate identification. If they had possessed the requisite identification documents on 9/11, then, apparently, there was nothing else about these two individuals that would have caused them to have been selected by CAPPs.

At the time of 9/11 there was only one extra security provision that would have been taken with respect to the above named individuals – or anyone selected by CAPPs. The luggage of such people would have been withheld from loading until verification was received that the ‘selectees’ were on the plane.

There was one individual (Waleed al-Shehria) among the alleged 19 hijackers who was selected by CAPPs for such extra security measures on 9/11, but because that person did not have any luggage, he was not, in actual terms, affected by the extra security provisions of the CAPPs program.

Many, but not all, of the 19 alleged hijackers had been selected by CAPPs for the extra security precautions noted above. Those who had been selected by CAPPs included four out of five alleged hijackers on Flight 11 (Wail al-Shehri, Satam al-Suqami, Waleed al-Shehri, and Mohamed Atta); all five of the alleged hijackers for Flight 77 (Majed Moqed, Hani Hanjour, and Khalid al-Mihdhar, as well as the two noted previously– namely, Nawaf al-Hazmi and Salem al-Hazmi); only one out of the alleged four hijackers for Flight 93 was selected by CAPPs (Ahmad al-Haznawi); and none of the alleged hijackers for Flight 175 were selected by CAPPs.

We don’t know why eight of the ten alleged hijackers who were identified by CAPPs were singled out by that program, and, yet, there were another nine alleged hijackers who were not so identified. We do know, apparently, that if not for a lack of appropriate identification, two more of the alleged 19 hijackers might have cleared the CAPPs program -- and one wonders why hijackers – who were supposedly smart enough to plan and execute such an audacious operation – would have run the risk of fouling up their operation simply because they didn’t seem to know enough to bring with them the right kind of identification on the day in question.

This leads to a further question. If nine out of the 19 alleged hijackers did not trigger the CAPPs system, then how did the FBI positively identify the alleged 19 perpetrators of the 9/11 hijackings within such a short period of time following the various crashes on September 11, 2001?



Apparently, using information from the flight manifests for the hijacked planes, the FBI was, according to a September 12, 2001 *New York Times* story, able to raid some of the flight schools that reportedly had been used by several of the alleged hijackers. However, what did this have to do with being able to identify the 15 other individuals who supposedly took part in the 9/11 events who were not pilots, who had not taken flight training, and many of whom had not been selected by the CAPPs program ... how did the FBI obtain the names of these people so quickly following the events of 9/11?

The answer to this question would seem to be: The FBI obtained the names from the official flight manifest lists of passengers. However, this answer might not prove to be all that satisfactory.

More specifically, this issue of identification becomes somewhat problematic when one reflects on the fact that none of the 'unofficial' passenger manifest lists that have been published by any of the media agencies contain Arabic names. Furthermore, apparently, not only have none of the 'official', final passenger manifest lists been released by either American or United Airlines, but those two companies evidently were reported to have resisted efforts to make those 'official' passenger lists public.

In the passenger lists that were released through the media, there are discrepancies among the unofficial media lists that have been published. Some lists contain a few more names than do other versions of the same lists, and some of these lists have a few names that are different from the names appearing on other lists, and some of the lists seem to refer to a few people who booked flights but did not show up to actually board the indicated planes, and there are a few other minor mysteries concerning such lists. However, what all of these lists have in common is the absence of any Arabic names.

This mystery deepens when one learns that Thomas R. Olmsted, M.D., an ex-Naval line officer and now a psychiatrist in private practice in New Orleans, was able to obtain a copy of the autopsy list from Flight 77 (the hijack plane that purportedly was assigned to crash into The Pentagon) via the Freedom of Information Act. Surprisingly, there are no Arabic names on that list either.

According to Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, there were 189 people killed at the Pentagon on 9/11. 125 of the 189 individuals worked at, or for,

the Pentagon. The other 64 individuals were said to be passengers from Flight 77.

The CNN count for the number of total passengers (including flight crews, flight attendants, and passengers) for American Airlines Flight 77 was 56. The autopsy list for Flight 77 that was obtained under the FOIA contains 58 names.

No one has explained why there are differences among the numbers provided through the AFIP (64), CNN (56), and the autopsy documents (58). Even if one were to arbitrarily add on 5 people (the alleged hijackers) to the CNN list and the autopsy document, neither of these counts agree with one another, nor do either of them agree with the AFIP count.

Furthermore, as far as I know, there has been no explanation – at least one which has been made publicly available from official sources -- that indicates how the medical/forensic personnel who conducted the autopsies were able to distinguish the remains of the passengers on Flight 77 who were ‘victims’ from the remains of the passengers who are alleged to have been hijackers. Did they use dental records, DNA analysis, and/or fingerprints? If so, from where did they obtain the standards of comparison for the remains’ samples of the alleged hijackers?

*The 9/11 Commission Report* does speak about the seating arrangements for the alleged hijackers (pages 2-5) on all four of the hijacked flights. Presumably, this was drawn from information provided by the respective airlines. Consequently, one is more than a little puzzled about why all of this isn’t made official by the release of the actual flight manifest lists for the passengers aboard the different hijacked airlines.

Nonetheless, further issues swirl about the problem of identification in conjunction with the alleged hijackers. According to stories carried through the *Manchester Guardian* and the BBC shortly after September 11, 2001, there is considerable doubt about the actual identities of at least five of the alleged hijackers. A. Saeed al-Gambi, one of the alleged hijackers of 9/11, is, apparently, currently living and working as a pilot in Saudi Arabia. A second pilot and alleged hijacker, Waleed al-Shehri, is working for Saudi Arabia Airlines out of Casablanca, Morocco but admits that, for a time, he had taken flight training in the United States during 2000. Another alleged hijacker, Salem al-Hazmi, is said to be employed at a petrochemical plant in Yanbu, Saudi Arabia. A fourth alleged hijacker, Khalid al-Midhar, was also reported to be still among the living, and, finally, a fifth alleged hijacker,

Abdulaziz al-Omari, not only indicated that he was alive but that he had lost his passport while traveling through Denver, Colorado.

Al-Omari reported that the FBI list had the correct birth date next to his name, so, this would seem to rule out the possibility of two people with the same name somehow, coincidentally, having been caught up in the events of 9/11. On the other hand, given the loss of his passport, what this might suggest is the possibility of identity theft for some, perhaps many, of the alleged hijackers.

What does all of this mean? I don't know.

However, as a member of a hypothetical grand jury, I would like the people who convened my investigative body to subpoena the official flight manifest lists as well as the autopsy list for Flight 77, and I would like to be able to question all of the people involved (Commission researchers, AFIP, CNN, medical/forensic personnel, American Airlines and United Airlines personnel) about what was going on with these lists.

On the basis of the foregoing considerations, there seems to be more than enough reasonable doubt raised about whether we really know the actual identities of a number of the hijackers. We have some names, and we have a few security videos, but all of the rest is shrouded in a considerable fog bank of ignorance, uncertainty, and speculation.

Let us return to the Charlie Sheen excerpt quoted here a number of pages ago that was taken from *Debunking 9/11 Myths*. Among other things, Mr. Sheen was quoted as referring to the hijackers as "amateurs", and the two editors of that book would like to take issue with Mr. Sheen's choice of words.

According to the editors: "The hijacker pilots – Muhammad Atta (American Airlines Flight 11), Marwan al Shehhi (United Airlines Flight 175), Hani Hanjour (American Airlines Flight 77) and Ziad Jarrah (United Airlines Flight 93) – might not have been highly skilled, but they were not complete amateurs. According to *The 9/11 Commission Report*, Hanjour earned both his private pilot's license and commercial pilot's license in Arizona training from 1997 through April 1999. ... By December 2000 he was back in Arizona for refresher training on small commercial jets and for Boeing 737 simulator training. Although he was repeatedly encouraged to quit because of his poor performance, he finished simulator training in March 2001."

On page 531, in footnote 170, of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, one finds the following: "FBI report, 'Summary of Penttbom Investigation' February 29, 2004, pp. 52-57. Hanjour successfully conducted a challenging certification flight supervised by an instructor at Congressional Air Charters at Gaithersburg, Maryland, landing at a small airport with a difficult approach. The instructor thought that Hanjour might have had training from a military pilot because he used a terrain recognition system for navigation. Eddie Shalev interview (Apr 9, 2004)."

There is no indication given in *The 9/11 Commission Report* of when the foregoing certification flight took place, nor is anything said about what kind of plane was involved in that certification process. However, whenever it might have taken place and irrespective of the kind of plane involved, the incident raises some questions.

For example, one might consider the following fact. Not too long following 9/11, *The Prince George's Journal* in Maryland filed a report that Hani Hanjour had visited the Bowie Maryland Freeway Airport in mid-August of 2001 – less than one month before 9/11. According to the newspaper article, Hanjour's reason for visiting Bowie Maryland Freeway Airport was to satisfy the requirements that would permit him to rent an airplane at the airport.

However, on three different occasions Hanjour was judged by those at the Bowie airport who checked him out to be too clumsy and inept a pilot even in relation to a Cessna 172. A Cessna 172 is a single engine, prop-driven aircraft, and it is not only minuscule compared to a Boeing 757 (the hijacked plane he supposedly flew), but, by all accounts, the former is far, far easier to operate than a large commercial jet.

Due to his complete incompetence with respect to a Cessna 172, Hanjour was denied rental privileges at the Bowie, Maryland airfield. Furthermore, as indicated earlier, this denial of rental privileges took place less than one month prior to the events of September 11, 2001.

So, what is one to make of an individual (i.e., Hani Hanjour) who, on one occasion, performs a difficult landing maneuver employing, among other things, "a terrain recognition system for navigation" that resonates with what a military pilot might be able to do and, then, on a number of other occasions (quite possibly, at a much later date), is refused plane rental privileges because that person is judged to be too clumsy and inept a pilot even in relation to a Cessna 172?

Not only was Hanjour, by most accounts, considered to be a terrible pilot, but after several lessons at the Sorbi Flying Club in San Diego, he was advised by the instructors to quit – not because of a lack of facility with English, as the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* indicate was a problem – but because he had no understanding of what he was doing in a cockpit, and, as well, he was subject to panic attacks while in the training craft.

Yet, allegedly, this is the pilot who took a Boeing 757 into a 270 degree downward spiral, dropping some 7,000 feet in the process and, finally, leveled out just inches or a few feet above the ground to set the stage for a final approach to the Pentagon. The maneuver was done so tightly and with such expertise that the radar controllers observing the event thought the unidentified flying object on their screen was a fighter plane.

Trying to reconcile such wide fluctuations in skill and competency levels within one and the same individual seems to present something of a considerable challenge. Consequently, one thought that crosses my mind in conjunction with the foregoing conflicting crosscurrents is this: Maybe one is not really dealing with one and the same individual across all the different events that have been described.

According to the FAA, in order to obtain a pilot's certificate, one has to pass a written test on aeronautical knowledge, demonstrate aircraft proficiency in an actual flight, as well as be checked out or type-rated for a specific kind of airplane. There are additional requirements for obtaining a commercial pilot's license.

As a member of a hypothetical grand jury, I would like to carefully question all those who were involved in the process of providing Hanjour with his pilot's certificate, commercial pilot's license, or any other kind of flight certification test. If Hanjour was as incompetent and panic stricken in a cockpit as he has been described to be by a number of different individuals who were in a position to assess his ability to fly even single engine planes – and, some of this assessment took place less than one month prior to September 11, 2001 -- then exactly how was Hanjour able to obtain his pilot's certificate for single engine planes along with a commercial pilot's license that enabled him to fly multi-engine planes, let alone take a Boeing 757 through an extremely difficult bit of flying in the last few minutes prior to allegedly slamming into the Pentagon?

In addition, I might like to investigate whether the pilot's certificates, or the commercial pilot's license, or the instrument flight rules

certifications that were supposedly earned by the four alleged hijack pilots were authentic or whether they could have been forged. If the latter were the case, then the efforts of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, as well as the efforts of the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, to portray the alleged hijack pilots as fully or even minimally qualified to fly commercial jet planes might be brought into serious question.

Moreover, even if all of this documentation is legitimate, then I still would like to question the people who examined these four alleged hijack pilots and who gave these alleged hijackers passing grades on the different aspects of their pilot testing. I might also like to look into whether someone other than the alleged hijack pilots could have taken the various written and flight performance tests for the people who are identified as allegedly being the hijack pilots.

I am raising all of these concerns because I am having difficulty accepting the idea that the four alleged hijack pilots being described to me would have been capable of flying large commercial jet airplanes and hitting the targets that they are alleged to have hit. These four individuals might, indeed, have perpetrated the acts with which they have been charged, but the picture that is being drawn for me by *The 9/11 Commission Report* and *Debunking 9/11 Myths* concerning the competency of the accused individuals is not all that compelling. And, naturally, this leads to the question: If the four alleged hijack pilots were not capable of flying large commercial jets in the manner depicted on September 11, 2001, then who did fly those airplanes?

Everyone agrees that on 9/11, four commercial jets were hijacked. However, the storyline about how 19 hijackers were able to successfully evade security on four different flights at different airports and smuggle knives and box cutters onto the planes, and how they got access to the cockpits, and why none of the airline pilots signaled that a hijacking was in progress, and whether, or not, the four alleged hijack pilots were really able to fly the planes in a way that could hit designated targets – this storyline is, to say the very least, very vague, filled with lots of ‘we don’t know’, and is far from compelling in an evidentiary sort of way.

The chain of evidence leading from airport security breaches to the terrorist acts of crashing the planes is extremely shaky. It is not as if we have video evidence and eye-witness testimony that demonstrates the exact identity of the people who hijacked the planes, nor do we have video

evidence or eye-witness testimony that describes how the hijackers got into the cockpits of the respective planes and went about flying those jets to different targets.

There is some security video evidence compiled through the airport screening procedures used in conjunction with a couple of the hijacked planes, and there are the CAPPs protocols that require verification that a person going under a given name has boarded a plane before that person's baggage is loaded. On the other hand, there is only a limited amount of forensic evidence (e.g., security video for several but not all of the hijacked planes) that demonstrates that the names that were selected by the CAPPs program really belonged to the individuals who gave those names at the airport or who purchased airline tickets in those names.

Furthermore, there is not even any forensic evidence that demonstrates that the individuals who have been identified through CAPPs and/or the security video actually committed the acts with which they are accused. They might have been present, but this is not enough, in and of itself, to show that they were the hijackers.

There is, of course, the possible testimony of people who have been captured and are alleged to be al-Qaeda members that might have been used to implicate the 19 individuals named by the FBI as the perpetrators of the terrorist acts of 9/11. However, before I trust such information, I would like my hypothetical grand jury to be able to interrogate those individuals to our own satisfaction and, among other things, to be able to determine that the information that we are being asked to accept as true was not obtained through torture or other means that are not only impermissible under the Geneva Conventions but that has been shown, again and again, to be very unreliable.

This latter facet of things is a very tricky issue. This is so because even if one were able to subpoena such witnesses, those potential witnesses understand all too clearly that when all is said and done they will be returned to custody and subject to a process that is not open to investigation by an independent body of citizens but is totally under the control of the military. This is not exactly conducive to truth telling.

Moreover, if one keeps in mind that it was Robert Mueller, III, the Director of the FBI, who was quoted earlier in this book as saying that the 9/11 hijackers left no paper trail, then, really, what one is being asked to accept is the testimony of witnesses (namely, informants of questionable motives

and prisoners who have been labeled ‘enemy combatants’ and, as such, have very, very few rights and protections) that is totally uncorroborated by any forensic or physical evidence. There is something deeply disquieting about this state of affairs.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* try to make all of these competence issues with respect to flying commercial jets seem like much to do about nothing – ‘so easy’, some might say, ‘that even a caveman could do it’. The two editors quote a flight instructor with Airline Transport Professional Flight Schools as saying that all the hijack pilots would have had to do was “point and go. It’s even easier than driving a car because there are no roads.” (Page 6)

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* do not say whether the air flight trainer they quoted had been checked out on jets of any kind -- let alone Boeing 757s – and, therefore, would have been qualified to offer an opinion about how easy it would be to fly such aircraft. However, Russ Wittenberg, who is a commercial jet pilot and who has been checked out on everything from a DC-3 to a Boeing 777 – including the kind of jets that had been hijacked on 9/11 – doubts that people with as little training as the hijack pilots were alleged to have had could have successfully flown those planes and hit the targets they are alleged to have hit. Furthermore, there are other commercial jet pilots who agree with his assessment of things.

For example, on September 12, 2001, two commercial pilots from Germany, both of whom had extensive experience at the helm of Boeing 757s and 767s, stated in a television interview that neither working with a professional flight simulator nor its much cheaper cousin – flight simulation software for a personal computer – would provide one with the skills and experience necessary to fly a large commercial jet. Furthermore, the pilots indicated that irrespective of whether the autopilot was on or off, one would need considerable training to learn how to steer a large commercial jet with any degree of accuracy.

Shortly after 9/11 a group of pilots – both civilian and military – conducted a three-day seminar, organized in part by Donn de Grandpre, a retired colonel. The conclusion of this body of experienced pilots was that it was very unlikely, if not impossible, for individuals with as little experience as the alleged four hijackers reportedly had to have been able to fly large commercial jets and hit the various targets.



The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* offer one flight instructor of unknown pedigree to support their case that practically anyone could have flown the 9/11 jets into their respective targets. The editors did not even allude to the possibility that there were many experienced pilots who strenuously disagreed with the editors' own alleged 'expert witness'.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* attempt to enhance their idea of how easily the flying of commercial jets could have been accomplished by noting that *The 9/11 Commission Report* indicates that Jarrah – one of the alleged pilots – had tried to purchase four GPS units at a store in Miami but had to settle for the only one that was in stock. Although the two editors did not mention it, *The 9/11 Commission Report* also notes on page 247 that Moussaoui had “inquired of two manufacturers of GPS equipment whether their products could be converted for aeronautical use.”

*The 9/11 Commission Report* doesn't indicate whether, or not, Moussaoui received any replies to his inquiries, or, if he did receive any responses, what was contained in those communications. Nor does the *Report* comment on whether, or not, there would have been any need to convert GPS equipment to aeronautical use, or if there were such a need, what this sort of conversion would require.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* proceed on to indicate that Mohammed Atta had purchased three GPS units and “possibly visited the World Trade Center on September 10, 2001 for a final GPS reading.”(page 6) The editors do not provide any evidence that Mohammed Atta either actually did visit the World Trade Center the day before 9/11 and obtained a final GPS reading for Ground Zero and, thereby, demonstrate that the position of these two editors at this point is rooted in facts rather than the sort of unsubstantiated claims that supposedly populate the theories of 9/11 conspiracy nuts.

In fact, *The 9/11 Commission Report* actually provides information that tends to rule out the idea put forth in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that Atta “probably visited the World Trade Center on September 10, 2001 for a final GPS reading.” More specifically, on page 253 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, one reads: “On September 9, he [Atta] flew from Baltimore to Boston. By then, Shehi had arrived there, and Atta was seen with him at his hotel. The next day [my note: this would have been September 10], Atta picked up Omari at another hotel, and the two drove to Portland, Maine for reasons that

remain unknown. In the early morning hours of September 11, they boarded a commuter flight to Boston to connect to American Airlines Flight 11. The two spent their last night pursuing ordinary activities: making ATM withdrawals, eating pizza, and shopping at a convenience store.”

If one likes, one might speculate, as the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seem to be doing at this point, that sometime during the night of September 9<sup>th</sup> and the early morning of September 10<sup>th</sup>, Atta made a trip from Boston to New York and, then, back again, and during this trip he went to the WTC for a final GPS check. However, there is nothing to this speculation except speculation ... no facts and not even evidentiary grounds for a “probably”.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* next describe how the alleged hijackers could have punched the requisite GPS coordinates for their respective destinations into the on-board flight management system of their hijacked aircraft. If one accepts the reasoning of the two editors, then the only other thing that the alleged hijackers would have had to do would be to monitor their (the hijackers) navigation system while the flight management systems did most of the flying for them.

The whole issue of the purchase of GPS units and how easy the possession of such units would have made flying the hijacked jets becomes something of a non-issue in relation to Hani Hanj our. According to *The 9/11 Commission Report*, data from the flight recorder for Flight 77 indicated that the pilot of that hijacked plane had punched in autopilot coordinates for Reagan National Airport, less than five miles south of the Pentagon. So far so good as far as the current theory of the aforementioned editors is concerned.

However, the same data recorder indicates that the pilot for the hijacked Flight 77 resorted to manual control of the aircraft during the last eight minutes of the flight. Yet, this very fact vitiates the whole basis of the foregoing argument by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that attempts to claim that the possession of GPS units would make flying the hijacked planes a piece of cake ... easier than driving a car.

The last eight minutes of Flight 77 is when all the fancy flying took place that was supposedly captured on radar and witnessed by a number of flight controllers. This is the part of the flight where Flight 77 supposedly went into a downward spiral of some 7,000 feet and leveled out in time to skim just inches or several feet above the grass on the Pentagon lawn

before striking the west face of that building. How did a bumbler who, less than a month before 9/11, was not going to be permitted to rent so much as a Cessna 172 at the airfield in Bowie, Maryland, suddenly become capable of stupendous feats of flying in a Boeing 757 – a plane Hanjour had never previously flown?

On pages 32-33 of *The 9/11 Commission Report* one finds diagrams for the purported flight paths of the four hijacked planes. The flight paths for American Airlines 11 (allegedly flown by Mohammed Atta) and United Airlines Flight 175 (allegedly flown by Marwan al Shehhi) do not give any clear-cut indication of necessarily operating under the identifiable influence of coordinates that have been punched into the flight management systems of their respective planes. More specifically, both flight paths go through a number of course corrections before reaching their twin tower targets, including the fact that Flight 175 completely misses New York City (quite a bit to the north and west) and has to turn around in order to get back to the home of the twin towers, while the diagram for Flight 11 shows the plane had headed northwest into upper New York state for some distance before the plane begins to head south and, even then, appears to have made some last-minute course corrections to be able to locate its target. None of this seems to be the stuff of merely having to punch in GPS coordinates and letting the flight management system do everything else.

Let's also remember that a number of the alleged hijack pilots were apparently so unfamiliar with the cockpit of a large commercial jet airplane that they seemingly couldn't tell the difference between an intercom that allowed the pilot to communicate with the passengers and a radio that allowed the pilot to communicate with flight controllers on the ground. We know this because *The 9/11 Commission Report* describes this situation in conjunction with several of the hijack scenarios – especially Flight 11, said to be flown by Mohammed Atta, the reputed head of the hijacking operation.

On the one hand, we are supposed to believe that the hijack pilots were sufficiently sophisticated in their understanding of the maze of gauges, toggle switches, and equipment in a large commercial jet cockpit that they were able to know how to punch coordinates into an on-board flight management system, monitor the navigational system, and respond to the information coming from that navigational system in an appropriate way. On the other hand, we are apparently supposed to simultaneously believe

that the hijack pilots were so incompetent that they couldn't tell the difference between a radio and the intercom.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* do make passing reference to the fact that the alleged hijack pilots got confused in relation to being able to differentiate the public address system that is tied to the passengers on board and the radio that was tied to air traffic control channels. However, this all becomes part of a neatly packaged system that allows the alleged hijacking pilots to serve a variety of explanations.

The editors switch back and forth as is needed by their storyline. Thus, on page 6 they can say: "So it is not surprising that they operated the planes with some degree of competence." Then, one page later, the editors are able to describe the flying skills of the alleged hijack pilots as "rudimentary – far from top-gun material" ... except, of course Hani Hanjour who, apparently, can do things in a commercial jet airplane that many veteran commercial jet pilots might not be able to accomplish.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* are trying to have their cake and eat it, too. When it serves the purpose of their argument, they claim that the hijack pilots wouldn't need much flying skill. It could all be done with GPS units plus the punching of the appropriate coordinates derived from the GPS device into a flight management system – coordinates that Mohammed Atta could have picked up in his evidentially challenged trip to the World Trade Center on the day before September 11, 2001.

On the other hand, when the structure of the editors' argument needs to portray the alleged hijack pilots as possessing considerable more competence and skill than the "amateurs" alluded to in the aforementioned Charlie Sheen quote, then the editors change their tune, and, suddenly, Hani Hanjour becomes a person who, one moment, is a person who suffered panic attacks in, and didn't know his way around, a cockpit even with respect to a simple single-engine plane, while in the next moment, Hanjour becomes transformed into someone who is capable of pulling off the most technically difficult of flying maneuvers.

According to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*: "The other three pilots [besides Hani Hanjour - my clarification] came to the United States in 2000 and underwent at least 40 hours of private flight school to receive private pilot's licenses, which permit flights on single engine planes." In addition, the editors state: "Like Hanjour, the other three men had a rocky training process. All three changed schools repeatedly, with Atta and

Shehi flunking flight exams. But they continued training and by the end of 2000 had all logged a minimum of 250 cumulative flight hours and earned FAA commercial pilot's licenses, the lowest-level license for flying multiengine planes. Then they enrolled in simulator training for large jets." (Page 5)

What evidence is there that the training these individuals supposedly received with respect to single engine and multi-engine prop planes would have prepared them to competently know how to punch in GPS coordinates to the flight management system of a commercial jet, monitor the navigation system of such an airplane, make whatever adjustments needed to be made in relation to the information they were getting from the navigation system and, then, take over manual control of the commercial jets in the last minutes of approaching their intended targets? What evidence is there that these three other alleged hijack pilots became sufficiently proficient through their jet simulator training that they had learned everything they needed to know except, of course, the difference between an intercom switch and the radio?

Everything which *The 9/11 Commission Report* tells us about the four alleged hijack pilots is that they were not naturally gifted pilots. At best, it was a struggle for all of them. They flunked a lot of their tests. They were considered incompetent by many of their flight instructors.

Consequently, why should one assume that their jet simulator training went any better? In other words, why should one assume that these three other alleged hijack pilots were able to pick up this jet- simulation training with a greater facility than they had displayed in relation to far simpler single engine and multi-engine prop planes?

I know from my own experience as a teacher of psychology that students often find ways to pass a given test. Nevertheless, simply because a student is able to pass such a test does not mean they understand the subject matter or would be able to apply it to an actual life situation. In fact, sometimes, I can ask these students the same question, but in a slightly different form, and although a student might have gotten the answer correct the first time around, that same student might miss a subsequent variation on the previously asked question.

The fact all of the alleged hijack pilots were able to pass certain tests in conjunction with single engine and multi-engine aircraft does not necessarily carry many positive indications with respect to being able to pilot – even in part – a large commercial jet airplane. Presumably,

this is the point that the aforementioned Russ Wittenberg, a commercial jet pilot, was alluding to when he said that he doubted that four individuals with the background of the alleged hijack pilots would have been able to pilot the planes they are alleged to have piloted and hit the targets they are alleged to have hit.

The entire argument put forth by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* with respect to whether, or not, the four alleged hijack pilots could have successfully flown the indicated jet passenger planes is entirely an exercise in speculation. A few facts are taken, and they are arbitrarily woven into what the editors believe are plausible storylines.

When someone else does what the editors of the book in question do (that is, speculate and try to force certain facts into a problematic storyline), those other people are labeled as conspiracy nuts and the editors claim that what they (the editors) are doing is debunking the myths. If a person is not prepared to apply the same standards of judgment to himself or herself that one applies to others when faced with similar circumstances, then this raises questions about the degree of objectivity, consistency and credibility of the person in question.

At this point in their book, the storylines that the editors are manufacturing are not the result of a rigorous, critical examination of the available data. Unwarranted extrapolations are being made by the editors (e.g., that the GPS units that were bought were to be used to help fly the jet planes that were to be hijacked rather than for some other purpose or that Mohammed Atta allegedly visited the World Trade Center on September 10, 2001 and got a final GPS fix for that complex). Unwarranted interpolations also are being made by them (e.g., that because they had jet simulator training, this provided them with all the knowledge and understanding they would need to be able to successfully fly commercial jets on 9/11).

In addition, conflicting evidence is often ignored altogether by them (e.g., Hani Hanjour's flying debacles in Bowie, Maryland just prior to 9/11). Or the editors try to rationalize such problems away by constructing unverified storylines that are sympathetic to their position (e.g., the GPS idea that lets the flight management system do the flying – except, of course, for those tricky parts where the autopilot is not engaged and Hani Hanjour does his impression of Chuck Yeager with all the 'right stuff').

On page 7, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* state: “Soon after taking the controls, all four hijackers forced their planes to descend rapidly. In the clear conditions of September 11, they were able to fly by sight rather than by instruments (flying by instrument being a much more difficult skill, although three of the four had earned instrument flight rules certification). The pilots were also helped by choosing targets that were easy to identify from a distance.”

Earlier, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* described how punching coordinates into the flight management system and using the autopilot would eliminate a lot of problems for the alleged hijack pilots. The planes were already in the air when they were hijacked, and with a few simple adjustments, the jets would fly themselves, so, really, the hijack pilots would need hardly any flying skills at all.

Now the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* are saying that the planes were manually operated as those planes were ‘forced’ to descend to a lower altitude, and, therefore, the planes were not on autopilot. Yet, the theme of ‘easier flying’ is re-introduced by saying that the hijack pilots apparently wanted to switch over to flying by sight rather than using instruments because the former is easier to do than the latter.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* do not say precisely when this switch-over occurred –just “soon after taking the controls.” However, if this is actually what occurred, then one wonders what need there was for the whole GPS scenario to be introduced – with its concomitant easy punching of coordinates into the flight management system so that the plane could fly itself.

Furthermore, if flying by sight takes place too early in such a flight, or if it occurs too many miles away from one’s target, one is left with the question of how the pilots would have been able to navigate the plane prior to the time they would have been able to view their targets from the air. After all, depending on the altitude at which one is flying, no matter how big the targets are, one is not going to be able to see beyond the visual horizon. If one’s targets are on the far side of that horizon, then one probably is going to need something more than the size of those targets to locate them.

My understanding, based on what some people who are pilots have said, is that using geographical landmarks as navigational aides is not necessarily as easy as the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* try to make that sound. This

is especially the case if one is not really familiar with the geography over which one is flying. It is very easy to lose one's bearings when doing this.

In addition, if three of the four hijack pilots had their ratings for flight instrumentation (and why didn't the editors mention which one of the four hijack pilots did not have this rating?), then why would there be any need to switch over to flying by sight ... except for the individual who did not earn instrument flight rule certification? Either these guys can fly or they can't.

If they can fly, they don't need to resort to flying by sight and probably might be better off sticking with instruments. But, if they can't fly, then, flying by sight is not likely to be that much of a help, and, depending on circumstances, it could create as many problems as it solves – even on the sunniest and clearest of days.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seem to want to prepare formalistic contingencies for every kind of objection ahead of time. If someone makes objections concerning the possible lack of competency possessed by the alleged hijack pilots, then tell those critics how these commercial jets practically fly themselves. If someone puts forth an objection that 'amateurs' couldn't possibly have hit the targets they did with large commercial jet airplanes, the two editors roll out the stories about how much training the hijack pilots had gone through and make references to all the pilot and instrumental certificates they had acquired, as well as mention all the jet-simulator work they did. On the other hand, if someone else objects by wondering how such accomplished pilots could fail to know the difference between the intercom button and the radio, one returns to the story that characterizes the hijack pilots as merely possessing 'rudimentary' flying skills, and one further notes how *The 9/11 Commission Report* states that many of the phone calls from the passengers on the different flights mentioned that these planes were flying erratically and making some of the passengers air sick ... suggestive of a limited amount of flying skill on the part of the pilots.

If someone raises a question about how flying by instruments can be difficult, one merely indicates that the hijack pilots used flight by sight methods that are a lot easier. On the other hand, if someone raises questions about the problems associated with flight by sight, then one points out that the hijack pilots had GPS units and all one has to do is punch in some coordinates and be chauffeured to one's target.



At this point, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* are putting forth a perspective that can never be falsified. They really don't have a clear theory about how the alleged hijack pilots were able to accomplish their missions, but, instead, they have a story – not a theory or hypothesis – but a story that arbitrarily weaves elements together in a narrative that like some movies on a DVD offers alternative possibilities in relation to some of the basic components of the story -- depending on which facts one wishes to emphasize, ignore, rationalize, or spin.

Although the title of their book is: *Debunking 9/11 Myths: Why Conspiracy Theories Can't Stand Up To The Facts*, nevertheless, so far, the editors of that book really seem to be engaged in spinning some myths of their own. Moreover, the two editors also are providing a certain amount of evidence which suggests that, perhaps, their own created myths cannot necessarily stand up to the available facts very well.

-----



### **5 - Case of the Mysterious Pod and Windowless Plane**

In the next few pages of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* (pages 8-14), the editors busy themselves with trying to shoot down several myths concerning the issue of whether, or not, there was a 'strange pod' underneath the fuselage, near the right wing, of Flight 175 that crashed into the south tower of the WTC. In addition, the editors examine claims of some individuals that this same Flight 175 was reported to not have had any windows on the sides of the plane as one would expect in the case of a commercial jet.

Ultimately, the thrust of this point-counterpoint is about whether, or not, remote control technology might have been used on 9/11. The 'pod' issue and the windowless -- or partially windowless -- plane possibility constitute one of the battlegrounds that the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* have chosen in order to demonstrate the weaknesses in various anti-'official' stances.

Before taking a look at some of the material in this aspect of things, there are a few preliminary comments that should be noted. First of all, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seem to spend an inordinate amount of time poking around the Internet trying to find the weakest, least well-developed, most extreme forms of argument that have been put forth by some of the people who do not accept the 'official' version of things.

This modus operandi is a little like an adult going around picking fights with little kids and, then, after pummeling children who have little to offer in the way of self-defense, return to the local bar to brag about their fighting prowess. One might be far more impressed if the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* took on someone in their own weight class, or higher, and mixed it up ... conceptually and evidentially.

Having read a great deal of the literature concerning 9/11, there are very few, if any, individuals of serious scholarship who are talking about 'pods' on the underside of the fuselage of Flight 175, nor are they talking about a possibly windowless jet that slammed into the south tower. At most, they might refer to such things in passing, but the crux of their arguments does not rest on such issues.

Technically speaking, by attacking those with poorly constructed arguments concerning 9/11, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* might be adhering to the stated purpose for which their book was published –

namely, to show how certain claims concerning 9/11 do not necessarily stand up to the facts. Nevertheless, in a lot of instances this is all that their book entails – arguments that might be technically true in relation to some fringe claim or in relation to claims that they have taken out of context, yet, such arguments really don't address many of the issues, facts, questions, lacunae, and problems with which numerous anti-'official' theory individuals are concerned.

Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* quotes quite a few experts in photography during the process of critiquing the mysterious 'pod' idea to demonstrate that what appears to be an unusual pod – which some claim to be possible evidence of a remotely controlled plane – is really nothing more than an artifact of such things as: the angle of the plane as it approaches the tower; a problematic confluence of lighting, camera position, and plane angle; low resolution of the camera images which give poor quality pictures that lead to misinterpretations of what actually is present, and the problems of playing around with digital images on the internet (e.g., resizing an original image or fitting that original image to a certain size space).

However true such 'expert' testimony might be, one needs to draw a distinction between this sort of testimony and reality. Expert testimony of the kind that is being advanced at this point by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is an attempt to provide the reader with an alternative explanation for someone else's interpretation of the same sort of photographic evidence.

That alternative account encompasses a variety of technical issues and problems concerning the interpretation of photographic evidence. After presenting such evidence and making concomitant cautionary statements, the expert witnesses conclude that in their opinion what is being pointed to as a 'pod' is not really physically present but is due to a combination of different visual factors that are capable of misleading the uninformed eye and, as a result, induce some people to draw conclusions that are not warranted concerning the nature of what those individuals believe they are seeing.

Sometimes it is more prudent to believe what someone else is telling one about what one is seeing rather than one's own lying eyes. Sometimes it is not more prudent to do so.

Is it possible that there was a pod on the underside of the fuselage near the right wing? In other words, is it possible that the testimony given by the expert witnesses -- although, in general, consisting of quite valid testimony concerning technical matters -- is wrong, nonetheless, on this particular occasion ... is wrong with respect to why what someone believes he or she is seeing on the underside of that plane is, in fact, not there but is, rather, a 'creation' of the photographic circumstances through which a given picture was taken and published?

The answer to the foregoing questions is: yes. In the language of scientific methodology, it is always possible that a hypothesis which ultimately turns out to be true might, in a given instance of testing, be rejected as false.

However, one must consider the odds of the expert witnesses being incorrect on this particular occasion ... of having generated a false negative position. In the absence of any other compelling data, there is really no evidentiary basis for rejecting such expert testimony even though there still remains some possibility that what the photographic experts are claiming is an artifact of the photographic process is, in fact, an actual 'pod' on the underside of the fuselage of the plane that crashed into the WTC tower.

I am inclined to accept what the experts are saying on this particular issue of interpretation and conclude that the evidence for the existence of a pod on the underside of the fuselage of Flight 175 is very slight. However, is there any other evidence pertinent to this point that should be examined?

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* goes on to report an interview with Mark Birnbach who, apparently, might have been the original source for the 'no-windows-on-Flight-175' story. He had done a phone interview with Fox news on 9/11, and, during that interview, he stated: "It definitely did not look like a commercial plane. I didn't see any windows on the side."

Later, Mr. Birnbach also spoke with producers of a documentary called *911 In Plane Sight* in which he confirmed that he did not see any windows on Flight 175, but he also indicated to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that he doesn't "believe the plane was anything other than a passenger jet" (pages 12-13, and these are the words of the editors not Mark Birnbach). He went on to recount to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* how he had been asked to appear on screen in the aforementioned

documentary but refused to do so because: “I don’t believe their theory. I think they are completely out of line.”

The editors, then, put forth two further pieces of evidence that they maintain demonstrates the ‘no windows’ story doesn’t have any newsworthy legs. First, they make reference to the idea that the angle of the plane coming into the south tower and the position of the sun were such that people in Brooklyn and Manhattan would not easily, if at all, have been able to see the windows on the right side of the plane – the only side that the editors claim would have been visible, to some extent, to people on the ground.

Secondly, the editors cite the testimony of W. Gene Corley, a licensed structural engineer who helped lead the FEMA investigation concerning the collapse of the World Trade Center. Mr. Corley indicated that during their investigation they had compiled aerial photographs of the WTC site, and one of the photographs shows a chunk of fuselage with windows on the roof of Building 5, and Mr. Corley identifies that piece of fuselage as having come from United Airlines Flight 175 that hit the south tower.

There are a number of ideas that occur to me in relation to the foregoing discussion about the alleged lack of windows with respect to Flight 175. To begin with, I have seen a few photographs of the

Building 5 roof area, and there is no readily identifiable piece of fuselage lying on the roof.

In fairness, of course, one could counter the foregoing with the possibility that Mr. Corley had access to photographs that give much higher resolution, as well as the magnification benefits of zoom lenses, with respect to the roof area of Building 5 than do the photographs to which I have had access. However, even if one grants this point, there remain a number of other questions.

According to Mr. Corley, there was not just one plane remnant that was found on the roof of Building 5. There were a number of pieces of plane discovered in that roof area.

Apparently, in addition to the piece of fuselage with windows, there also were two other pieces that were discovered on the roof of Building 5. On the one hand, most of one engine was found there, and, in addition, there also was a fragment that contained part of a landing gear ensemble – although it is not indicated how big this latter ‘fragment’ was.

One question is this: How did these fragments land on the roof of Building 5? According to Mr. Corley, he studied some ABC video footage involving the crash of Flight 175 and, then, tracked the trajectory of the three aforementioned pieces through the building and out through the north side of the building

Mr. Corley's account is somewhat ambiguous at this point. Did the ABC video capture the exiting of the three fragments from the north face of the south tower, or did Mr. Corley take certain information and, then, extrapolate ... making assumptions about what the path of those objects might have been and what those objects might have hit and how such collision might have affected the trajectories of three different elements – namely, the engine, the landing gear fragment, and the three-windowed fuselage fragment?

Mr. Corley also doesn't indicate – or, perhaps, more accurately, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* didn't ask, or, if they did, they didn't state what was said concerning the position of the ABC camera from which the video that Mr. Corley studied was taken. In other words, we don't know the nature of the video that he analyzed, so it is hard to determine just what Mr. Corley is saying ... did he see the whole thing (both south and north sides of the building) at the same time and watched on video as the three objects came out the north side of the south tower ... objects that could be identified in the air as: respectively, most of an engine, a landing gear fragment, and a fuselage fragment, and, then these elements were followed down to the surface and seen to land on the roof of Building 5?

While the foregoing 'total view' might have been captured by ABC, I somehow doubt it – although I am quite prepared to be corrected on this matter. What I suspect is being said by Mr. Corley is that he took some video footage from ABC and proceeded to calculate a number of likely trajectories through the south tower and out the north side for objects that were from one of the crashed hijacked jets – objects that were later allegedly found on the roof of Building 5.

If Mr. Corley did undertake such a calculation, there are quite a lot of variables that would have had to be taken into account. These variables would all have taken place inside the south tower, and, as a result, we are presented with something of a black-box problem in which we have input data (namely, the trajectory, speed, weight, and composition of the plane as well as the structure of the building), but we really don't have anything else, except the assumption that the three objects on the roof of Building 5 got

there as a result of their continued momentum (derived from an airplane traveling at some 500 mph, or slightly higher) when it crashed into the south tower and out the north side of that building ... carrying several hundred feet further onto the roof of Building 5.

Mr. Corley seems to be making a lot of assumptions about what went on in the south tower and about when and how different parts of the plane were shredded by building impact (and by what), and where such fragments might have traveled after impact, and how much momentum would have been lost at any given point along such a projected trajectory. Since Mr. Corley didn't give the details of the calculations he used to generate a trajectory model for any of the objects in question, we really have no way of confirming if his trajectory calculations for any of the three objects are correct (and one should keep in mind that the weight and density of an engine or partial landing gear fragment is going to be quite different from a piece of fuselage).

Are there any other theoretical possibilities that might account for how three objects from Flight 175 ended up on the roof of Building 5? Well, if we just stick with the 'official' theory for a moment (and there are other possibilities beyond the horizons of the 'official' theory that also offer an explanation for how the buildings at the WTC came to collapse – a theory that will be explored later in this book and a theory that might account for how plane fragments from Flight 175 ended up on the roof of Building 5 in a manner that involved something other than the forward momentum of a crashing jet), there might be another way of accounting for the observed data of three objects on the roof of Building 5.

According to the 'official' pancake theory of collapse, there would have been a certain amount of air pressure created as one floor collapsed on top of another. The air in the space below a collapsing floor would be vectored by the collapsing weight of the floor above it to follow the line of least resistance either out the sides of the building or down the space formed within the area surrounded by the core columns.

If one were to posit an air pressure hypothesis, then conceivably, enough force might have been generated through air compression so that objects could have been ejected in the exit-squib that was created by the movement of the air under the pressure of the collapsing floor. Thus, the three fragments of plane discovered on top of Building 5 might have found



their way to the roof area as a result of being forcibly ejected out of the north side of the south tower as a result of air compression.

One question that arises in relation to the foregoing scenario is whether the force of air compression due to a pancake theory of collapse would have been sufficient on the several floors struck by Flight 175 (and this is important because one might anticipate that the greatest force of compression would come on the lower floors as the momentum of the collapse progressed) to have created a force great enough to eject a piece of fuselage, or an engine, or a landing gear fragment several hundred feet to the roof of Building 5.

A second question I have with respect to the foregoing is the following one: What would the trajectory have been of a piece of fuselage with three windows that, somehow, was ripped from Flight 175? Would that piece have had to contend with weaving its way through the core column matrix (the core columns consist of prefabricated sections that have steel cross meshes that are bolted to the core columns) of the south tower? Or would it have missed the core column section of the south tower? Moreover, irrespective of the core column matrix, there is the question of the trajectory of the fuselage section as it traversed the rest of the building on the other side of those core columns – especially the peripheral columns on the north side.

The foregoing might all be, as one of Sheryl Crow's songs puts it, 'apropos of nothing', but I am trying to get a mental picture of how things might fit together in a logical sort of manner. However, there is something about a piece of fuselage landing on a roof several hundred feet away as a result of air compression that seems somewhat odd ... even though this might be a perfectly true state of affairs. In fact, even if one throws out the idea of air compression ejecting plane parts from the south tower, I still am having difficulty understanding how a relatively low density and lightweight piece of fuselage was able to 'find' its way through a sea of obstacles and out the north side of the south tower to fall to the roof of Building 5 several hundred feet away.

We are told definitely that the piece of fuselage came from the south tower and it was from United Airlines Flight 175. According to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, the fuselage fragment "carried the gray and blue markings of United Airlines planes (page 13)." Furthermore, the editors stipulated that some of the fragments found on the roof of Building

5 carried parts numbers that were the sort of components used on the Boeing airplane known as Flight 175.

The fact that “some” of the fragments found on the roof of Building 5 carried part numbers that corresponded with those used in a Boeing aircraft of the Flight 175 variety suggests that some of the fragments found on the roof area did not carry any identifiable part numbers. Since the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* did not specify which parts carried parts numbers and which did not, one is left with a piece of information that appears to validate the pedigree of some fragments as belonging to Flight 175 but leaves the pedigree of other fragments found on the roof area in some doubt.

It might be a reasonable assumption to suppose that ‘birds of a feather flock together’ and, therefore, all of the plane fragments found on the roof of Building 5 came from Flight 175. On the other hand, it also might be a reasonable assumption to suppose that some of the plane fragments without parts numbers might have come, somehow, from the somewhat closer north tower.

The editors quote Mr. Corley as saying: “the fuselage fragments come from the rear section of the plane (page 14).” What is not said by either Mr. Corley or the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is anything that identifies which side of the plane the piece of fuselage came from.

After all, what happens – and, admittedly, the following is pushing the envelope of possibility to the point of nearly rupturing --if only one side of the plane were, for some unknown reason, windowless? If the piece of fuselage laying on the roof of Building 5 was, indeed, from Flight 175, then the fact the piece had windows is not necessarily conclusive evidence that the ‘no-windows’ idea is false because the piece of fuselage found on the roof of Building 5 might have come from the other side of the plane – the side with windows.

Alternatively, it might be possible that although the rear portions of Flight 175 had windows, maybe the forward sections – on one or both sides – of that plane didn’t have windows. Unless one can rule out as many things as possible, then the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* might be leaving themselves open to counter arguments in relation to the missing details of the editors’ argument.

Speaking of missing details, another piece of information that is absent from the editors’ account of things is any mention of where Mark

Birnbach was standing when he claimed that the plane he saw was not of a conventional sort, and it did not appear to have any windows. The editors do speak of what would have been visible from the ground in Manhattan and Brooklyn. However, I am uncertain where Mark Birnbach was positioned when he saw whatever he saw. Maybe, he wasn't on the ground but, rather, was witnessing events from higher up in another office building.

These sorts of detail might, or might not, be of any significance.

Nevertheless, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* often try to frame everything that they are saying as being fact, and, oftentimes, the reader doesn't know the full nature of the alleged facts to which the editors are alluding.

Sometimes this absence of detail is immaterial. At other times, one might not be so ready to treat the absence of details as a 'gimme' – such as in the editors' narrative which claims that the piece of fuselage was from Flight 175, that it had windows, and that it landed on the roof of Building 5 as a result of its momentum trajectory following the crash.

Furthermore, I have some problems with the sort of universal criticism advanced by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* which says that nobody on the ground, no matter where they were standing in Brooklyn or Manhattan, would have been able to see the right side of Flight 175 because it was tilted upward. What the editors are saying might, or might not, be true, but their claim would require empirical confirmation in order to be able to conclusively demonstrate that no one on the ground in either of the two boroughs could possibly have seen a given side of the plane and, thereby, determine whether, or not, there were, for example, any windows.

In other words, what the two editors are stating is not fact but conjecture. That conjecture might, at some later point, be shown to have been correct, but, at the present time, absent any further data, it is conjecture, not fact.

The reason why I am going through the current analysis concerning Flight 175 and whether, or not, there was a mysterious pod on the underside of the fuselage, along with whether, or not, there were any windows on one side of the plane, is not because I am a proponent of either the pod or windowless scenarios. Both of the foregoing ideas are connected with a hypothesis first met when discussing the 'bumble plane' and Operation

Pearl theories in Chapter 3 – namely, that the planes which crashed into the twin towers were remote controlled, and the pod/windowless combination is being put forth as possible evidence which is consistent with the remote controlled thesis.

As indicated earlier, I am disinclined to embrace such a theory. My lack of commitment is not due to any belief that such an idea is, on its face, absurd because the military already has test-proven the reality of the underlying technology by means of a jet that was directed on a flight from the U.S. to Australia via remote control from take-off to landing.

More specifically, the Australian Defence Science and Technology Organization reported that on April 23, 2001, an RQ-4A Global Hawk was successfully flown, via remote control, from Edwards Air Force Base in California to Edinburgh Air Force Base in Australia. After several months of flight testing out of Australia, the plane was flown back to the United States on June 7, 2001.

Such facts notwithstanding, I do not find that the available evidence from 9/11 can easily be woven into a compelling case in support of the remote control theory. To be sure, there are bits and pieces of data that make one wonder (e.g, why did none of the commercial jet pilots punch the '7500' code into the transponder to indicate that a hijacking was going on, or how did Flight 77 do its 270 degree downward turn through 7,000 feet and level out at virtually a grass top level before allegedly plowing into the Pentagon), but, on the whole, I do not find such a theory to be very compelling ... at least not at this time.

So, why am I bothering with this discussion? While examining the issue of the pod and windowless stories, a number of issues have arisen concerning the interpretation of evidence and the sorts of conclusion that tenably can be supported on the basis of such interpretations.

Grand juries are about the presentation of evidence. They are about the interpretation of that evidence. Grand juries are about the conclusions one can draw from such evidence and interpretations.

While, in the absence of additional evidence, I might be inclined to accept the expert witness testimony concerning the photographs of the alleged 'pod' as being more believable than the remote-controlled planes idea, this is not because I believe that those experts are seeing 'reality' while the pod-theorists are delusional. Instead, the experts in this case have given me a

fairly good picture of how someone might come to believe that an artifact of the photographic process was evidence of something that, in actuality, did not exist. On the other hand, the alternative theory about what the photographs might be evidence of (i.e., a pod containing remote control technology) is nothing more than a conjecture – which might be true but is not backed up by any independent evidence.

Notwithstanding the foregoing concessions, I do not find the evidence put forth by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* in relation to the Mark Birnbach facet of the discussion to be as compelling. Now, let me state up front that I am not saying that what Mark Birnbach actually saw was anything other than a conventional airplane. Nonetheless, there are a number of questions that arise in conjunction with an examination of the testimony surrounding Mark Birnbach that do not arise in relation to the pod side of things.

Some of these questions already have been raised with respect to the comments of W. Gene Corley. However, let me introduce a few more items.

Mark Birnbach indicated to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that he didn't want to participate in the 9/11 documentary because he didn't believe in the theory that they were trying to propound and felt that it was totally out of line. Yet, he did indicate during a phone interview with Fox that the plane didn't appear to be a commercial plane and that, from his perspective, the plane didn't seem to have any windows on the side facing him.

What a person believes (in this case, Mark Birnbach), or would like to believe, concerning the causal nature of the events on 9/11 is irrelevant – hopefully – to the nature of the testimony which that individual gives. Naturally, if a person's beliefs bias his or her testimony, then, yes, this is a problem, but Mark Birnbach gave his testimony despite not agreeing with the way in which the 9/11 documentary makers wanted to use that testimony.

Does his testimony prove that Flight 175 was not a conventional airplane and that there were no windows on the side of the plane to which he was visually privy? No, it doesn't.

At the same time, is his testimony inconsistent with the thesis of those people who speculate about whether, or not, the planes that crashed into the twin towers were remote controlled? No, it isn't.

Furthermore, none of the testimony or evidence that the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* cite in their attempt to show that Mark Birnbach's testimony does not support, or is not consistent with, the 'remote controlled plane' idea, is very compelling. This is especially so in conjunction with the testimony of W. Gene Corley – the aforementioned structural engineer who was working with FEMA to determine the cause of the building collapses at the WTC.

The questions that I have about Mr. Corley's testimony are not because I feel he has not told the truth. Rather, the questions I have about his testimony is that I am having difficulty getting a clear understanding of how things might have happened that – given the 'official' theory of things – would have led to a piece of fuselage from Flight 175 ending up on the roof of Building 5, several hundred feet away--in good enough shape that would permit its ready identification as having come from Flight 175.

Conceivably, things might have happened just the way Mr. Corley said they did. On the other hand, there are quite a few assumptions and calculations that form the links between the available data and the conclusions that Mr. Corley draws concerning the trajectories of the plane fragments in question, and, as a result, I have some reservations about the reliability of both his modeling process as well as the inferences he makes on the basis of the calculations he performs on the basis of his trajectory model.

In addition, there are some missing details with respect to his account that are not necessarily indicative of anything other than the fact that the absence of those details makes it difficult to compose as complete a picture as possible in one's mind's eye concerning Mr. Corley's testimony. For example, we don't know how big the piece of fuselage was, and we don't know which side of the plane the piece of fuselage was from.

Moreover, there are aspects of Mr. Corley's testimony that raise questions for other facets of trying to explain events on 9/11 in as rigorous and as complete a way as possible. For instance, given the 'official' pancake theory of collapse – and assuming, for the moment, that the various pieces of plane found on the roof of Building 5 did not get there as a result of forward momentum following the crash – how did the piece of fuselage, along with hundreds of pieces of heavy steel beams, end up not

only on the roof of Building 5, but strewn hundreds of feet in all directions? Is the force of air compression caused by a collapsing building sufficiently strong to be able to do this? Did the piece of fuselage arrive on the roof of Building 5 via its forward momentum that was derived from the crash of Flight 175, or did it arrive on that rooftop in some other fashion?

I do not know of any studies that have been done that modeled the conditions of the twin towers specifically in order to examine the forces of air compression that might, or might not, have been created under the 'pancake' theory of collapse. More specifically, I know of no studies that have been done in conjunction with the collapse of the twin towers that have either demonstrated, or not demonstrated, that the sort of air pressure created by the collapse of the twin towers under the pancake theory would have been sufficient to jettison many heavy metal objects for hundreds of feet.

Would I conclude, on the basis of Mark Birnbach's testimony, that there was some funny business going on at the twin towers with at least one of the planes ... in other words, that Flight 175 was not a conventional commercial airplane or that it appeared to be windowless and that this constituted evidence that remote controlled planes were used at the WTC? No, as a member of a hypothetical grand jury, I, personally, would not come to such a conclusion, but during the course of considering this issue, some important aspects of deliberating about evidence, interpretation, logic, and drawing conclusions has come forth that bear upon the rest of the investigation into the events of September 11, 2001 – qualities of thinking that need to be applied to every facet of the 9/11 problem.

-----





## 6 - I Command You To Stand Down

On Page 14, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* introduce an eight-page-plus section on the 'stand down' claim of some of the opponents of the 'official' theory concerning the events of 9/11. Approximately a half page is devoted to providing an outline of their heavily redacted version of the other side's theories concerning the issue of 'stand down'. The rest of the eight-plus pages concentrate on reiterating the position of *The 9/11 Commission Report*.

The editors use the latter report as their standard of measurement without once conducting a critical inquiry into the character of that report and whether, or not, it deserves to be treated as such a standard. This is like convening a grand jury and assuming that whatever the prosecutor says must be true, and, therefore, the members of the grand jury have no choice but to accept the prosecutor's perspective as being the standard that should be used to measure all things in the case at hand.

The problem with this is that it is the duty of each and every member of a grand jury – hypothetical or otherwise – to independently and critically reflect on the case put forth by the prosecutor to determine whether there is, in fact, a sufficiently strong case to issue an indictment against a given individual or individuals. To merely assume one's way to this conclusion is to abdicate one's duty as a grand juror ... and it is also to abdicate one's responsibility as a citizen.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* sum up the alleged case of the 'stand down' perspective by quoting from two sources: [emperorsclothes.com](http://emperorsclothes.com) and [standdown.net](http://standdown.net). In relation to the former source, the editors provide the following excerpt: "On 11 September Andrews [Air Force Base] had two squadrons of fighter jets with the job of protecting the skies over Washington, D.C.. They failed in their job." And, from the second web site noted above, the editors provide the following claim: "There is only one explanation for this. Our Air Force was ordered to Stand Down on 9/11."

In actuality, the two foregoing quotes do not necessarily have anything to do with one another. It is a categorical and undeniable fact the United States military – including Andrews Air Force – failed to do their jobs on 9/11.

One does not need to be a proponent of any kind of conspiracy theory whatsoever to arrive at the above conclusion. America was under attack,

and no known effective action was taken by the military to protect people or property.

Apologists might, if they wish, try to site such mitigating factors as: the unprecedented nature of the attacks; or the military was in a mindset that predisposed them to be looking for attacks from outside the United States rather than from within America; or due to a variety of military exercises that were being run that day, the Air Force was left understaffed to adequately respond to the hijackings; or the events of 9/11 were of an unprecedented nature, so how can anyone reasonably expect the military to effectively respond to such unprecedented happenings; or because the transponders of the hijacked planes were turned off, this made it difficult for the military to properly track the four aircraft; or there was a lack of 'actionable' intelligence concerning the events of 9/11; or decisions had to be made in accordance with a chain of command that proved too cumbersome for the challenges of 9/11; or the military was relying on the FAA to do its job, and because that agency failed to be timely in its warnings, the military did not have the information it needed to act effectively; or there was a tremendous amount of confusion on 9/11, and this confusion led to human error and faulty judgment that shaped a fair amount of the military's response on that date.

Each and every one of the foregoing claims is nothing more than a poorly conceived rationalization. The military has, over the last 40-50 years, received trillions of dollars from the American taxpayers to accomplish just one goal: defend the people of the United States. But on 9/11 all of those trillions of dollars resulted in exactly zero defense for the citizens of this country.

The FAA is not part of the Defense Department. Whatever the mistakes of the FAA might, or might not, have been on 9/11, it was not their task to defend the United States of America.

Did the FAA have certain security responsibilities? Yes, it did, and some of those duties appear not to have been fulfilled on 9/11.

However, having a mandate to provide security in relation to private and commercial aviation is not at all the same thing as having a mandate to protect the United States against all enemies, both foreign and domestic.

There is considerable evidence – some of which will be discussed later in this book – that both the FBI and CIA also failed to do their jobs in

relation to 9/11. Nevertheless, although both the FBI and CIA have roles to play with respect to helping to enhance the security of America, neither the FBI nor the CIA has the task of defending this country in quite the same way as does the military.

Whatever the 'reasons' might be, the military failed to fulfill its primary mission on September 11, 2001. For this, there should be no excuse that is offered, and there should be no excuse which is accepted.

The foregoing considerations notwithstanding, I feel there is an important proviso that needs to be attached at this point. When I used the term "military" in the previous statement, I did not mean to say that every enlisted man and woman in the military failed to do their jobs on 9/11. Many, perhaps most, of the men and women in uniform were doing what the military leadership indicated should be done on that day.

On the other hand, I have no doubt there was a remarkable failure of leadership among a significant number of individuals within the military (especially the Air Force) not only with respect to what transpired on 9/11 but, and perhaps just as importantly, in all the years leading up to 9/11 in which trillions of dollars were spent inducing Americans to believe they were safe when such, sadly, was far from the truth.

Ironically, on the day before 9/11, then Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, held a news conference in which he reported that some 3 trillion dollars could not be accounted for with respect to Pentagon expenditures. Even more ironically, on the evening of 9/11 he asked for, and received from Congress, an appropriation amounting to billions of more dollars in order to do battle with those who had attacked America earlier in the day.

Apparently, several trillion dollars of the aforementioned sum has been recovered or located. However, there is still a trillion dollars, or so, whose fate remains a mystery, and to paraphrase Everett Dirksen – a former Senator from Illinois – a trillion dollars here and a trillion dollars there, and pretty soon we're talking about some real money.

Not only does the foregoing confession of Donald Rumsfeld indicate a rather careless attitude – on the part of someone -- concerning what happens to money that comes from taxpayers, but it also demonstrates a brazenness on the part of the Department of Defense. More specifically, at a time when the military had, in a very important way, failed in its primary objective

to defend the United States and, thereby, demonstrated – at the very best – not only considerable incompetence concerning its raison d'etre, but, as well, that trillions of dollars had, in a very substantive way, been spent for nought, the Department of Defense had the nerve to ask to be given a bonus for its incompetence.

So, if we return to the first quote provided by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* in which someone at the web site [emperors-clothes.com](http://emperors-clothes.com) stated that the military -- and, more specifically, Andrews Air Force Base -- “failed to do their job”, this is not just a claim, it is a fact. And, yet, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* place this quote on the ‘CLAIM’ side of the ledger rather than in the ‘FACT’ column while offering no evidence to back up their decision to arrange things in that fashion.

Rather than sifting through the arguments and trying to disentangle fact from fiction or reality from myth, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seem more interested in painting everything that might be said by someone who disagrees with the ‘official’ version as being part of a vast network of lunatic conspiracy theorists. By engaging in a process of seeking to brand people as conspiracy theorists who have absolutely nothing of value to say, then, in my opinion, the editors only hurt their own credibility because, rightly or wrongly, such activities make them appear to have an axe to grind or an underlying agenda to promote, and such considerations tend to weigh very heavily in assessing the potential worth of that testimony.

To say that the military failed to fulfill its primary mission on 9/11 is not to advance a conspiracy theory. It is, I believe, a statement of bitter truth.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* juxtapose the quote from [www.standdown.net](http://www.standdown.net) next to the quote from [emperor-clothes.com](http://emperor-clothes.com) in order to make it all seem like one seamless conspiracy theory – as if asking the military to take responsibility for upholding its sworn duty is the same thing as someone advancing a theory which stipulates that the reason why the military failed to observe its duty on September 11, 2001 was because someone – they don’t know who – ordered a ‘stand down’ of the military on 9/11. The fact the military failed in its duty to the citizens of the United States on 9/11 is one thing, and conjectures as to why such a failure occurred is a totally separate matter.

Moreover, in the interests of accuracy, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* give a very limited and distorted understanding concerning the diversity of perspectives that exist in relation to the 'stand down' issue. Some people argue that an actual 'stand down' order was given – and, among other things, they point to the testimony of Norman Mineta, then Secretary of Transportation, to the 9/11 Commission investigators (for some reason, Secretary Mineta's testimony never made it into *The 9/11 Commission Report*).

More specifically, on the morning of 9/11, Secretary Mineta was in the Presidential Emergency Operations Center deep underground beneath the White House, and he reported having witnessed a running interchange between Vice President Cheney and a young man who was updating Vice President Cheney about the closing distance of an incoming unidentified flying object – believed to be Flight 77, which the 'official' story alleges struck the Pentagon. Secretary Mineta testified that: "There was a young man who would come in and say to the Vice President, 'The plane is 50 miles out,' 'The plane is 30 miles out.' And when it got down to 'the plane is 10 miles out,' the young man also said to the Vice President, 'Do the orders still stand?' And the Vice President turned and whipped his neck around and said: 'Of course the orders still stand! Have you heard anything to the contrary?' Well, at the time I didn't know what all that meant."

Although there is a certain amount of discrepancy between accounts, some degree of confirmation concerning the foregoing interchange witnessed by Secretary Mineta might come via Danielle O'Brien, an air traffic controller working at Dulles International

Airport on 9/11. Several September 2001 articles, one by the *Washington Post* and the other from *Newsday*, described how an unidentified object was spotted by Dulles air traffic controllers heading for Washington, D.C. airspace. Ms. O'Brien indicates that after briefly monitoring the path of the unidentified object approaching Washington, her supervisor called the White House and began relaying information concerning the location of the inbound UFO.

Ms. O'Brien reports the words of her supervisor who was on the phone with the White House. "... we have an unidentified, very fast moving aircraft, headed toward your vicinity, 8 miles west ... . And it went six, five, four. And I had it in my mouth to say three, and all of a sudden, the plane turned away.

“... We lost radar contact with that aircraft... then the Washington National controllers came over our speakers ... and said: ‘Dulles, hold all of our inbound traffic. The Pentagon’s been hit.’”

Some people have speculated that the aforementioned ‘orders’ alluded to in the interchange between the young man and Vice President Cheney had to do with a shoot-down command. Other individuals conjecture that those ‘orders’ refer to a decision by someone not to shoot down the incoming plane, and, as such, was interpreted by the latter set of individuals as an example of at least one ‘stand down’ order that might have been given on 9/11.

The fact of the matter is, we really do not know what that exchange between Vice President Cheney and the young man actually meant. Did it refer to a shoot-down order? Did it refer to a ‘stand down’ order? Did it refer to some other kind of order? No one – including the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* – knows the truth of this matter except, at a minimum, the two principles in the foregoing interchange – namely, Vice President Cheney and the young man briefing him intermittently.

One can speculate about things all one likes. However, the only way to ascertain what the orders were to which both Vice President Cheney and the young man were referring would be to ask them. The published version of *The 9/11 Commission Report* provides no information that could clear up this matter. As previously indicated parenthetically, the 9/11 Commission did not even bother to include the foregoing account of the Secretary of Transportation in the final report of the Commission.

As a member of my hypothetical grand jury, I would like to subpoena the young man, Secretary Norman Mineta, Vice President Cheney, the Commission personnel who conducted the interviews, and the person or persons who actually wrote and/or edited the report and ask a variety of questions. These questions would have to do both with what went on that morning in the White House Presidential Emergency Operations Center, as well as what took place within the Commission concerning that event, and why neither the incident nor the Mineta testimony made the final cut into *The 9/11 Commission Report*.

I also find it strange that the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* do not mention or explore either the foregoing interchange issue or the concomitant matter involving the Commission’s decision to exclude everything concerning that exchange from its final report. The editors of

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* attempt to create the impression that they deal with 'nothing but the facts', and, yet, time and again – at least so far -- I have found them either inventing facts, ignoring facts, using innuendo as if it were fact, or treating their conjectures and speculations as if they were fact.

Supposedly, the two editors are engaged in an effort to show how conspiracy claims cannot stand up to facts in relation to the 'stand down' issue. Yet, when it comes to one of the pieces of evidence that is most often cited by people who believe that a 'stand down' order of some kind might have been given – at least in certain instances – on 9/11, the editors are completely silent about the matter.

Consequently, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* have not shown that a claim concerning the possible meaning of the interchange between Vice President Cheney and the young man that was witnessed by Norman Mineta was not a 'stand down' order, and, therefore, they have not demonstrated that such a claim has not been able to stand up to the facts of the matter. They have not shown this to be the case because they do not even discuss it.

Can one conclude from the foregoing discussion concerning what Secretary Mineta observed on 9/11 was a 'stand down' order? Not necessarily, but as things currently stand, the foregoing evidence certainly is consistent with such a possibility.

Before moving on to discuss other sorts of consideration in the 'stand down' stand off, one should also point out that the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* fail to indicate that not everyone who takes exception with the so-called 'official' theory is an advocate of a position which claims that – with the possible exception of the aforementioned Norman Mineta testimony concerning Vice President Cheney – there was some sort of 'stand down' order ( officially or unofficially) given by, or to, the military on 9/11. There are many ways of disrupting military activity that do not necessarily require that a 'stand down' order be given.

I am inclined to accept the argument that for someone in the military to have ordered a general 'stand down' of the Air Force entails far too many problems to be permitted to go unchallenged. I believe – although I might be wrong on this – that there continue to be a great many good people – people of integrity – serving within the military who would question the validity, strategic purpose, and legality of any such order. I

think the same kind of objection could be made in relation to any sort of 'unofficial' 'stand down' order.

However, if a small group of individuals within the FAA, the military, and/or the Defense Department were to have worked together to put the armed forces just enough off their 'game' that the military would have been unable to defend the United States, then, no 'stand down' order – official or otherwise – had to be given. Let us put aside, for the moment, the fact that there have been any number of people over the past several hundred years who -- for ideological, financial, sexual, and/or pathological motivations -- have betrayed their country (the names Aldrich Ames, Robert Hanssen, and Jonathan Pollard come readily to mind, but there are quite a few others) and, thereby, avoid the problems associated with trying to determine who, if anyone, might have been in a position to betray America with respect to the performance of the military on 9/11. Let us just concentrate on possible techniques that might have been employed to effectively disrupt the military on 9/11.

For example, on September 11, 2001, there were at least 15 military/intelligence related exercises that were being conducted, in progress, or about to be run that were directly or indirectly related to the events that transpired in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania on 9/11. Some of these exercises were being run by NORAD – for example, *Vigilant Warrior* and *Northern Vigilance*.

This latter exercise might have particular relevance to the present discussion because it involved the real world deployment of a large number of fighter planes and other aircraft to Alaska and northern Canada. This exercise removed a substantial portion of American air defenses in certain areas, and, as a result, that exercise left the military somewhat understaffed should certain kinds of emergency arise ... such as those of September 11, 2001.

On the other hand, there were many other exercises occurring on and around 9/11 that might be of equal interest. For instance, one could mention *Amalgam Virgo* that focused on the problems of defending against rogue states that employed either cruise missiles or hijacked planes as military weapons. *Amalgam Warrior* was another exercise, and it consisted of large scale maneuvers that focused on tracking, surveillance of, and intercepting live targets. *Vigilant Guardian* was a second exercise that was concerned specifically with mounting an air defense in relation to hijacked planes.



*Apollo Guardian* was a large scale operation that involved live-flying defense in relation to the surveillance and tracking of hostile craft. The National Reconnaissance Office was running an exercise requiring emergency response to the crashing of planes into buildings. Moreover, there was an AWACS exercise to be conducted over Florida and Washington, while FEMA was in Manhattan to run an exercise – named *Tripod II* – that would study emergency response to a simulated biochemical attack. As well, Pentagon firefighters were taking an ‘aircraft crash’ refresher course in Fort Meyer, Virginia.

There were a number of additional exercises being run on September 11, 2001. Timely Alert II was an emergency response exercise in relation to bomb attacks. *Global Guardian* was a study in nuclear warfare.

To be sure, military exercises have to be run some time. Consequently, one might suppose that the fact so many exercises had been scheduled for roughly the same time was just a matter of coincidence.

As a member of my hypothetical grand jury, I have to make judgments about a lot of things. One of the judgments I have to make is how to differentiate between those events that are, truly, coincidental and events that might be ‘too’ coincidental and, therefore, possibly indicative of something beyond mere happenstance.

According to George Tenet, head of the CIA, during the summer leading up to 9/11, the “system was blinking red” (Chapter 8, page 254 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*). Among other things, the system was blinking red because the CIA and other federal agencies had been receiving very specific sorts of intelligence from a stunning array of countries including: Britain, France, Italy, Jordan, Russia, Israel, Morocco, Egypt, and even Taliban-led Afghanistan (posted in a September 7, 2002 edition of *Independent Digital*), concerning the strong possibility of looming terrorist missions involving planes and attacks upon the United States. Some of this intelligence indicated that late summer or early September of 2001 carried a very high risk for such attacks to occur, and, furthermore, a number of sources independently singled out the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and the White House as likely targets.

In addition, according to a September 24, 2001 *Newsweek* article, on September 10, 2001, a number of high-ranking Pentagon officials had cancelled their air travel plans for September 11, 2001. A September

12, 2001 article in the *San Francisco Chronicle* reported that Mayor Willie Brown had received some sort of tip-off from his security people at the airport concerning his scheduled commercial flight to New York City on September 11, 2001 and how taking that flight might be a high-risk venture.

Salman Rushdie indicated during an interview reported in the September edition of *MX* that he had been banned from taking commercial flights a week prior to 9/11. Furthermore, according to a CBS correspondent by the name of Jim Stewart, Attorney General John Ashcroft discontinued taking commercial flights and began flying exclusively on government-chartered jets in the weeks leading up to 9/11 due to a threat assessment issued by the FBI.

Not only was the 'system blinking red', but a number of prominent people had received information about a heightened security concern in relation to commercial flights for a specific time frame. As a member of a hypothetical grand jury, I would be very interested in knowing the basis on which people cancelled their flight plans for September 11, 2001 or why some people had their travel modus operandi altered in the weeks leading up to 9/11.

Moreover, given the foregoing information, I do wonder about the timing of a whole slew of exercises that had been scheduled to take place during the temporal framework that had been identified -- through multiple, independent sources coming from intelligence services both internal and external to the United States -- as carrying an extremely high risk in relation to the occurrence of a possible terrorist attack. Was this merely a coincidence, or was it a collective exercise in poor judgment and unfortunate timing, or was it something else -- at least in some, although not necessarily in all, instances?

Let's take a little closer look as to how one, or more, of the military, intelligence and preparedness exercises that took place on, or around, September 11, 2001 might have served as obstacles in relation to an effective response to the events of 9/11.

I already have mentioned that the Northern Vigilance exercise had resulted in the re-deployment of many defense assets of the Air Force to Alaska and northern Canada. This not only meant there were fewer material resources to deal with the events of 9/11 (e.g., pilots and fighter planes), but, just as importantly, the nature of the Northern Vigilance exercise meant that the focus of a great many personnel in the Air Force would be concentrated on

events going on – either actually or virtually – at the other end of the continent from where the real world attacks were taking place.

In addition to the foregoing, it has been reported that some of these exercises involved what are known as computer ‘inserts’ with respect to various radar systems. These are computer-generated programs that provide an image on a radar screen that gives the appearance of being a ‘real’ world phenomenon when, in fact, they are only virtual in nature.

Richard Clarke reports in his book, *Against All Enemies*, that when he first spoke with Richard Myers, the general said that he was engaged in a NORAD exercise known as Vigilant Warrior. In addition, NORAD was also conducting another exercise that required deploying planes to northern Canada and Alaska.

In Chapter 1 of *The 9/11 Commission Report* one learns about interchanges between the FAA and the military. Lt. Colonel Robert Marr, who was the commander in charge of NEADS (Northeast Air Defense Sector) at the time it was informed by the FAA Boston Center about the hijacking of Flight 11, Lt. Colonel Marr is reported to have queried: “Is this real world or exercise” (page 20)”

When asked about the extent to which any of the exercises transpiring that day might have interfered with the effectiveness of the military response, General Myers is reported to have informed the Commission that, on the contrary, the exercises probably placed the United States in a better position to be able to respond to ongoing events. If so, one can only be thankful for the exercises. After all, if those exercises had not been going on, the US might have been in real trouble on 9/11.

In any event, if one wanted to create confusion, misdirection, delays in identification, and miscommunication, then surely, running exercises that entailed fooling around with radar systems and inserting false ‘blips’ into such systems – blips that could not be distinguished from real-world airplanes -- then a military exercise might serve as a perfect cover for someone who was interested in undermining the ability of military personnel to effectively respond to a real world crisis. One wouldn’t need a lot of people to accomplish this sort of disruption, just enough people with the requisite kind of technical skill, knowledge, and authorization.

There is some indication that not just military computers were having to try to deal with computer ‘inserts’ on 9/11. A number of FAA flight

controllers have reported that there might have been a number of blips appearing on some of their screens that did not correspond to real world objects.

I don't know what the truth of any of the foregoing FAA reports might be. I don't know if there was anyone monkeying around, in an unauthorized way, with one, or more, of the military exercises being conducted on September 11, 2001.

What I do know is that as a member of my hypothetical grand jury I would like an array of people from the FAA and the military to be subpoenaed so that they could be questioned about a variety of relevant issues. One of these issues would be to ask why so many exercises had been scheduled to take place during a time frame when an overwhelming amount of intelligence indicated that September might be a very bad time to conduct such exercises.

This is an issue worth exploring because, among other things, the observance of such exercises within the general time frame of concern (i.e., 'the system was blinking red') should have been foreseen by someone as entailing the very real possibility of potentially interfering with the ability of the military to fulfill its primary mission – namely, to defend the United States – during the time in which the exercises were to be conducted. What was the thinking of those who made a decision that despite the foreseeable risks surrounding a possible imminent attack, they would proceed, nonetheless, with the exercises? Who made such decisions? Did anyone discuss the possibility that, maybe, the exercises should be delayed or called off? Furthermore, no matter how innocently such decisions might have been made within the military, is it possible, if not plausible, to hypothesize about whether, or not, there might have been rogue elements in either the military or the intelligence community who could have run a covert operation in the midst of such exercises– covert operations that would have effectively compromised the response of the military and the FAA to a sufficient degree that they would have been a little late and in the wrong place for several critical hours?

None of the foregoing requires that a 'stand down' order be given – either officially or unofficially. However, the foregoing scenarios – taken either individually or collectively -- have the same kind of effect as such an order, because those sort of machinations would prevent the FAA and the military from doing their jobs in a timely and effective manner.

Another issue that I would like to explore within the context of my hypothetical grand jury is the nature of some of the military exercises being run on, and around, September 11, 2001. More specifically, I would like to know some of the nuts and bolts issues in relation to those exercises that were focusing on the possible threats posed by hijacked planes and/or using hijacked planes as weapons – for example, *Vigilant Guardian* and *Amalgam Virgo*.

Weeks and months are spent in preparing for such exercises. A set of official protocols were already in place with respect to hijacked planes.

The protocols that were in existence on 9/11 are as follows. If a commercial plane: (1) deviates from its established flight plan, (2) does not respond to radio contact, and/or (3) turns off its transponder, then these are all red flags indicating that the military is to be notified by the FAA. In the case of Flights 11, 175, 77, and 93, all three of the aforementioned red flags had been triggered. Furthermore, the FAA's *Aeronautical Information Manual* instructs flight controllers that should there be “any doubt that a situation constitutes an emergency, handle it as if it were an emergency.”

Once the military is notified and planes are scrambled, then on September 11, 2001 there also were a set of established protocols for -- depending on circumstances – generating a graduated response to the situation. According to a report filed shortly after 9/11 by Glenn Johnson of the *Boston Globe*, graduated response protocols outlined by NORAD spokesperson Major Mike Snyder are the following: (1) Once a scrambled jet fighter reaches a potentially problematic plane, and if the latter craft continues to be non-responsive to radio contact, then, the jet fighter is supposed to fly a little above, in front of, and to the left of the errant flight, followed by a rocking of the fighter plane's wings -- which is the established sign that the commercial flight has been intercepted and that the appropriate response is for the plane being signaled to rock its wings acknowledging that it has been intercepted; (2) If the problematic plane responds properly to the signal given by the fighter jet, the jet fighter will perform a slow left turn and will escort the plane back to a proper heading; (3) If an errant flight does not properly respond to its jet fighter escort's signals, there are a set of further graduated responses that are intended to induce compliance, such as: making passes in front of the errant plane, firing tracer bullets across the flight of the errant flight, and, under certain conditions, downing the errant flight with a missile.

Given the foregoing, the question that I have in conjunction with the hijacking exercises that were being conducted by the military on September 11, 2001 is what, if anything, new was being added to the already established way of handling such event? Presumably, there was a game plan for the exercise. What was it?

Furthermore, according to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3610.01A, dated June 1, 2001: "In the event of a hijacking, the NMCC [which refers to the National Military Command Center – my note] will be notified by the most expeditious means by the FAA. The NMCC will, with the exception of requests needing an immediate response [my emphasis]" pass on the information to the Department of Defense in order to obtain the approval of the Secretary of Defense. Consequently, contingencies had been foreseen in which the normal chain of command might have to be circumvented in relation to those "requests needing an immediate response," and, therefore, there were degrees of freedom in place for command decisions to be made at levels below that of the Secretary of Defense.

If nothing new was being added to the hijacking exercises that were being conducted on 9/11, then all jet fighter pilots and their commanding officers who were on duty for September 11, 2001 were intimately familiar with the drill of how things were to proceed if called upon to scramble fighter planes. Of course, sometimes one of the reasons for running exercises is to test the quality of preparedness of various military units.

Perhaps this is what the hijacking exercises on 9/11 were intended to explore. Nevertheless, if nothing new was being introduced into these exercises, then they were intended to be a measure of the readiness of different units to deal with known parameters of possibility. Consequently, there should have been no confusion or uncertainty about how to proceed on 9/11.

What interests me about the exercises is whether, or not, there were some new twists in the preparedness tests that were being conducted on 9/11. Had someone in the military been thinking outside the box as a result of intelligence that had been gathered and, as a result, wanted to introduce some new wrinkles of preparedness with respect to how to conduct air defense in relation to hijacking airplanes? Alternatively, irrespective of whether the exercises were of a conventional or unconventional nature, was

there someone within the military or intelligence community or some other facet of government who wanted to use those exercises as cover for some sort of rogue, covert operation?

I don't know the answer to such questions. However, I think they might be worthwhile avenues of exploration.

What I do know is that, as previously noted, individuals such as Aldrich Ames, Robert Hanssen, and Jonathan Pollard have been quite prepared to take their positions of trust within the CIA, FBI, or the government and to betray that trust. So, the possibility of one, or more, Americans being willing to run a rogue, covert operation to benefit themselves in some way, while doing considerable damage to the United States, is not necessarily the product of some conspiratorial, delusional theory.

Moreover, what I do know is that unless one critically explores such questions, one will never have as complete a picture as possible about what might have occurred on 9/11. What I do know is that the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* didn't explore such a possibility during their discussion of why claims concerning the issuance of a 'stand down' order on September 11, 2001 can't stand up to the facts.

Instead, the two editors have created the impression that anyone who resists the 'official' explanation is someone who claims there was a 'stand down' order given – directly or indirectly – on 9/11. This is simply not factually correct since there are individuals who do not accept certain aspects of the 'official' theory of 9/11, and, yet, such individuals do not agree with people who are proponents of the theory that a 'stand down' order of some kind was issued on 9/11.

*The 9/11 Commission Report* places a great deal of the onus of responsibility for the failures of 9/11 on the FAA. The Commission puts forth a case that seeks to demonstrate that the FAA did not, on a number of occasions, follow standard procedure on 9/11, and, as a result, the FAA's communications to the military either did not take place at all or were tardy. The *Report* indicates that if the FAA had done its job properly on 9/11, then there might have been some opportunity to effectively intervene with respect to Flight 175 (south tower), Flight 77 (Pentagon), and Flight 93 (Shanksville, Pennsylvania) ... although many people, but not everyone, seem to indicate that there was no real chance for anyone to do much about Flight 11 (north tower) even if warnings had been timely.

A little later I will explore the issue of the FAA and whether, or not, any of its communications were sufficient to provide the military with adequate lead time to intercept any of the hijacked planes. At that time, I will also consider the question of whether the military's response could be construed as giving expression to a 'stand down' order.

In the meantime, I would like to proceed in another direction. The United States military has some of the most sophisticated radar systems in the world.

For example, the PAWS (Phased Array Warning System) network is capable of detecting and tracking multiple sea-launched and/or intercontinental ballistic missiles as well as detect and track earth-orbiting satellites. In addition, there are advanced warning radar systems at NORAD, and there are a variety of satellite systems that are capable of maintaining very exacting surveillance on a large part of the world, including the geographical United States.

There are also AWACS planes – some of which might have been in the air on 9/11 in different parts of the United States. As previously noted, in *Against All Enemies*, Richard Clarke quotes General Myers as saying that the "AWACS are at Tinker and not on alert (page 5)" – Tinker being a reference to Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma. Yet, one of the exercises to be conducted on 9/11 – apparently, and appropriately enough, called AWACS – involved the deployment of AWACS to both Florida and Washington, D.C..

Furthermore, the Air Force, Navy, and Army all have their own flight controllers and radar systems. Those radar systems are capable of identifying objects in the sky, irrespective of whether, or not, those unidentified flying objects carry transponder codes ... which hostile aircraft are not likely to display. In addition, those radar systems are not dedicated only to what might try to enter the continental United States from beyond our borders but are very much capable of tracking what goes on within those borders.

The Secret Service also has radar systems that are reported to be among the best in the world. They were, presumably, working on 9/11.

The Secret Service angle might have more than passing relevance here. Both William Safire of the *New York Times* and Bob Woodward of the *Washington Post* reported – and the incident also was discussed in a *Fox*



*News Sunday* interview between Tony Snow and Condoleezza Rice – that on the morning of September 11, 2001, agents for the Secret Service had received a message saying direct threats had been made against the President and Air Force One. The threats contained information which indicated that whoever had sent the message had intimate knowledge of the code name for Air Force One, its transponder codes, and the capacity to track the whereabouts of the presidential jet.

The code for Air Force One that day was ‘Angel’. In part, the threat stated: ‘Angel is next.’

Aside from the chilling implications to which this kind of threat gives expression with respect to the very critical question of who could have had access to such highly classified information in relation to Air Force One, the existence of the aforementioned threat not only suggests that the Secret Service might have been on even higher alert status than normal, but, as well, given the nature of the threat involving Air Force

One, prudence might reasonably have demanded that, among other things, the radar capabilities of Air Force One would have been firing on all pistons, so to speak.

The foregoing possibility is enhanced when one understands that, apparently, prior to the onset of the later events of 9/11, there had been a number of Secret Service security concerns involving possible threats toward the President while he was in Sarasota, Florida. Apparently, there had been reports about these concerns in some of the local papers following 9/11.

Given such a context of heightened alert with respect to security, one would presume that the Secret Service would have been using all its tools to try to determine what might be going on. Thus, when the President was waiting to go into the elementary classroom in Florida and allegedly saw or heard reports about a plane hitting the north tower and said “There’s one terrible pilot”, one might reasonably anticipate that someone in the President’s immediate Secret Service detail would have sought more details to see if the New York incident involved anything that might have implications for presidential safety. More emphatically, when Andrew Card entered the classroom and whispered to the President about the second plane hitting the WTC and, then, indicating that “America is under attack”, the Secret Service most definitely should have been manning its various detection systems on Air Force One to see what other aerial threats might be present.

Perhaps the Secret Service was not in a position to do anything about the first two hijacked planes, but they certainly were in a position to use their state-of-the-art communication, electronic, and radar systems to help identify the extent of the threat to the President with respect to any other hostile aircraft that might still be in the air. One wonders if any of this was done in relation to Flight 77 or Flight 93, and if this was not done, one would like to know why not.

The narrative that *The 9/11 Commission Report* apparently is trying to construct is that on 9/11, the military was totally helpless because the FAA didn't provide the military with the appropriate information in a timely fashion. Even if one accepts the foregoing contention as true (and, in fact, not everyone does accept the Commission's perspective on this matter as being true because there is a great deal of controversy over the timelines of who said what and did what precisely when on 9/11), nevertheless, I am having difficulty grappling with the Commission's allegations as they stand.

If one is to accept the perspective of the 'official' story concerning 9/11, one seems forced to conclude that without the FAA, the military had no eyes on 9/11. If so, then, apparently, the military had no capacity to determine what was going on within the borders of the continental United States until the FAA told them.

There is a potentially crucial distinction that should be made at this point. While one might be willing to accept the idea that the military might not have been fully or properly exercising its full capacities in relation to, say, radar operations on 9/11, failing to exercise those capabilities is not the same thing as not having them.

The military – in the form of NORAD, satellite systems, AWACS, flight controllers, and other aspects of its technologically adept operating systems – had the capability, on its own and quite independently of the FAA, to be able to conduct surveillance as well as track any flying object in the skies over America. The question is: Why wasn't this capability being fully exercised on 9/11?

Part of the reason for not fully exercising such technical capabilities on 9/11 might have been due to a 'failure of imagination', or might have been the result of the sort of mental enervation that arises from military habit and routine, or such a failure might have been the result of some policy decision that had been made years ago, or it could have been part of the

collateral fallout that occurred in conjunction with the end of the 'Cold War', or it could have been due to a variety of attempts to cut costs or budget constraints. However, conceivably, some person or persons unknown might have taken advantage of the security holes that had crept into some of the leadership within, say, the Air Force, and such an individual or individuals might have helped widen those holes in certain directions which ensured that the military – and, possibly, the FAA -- would be working under a severe and under- appreciated -- if not unsuspected -- handicap when it came time to respond to the events of 9/11.

In addition to the foregoing considerations, there might be other reasons why one should not be too quick to blame the FAA or its flight controllers for the problems that arose on 9/11. For example, in a May 6, 2004 article in the *New York Times* it is reported that at least six of the flight controllers who were directly involved, in one way or another, with the four hijacked flights on 9/11 made audio tapes of their experiences on that day. This information comes via the agency of the Inspector General for the Department of Transportation.

According to the aforementioned article, a quality-assurance manager for the FAA destroyed those tapes, believing that such recordings were in contravention of stated FAA policy which stipulates that this kind of report should be in a written form. This same quality- assurance manager elaborated upon his reasons for destroying the tapes by saying he also was of the opinion that, due to excessive stress, the flight controllers who made the recordings “were not in the correct frame of mind to have properly consented to the taping.”

Whatever the letter of the law might be with respect to the FAA, there also are laws about the destruction of evidence in a criminal investigation. Some 3,000 people had been murdered on 9/11, and the quality-assurance manager took it upon himself to destroy evidence that might have been able to shed light on some of the circumstances that resulted in those deaths. Perhaps the person who was really suffering from stress and who was not in a proper frame of mind to make decisions about such matters was the quality-assurance manager and not any of the flight controllers who made the recordings.

In part, these tape recordings were directly material to the issue of what happened between the FAA – at least as far as the flight controllers were concerned – and the military. Among other things, the recordings were

reported to have dealt with when the military was notified and what was communicated and to whom.

One of the potential strengths of grand jury proceedings is that the process is supposed to be conducted in complete secrecy. People who, out of fear of losing their jobs, might not be willing to tell what they know under more public circumstances, do have a certain degree of anonymity in the context of a grand jury.

Although there are reports that various flight controllers have been instructed not to speak publicly about what went on during 9/11, maybe if flight controllers were subpoenaed to testify before my hypothetical grand jury, one might learn some very important details about certain facets of what transpired on 9/11. I definitely would have quite a few questions to direct toward the quality-assurance manager mentioned in the foregoing.

Among other things, I would like to know what he heard on those tapes that led him to believe that the flight controllers were either suffering from excessive stress or that they were saying the kind of things that, if they had been in a proper frame of mind, they would not have consented to allow them to be recorded. A lot of people say things under the stress created by a given crisis, but the presence of such stress does not automatically mean that what is said is untrue or inaccurate. I also would like to know if the quality-assurance manager possessed the sort of psychological expertise that would have qualified him to make a diagnosis either about the issue of stress, as well as in relation to whether, or not, the six flight controllers were really in a state of mind that constituted a condition of diminished capacity.

There are additional questions swirling about *The 9/11 Commission Report's* critique of the FAA's handling of the situation on 9/11. For example, the *Report* claims that the FAA set up its first phone bridge or teleconference with a variety of agencies, including the Department of Defense, somewhere around 9:20 a.m., some 15 minutes after Flight 175 had crashed into the south tower of the WTC.

The claim of the 9/11 Commission is directly contradicted by Laura Brown, the Deputy for Public Affairs in the form of a follow-up memo she sent on May 22, 2003 to the 9/11 Commission following the testimony of Jane Garvey, then FAA Director, before the Commission. Ms. Brown states: "Within minutes after the first aircraft hit the World

Trade Center, the FAA immediately established several phone bridges that included FAA field facilities, the FAA Command Center, FAA headquarters, DoD (Department of Defense), the Secret Service, and other government agencies.” Laura Brown goes on to state in her memo to the Commission that: “The US Air Force liaison to the FAA immediately joined the FAA headquarters phone bridge and established contact with NORAD on a separate line.

“The FAA shared real-time information on the phone bridges about the unfolding events, including information about loss of communication with aircraft, loss of transponder signals, unauthorized changes in course, and other actions being taken by all flights of interest.”

The first plane hit the WTC at around 8:47 a.m.. Therefore, one might reasonably surmise that somewhere before 9:00 a.m. a phone bridge might have been created that linked, among others, the Department of Defense with a variety of FAA departments in real time.

This issue is of central importance because, if true, it could undercut any attempt by the Commission, the Department of Defense, the Air Force, or NORAD to try to argue that the military had not been receiving timely information concerning the unfolding events. In fact, if Laura Brown’s memo is accurate, then the military-- via the Department of Defense and the US Air Force liaison to the FAA -- would have been receiving information almost simultaneously with the FAA. If the Department of Defense and the Air Force FAA liaison were part of this phone bridge, and if the Department of Defense and Air Force liaison were doing their job of keeping appropriate branches of the military – such as NORAD -- informed, and if this phone bridge began, at the latest, a few minutes before 9:00 a.m., then the military cannot necessarily argue it was not receiving timely information from the FAA.

Is it possible that Laura Brown was mistaken about when the phone bridge was set up? Yes.

Is it possible that the Commission was mistaken about the start-up time for that phone bridge? Yes.

However, the Commission never bothers to justify the time it fixes for the initiation of the phone bridge except through, at best, unverifiable ways. More specifically, the Commission bases its

conclusion about the time of the phone bridge on an FAA document entitled: *'Chronology ADA-30, September 11, 2001'*.

Nothing is said by the Commission about how or who compiled that document or when it was compiled. Nothing is said about whether any sort of chain of evidence was established to preserve the integrity of that document.

Moreover, *The 9/11 Commission Report* does not contain any reference to the Laura Brown memo. Apparently, someone within the

Commission made a judgment that the aforementioned *'Chronology'* document was correct and Laura Brown was wrong, but, the public has no access to the considerations that went into such a decision.

I would like to know who in the Commission made the foregoing decision. I would like to know why the Laura Brown memo, or excerpts thereof, was not mentioned or included in *The 9/11 Commission Report*. I would like to examine the provenance of the FAA document: *'Chronology ADA-30, September 11, 2001'*. I would like to question the individual or individuals who compiled that document. I would like to question the Commission researcher(s) who investigated this issue.

Someone, whether intentionally or unintentionally, is not telling the truth about the time of start-up of the FAA initiated phone bridge. I would like to know who is not telling the truth and why.

All of the foregoing bears upon the issue of whether, or not, there is any evidence that some sort of 'stand down' order was issued on September 11, 2001. However, the way the above material bears upon this 'stand down' order issue is not in quite the way one might think.

On the basis of currently available data and evidence, I am of the opinion that no official or unofficial 'stand down' order from the military was issued on September 11, 2001. On this aspect of things, I tend to be in agreement with the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* – at least up to a point but with some significant reservations.

As previously noted, one does not have to issue a 'stand down' order to be able to undermine the military's capacity to respond to a given crisis – such as the one on 9/11. Earlier I introduced the idea that it is not inconceivable to suppose that someone in a position of governmental trust might have done things on 9/11 in conjunction with some of the military exercises being run on that day that could have misled, confused, misinformed, or delayed personnel both within the military and the FAA.

If such a person exists, I have no idea who it might be. I have no idea if more than one person might be involved.

However, as a member of a hypothetical grand jury, I don't necessarily consider it part of my duty to have to be able to identify who such people are even if they do exist and even if they were to have committed such acts of treachery. My duty as a grand juror is to raise questions about, as well as reflect on, the evidence that is before me and to follow such evidence, questions, and reflections to wherever they might reasonably lead me in relation to the issuing, or not issuing, of an indictment of some kind in relation to the events of 9/11.

The previously noted 9/11 military exercises could have been a medium through which someone might have tried to disrupt the military's and FAA's capacity to operate effectively on 9/11. Similarly, conceivably, the military chain of command and/or the chain of command within the FAA, and/or the liaisons between the two could have served as vehicles through which one, or more, persons -- for reasons as yet unknown -- might have done, or not done, something that might have helped mislead, misinform, confuse, misdirect, or delay military and/or FAA personnel to be able to conduct an effective response in relation to the events of 9/11.

With such possibilities in mind, then, if-- some time slightly before 9:00 a.m. on 9/11 -- the Department of Defense, as well as NORAD via the Air Force FAA liaison officer, had been receiving real-time information and updates from the FAA about possible on-going hijackings involving commercial jets in addition to Flight 11 (which already had crashed), then one of the questions that arises in my mind is this: What was the Department of Defense and NORAD doing with the information that was coming its way from the FAA? Another question would be: What information were they receiving from the FAA through the phone bridge? A third question might be: To whom, if anyone, was the Department of Defense and NORAD (via the Air Force FAA liaison officer) passing on this information? A further question would be: What were those subsequent individuals doing with the information they were acquiring via the Department of Defense officials hooked into the FAA phone bridge? A fourth question might be: Why didn't any of this information make a difference with respect to defending against the three other planes that had been hijacked or were about to be hijacked on 9/11?

According to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*: “Under the protocols in place on September 11, a controller’s concerns that something was amiss had to ascend through multiple layers at the FAA and the Department of Defense before action could be taken.” (page 15). If Laura Brown’s aforementioned memo is accurate, then the foregoing claim of the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* would no longer be relevant as of shortly before 9:00 a.m. on the morning of September 11, 2001 – the time the phone bridge was, according to Laura Brown, allegedly established. This is so because multiple levels of the FAA would have been tied in directly to the Department of Defense and NORAD (via the Air Force FAA liaison officer) by means of the FAA- initiated phone bridge, and, as a result, the FAA and the Department of Defense, as well as the Air Force FAA liaison officer, would have been discussing events in real time. If Laura Brown’s memo to the Commission is true, then one is going to have to find some other way than the FAA’s alleged failures on 9/11 to satisfactorily account for the delays, misinformation, misdirection, and confusion that have been identified as adversely affecting the military’s response effectiveness.

This brings my hypothetical grand jury back to issues of credibility, accuracy, and reliability in relation to the duel between, on the one hand, the Laura Brown memo of May 22, 2003 and, on the other hand, the FAA document entitled: *‘Chronology ADA-30, September 11,2001’*.

I don’t know who will win the above noted duel, but I do know that I would have quite a few questions to ask of a variety of people concerning the issue at contention between the two dueling sides.

Moreover, depending on how the foregoing duel turned out,I might have a great many questions to ask of the Department of Defense, the Air Force FAA liaison officer, and NORAD with respect to, for example, what they did with the information they were getting from the FAA. These are the sort of questions that would arise if Laura Brown’s memo won out over the FAA ‘Chronology’ document.

Until the foregoing duel is resolved, one will not be in a position to know what timelines are of relevance to the issue of whether, or not, the military was notified by the FAA with due diligence. Furthermore, if Laura Brown’s memo is correct, then what people might, or might not, have said – or when they said it -- might not be all that important when it comes to those who are on the lower levels of the pecking order within the chain of command of either the FAA or the Department of Defense. If Laura Brown’s



memo is true, then what becomes crucial is the nature of the information that the Department of Defense and NORAD (via the Air Force FAA liaison officer) was receiving through the FAA phone bridge that might have been established just prior to 9:00 a.m. on September 11, 2001, and what the Department of Defense and NORAD were doing with the information they were receiving?

On the other hand, if the phone bridge in question was not initiated by the FAA until 9:20 a.m., then an appropriate question might be the following: Why hadn't the FAA convened a phone bridge earlier than it did when FAA protocols indicate that such phone bridges should be established in times of emergency? After all, one commercial jet (Flight 11) had already crashed amidst mysterious circumstances with strong overtones of a hijacking. A second commercial jet (Flight 175) was still in the air, and by 8:52 a.m. some members of the FAA knew that the plane was beginning to display aberrant behavior. As well, due to a number of calls that, apparently, had been made by some of the passengers and flight crew of Flight 175, there were various other people who knew that the plane was in trouble, including the flight office for United Airlines in San Francisco.

One might suppose that by 9:00 a.m. enough information had accumulated within the FAA to warrant the initiating of a phone bridge. Therefore, if a phone bridge did not get set up until 9:20 a.m. (The Commission's timeline), then one might like to know why there was a 20-minute delay in establishing the phone bridge.

One also might like to know when Jane Garvey, the Director of the FAA, was first notified about the developing 9/11 emergency and by whom. One also would like to know what the logistics are for setting up a phone bridge and who has the authority to order this, and, in addition, who actually did order the FAA phone bridge on 9/11.

Neither *The 9/11 Commission Report* nor *Debunking 9/11 Myths* can help clear up any of the foregoing issues because neither one of them discusses these matters. Consequently, this points to the clear need for further inquiry by someone other than either the Commission or the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*.

If there were people of compromised integrity within the Department of Defense's chain of command, then it is possible that one or more of those individuals might simply have dithered, hemmed, and hawed with respect to either the timely passing on of crucial information

or in relation to making decisions concerning that information. If there were people of compromised integrity within the FAA's chain of command, then it is possible that one or more of those individuals might simply have dithered, hemmed, and hawed with respect to either the timely passing on of crucial information or in relation to making decisions concerning that information.

Historically, it is not unknown in intelligence circles for a 'mole' to assume an identity of incompetence or indecisiveness in order to camouflage and protect an underlying operation that is anything but incompetent and indecisive. Like the presence of certain poisons within the human body whose presence might be difficult to detect because it hides amidst the naturally occurring biochemistry of human beings or because one is not quite sure what one is looking for, so too, the presence of espionage can be very difficult to detect because actions can be set within a context that uses an aura of 'naturalness' to camouflage nefarious activities. This was the case with respect to such individuals as Aldrich Ames and Robert Hanssen, and it could be the case again with respect to some of the events in conjunction with 9/11.

Furthermore, and not to put too fine a point on the foregoing theme, earlier, in passing during a discussion about the Secret Service, I mentioned that on 9/11 Air Force One had been threatened with "Angel's next" following the plane crashes at the World Trade Center. Someone who had acquired certain access codes, security codes, and transponder codes – all of a classified nature – had let the President and the Secret Service know that security surrounding Air Force One had been breached.

If one likes, one can believe that a person sitting in a cave somewhere in the Tora Bora region of Afghanistan used a laptop to hack into a variety of encrypted U.S. government computer files, or perhaps this person mysteriously had been able to obtain a wiretap warrant from the FISA court and listened in on Secret Service communications. However, the more likely explanation is that someone within the American government might have been involved in some, or all, of the events of 9/11 or had used those events as a cover for a rogue operation of a different pedigree.

Even if the Laura Brown memo turns out to be incorrect and the FAA '*Chronology ADA-30, September 11, 2001*' document were to definitively demonstrate that the FAA-initiated phone bridge began at around 9:20 a.m.,

then this still raises a lot of questions about the two hijacked planes that had not yet crashed – namely, Flight 77 and Flight 93. Many of the same questions that might arise if Laura Brown’s memo were correct would also arise with the later start time of the FAA phone bridge – what kind of information was the Department of Defense and NORAD (via the Air Force FAA liaison officer) receiving from the FAA, and what did the Department of Defense do with that information?

None of the foregoing is intended to impugn anyone’s character. However, to borrow a line from the infamous Inspector Clouseau of *Pink Panther* fame: “I suspect no one, and I suspect everyone.” Although uttered by a movie buffoon, the attitude of a grand juror ought to be a balance between the two possibilities cited by the movie character – suspecting everyone and suspecting no one ... follow the evidence and do not let anyone’s pre-existing biases – for example, those of the prosecuting attorney who is presenting his or her case before the grand jury or even one’s own biases – deter one from impartially considering all the evidence.

I don’t know the members of the Commission. I don’t know the people in the FAA or the Department of Defense or NORAD or the Air Force. I don’t know ‘Usama bin Laden or anyone who belongs to al-Qaeda.

Consequently, no one who appears before my hypothetical grand jury should either get a free ride or be indicted merely on the basis of unsubstantiated allegations. One is as innocent as the evidence says one is.

The foregoing discussion concerning the military exercises and phone bridge issue has been pursued for a reason. The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* would have their readers believe at least three things – namely, (a) that one of the marks of alternative approaches to the official version of 9/11 depends on arguing that someone gave a ‘stand down’ order to the military; (b) because no ‘stand down’ order was given, therefore, the claims of the conspiracy theories alluded to in (a) cannot stand up to the facts; (c) such things as: the FAA’s failure to follow standard procedure, untimely delays on the part of the FAA, as well as the confusion that was brought about by an unprecedented set of events on 9/11 – all of these issues can be accounted for by human error, and there are no other approaches that might account for what went on in relation to the military’s response to the hijackings on 9/11.

For a variety of reasons noted earlier, I am inclined to accept the idea that no 'stand down' order, official or unofficial, was given on 9/11. However, acceptance of such a perspective does not thereby require one also to maintain either that the 'stand down' order idea is the only way that someone who does not accept the 'official' view might go about accounting for certain events on 9/11, nor does such a commitment (i.e., no 'stand down' order given) require one to agree with the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that the idea of the "stand down' order' is, or must be, an integral part of non-official approaches to trying to understand 9/11.

There are many outstanding questions concerning the timing of the military and intelligence exercises that were conducted on 9/11 in the face of so much intelligence that 'the system was blinking red'. I am not currently satisfied that the timing of the military exercises was merely a matter of coincidence. Therefore, I am not, yet, persuaded that the military exercises can be eliminated as a vehicle through which someone might have committed sabotage with respect of either the military's and/or the FAA's capacity to be able to respond effectively on 9/11.

Similarly there are many outstanding questions concerning the timing of the FAA-initiated phone bridge. Until this timeline issue is settled in a way that has not been accomplished by *The 9/11 Commission Report*, then I would have to reserve judgment about what might, or might, not have happened on 9/11 in relation to why the FAA or the military were not able to respond effectively.

I have not found much evidence to support the idea of a 'stand down' order, per se. On other hand, I am faced with a lot of questions concerning whether, or not, there might have been a way to compromise or undermine the effectiveness of either the FAA and/or the Department of Defense and/or the Air Force FAA liaison, and/or NORAD by means of some form of 'information sabotage' perpetrated by a person or persons unknown, who was (were) working within the shadows of those agencies.

On the basis of available evidence, none of these considerations can either be affirmed or rejected without a great deal of further inquiry. However, at different junctures during the previous discussion, I have noted some questions related to the foregoing issues that I feel need to be addressed, and, as well, I have pointed to a variety of people and documents that would need to be subpoenaed in order for my hypothetical grand jury to be in a

position to further explore different possibilities – possibilities that neither *The 9/11 Commission Report*, nor the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* explore. Until one knows what the facts are, one is not in any kind of position to determine whether given claims – ‘official’ or non-official – are capable of standing up to the facts.

-----

As a whole slew of books about 9/11 have pointed out, the ‘official’ explanation from the Air Force and NORAD in relation to what happened on 9/11 has evolved over a period of time. Another way of saying this is that those agencies have changed their story a number of times.

On September 13, 2001 U.S. Senator Carl Levin asked General Richard Myers – during hearings focusing on the General’s nomination for the position of Chairman of The Joint Chiefs of Staff – about whether the order to scramble jets had been given prior to, or following, the event at the Pentagon. General Myers, who had been Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, responded with: “That order, to the best of my knowledge, was after the Pentagon was struck.”

As it turns out, the best of the General’s knowledge was not all that good. On September 14, 2001, *CBS Evening News* reported that jets had, in fact, been scrambled in relation to both Washington and New York prior to the Pentagon incident, but, unfortunately, those planes had arrived too late to prevent any of the attacks.

The aforementioned CBS report was followed up with an official press release from NORAD on September 18, 2001 that, more or less, confirmed the information given in the television news story that had aired on CBS. However, the press release also contained details – at least NORAD’s version of those details – about the interchange between the FAA and NEADS (Northeast Air Defense Sector) and when the FAA had contacted NEADS, as well as when NEADS had scrambled jets.

According to the FAA, the flight controller responsible for Flight 11 out of Boston’s Logan Airport had concluded by 8:21 a.m., on the basis of a number of indicators, that the American Airlines flight probably had been hijacked. Yet, according to NORAD, NEADS was not contacted by the FAA until 8:40 a.m., some 19-20 minutes later.

So, if NORAD's timeline is accurate, then one obvious question is why was there a delay of nearly 20 minutes between the time FAA flight controllers strongly suspected that a hijacking was in progress and the time when NORAD claims that NEADS was informed by the FAA that a hijacking might be in progress?

*The 9/11 Commission Report* seems to accept the factual character of the delay interval noted by NORAD. Nonetheless, one doesn't get a very clear picture from the *Report's* description of events involving Flight 11 as to what went on within the FAA that would have induced FAA personnel not to follow the standard procedure protocols that were in effect on 9/11.

*The 9/11 Commission Report* clearly alludes to meetings and discussions that, apparently, took place on different levels of the FAA hierarchy in response to the hijacking possibility having been kicked up the chain of command due to a flight controller's report. What is far less clear is what the nature of the discussions were that were being conducted by different levels of FAA management.

Seemingly, the situation could be summed up by one question: What was there to discuss? As previously pointed out in this book, if a hijacking even had been suspected, the FAA manual indicated that personnel were to treat the matter as an emergency, and the military was to be notified so that a series of steps could be initiated that might, in one way or another, lead to the resolution of the existing problem.

Were FAA managers waiting for the hijackers to provide them with a list of demands? Why would the FAA managers have assumed that such a set of demands might be forthcoming when the radio for Flight 11 had been turned off, and repeated attempts by the FAA to contact Flight 11 had not been acknowledged, and the plane's transponder signal had been terminated, as well?

As a member of a hypothetical grand jury, I would like to subpoena each and every member of the FAA who had something to do with Flight 11 – from flight controllers to managers to directors and to everything in between – and ask them to account for all of the 20 minutes that are at issue, and, as well, I would like to ask them about the nature of their deliberations, and their judgments, and their conclusions, and their actions, because, as things stand, I really don't understand what transpired during that period of time.

Does this 20-minute delay constitute a ‘stand down’ order being issued by the FAA? Not necessarily.

However, if someone were to carry out their job description in an obstreperous manner, or if that person were argumentative while discussing matters, or if they were urging excessive caution, then all of these actions could be things that helped create delays in the decision-making process on 9/11. Such delays might just be a reflection of what people do, sometimes, when under pressure, or the creation of delays might be an expression of something more sinister – something that has been alluded to before as an alternative theory to the idea of a ‘stand down’ order that would have the same kind of effect as a ‘stand down’ order – that is, things do not get done or they get done belatedly – but are far less likely to draw attention to itself.

Despite the existence of such a 20-minute delay on the part of the FAA, Flight 11 still might have been engaged prior to its crash into the north tower of the WTC at 8:47 a.m.. For example, this engagement might have occurred if NEADS had contacted an Air Force base relatively close to New York City – such as McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey. According to NORAD’s timeline, the FAA contacted NORAD by 8:40 a.m., and, if this is true, NORAD still would have had time to order NEADS to scramble a plane to get up over Manhattan before 8:47 a.m. – the time when Flight 11 struck the north tower of the WTC – to engage a hijacked plane that all radar reports indicated was heading for New York City.

For reasons that are not eminently clear, Otis Air Force Base near Cape Cod, Massachusetts – a point more than twice as far away as McGuire – was selected as the place from which to scramble jets. One possible answer for such a decision is, perhaps, McGuire Air Force Base was not scheduled to have units on active duty on 9/11 but Otis Air Force Base was so scheduled.

Nonetheless, I wonder if calls were made by NORAD or NEADS to either McGuire Air Force Base or any other Air Force base closer than Otis in order to ask: ‘How soon could you scramble planes?’ Moreover, if the answer to this question were: no, we did not make such calls, then, I would like to know why not.

Although the Otis jets originally had been scrambled in relation to Flight 11, the fact of the matter is that NORAD also received a notification about Flight 175 (8:43 a.m., three minutes after NORAD was warned in

relation to Flight 11), and this was around the same time as a decision was being made to scramble planes from Otis with respect to Flight 11. So, in effect, NORAD/NEADS had about 19 minutes to come up with some way of dealing with Flight 175 that crashed into the south tower at 9:02 a.m..

From the time of first being notified by the FAA about the possible hijacking of Flight 11, NORAD/NEADS collectively took 10 minutes to scramble the Otis jets. Apparently, once the actual orders to scramble were transmitted to Otis (which took four-five minutes), an additional six minutes was needed for the two F-15s at Otis to be scrambled and become airborne at 8:52 a.m. This is ten minutes prior to the crash of Flight 175 into the south tower and five minutes after the crash of Flight 11 into the north tower.

My understanding is that the indicated scramble time (six minutes) is on the sluggish side – by quite a few minutes – of what constitutes a normal time frame for such procedures. Consequently, if my understanding of such things is correct, then the question is: What happened?

What went on in the four minutes during which a decision was being made by NORAD and NEADS about how to proceed? What went on during the six minutes at Otis when the scramble order was executed?

In addition, there seems to be a problem about the precise nature of the air speed achieved by the F-15s once they got going. According to a report in the June 3, 2002 edition of *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, one of the pilots, Lt. Colonel Timothy Duffy, indicated the jets were traveling “full blower all the way.”

The top speed – the presumed meaning of “going full blower all the way” – of an F-15 is around 1850 mph. At this rate of speed, the distance between Cape Cod and Manhattan should have taken, roughly, between five-six minutes (putting them in Manhattan at about 8:58 a.m. or so) . Yet, when the second tower was hit at approximately 9:02 a.m., according to NORAD, the jet fighters were still some 70 miles distant from Manhattan.

When one does the arithmetic, being still 70 miles removed from Manhattan when the F-15s should have been at their destination four minutes before, suggests that the jets must have been flying at less than half of “going full blower.” Someone’s timeline and/or indicated speed appears to not be able to stand up to the facts too well.

If the F-15s had been going full tilt all the way from Cape Cod to Manhattan, they should have been in a position to intervene, in some way,



with respect to Flight 175 because they would have arrived four minutes prior to the actual impact of Flight 175 into the south tower. However, the pilots would have had more than just four minutes to devise and implement a plan, because as the F-15s were journeying to Manhattan, the pilots should have been getting updates and receiving various engagement strategies from their superiors about what to do once the jets arrived in the skies over Manhattan.

This aspect of devising rules of engagement options while the F-15s were scrambling toward Manhattan especially would have been in order since Flight 11 had, by this time, crashed into the north tower of the WTC. Consequently, there should have been a clear understanding among the leaders of NORAD and NEADS concerning what, potentially, was at stake if effective measures were not carried out with respect to Flight 175.

Whatever uncertainties might have surrounded Flight 11 about what the intentions of the hijacking might have been should have evaporated at 8:47 a.m. when the plane crashed into the north tower. This crash should have changed everyone's thinking about Flight 175.

To be sure, in the absence of further information, one might offer the possibility that the crash of Flight 11 was an accident or aberration and, therefore, there was no guarantee that Flight 175 was operating with any hostile intent. However, not only was there a complete absence of evidence to support such a possibility, prudence and due diligence would require one, at this point, to assume the worst and devise one's rules of engagement accordingly.

Whether anything could have been done that might have lowered the eventual loss of life is hard to calculate. Few people would have anticipated that either of the twin tower would collapse, let alone both of them.

Therefore, seemingly, one is faced with a choice between letting the plane hit its target or trying to shoot the plane down over a heavily populated area. One, in short, would have to engage in some form of a casualty triage process in which one attempts to make morbidity estimates that will assist one to decide which of several possible options might constitute the 'best' plan for engaging the hijacked plane.

It is possible that the Air Force pilots could have maneuvered their F-15s in such a way that the path of Flight 175 might have been sufficiently altered so that the hijacked plane would have been over water

if it were shot down. If feasible, such an option could have significantly lowered the loss of life that might have occurred in conjunction with Flight 175 if the latter plane had to be forced down or shot down.

What might have been tactically and strategically possible is best left to those who know about such things. What can be said is that if the F-15s really did scramble when the NORAD timeline indicates (8:52 a.m.), and if the fighter pilots really did go “full blower all the way” (1850 mph), then, the Air Force planes should have been in a ready position over Manhattan prior to the crash of Flight 175 into the south tower of the WTC – a position that would have afforded them a tactical and strategic choice concerning the crisis instead of being 70 miles away when the hijacked plane hit the south tower.

Even if one accepts NORAD’s account concerning the belated notification (by 20 minutes) from the FAA, the jet fighters from Otis Air Force Base should have been in a position to do something in relation to Flight 175 prior to its crash into the south tower. To be sure, because of the tardy FAA notification, the Air Force jets would have been too late to do anything about Flight 11 – indeed, the fighter jets did not scramble until five minutes after Flight 11 had hit the north tower.

However, none of the foregoing would have relieved NORAD or NEADS from the responsibility of ascertaining whether McGuire Air Force Base or any other Air Force base closer than Otis Air Force Base would have been in a position to send up an airplane to investigate the possible hijacking, and this would be true quite independently of whether such jets would have been armed or not. Nor does any of the foregoing answer the question of why the scramble time at Otis took an apparently sluggish six minutes, or why four minutes were required to issue a scramble order, or why, apparently, the scrambled airplanes were not going ‘full-blower’ once the F-15s were aloft.

There are a lot of questions that need to be asked of the FAA. There are also a lot of questions that need to be asked of NORAD, NEADS, Otis Air Force Base, as well as the two jet fighter pilots scrambled from Otis because, at the very minimum – the arguments of NORAD and *The 9/11 Commission Report* to the contrary -- the Air Force did have sufficient time to engage Flight 175, and, therefore, one would like to know how and why that engagement did not take place.

Does the foregoing necessarily mean that some sort of ‘stand down’ order was given? No.

I can think of several possibilities that do not require one to suppose that a ‘stand down’ order was given under such circumstances. For example, the pilots for the jet fighter planes might have decided – either at their own discretion or on the orders of someone else – that peacetime rules of engagement applied to the current scramble and, as a result, one is not permitted to break the sound barrier when flying below certain altitudes. If the planes were flying below such altitudes, then this might indicate why they were flying at less than “full blower all the way.”

Once the enormity and scope of the tragedy of 9/11 began to unfold, some people in the military might have been looking for cover with respect to the issue of why didn’t the two jets from Otis fly faster. So, rather than tell the truth that someone made a decision to fly in accordance with peacetime rules of engagement rather than in accordance with some other set of engagement rules, someone decided to give the impression that the fighter planes were observing due diligence and going “full blower all the way” hoping that no one would notice that such an explanation creates a few logistical problems about where the planes should have been at 8:58 a.m. rather than the reported position of 70 miles from Manhattan.

If there had been a decision to fly in accordance with peacetime rules of engagement, whoever made that decision could have done so in a very innocent way, but a decision, nonetheless, which had tragic consequences. On the other hand, such a decision could have been made by someone for other, far less innocent reasons.

The problem with establishing malevolent intent is that unless one has corroborating evidence gained through independent means, then demonstrating that a given decision was anything other than an innocent, but tragic, mistake becomes a very difficult task to accomplish. Indeed, part of the difficulty presented by such a task is that commonly occurring instances of mistakes in human judgment can be used as an almost unassailable cover story to camouflage ulterior motives.

I don’t know if something untoward occurred at any point during the chain of events ranging from: NEADS’s scramble order with respect to Otis, to: the actual scrambling process, as well as the issue of speed at which those jets flew toward Manhattan. However, I do know that the military’s

story as it stands has some problems, and, consequently, I would want my hypothetical grand jury to subpoena each and every person and each and every document entailed by that chain of events so that it all might be critically examined by the grand jury to determine what the truth of things might be.

Notwithstanding what has been said in the previous paragraph, what does seem clear on the basis of what information is known is that the Air Force had the opportunity to defend America against, at a minimum, Flight 175, but the Air Force did not fulfill its primary purpose on that occasion. This leaves us with an unanswered question: Why was the primary purpose of the Air Force not fulfilled in relation to Flight 175?

Is it possible that someone within the military could have slowed things down through a sluggish scramble, or via slow air speeds, or by means of a decision to operate in accordance with peacetime rules of engagement rather than some other set of high-speed rules of engagement, and, thereby, in one way or another (or collectively) undermined the capacity of the military to properly respond to the crisis presented by 9/11? The answer is yes.

Did someone do this? The answer is: I don't know.

One might not be able to establish the answer to such a question without a rigorous investigation into these matters. The 9/11 Commission did not appear to conduct such an investigation into these aspects of things because it was operating under the premise that what happened on 9/11 was a tragedy that was perpetrated solely by a group of 19 al-Qaeda members plus whoever was aiding and abetting those operatives in foreign lands, and, consequently, there were certain avenues of consideration that the Commission did not bother to pursue very rigorously during its inquiries.

The aforementioned premise (i.e., that al-Qaeda was alone responsible for the events of 9/11) which oriented the Commission's way of doing things might be wholly correct, and, then again, that premise might only be partially correct. At this point I don't know which is the case, but I do know that the assumptions inherent in the Commission's premise seemed to disincline the Commission to either carefully look at certain kinds of evidence altogether, or such assumptions prevented the Commission from looking at that evidence in a totally objective and unbiased manner.

In fact, such biases appeared to lead the Commission to claim that many of the failures that occurred on 9/11 should be laid at the doorstep of the FAA. Such a conclusion was issued despite the presence of considerable evidence that the Commission might not have conducted an investigation that was sufficiently critically reflective with respect to what the military actually did, and did not do, on 9/11, together with a failure by the Commission to diligently pursue a thorough, rigorous examination concerning the deliberations, evaluations, judgments, and decisions that went into determining what was, and was not, done by the Department of Defense and the military on 9/11.

Many of the foregoing kinds of question that swirl about Flight 11 and Flight 175 apply, as well, to Flights 77 and 93. In fact, even more questions arise in relation to these latter two flights.

For example, according to NORAD, the military was not informed by the FAA about problems with Flight 77 (loss of radio contact, transponder turned off, deviation from filed flight plan) until 9:24 a.m. – some 28 to 34 minutes after a hijacking was suspected by members of the FAA. A variety of stories filed by the *New York Times*, the *Boston Globe*, *Guardian*, *Newsday*, and the *Washington Post* indicate that by 8:50 a.m., sufficient knowledge had accumulated to indicate that Flight 77, in all likelihood, should have been added to the list of hijacked planes.

In a October 17, 2001 *Guardian* article, it was reported that at 8:25 a.m. FAA controllers in the Boston Center notified other FAA centers that Flight 11 had been hijacked. Although I have not seen any media reports confirming what I am about to say, nevertheless, one might reasonably suppose that if the Boston Center had notified other FAA centers about Flight 11, then the Boston Center also might have notified other centers about Flight 175 that also originated out of Boston. Irrespective of whether one or two heads-up notifications had been provided to other FAA centers by the Boston Center, one might reasonably anticipate that all FAA centers should have been sensitized to the possibilities of hijackings in their respective sectors.

At 8:46 a.m. Flight 77-- which had departed from Dulles Airport around 8:20 a.m. -- deviated considerably from its assigned flight path. This significant flight deviation occurred 21 minutes after FAA centers – including the one that was looking after Flight 77 – had been sensitized

to the fact that at least one hijacking – and, possibly, two – already had taken place.

Although Flight 77 apparently returned to its designated flight plan by 8:50 a.m., nevertheless, around this same time radio contact was lost. At 8:56 a.m., the transponder for Flight 77 was turned off. Consequently, three of the basic criteria (flight deviation, loss of radio contact, and loss of transponder signal) for reporting a flight emergency were present in relation to Flight 77. If one takes into account the Boston flight controller's heads-up to all the other FAA centers about the hijacking of Flight 11, then the air traffic control center responsible for Flight 77 had sufficient information by 8:50 a.m., to suspect that a hijacking was in progress.

As previously noted, NORAD indicates that NEADS had not been notified by the FAA with respect to the hijacking of Flight 11 until 8:40 a.m., some 20 to 24 minutes after the FAA first suspected that Flight had been hijacked. Apparently, during this 20-24 minute period, upper level supervisors, managers, and directors within the FAA were engaged in a discussion about what to do – although, as indicated earlier, what was transpiring at the FAA during this 'period of discussion' still needs to be spelled out in far more detail than has been provided through *The 9/11 Commission Report*.

Now, apparently, in conjunction with Flight 77, the FAA had to reinvent the wheel and take another 34 minutes to discuss options and possibilities between 8:50 a.m. and 9:24 a.m. on the morning of 9/11. Once again, one needs to ask the question: What was there to discuss?

As earlier noted, protocols were already in place for dealing with such emergencies. Those protocols did not have to be newly devised on 9/11, and, so, really, there was nothing to discuss – there was nothing to discuss during the first instance in relation to Flight 11, and there was nothing to discuss during the second episode in conjunction with Flight 77 since in each instance existing protocols for engaging such situations should have been activated immediately, but, apparently, this was not the case.

Twice on the morning of 9/11, two excruciatingly long and inexplicable conferences supposedly took place within the FAA. *The 9/11 Commission Report* did absolutely nothing to enlighten the public about what went on during those two periods of conferencing.

The story does not end here however. If the previously discussed phone bridge that the FAA's Laura Brown claimed--in a letter to the 9/11 Commission and which, as noted earlier, was not discussed in *The 9/11 Commission Report* – had been set up within a few minutes after the crash of Flight 11 into the north tower of the WTC – a phone bridge in which members of NORAD participated and during which information was being shared in real time among all participants of that phone bridge – then NORAD's contention that the FAA did not inform NEADS about the hijacking of Flight 77 until 9:24 a.m. – some 34 minutes after signs of a hijacking were present in relation to Flight 77 – becomes suspect. Through the phone bridge, NORAD would have had real time access to the fact that Flight 77 showed signs of having been hijacked at 8:50 a.m., and this would have been information acquired almost simultaneously with the FAA's knowledge concerning Flight 77.

If NORAD did have access to information concerning the hijacking of Flight 77 contemporaneously with the FAA via the phone bridge that had been established prior to 9:00 a.m. on 9/11, then the questions become three: (1) What did NORAD and/or NEADS do with the information they received through the FAA phone bridge? (2) If the information about when the FAA phone bridge was established is true, then why did NORAD claim that it had not been notified by the FAA concerning Flight 77 until 9:24 a.m.? (3) Why didn't *The 9/11 Commission Report* thoroughly discuss the two foregoing issues within its pages instead of burying the matter in interviews that are alluded to in footnotes but to which the public does not have direct access?

There is a further question looming on the horizon – one that does not have anything to do with whether, or not, the FAA did, in fact, establish a phone bridge prior to 9:00 a.m. on 9/11 and to which NORAD representatives were allegedly participants. More specifically, even if one were to accept the NORAD position that the FAA did not set up a phone bridge until around 9:20 a.m., I would like to know why NORAD and NEADS were not taking a more proactive stance during the morning of 9/11.

More specifically, by 8:43 a.m. on September 11, 2001, NORAD had received separate notifications from the FAA that two commercial jets had been hijacked. If someone at the Boston Air Traffic Center had been proactive enough to alert all other FAA Flight Control Centers at 8:25 a.m. that a plane had been hijacked, then I wonder why no one at NORAD or NEADS or

anywhere else in the Defense Department seems to have been sufficiently intelligent, concerned, or prepared to contact all FAA centers and ask for any potentially pertinent information – such as the fact that Flight 77 was behaving in an aberrant fashion at 8:46 a.m. – which might suggest that further air emergencies could be in progress.

If one accepts their version of things, NORAD complains that no one bothered to tell them what was going on until it was too late. Yet, as early as 8:43 a.m., NORAD had in its possession information that a hijacking trend might be unfolding (in other words, they already knew that two planes had been hijacked), and, yet, NORAD took absolutely no proactive steps of its own to determine if other planes might also fit into this pattern.

If NORAD – at its own initiative and not waiting to be notified by the FAA -- had contacted the other flight control centers as the Boston Center had done, then NORAD could have discovered at 8:46 a.m. that a third commercial jet – Flight 77 -- also might be in trouble. In effect, irrespective of whatever the mistakes and errors of the FAA might, or might not, have been on 9/11, NORAD has no one to blame but itself for failing to protect America on 9/11 with respect to both Flights 77 and 93.

There were proactive steps NORAD could have taken before the fact, and it did not do this. Instead, NORAD pointed the finger of blame at an agency that is not really responsible for the defense of America ... although the FAA does have a role to play in helping to maintain security.

Another question arises out of the foregoing. Why did the 9/11 Commission let NORAD get away with deflecting blame from itself and implicating the FAA as the agency that had failed America?

From the moment that NORAD knew two hijackings were in progress at 8:43 a.m. and did nothing on its own to determine if other hijackings might be in progress, then from that moment forward some person or persons at NORAD was (were) derelict in their duty ... some person or persons at NORAD failed to exercise due diligence ... some person or persons at NORAD failed to take steps that were clearly within their power to take and that were eminently reasonable and prudent precautionary decisions that could have been, and should have been, made.

Even if one accepts – as the 9/11 Commission has done without any real discussion -- NORAD's contentions concerning when the defense agency was notified by the FAA with respect to Flights 11, 175, and 77, and even if one



accepts NORAD's assertion that the phone bridge was not set up by the FAA until around 9:20 a.m. (as the Commission has done without any real discussion of this issue), one would like to know why no one within the Commission – either its Commissioners, its researchers and investigators, or its director – seems to have grasped the fact that NORAD had sufficient timely information in its possession that could and should have led to its taking a more proactive role on the morning on 9/11, but NORAD did not do this and, instead, the Commission members let NORAD get away with claiming NORAD was totally at the mercy of what the FAA did, and did not, do on 9/11.

On pages 16 and 17 of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, the editors of that book run through a brief synopsis of the differences between primary and secondary radar systems. Secondary radar systems are keyed to a plane's transponder and provide such information as the tail number of the plane, as well as the speed and altitude of the plane.

Primary radar systems, on the other hand, will generate a blip on a screen but not much more. Direction and range is about all one gets from the decoding of a primary radar signal.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* go on to state parenthetically: "The difficulty of keeping track of multiple aircraft using ground based radar alone is one reason the military typically flies sophisticated radar aircraft known as Airborne Warning and Control Systems, or AWACS, over battle zones."

Again, as previously indicated, in Richard Clarke's book *Against All Enemies*, the author reports a conversation between General Richard Myers, of NORAD, and himself. Richard Clarke says: "I assume NORAD has scrambled fighters and AWACS. How many? Where?"

After providing information concerning jet fighters scrambled from Otis Air Force Base in Massachusetts and that Langley was supposedly trying to get up a couple of jets as well, General Myers says: "The AWACS are at Tinker (Air Force Base in Oklahoma) and not on alert."

The foregoing conversation took place around 9:28 a.m.. The foregoing conversation is notable for several reasons.

First, the conversation is taking place some 45 minutes after NORAD/NEADS had enough information to realize that a possible trend of hijackings had already been established with respect to Flights 11 and 175 and should have begun to take a proactive stance and actively seek out

information concerning events rather than sitting around and waiting for the FAA to let the military know what was taking place. Even if one were to accept the General's statement that the AWACS at Tinker were not on active duty, one would like to know why no steps had been taken in the previous 45 minutes to place the AWACS on active duty.

At a minimum, the excuse that no one (i.e., the FAA) had bothered to inform NORAD/NEADS with due diligence ceased to be viable (if it ever really was) at 8:43a.m. when NORAD had information in its possession that a hijacking trend had been established. From that moment on, all resources available to the military should have been activated – including AWACS – and, yet, we have testimony from Richard Clarke that General Myers still had done nothing about activating AWACS some 45 minutes later.

Secondly, one of the 15, or more, military exercises scheduled to be run on, or about, September 11, 2001 involved AWACS exercises that were scheduled for both Florida and Washington, D.C.. Even if one were to assume that these exercises were to be run later in the day, and even if one were to assume that such aircraft had not, yet, been redeployed to the areas where the exercises were to be conducted, surely the AWACS that were to be involved in those exercises would have been ready for use rather than in a hangar somewhere while their engines and electronic systems were undergoing maintenance – or, is one to suppose that there were no AWACS anywhere in the United States that were capable, on short notice, of becoming activated even if they were not on alert?

On page 352 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, we are told that “America’s homeland defenders faced outward. NORAD itself was barely able to retain any alert bases. Its planning scenarios occasionally considered the danger of hijacked aircraft being guided to American targets, but only aircraft that were coming from overseas. We recognize that a costly change in NORAD’s posture to deal with the danger of suicide hijackers, before such a threat had ever been realized, would have been a tough sell. But NORAD did not canvas available intelligence and try to make the case”

What “costly change in NORAD’s posture” is the Commission talking about? Trillions of dollars already had been spent on the development of AWACS, the PAVE PAWS radar system, which is capable of tracking multiple targets – none of which had transponders -- as well as myriad forms of satellite technology that are capable of providing real-time data

and imaging formats with respect to every kind of energy signature profile related to activities on Earth one could think of – and, probably, quite a few that one couldn't imagine.

Nothing new was needed. What the military already had was not used at all or was not used appropriately or was not utilized in a timely fashion.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* try to make it seem that the task of locating several hijacked airplanes – notably Flights 77 and 93 – posed a problem of inordinate difficulty on September 11, 2001. They state: “There were 4,500 planes in the skies over the continental United States. Without transponder data or radio contact, controllers were forced to search for the missing aircraft among all the identical radar blips, with each controller responsible for varying number of planes in his or her sector. The Indianapolis controller who first noticed Flight 77's disappearance, for instance, had been monitoring 15 planes. In addition, on September 11, 2001, the ATC systems were woefully inadequate. The Cleveland Air Traffic Control did not even have combined transponder and radar displays. To view primary radar controllers had to go to displays on a different floor.” (Page 17)

The fact that there might have been 4,500 planes in the air on the morning of September 11, 2001 is really irrelevant. Flights 77 and 93 were not just flying just anywhere over America but were traveling in a relatively circumscribed area.

Even if, for the sake of argument, one accepts the idea that flight controllers did not know precisely where the allegedly missing planes were, FAA personnel had a general area for which a search grid could be established. Consequently, the task was not to find two blips amidst 4,500, but rather two blips amidst a much, much, much smaller group of blips in a particular part of the air space over a specific section of the United States.

Secondly, the fact that the Indianapolis flight controller who first noticed that 77 was missing had been monitoring 15 planes is also largely irrelevant. Presumably, monitoring a number of planes is part of the job description for a flight controller and something that they are trained to be able to handle effectively and efficiently. In addition, apparently, this particular flight controller was not so overwhelmed with his or her duties that she or he failed to notice that Flight 77 was missing.

Moreover, as I understand things, there are supervisors and managers on duty within the various air traffic centers who have oversight responsibilities for the activities and performance of flight controllers. Monitoring duties can be reassigned as needed so that no one flight controller becomes overburdened with her or his responsibilities.

Thirdly, while it might, or might not, have been true that the Cleveland Air Traffic Control Center did not possess combined transponder and radar displays and had to go to another floor to be able to access primary radar displays, the point of such information is what? One or more persons is sent to that floor where the primary radar equipment is located, and those individuals utilize the equipment and maintain phone contact or walkie-talkie contact with the people on the floor where the secondary radar systems are maintained ... where is the problem here?

Why do the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seem to be working overtime to try to convince the reader that everything was just so complicated and difficult on September 11, 2001 with respect to the task of locating two missing aircraft whose transponders had been turned off? Why is the Cleveland center being mentioned? Why isn't there any detailed description in either *Debunking 9/11 Myths* or *The 9/11 Commission Report* about what, specifically, happened at each of the relevant Air Traffic Control Centers (such as Indianapolis, Cleveland, and Dulles) which would permit the reader to develop a very clear picture of everything that went on in those centers on the day in question?

Finally, whatever the difficulties of the FAA might have been with respect to the location of the two missing flights (77 and 93), all of the attention that is being focused on the FAA tends to misdirect attention away from the fact that – and as has pointed out several times previously – it is not the task of the FAA to defend the United States. That duty falls to the military, and the U.S. military has an array of technical capabilities that should have permitted it to locate what ever planes might have been missing, but, the military leadership failed to bring about such a resolution to the prevailing problems on 9/11.

If the military leadership had exercised due diligence on the morning of September 11, 2001 from about 8:43 a.m. on [a time when NORAD/NEADS had sufficient information concerning the possible existence of a hijacking trend ... knowledge that should have induced a far less passive mode, and a far more proactive stance, by the military with

respect to the unfolding events], the U.S. military was fully capable of accomplishing what the FAA might not have been equipped to do – that is, locate two aircraft whose transponders had been turned off. To try to argue – as the Commission does – that the military was unable, for nearly an hour, to locate Flight 77 until it was 6 miles from the White House seems, to say the least, to be stretching credulity far beyond the breaking point.

According to the Commission, “the military did not have 14 minutes to respond to American 77, as testimony to the Commission in May2003 suggested. It had at most one or two minutes to react to the unidentified plane approaching Washington...”(page 34)

The Commission makes the foregoing assertion because it claims – NORAD’s public testimony to the contrary – that NEADS never received notice from the FAA that Flight 77 had been hijacked. The Commission claims that all of this is clear “not just from taped conversations at NEADS but also from taped conversations at FAA centers; contemporaneous logs compiled at NEADS, Continental Region headquarters, and NORAD; and other records.” (Page 34)

The public has access to little, if any, of the foregoing tapes, logs, and records. Consequently, there is no way to verify what the Commission is claiming with respect the Flight 77.

Furthermore, *The 9/11 Commission Report* is unclear at this point as to whether any of the taped conversations, logs, or records that are alluded to in the foregoing come from the phone bridge initiated by the FAA (at either a few minutes prior to 9:00 a.m. or at 9:20 a.m. depending on whose version one accepts) and in which NORAD was a participant. Conceivably, information concerning Flight 77 might have been transmitted during this phone bridge that might not have showed up on any of the other taped conversations, logs, or records.

However, irrespective of whether the Commission is correct or incorrect with respect to what NORAD knew about Flight 77 and when or how NORAD acquired such information, the Commission totally fails to address the fact that NORAD could have begun to take proactive steps as early as 8:43 a.m. but did not do this. After 8:43 a.m., it doesn’t matter who told NORAD what and when or if someone told them about such matters, because from 8:43 a.m. onward, NORAD had all the information it needed to begin conducting its own proactive response to the events of 9/11, and NORAD failed to do this.

According to *The 9/11 Commission Report* (see page 34) NORAD/NEADS was never informed about Flight 77 until 9:37 a.m. when it was told “that an unknown plane was 6 miles southwest of the White House”. The foregoing contention of the Commission is, at a minimum, contradicted by the testimony of then Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta, who, as previously noted, gave testimony to the Commission about a conversation between a young man and Vice President Cheney in the Presidential Emergency Operations Center concerning the progress of an inbound flight as the latter neared Washington. According to Secretary Mineta’s testimony, the inbound flight had been tracked from, at least, 50-60 miles outside of Washington ... not just 6 miles as the Commission claims. Unfortunately – again, as previously noted – Secretary Mineta’s testimony is nowhere to be found in *The 9/11 Commission Report*.

A further set of considerations surfaces in relation to *The 9/11 Commission Report* at this juncture. The Commission claims that NORAD/NEADS had never been informed about Flight 77 because the information NORAD/NEADS had received from the FAA was in relation to what was believed by the FAA to have been about Flight 11 turning south.

There is no discussion in *The 9/11 Commission Report* about how Flight 11 had gotten so far south or where it was turning south from or how Flight 11 could still be in the air since it had been tracked by flight controllers right to the north tower of the WTC. There is no discussion in *The 9/11 Commission Report* why some FAA flight controllers, supervisors, managers, or directors were under the impression that Flight 11 was the plane heading toward Washington, nor was there any discussion in *The 9/11 Commission Report* about the following question: If Flight 11 was still in the air and heading south toward Washington, what had crashed into the north tower?

It is possible that the mistaken identification of Flight 11 could have something to do with all the aforementioned military and intelligence exercises that were being conducted on, and around, 9/11. It is possible that the blip that was identified as Flight 11– a flight which, supposedly, already had crashed – could have been a radar insert arising from the radar software being used in conjunction with the military exercises taking place on 9/11.

The foregoing are realistic possibilities. However, if one uncritically accepts *The 9/11 Commission Report's* version of things, one will forever be in the dark because, as previously noted, the Commission never really explores the whole issue of the military exercises that were being run on 9/11 and the extent to which those exercises might have had an adverse impact on the ability of the FAA and the military to effectively respond to the crises that unfolded on that day.

Another set of problems that are linked to the circumstances surrounding Flight 77 concerns the manner in which NEADS responded to the situation – irrespective of whether one construes things in terms of the so-called Flight 11 scenario or one approaches the issue in terms of Flight 77 proper. To begin with, the scramble order was issued to Langley Air Force Base in Virginia, some 130 miles from Washington, rather than Andrews Air Force Base, which is about 10 miles from Washington.

Supposedly, Andrews Air Force base bears the responsibility for protecting the capital of the United States not just occasionally but all of the time. Thus, one question that needs to be answered – and about which the Commission does not really provide any clear understanding within its report – is why was Langley Air Force Base called on to protect Washington rather than Andrews Air Force Base?

According to the 9/11 Commission, planes were scrambled from Langley in response to alleged reports from the FAA Boston Center about something being referred to as 'Flight 11'. Apparently, according to someone, this particular version of 'Flight 11' had turned south toward Washington from New York

If the newly reported flight path of American Airlines 11 was turning south from New York, scrambling planes from Langley makes no logistical sense because that base is south of Washington and, therefore, not in the best position to engage a plane that supposedly has turned south from New York. Andrews Air Force Base would be the better logistical choice for anything coming south from New York even if Andrews did not carry the primary assignment for protecting the capital – which, in fact, it did have.

Another problem arises out of the alleged Boston Center report about the idea that Flight 11 had not crashed into the north tower of the WTC but was, allegedly, still in the air. What was the identity of the individual from the Boston Center who, supposedly, had informed NEADS that Flight 11 had not crashed into the north tower of the WTC, but, in fact, was heading

south toward Washington? The only evidence cited by *The 9/11 Commission Report* in support of the claim is that someone from the Boston Air Traffic Control Center said: "I just had a report that American 11 is still in the air, and its on its way – heading toward Washington" is a reference in footnote 148 (Chapter One Notes) to a "NEADS audio file, identification Technician position, channel 7, 9:21:10"

Of course, the public does not have access to the NEADS tape being referred to in footnote 148 of the Commission's report. Furthermore, not only is the public precluded from learning any details through *The 9/11 Commission Report* with respect to specifics concerning the identity of the person in the Boston Center who allegedly said the foregoing statement about American 11 still being in the air, one also does not learn whether, or not, the person being quoted in *The 9/11 Commission Report* disclosed the identity of who it was that initially issued the report claiming that American 11 was still in the air and on what evidence such a report was based.

Here is another mystery or problem. *The 9/11 Commission Report* indicates that planes which were scrambled from Langley and that were ordered to go toward Baltimore in order to be in a position to intercept that which was being referred to as 'Flight 11' ended up, instead, somewhere out over the ocean east of Washington. Apparently, someone had misunderstood the orders, or there had been some kind of miscommunication about those flight orders, in relation to the scrambled planes.

Leaving aside the issue of how such a snafu of understanding or communication had taken place – yet another problem that is not critically explored in *The 9/11 Commission Report* -- one still wonders about the logistics underlying the decision to scramble fighters from Langley and vector them toward Baltimore.

Baltimore is north of Washington and even further north from Langley Air Force Base in Virginia. Again, if the idea is to intercept a plane flying south from somewhere north of Washington, then Andrews Air Force Base is the logical choice from which to scramble fighter jets – not Langley.

So, once more, why are jet fighters being scrambled from Langley rather than from the much more strategically situated Andrews Air Force Base? *The 9/11 Commission Report* never adequately explains the nature of this decision just as *The 9/11 Commission Report* never adequately explains how 'taking a defensive position over Baltimore' somehow got transformed



into' jet fighters assuming a holding pattern out over the ocean east of Washington'.

Another issue that is left unresolved by *The 9/11 Commission Report* is the following. Once the plane that came to be designated as Flight 77 suddenly showed up on the radar screens six miles southwest of Washington, one wonders what happened to 'Flight 11' that, theoretically was being tracked by the FAA and NEADS and for which planes allegedly had been scrambled. *The 9/11 Commission Report* never explains any of this.

Another related question left unanswered by *The 9/11 Commission Report* is the following. After Flight 77 was reported as a likely hijack at around 8:50 a.m., what happened to it?

The next thing one hears about Flight 77 is that it – or something believed to be Flight 77 (after all, there was no transponder signal) – was detected around 9:30 a.m., or so, six miles southwest of the White House, just shortly before its alleged impact at the Pentagon. Where was Flight 77 between the time of 8:50 a.m. – the time it was reported as a possible hijack – and 9:30 a.m. – just prior to its alleged date of destiny with the Pentagon, and why, apparently, was no one able to detect the presence of this airplane until, according to the Commission, just prior to impact?

In the matter of Flight 93, one encounters similar problems. On May 23, 2003, General Larry Arnold, the head of NORAD's U.S. Continental region, testified before the 9/11 Commission that the FAA had reported to NORAD at 9:16 a.m. that United Airlines Flight 93 could be a possible hijack. On page 34 of its report, the 9/11 Commission corrected the testimony of General Arnold by saying his "statement was incorrect" because "United 93 was proceeding normally as that time."

As indicated earlier, *The 9/11 Commission Report* also stated that NORAD's May 2003 testimony concerning events surrounding Flight 77 were incorrect. According to the Commission, NORAD was confusing Flight 77 with Flight 11 – the latter supposedly had been reported to have turned south from New York. The Commission also maintained that NORAD's testimony was incorrect with respect to the identity of the hijacked plane for which fighter jets had been scrambled from Langley.

The Commission purports to correct the NORAD May 2003 testimony in so many crucial ways. However, the Commission fails to pursue

an obvious issue – namely, how could NORAD have been so confused about simple facts concerning Flights 77 and 93?

In its report, the Commission corrects what it considers to be the factual errors made during the NORAD May 2003 testimony (page 34), but the Commission never examines the existential context out of which those alleged mistakes arose. I would like to know how, allegedly, NORAD could be considered by the Commission to be so wrong about such basic facts, and, yet, the Commission seems totally uninterested in why NORAD is mistaken about those facts.

The command structure of NORAD had more than a year and a half to get their facts straight prior to the 9/11 hearings, but if one accepts the Commission's perspective on this, then NORAD's command structure couldn't accomplish the rather modest feat of getting some basic facts right. Apparently, NORAD didn't know what was going on during 9/11, and, apparently, NORAD still didn't know what transpired on 9/11 more than a year later.

Apparently, however the Commission didn't find the foregoing state of affairs to be odd or a concern for which a satisfactory answer should be found or about which the American public was entitled to know. As a member of my hypothetical grand jury, I find the Commission's lack of curiosity on this matter rather odd.

Footnote 148 of the first chapter in *The 9/11 Commission Report* stipulates: "John Thomas interview (May 4, 2004); Charles Thomas interview (May 4, 2004). We have reviewed all FAA documents, transcripts, and tape recordings related to Flight 77 and have found no evidence that FAA headquarters issued a directive to surrounding centers to search for primary radar targets. Review of the same materials also indicates that no one within FAA located American 77 until the aircraft was identified by Dulles controllers at 9:32. For much of the time, American 77 was flying through Washington Center's airspace. The Washington Center's controllers were looking for the flight, but they were not told to look for primary radar returns." (Page 460)

The first two things that occur to me when reading the foregoing is: (1) Why would FAA headquarters have had to issue a directive to surrounding centers instructing the latter to look for primary radar returns when there is considerable evidence to indicate that some of the flight controllers were doing precisely this on their own initiative, and why wouldn't one suppose

that this sort of contingency is covered in the basic Air Traffic Control manual that governs the responsibilities and duties of flight controllers and their supervisors? (2) If the Commission thought the foregoing point was sufficiently important enough to include as an explanatory footnote, why didn't the Commission explore the obvious follow-up issue – namely, why was there no order given “to look for primary radar returns”?

Another thought that crosses my mind is the following. If the Washington Center's controllers were looking for American 77, and if they were not told to look for primary radar returns, then how does one look for a commercial jet whose transponder has been turned off by means of secondary radar that only can operate in conjunction with planes whose transponders are turned on and functioning? In addition, if the transponder for American 77 was turned off, and if the Washington Center's controllers were not told to look for primary radar returns, how did the Dulles controllers identify Flight 77 at 9:32? Finally, who was it that had located what appeared to be Flight 77 and about which Norman Mineta testified to the Commission was being reported on by a young man in the Presidential Emergency Operations Center and about which that young man had been making regular updates to Vice President Cheney? According to then Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta, these reports went on for several minutes and appeared to take place during a time interval prior to the time of 9:32 a.m. cited by the Commission as the time when the Dulles controllers were allegedly able to identify American 77– a time when the blip on the radar screen was just six miles away from the White House. Obviously, whoever was supplying information to the aforementioned young man – who, in turn, was relaying it to the Vice President-- appeared to have access to information quite independently of the Dulles controllers because the former individual or individuals had located the object being tracked a fair distance before it reached the six-mile mark.

-----

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seek to make a distinction between scrambling a jet fighter and the process of using scrambled jets to intercept some other aircraft. Scrambling refers to the procedures for getting jet fighters off the ground quickly once a scramble alert has been sounded, whereas interception alludes to an actual in-air approach to the

object of the interception (e.g., a hijacked plane or a plane experiencing some other sort of emergency).

When the two editors for *Debunking 9/11 Myths* contacted spokespersons for both the FAA and NORAD concerning the issue of scrambling and interception, those officials stipulated that although scrambles were fairly routine, the process of intercepting planes was not something that took place all that frequently. The reason the editors make the foregoing distinction between scrambling and interception is because they wish to counter the way in which an August 12, 2002 Associated Press article has been used by many conspiracy theorists.

More specifically, according to the two editors, conspiracy theorists attempt to use the foregoing Associated Press article as proof of how frequent scrambles and intercepts by NORAD are and, therefore, how such scrambling frequency constitutes evidence for why the events of 9/11 should not have been beyond the capabilities of the U.S. military. The Associated Press article indicates that jets were scrambled some 67 times between September 2000 and June 2001.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seek to place the foregoing data in what they consider to be a proper perspective by citing a *Knight-Ridder/Tribune News Service* item that appeared in the September 28, 2002 edition of the *Colorado Springs Gazette*: "From June 2000 to September 2001, NORAD scrambled fighters 67 times but not over the continental United States." The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* go on to point out that all NORAD interceptions that occurred prior to 9/11 – with the exception of the Payne Stewart incident – involved Air Defense Identification Zones that took place offshore and primarily concerned drug smugglers.

In addition, a spokesperson from NORAD is quoted by the two editors as saying: "From September 11, 2000 to October 10, 2000 we had in all of NORAD seven scrambles ... Six were training." (Page 25) Presumably, the point here being that even most of the scrambles taking place in NORAD were merely for purposes of training and nothing more.

I do wonder why the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* cited statistics that covered only a one-month period – namely, September 11, 2000 until October 10, 2000. It would have been far more informative to cite statistics for a period of one or two years rather than just 30 days or so.

Moreover, even if every single incident of jets being scrambled merely gave expression to a training exercise, this would not alter one basic fact. American pilots knew how to scramble jet fighters. Furthermore, one might suppose that those Air Force bases within the continental United States who were designated as active duty bases (Otis, Langley, Andrews, etc) also knew how to scramble jet fighters

Consequently, the process of scrambling planes on September 11, 2001 would not have been an unprecedented event. In addition, jet fighter pilots are also trained in the art, craft, and science of intercepting planes – after all, what is the point of being able to scramble a plane if one can't use that skill to be able to intercept a designated target?

One can make the distinction between scrambling and intercept as the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* have done. One could even accept their contention – based on NORAD testimony -- that scrambling jet fighters is a lot more common than actual instances of intercepting.

Nevertheless, despite all of the foregoing concessions, the following question still arises. What does any of the foregoing information have to do with purported myths involving 9/11?

What difference does it make where the scrambles and intercepts took place? Does the U.S. military know how to scramble planes or don't they? Do the Air Force bases existing in the continental United States and that have NORAD active duty responsibilities – do these bases know how to scramble airplanes or don't they? Do American military pilots have the skills with which to intercept airplanes or don't they?

Are the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* trying to imply that none of the jet pilots who were stationed at Air Force bases in the continental United States prior to 9/11 possessed the requisite skills, knowledge, and experience that would permit them to scramble a jet fighter and, if necessary, intercept an aircraft – hostile or otherwise?

Isn't the whole purpose of training exercises – of the sort that took place between September 11, 2000 and October 10, 2000 – a means of providing pilots with the necessary skills, knowledge and experience to be able to function effectively when called upon to do so in a non- training exercise? Moreover, if there were six training exercises that took place in one month within NORAD in relation to scramble training, then might one not reasonably assume that in the months leading up to September

11, 2000, as well as during the months following October 10, 2000, that there might have been many other exercises that were conducted for training purposes and that were intended to prepare jet pilots for the possibility that on some future occasion – such as September 11, 2001 – they might have to apply all that training to real life?

Whatever some people might have said or misunderstood about the Payne Stewart incident, none of that has anything to do with the issue of whether U.S. military pilots were capable of scrambling and, if necessary, intercepting planes on September 11, 2001. If NORAD scrambled planes 67 times between September 2000 to June 2001, then it is not a myth nor a wild claim nor an expression of conspiracy theory to maintain that the nearly 70 scrambles mentioned in the August 12, 2002 Associated Press story serve as evidence that tends to demonstrate that U.S. military pilots knew how to scramble and intercept planes on September 11, 2001. Furthermore, one is not making a wild claim or giving vent to a conspiracy theory to say that on September 11, 2001, protocols were in place that outlined a graduated set of responses that might take place with respect to scrambled jet fighters under certain circumstances.

The discussion by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* concerning distinctions between scrambling and interception, or about where such scrambles and interceptions took place, or whether they were training exercises or real world missions – all of this is really a way of obfuscating the fact that on September 11, 2001 it was standard operating procedure to scramble and, if necessary, intercept aircraft when ordered to do so. The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* are seeking to create a myth of their own if they are trying – through their discussion on the foregoing matter -- to create the impression that being ready to scramble fighters and intercept aircraft were not part of standard operating procedure on September 11, 2001.

If scrambling and intercepting planes was not part of standard operating procedure, then jets would not have been scrambled from Otis and jets would not have been scrambled from Langley upon receiving a request to do so by the FAA. If scrambling and intercepting planes was not part of standard operating procedure, then General Myers would not have informed Richard Clarke that a Combat Air Patrol would be up over Washington, D.C. in 15 minutes. The fact that this should have been done 45 minutes earlier is another matter.

-----

On pages 14 through 21, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* provide an abbreviated account of some of the issues and controversies surrounding the FAA and military responses to Flights 11, 175,77, and 93. One of the problems with the account put forth in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is that it largely – but not entirely – is an uncritical synopsis of information concerning the response issue that has been advanced by *The 9/11 Commission Report*.

Consequently, all of the questions that are left unanswered by the latter report with respect to the response of the FAA and NORAD/NEADS to the events of 9/11 are also left unanswered by the *Popular Mechanics* (i.e., *Debunking 9/11 Myths*) account. As has been pointed out previously, much of what *The 9/11 Commission Report* has to say about a range of topics appearing in the main text portion of the *Report* cannot be verified because what is reported is rooted in tapes, logs, interviews, and research to which the public does not have access.

This leaves one with a problem. Should the Commission's report be accepted at face value – as a good faith effort that might not contain all of the truth but that does give expression to the gist of what took place prior, during, and following 9/11?

At this point in time, I am not inclined to give the Commission the benefit of the doubt about much of anything. There are reasons for this disinclination to take *The 9/11 Commission Report* at face value.

I believe it is a natural human response for someone to begin to entertain doubts about testimony or the reliability of documents when someone tries to create the impression that a document or testimony gives expression to all the important and relevant facts that are necessary to have an informed understanding of a given issue – in the present case the events surrounding 9/11 -- and then one discovers that many things have been left out or are unaccounted for, and, yet, no explanation is provided for why such information, documents, interviews, tapes and so on are missing, incomplete, or unavailable for examination.

In my opinion the credibility of the Commission suffers significantly because – and the following is but a small sub-sample of the sort of information that should have been in *The 9/11 Commission Report* but was not – the Commission does not discuss the testimony of the Secretary of

Transportation, Norman Mineta, concerning what he observed in the Presidential Emergency Operations Center, nor does the Commission discuss the letter written by the FAA's Laura Brown to the Commission following the testimony of Jane Garvey, the Director of the FAA, nor did the Commission discuss the testimony of any number of individuals from the CIA, FBI, and other government agencies who had pertinent information concerning the events of 9/11 but whose point of view was excluded from *The 9/11 Commission Report* – individuals who had complained about the omissions and exclusions following the release of the *Report*, nor does the Commission discuss the testimony of Sibel Edmonds (more on this later in the book), a translator for the FBI who has been placed under a gag order by the government for purposes of national security – [and, as a member of a hypothetical grand jury looking into the events of 9/11, I believe the burden of proof rests with the government to be able to rigorously and empirically demonstrate that whatever Sibel Edmonds might have to disclose would – with 'a clear and present danger' – be potentially more damaging to the security of the United States than were the deaths of 3,000 American citizens especially since governments sometimes invoke the idea of national security more as a way of trying to put a lid on information that might prove to be quite revealing about the mistakes, errors, and, possibly, incompetence of government officials rather than really being a matter of urgent national security.]

Neither *Debunking 9/11 Myths* nor *The 9/11 Commission Report* appears to be able to stand up to a variety of facts and questions [some of which already have been outlined in the previous 100-plus pages, and some of which are to follow in subsequent chapters] concerning a number of the events surrounding 9/11. So far, the two aforementioned works have not provided me with a full, detailed unproblematic portrait or understanding of what happened on 9/11. Both of the foregoing works, each in its own way, do construct a narrative that seeks to account for the events surrounding 9/11, but those narratives are incomplete in important ways.

If I have problems with what is on the surface with the foregoing works, then I am very likely going to have some doubts and concerns about what lies beyond my access in relation to classified interviews, tapes, and documents. Trust concerning what is alluded to with respect to that which is beyond my capacity to access (e.g., tapes, logs, interviews, government documents) is built on the trust that develops as a result of



what I do have direct access to, and, so far, neither the 9/11 Commission nor the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* have provided me with much in the way of what is visible that would incline me to accept, at face value, what is not visible in the way of evidence.

For example, according to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, the military delays in responding to the hijackings that occurred on 9/11 “were caused by a series of communication breakdowns among government officials and an inability to quickly process and react to an unprecedented event.” (Pages 14-15) While I would agree that the foregoing quote gives expression to part of the narrative that is being advanced by means of the so-called ‘official’ theory concerning 9/11, I would disagree that what is contained in the foregoing quote is what has been demonstrated by the 9/11 Commission, and the reason why such claims have not been demonstrated is because the 9/11 Commission has left out too many pieces of information.

After reading the ‘official’ account of 9/11, I have difficulty understanding how the Commission came to the conclusions it did with respect to, for example, a breakdown of communications. Based on what I am told in the *Report*, I still don’t have a clear idea of what happened at the Boston Air Traffic Control Center, and I don’t have a clear idea of what happened within the FAA, and I don’t have a clear understanding of what happened with NORAD and NEADS, and I don’t have a clear understanding of what happened at Otis or with the jets that were scrambled from Otis, and I don’t have a clear idea of what happened at Langley Air Force Base or the pilots who were scrambled from there. If I don’t have a clear picture of what transpired, then I really am not in any position to say that what happened on 9/11 was the result of a breakdown of communications, or was due to massive incompetence, or resulted from a failure to exercise due diligence along with possible dereliction of duty, or constitutes possible evidence that treason might have been committed by a person or persons unknown within the FAA and/or military and that was intended to be camouflaged as, for example, a breakdown of communications.

I don’t have a clear picture of these things because the 9/11 Commission left out testimony it should not have left out, and the 9/11 Commission failed to raise questions and pursue issues that it should have raised and should have pursued. I don’t have a clear picture of things because the 9/11 Commission has made an array of tapes, documents, logs, research and interviews unavailable for critical review.

Moreover, as far as the claim is concerned that is issued by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* in relation to idea that the military was “unable to process and quickly react to an unprecedented event”, I find such an explanation to be totally unsatisfactory. Military leadership is all about – or should, I believe, be about – how to process information quickly concerning unprecedented events by adapting what one knows in order to engage the unexpected. If the best that the command structure of the U.S. military can come up with is that things were happening too quickly for them, and, as a result, they couldn’t process the information fast enough and that they didn’t know what to do because the situation was unprecedented, then I would say that someone ought to get rid of those who can’t keep up with things and find some people who are capable of strategically and tactically adapting to changing events and meeting the challenges of unprecedented events – because that is the nature of life ... adjusting to the unprecedented as well as acting in relation to that which is anticipated.

Due to all of the foregoing questions and unresolved issues, everyone who worked for, or served on, the 9/11 Commission, as well as the command structure of the FAA, NORAD, NEADS, and both the commanders and pilots at Langley and Otis should be subpoenaed and questioned by my hypothetical grand jury with respect to the foregoing issues. As things stand, *The 9/11 Commission Report* does not seem to be able to satisfactorily address any of the questions that have been raised in the foregoing pages, and, therefore, it is left to a new venue of inquiry – such as my hypothetical grand jury – to explore issues that have not been properly dealt with by the 9/11 Commission.

-----

## 7 - The Walls of Jericho

Before engaging the many issues swirling about the collapse of the north and south towers of the World Trade Center, I would like to explore the collapse of Building 7. There are a number of reasons for proceeding in this fashion.

First of all, I am intrigued by the fact that *The 9/11 Commission Report* has absolutely nothing to say about the collapse of Building 7. I find this to be nothing less than extraordinary in a document that purports to provide an explanation concerning the events of 9/11.

Building 7 -- a 47-storey structure (consisting of 24 massive steel beam core columns and 57 peripheral steel columns linked by a complex network of concrete/steel mesh flooring) located some 350 feet to the north of the WTC north tower struck by Flight 11 -- was not hit by a hijacked plane, and nobody knows how fires began in this building. To be sure, there are photographs which provide evidence that the building was struck by debris of some kind, especially on the south face -- the side facing the twin towers. However, there is no evidence that any of this damage would have led to the initiation of fires. The leap from photographs depicting external damage along the south face and the southwest corner, to the emergence of fires is a conjecture that lacks demonstrable supporting evidence.

Nonetheless, one might admit that the idea of fires starting in Building 7 as a result of debris ejected from the collapsing twin towers is not implausible and, perhaps, not even highly improbable. At the same time, the foregoing idea is nothing more than a possibility, and one should be careful about assuming one's conclusions.

According to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*: "The collapse of WTC 7 was initially puzzling to investigators, but they now believe the building failed from a combination of long-burning fires in its interior and damage caused by debris from the North Tower's collapse." (Page 53) The two editors point out that the foregoing 'belief' is a modification of some initial findings of FEMA.

This latter point is interesting because FEMA concluded in its preliminary findings that it did not know why Building 7 collapsed. Therefore, the 'belief' being alluded to by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is not really a "modification" of the FEMA report as much as the aforementioned 'belief' is a different account altogether from that which FEMA put forth.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* make reference to NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) investigators who, after examining photographic evidence, conclude that there was far more substantial damage to Building 7 than had been indicated by the initial FEMA report. Those investigators state: “The most important thing we found was that there was, in fact, physical damage to the south face of the building ... On about a third of the face to the center and to the bottom – approximately 10 stories – about 25% of the depth of the building was scooped out.” Furthermore, the NIST investigators also make mention of additional evidence of damage that, previously, had been undocumented concerning some of the upper floors of WTC 7 as well as the southwest corner of that building.

All of the foregoing is very interesting. However, such data is not as interesting as the fact that NIST still has not issued a final report on what caused Building 7 to collapse.

Saying that damage to that building was far more extensive than previously indicated by FEMA does not constitute a scientific explanation for what caused the collapse of Building 7. Moreover, there are no empirical models that have been advanced by NIST that provide a plausible account for how observed damage and even lengthy fires could have combined to lead to the collapse of Building 7. There are no empirical models that have been advanced by NIST that show how the scooping out of 25% of the depth of the building would have either compromised the core columns or set in motion a series of stresses that would have compromised the core columns. There are no empirical models that have been advanced by NIST that demonstrate how the previously undocumented damage to the upper floors of Building 7, or to the southwest corner, or to the lower 10 stories of the south face would have led to the collapse of that building.

I also wonder about what the claim that ‘25 % of the depth of the building had been scooped out’ is based on. Was this based on photographic evidence, and, if so, why didn’t the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* enter into an extended discussion of the potential problems surrounding the drawing of conclusions from photographic evidence as the two editors did when discussing the ‘pod’ theory that some people believe, on the basis of certain photographs, was beneath the wing of Flight 175 that crashed into the south tower of the WTC?

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* do make reference to one of the few clear photographs taken of the severe damage that occurred in relation to the south face of Building 7 and provide a government web site address (the NIST web page) where one can find the picture being mentioned. I went to the internet site indicated, and after some sleuthing about [the location of the picture was not all that easy to find], I was able to locate said picture. Damage there was, but the picture did not appear to me to be able to permit one to contend that 25 % of the depth of the building had been scooped out ... so, I continue to wonder on what the 25 % claim is based.

Of course, the aforementioned 25 % claim might be based on eyewitness testimony. If so, we certainly don't learn about the specifics of such testimony from the pages of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*.

The NIST analysts also suggest that long-burning fires in the interior of Building 7 helped lead to its collapse. Although fires were reported in relation to the interior of Building 7, there is almost no information – certainly none provided by NIST, or FEMA, or *The 9/11 Commission Report*, or the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* -- concerning where, specifically, in the interior of Building 7 those fires were burning, or how hot they were, or for how long they burned in individual locations, or whether any [and, if so, how many and on what floors] of the core columns and/or peripheral columns were involved in those fires. Furthermore, there is no information about the degree of efficacy with which the fire-proofing that had been sprayed onto all of the core and peripheral columns of Building 7 during the process of construction fared in relation to the fires taking place in that building.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* indicate that one of the primary reasons cited by NIST for the collapse of Building 7 had to do with that structure's unique design due to a need to incorporate an already existing Con Edison electric substation into the design of the building. Accommodating the substation required a design that necessitated that a number of columns would have to carry a substantial load – some 2000 square feet of floor area per floor.

One of the investigators working with NIST stated: “What our preliminary analysis has shown is that if you take out just one of the columns on one of the lower floors ... it could cause a vertical progression of collapse so that the entire section comes down” (page 55). The

editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* provide a bottom line for all of the foregoing possibilities by stating: “NIST’s analysis suggests the fall of WTC 7 was an example of “progressive collapse,” a process in which the failure of parts of a structure ultimately creates strains to cause the entire building to come down.” (Page 55)

The NIST investigator did not appear to be saying that the entire building would come down if one of the specially engineered columns on the lower floors of Building 7 were taken out. The investigator seemed to be saying that the column that was carrying an exceptional load could [and “could” is not the same as ‘did’] lead to “a vertical progression of collapse” and the series of 2000 square feet of flooring sections that were being carried by that particular column might collapse.

The editors have extrapolated from what the NIST investigator said and concluded that NIST was suggesting that the collapse of such a section would lead to a progressive collapse of the rest of the building due to the purportedly overwhelming strains generated throughout the rest of the building that, supposedly, were created by the initial failure of the specially engineered columns. To lend support to this idea, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* make reference to video footage that “shows a crack or kink in the building’s facade just before the two penthouses disappeared into the structure, one after the other.” (Page 55)

There is, at least, one other explanation for why the aforementioned video footage displayed the particular characteristics of collapse that it did (i.e., the ‘kink’)– an explanation which *The 9/11 Commission Report* did not explore and which *Debunking 9/11 Myths* did not explore in any rigorous fashion. That alternative explanation concerns the idea of a controlled demolition.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* reject such a possibility. They believe the idea of a controlled demolition is just one more expression of implausible conspiracy theories concerning 9/11 – merely another myth that cannot stand up to the facts.

However, the fact of the matter is, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* don’t really have many facts concerning the collapse of Building 7 that demonstrates that their own theory of collapse stands up to the facts better than does the alternative theory for explaining the collapse of Building 7. If their theory really stood up well to the available facts, one might suppose that, by now, NIST would have come out with a final report that explained to all of us in exacting detail just how Building 7 collapsed due to a

progressive set of strains that were put into play by the vertical collapse of one, or more, of the specially engineered core columns.

NIST has not, yet, issued its report on this matter. One wonders why not.

Perhaps the failure to release such a report is because NIST really has insufficient information upon which to construct even a plausible model for the alleged progressive collapse of Building 7. The NIST investigator said that eliminating just one of the specially engineered columns might be enough to cause a vertical progression of collapse, first for the floor sections being supported by that column and, then secondly, in relation to a hypothetical cascading set of failures allegedly brought about by the stresses set in motion by the initial vertical collapse.

Okay. The idea of progressive collapse – at least in broad terms – is clear. Now, how about some evidence to support such an idea?

For example, how did the initial, specially engineered column get taken out on one of the lower floors? The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* do mention that considerable damage – maybe even up to 25 % of the lower ten floors on the south side got scooped out -- but there is absolutely no evidence to indicate that any of this damage included the taking out of one of the specially designed core columns. Moreover, there is nothing in the way of technical information that is provided by either NIST or the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* concerning what sort of force would be required to accomplish the taking out of one of the right kind of columns or how that force would be either generated or applied to the requisite column.

What was the precise set of steps that would have led from the vertical progressive collapse of the section of floors carried by one of the specially engineered columns to the collapse of the entire building? I would like to form a clear picture in my mind of how the initial collapse could have created the sort of stresses that would have cascaded and overwhelmed the structural integrity of the rest of the building.

Where are the NIST tests which would demonstrate that this progressive collapse theory is very plausible, if not likely, with respect to Building 7? What tests has NIST run concerning Building 7? Where is the data for these tests? What models has NIST constructed on the basis of such data? What computer simulations have been run? What were the assumptions on which those simulations were based?

Apparently, the answers to the foregoing questions is: 'nowhere'; 'none'; 'non-existent'; 'none'; 'none', and, finally, both 'many', as well as, 'questionable'.

If the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* are going to criticize those they label as conspiracy theorists concerning the latter's alleged myths concerning the collapse of Building 7 and how those myths cannot stand up to facts, then surely, engineers and scientists who live in metaphorical glass houses might consider being a little cautious when it comes to casting the first stone. The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, the investigators at NIST, and the 9/11 commission investigators have almost no facts to support their version of things, and, therefore, one has difficulty seeing how their theory concerning the collapse of Building 7 stands up at all when it is placed in juxtaposition to the facts.

Instead, the 'facts' surrounding the theory for the collapse of Building 7 that is being advanced by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* have a lot of 'if-termites' crawling around inside of those wooden facts, rotting them from the inside out ... if one of the specially engineered columns was taken out, and if the fires burned in the right way and in the right place and for a long enough period of time, and if the vertical collapse of one section really did lead to the progressive collapse of the rest of the building, and so on.

I have looked at video footage covering the collapse of Building 7. The collapse is pretty nearly symmetrical.

This issue of symmetry leads to a further issue. Let us assume that Building 7 came down as a result of the manner in which long-burning fires in Building 7, together with debris from the collapse of the north tower, caused extensive damage to some of the core and peripheral steel columns and that this extensive damage led to the two-stage progressive collapse of Building 7- stage one being the vertical progressive collapse associated with one of the specially engineered core columns that straddled the Con Edison electrical substation being taken out, and stage two being the way that the stage-one collapse generated unmanageable stresses in the rest of the building, causing the remainder of the structural support system to fail.

Given the foregoing assumptions, why did the building collapse in a symmetrical manner? For example, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* indicate that as much as 25 % of the south face along the lower ten floors might have been scooped out, and the two editors also indicate that the



southwest corner of the building was heavily damaged, as well. In the light of such information, why didn't the building fall toward the south rather than in the straight down way that was observed in the video footage?

In other words, when one chops down a tree, how one cuts into the tree will often determine which direction the tree will fall. The asymmetry of the chopping tends to dictate the direction in which the tree will fall. If the primary damage to Building 7 was on the south side and to the southwest corner, then, why didn't the collapse follow the asymmetry of the damage?

One can approach this same issue in a slightly different manner. The NIST investigator quoted earlier seemed to indicate that in its preliminary analysis, NIST determined that if just one of the specially designed core columns straddling the electrical substation were to fail, this could be enough to bring down one of the sections of the building. The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* maintain that the NIST investigators appear to believe that a two-stage progressive collapse brought down Building 7.

Although neither the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* nor the NIST investigators provide the necessary details, the implication of the foregoing is that there was more than one of the specially designed core columns. If this is an implication of what has been said, then, obviously, depending on which of the specially designed core columns was taken out, one might anticipate that there could be different modalities of progressive collapse in each case.

Some forms of progressive failure might cause the building to collapse asymmetrically in various directions. Some forms of progressive failure might cause the building to collapse in a symmetrical manner.

Is there any scientific reason or reasoning based on engineering principles to believe that a symmetrical collapse is more likely to happen when, say, specially designed core column 'x' is taken out rather than, say, specially designed core columns 'y' or 'z'? If so, what are the technical reasons for believing that a symmetrical collapse is more likely when specially engineered columns are placed in a certain position rather than when other such core columns are placed in a different position?

Could one expect that all forms of progressive collapse might lead to a symmetrical result? Is it even reasonable to suppose there would be any instance of a naturally occurring progressive failure that might end in a symmetrical collapse?

Approached in yet another way, one might ask the following question. What technical reasons are there to believe that if one of the specially engineered core columns were to be taken out, then the collapse of the floor load borne by such a core column will induce the rest of the building structure to collapse in a symmetrical way?

Why would a cascading, progressive collapse due to set of shifting stress loads that overwhelm structural viability as a result of a process set in motion by an initial collapse of certain portions of various floors lead to a symmetrical collapse? This would seem to be a non-linear, unpredictable, catastrophic event, and, so, one wonders how the symmetry of the collapse arises according to the progressive collapse theory, and one wonders how one would build a model that could plausibly take into account all of the variables that would govern the form that any given progressive collapse might assume.

A related issue concerns the time of collapse for Building 7. That building took than 6.8 seconds to collapse, which is very close to free fall – that is, if one were to have dropped a ball off the roof of Building 7, it would take about 6 seconds to reach the ground, impeded only by a small amount of air resistance.

Therefore, an obvious question is the following. If one accepts the progressive collapse theory being advanced by NIST and that is being promoted by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, then how does one account for the collapse time interval?

In other words, once the initial collapse of a given specially engineered core column allegedly took place in Building 7, this would set in motion a series of shifting stresses that rip apart various bolts, welds, concrete-steel mesh flooring units, prefabricated steel sections, and the like -- eventually leading to the progressive collapse of the rest of the building structure. Presumably, this two-stage process of progressive collapse takes some amount of time 'x', and one would like to know how this all comes about in a way that doesn't take more than 6.5 - 6.7 seconds – the observed time for the building's collapse.

Physicists speak of something called the 'law of the conservation of momentum'. Presumably, this law of physics should be applicable to the collapse of Building 7.

More specifically, as higher floors collapse onto lower floors, there should be some sort of delay caused by the resistance of the underlying, not-yet-collapsed portions of a lower floor with respect to the impacting portions of the upper floor. The underlying, not-yet-collapsed lower floors should serve to impede, to a degree, the process of collapse, and this phenomenon of impedance, together with its attendant time lag, gives expression to the law of the conservation of momentum.

I find no explanation in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* concerning the role that the foregoing phenomenon would play in the progressive theory of collapse. I find no discussion of that phenomenon in relation to the preliminary analysis put forth by NIST. Moreover, there definitely is no explanation of the foregoing issue in *The 9/11 Commission Report* because, for unknown reasons, that report doesn't talk about the collapse of Building 7 at all.

In many ways, the idea of a progressive collapse of Building 7 is not so much an explanation of what happened as it is a belief or conjecture or hypothesis concerning what happened. Beliefs, conjectures, and hypotheses are not scientific explanations unless one can demonstrate that there is evidence which substantiates such beliefs, conjectures, or hypotheses and ties the latter to the real world.

Moreover, in a very important way, beliefs, conjectures, and hypotheses that cannot be shown to be demonstrably true are little more than myths. The account of the collapse of Building 7 being advanced in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is much closer to a myth than it is to any sort of a 'proof'.

If we shift focus away from the foregoing sort of considerations, and think, instead, about the issue of fire in Building 7, there also are some unanswered questions. As previously indicated, no one knows how the fires got started in Building 7 ... although debris from the collapse of the north tower might have brought this about in some unknown fashion.

Some people have suggested that there was a great deal of diesel fuel being stored in the building since a number of tenants had back-up generators installed on various floors to serve their needs in the case of an electrical disruption. Diesel storage tanks that supplied these generators were also located on the floors where generators had been installed..

FEMA indicated that some of these storage tanks – accounting for approximately 20,000 gallons of diesel fuel – apparently survived the collapse relatively intact. However, even taking such a discovery into account, there were still thousands of gallons of diesel fuel unaccounted for (when matched with fuel records for the building), and, consequently, possibly some of the diesel storage tanks might have caught fire at some point.

The problem with the foregoing is that many, if not most, of the diesel storage tanks were embedded in fire-proof enclosures. Moreover, the pipelines carrying the fuel consisted of double-wall steel intended to serve as extra protection.

Consequently, the question remains: How did the fires in Building 7 start? How intense were they? What was serving as fuel? How long did they burn, and where did they burn? What proof is there that any of the fires took place near any of the core or peripheral steel columns or that those fires burned sufficiently long and with sufficient intensity to be able to compromise the strength of any of the aforementioned columns, or that even if such fires did take place near various columns and were able to weaken the strength of those columns to the point where some of them buckled, what evidence is there that this would have necessarily led to a progressive collapse that would have induced the whole building to collapse in a symmetrical way within seven seconds?

There are also questions surrounding the time when the fires started in Building 7. Some reports indicate that the fires started some time shortly after 10:30 a.m., while others indicate that fires did not begin until late in the afternoon on 9/11.

In 1991 a fire raged for 18 hours at One Meridian Plaza in Philadelphia. That building, like Building 7, was a steel-framed structure, but the former building was 38 floors tall rather than 47 stories like Building 7.

The FEMA report on the One Meridian Plaza fire indicated that there had been extensive structural damage, including the twisting and sagging of steel beams, as well as the gutting of eight floors. Nonetheless, the building did not collapse.

Another fire burned for 17 hours in a 50-storey steel-framed building in Caracas, Venezuela. The fire occurred in 2000, and although the top 20 storeys of the building were gutted, the building did not collapse.

The earliest that Building 7 is likely to have caught fire is some time after 10:30 a.m., following the collapse of the north tower. The building collapsed at 5:20p.m. Consequently, the longest the building could have burned was around seven hours, and, conceivably, the fires might have burned for a much shorter time ... there is no real hard empirical evidence concerning any of this.

In considering the foregoing seven-hour interval, one should factor in fire-proofing that had been sprayed onto the steel beams used to construct Building 7, and my understanding is that such fire-proofing is rated to impede fire for around four hours. One should also factor in sprinkler systems that also might have helped to impede some of the fires.

Finally, there is very little photographic evidence or oral testimony of which I am aware which demonstrates that the fires in Building 7 were of a substantial nature. To be sure, there were fires, but, apparently, those fires were not so fierce or intense that windows were blown out, and, there is little, or no, evidence indicating that Building 7 was being consumed by a raging fire (or fires). Consequently, one has to wonder about how much serious damage to the core or perimeter columns such fires could have caused.

In the light of the above considerations, one of the questions that arises is the following: If a steel-framed building in Philadelphia can burn for 18 hours, and a steel-framed building in Caracas, Venezuela can burn for 17 hours and, yet, each of those respective buildings, nonetheless, remained standing, then why should a fire that burned for under seven hours be able to help lead to the collapse of Building 7?

There is almost a complete absence of evidence for any of the conjectural 'ifs' and unanswered questions that surround the progressive collapse theory being advanced and promoted by, respectively, NIST and the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*. One of the reasons for this lack of evidence is because almost all of the evidence has been destroyed.

According to the argument proffered by various individuals, the reason why materials (such as steel beams) were destroyed in relation to the

north and south towers of the World Trade Center was because there was an urgent need to remove as much of the rubble as possible in order to facilitate a search and rescue operation for potential survivors. Such an explanation is not really viable.

I'm sure no one has a problem with the fact that rubble which was impeding a search and rescue operation at the Trade Center Plaza needed to be removed. However, just as one does not need to break the chain of custody when someone from the police department removes evidence from a crime scene, so too, removing rubble from the World Trade Center to another site does not mean that one has to break the chain of custody by selling the evidence to a foreign country [The steel was sold at bargain-basement rates and shipped off to India and China as fast as it could be removed from Ground Zero, and there were special piers constructed to facilitate this process of removal].

The evidence technician from the police takes evidence that is removed from a crime scene and brings it to a special location where it remains in safekeeping for subsequent examination. One could have found – should have found – some field, hanger, and/or set of warehouses to store the rubble until it could be forensically analyzed. Unfortunately, this was not done, and *The 9/11 Commission Report* provides no explanation for why this occurred.

Bill Manning, editor of *Fire Engineering* magazine, stated: "I have combed through our national standard for fire investigation, NFPA 921, but nowhere in it does one find an exemption allowing for the destruction of evidence for buildings over ten stories tall."

There were people I knew who visited Ground Zero shortly after 9/11 and who were told that they could not take photographs because the entire area was a crime scene. Yet, tons of WTC evidence were destroyed without so much as a judicial tremor.

As a member of my hypothetical grand jury, I would like to know why people were able to commit a federal crime in plain sight, yet nothing was done. I would like to know who authorized the destruction of all of this evidence and what was the justification for doing so.

The rationalization for destroying the rubble evidence from Building 7 is even more of a mystery than the destruction of evidence in

conjunction with the north and south towers. This is because no one died in Building 7– either before or during its collapse.

With certain exceptions, Building 7 had been evacuated before the south tower had even collapsed. Consequently, there was no urgency to remove the rubble in the search for possible survivors, and, yet, the steel from Building 7 was removed, sold, and shipped overseas just as quickly as was true with respect to the rubble from the twin towers.

Crimes had been committed. People had been murdered. Property worth hundreds of millions of dollars had been destroyed, and, yet, material evidence was dispatched overseas before it could be examined by appropriate experts.

Even if no crimes had been committed, my understanding is that a standard practice in matters involving building disasters or bridge failures and the like is for engineers to try to determine what went wrong so that future buildings or structures would not be built with the same vulnerabilities. Yet, the evidence at the World Trade Center was destroyed, and, as a result, engineers were not afforded an opportunity to determine if there were anything that might be learned about architecture or construction techniques that could have heuristic value for subsequent generations of builders.

-----

According to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, one of the claims made by so-called conspiracy theorists is that Building 7 was destroyed because it housed offices belonging to the CIA, the Secret Service, the Securities and Exchange Commission and other organizations who value their privacy, and, therefore, Building 7 was a “repository of secrets and evidence that needed to be destroyed.” (Page 53) Whatever the truth or falsity of such claims might be, the fact of the matter is that there is a very real mystery associated with Building 7 that might have nothing to do with secretive government agencies.

More specifically, on September 12, 2001, during an interview with Peter Jennings of ABC news, Mayor Rudolph Giuliani talked about how he had been evacuated from the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor of Building 7 where the Emergency Management Command Center for the City of New York was located. Mayor Giuliani stated: “We were operating out of there [i.e., the Command Center]

when we were told that the World Trade Center was going to collapse, and it did collapse before we could get out of the building.”

The obvious questions that come to mind in relation to the foregoing are the following: Who was it that informed the mayor and his staff that the World Trade Center towers were going to collapse?

How did the person or persons who informed the mayor know that the buildings were going to collapse? Was the latter person or persons informed by someone else, and, if so, by whom? When did such an understanding become known to the person or persons who informed the mayor? How long was the interval between the time that the mayor and his staff were given the foregoing information and the time that they sought to leave the building? Where were the mayor and his staff in the evacuation process when the WTC collapse took place? Why did the mayor believe the information that he received was reliable rather than the result of someone’s speculation? Did Mayor Giuliani take any steps to verify the information through independent means – for example, by contacting any of the high-ranking fire officials who were on site -- and asking what they knew about an impending building collapse? If such a step was not taken, then why was this not done? Did Mayor Giuliani direct anyone to ensure that whatever steps for evacuation that could be taken at the twin towers should be set in motion before the impending building collapse took place, and if this was not done, then why wasn’t such a step taken?

There is no mention of any of the above issues in *The 9/11 Commission Report*. One does learn about an April 20, 2004 interview conducted by Commission researchers in conjunction with Mayor Giuliani (footnote 27 on page 542), but one has no access to that interview, so one doesn’t know what was said or wasn’t said.

On page 311 of *The 9/11 Commission Report* one also learns that: “Mayor Giuliani, along with the Police and Fire commissioners and the OEM director, moved quickly north and established an emergency operations command post at the Police Academy.” However, there is absolutely nothing about why there was a need to move north or how this move north had been initiated.

Why would the 9/11 Commission believe that the idea that someone apparently knew about how one, or both, of the WTC towers was (were) going to collapse before this actually occurred constituted such an irrelevant or inconsequential issue that it was not worth mentioning in their



report? Or, if the Commission researchers were not aware of the foregoing information, then one wonders why Mayor Giuliani considered the matter to be so inconsequential that he did not bother informing the Commission about the matter.

There is independent confirmation of the fact that Mayor Giuliani and his staff in the New York City Emergency Management Operations Center on the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor of Building 7 were informed of a possible, impending collapse. However, this second account is slightly different than the one given by the mayor during his interview with Peter Jennings.

Richard Zarrillo, an emergency medical technician for New York, indicated during a World Trade Center Task Force Interview, recorded on October 25, 2001, that shortly after arriving at the Emergency Operations Center on the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor of Building 7, he stated that someone from the OEM came into the room and said a third plane was reported to be inbound, and since this might lead to the collapse of the WTC, the building should be evacuated.

Mr. Zarrillo further stipulates that after leaving Building 7 he had tried to warn various people about what he had heard and mentioned conversations with Steve Mosiello, Chief Peter Ganci, Commissioner Feehan, and a few others. These conversations took place across a sequence of events, rather than all at once, and Mr. Zarrillo maintains that none of the people with whom he talked had heard anything about an impending building collapse, but, shortly after the conversation with Commissioner Feehan, the south tower came down.

This oral testimony of Richard Zarrillo raises a set of additional questions. How did he know that the person coming into the room was from the OEM since, seemingly, Mr. Zarrillo did not know the individual by name? Assuming the identification of the person who came into the room was correct and that the person was an OEM official of some kind, who was that person, and where had he gotten his information? Why hadn't Mayor Giuliani mentioned anything about being told that a third plane was supposedly headed for New York City during his interview with Peter Jennings? Why assume that even if a third plane was inbound, and even if one were to assume that the plane was headed for the World Trade Center, why should anyone conclude that this would lead to the collapse of either of the buildings at the World Trade Center? Moreover, given that the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor of Building 7 was a reinforced structure some 350 feet from the north

tower and even further away from the south tower, then why should anyone suppose that Building 7 would have been in any immediate danger even if the twin towers were to collapse?

Mr. Zarrillo's account concerning Building 7 also leads to some other considerations involving a timeline. According to Mr. Zarrillo, after learning about the need to evacuate the building, he had enough time to leave the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor, take the elevator down to the main floor, go out into the street and proceeded to have a number of different, sequential conversations with various fire and emergency personnel in relation to the information about a WTC building collapse, and, then, the south tower finally came down.

Mayor Giuliani told Peter Jennings that the tower collapsed before they had evacuated the building. Consequently, one would like to know what the mayor and his staff were doing in the 15-20 minute interval that seems to be implied by Mr. Zarrillo's account [given to the New York City Fire Department] with respect to the likely passage of time between the time Mr. Zarrillo left the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor of Building 7 and the collapse of the south tower following his three conversations with different emergency personnel.

Conceivably, if an evacuation order had been relayed by the mayor to first responders at the north and south towers, as well as to the command structure for New York City firefighters and police, as soon as the alleged OEM individual came into the room on the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor of Building 7 and indicated that the premises should be evacuated because of the possibility of an impending building collapse at the World Trade Center, then the 15-20 minutes that ensued before the south tower collapsed could have been used to move an awful lot of people to safety. Instead, according to survivors, what they heard over the public address system was that it was safe to return to their offices – which raises a whole set of further questions about who gave that public address message or why and on whose authority.

Moreover, according to Mr. Zarrillo, none of the high ranking fire officials with whom he spoke after evacuating Building 7 had heard anything about either another inbound plane or the impending collapse of any of the WTC buildings. Surely, Mayor Giuliani had ample time (15 to 20 minutes) to inform these officials, and, yet, apparently, this was not done. If this were not done, one like to know why it wasn't done?

There is further puzzle that arises in conjunction with Building 7. This puzzle is implicit in the section of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that deals with

Building 7, but this particular problem is not specifically addressed by the editors of that book.

Toward the bottom of page 56 and near the top of page 57, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* state: “Conspiracy theorists claim that real-estate developer, Larry Silverstein, who leased WTC 7 from the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, admits in a 2002 PBS documentary to intentionally bringing down the building. In the film *America Rebuilds, A Year at Ground Zero*, Silverstein talks about the WTC collapse: ‘I remember getting a call from the, er, fire department commander telling me that they were not sure they were going to be able to contain the fire, and I said: ‘We have 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 editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* go on to discuss interviews that were conducted with Jon Magnusson of Magnusson Klemencic Associates, Ron Dokell, a former president of Olshan Demolishing Company, and Mark Loizeaux of Controlled Demolition, all of whom maintain that they have never heard the term ‘pull’ in reference to a controlled demolition of a building, and, therefore, Larry Silverstein could not have been talking about a controlled demolition with respect to Building 7 during his interview in the aforementioned PBS documentary.

On the other hand, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* do point out that firefighters contacted by *Popular Mechanics* state that ‘pull’ is, in fact, a common term used in relation to the removing of firefighters from a burning building. Moreover, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* indicate that “Silverstein subsequently released a statement on September 5, 2005, saying his comments were misinterpreted. He says he was referring to his desire to pull a squadron of firefighters from the building. The statement read in part: “Mr. Silverstein expressed his view that the most important thing was to protect the safety of those firefighters, including, if necessary, to have them withdrawn from the building.” (Page 58)

There are a number of problems surrounding the Larry Silverstein issue outlined above, and none of these problems necessarily have anything to do with what he might have meant by his words captured in the PBS documentary. Before moving on to these other problems, however, there are a few things that should be said in conjunction with his use of the term ‘pull’.

First of all, since Mr. Silverstein is neither a demolition expert nor a firefighter, irrespective of whether some people use such a term as 'pull' (which demolition people apparently do not) or how they use such a term (which firefighters do but not in the way some have interpreted), nevertheless, such considerations are actually irrelevant to the question of what it is that Mr. Silverstein actually meant during his part of the 2002 PBS documentary. Secondly, Mr. Silverstein did not say 'let's pull the firefighters' or 'let's pull them.' He said "pull it".

Now, of course, it is possible that the indefinite pronoun "it" was intended to refer to the firefighting squadron mentioned in his tardy 2005 attempt at clarifying his original 2002 conversational statement. Nevertheless, there is no indication in his earlier PBS interview that he was talking in terms of a squadron of firefighters.

The fire department commander with whom he allegedly spoke might have said: 'We've got a squadron of firefighters in Building 7, and they might not be able to contain the fire', and, in response to that, Mr. Silverstein might have said in reference to that squadron "pull it", but, if the foregoing synopsis gives expression to the gist of that conversation, then at the very least, this is an odd, impersonal way of speaking ... especially given his clarifying statement of 2005 in which he stipulated that the safety of the firefighters – that is, human beings, not an 'it' – was the utmost concern in his mind on September 11, 2001 in the light of all the loss of life that already had taken place on that day. Furthermore, we don't have any evidence of what the fire department commander said to Mr. Silverstein and whether, or not, the term "squadron" even came up during the conversation, and if that term did not occur during the conversation, then Mr. Silverstein's use of "it" in conjunction with human beings seems rather strange for one wonders why he would have been thinking in terms of a squadron rather than in terms of a number of human beings who might have been in harm's way.

One's puzzlement is enhanced when one considers the remainder of Mr. Silverstein's PBS film interview, namely: "...they [meaning the fire department] made that decision to pull and we watched the building collapse." What was the location from which Mr. Silverstein watched the building collapse?

According to Mr. Silverstein, he had received a call from the fire department commander. Where was he when he got the call? When did he

get the call? Did he have to travel to arrive at a vantage point where he could watch Building 7 collapse? If so, why would he do that?

Apparently, wherever he was, he was able to watch the collapse of the building. On the other hand, one wonders how much time elapsed between the time of getting the call and the collapse of the building.

Mr. Silverstein was supposedly informed by the fire department commander about the possibility that they might not be able to contain the fire in Building 7. At some point, a decision was made by someone to – let us assume – ‘pull’ the squadron of firefighters from that building. Finally, at some point after pulling the firefighters, Building 7 collapsed, and Mr. Silverstein allegedly watched that building collapse.

This entire sequence of occurrences took how long? Moreover, since the building did not give any warning of impending collapse, but, suddenly, came down around 5:20 p.m. on the afternoon of September 11 and only took about seven seconds to disintegrate, should we suppose that Mr. Silverstein just kept watching – perhaps for hours – from some unknown location until the building suddenly came down, and his attention was so riveted by what was going on – and he had so little else to attend to on 9/11-- that he did not miss the seven-second event?

The puzzlement might not end with the foregoing considerations. According to a October 17, 2000 edition of *Business Wire*, Blackstone Real Estate Advisors -- a subdivision of The Blackstone Group -- secured the participating mortgage for Building 7 at the World Trade Center from Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. On April 26, 2001, Silverstein Properties and Westfield America, Inc. leased, for 99 years, the two world trade towers from The Port Authority of New York, with Westfield America concentrating on the retail space beneath the twin towers and Silverstein Properties focusing primarily on the office space above ground.

If the foregoing is true, then Silverstein Properties had nothing to do with Building 7. The building was owned by someone else – Blackstone Real Estate Advisors.

So, the following question sort of bubbles to the surface. If Silverstein Properties did not own or lease Building 7, why was the fire department commander calling him about that building?

Of course, in the often convoluted business arrangements that exist in the complex economy of the modern world, maybe Silverstein Properties

and the Blackstone Real Estate Advisors had worked out a deal concerning the management of Building 7 that, somehow, involved the participation of Silverstein Properties.

However, since Silverstein did not own Building 7, he would not have been the person to call – assuming such a call was made – to discuss the circumstances of Building 7. Moreover, one wonders why there was nothing in the 2002 PBS documentary or his subsequent 2005 ‘clarification’ that suggested that he informed the fire department commander who allegedly called him that Silverstein Properties didn’t actually own Building 7 and, therefore, the fire department commander was speaking to the wrong guy.

Even if Silverstein Properties did have some leasing arrangement with the owners of Building 7, nevertheless, while leasing might provide one with a fiduciary interest in what happens to the property in question (and Silverstein Properties was eventually awarded some seven billion dollars for the loss of the twin towers), one’s status as a leaseholder does not necessarily give one the right to make decisions about the fate of the property being leased. That right belongs to the actual owners of the property. Consequently, once again, one wonders why the fire department commander is calling Larry Silverstein to discuss Building 7.

Furthermore, even if Silverstein Properties owned Building 7 lock, stock, and barrel, the fire department is not required to seek the owner’s permission with respect to how to proceed in relation to a fire – that is, whether to continue fighting the fire or to discontinue its attempts to contain the blaze. The decision to continue or discontinue fighting a fire is entirely the responsibility of the fire department.

Therefore, once again, one wonders why the fire department commander is telephoning Larry Silverstein. Mr. Silverstein possesses no authority whatsoever in the matter of how to fight a fire or whether to discontinue fighting a fire.

A fire department commander who feels the need to consult with Larry Silverstein about what should be done with the firefighters who, supposedly, are still in Building 7 should not be a fire department commander. The decision to ‘pull’ or not ‘pull’ those people belongs to the fire department and to no one else.

If a determination is made that a fire cannot be contained, people who lease property don't get a vote. The judgment that a fire cannot be contained is a professional and technical one, not a business decision.

If Silverstein Properties had some sort of leasing arrangement in relation to Building 7, one might suppose that a fire department commander could have made a courtesy call in order to inform an owner or leaseholder that the fire department was not certain it would be able to contain the fire, and, at some point, a decision might have to be made to withdraw whatever fire personnel were still in that building. Such a courtesy call might be made to provide – where possible -- the owner, leaseholder, or tenants with an opportunity to be able remove valuable documents, files, papers, and the like from the building in question

On the other hand, if the fire department was uncertain that it was going to be able to contain the fire in Building 7, this tends to indicate that the fire was so out of control that no one would have been likely to have been permitted to enter the building to engage in such a treasure hunt. Therefore, if that was the case, then again, what was the point of the 'courtesy' call, especially since it seemed, at best, to have been placed to the wrong guy?

Did the fire department commander call, among others, the FBI, Secret Service, the CIA, and The Securities and Exchange Commission – all of whom were tenants of Building 7 -- to provide them with a courtesy call concerning the impending fate of Building 7? And, if these other, rather important and prestigious, tenants were not contacted, then why did the fire department commander call Larry Silverstein of all people?

I would also like to know the name of the fire department commander who contacted Larry Silverstein. I would like to invite that individual to my hypothetical grand jury so that he or she might testify about where and why Larry Silverstein was called and whether anyone else was informed about what was going on with Building 7. I would like to know who made the decision to discontinue fighting the fire in Building 7 and on what that decision was based since, as indicated earlier, none of the photographic evidence concerning the fires in that building suggested that any of the fires were of a substantial nature or out of control.

I also would like to know who the firefighters were in the squadron allegedly attending to Building 7, and I would like them all to testify about what they saw and encountered while in Building 7. One of the reasons why questioning these individuals would be important is because,

presumably, they would have information that might be pertinent to any final report produced by NIST concerning an explanation for the collapse in Building 7, and, since, the NIST has not come out with a final report on Building 7, one might wonder if part of the reason for the absence of such a final report is because whatever testimony, if any, that was given by firefighters concerning Building 7 might be inconsistent with the provisional hypothesis or conjecture that has been advanced by the NIST concerning the reasons for the collapse of Building 7.

On page 50 of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, the two editors end the section about Building 7 with the following: “In addition, the NIST report is definitive on this count. The preliminary report states flatly: ‘NIST has seen no evidence that the collapse of WTC 7 was caused by bombs, missiles, or controlled demolition.’”

How can one be definitive when one has almost no evidence on which to base such a conclusion? Almost all evidence concerning Building 7 was done away with, never to be examined or studied. To say that an evidence-less conclusion is definitive is like saying that one is certain of something with respect to that about which one is almost completely ignorant.

How can there be forensic evidence for, or against, the possibility of a controlled demolition when all, or almost all, evidence has been eliminated? Furthermore, under such circumstances, what does it really mean that NIST “has seen no evidence that the collapse of WTC 7 was caused by bombs”?

Where did NIST look for evidence? What evidence did NIST consider?

One of the biggest liabilities faced by NIST with respect to explaining the collapse of Building 7 is the fact that the investigative agency has no compelling and substantial evidence to support its basic conjecture that the collapse of Building 7 was due to a progressive collapse. In fact, not only does NIST lack any compelling evidence in this regard, it actually has no real evidence at all that a naturally occurring progressive collapse -- due to debris damage from the north tower along with out-of-control fires -- brought about the fall of Building 7.

At this point in time, NIST is advancing nothing more than a myth concerning the collapse of Building 7. The 9/11 Commission doesn't even have a myth to offer in this matter because it was totally derelict in its duty



with respect to the matter of discussing and explaining the collapse of Building 7.

The only thing definitive about NIST's account concerning Building 7 is the complete absence of rigorous, critical, objective, scientific analysis concerning the question of what caused the collapse of that building. The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* claim: "A final report is expected in the fall of 2006." ... well, as I am finishing this chapter of *The Essence of September 11th*, it is presently the dead of winter in 2007 and the alleged, aforementioned final report has not yet even emerged from its hole to look for a shadow and, thereby, provide a glimmer of hope that a spring of enlightenment is not far removed.

-----



## 8 - The Two Towers

On page 31, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* state the following: “Leslie Robertson, Skilling’s chief colleague in the WTC project [i.e., its architectural design], told the *New Yorker* magazine in a November 2001 article that he and Skilling engineered the towers to withstand the impact of a Boeing 707, the largest commercial airliner at the time. ‘We studied it, and designed for the impact of such an aircraft’, Robertson said. ‘The next step would have been to think about the fuel load, and I’ve been searching my brain, but I don’t know what happened there, whether in all our testing we thought about it. Now we know what happens, it explodes. I don’t know if we considered the fire damage that would cause.’”

And the relevance of the foregoing to the question of what caused the collapse of the twin towers at the WTC is what? We have a guy who can’t remember what he did or didn’t do, or what he did and didn’t test.

As far as the fuel load issue is concerned and what happens when a commercial jet hits a building, the probative value of Leslie Robertson’s blank memory testimony is zero. What he doesn’t remember is irrelevant.

Furthermore, contrary to the foregoing claims by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, Robertson was not “a chief colleague in the WTC project”. He was, apparently, only a junior employee in the firm: Worthington, Skilling, Helle, and Jackson.

Nonetheless, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* go on to quote Robertson in the *New Yorker* article by saying that “The World Trade Center was a team effort, but the collapse of the World Trade Center was my responsibility, and that’s the way I feel about it.” According to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, Robertson is racked with grief about 9/11 – presumably as a result of the role that he believes he played in the collapse of the various buildings through a presumed failure to test for how the jet fuel variable would have affected the viability of the twin towers.

However, as it turns out, John Skilling actually made a statement in 1993 following the truck bombing at the World Trade Center that helps shed light on the subject matter at issue here. Mr. Skilling said that if the World Trade Center towers were to be hit by a jet filled with fuel, while there would be a “horrendous” fire and many people likely would die, nonetheless, the

buildings would remain standing. This account was reflected, to a degree, in City in the Sky by Glanz and Lipton ... so much for the relevance of what has gone missing in the memory of Leslie Robertson.

One wonders why the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* even bothered to include the Robertson material in their book. One also wonders why, seemingly, the two editors failed to conduct any research with respect to what the actual head of the WTC project – namely, John Skilling – had to say about what the possible consequences might have been if a jet loaded with fuel had hit the World Trade Center towers.

The introduction of the Leslie Robertson story seems like something of a myth. To be sure, Mr. Robertson apparently is wracked with some degree of guilt and grief concerning his own belief and feeling that he might have had something to do with the death of nearly 3,000 people, but, the fact of the matter is, the foregoing belief and feeling might be somewhat removed from the actual facts of the situation given John Skilling's 1993 statements on this matter.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seem to be quite annoyed with others when the former individuals seek to demonstrate that those individuals are perpetuating myths concerning 9/11. Yet, the two editors appear to be engaged in some myth-making of their own when it comes to reporting and using information about people such as Leslie Robertson.

Toward the beginning of *Debunking 9/11 Myths'* second chapter [entitled "The World Trade Center"] the editors mention an online essay by Henrik Malvang. In the essay, according to the editors, Malvang, who is from Denmark, advances a thesis which claims that the Freemasons set off bombs inside of the World Trade Center on the morning of 9/11 in an attempt to establish a New World Order. The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* further note that Malvang has written a book and produced a video – both of which are for sale on Malvang's web site – which purports to demonstrate that the Apollo moon landings were a scam and did not actually take place.

The two editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* proceed to say: "Not everyone inclined to believe that bombs were used to bring down the towers is so far removed from the mainstream" (Page 28) as is Malvang. This is a neat way of trying to eat your cake and have it too.

If one looks hard enough, I am sure one probably can find representatives from almost any group on Earth whose moorings to 'reality' might have become precariously loosened – ranging from Democrats to Republicans, and from scientists to government employees, as well as from military officers to business people. This is something that most people understand, and, therefore, one wonders why the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seem compelled to include mention of someone like Henrik Malvang in the run-up to their discussion concerning the cause of the collapse of the two towers at the World Trade Center.

As has been done elsewhere in the book for which David Dunbar and Brad Reagan serve as editors, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seeks to provide a 'flavor' for the sort of mentality they continuously imply one is dealing with when discussing those who do not subscribe to the official version of 9/11. Thus, the supporters of conspiracy theories are often described in the aforementioned book as those who run in circles that believe things such as the Apollo moon landings were a hoax, or that the Freemasons are trying to take over the world, or that the Holocaust is a Jewish conspiracy.

Of course, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* does say that not everyone who is a conspiracy theorist in conjunction with 9/11 is as lunatic-fringe as some of the people mentioned in that book. However, the damage is done because the implication is often given in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that while people who don't accept the official theory might not all be of questionable sanity, nonetheless, the differences are merely a matter of degree, not kind.

For example, just after mentioning a few of the oddities that appear to permeate the ideas of Henrik Malvang, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* talks about Morgan Reynolds, a professor emeritus at Texas A & M, as well as former chief economist with the U.S. Department of Labor. Professor Morgan is quoted as saying: "only professional demolition appears to account for the full range of facts associated with the collapse of the three buildings."

Following the foregoing quote, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* notes that Robert Gates -- then-president of the university in question and now Secretary of Defense -- released a public statement in which he described Reynolds as someone who did not have an office at the university and whose comments about 9/11 were "beyond the pale". At this point, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* includes a parenthetical statement about how 9/11 conspiracy theorists try to dismiss President Gates' critical commentary concerning

Professor Reynolds by pointing out that Robert Gates used to be the head of the CIA.

Actually, if one wishes to place things in a proper context, one might add that not only was Robert Gates director of the CIA, but he was a member of the CIA when, among other things, the Iran-Contra scandal was taking place all around him, and, if one accepts his version of things, Mr. Gates didn't have a clue about what was transpiring. Seemingly, if one couldn't even penetrate the deception and illegal behavior that was going on in his own agency and associated government offices, then such apparent ineptness would not seem to auger very well for someone who was supposed to be a gatherer and analyst of intelligence with respect to those who seek to deceive America and behave problematically outside the United States.

However, one doesn't have to make any reference to the CIA connection in order to take exception with the comments alluded to earlier that were used by the former university president, Robert Gates, to both discredit Professor Reynolds as well as to distance the university from that professor. As the head of a university, one might harbor some degree of hope that President Gates would have been an enthusiastic advocate of academic freedom and realized the importance of being able to utilize the university environment to form a crucible for engaging, exploring, analyzing, and critiquing a variety of ideas – even those ideas that might be unpopular or those ideas that might not be shared by other academics.

Of course, academically speaking, President Gates is entitled to voice his opinion concerning the value of a perspective that might be espoused by someone – especially someone who once had been an active member of the university for which he serves as president. This academic right, however, should be distinguished from a university president's right, as the acting head of a corporate body, to be legally empowered to make all kinds of statements that serve functions that might be quite independent of the intellectual quality of such 'official' statements.

President Gates has the aforementioned academic right only if he actually has studied the available evidence concerning the issue about which he is making a pronouncement. His pronouncement in the present case concerns the position held by Professor Morgan Reynolds – namely, that the collapse of the three buildings at the World Trade Center were not caused by a combination of structural damage due to the plane crashes

together with the substantial weakening of core columns as a result of the fires ignited by those airplane crashes.

The former president of Texas A & M university, Robert Gates, proclaimed that Professor Morgan's previously outlined position was "beyond the pale". Therefore, I would urge those who have oversight over the hypothetical grand jury of which I am a member to invite Robert Gates to testify and see whether he really knows anything about the technical issues involved in the different theories of collapse concerning the WTC building.

If Robert Gates actually could demonstrate that he was well-versed in the various issues surrounding the collapse of the three WTC buildings, then I would have a variety of questions to ask him to test that understanding and to determine whether, or not, his particular perspective could be shown to be defensible and viable. However, if it were to turn out that the once-and-former-university-president Robert Gates could not defend his position or if he could not demonstrate that he actually understood the essential issues, then his comment about how the position of Professor Reynolds was "beyond the pale" is really a purely political and anti-scholarship perspective, said in ignorance – a statement that, more than anything, appears to be an attempt to stifle the sort of freedom with which the underlying debate ought to be imbued.

Under the latter set of circumstances, seeking to publicly castigate and impugn someone who was only trying to exercise his right (i.e., the right of Professor Reynolds) to contribute to a discussion of potential critical importance to the country would be nothing less than a betrayal of the very essence of the idea of academic freedom. If the former president was assuming a purely political posture because he, himself, was under pressure to say something in order to try to 'manage' and contain the situation by way of intimidating people from speaking critically of the 'official' government position concerning 9/11 – something that a president of any university should not do no matter what the political pressure on such a person might be -- then such an individual is someone who has betrayed and abused academic freedom and, therefore, has no business being the president of a university. The issue of academic freedom and the threat represented by those who might attempt to place obstacles in the way of a full examination of any given issue is a principle that -- notwithstanding the parenthetical implications of the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* to

the contrary -- really has nothing to do with whether, or not, someone was once a director of the CIA or had been a member of that agency.

Toward the bottom of page 28 and the top of page 29 in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, one finds the following: "Though Reynolds and a handful of other skeptics cite academic credentials to lend credence to their views, not one of the leading conspiracy theorists has a background in engineering, construction, or related fields."

There is both a certain amount of truth as well as something of an elitist snobbery that simultaneously seem to be running through the foregoing statement. The truth part of things is that simply saying one has some academic paper credentials associated with one's name does not necessarily, in and of itself, mean much of anything. In fact, if someone is tacking on degrees to her or his name in an effort to influence others through the aura of status or prestige that might surround possession of a degree, then this constitutes little more than an attempt to create an argument from authority that might be more of an exercise in undue influence rather than a sincere attempt to assist people to understand a particular problem.

Use of terms like 'intellectuals for truth' or 'intellectuals speak out' is somewhat disconcerting and annoying. It implies -- although I am sure this was not the intention of those who use the term -- that either non-intellectuals are not for the truth or that non-intellectuals shouldn't speak out because the opinions and ideas of the latter don't matter as much as do the ideas and opinions of people who do have degrees or academic credentials.

However, the foregoing issue concerning academic credentials is a sword that can cut in several directions. If I am a person who has expertise in a particular area, and I try to leverage that expertise to give the impression that I am an expert in other areas as well, then this tends to raise a question of credibility with respect to the value of anything I might have to say about matters that are beyond my area of expertise ... having a doctorate in literature does not automatically qualify one to make pronouncements about, say, medical treatment.

On the other hand, there are any number of people who call themselves 'scientists' and, yet, engage in little more than 'junk science' on behalf of, say, tobacco firms or a variety of other, vested interests. There are lobbyists with a technical background in science and engineering



who are little more than hired gunslingers who wield junk science like a weapon to shoot down opponents [in the back if necessary] in order to influence the decisions of governmental regulatory bodies on behalf of, for example, a chemical company who might wish to be afforded the freedom to spew into the environment whatever by-products it likes irrespective of what damage such chemical by-products might do to the ecology, or they are junk scientists who publish technical sounding articles in industry-run technical sounding journals that document, in a problematic way, the possible medical and health benefits of some pharmaceutical product that might be manufactured more out of a desire to make a profit than to help human beings (or avoid harming them), or they are junk scientists who attend various symposia and who make themselves available to the media in order to try to forestall governmental action on global warming or who seek to block stem-cell research, and so on. Not everyone who bears the title of scientist or engineer necessarily carries that title with the sort of honor or integrity that gives expression to what being a scientist ought to entail.

One of the tasks of junk science is to muddy the waters of rational debate and to confuse people. In other words, one 'scientist' says this, and another 'scientist' says that, and how is one to know where the truth lies or who to believe?

Of course, there also are scientists and engineers who pursue their calling with honor and integrity, and, yet, they might arrive at incorrect conclusions and judgments, or they might fail to exercise due diligence in a given set of circumstances. For example, the science and engineering underlying the shuttle/space program is not of the junk variety, and, yet, nonetheless, the Columbia and Challenger disasters still happened, as did the multi-billion dollar Mars Polar Lander, Mars Climate Orbiter, the Mars Observer, and the Hubble telescope debacles – despite the fact that hundreds of top-notch scientists and engineers [from academia, government, and private industry] participated in those programs.

Under bureaucratic pressure and/or under the pressure of budget constraints and/or under the stress of worrying about one's career, decisions are reached that, sometimes, give expression more to politics than good science or robust engineering. This might, or might not, be the case in the matter of 9/11.

In any event, people like the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* who wish, by implication, to cast aspersions upon their opponents by pointing out that the latter don't have any real technical expertise in engineering and construction ought to have a little humility and realize that science and engineering have both grown out of a long history of numerous researchers having gotten many things quite wrong along the path of progress. Consequently, it is quite conceivable that even people who have a technical background in engineering and construction might get things wrong and, therefore, just because the latter group of people says something, the saying of it doesn't necessarily make it so.

There is a second point that is related to the foregoing. One doesn't have to be a scientist or an engineer in order to be able to consider whether what a scientist or engineer is saying makes sense or seems well-argued or is capable of being defended against a variety of relevant questions.

In the American court system it is not expert witnesses who are the finders of fact. The members of a jury are the actual finders of fact and determiners of witness credibility.

This is how I intend to proceed in the following. I do not profess to be an expert in anything – certainly not in engineering nor in the architecture and construction of buildings -- but I do have a very curious, questioning nature, and, as well, I have the cognitive capacity to engage technical arguments – such as expert witnesses might give to my hypothetical grand jury – and make reasoned judgments about how credible and well-founded (or not) that testimony seems to be.

I don't have to be a scientist or engineer to be able to come to an understanding of what such people are trying to say. If an expert witness is sufficiently clear in her or his presentation about a given technical position, I believe that I will be able to understand the structural character of that argument sufficiently well to be able to ask relevant questions concerning whether, or not, the position makes sense and, more importantly, whether there might be problems or unanswered questions associated with a given technical perspective.

According to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*: "... the collapse of the three World Trade Center buildings are among the most extensively studied structural failures in American history. In the five years since 9/11, they have been the subject of lengthy investigations and engineering

school symposiums, together involving hundreds of experts from academia and private industry, as well as the government. The conclusions reached by these experts have been consistent. A combination of physical damage from the airplane crashes – or, in the case of WTC 7, from falling debris – and prolonged exposure to the resulting fires, ultimately destroyed the structural integrity of three buildings.” (Page 29)

The foregoing quote is very misleading in a variety of ways. First of all, although the ‘official’ theory might hold that Building 7 collapsed due to a progressive failure brought about by a combination of debris damage and prolonged fires, the fact of the matter is, no one has been able to put forth a rigorous presentation of evidence that is capable of substantiating the ‘official’ claim – including NIST [National Institute of Technology and Standards], that, as pointed out in the last chapter, has yet to release a final report that shows, in a step by step fashion, how real world events are likely to have led to the observed manner of Building 7’s collapse.

A conjecture or hypothesis might offer a temporary explanation of how something might have happened, but science requires that one should be able to demonstrate the viability of such an explanation in terms of evidence and models of that evidence which, when run in real time, account – in a relatively problem-free manner -- for what is known and/or has been observed. To the best of my knowledge, there is no such demonstration concerning Building 7 that is currently in existence.

FEMA has not produced such a document. NIST has not produced such a document. The 9/11 Commission has not produced such a document. *Popular Mechanics* has not produced such a document (indeed, as pointed out in the previous chapter’s critique of the account in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* about Building 7, that book does not contain such an account). *Scientific American* has not produced such a document.

Consequently, I am curious about which symposiums, technical journals, government bodies, or academic institutions have produced a document that provides rigorously established evidence and defensible models demonstrating how and why Building 7 came down in the way it did. To be sure, I am sure that if I were to ask any number of engineers, scientists, academics, and technical people from either private industry or government what caused Building 7 to collapse, they would say words to the following effect: ‘Oh, it was due to a combination of structural

damage caused by falling debris from the north tower of the WTC, together with prolonged exposure to the fires that were burning in that building.’

However, if one were to ask any of the technical ‘experts’ about the nature of the evidence on which they are basing their expert opinion, there is very little those people have to offer that is of a concrete, palpable, demonstrable nature. Their position is not one of scientific proof, but, rather, it is an expression of speculation wrapped in the guise of science. They tend to be assuming their conclusions, because they have little, or no, evidence to support their hypothesis ... just supposition and conjecture.

Secondly, the quote from page 29 of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* noted earlier that asserts how hundreds of technical experts have all given one consistent answer to the question of what caused the WTC buildings to collapse is misleading in another way. Superficially, it might be true that all the experts to which the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* are alluding might believe that a combination of structural damage from plane crashes or falling debris, together with the compromise of steel integrity brought about by prolonged exposure to fire, led to the collapse of, for example, the twin towers.

Nonetheless, what the foregoing quote from *Debunking 9/11 Myths* fails to note is there is not just one explanatory account of how the two main factors (i.e., structural damage plus prolonged fire exposure) actually led to the collapse of any of the buildings. In fact, there are, at least, three different theories about the precise mechanism that caused the buildings to collapse.

In effect, the fact there are at least three different, competing theories that have, at various times, been advanced in an effort to explain the possible mechanism underlying the collapse of, say, the twin towers really tells me that none of those who have advanced a theory knows, for sure, what actually happened at the twin towers. Their theories give expression to models that provide a way of trying to account for what might have gone on in the twin towers based on what is known and based on certain assumptions, but the proof of the pudding, so to speak, must be sought within the strengths and weaknesses of the different models that are being advanced and whether, or not, those models are capable of standing up to the available facts.

There might be one consistent position among experts when it comes to agreeing upon a general framework that is to serve as an explanation for how the twin towers collapsed. Nonetheless, there is not one, consistent

theoretical position among experts with respect to specifying the set of technical details that purportedly account for the collapse of those buildings.

Having a general explanation for the collapse of the two towers and having a specific explanation for the collapse of those two towers are two entirely different issues. Saying that experts are agreed on the former, general explanation – as is done in the foregoing quote from *Debunking 9/11 Myths* – leaves unaddressed the whole specific, technical side of things and, as a result, might leave people with the mistaken impression that experts are completely in agreement about what happened at the twin towers when, in point of fact, such unanimity of agreement is not the case as far as specific, technical, causal issues are concerned.

The technical issues are the key to trying to understand what might have caused the collapse of the twin towers. The general explanation is the hypothesis that stands in need of proof, and the technical, specific account is that which is sought in order to try to demonstrate the validity of the general hypothesis.

As indicated above, there are no fewer than three different, but somewhat overlapping, accounts of the building collapses at the World Trade Center on 9/11. These different theories are put forth by: Eagar and Musso; Bazant and Zhou; and NIST [FEMA also put forth a report concerning the collapse of the two World Trade Center towers, but since it consists, to a large extent, of variations on certain elements of the foregoing theories, I do not examine it as a separate theory in the discussion that follows].

-----

According to Hyman Brown, who was the construction manager during the building of the twin towers, the two structures were designed with excess capacity to withstand a variety of assaults upon the integrity of the two buildings -- assaults ranging from those of nature: such as hurricanes and snowstorms, to those of a man-related nature such as bombings and airplane crashes. Thomas Eagar, a materials engineering professor from MIT, and Christopher Musso, a then-graduate research student, stated in a 2001 edition of *JOM: Journal of the Minerals, Metals, & Materials Society* that: “While the aircraft impact undoubtedly destroyed several columns in the WTC perimeter wall, the number of columns lost on the initial impact was not large and the loads were shifted to remaining columns in this highly redundant structure.”

Such steel-frame constructions had demonstrated their durability by surviving an 18-hour fire in Philadelphia and a 17-hour fire in Caracas, Venezuela that, despite generating massive damage, did not lead to the collapse of either of those buildings. Moreover, Buildings 5 and 6 at the World Trade Center – both of which have a steel-frame structure that is similar to the twin towers design – did not collapse on 9/11 despite suffering very heavy damage from falling debris and fires. Finally, in 1975 there was a fire in the north tower at the World Trade Center that spread to six floors but did not compromise the structural integrity of the tower and did not lead to its collapse.

Thomas Eagar and Christopher Musso also stipulated in the aforementioned *JOM* article that the “The fire is the most misunderstood part of the WTC collapse. Even today, the media report (and many scientists believe) that the steel melted. It is argued that the jet fuel burns very hot, especially with so much fuel present. This is not true.”

According to the authors, one of the primary reasons for the foregoing misunderstanding is a failure – even, as noted above, among some scientists – to distinguish between the heat of a fire and its temperature. Although there is a functional relation between these two properties, heat is described as an extensive property that is dependent upon the heat capacity and the amount (mass or density) of a given substance, while temperature is said to be an intensive property that does not depend on the amount of the substance that is burning.

Adding a certain kind of fuel to a fire might increase the amount of heat potential that is present, but introducing additional fuel of the same kind that is already burning does not appreciably affect the temperature of that fire. The temperature of the fire remains about the same even as the heat potential increases due to the way that the additional fuel enables the fire to burn longer or to increase in size.

Eagar and Musso indicate there are a variety of factors that might affect the temperature at which a fire burns. For example, aside from the nature of the substance or fuel that is feeding a fire, the relationship between the fuel and the oxidant (e.g., oxygen or air) that assists the fuel to burn also plays an important role.

In addition, if the fuel and oxidant are mixed in the right proportions and ignited in a fixed-volume container with an appropriate opening or exhaust (such as a jet engine), then the ignited flames

will be forced from the container – because they cannot expand within the container – both at a substantial velocity, as well as completely combusted due to the way in which the oxidant and fuel were evenly and proportionately mixed when ignited within the container. If, on the other hand, a fuel and oxidant mixture are combined in the right proportions (called a pre-mixed flame) but ignited as they exit a container kept under a certain constant pressure (such as with a Bunsen burner or oxyacetylene torch) rather than ignited within a container and, then released, one produces considerable heat intensity but not as much as with the previous jet-engine type of arrangement.

A further possibility for igniting a combination of fuel and oxidant involves situations where the two ingredients come together in something of a random or uncontrolled manner. When such a combination reaches the right critical values in the presence of some form of ignition, then combustion will occur.

According to Eagar and Musso, this latter form of combustion is referred to as diffuse flame. One encounters this sort of flame in a fireplace where air and fuel combine according to what conditions permit – if there is not much air, the fuel burns poorly or not at all, and if there is a plentiful supply of air, the fire burns better. Even then, however, the fire does not burn with nearly the intensity of either a premixed flame or a constant-volume jet flame, and certainly not with the same degree of full or complete combustion as either of the first two flame modalities noted earlier.

When mixed with pure oxygen in the right proportions and under optimum circumstances, Eagar and Musso claim that hydrocarbons can achieve a maximum temperature of about 3,000 degrees Centigrade. If, however, air is substituted for pure oxygen, the maximum temperature attainable by a burning hydrocarbon is, under optimum conditions, approximately 1000 degrees Centigrade.

The lower temperature in the latter case, relative to the former instance involving pure oxygen, is due to the molecular complexity of air relative to oxygen. Since more molecules must be heated when air is used as an oxidant than when pure oxygen is the oxidant, the additional molecular complexity of air reduces, by a factor of two-thirds, the intensity of heat that is capable of being generated under those conditions.

Eagar and Musso maintain that 1000 degrees Centigrade is the maximum temperature achievable when air is the oxidant for a diffuse flame combustion. However, this upper limit only can be reached under optimum conditions – that is, among other things, when the mixture of air and fuel are in the right proportions or ratios.

These optimum ratios rarely, if ever, exist in everyday sorts of fires when fuel and air come together in unpredictable and uncontrollable combinations. This set of non-optimum conditions lowers the likely maximum temperature that is achievable under such circumstances down to around 650 degrees Centigrade -- although the maximum temperature might be as low as 500 degrees Centigrade, depending on the nature of the mixture of fuel and oxidant that is present.

One of the reasons for the lowering of the upper temperature limit in the foregoing circumstances is that a portion of the fuel is not combusted, and this unspent fuel is also heated by the fire and, thereby lowers the flame's efficiency. This kind of diffuse flame combustion is described as being fuel rich because of the extra fuel that remains unburned, and one of the tell-tale signs of such a fuel rich flame is the black smoke that arises from the unburned particulate soot that has been created.

On the other hand, according to Eagar and Musso, the presence of soot might also help increase the temperature of a flame because it can lower the amount of radiative heat loss that occurs. In addition the volume of the flame might affect radiative heat loss, as well, and in the process help maintain a higher temperature flame.

The amount of fuel, the volume and flow of air, the manner in which the air and fuel combine, the degree of fuel richness, and the extent to which soot and flame volume prevent radiative heat loss can all affect the temperature with which a fire burns. Consequently, the range of temperatures for a fuel-rich diffuse flame fire runs between 500 degrees and nearly 1000 degrees Centigrade, depending on the prevailing circumstances in which the flame exists.

The fires in the twin towers have been described by Eagar, Musso, and others as fuel-rich, diffuse flame forms of combustion. This means that in places the fires might have reached nearly a thousand degrees Centigrade (and the force of 'might have' in the foregoing is only one of stating a possibility and not, necessarily, indicating what actually occurred) , and



in other places the fires might not have achieved much more than 500 degrees Centigrade in temperature.

Steel melts at 1,500 degrees Centigrade. Therefore, even if the WTC fires had burned with maximum intensity, this would not have been enough to melt any portion of either the perimeter or steel columns that framed the two towers.

In their 2001 *JOM* article, Eagar and Musso do note that one does not have to argue that steel columns must melt in order for their structural integrity to be compromised. The two authors indicate that steel loses approximately half of its strength when raised to a temperature of about 650 degrees Centigrade, and, therefore, someone might hypothesize that, perhaps, such a loss of structural strength might have helped lead to the collapse of the World Trade Center building.

Eagar and Musso reject such an idea. They refer to the redundant design built into the twin towers.

The two authors point out that in the low-wind conditions that prevailed on the morning of September 11, 2001, the buildings probably were only moderately stressed as a result of wind conditions. Consequently, even if the fires in the twin towers had achieved a temperature of 650 degrees Centigrade and, as a result, weakened the structural strength of some of the steel columns, the buildings would have been able to easily withstand even a loss of 50% strength in the steel columns and still would have had plenty of stress resistance in reserve.

There are a number of assumptions in the foregoing discussion. An assumption is being made that core and/or peripheral columns were, at some point, subjected to a temperature of 650 degrees Centigrade, and, more importantly, it is being assumed that those columns were subjected to such a flame intensity for a sufficiently long period of time that either the flame was able to burn through whatever fireproofing foam might have been present on the columns and, then, heat up the beam to the point where the steel lost strength, or it is being assumed that the flame was juxtaposed next to an area of beam that was free of fireproofing and that the heat of the flame was not radiated away in such a manner that this would have impeded the rise of temperature in the exposed portion of the beam.

According to the NIST report – which advances its own theories for the collapse of the north and south towers (and there will be a critical analysis of

the NIST position shortly) ... a theory that is different from the one being advanced by Eagar and Musso – only “three columns had evidence that the steel reached temperatures above 250 degrees Centigrade”. No one knows how much higher than 250 degrees Centigrade might have been reached on those three steel columns from the World Trade Center building, and so anything said in that respect is pure speculation. All one can say is that on the basis of existing evidence (provided by NIST), there is no indication that any of the pillars in the twin towers – whether core or perimeter – ever reached temperatures much higher than 250 degrees, and this level is far removed from the temperatures at which steel softens (425 degrees centigrade) or begins to lose half of its strength (650 degrees Centigrade)

According to Eagar and Musso, there is something much more important to consider than any possible loss of strength in steel columns with respect to any possible explanation for what caused the twin towers to collapse. This more important factor concerns the distortion of steel that results when a steel column is exposed to a certain level of temperature differential with respect to its outer and inner faces.

More specifically, the fires in the WTC were not burning in a uniform manner. Not only were the fires hotter in some places compared to other locations, but the internal face of the perimeter columns were likely exposed to much hotter temperatures than were the outer faces of the same columns.

A differential temperature of 150 degrees Centigrade is capable of generating considerable residual stresses in a steel column via nonuniform modes of expansion in a given steel column. This source of distortion might have lead to the structural failure of any beam caught up in such a temperature differential, causing it to buckle.

Eagar and Musso believe there were two primary factors underlying the collapse of the twin towers. Firstly, there is the issue of the loss of strength of the steel due to exposure to the requisite temperatures, and, secondly, there is the loss of structural integrity in the columns as a result of being subjected to sufficiently high temperature differentials.

There are a number of potential problems with the foregoing account. To begin with, NIST, itself, indicated that based on an analysis of the paint of sample columns, there is no evidence that any of the columns in

the twin towers experienced temperatures much higher than 250 degrees Centigrade. When these same samples were analyzed through metallographic procedures, there was no evidence to indicate that any of the samples examined (consisting of sections from 16 perimeter columns and several core columns) had been exposed to temperatures above 600 degrees Centigrade.

None of these findings is sufficient to warrant maintaining that a significant number of columns – whether perimeter or core – had suffered an appreciable loss of strength. Eagar and Musso can, if they wish, insist that such a loss of strength played a contributing role in the collapse of the twin towers, but they do so with almost no discernible evidence to back them up on this point.

In addition, although one understands the general idea of how temperature differentials could cause uneven modes of expansion in a steel column and that this, in turn, might lead to the buckling of a steel column, nevertheless, where is the evidence that this is in fact what happened in the twin towers? While there is something of a weak prima facie case to be offered in conjunction with the possible distortion of some of the perimeter columns being affected by temperature differentials, there is absolutely no evidence to indicate that the differential temperature process affected any of the core columns.

One also would like to know – specifically – which steel beams were affected in this way? Moreover, what evidence is there to indicate that the number of such beams would have been substantial in number? Furthermore, even if some of the steel beams were distorted due to temperature differentials, and even if some of them had buckled, what evidence is there that the stress-handling redundancies that were built into the towers would not have been able to compensate for the buckling of some of the perimeter steel columns? Why should one suppose that the unaffected core and perimeter columns, together with the complex truss-mesh floor system that permitted loads to be shifted as needed, would have been overwhelmed by whatever number of columns might have been affected by temperature differential structural distortions? What evidence is there that the stresses set in motion by the structural failure of some of the perimeter columns due to temperature differential would have been capable of unzipping the floor assemblies like a series of falling dominoes?

Eagar and Musso are of the opinion that as some of the perimeter steel beams failed on several of the floors where fires had been burning most intensely, these columns bowed outward, and, in turn, the floors above those floors fell. The floors below could not support the gravity load of the upper floors crashing down on the angle clips (these bind floor joists to the perimeter and core columns and are thought by some to constitute a weak part of the structural design) of the underlying floor assemblies, and this set in motion the pancake collapse of the remainder of the building

The available evidence bearing upon this latter point does not lend credence to the foregoing scenario. Underwriters Laboratory tested the floor assembly designs used in the twin towers in August 2004 in order to determine if those assemblies could be induced to collapse under the sort of stresses entailed by, among others, the Eagar and Musso theory outlined above.

The results of those tests demonstrated that the floor assemblies did not collapse under such stresses. These results were mentioned in an October 2004 update by NIST as well as in its draft report of June 2005, and in the latter document NIST stipulated that the floor assemblies were capable of handling considerable gravity stresses brought about by the sort of steel column failures being discussed.

Eagar and Musso state that if the building had collapsed in free fall time – that is, with no restraint, it would have taken eight seconds. However, if one takes into account the domino process in which upper floors crash down on lower floors and, in effect, unravel the floor assemblies via the angle clips, the two authors claim that it would match the observed collapse time of 10 seconds.

Eagar and Musso might be slightly off on the first figure. The free time for either of the twin towers appears to be about 9.22 seconds for a 1368 foot (417 meter) tower (not taking into consideration the antenna).

In any event, once one measures the actual observed rate of collapse for the twin towers, one would need to compare that figure against the free fall time and determine whether the conservation of momentum would have been preserved under the theory being advanced by Eagar and Musso. In other words, as upper floors crash into lower floors, the upper floors meet with resistance, and overcoming this resistance or inertia of the lower floors requires a certain amount of time (including the time to unravel the various ways in which the floor is attached to the rest of the building). When

the inertia of the lower floor has been overcome, the momentum of the floors are combined and proceed onto the next lower floor where the same process of combining momentums takes place.

The process of meeting and overcoming resistance during the combining and conserving of momentum for the various floors that are engaging one another at any point of time during a collapse takes some amount of time 'x'. One has to factor in this time-delay 'x' when measuring the actual observed time of collapse and comparing that time against the time of collapse that one expects to take place during free fall in order to see whether the differential of the predicted time of collapse for the pancake/domino theory generates a result that is sufficiently different from the calculated free-fall time to reflect the actual time delay brought about by the conservation of momentum during the observed, real-world collapse of the twin tower buildings.

The closer the observed time of collapse and the expected free fall time for collapse are to one another, the less likely it is that one can both account for such a small time differential when matched against real world events, while, simultaneously, being able to preserve the fundamental principle of the conservation of momentum. Eagar and Musso do not mention in their article about whether they performed an actual experiment to determine what the time-delay would be as a result of taking into account the set of forces associated with the conservation of momentum during the collapse of a 110-storey building – and this is a crucial piece of missing data.

The two authors do say that according to their calculations there was a two-second differential between what they claim is the observed time of collapse (10 seconds) of the twin towers and the time that they claim is to be expected based on free fall (8 seconds according to the two scientists but, possibly, the figure of 9.22 seconds noted previously might be closer to the actual free-fall time), and they do say that there would be a difference of 100 km/hour between the velocity of free fall (300 km/hour) and the alleged observed velocity of collapse (200 km/hour). However, based on the information that Eagar and Musso provide in their article, one is not in any position to know whether their model is capable of reflecting the time-delays that necessarily would follow from momentum being conserved across 110 stories (the north and south towers) or 47 stories (Building 7) during the process of progressive collapse.

Eagar and Musso appear to be saying that a time differential of two seconds [10 seconds (observed time of collapse) minus eight seconds (their free fall calculation)] represents the law of the conservation of momentum in action. This conjecture needs to be empirically tested.

On the other hand, the issue of time delay in conjunction with the conservation of momentum might be something of a moot point. As noted above, tests conducted by Underwriters Laboratory indicate that the floor assemblies would have been able to withstand the sort of stresses that might have been initiated by the structural failure and buckling of various perimeter columns.

According to Eagar and Musso, the fact that the twin towers fell straight down, in a relatively symmetrical fashion, rather than asymmetrically with some sort of lateral movement is not unexpected. They claim that a 500,000+ ton structure like either of the world trade center towers possesses “too much inertia to fall in any direction other than straight down.” The foregoing statement assumes that the vectored motion of the collapsing building’s momentum is a simple, linear function dependent only on the breaking of angle clips variable and that these angle clips will be broken simultaneously and completely.

The Eagar/Musso theory presupposes that the angle clips are the weak link in the structural design of the twin towers. The Underwriters Laboratory tests suggest that presupposition is incorrect.

Therefore, given that the collapse of the towers cannot necessarily be reduced down to a simple, linear account of angle clips breaking under the stress of collapsing floors, this leaves open several important questions. Why did several of the buildings collapse in a largely symmetrical manner into their own footprint? What prevented nonlinear forces from entering into the dynamics of the collapse event and skewing that symmetry?

Eagar and Musso claim that due to the almost free-fall velocities of the collapsing towers, there was not enough time for any given portion of the building to acquire a significant degree of lateral movement.

What is missing from such an explanation is the following: (1) Irrespective of the conservation of momentum time factor, if a building’s collapse were to be subject to some internal set of skewing forces generated by a non-linear process of bending and twisting among the 47 core columns or the 236 exterior columns as they collapsed, then one would not

expect those buildings to fall in the symmetrical manner that was actually observed, and one would like to know why such nonlinear skewing forces did not occur with respect to the collapse of the north tower but in relation to the collapse of Building 7, as well. What prevented this from happening – especially given that the Underwriters Laboratory report indicated that the floor-assemblies (including the suspect angle clips) had been tested, and the result of those tests demonstrated that the twin tower floor assemblies were not likely to have collapsed under stress conditions similar to the ones that were believed to have existed in the twin towers on 9/11?

Eagar and Musso also point out that the twin towers are 95 percent air. They claim this means that the buildings are able to implode on themselves.

However, those buildings are not going to implode on themselves without encountering a set of forces that leads to such an implosion. Even assuming everyone agrees that both twin towers and Building 7 did implode on themselves, nevertheless, the theory put forward by Eagar and Musso does not appear to be a viable means for explaining how the three buildings imploded on themselves. Consequently, one continues to search for a plausible and defensible theory of why and how the buildings imploded on themselves, and why the collapse was almost nearly symmetrical, and why that collapse took place at near free-fall velocities.

-----

Very shortly following 9/11, Zdenek P. Bazant and Yong Zhou wrote a paper entitled: 'Why Did The World Trade Center Collapse – A Simple Analysis'. It was slated to be published in the *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*.

In the abstract for the article one finds the following statement: "The analysis shows that if prolonged heating caused the majority of columns of a single floor to lose their load carrying capacity, the whole tower was doomed." The validity of the article's conclusion depends, in part, on the truth of certain assumptions – namely, (a) A majority of the columns on a single floor lost their load carrying capacity; (b) The cause of this loss of load carrying capacity was prolonged heating.

Written two days after 9/11 and expanded eleven days later, the two scientists purported to be able to provide an explanation for the collapse of the twin towers ... an explanation that was accomplished largely independently of actual empirical considerations. In other words, the two

scientists had no empirical data concerning whether the requisite number of columns on any single floor actually did lose their load carrying capacity due to prolonged exposure to heat. Furthermore, the two scientists had no data about where the fires were or whether those fires could have been sufficiently intense or sufficiently long-lasting or insufficiently impeded by lack of air, fuel, or the presence of fire-retardant or fireproofing materials to be able to compromise the structural integrity of all of the columns on a given floor.

Bazant and Zhou contend that the steel columns were exposed to a sustained temperature of more than 800 degrees. Unfortunately, they seem to be arbitrarily picking this number out of a hat because they have no empirical evidence to substantiate their claim – either with respect to the magnitude of the temperature or in relation to the actual number of columns that might have been exposed to heat of sufficient intensity and length to be able to lower the load carrying capacity of such columns.

Bazant and Zhou are of the opinion that the process of heating different columns was aided by the loss of fireproofing insulation that had been sprayed onto the columns during construction. They believe this loss of insulation would have occurred as a result of the forces set in motion by the plane crashes.

Once again, the two scientists are making assumptions about what did and did not happen in the twin towers. For example, they are making assumptions about whether, in fact, insulation was dislodged to a sufficient degree to leave portions of the steel columns vulnerable to heat (and, given that the buildings were designed with an excess capacity to transfer stresses, it is not immediately obvious if, on the one hand, the impact of a jet plane would jar foam insulation loose from any of the columns or if, on the other hand, the force of that impact might be absorbed by various portions of the building by being transferred in a number of different directions by virtue of the complex floor assemblies that permitted, among other things, fairly substantial lateral or swaying motions). The two scientists also are making assumptions that if, in fact, portions of the steel columns were stripped of some, or all, of their insulation, these particular bare areas were the precise ones that would have been exposed to fire.

If we give the two scientists the benefit of the doubt with respect to all of the foregoing assumptions, then, according to Bazant and Zhou, viscoplastic deformation (or creep) occurs in the steel columns. That is, under sustained



heat of the requisite temperature (650 degrees Centigrade), the structural integrity of the steel becomes compromised, and this can lead to “creep buckling” of the columns caught up in this process as those columns lose their load carrying capacity through the viscoplastic deformation.

As noted earlier, Eagar and Musso had indicated that even if a number of the columns lost as much as 50% of their strength through prolonged exposure to fires with the requisite temperatures, this was not likely to lead to the collapse of the towers due to the excess capacity designed into the twin towers that permitted them to viably survive an assortment of substantial stresses. Moreover, as also was noted earlier, NIST stated that just three of the perimeter columns examined showed evidence (based on an analysis of the paint) of having sustained temperatures of much more than 250 degrees Centigrade, and, furthermore, using metallographic analysis NIST concluded that none of the samples displayed any evidence of reaching temperatures higher than 600 degrees Centigrade

Could some of the columns in the twin towers have been exposed to higher temperatures – for example, around the 800 degree Centigrade level assumed by Bazant and Zhou? Yes, this could have happened, but there is no evidence to support such a contention, and, as a scientist, one is not permitted to assume one’s conclusions – those conclusions must be substantiated through empirical data and research.

Various critics of the initial Bazant and Zhou theoretical explanation for the collapse of the twin towers published evidence that indicated that there was no empirical data to support the existence of 800 degree Centigrade temperatures in either of the twin towers – temperatures that played a central role in the collapse theory advanced by Bazant and Zhou in their *Journal of Engineering Mechanics* article. Taking this point in hand, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* conducted a follow-up interview with Zdenek Bazant.

Responding to the editors’ request to respond to the charges concerning the absence of evidence to support his original contentions concerning the existence of 800 degree Celsius temperatures in either of the twin towers, Bazant is reported to have said: “Today it is clear that the temperatures were much lower, but this is unimportant for my analysis. Structural steel begins to creep already at less than 400 degrees centigrade, and that is enough to cause viscoplastic (creep) buckling.” (Page 48)

Actually, Bazant is quite wrong – the issue of temperature is very important to his analysis. This issue of temperature is not tied to the new information being introduced by Bazant – namely, that 400 degrees centigrade is sufficient “to cause vicoplastic creep” -- but, rather, the issue is whether there were enough fires of even a magnitude of 400 degrees centigrade that lasted for sufficiently long in enough of the right places with respect to proximity to core columns and perimeter columns – temperatures that were not retarded, impeded, or constrained by such factors as fireproofing, water sprinklers, an adequate air supply, or a fuel supply of the right kind – to enable “vicoplastic (creep) buckling” to take place.

One can take Bazant at his expert word and acknowledge the idea that temperatures do not have to reach 800 degrees centigrade in order for vicoplastic deformation to begin to occur – although one still might wonder why, in his original paper, Bazant didn’t include this not inconsiderable point about what sort of minimal temperatures were necessary to get vicoplastic deformation started. Nevertheless, even when one accepts the fact about the 400 degree centigrade temperature, this admission does absolutely nothing to counter another factual consideration – namely, Bazant has little more than supposition and conjecture to support a central assumption of his theory ... that there were, in fact, fires of sufficient intensity (400 degrees centigrade or so), duration, and appropriate location to bring about vicoplastic buckling. This is especially so since Bazant’s thesis requires a substantial number of fires of the right intensity, duration, location, and conditions (e.g, no fireproofing, adequate air supply, fuel, and mixing, as well as the relative absence of retardants such as water) to bring about vicoplastic buckling in over half the perimeter and core columns needed to make his theory for the collapse of the twin towers even plausible let alone viable.

Conceivably, if a large enough number of columns were to have been compromised through vicoplastic deformation – and Bazant and Zhou stipulate that this number would have to be more than half of the total of 47 core columns and 236 perimeter columns – then, perhaps, the caveat put forth by Eagar and Musso concerning the implausibility of the loss of structural strength being the sole reason why the towers collapsed might be set aside. The problem with such a possibility is that there is a complete absence of evidence to indicate that anywhere near more than half of the columns on any given floor might have fallen victim to vicoplastic deformation – in fact,

the only evidence which exists suggests that none of the columns in either of the twin towers were subject to vicoplastic deformation because the temperatures did not appear to be high enough or to burn for a sufficient length of time to be able to bring about the sort of deformation being proposed.

Given that the jet fuel was expended within just a few minutes following impact, and given that NIST tests indicate that office furniture burns for no more than 15-20 minutes before such fuel is consumed, there is really no plausible mechanism that can be shown to have been likely to occur in either the south or north towers of the World Trade Center that would generate the sort of temperatures (400 to 800 degrees Centigrade) needed for the Bazant and Zhou model to become either compelling or persuasive. It is unfortunate that these authors didn't spend time compiling actual empirical data before developing their thesis because there is a mismatch between what their theory requires in the way of assumptions and what the real world (namely, the events of 9/11) actually provides in the way of facts.

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* goes on to quote Bazant as saying in the follow-up interview that: "Also, I was not sure whether the framed tube columns buckled over the height of many floors or one floor. Today we know from accurate photo analysis and from the NIST study that the initial buckling actually occurred over the height of several floors, with the initial imperfection (i.e., inward lateral displacement) caused by the horizontal pull of floor trusses. Multi-floor buckling provides less resistance to collapse than single-floor buckling. Anyway, my analysis (and the figures) assumed both possibilities, and in either case, the energy dissipation was shown insufficient to arrest the collapse." (Page 48).

One can acknowledge that "the initial buckling occurred over the height of several floors". The question is: What caused that initial buckling?

For Bazant's initial thesis to be verified, there would have to be evidence demonstrating that vicoplastic deformation involving a large number (over half) of steel columns (both perimeter and core) had taken place on a number of floors. However, there is almost no evidence to support his position since the paint analysis of what few samples were examined indicated that temperatures did not exceed 250 degrees centigrade, while the metallographic evidence indicated that none of the columns reached even 600 degrees centigrade.

This latter metallographic data does leave open the possibility that some columns might have been exposed to temperatures above the 400 degrees centigrade minimum needed to generate vicoplastic deformation. Nonetheless, one cannot jump from the possibility that a few columns might have been exposed to temperatures of 600 degrees centigrade to the conclusion that, therefore, more than half of all columns on a number of different floors were exposed to such temperatures.

Moreover, it is not enough for steel columns to be exposed to such temperatures. One must be able to demonstrate that those columns were subjected to the requisite temperatures for a sufficiently long enough period of time to generate vicoplastic creep and that the amount of vicoplastic creep so generated would have led to the, more or less, simultaneous buckling of an extensive variety of columns across a number of floors. Bazant and Zhou have no empirical evidence to support any part of the underlying thesis.

In addition, the causal mechanism mentioned above by Bazant in his follow-up interview with the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* concerning the “initial imperfection (i.e., inward lateral displacement) caused by the horizontal pull of floor trusses” must also be brought into question. As noted earlier, studies have been done by Underwriters Laboratory that indicate that the floor trusses would have been able to contend with the load shift stresses that were believed to be taking place in the twin towers, and, consequently, floor truss failures are not likely to have led to the sort of inward lateral displacement that would have led to a progressive collapse of the entire building.

Finally, contrary to the implication of Bazant’s previous quote, no one, least of all NIST, has demonstrated that the “energy dissipation [in the twin towers – my note] was shown insufficient to arrest the collapse”. While later in the present chapter there will be a more detailed discussion on the WTC collapse study published by NIST, suffice it, for now, to say that the NIST study did not demonstrate what Bazant claimed it did – namely, that the “energy dissipation was shown insufficient to arrest the collapse”.

To make a long story much shorter, the NIST study threw out experimental data that was inconsistent with its preferred model – that is, the one that got published as being “THE” explanation for why the twin towers collapsed. This preferred collapse model was the one chosen after throwing out inconvenient experimental results and, then, proceeding to

manipulate variables within the preferred model until the researchers behind the NIST study were able to produce a desired result in their computer simulation – that desired result being a failure in the structural integrity of their twin tower models that might lead to a progressive collapse of the modeled buildings ... but quite independently of whether the variable manipulations within their preferred model reflected any conditions and events that actually might have existed or taken place within the north and south towers on 9/11.

In a high school physics lab, this sort of process might be called fudging one's results. Now, apparently, it is called research.

Bazant and Zhou admit that “the details of the failure process after the decisive initial trigger that sets the upper part in motion are of course very complicated and their clarification would require large computer simulations.” By way of supplementing this point, the two authors indicate that the plane's impact leads to a very nonuniform distribution of forces among the perimeter columns, the core columns, and the floor assemblies, and, as well, the authors provide a specific example of this complexity by pointing out that the top portion of one of the towers (the south tower) leans and tips to the west.

This point runs contrary to the Eagar and Musso position that stipulates that one would not expect much lateral or tipping movement on the part of either of the twin towers because, among other things, the near free-fall speed of the collapse would not provide the time necessary for such a possibility to take place. Yet, nonetheless, the top 34 stories, or so, of the south tower did tilt away from the rest of the building.

This tipping motion creates something of a problem for both the Eagar and Musso model as well as the Bazant and Zhou explanation concerning the collapse of the south tower. Both of those theoretical models suppose that the downward kinetic vectoring set in motion by buckling columns would lead to a progressively overwhelming set of stresses that, in short order, would compromise the structural integrity of subsequent floor assemblies, along with various segments of perimeter and core columns, on lower stories of the building ... setting in motion a domino or pancaking process as the structural integrity of lower floors was annihilated by the momentum of the upper floors crashing down upon those lower floors.

However, one has to ask the following question: Why would the floors below, say, the 76<sup>th</sup> or 77<sup>th</sup> floors (which mark the bottom-most portion of the

south tower that might have suffered direct damage from the crash of the commercial jet), be subject to a domino effect when the upper 34 stories were tipping away from the building rather than picking up momentum in a straight downward direction?

One also would like to know why the top 34 floors were tipping away from the building at all because this would suggest that not only were there a substantial number of perimeter columns on the west and east side of the south tower that all had been structurally compromised virtually simultaneously, but, as well, there would have had to have been a considerable loss of core column support at the same time. What could have brought about such a massive, simultaneous structural failure of so many perimeter and core columns?

According to a November 9, 2002 article in the *New York Times*, firefighters on the 78<sup>th</sup> floor indicated that there were only a few, small pockets of combustion. They believed that the fires that they encountered could easily be contained and brought under control.

The black smoke coming from the south tower indicated that the fires were largely oxygen starved and, therefore, lacking in intensity. Photographic evidence does not indicate that fires had spread widely through the six floors, or so, which had been most affected by the impact of the jet plane.

The paint analysis on some of the perimeter columns indicates that temperatures did not reach much above 250 degrees Centigrade. Metallographic analysis of some of the samples indicates that none of the columns examined encountered temperatures above 600 degrees Centigrade.

Fires take time to spread in a building with floor space like that in the south tower. The tower collapsed in less than an hour, and, therefore, there just doesn't seem to have been sufficient time for fires to spread and burn with the requisite intensity for a long-enough period of time to compromise the number of perimeter and core columns necessary to cause the top 34 floors to tilt to the west. Furthermore, none of this takes into account any of the factors such as: sprinklers, fireproofing insulation, heat transfer, lack of oxidant, and so on which might impede the compromising of the structural integrity of either the perimeter or core columns as a result of being exposed to fire.

One could, of course, hypothesize that the aforementioned notion of the temperature differential (of 150 degree Centigrade between the outer and inner faces of a column) noted by Eagar and Musso played a substantial role all along the west and east perimeter columns of the south tower and, thereby, led to the simultaneous buckling of a substantial number of columns. The problem with this is that there is little, or no, evidence to substantiate such a hypothesis or demonstrate its likelihood. Furthermore, even if the foregoing temperature differential scenario did occur with respect to the perimeter columns, one has greater difficulty understanding – and even less evidence through which to substantiate such an understanding – how enough of the core columns would have buckled to permit the upper 34 stories of the south tower to tilt to the side as they did.

Finally, even if, for the sake of argument, one were to allow the foregoing simultaneous buckling scenario to stand unchallenged, this still leaves a major question unanswered. If the upper floors are tilting away from the remainder of the building, if the potential energy of those floors is being converted into kinetic energy by the pull of gravity, then how and why should this lead to a progressive collapse of the floors below the portion of the tower that is tilting away from the bottom portion of the tower and, therefore, vectoring its momentum in a lateral downward motion rather than in a straight downward direction?

In addition, available photographic evidence – both video and still pictures – indicates that as the top 34 floors are tilting to the west, there comes a point when that whole section seems to explode or disintegrate. What caused this to occur? Neither Eagar and Musso nor Bazant and Zhou seem to have any explanation for that event.

Bazant and Zhou state that: “In spite of the approximate nature of this analysis, it is obvious that the elastically calculated forces in columns caused by the vertical impact of the upper part must have exceeded the load capacity of the lower part by at least an order of magnitude.” The problem with the foregoing characterization of things is that it is not at all obvious “that the elastically calculated forces in columns caused by the vertical impact of the upper part must have exceeded the load capacity of the lower part by at least an order of magnitude,” and this is so for at least one rather substantial reason.

To begin with, an approximate analysis is not sufficient to show what the authors claim it shows. Earlier, Bazant and Zhou indicated, as

previously quoted, that it is necessary to develop a computer simulation capable of taking into account all of the non-uniform complexities that are at work during the plane crash and subsequent fires in order to properly understand what is transpiring through the dynamics that led up to and are manifesting themselves in the collapse of the towers. Now Bazant and Zhou are claiming that even without a computer simulation model and only armed with an approximate analysis that it is “obvious” that the vertical impact of the upper part “must have exceeded the load capacity of the lower part by at least an order of magnitude.”

The foregoing is only obvious if one assumes one’s conclusions. The reason why a rigorous computer simulation is needed is so that one can test out whether the details of a model that incorporates a lot more empirical data and physical nuances than are being considered by Bazant and Zhou in their approximate analysis will confirm or disconfirm their quickly worked out theoretical hypothesis.

The two authors assume their conclusion in a similar way when they claim: “A computer is not necessary to conclude that the collapse of the majority of columns of one floor must have caused the whole tower to collapse.” Everybody (even the so-called ‘conspiracy theorists’ who are repeatedly referred to by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* in such condescending ways) agrees that a substantial number of columns collapsed, but differences arise over what caused those columns to collapse.

Bazant and Zhou have mastered the obvious by pointing out that the columns of the twin towers collapsed. What is far less obvious is the mechanism that brought about that collapse, and Bazant and Zhou simply have not provided a plausible and viable explanation in that respect for what transpired on 9/11 at the twin towers, not to mention Building 7.

According to Bazant and Zhou: “We may assume that all the impact forces [from the plane crashes] go into the columns and are distributed among them equally. Unlikely though such a distribution may be, it is nevertheless the most optimistic hypothesis to make because the resistance of the building to the impact is, for such a distribution, the highest. If the building is found to fail under a uniform distribution of the impact forces, it would fail under any other distribution.” Leaving aside the issue of whether the building would actually fail under a “uniform distribution of impact forces” (a questionable conclusion in the light of the discussion that already has been presented earlier in this chapter), let’s take



a closer look at their claim that such an assumption (i.e., that impact forces from the plane crash are distributed among the columns equally) is “unlikely”.

I find the foregoing claim to be interesting. The reason underlying this feature of interest is that the foregoing claim raises, once again, questions about the relatively symmetrical nature of the collapse of all three buildings of the World Trade Center. If one introduces asymmetry into the analysis, and if one were to suppose that there were a non-uniform distribution of loads due to impact stresses as well as non-uniform distribution of buckling columns brought about by viscoplastic deformations and/or the requisite sort of temperature differentials between the external and internal faces of a perimeter column, then part of what happened with the upper 34 floors of the south tower becomes understandable since that is an expression of some kind of asymmetric set of forces at work – a set of forces for which neither Eagar and Musso nor Bazant and Zhou provide much of an explanation as to how such asymmetries arose.

Bazant and Zhou stipulate: “the duration of the collapse of the tower, observed to be 9 s, was about the same as the duration of a free fall in a vacuum from the tower top (416 m above ground) to the top of the final heap of debris (about 25 m above ground).” As appears to have been the case in relation to Eagar’s and Musso’s statements about free fall and observed collapse times for the twin towers, Bazant and Zhou have, somehow, come up with a free fall time that is approximately the same as their alleged collapse time of 9 seconds.

Although it might be a matter of quibbling over nothing, there are differences in both the free-fall calculations as well as the observed collapse times between the two sets of scientists. Eagar and Musso have indicated that the free-fall time is about 8 seconds, while the observed collapse time is ten seconds, whereas Bazant and Zhou calculate the free-fall time as approximately 9 seconds (which is closer to my aforementioned figure of 9.22 seconds) and the observed collapse time is about the same as this free-fall figure (although the latter pair of scientists don’t seem to specify an observed time of collapse figure).

By roughly equating the free-fall time and the alleged observed collapse time for the buildings, Bazant and Zhou raise the problem, as did the position of Eagar and Musso, involving the conservation of momentum issue with

respect to a progressive collapse or pancake/domino theory of collapse. That is, the time differential between the calculated free fall for an object from some 1368 feet (the roof height of the 110-storey towers) and the actual, observed time of collapse should be sufficient to account for the time delays that are associated with giving expression to preservation of the conservation of momentum for a collapsing building that is not being brought down by controlled demolition (which is what the authors are assuming).

The authors are assuming that this time differential is negligible, and one would like to know why that time differential should be considered to be negligible. What justifies assuming that the collapse of the twin towers – which are meeting with structural resistance from core columns, perimeter columns, and floor assemblies, as well as inertial resistance from the mass of the floors below the collapsing portions of the towers – would take approximately the same amount of time as it would take a ball dropped off the top of the towers and encountering nothing but air resistance to reach the ground?

The authors, once again, assume their conclusions. They assume that the aforementioned time differential would be negligible without providing an adequate empirical justification for their assumption.

Bazant and Zhou also argue that the kinetic energy generated by the collapse of the buildings “should have acted like a piston running down through an empty tube, which helps to explain the smoke and debris that was seen being expelled laterally from the collapsing tower.” Several problems with their simile are the following: The twin towers were not an empty tube, and the piston-like collapse of the buildings is not being propelled by an independently fueled engine of some kind, but, rather, the building collapse is operating in accordance with the force of gravity that places limits on the amount of kinetic energy that can be generated.

One question that arises under such circumstances is the following: Would the gravity-generated pressure on air within the twin tower buildings have been sufficient to break apart sections of core and perimeter columns weighing many tons and, then, eject those sections of column hundreds of feet in a horizontal and sometimes in a slightly upwardly inclined direction as was observed to be the case on 9/11?

For example, the extensive damage to the southwest face of Building 7 was, supposedly, the result of flying debris that came from the

collapse of the north tower. Building 7 stands some 350 feet from the north tower.

Presumably, if one is talking about 25% of a portion of Building 7 being scooped out – as proponents of the ‘official’ theory proclaim – then one might suppose that something more than a few flying telephones, desks, chairs, and computer terminals was required to create such damage. Presumably, one is talking about sections of various steel columns from the north tower being propelled some 350 feet with sufficient force to scoop out sections along the south west facade of Building 7.

Would the forces created by a gravity dominated collapse have been sufficient to move air with an intensity that would break apart and jettison sections of steel weighing many tons over a distance of 350 feet? Trying to make such a calculation would be complicated considerably by trying to take into account all the nonlinear factors involved in a building collapse that might dissipate the horizontal force of such air pressure.

In the absence of a computer simulation that models, relatively accurately, all of the actual empirical forces involved in the sort of scenario alluded to by Bazant and Zhou, one really has no grounds for arguing that heavy debris, weighing many tons, could have been expelled or ejected from such collapsing structures with sufficient force -- due to the air pressure generated by a gravity dominated collapse -- to be able to cause that debris to travel some 350 feet and, then, proceed to scoop out large sections of Building 7. The force of air pressure generated by a collapsing building might explain some of the dust and debris that is seen emanating from those collapsing buildings, but the force of air pressure that could arise from a gravity-dominated collapse might not be adequate to explain other phenomena that were observed to take place on 9/11 – such as the expelling of steel column sections many hundreds of feet in all directions.

Furthermore, if air pressure resulting from ‘a piston running through an empty building’ (i.e., the collapsing building) is the explanation for the appearance of dust and debris in the twin towers, then one wonders why this phenomenon of air-pressure-induced debris ejection did not seem to occur to the same extent or in the same way when Building 7 collapsed. More specifically, the video of Building 7’s collapse looks somewhat different from the videos depicting the collapse of each of the twin towers. The latter two building collapses seem to involve an

expenditure of more lateral kinetic energy than did the collapse of Building 7 – although these apparent differences might be due to, for example, purely video-graphic considerations having nothing to do with the actual set of forces at work in the collapse of the three buildings.

In relation to the debris ejection issue, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* seeks to inform their readers with the following:

“Like the vast majority of office buildings, the Twin Towers were mostly air. As they pancaked, all that air – along with the concrete, drywall, and other debris pulverized by the force of the collapse – was ejected with enormous energy. ‘When you have a significant portion of a floor collapsing, it’s going to shoot air and concrete dust out the windows,’ NIST lead investigator Shyam Sunder tells *Popular Mechanics*. ‘Those clouds of dust might create the impression of controlled demolition to untrained eyes,’ Sunder adds, ‘but it is the floor pancaking that leads to that perception.’

“Structural engineer Jon Magnusson says that it is a fairly common phenomenon in building collapses. ‘That happens because the air is going to find wherever the weakest points are,’ he says. ‘You could actually have a collapse starting at the top of the building, and the air could come out of the bottom, going down the elevator shafts. It finds the path of least resistance.’ ”(page 45)

I do not have a problem with the idea that the force of air pressure seeking the path of least resistance could have ejected a certain amount of concrete dust, drywall dust, and low weight debris from the collapsing buildings. However, I do have a potential problem with the idea that the force of such air pressure was sufficiently great to eject a wealth of multi-ton sections of steel columns with enough force to land many hundreds of feet from the collapsing building as a variety of evidence indicates was the case.

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* does say that the air in the collapsing building was “ejected with enormous energy”. On the other hand, there is no quantitative figure given concerning what the force of that energy might be, nor is there any test data provided by the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that would provide one with a reasonable idea of what the intensity of such force is likely to be and what sort of force would be necessarily to eject multi-ton steel column sections hundreds of feet through the air.

There is also something of a visualization problem surrounding the whole issue of whether, or not, the air pressure generated by an office building collapsing under the force of gravity would have been sufficient to eject multi-ton steel beam sections several hundred feet, or more, from the collapsing buildings. If air pressure is being generated by collapsing floors, then how would such air pressure be sufficient to rip apart and, with tremendous force, eject sections of steel beams on various floors below the collapse – levels on which the floor assemblies had not, yet, allegedly disassembled under the stress of collapsing floors and which were not, yet, likely to have had their perimeter and core columns structurally compromised through either fire or overwhelming shift load stresses? Furthermore, on the floors where the collapse was taking place, one might suppose that the speed with which a given floor collapses would have interfered with the ability of air pressure created by that collapse to be able to eject multi-ton steel columns from those collapsing floors with sufficient force to sail hundreds of feet through the air.

If the tendency of the air pressure is to follow the line of least resistance, then, the force of most, but not necessarily all, of the generated air pressure might have been mostly downward (through the elevator shafts and stairwells) rather than in a lateral direction. Some dust and a limited amount of relatively low-weight debris might have been ejected from such floors or out through some of the windows on lower floors, but the upper weight limit on what would have been ejected in this manner seemingly would be of a fairly low order.

In addition, notwithstanding Bazant's and Zhou's piston analogy, the twin towers were not completely air-tight cylinders. The air crashes had created 'leaks' in the cylinder on a number of floors in the form of secondary damage. Some of the fires might have created a few more leaks here and there. The elevator shafts were not so well sealed that fire and smoke couldn't enter into some of the floors (as *Debunking 9/11 Myths* indicates on pages 33 and 34) through the shafts.

In the case of a regular piston cylinder, the more holes there are in the cylinder, then, the less compressive force there will be through which one can create intense pressures per cubic inch of cylinder space. Therefore, one wonders what effect all of the structural 'leaks' in any of the collapsing World Trade Center buildings might have had on the efficiency of the 'piston

cylinders' supposedly formed by the interior, core portions of those buildings.

I don't know the answer to the foregoing question, but I would like to have an answer. However, neither *Popular Mechanics*, NIST, *The 9/11 Commission Report*, or Bazant and Zhou offer any sort of concrete, quantitative assistance on this issue.

Bazant and Zhou use a certain amount of mathematical formulae in their article that helps lend an aura of technical rigor to their paper. However, the value of such mathematical tools is only as good as the underlying assumptions permit. Unfortunately, as has been outlined in the foregoing discussion, many of the assumptions on which those mathematical formulae rest seem to be unwarranted, arbitrary, and raise questions that the authors have not addressed in their article.

Facts are more important than having mathematical formulae at one's disposal. However, when one seeks to rush an article into print within days of an event like 9/11 – as Bazant and Zhou did – and before much data has even accumulated or been verified, then one is likely to end up with an article that is rich in formulae but suffering from a dearth of facts – as is true of the article by Bazant and Zhou.

No number of caveats proclaiming that what they are doing is just a preliminary analysis can excuse an absence of empirical data. One wonders why the two authors seem to have felt so compelled to quickly publish the results of an analysis that is of such a preliminary nature that it contains few, if any, relevant or demonstrable facts.

-----

NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) analysts state, and most observers agree, that the vast majority of the jet fuel at the WTC towers would have been consumed within the first few minutes following impact and ignition of that fuel. Therefore, after that initial period of jet fuel-fed fires, other sources of fuel would be needed to keep fires going, and this would come in the form of office furnishings, office supplies, passenger luggage, and whatever other combustibles might be available from the buildings or the planes.

One also would have to take into account such things as: (1) the amount of fire-retardant materials that were present in various office and plane furnishes; (2) the degree of fireproofing remaining on the steel columns;

(3) the effect of sprinkler systems; (4) the heat capacity of various potential combustibles; (5) the amount and flow of air; (6) the amount of combustibles that might have been present at different locations within the building, and, finally, (7) the extent to which radiative transfer might have played a role with the steel columns since heat tends to be radiated away from the point of flame in such columns and, as a result, it takes longer for any particular portion of a steel column that is being heated to reach a certain temperature. In addition, one would have to factor in how long a fire might have lasted in any given location before dying out or moving on, and one would have to try to determine with what intensity a fire burned at any given location.

Building a theoretical model to take all of the foregoing considerations into account and generate an accurate reflection of what might have happened in the real world (in this case, the twin towers) requires making a lot of assumptions. One is making assumptions about how the jet fuel spilled from the plane into the building, and one is making assumptions about what the nature of the heat capacities and combustibility of materials were with which fires might have come into contact, and one is making assumptions about the degree to which fireproofing might have retarded flame intensity, and one is making assumptions about what impact, if any, sprinkler systems might have had on fires, and one is making assumptions about where fires might have ignited, and one is making assumptions about how long or how intensely those fires might have burned, and one is making assumptions about how and where the fire might have spread, and one is making assumptions about the flow of air within the building, and one is making assumptions about how radiative heat loss might have been enhanced (e.g., by the tendency of steel to radiate heat away from the point of heat incidence) or impeded (e.g., by the tendency of soot and flame volume to prevent radiative heat loss) the impact of any given fire, and one is making assumptions about which, if any, perimeter and/or core columns would have been affected by a fire.

Each of the foregoing assumptions constitutes a variable that could significantly affect not only where, when, and how a fire burned in either of the twin towers, but, more relevantly, whether those fires would have been capable of doing sufficient damage to any of the core and peripheral columns in the time available (an hour and 43 minutes, or so, in the case of the north tower, and just under an hour – 56 minutes – in the case of the

south tower) so that the structural integrity of the buildings might have been seriously compromised to such an extent that this helped bring about the collapse of those buildings. The theoretical models that are built from the dynamic interaction of the foregoing sort of array of variables all work on an 'if-then' format – if we know or assume 'x', then possibility 'y' might result.

We might know, approximately, the velocity, mass, and angle with which a given plane hit a tower, and we might know, roughly, the amount of fuel being carried, and we might know the precise architectural and structural specifications for that tower, and we might be able to run tests on how certain kinds of office and plane furnishings might burn, but beyond these known quantities, there is a great deal that is unknown concerning what actually might have transpired within the twin towers following the crash of the planes, and this is so for two reasons: (1) As indicated in the previous chapter concerning the collapse of Building 7, almost all the material evidence was destroyed prior to being exposed to any rigorous process of critical, technical analysis; (2) One cannot reconstruct with any degree of certainty how chance factors within the various buildings might have played out their dynamic among the many variables that need to be taken into consideration concerning how, where, when, for what length of time, with what degree of intensity, and with what effect the fires burned within the towers.

According to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* "A three year study into the collapse of the towers found that plane debris sliced through the utility shafts in both towers' cores." (page 33) Actually, technically speaking, the foregoing claim of the two editors is stated in a potentially misleading manner.

Actually, the three-year study to which the editors allude did not necessarily find anything of the sort that is being alleged by the editors. The three-year study – namely, the report presented to NIST – ended up with, in part, a computer simulation model that is rooted in a variety of assumptions about what might have gone on within the two towers but for which very little factual evidence exists.

When such computer models are being put together, they incorporate a variety of assumptions, data, and mathematical functions that operate on those assumptions and data and, in the process, the analysts write or use a complex software program that generates a simulation of what might have occurred in the twin towers following the crashes by the commercial jets. The model might be an accurate representation of



what transpired, or it might be a distorted and erroneous representation of what happened – but, in both cases it is a reconstruction of events, and, as such, the model is not necessarily a finding of fact, per se.

This computer model didn't establish anything in the way of empirical evidence. What it did accomplish was to create a technical storyline for what might have happened on 9/11 that might be consistent with a certain amount of known facts about the crash events, as well as different structural properties of the WTC buildings, together with a number of presuppositions concerning what might have been the case or could have been the case but, in reality, is unknown.

For example in the *Executive Summary* of the *Final Report* compiled by the National Construction Safety Team on the Collapses of the World Trade Center – a document prepared for the NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) – one finds the following information with respect to the WTC 1 (north) tower: “Within the two floors [the 95<sup>th</sup> and 96<sup>th</sup> floor], 15 to 18 perimeter columns and five to six core columns were severed, and an additional one to three core columns were heavily damaged.” [page 119– for purposes of convenience, I am using the version of the aforementioned executive summary that appears in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*]. The ranges of possibility given with respect to the perimeter columns (15 to 18) and the core columns (five to six) is an indication of the degree of uncertainty surrounding the way in which different variables interact within the context of the model being created to produce various projected outcomes.

If certain things were the case with respect to the way the crash unfolded within the building, then the damage might have been a little less (15 columns rather than 18 perimeter columns and five rather than six core columns). If certain other things were the case with respect to the way the crashing jet interacted with the north tower, then the damage might have been as much as 18 perimeter columns and six core columns.

We are not told how the computer program underlying the simulation is put together. Consequently, one doesn't really know what was being assumed or what data was taken into account, or what kind of physical and mathematical analyses were being used in order to come up with the range of possibilities indicated.

Is it possible that the number of severed columns from the crash could have been more than 18 perimeter columns and 6 core columns? Yes, but, in truth, the investigators don't know.

Is it possible that the number of severed columns might have been less than 15 perimeter columns and 5 core columns. This also is possible -- although there is probably likely to be a lower limit on how far the perimeter columns can be reduced in number just based on photographic evidence -- but, in any event, the investigators are not certain.

Is it possible that when the computer model was run under some sets of variable conditions and assumptions that a range of values could have been generated for the number of perimeter and core columns that might have been higher or lower than the one published in the executive summary? Yes, this is possible.

Is it possible that the published range of severed columns for the north tower was settled on because it seemed to the investigators to represent, in their opinion, the outcome that best reflects what actually might have happened? Yes, this is possible.

Does the public have ready access to any of the considerations that shaped the opinion of the investigators in arriving at the conclusion that one computer model outcome was 'more likely' or 'realistic' or plausible than other possible computer simulation outcomes. No, the public doesn't have ready access to such information.

Consequently, the investigators [and, possibly, not even all of the investigators since not everyone might have been responsible for developing the computer simulation] are the only ones who know precisely what the range statement quoted above means or how the investigators arrived at those figures or what factors were considered, rejected, or not considered at all. The 'finding' to which the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* refer in the aforementioned quote really represents the outcome of an analytical process that has not been properly explained, and, therefore, a reader of the report cannot be sure what one is being told... one can't be sure what the 'finding' means or how defensible that finding is.

I have been told by someone who works within the judicial system that many courts are very reluctant to permit computer simulations to be entered into evidence. One of the reasons for this is because whatever potential

probative value such computer models might have, nonetheless, that value could be far outweighed by the substantial prejudice that might be introduced into a trial through creating a lasting impression in the minds of jurors that what is being put forth as 'fact' is, actually, a judgment generated through a computer program whose structural character is not readily transparent to a juror and whose content might be proprietary and, therefore, not open to adequate analysis by either side in a criminal or civil case.

Since an underlying premise of this book is that the material critically explored herein is being approached through the lens of a hypothetical grand jury, then, while acknowledging that many scientists and engineers might feel quite comfortable with a given computer simulation model, nevertheless, this sense of comfort is not necessarily shared by the judicial system nor by the opposing parties in a given case, and, as a result, the meanings that science ascribes to a computer simulation might not be the same as that which jurors or the law ascribes to that same model. The foregoing problem is exacerbated by the degree of opaqueness that surrounds and permeates the cloud of unknowing within which a given computer simulation program is used as well as the results arising out of that form of modeling.

Similar reservations might be stated in conjunction with the projected results of the computer simulation concerning the number of core columns that were damaged (rather than being severed), or the extent to which those core columns were damaged. To state that between one and three core columns were heavily damaged is not necessarily a reflection of empirical fact but, rather, gives expression to the fact that the analysts, themselves, are uncertain about what transpired within the buildings, and, if they weren't uncertain, they would have given precise figures and not ranges of possibility.

Does the claim that between one and three core columns in the north tower were heavily damaged constitute a 'scientific' opinion? To the extent that scientific methods and mathematical calculations were involved in the shaping of that opinion, then, the answer is yes. Nonetheless, there is also a certain degree of arbitrary conjecture associated with such an opinion, and, therefore, the value or significance of that 'scientific' opinion is of a questionable or uncertain vintage.

Further questions might be asked concerning the claim of the two editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* about how the damage to the core columns created “conduits for burning jet fuel – and fiery destruction through the buildings.” While it is possible that structural damage done to the buildings by the jet crash might have created the foregoing kind of conduits through which jet fuel might have flowed down the utility shafts located in the central section of the building and, thereby, led to fiery destruction throughout the rest of the north tower, the fact of the matter is that this contention of the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is pure conjecture.

Neither the analysts behind the NIST report nor the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* know when or where the fuel tanks in the jet were breached, or in what manner they were breached, or where the jet fuel spilled out once the tanks were breached, or what happened to that jet fuel after it spilled out. Was most of the jet fuel released upon impact as the wings (which contain the jet fuel) severed and were shredded by some of the perimeter columns? How much of the fuel was released and/or burned along the exterior of the buildings? Did some of the fuel reach the utility shafts?

Certainly, some of it, maybe all of it, ignited. However, when, where, how, to what extent, and with what effect that fuel ignited are all unknowns.

Even if one were to grant the assumption that jet fuel flowed down the utility shafts, did the fuel do so in an ignited or non-ignited state? If one assumes that the jet fuel was already ignited as it fell down the utility shaft, then it is possible that whatever flames existed might have burned themselves out entirely within the utility shaft without necessarily setting other floors on fire. If one assumes that the jet fuel that flowed down the utility shaft was not ignited, then one has to provide an explanation for how such fuel was subsequently ignited.

Furthermore, if one assumes that some quantity of jet fuel flowed down the utility shaft, this leads to further issues. How much jet fuel was released into the utility shaft? Was it a lot or only a little? In addition, however one answers the foregoing question, this has implications for the fires on the crash floors, for if a lot of fuel poured down the utility shaft, this means there was that much less jet fuel to support the fires on the floors where the jets crashed and did the most structural damage.

One can grant every conjecture that the NIST's computer simulation makes with respect to how many perimeter and core columns were severed and/or damaged, and this does absolutely nothing to help us understand where the jet fuel spilled, or what fires ensued, or where those fires were located, or how long those fires lasted, or with what intensity they burned.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* maintain that: "The 10,000 page NIST report included the input of hundreds of experts from private industry and academia. A supplement to the report notes that 'elevator lobbies throughout the building were particularly affected by the airplane impacts, likely by excess jet fuel ignited by the crash pouring down the elevator shafts.'"(page 33)

One would like to know the empirical basis on which the report supplement is based. First of all, one doubts that there was sufficient time to inspect all of the elevator lobbies throughout the building to determine what effect, if any, the plane impact had on those lobbies, so what is the empirical basis for the statement?

Secondly, one also would like to know the nature of the empirical basis for claiming that if there were such damage, then it was "likely" due to "excess jet fuel ignited by the crash pouring down the elevator shafts". The report supplement uses the term "likely" because the people who wrote that portion of the report don't actually know what happened, and therefore, the claims of the report supplement is of questionable empirical and scientific pedigree.

However, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* appear to be treating such information as if it were factual and, therefore, capable of lending support to, or substantiating, their earlier statements about how jet fuel poured down the utility shafts and ignited destructive fires throughout the north tower. There is nothing factual or empirical in any of this – just conjecture and speculation.

Is it possible that the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* are correct on this point about fires being ignited throughout the north tower as a result of the jet fuel that was pouring down the utility shafts? Yes, this is a possibility, but possibilities are one thing and facts are another.

Making reference to a report consisting of some 10,000 pages to which hundreds of experts had input – which *Debunking 9/11 Myths* does -- sounds very scientific and rigorous. Nevertheless, none of this quantity or expertise

can necessarily transform speculation into fact, nor can a mere possibility become something more than the available evidence permits.

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* notes how Shyam Sunder, the lead investigator for NIST, claimed that “the core of the building is where a large number of elevator shafts and stairwells were damaged. These provided an easy path for jet fuel to traverse down.” (Page 33) Although it might be true that elevator shafts and stairwells might have offered an easy path for the downward flow of jet fuel if the jet fuel flowed in that direction, what we don’t know is whether jet fuel actually flowed down the elevator shafts and stairwells, and, if it did flow, in what quantities and with what effect.

Shyam Sunder claims that a “large number of elevator shafts and stairwells were damaged”, but there is a lack of specificity about how many elevator shafts and stairwells were damaged, or to what extent they were damaged, or what caused the damage. The reader is being asked to make an inferential leap from: Sunder’s statements about how the elevator shafts and stairwells would have constituted easy routes to a downward flow of jet fuel, to: Sunder’s statement about the extensive damage to the elevator shafts and stairwells ... with the link between the two being a logical leap that the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* would have one make by concluding that it was burning jet fuel that led to the extensive damage of elevator shafts and stairwells.

The link between the two is, at best, speculative and tenuous. The following discussion provides some of the reasons why this is so.

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* indicates that NIST investigators spoke with more than a thousand witnesses and survivors – on the condition of anonymity -- in an attempt, among other things, to try to map out the “progression of damage to the building” (page 33). Moreover, according to *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, NIST reports that a number of witnesses “reported seeing pockets of fire in locations far from floors directly affected by the aircraft impacts.”

One of these reports apparently took place somewhere between the 40<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> floors of the north tower. The survivor who made this report stated: “I saw the elevator in front of me had flames coming out of it. The elevator was closed but the flames came from the front where the doors meet and on the sides ... I saw a chandelier shaking; it was really moving ... Black smoke began filling the corridor, it got really dense, really fast” (Pages 33-34)

From the perspective of hoping to acquire as much information as one can without being thwarted by the possible reluctance of people to not only have their statements aired in public but, as well, attributed to them, the offer of anonymity is understandable. Nevertheless, from a number of other perspectives, such an offer might be of questionable value.

For instance, from a judicial point of view, the reports alluded to by NIST that were collected under the condition of anonymity generate little more than hearsay testimony. There are exceptions to the hearsay rule – such as in relation to some forms of excited utterances -- but NIST conducted its interviews over a period of a number of years, and, consequently, there might be legal problems surrounding the admissibility of such anonymous reports under any of the possible exceptions to the hearsay rule.

On the other hand, my understanding is that hearsay evidence can be introduced into a grand jury proceeding. However, there is nothing to prevent the members of my hypothetical grand jury from inquiring into the credibility of such hearsay evidence.

Some of the issues with which I might be concerned in relation to the anonymous testimony alluded to in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* are the following: How was the offer of anonymity put forth?

For example, were witnesses given the choice of having their testimony recorded with or without attribution? If they were, then why is more prominence not given to non-anonymous reports rather than to anonymous reports? On the other hand, if witnesses were not given such a choice, why did the NIST investigators automatically assume that many witnesses might be unwilling to go on record with whatever information they had?

Whatever the choices were that had been given to surviving witnesses by NIST, the condition of anonymity is problematic especially when only snippets of testimony are presented or only a few exemplars of that testimony are given. With more than a thousand interviews, one is inclined to wonder if what has been presented in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* was representative of what the 1,000-plus witnesses had to say.

Moreover, the public does not have access to those interviews. The public doesn't know what NIST asked the more than a thousand survivors, and,

perhaps even more importantly, we don't know what NIST did not ask those individuals.

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* indicates that "a number of witnesses reported seeing pockets of fire in locations far from floors directly affected by the airplane impacts." (Page 33). How many witnesses made such reports and in what locations? Moreover, the term "pockets of fire" would seem to indicate the fires were relatively small.

How much specific information was transmitted through the anonymous testimony about various elevators and stairwells? How many different people made such reports? How many of the reports were overlapping descriptions of the same elevator shaft and/or stairwells?

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* provides one semi-specific example of a person talking about fire in relation to an elevator door somewhere between the 40<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> floor. Why was the range of floors so large?

To be sure, a person who is caught up in such circumstances is likely to be uncertain about various details for a variety of reasons. Apparently, one of these fuzzy details concerned the exact location of the floor on which the elevator experience transpired.

This uncertainty raises the possibility that the person might have been mistaken about where, exactly, the experience took place. Perhaps it occurred between the 50<sup>th</sup> and 60<sup>th</sup> floors, or between the 30<sup>th</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> floors. On the basis of the information that is being supplied through *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, we just don't know for sure.

Nothing appears in the testimony provided by *Debunking 9/11 Myths* about when the aforementioned elevator event took place. Was it immediately after the jet crashed into the north tower? Was the swinging chandelier spoken of by the witness tied to the impact that the jet crash had on the building, or was it due to some other cause?

The witness being alluded to by NIST and *Debunking 9/11 Myths* in the foregoing quote didn't necessarily know what was fueling the flames, (it might have been something other than a jet fuel fed fire) or how long those flames lasted, or when the flames began, or how extensive and intense those fires were. The witness mentioned flames in conjunction with only one of the elevator doors – and, presumably, there were other banks of elevators nearby. Conceivably, the reported fire, whatever its origin, might have been confined to just one elevator shaft. We just don't know.



The witness did indicate that black smoke had begun to fill the corridor and that the smoke quickly became very dense. Black smoke is an indication of an oxygen-starved fire, and, possibly, the fire associated with the reported elevator fire was on its way to burning itself out as quickly as it might have begun ... we just don't know.

Nobody disputes the existence of fires in either of the twin towers. Questions do arise, however, in conjunction with the nature of those fires, their duration, their intensity, their location, and the extent of the damage that they might, or might not, have inflicted on either perimeter or core columns.

Fires in some of the elevator shafts and/or stairwells does not prove or demonstrate that the core columns had been engulfed in flames or even exposed to flames. All such information shows is that there were some fires of unknown size, duration, and intensity that were in the general vicinity (the elevators and stairwells were housed in the gaps between the core columns).

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* appear to be trying to create the impression that the fires in the twin towers were extensive and sometimes located in places far removed from the crash sites. The editors also are attempting to imply that many of these latter fires were made possible by jet fuel that flowed down the elevator shafts and stairwells, and they seek to buttress that possibility with references to anonymous testimony in the form of a couple of reports drawn from more than a thousand witnesses.

Finally one of the possible implications of the foregoing survivor testimony concerning a fire in one of the elevator shafts is that fires had spread everywhere – including into the elevator shafts – and, therefore, this is an indication that the core columns must have been engulfed in such fires. In actuality, however, such an implication has not been substantiated. All that has been shown is a possibility and not necessarily an actuality.

Without direct access to that testimony and without the ability to question the individuals who provided such accounts, there is very little one can determine about the significance, value, or reliability of such information concerning the fires in the twin towers. As has been intimated in the foregoing, brief discussion, a lot of questions might be asked just in relation to the few semi-specific pieces of testimony that did appear in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* allude – in very limited terms – to survivor testimony concerning the existence of fires in other parts of the twin towers far removed from the floors primarily impacted by the crashing jets. The authors of the WTC collapse report presented to NIST and the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* were not shy about drawing information from their anonymous interviews when it lent some degree of support – even when such support was very tenuous and speculative – to their theory about how the structural damage brought about by plane crashes and ensuing fires led to the collapse of the twin towers.

One wonders, however, why the authors of the WTC collapse report that was presented to NIST or why the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* do not allude to the survivor testimony concerning the issue of explosions that were, allegedly, experienced by many people just prior to the collapse of the twin towers. What is going on?

The possibility of explosions having taken place in the north and south towers of the WTC prior to their collapse has been known about and talked about for years. There is tacit acknowledgment of this controversial issue in a NIST quote that is cited in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* – namely, “NIST has seen no evidence that the collapse of WTC 7 was caused by bombs, missiles or controlled demolition.” (Page 58)

If NIST knew enough about the matter to issue a statement in conjunction with Building 7, then, surely, it had encountered the talk about the idea of explosions in the twin towers. There have been many people – firefighters, police, news correspondents, emergency medical personnel, and people employed in the twin towers – who have given testimony on this issue of explosions.

Were the people who heard, saw, and experienced multiple explosions not among the 1,000-plus witnesses interviewed by NIST? If they weren’t, why weren’t they among the interviewees?

On the other hand, if such people were, in fact, among the people interviewed by NIST, then were those individuals asked whether, or not, they had heard, seen, or experienced any explosions, and, if they weren’t asked this, why not, or, if, on the other hand, the survivors were asked such questions, then why didn’t NIST or the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* disclose that information?

To exclude evidence because it raises potentially inconvenient questions for one's theory of choice-- or because such evidence might be at odds with a theory one is championing or in which one is invested -- is a terrible way to pursue science and technical research. In the judicial system, if someone deliberately hides exculpatory evidence or places obstacles in the way of such evidence being submitted to full and proper discovery, this could be grounds for being disbarred or, at the very least, such actions constitute grounds for sanctions being imposed, and, perhaps, there ought to be a similar sort of official process in the realm of science and engineering such that when people frame their research in a way that favors their own point of view while excluding relevant and material evidence that conflicts with their theory or idea of preference, then perhaps one ought to question the right of such people – no matter what degrees and job experience they have – to label themselves as scientists or serious researchers. In effect, such individuals are doing 'junk science'.

There are only a few short sections in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* on the issue of explosions and the collapse of the twin towers. For example, on pages 35 and 36 of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, the Louie Cacchioli incident is outlined. More specifically, Mr. Cacchioli is a former New York City firefighter – now retired, apparently, due to health reasons stemming from that fateful day – and he almost died on 9/11.

Just after he helped lead 40 people from the north tower, the south tower collapsed. The falling debris nearly finished him off, but he was pulled from beneath some of that debris.

Shortly after being extricated, a *People* magazine employee interviewed him, and the firefighter is reported to have said: "On the last trip up, a bomb went off. ... We think there was [sic] bombs set in the building."

Investigators from *Popular Mechanics* did a follow-up interview with Mr. Cacchioli. During this session, Mr. Cacciocchili said that he had been misquoted in the *People* magazine article.

Mr. Cacchioli stated that he actually said: " 'It sounded like a bomb'. I tried to explain what I meant [after the fact], but it was already out there." Mr. Cacchioli further indicated during the *Popular Mechanics* interview that a variety of people have contacted him in the attempt to get him to say that "there were bombs in the building, but he refuses to do so." (page 36)

I wasn't at the *People* magazine interview, so, I am not in any position to know what Mr. Cacchioli did or didn't say. However, even if one takes the retired firefighter at his word and accepts that he actually only said: "It sounded like a bomb", one is still uncertain what he meant by his statement or what – other than stating the nature of the misquote – he believed needed to be explained above and beyond that correction, or why the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* did nothing to enlighten the reader with respect to any of these questions.

Mr. Cacchioli claimed that he had tried to explain what he meant, but because the *People* magazine article was already out there, he apparently had difficulty getting people to listen to him or to permit him an opportunity to explain what he actually meant by his words. Nonetheless, one is clear that, at least now, the firefighter is saying that although he might have heard something that sounded like a bomb, he did not say on 9/11, and he is not presently saying, that bombs had been set in the north tower.

Okay. He heard something that sounded like a bomb explosion. What caused the sound? Was it a bomb explosion or was it something else?

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* doesn't tell us the answer to these questions. Instead, the book says: "Cacchioli, like every other firefighter contacted by *Popular Mechanics*, accepts that the combination of jet impacts and fire brought down the WTC buildings." (Page 36)

One wonders to which firefighters the investigators for *Popular Mechanics* talked. While it might, or might not, be true, that none of the New York City firefighters who were at Ground Zero believes that anything but the jet crashes and fires led to the collapse of the twin towers, there are quite a few firefighters who have given oral testimony that they heard explosions prior to the collapse of the towers.

This testimony had to be pried loose from the New York City vaults by a Freedom of Information request. This request was resisted by the City of New York all the way to the Supreme Court of New York State before the City lost its fight to keep such testimony secret (the oral testimony reports were finally released on August 12, 2005).

Among others, the aforementioned list of witnesses includes: Chief Frank Cruthers; Chief Brian Dixon; John Sudnik, Battalion Chief; Lieutenant Bradley Mann; Richard Banaciski; Craig Carlsen; Kenneth Rogers; Edward Cachia; Thomas Turilli; James Curran, and Timothy Julian. A number of these

individuals reported hearing a series of explosions in rapid succession – some said as many as ten, while others said they had heard seven or eight explosions.

Assistant Commissioner Stephen Gregory, Captain Karin Deshore, and Lieutenant Evangelista all reported seeing a series of low-level flashes emanating from each of the twin towers prior to their collapse. Several of these individuals reported that these flashes seemed to run sequentially around certain portions of the building that they could see.

The testimony of the firefighters is supported by other first responders. For example, Gregg Brady and Michael Ober, who were both emergency medical technicians on 9/11, as well as Kevin Darnowski and Daniel Rivera, both paramedics, all report having heard explosions prior to the collapse of the twin towers.

[The foregoing information concerning the firefighters and the medical personnel can be verified by going to the following web page of the *New York Times* and downloading the pdf files that give expression to the oral testimony of some 503 firefighters, paramedics, and emergency medical personnel encompassing over 12,000 pages -- which is 2,000 pages longer than NIST's report and no less relevant:

[http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/html/nyregion/20050812\\_WTC\\_GRAPHIC/met\\_WTC\\_histories\\_full\\_01.html](http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/html/nyregion/20050812_WTC_GRAPHIC/met_WTC_histories_full_01.html)

Several reporters from the *Wall Street Journal*, including John Bussey, indicated that they had heard explosions in association with the collapse of the towers. A BBC correspondent, Steve Evans, stationed in New York, reported that he had heard a number of explosions in conjunction with the collapse of the south tower.

Sue Keane, an ex-U.S. Army sergeant who was a police officer from New Jersey, stated that a series of explosions had occurred in the south tower prior to the building's collapse, and she further said that each of the explosions lifted her off the ground and threw her, until, finally, she ended up in an area outside of the south tower. Theresa Veliz, who was employed by a software development company located on the 47<sup>th</sup> floor of the north tower, indicated that as she was trying to evacuate the building, she heard so many explosions going off all around her that she didn't know where to go.

Mike Pecoraro, who was an engineer working with some other people in the sixth sub-basement of the north tower, reports having heard a

substantial explosion while in that sub-basement. They left the sub-basement and proceeded to higher sub-basement floors.

When they reached the C-level, Mr. Pecoraro noted there was a machine shop that used to be there and that had been totally destroyed, and the machine shop contained a 50-ton hydraulic press that was now missing.

As they proceeded to still higher floors in the understructure of the north tower, they discovered that the parking garage was totally destroyed. In addition, on B-level, Mr. Pecoraro testifies that a 300 lb door made of concrete and steel had been wrinkled as if it were “a piece of aluminum foil”.

The north tower had not, yet, collapsed. So, what had caused this kind of extensive damage that was witnessed by Mr. Pecoraro, along with others, and what had caused the explosion that they heard while in the sixth sub-basement?

Last, but certainly not least, is the testimony of William Rodriguez, a twenty-year veteran employee of both the New Jersey and New York Port Authority. On 9/11 he was in charge of maintenance for three of the stairwells in the north tower, and he possessed one of five master keys that permitted access to all of the stairwells in the north tower.

His control of that master key proved to be of great value when he assisted New York City firefighters on 9/11. In fact, Mr. Rodriguez accompanied the firefighters as they went up through various floors of the north tower, and he was the last person to leave the north tower before it completely collapsed.

Mr. Rodriguez actually was feted as something of a hero by President Bush and other officials for his efforts in relation to the north tower tragedy. Yet, despite testifying in closed session for several hours before 9/11 Commission investigators, his testimony never made it into

*The 9/11 Commission Report*, and, furthermore, despite trying to make contact with NIST officials on four separate occasions in order to share with them his experiences on 9/11, nobody from NIST wanted to speak with him.

According to Mr. Rodriguez, he arrived at work at 8:30 a.m. on 9/11. He proceeded to the maintenance office for the north tower that was located in the top sub-basement of a six-floor understructure of the north tower. There were ten, or more, people in the maintenance office, and they were talking among themselves prior to beginning work for the day.

Mr. Rodriguez said they all heard and felt a substantial, very loud explosion that appeared to have taken place on one of the subbasement levels below them – possibly on level B-2 or B-3 of the north tower. He is quite certain that the explosion took place before Flight 11 struck the building, but he also heard other explosions after Flight 11 had crashed into the building.

The latter impact took place a few seconds after the initial explosion noted above. Mr. Rodriguez was of the opinion that whatever happened to produce the second sound took place in the higher part of the building, and that event caused the building to sway back and forth a little for a brief period.

With respect to the first explosion – the one that, according to Mr. Rodriguez, had taken place prior to Flight 11's crash into the building and that occurred somewhere beneath the first sub-basement level -- Mr. Rodriguez tells of a fellow worker, Felipe David, who had been standing near a freight elevator some 350-400 feet from the maintenance office and who was badly burned from an explosion and/or fire that emanated out of the elevator shaft. Somehow, despite being badly injured and probably in shock, Mr. David had made his way to the maintenance office and indicated what had happened.

Part of Mr. Rodriguez's testimony has been corroborated by another individual, Jose Sanchez, who was working in a lower subbasement and later reported that he, and another individual who was with him, heard and felt a very large explosion. A flash of fire then went through the freight elevator.

Mr. Rodriguez subsequently took the injured Felipe David to the surface and returned to the understructure of the north tower. When he got there, the elevator shafts were being deluged with water from the sprinkler systems that had gone off on a variety of floors.

There was so much water flowing down the elevator that people who were working on lower sub-levels but who were trapped due to the explosions were in danger of drowning. Mr. Rodriguez found an extension ladder and lowered it down the elevator shaft to enable people below to escape.

This testimony concerning the huge amounts of water in the elevator shaft bears upon the anonymous testimony acquired by NIST with respect to the individual who encountered flames coming out from an

elevator somewhere between the 40<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> floors and that was briefly discussed, as previously noted, in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*. According to Mr. Rodriguez, there was so much water in the elevator shaft that people were in danger of drowning, and, therefore, one needs to factor in possibly copious amounts of water that was flowing down some, or all, of the elevator shafts and that might have a substantial dampening effect on whatever ignited jet fuel there was that might have flowed down the elevator shafts.

Furthermore, it is conceivable that some of the reports of fire on floors far removed from the point of plane impact in the towers might have been due to explosions from the substructure of the building rather than from ignited jet fuel flowing down from above. Such a possibility has not been proven, but there is at least as much evidence in support of this possibility as there is in support of the hypothesis that fires ignited throughout the towers as a result of jet fuel flowing down the elevator shafts and stairwells.

The editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* do not rigorously explore any of the themes surrounding the issue of explosions. Rather, they just go through the semblance of an examination and, for instance, refer to one ex-firefighter, Louie Cacchioli, who says that he was misquoted but did admit to having heard something that “sounded like a bomb”, or *Debunking 9/11 Myths* makes a reference to the NIST statement that categorically denies having found any evidence to indicate that bombs, missiles, or controlled explosions were involved in the collapse of Building 7.

Unlike the survivor/witnesses to whom NIST alludes for its alleged evidence, none of the foregoing testimonies are anonymous. Furthermore, these non-anonymous sources give expression to evidence that runs contrary, in a very significant way, to the thesis being pushed by NIST and the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that nothing was responsible for the collapse of the twin towers except the structural damage brought about by, first, the jet crashes, and, secondly, the ensuing fires.

Finally, the 9/11 Commission failed to explore any of the oral testimony given by a wide variety of individuals concerning the explosions that were heard, seen, and felt in relation to the collapse of the twin towers. This constitutes an egregious oversight by that report, its investigators, and the Commissioners.

As a member of a hypothetical grand jury, I certainly would like to speak with all the firefighters, police officers, medical personnel, reporters,



engineers, maintenance workers, and other individuals who, on 9/11, reported hearing explosions at Ground Zero, or who heard multiple explosions, or who reported being thrown about by such explosions, or who experienced so many explosions that the individual didn't know where to run, or who saw explosion-like flashes of light running around certain floors of the towers, or saw, first hand, the extensive damage that had occurred on B-level, C-level, and the parking garage in the understructure of one of the towers.

-----

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* contains a short section on an individual by the name of Van Romero who is identified as being associated with the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology. According to *Debunking 9/11 Myths* some people – such as Van Romero – have “become targets of accusations and invective” (page 49) because they have spoken out in a way that has, apparently, displeased the conspiracy theorists.

An article appeared in the *Albuquerque Journal* on September 14, 2001. The article was written by Olivier Uyttebrouck, a staff writer for the *Journal*.

The story ran beneath the following headline: 'EXPLOSIVES PLANTED IN TOWERS,' NEW MEXICO TECH EXPERT SAYS. Although this story once was archived on the paper's web site, the article is no longer available on-line through the *Journal's* web site, but I did manage to locate a copy of that article.

In the article – which is based on a phone interview that took place while Van Romero was in Washington, D.C. on a trip to discuss Defense Department funding for research at the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology -- Van Romero is quoted as saying: “My opinion is, based on the videotapes, that after the airplanes hit the World Trade Center there were some explosive devices inside the buildings that caused the towers to collapse.” Moreover, in the article, Van Romero is said to have indicated that the collapse of the two towers were like the controlled implosions used to bring down old buildings and that the collapses appeared to be “too methodical” to be the result of airplanes crashing into the towers. During the *Journal* interview, Van Romero is depicted as maintaining: “It would be difficult for something from the plane to trigger an event like that.”

According to a follow-up interview conducted by *Debunking 9/11 Myths* researchers, Van Romero claimed that “I was misquoted in saying that I thought it was explosives that brought down the building ... I only said that that’s what it looked like.” I’m a little unclear about the nature of the misquote.

Do people get misquoted by the media? Sure, this happens. On the other hand, quite frequently, when people find themselves between a rock and a hard place with respect to the media and the public, the claim of having been misquoted is a common escape tactic that is used to misdirect attention away from some given issue – in this case, possible explosive devices within the twin towers on 9/11.

However, in reading through the September 14, 2001 *Albuquerque Journal* article by Olivier Uyttebrouck, the idea of a misquote becomes somewhat problematic because there are too many other quotes attributed to Van Romero in the story that seem to substantiate the character of the lead headline as an accurate reflection of what the reporter claims was said during the phone interview. For example, the collapse of the twin towers was described as being “too methodical” to be due to the airplane crashes, Van Romero is reported to have said. As indicated above, he also is reported to have said: “It would be difficult for something from the plane to trigger an event like that.” And, finally, Uyttebrouck quotes Van Romero as saying: “My opinion is, based on the videotapes, that after the airplanes hit the World Trade Center there were some explosive devices inside the buildings that caused the towers to collapse.”

Apparently, Van Romero was misquoted on three different occasions in the same article. On each occasion, he didn’t really say any of the things that have been attributed to him, but, rather, merely said that based on what he saw on video, it only looked like explosions brought down the building.

If what Van Romero says is true, then he wasn’t misquoted. Instead, an entire story was fabricated. If what Van Romero is saying is true, the reporter took his statement that ‘it looked like explosives brought down the building’ and totally invented words that do not even approximate what was actually said.

Of course, such a possibility is not totally implausible. There are instances such as what happened with Jayson Blair, while working at the *New York Times*, and how he concocted entire scenes based on his

imagination rather than actual evidence. Or, one might cite the case of Steven Glass and *The New Republic* in which he was found to have included fabricated material in 27 of 41 articles that he wrote for the magazine in the late 1990s. Or, one might mention Patricia Smith, an award-winning writer, who was fired in 1998 from the *Boston Globe* for inserting fictional individuals into a number of her columns about, supposedly, real human beings.

However, Van Romero doesn't say that the *Albuquerque Journal* piece was a complete work of fiction – only that he was misquoted. Perhaps he was being gallant.

According to *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, a second article appeared in the *Albuquerque Journal* on September 22, 2001. This story was entitled: "Fire, Not Extra Explosives, Doomed Buildings, Expert Says." In this second article, Van Romero is quoted as saying: "Certainly the fire is what caused the building to fail." Mr. Romero also is described in the second article as indicating that he has received a substantial amount of e-mail from 'conspiracy theorists' and with respect to such communications Mr. Romero is quoted as saying: "I'm very upset about that ... I'm not trying to say anything did or didn't happen."

The second article from the *Journal* says: "Romero [now] supports other experts, who have said the intense heat of the jet fuel fires weakened the skyscrapers' steel structural beams to the point that they gave way under the weight of the floors above". One has difficulty trying to reconcile this statement with the words being attributed to Mr. Romero above when he claimed that "I'm not trying to say anything did or didn't happen."

One can't have it both ways. Either Mr. Romero would like to remain neutral by refusing to admit that "anything did or didn't happen", or, he believes that "Certainly the fire is what caused the building to fail." To offer both statements within one and the same interview seems, at the very least, to be rather inconsistent.

One wonders what evidence was considered by Mr. Romero between September 14, 2001, the date of the first article in which he seemed to indicate that explosives might have been involved in the collapse of the twin towers, and September 22, 2001, the date of the second article in which Mr. Romero apparently sought to distance himself from the first article by 'clarifying' his position vis-à-vis the misquotes. In a little over one week, Mr. Romero has gone from: possibly claiming that

explosives might have been involved in the collapse of the twin towers, to: “certainly fire is what caused the building to fall”.

At the time of the second *Albuquerque Journal* article, neither the FEMA nor the NIST reports had been compiled. In fact, there was very little empirical data concerning the collapse of the three World Trade Center buildings that had been collected by the time of the second *Journal* article on the Romero issue.

Consequently, how did he acquire such certainty in the absence of any rigorous and empirically verifiable modeling of the collapse? Is this what scientists and engineers do ... make statements of certainty in the absence of experimentation and reliable empirical data?

Yet, according to the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, Mr. Romero felt it was necessary to clarify his position in the second *Albuquerque Journal* article because: “I felt like my scientific reputation was on the line.” (Page 49) How does one salvage a scientific reputation by making statements – such as those that are attributed to Mr. Romero in the second *Journal* article – which are not based on anything remotely resembling scientific method or rigorous technical analysis?

As it turns out, Van Romero is not your average ‘man-in-the-street’. At the time of the September 14, 2001 phone interview, he was a research vice president at New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology. Moreover, according to the *Albuquerque Journal* article of September 14, 2001, the Institute frequently “assists in forensic investigations into terrorist attacks, often by setting off similar explosions and studying the effects,” and it was in conjunction with such work that Van Romero was in Washington, D.C. on September 11, 2001.

In the September 14, 2001 *Albuquerque Journal* – the first one – Mr. Romero is reported to have indicated that “If explosions did cause the towers to collapse, the detonations could have been due to “a relatively small amount of explosives placed in strategic points.” The article further describes Mr. Romero as saying that: “The explosives likely would have been put in more than two points in each of the towers.”.

The foregoing article statements substantially undermine Mr. Romero’s subsequent claims that he was misquoted – that all he said was that it ‘looked like’ explosives brought down the building. Unless all of these words were totally fabricated by the *Albuquerque Journal* staff

reporter, Mr. Romero is doing something in the above attributions that is more than merely stating that it looked like explosives might have been involved.

Indeed, Mr. Romero is outlining a whole scenario of how the collapsing towers might have been brought about. The *Journal* article goes on to report that Mr. Romero relates how terrorists often use initial attacks as a diversionary tactic to draw emergency personnel to the scene before setting off a secondary explosive device. According to the article, Mr. Romero stated that if that scenario is correct with respect to the twin towers, then the planes flying into the twin towers might have been such a diversionary attack ... a prelude to subsequent explosive devices being set off in the buildings.

The above information leads to another problem. On page 47 *Debunking 9/11 Myths* provides an account of an interview that *Popular Mechanics* conducted with Mark Loizeaux, an executive with Controlled Demolition, Inc. -- a company operating out of Phoenix, Maryland, founded by Mr. Loizeaux's father and that was involved in the cleanup at Ground Zero.

During this interview, Mark Loizeaux critiques the claims of a Brigham Young University physicist, Steve Jones, who has maintained that as little as 2,000 lbs of RDX-grade charges could have brought the twin towers down if those explosives had been strategically placed throughout the tower buildings. *Debunking 9/11 Myths* states: "According to Loizeaux, Jones is simply wrong. "The explosives configuration manufacturing technology [to bring down those buildings] does not exist ... If someone were to attempt to make such charges, they would weigh thousands of pounds apiece. You would need forklifts to bring down the building." (Page 46)

Yet, in the September 14<sup>th</sup> *Albuquerque Journal* article, Van Romero - who conducts research into the use of explosives by terrorists and who often is engaged in reproducing such explosions and who works in association with the Pentagon on such projects - claims that a relatively small amount of explosives could have been effective if placed in strategic locations within the buildings. Van Romero didn't specify a quantity, but his words didn't seem to imply that one would need forklifts to bring such charges into the buildings.

Perhaps, Mr. Romero was misquoted here as well. Perhaps, what he actually said is that one would need forklifts to bring the necessary amount

of explosives into the twin towers but, instead, was described by the *Journal* as saying that only a relatively small amount of strategically placed explosives could have brought the buildings down.

If this is the case, then one wonders why – when he had a chance to do so in the second *Journal* article – Mr. Romero didn't add words to the effect that it would be silly for anyone to suppose that short of fork-lifting tons and tons of explosives into the twin towers, there was no way that explosives could have brought those towers down. If Mr. Romero was misquoted on these issues as well, why didn't he also set the record straight on this matter?

According to *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, Mr. Romero told *Popular Mechanics* researchers that he was concerned about his scientific reputation. However, in the light of what Mark Loizeaux has stated, Mr. Romero is, in effect, being lumped in with Steve Jones as someone who doesn't know what he is talking about – namely, that a relatively small amount of the right kind of explosives placed in strategic locations could have brought the twin towers down.

Here we have two alleged experts in the area of explosives – Van Romero and Mark Loizeaux – who appear to be expressing differences about what would be necessary to bring down the twin towers. I don't know which, if either of them, should be believed, but I think they both would be good candidates to bring before my hypothetical grand jury in order to be able to critically probe what they did or didn't say, or what they did or didn't mean, or what they did or didn't know.

There is something else arising from the statements of Mark Loizeaux that might be true but is not very clear. More specifically, he stated in the *Popular Mechanics* interview that “The explosives configuration manufacturing technology [to bring down those buildings] does not exist.” Yet, apparently, plane crashes and fires were enough to bring those buildings down.

The role played by the plane crashes was to create a certain amount of structural damage and, then, to generate the initial fuel-fed fires that would lead to further fires that could – either through heat differentials of the right kind between the outer and inner faces of a steel beam (Eagar's and Musso's thesis) or vicoplastic deformation (Bazant's and Zhou's thesis) – set in motion a progressive collapse or failure of the entire buildings. Surely, in theory, someone might have been able to set a series of explosive devices that could have reproduced the effects of what the 'official account'

(damage caused by plane plus fires) claims actually happened on September 11, 2001, and, consequently, I find Mr. Loizeux's statement that the "explosives configuration manufacturing technology does not exist" somewhat problematic. More specifically, if planes and fires could bring down a building, then so could explosives that were strategically set to bring about the same kind of structural damage as is claimed to have taken place by the "official account".

According to *Debunking 9/11 Myths*: "The biggest commercially available charges, Loizeaux tells *Popular Mechanics*, are able to cut through steel that is three inches thick. The box columns at the base of the World Trade Center towers were 14 inches on a side. If big enough charges did exist, Loizeaux says, for each tower it could hypothetically take as long as two months for a team of up to 75 men with unfettered access to three floors to strip the fireproofing off the columns and then place and wire the charges. "There's just no way to do it," Loizeaux says." (Pages 46-47)

Mr. Loizeaux mentions "the biggest commercially available charges". He does not say anything about charges that might not be commercially available but which still might be in existence or capable of being produced by individuals – either with prior military training or with expertise acquired in some other way – who either already have or who might be able to create such 'tools'.

Moreover, in the foregoing quote, Mr. Loizeaux begins talking hypothetically about how many men would be needed for how long a period of time and how they would need unfettered access to three floors to be able to strip fireproofing, plane and wire the charges in order to be able to pull off such a feat. If the requisite "explosives configuration manufacturing technology does not exist," one wonders why Mr. Loizeaux even bothers to entertain such a hypothetical proposition, because by engaging in such a hypothetical exercise, he implies that the requisite explosives configuration manufacturing technology might exist but the logistics surrounding the use of such technology, rather than the technology per se, would be the obstacle to implementing any plan involving that technology.

Mr. Loizeaux is vague about what kind of explosives might be used in his hypothetical scenario. He also is vague about the quantity of such an explosive that would be needed.

If one doesn't know the nature of the explosives technology to be used (and since Mr. Loizeaux says that such technology does not exist, he is

really talking out of ignorance rather than from an informed understanding of, in his opinion, such non-existent technology) and if one doesn't know the quantity of such explosives that would be needed to bring down the twin towers, then how " does one know it would take as long as two months for a team of up to 75 men with unfettered access to three floors to strip the fireproofing off the columns and then plane and wire the charges." What Mr. Loizeaux says might, or might not, be true, but it is totally speculative and conjectural.

Furthermore, as already has been discussed earlier in this chapter, at least one massive explosion was not only reported coming from the area of some of the lower sub-basements of the north tower prior to the impact of the first hijacked jet, but these explosions were also felt and the tremendous damage arising from those explosions was seen by people working in those sub-basements. In addition, as also has been previously discussed, numerous firefighters, emergency medical personnel, reporters, and people who worked in the World Trade Center reported hearing and seeing the flashes from what were believed to be a variety of explosions taking place at different locations within the twin towers prior to their collapse.

The foregoing reports suggest the possibility that when Mr. Loizeaux states that such: "explosives configuration manufacturing technology does not exist," then possibly, he might not know as much as he claims to know about those sort of matters. At the very least, such testimony appears to be at odds with some of Mr. Loizeaux's foregoing claims.

There is another factor that bears upon the present discussion, and this has to do with the issue of the need to have unfettered access to different parts of the world trade centers if explosive charges were to be planted. According to a September 24, 2001 article in *People's* magazine, Ben Fountain, a financial analyst employed by the Fireman's Fund located in the south tower, stated that there had been a number of evacuations in the two towers prior to 9/11. In addition, Scott Forbes, a employee of Fiduciary Trust, located in the south tower, indicated that on the week-end prior to 9/11, there was a power down in the building on the fiftieth floor and above that meant that this area of 60 floors was without any form of video or electronic surveillance or security.

Perhaps, the foregoing pieces of testimony are apropos of nothing and merely constitute a strange but innocent set of circumstantial



coincidences. On the other hand, the aforementioned series of World Trade Center evacuations in the weeks leading up to 9/11 and the power down for 36 hours on the weekend prior to 9/11 might have provided someone with opportunities for the sort of unfettered access that was alluded to by Mr. Loizeaux during his previously noted interview with *Popular Mechanics*.

According to a November 19, 2001 article by John Seabrook in *The New Yorker* magazine -- which, among other things, contained portions of an interview with Mark Loizeaux -- Mr. Loizeaux stood alone among all of the experts on building construction with whom Mr. Seabrook spoke as one who said that he knew "within a nanosecond" of learning about planes hitting the twin towers that the buildings were going to collapse. When asked to elaborate on how he knew what he knew, Mr. Loizeaux put forth a 'plane-crash-and-fire-damage' theory -- that is, what would come to be known as the 'official story' -- which was rooted in a number of assumptions involving: hot fires being fed by plenty of oxygen; severed perimeter columns; floor trusses made of thin metal; fires spreading everywhere; fire-protection that had been knocked off; sprinkler systems that had been sheared off due to the crashes; and water pipes that likely had been cut.

The problem with all the foregoing is that there is almost no empirical data to substantiate any of Loizeaux's reasoning -- especially given the date/time (i.e., prior to the November 19, 2001 publication date of the article) during which he is likely to have put forth this line of reasoning and, therefore, prior to the release of much in the way of scientific/engineering studies concerning the WTC building collapses. For example, as has been previously discussed, the tower fires were not as hot as Mr. Loizeaux tries to give the impression is the case during his interview with Mr. Seabrook -- indeed, in some of the photographs of the north tower, one can see people standing and lying down at the edge of the hole created by Flight 11. Secondly, there is ample evidence to indicate that after the first ten minutes, or so, following impact, many of the fires were relatively oxygen starved. Thirdly, the fact that some two-thirds of the perimeter columns might have been severed on the sides impacted by the planes would not have been able to appreciably compromise the structural integrity of buildings that had been designed and built with redundant safety features for redistributing stress loads. Fourthly, the floor truss assemblies were considerably more complex and substantial than what is described by Mr. Loizeaux in his interview with Mr. Seabrook, and the sturdiness of those

assemblies was attested to by the previously mentioned Underwriter's Laboratory tests. Fifthly, Mr. Loizeaux's bold contentions to the contrary, there is little, or no, evidence to indicate that the water sprinkler heads had been shorn off by the airplane crashes or that the water pipes had been cut, or that fires had spread everywhere (although, for a relatively short time, some of the fires might have been substantial), or that the fire-proofing was knocked off of the steel columns in just the right places and/or to a degree that would have reduced the fire-retardant protection of the steel columns down to zero (although the NIST report, on the basis of its simulation studies, does imply that something very similar to this did occur).

Yet, somehow, Mr. Loizeaux knew" within a nanosecond" of learning that planes had hit the twin towers that the towers were going to collapse. If he knew anything at all beforehand concerning the collapses, I have my doubts that his 'knowledge' was because of the line of reasoning that he gave to Mr. Seabrook.

In fact, apparently, Mr. Loizeaux is somewhat confused about what it means to 'know' something. On September 11, 2001, he might have guessed that the buildings would come down, or he might wondered if the buildings were going to come down, or he might have hypothesized that the buildings would come down, or he might have conjectured that the buildings could come down, but he didn't know that the buildings were going to collapse because on September 11, 2001 he presumably didn't have any of the facts, data, or experimental results that would have entitled him to say that he knew what was going to happen to those buildings.

*The New Yorker's* Seabrook article indicates Mr. Loizeaux stated that: "the second tower will fall first because it was hit lower down." One wonders about the engineering or scientific basis on which such a statement rests.

Quite frankly, the statement makes absolutely no sense unless one knows the extent of the damage. It is the quantity and nature of the damage that matters, not necessarily whether, or not, one building might have been struck twelve, or so, stories below the place where the other building was hit.

All that is accomplished by Mr. Loizeau's apparent prescient, but rationally unsupported, claims on September 11, 2001 concerning the collapse of the twin towers is to incline one to question Mr. Loizeaux's scientific credibility. On

either scientific or engineering grounds, Mr. Loizeaux could not possibly have known what he claimed to have known on September 11, 2001 just nanoseconds after learning that planes had crashed into the north and south towers of the World Trade Center.

Making such claims to knowledge does not enhance his scientific credibility but diminishes it – at least in my eyes. Furthermore, once someone’s credibility begins to show fault lines due to such reckless, unsubstantiated statements, then everything else the person says runs the risk of being disbelieved or discounted even if it turns out that what such an individual says might be true, and no one but Mr. Loizeaux, himself, has placed his own account of things concerning 9/11 in such a tenuous predicament.

Interestingly, *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, makes a special effort to point out how the technical expertise of Steven Jones -- the aforementioned physicist from BYU with whose theories on explosives Mark Loizeaux takes exception -- involves “metal-catalyzed, or cold, fusion, a speciality that is unrelated to engineering or the performance of tall buildings. Yet, he challenges the conclusions of some of the world’s leading engineering experts ...” (Page 47) Therefore, it seems only fair to point out that Mark Loizeaux expressed an opinion on September 11, 2001 within nanoseconds of learning that planes struck the twin towers to the effect that the two buildings were going to collapse, even though his opinion was not shared or voiced by any other expert on the construction of tall buildings with whom John Seabrook spoke.

One possible moral of the foregoing point is that challenging conclusions of some of the world’s leading engineering experts is neither here nor there if what one says turns out to be correct. To the extent that it is true that Mark Loizeaux actually did predict, on September 11, 2001, that the towers were going to collapse, then he ‘foresaw’ something that not one other expert in the world believed would happen, even if Mr. Loizeaux couldn’t possibly have known or understood why the building would collapse because he didn’t have the necessary facts or data at that time. In a parallel sort of manner, conceivably, Steven Jones might also be correct in what he claims concerning the issue of explosives and the World Trade Center even though in doing so he is challenging “some of the worlds’ leading engineering experts” and even though he might not know exactly how, or by whom, the buildings were rigged with explosives.

-----

Finally, before moving on to other issues, some attention ought to be given to the matter of motives with respect to the making of statements. For example, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* describes how so-called conspiracy theorists have sought to attack the credibility of Van Romero's clarification in the second *Albuquerque Journal* article in which he is reported to have corrected the misquotes being attributed to him in the September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2001 *Journal* article that indicated he allegedly claimed explosives might have been used to bring the twin towers down on 9/11.

The supposed discrediting tactic involves pointing out that Van Romero's research at the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology is funded by the Pentagon/Defense Department. The *Debunking 9/11 Myths* portrayal of the conspiracy theory argument continues on by pointing out how the conspiracy theorists's suggest that explicit or implicit pressure might have been brought to bear on Mr. Romero or the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology in order to get him to change his story concerning the September 14, 2001 article in the *Albuquerque Journal*.

According to *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, Mr. Romero has gone on record as saying: "Conspiracy theorists came out saying that the government got to me. This is the furthest thing from the truth." (Page 49)

Mr. Romero might be telling the truth in the foregoing. Nonetheless, one does not have to be a conspiracy theorist to raise questions concerning motives with respect to the two September 2001 articles in the *Albuquerque Journal* concerning Van Romero.

In 'The Science of Persuasion', an article appearing in the February 2001 edition of *Scientific American*, John Cialdini -- author of, among things, *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion* -- talks about a 1998 study published in *The New England Journal of Medicine*. This latter study found that only 37% of researchers who published results critical of the safety of a calcium channel blocker pharmaceutical had previously received financial considerations from drug companies, whereas among those researchers who published favorable results concerning the safety of such a drug, 100 percent of the researchers had previously received financial considerations from pharmaceutical companies.

In other words, researchers who had been funded by the pharmaceutical industry were some 2-3 times more likely to reach favorable conclusions concerning the safety of a given drug than were individuals who had not been funded by the same pharmaceutical industry. This principle of funding-influenced research is present in a great many areas of both government-funded as well as privately-funded research.

Does the fact that Van Romero and the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology received funding from the Pentagon/Defense Department necessarily mean that the former succumbed to pressure from the latter to change the September 14, 2001 *Albuquerque Journal* article? No, the presence of such funding doesn't necessarily mean that pressure was brought to bear by the government, nor does it necessarily mean that even if such pressure were applied that either Van Romero or the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology buckled under such pressure.

Having said the foregoing, merely raising the question of a possible relationship between funding and an apparent change in public statements is neither necessarily an attempt to illicitly discredit someone, nor does it necessarily constitute an exercise in character assassination or some form of conspiracy theory. For any grand jury or regular trial jury such issues are standard procedure and legitimate issues to probe when seeking to assess the credibility of a given witness or piece of testimony.

Similar sorts of questions concerning motives also might be asked in relation to Mr. Loizeaux without having to venture into conspiracy-tainted territory. After all, Mr. Loizeaux's company was the beneficiary of a contract involving certain aspects of the cleanup at Ground Zero, just as his company had been the beneficiary of a contract to help clean up in the aftermath of the 1995 Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building bombing in Oklahoma City.

Everything involving Mr. Loizeaux and Controlled Demolitions, Inc. might be perfectly above board and totally ethical. However, probing to gauge whether, or not, there might have been any kind of causal link between contracts received (in the past or, possibly, even in the future) and the character of public statements that were made by Mr. Loizeaux can also be an entirely ethical process in which to engage.

Not biting the hand that feeds one is a well-established practice in the business world. Exploring such a possibility does not require one to suppose that some sort of conspiracy is taking place. On the other hand, raising such an issue might have, potentially, direct relevance to assessing the credibility of a given witness's testimony – in this case, that of Mr. Loizeaux.

-----

According to *Debunking 9/11 Myths*: “NIST believes a great deal of the fire-proofing insulation was likely knocked off the surviving columns in the impact, leaving them more vulnerable to the heat. In WTC2, for instance, NIST found that the impact stripped fireproofing insulation from trusses that supported 80,000 square feet of floor space.” (page 38)

Actually, to be precise, NIST did not find “that the impact stripped fireproofing insulation from trusses.” The NIST report is based on a simulation that: assembled data from the structural features of the airplanes, as well as used data derived from the character of the aircraft impacts, along with data from the structural properties of the buildings, then mixed in some assumptions about what might have happened as a result of the coming together of all of the foregoing features, and proceeded to manipulate such variables within the mathematical formulae that were being used to model the collapse events on 9/11.

NIST did not find that the impacts stripped fireproofing insulation from the trusses because it had no direct empirical evidence to substantiate such a claim. Rather, the simulation model that was constructed indicated that the plane impact and subsequent aftermath might have caused, among other things, the stripping of insulation from some of the trusses.

If the model was a good one, then a certain level of confidence can be placed in the inferential and mathematical products arising out of that simulation. If the model was not so good as a result of the use of incorrect data, and/or questionable assumptions, and/or inappropriate mathematical tools, and/or faulty variable manipulation, then any conclusions that stem from the running of the simulation rooted in such considerations might be, empirically and scientifically, on shaky grounds.

There are many unknowns involved in such a simulation. For example: precisely how much fireproofing was stripped from the various trusses; exactly where in the buildings did such stripping occur; did fires

burn in all of these areas (for example, one needs to factor in such things as to what extent the plane, or parts thereof, might have been resting on such stripped sections and, as a result, served to impede, to a degree, whatever fires might have been burning in those areas); how intensely did the fires burn; how long did those fires burn; what factors might have retarded the fire – such as water sprinklers, jet fuel spillage patterns, oxygen supply, the degree to which office furniture was fireproofed, the extent to which metal filing cabinets might have resisted and/or contained the spread of certain parts of the fire, as well as the question of how much fireproofing might have survived the impact in relation to either the floor trusses or the columns.

All of the foregoing issues give expression to variables. Assumptions are made about what did and did not occur in conjunction with those variables. Variables are manipulated in accordance with these assumptions. Quantitative results are spit out on the basis of the manner in which manipulated variables are fed into various mathematical formulae and equations . Simulations structure the way all of the foregoing factors interact according to a set of programmed algorithms and protocols.

According to *Executive Summary of the Final Report of the National Construction Safety Team on the Collapse of the World Trade Center*: “The insulation damage estimates were conservative as they ignored possibly damaged and dislodged insulation in a much larger region that was not in the direct path of the debris but was subject to strong vibrations during and after the aircraft impact. A robust criterion to generate a coherent pattern of vibration-induced dislodging could not be established to estimate the larger region of damaged insulation.” (page 133 - For the sake of my convenience, I am using the pagination of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* with respect to the *Executive Summary* which appears as an appendix in that book).

Apparently, the intended implication of the term “conservative” in the above quote seems to be something along the following lines. There really was a great deal more damage to insulation than what the NIST *Executive Summary* indicates, but since the *Summary* is not factoring this more extensive damage into its account, the conservative estimates that are being used in the NIST *Executive Summary* constitutes the ‘best case’, most ‘optimistic’ scenario for what might have happened in the buildings–yet, despite such ‘conservative’ calculations, simulations can be constructed

which show that the collapse of the twin towers would have taken place even without taking such extra data into consideration.

On the other hand, the foregoing paragraph from the *Executive Summary* of the NIST report stipulates: “A robust criterion to generate a coherent pattern of vibration-induced dislodging could not be established to estimate the larger region of damaged insulation.” Another, more prosaic, way of saying the foregoing is that the researchers have no idea what happened in the larger area outside the area directly affected by the debris created by the plane’s impact into the interior of the buildings.

If one doesn’t know what happened in the larger area beyond the sections directly affected by the plane’s impact, one is not in a tenable position to maintain that one’s estimates are “conservative” without making an assumption. This assumption is that there was much more damage to insulation due to “vibration-induced dislodging” than one can prove or for which one can provide evidence in support of the foregoing assumption.

Is such an assumption warranted? If “a robust criterion to generate a coherent pattern of vibration-induced dislodging” cannot be established, then there really is nothing on which to base the plausibility of such an assumption other than pure conjecture and speculation – neither of which is, scientifically speaking, likely to be very “robust”.

The NIST *Executive Summary* states: “For WTC 1, partitions were damaged and insulation was dislodged by direct debris impact over five floors (floors 94,95,96,97 and 98) and included most of the north floor areas in front of the core, the core, and central regions of the south floor areas, and on some floors extended to the south wall.

“For WTC 2, partitions were damaged and insulation was dislodged by direct debris impact over six floors (floors 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83) and included the south floor area in front of the core, the central and east regions of the core, and most of the east floor area and extended to the north wall.” (pages 133-134)

Keeping in mind that the foregoing quote represents a ‘picture’ being generated by a modeling process rather than an actual empirical accounting of what transpired in the two buildings, there are some questions that can be raised concerning the nature of that ‘picture’. For example, while one can accept the general idea that insulation was dislodged as a result of direct



debris impact, the devil, so to speak, might be in the details – such as in: How much fireproofing insulation was lost at any given location with respect to the core columns, perimeter columns, or the floor trusses?

The researchers really cannot assign a reliable quantitative figure to the foregoing question. There are too many variables that might affect the final outcome of where and how much fireproofing might have been dislodged as a result of flying debris created by the impact of the planes.

As a result of dislodged fireproofing insulation, some areas of the impacted floors might have been more vulnerable to the effects of fire than other areas. But what does it mean to be more vulnerable?

Does this mean that absolutely every last vestige of fireproofing got dislodged from all four sides of every column? Or, does it mean that some unknown amount of fireproofing was dislodged from various columns at different points along those columns even as other portions of the same columns retained a greater amount of fireproofing?

With full fireproofing insulation, a given steel beam might be able to resist the potential viscoplastic deforming effects of a fire with the right temperature for up to two hours. On the other hand, conceivably, with less fireproofing insulation remaining due to dislodgment, the fire-resistant qualities associated with a given steel column might be reduced down to, possibly, an hour or a half-hour or fifteen minutes.

Without direct empirical observation, testing, and verification, one is only guesstimating in relation to how much fireproofing insulation might have been dislodged due to flying debris from an airplane crash. Without direct observation, then, seemingly, one might not be able to establish, with any empirical reliability, what degree of fire-resistance might have been retained by any given area of a steel column on any of the floors directly affected by the WTC airplane crashes.

Moreover, even if one accepts the general idea that fireproofing insulation was dislodged as a direct result of airplane crash-induced debris damage, one cannot be certain that fires burned directly adjacent to, or contiguous with, such points of vulnerability. Furthermore, one cannot be certain, or even reasonably certain, that fires in the vicinity of these points of heightened vulnerability burned with sufficient intensity or for a long enough period of time to compromise the structural integrity of the

columns via either viscoplastic deformation or the sort of temperature differential discussed earlier in relation to the Eagar/Musso theory of building collapse.

If some amount 'x' of fireproofing insulation was dislodged from a certain part of a steel column, but there was still some amount of insulation residue remaining that afforded even ten or fifteen minutes of resistance, then this increases the amount of time that a fire would have to burn at the minimum requisite temperature to bring about the beginning of viscoplastic deformation. Moreover, there are many unknowns with respect to how to factor in such things as water sprinklers or other variables (e.g., oxygen supply, amounts and kinds of fuel) that might have shaped the extent, intensity, duration, and location of various fires within the buildings.

In addition, even given that fireproofing insulation was dislodged, this does not eliminate such dislodged insulation from possibly still playing a role with respect to containing or dampening the fires. Dislodged fireproofing doesn't disappear. It goes somewhere, and, maybe, where it went played some sort of fire-retardant role with respect to the fires.

For example, although the plane crash might have stripped substantial portions of the fireproofing insulation on the floor assemblies across that the planes skidded, this stripped insulation was redistributed elsewhere. Where did such truss fireproofing get redistributed and what role, if any, did it play in the nature, intensity, duration, direction, and effect of some of the fires?

The issue of dislodged insulation is not an unimportant consideration. The NIST *Executive Summary* states: "The towers would not have collapsed under the combined effects of aircraft impact and the subsequent multi-floor fires if the insulation had not been widely dislodged or had been only minimally dislodged by aircraft impact." (page 130 - underlining added)

Furthermore, as noted earlier, even if one grants the idea that fireproofing insulation might have been dislodged, and even if one pushes aside, for the moment, the question of whether there was the sort of "widely dislodged" fireproofing that the *Executive Summary* suggests is necessary for its theory of building collapse to work, the issue of dislodged insulation is actually not enough, in and of itself. As indicated earlier, fires of the right intensity and duration must reach the points of vulnerability.

The NIST *Executive Summary* indicates: “None of the recovered steel samples showed evidence of exposure to temperatures above 600 degrees C [1, 112 degrees F] for as long as 15 minutes. This was based on NIST annealing studies that established the set of time and temperature conditions necessary to alter the steel microstructure. These results provided some confirmation of the thermal modeling of the structures, since none of the samples were from zones where such heating was predicted.” (page 131)

To claim that “the results provided some confirmation of the thermal modeling of the structures, since none of the sample were from zones where such heating was predicted” seems to be a rather strange way of putting things. None of the samples studied by NIST passed the temperature and time test set by the NIST annealing studies that determined the length of time and temperature at which a steel column must be exposed to a flame before the column’s microstructure begins to alter and, thereby, begin to bring about the sort of vicoplastic deformation that could lead to compromising the structural integrity of that steel column.

Yet, this is cited as evidence that provides “some confirmation of the thermal modeling of the structures.” If none of the samples exceeded the annealing standards that served as a baseline to indicate what conditions were necessary to bring about changes in a column’s microstructure, then one cannot be certain that steel columns located in other zones – even if higher temperatures were predicted for such zones – would have exceeded the annealing standards that had been set. One cannot be certain of any of this because we don’t know how hot the fires actually were in these other zones [and a prediction is not necessarily an accurate indicator of reality], or whether such fires burned with the necessary intensity for the minimally necessary amount of time, or whether the steel columns in question did or did not have some degree of fire-resistant insulation remaining.

Assumptions are being made about the locations of fires. Assumptions are being made about the temperatures of fires. Assumptions are being made about the duration of those fires. Assumptions are being made about the amount of insulation that had been dislodged from steel columns. Assumptions are being made about how many core and perimeter columns would have had their

microstructure sufficiently altered to compromise the structural integrity of those columns.

One cannot use a failure to exceed an annealing baseline standard in one zone of the building as positive empirical evidence that provides “some confirmation” of a thermal model when the latter model requires concrete evidence that tested samples from the other sectors have exceeded a given annealing test standard. Moreover, if one has no empirical data concerning the microstructure of columns from a zone of the building in which one predicts there will be more intense fires (and one does not have such data because the relevant evidence was destroyed), then one has no empirical data.

One cannot surmise one’s way to whatever conclusions one likes. Furthermore, one certainly, cannot use negative results from a building zone of lower temperatures to serve as “some confirmation” for a thermal model that requires very different experimental or empirical results in order for it to be confirmed.

Something that is missing from the NIST *Executive Summary* is some clear statements about the nature of the annealing studies that were conducted by NIST and that were used to establish the baseline for determining when microstructural changes would begin to take place in steel columns when exposed to certain temperatures (600 degrees C) for a certain length of time (15 minutes). Although it seems clear enough that microstructural changes begin to take place when steel is exposed to 600 degree C. for 15 minutes, one is less clear about the extent, if any, of the microstructural changes that take place at 15 minutes and how much structural strength would be lost as a result of exposure to the requisite temperature of 600 degrees C. for no more than 15 minutes ... especially under conditions in which heat might be radiated away from a piece of steel that is connected to other steel beams through the sort of assembly networks that existed in the twin towers in relation to core columns, perimeter columns, and floor assemblies.

The term “creep” that is used in conjunction with vicoplastic deformation suggests that such microstructural changes are relatively gradual and do not constitute a sudden phase shift in structural integrity of the entire section of a steel column that is being so exposed. So, the question that is left unanswered by the *Executive Summary* is: How long does it take for a section of a steel column to lose, say, 50% of its strength

through vicoplastic deformation if one assumes a constant temperature of around 600 degrees C.?

If microstructural changes in the structure of steel begin when subjected to temperatures of 600 degrees C. for 15 minutes, then how long before enough microstructural changes have occurred within that steel to significantly compromise its structural integrity? Furthermore, how much of a steel beam's structural integrity would have to be compromised before the beam began to buckle?

Moreover, a certain amount of confusion is created by the fact that, on the one hand, Bazant and Zhou, and, on the other hand, NIST seem to be using two different temperature standards as benchmarks for the conditions under which vicoplastic deformation would occur. The NIST standard is 600 degrees C., whereas, as noted earlier in this chapter, Bazant indicated to researchers from *Popular Mechanics* that vicoplastic deformation begins to occur at less than 400 degrees C.

Is one or the other of the standards incorrect? Are both of the standards correct but in need of some kind of qualifying remarks?

One possible way of reconciling the foregoing apparent inconsistency is as follows. Research indicates that steel begins to soften around 425 degrees Centigrade but loses half of its strength at around 650 degrees Centigrade.

Consequently, maybe, Bazant is talking about conditions under which some minimal sort of vicoplastic deformation begins to take place, whereas NIST is referring to the conditions under which such vicoplastic deformation would have reached a level that would cause significant weakening or loss of strength in steel columns. If half the strength of a steel column is lost when subjected to temperatures of 650 degrees Centigrade for 15 minutes, then I'm not sure what sort of strength would be lost in a column that was exposed to temperatures of 425 degrees for the same amount of time.

I'm not a scientist or engineer, so I don't know what the answers are to any of the foregoing questions. However, I do know that such questions and answers are important because they carry potentially significant implications for any attempt to build a plausible theory that purports to explain, say, how the south tower could collapse in less than an hour – especially in light of the testimony of firefighters who said that on the

floors near the place of plane impact they found only a few pockets of fire that could have been easily contained.

This brings us back to the issue of fireproofing insulation. The NIST *Executive Summary* describes some of the studies that were conducted in relation to SFRMs – that is, ‘sprayed fire-resistant materials’ – and these experiments are elaborated in somewhat greater detail on pages 60-64 in the NIST document ‘NCSTAR 1-5: Reconstruction of the Fires in the World Trade Center Towers’.

There were several kinds of SFRM’s that were sprayed onto the steel columns of the World Trade Center during its construction. In addition, there were four kinds of gypsum box structures that, in part, afforded further insulation in relation to most of the core columns.

According to NIST’s *Final Report*: “In 1969, the Port Authority directed that a 1/2 inch coating of Blaze-Shield Type D, a mixture of cement and asbestos fibers, be used to insulate the floor trusses. ... This coating had been installed as high as the 38<sup>th</sup> floor of WTC 1 when its use was discontinued due to recognition of adverse health effects from inhalation of asbestos fibers. The spraying then proceeded with Blaze Shield DC/F, a similar product in which the asbestos was replaced by a glassy mineral fiber and whose insulating value was reported by Underwriters Laboratories, Inc. to be slightly better than Blaze Shield D.” (page 70)

NIST studied the effects of fire on steel with and without various forms of the foregoing kinds of insulation. Among other things, the tests indicated that: (1) “the temperatures on the outside of the insulation rose sharply from the beginning of the test”; (2) “the 19.1 mm (.75 inch) insulation slowed the temperature rise and delayed reaching the peak steel temperature by almost an hour at all locations”; (3) “the highest temperature reached at the steel surface was approximately 300 degrees C lower than the temperature at the outside of the insulation material;” and, (4) the outer surface of the steel reached the targeted maximum temperature (just short of 600 degrees C) in about one third the time ... of the uninsulated steel tests.” Shortly thereafter, the NIST report states: “This brief analysis indicated how large an effect an intact SFRM played in extending the time for the protected steel to reach a temperature regime where it would lose a considerable amount of its strength.” (page 64 - NIST ‘NC STAR 1-5: Reconstruction of the Fires in the World Trade Center Towers’)

As discussed earlier in this chapter, NIST, by its own admission, indicated in the *Executive Summary* that: “The towers would not have collapsed under the combined effects of aircraft impact and the subsequent multifloor fires if the insulation had not been widely dislodged or had been only minimally dislodged by aircraft impact.” (page 130 – underlining added). The insulation test results outlined in the previous paragraph lend support to NIST’s above-noted admission.

The NIST *Executive Summary* says: “For thermal analyses of the perimeter columns, spandrel beams, core beams, and core columns, the insulation on these elements we set to the specified thickness due to a lack of field measurements.” (page 134) Apparently, because no field measurements could be taken at Ground Zero, the researchers had to improvise and arbitrarily use the same thickness of SFRMs as had been used in relation to the floor trusses.”

Though arbitrary, this procedure might have been roughly equivalent to what actually was the case with respect to such beams and columns in the WTC but, then again, maybe not. At the very least it adds one more element of variable uncertainty into the modeling process.

According to *Debunking 9/11 Myths*: “The spray-on fireproofing, which was first used widely in the 1960s, is lightweight and fluffy and can crumble from the touch of a hand, much less the impact of plane debris flying at several hundred miles per hour.” (page 38) While all of the foregoing might be true, the above quote, first, neglects to indicate that something must be hit with such debris before dislodgment can take place, and, secondly, the statement neglects to consider the fact that while flying debris might result in insulation dislodgment, the issue of how much insulation is dislodged in any given instance is a variable that plays a substantial role in affecting one’s thinking about what might have gone on within the twin towers ... depending on whether a portion of steel beam was left completely exposed, only partially exposed, or whether there were some residual – though thin -- coating of insulation that continued to adhere to the column in different locations despite the impact and, as such, might still serve as some degree of fire-retardant.

What empirical evidence is there that insulation was “widely dislodged”? To begin with, I would like to reiterate the earlier noted admission by NIST that outside the areas directly impacted by the planes, NIST researchers were unable to come up with any robust, defensible

guideline for determining what amounts of fireproofing insulation might have become dislodged through various sorts of structural vibration that could have been set in motion through the plane crashes. In addition, there actually is very little direct evidence concerning the extent of insulation dislodgement in the areas in front of the plane crashes – although there is an underlying assumption that debris created by the aircraft impact would have dislodged a great deal of insulation and that this damage could have ranged across five floors in each of the buildings ... but an assumption is not evidence even though some might wish to treat it as such.

The NIST *Executive Summary* does advance a sort of indirect piece of evidence in an attempt to support its hypothesis that substantial amounts of insulation had been dislodged as a direct result of the plane crashes – namely, “The adhesive strength of CAFCO Blaze-Shield DC/F to steel coated with primer paint was found to be one-third to one-half of the adhesive strength to steel that had not been coated with primer paint. The SFRM products used in the WTC towers were applied to steel components with primer paint.” (page 134) In other words, since the steel beams in the WTC had all been painted with a primer, the strength with which the SFRMs adhered to that primed steel was only one-third to one-half of what would have been the case without those beams being coated with a primer paint.

The foregoing does show that SFRMs do not adhere as well with a primed surface as they would without such a primed surface. However, the data doesn't really tell one how well, or poorly, SRFMs will fare when a steel beam is hit by debris – maybe one-third to one-half of the adhesive strength of non-primed steel might be good enough ... we don't know.

According to the NIST *Executive Summary*: on one or more floors, “43 of 47 core columns were stripped of insulation” in WTC 1 (page 119 of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*), while: again, on one or more floors, “39 of 47 core columns were stripped of insulation” in WTC 2 (page 126 of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*). What do such statements actually mean?

When one says that a steel column has been stripped, does one mean that the column has been stripped on all four sides? Does one mean that the steel column has been stripped right down to the primer paint?

A part of Mark Loizeaux's follow-up interview with *Popular Mechanics* that was discussed earlier bubbles to the surface of consciousness at this point. In criticizing Steven Jones' ideas about the possibility of explosives having brought down the World Trade Center



Buildings, Mark Loizeaux is described as saying: “for each tower it hypothetically could take as long as two months for a team of up to 75 men with unfettered access to three floors to strip the fireproofing off the columns and then place and wire the charges.” Apparently, a complete stripping of fireproofing is not so easy that one can just brush it off with one’s hand and, then, one will be right at the primer-coated surface.

Whatever the truth of the foregoing impression might, or might not, be, I believe that the term “stripped of insulation” might be, at best, a somewhat imprecise term. Taking any amount of insulation off a steel beam will, in one sense, be stripping the beam of insulation.

So, when one says that 39 of 47 columns or 43 of 47 columns have been stripped of insulation, how should one understand this? I seriously doubt it means that the columns were stripped of insulation on all four sides, and if it does, then I would like to be able to examine the empirical data in which such a claim is rooted.

Presumably, when columns are described as having been stripped of insulation, then, what is meant is that somewhere between 1 % and 100 % of a certain area of some given face of such and such column has suffered from some degree of insulation dislodgment. Since almost all of the evidence from the buildings that collapsed at the World Trade Center has been destroyed, there is no empirical way of determining exactly -- in the range between 1 % and 100 % -- over how big an area or at what precise section of a column face such dislodgment took place.

Where, precisely, did the debris go? How many core columns suffered substantial SFRM dislodgment over extensive portions of their surface areas? How many core or perimeter columns were completely stripped of all fireproofing insulation? How many of the columns that suffered SFRM damage were exposed to fires? How intense were those fires and for how long did they last? What degree of insulation protection, if any, was left in relation to those columns that did suffer SFRM dislodgment (after all, a column with some insulation still in place might be able to resist some of the effects of fire for a period of time and be more fire-resistant than a completely uninsulated column)? What happened to the gypsum boxes that protected the core columns? How many of them were damaged by the debris and what was the extent of the damage? What role, if any, did the gypsum from the damaged boxes play in helping to retard the fires?

NIST cannot answer the foregoing questions with any degree of certainty or reliability. While there might have been some columns that were rendered potentially vulnerable to the effects of fire through insulation dislodgment, and while they might have been some of those vulnerable columns that actually were subjected to fires with the requisite temperatures and for the right amount of time, there really is very little evidence to indicate that either the number of such insulation dislodged-fire-ravaged-columns were very numerous.

Moreover, what does it mean to say – as the NIST *Executive Summary* does and as has been noted previously -- that insulation was stripped from x number of columns ‘on one or more floors’? If some amount of fireproofing insulation has been stripped from some columns on one floor of a building, then, one validly can say that insulation was stripped from steel columns on one or more floors in that building even if no insulation had been stripped from columns on other floors of the building. However, if no insulation had been stripped from columns on other floors, then while the foregoing NIST statement might be true as far as it goes, it potentially becomes a very misleading statement.

If fireproofing insulation was stripped from columns on other floors, would it still be true to say that 39 (or 43, depending on which building one is discussing) of the 47 columns on these other floors were also stripped of insulation? No, not necessarily.

One cannot use what might have happened in the way of insulation stripping on one floor as an index for what might have happened with respect to insulation stripping on other floors. The conditions on each floor are different, and without specifying what those conditions are, one is not warranted to make the logical jump from the fact that, say, 43 columns suffered from some degree of insulation dislodgment on one floor, to a conclusion which claims that similar sorts of insulation dislodgment occurred on the other floors, as well.

Stating information in a misleading way is not helpful. Unfortunately, on several levels (which have been outlined above) this is what NIST has done when they claim that, respectively in the two towers, 43 of 47 and 39 of 47 columns were stripped of insulation on one or more floors.

To say that 39 of 47 columns or 43 of 47 columns were stripped of insulation on one or more floors sounds very impressive. However, the fact of the matter is that one doesn't really know what such statements actually mean.

To be sure, 'airplane-crash-induced-insulation-stripped' damage of some kind took place on September 11, 2001. Precisely how much of this sort of damage occurred or precisely where that damage was done or on how many floors it took place or how many of these damaged areas were exposed to fires of the requisite intensity and duration to bring about vicoplastic deformation are empirical matters that, seemingly, NIST is not in a position to resolve with any degree of reliability.

-----

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* seeks to set the record straight with respect to the manner in which some 'conspiracy theorists' have misinterpreted the 9/11 seismographs recorded through Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty laboratory/observatory that is located about 21 miles north of Ground Zero. In an interview conducted by researchers from *Popular Mechanics* with Won-Young Kim and Arthur Lerner-Lam -- several of the authors of a November, 2001 report entitled: 'Seismic Waves Generated by Aircraft Impacts and Building Collapses at World Trade Center, New York City' - Arthur Lerner-Lam is quoted as saying: "Nothing in the signal suggests this is anything more than an ordinary building collapse, and there's nothing in the signal that suggests an explosion." (page 51) Won-Young Kim also castigates those who have misrepresented the seismographic work expressed through the aforementioned article and is quoted as saying: "the representation of our work is categorically incorrect and not in context." (pages 50-51)

Be this as it might, there might be some potential problems that manifest themselves during the 'seismic wars' discussion in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*. More specifically, following the foregoing quotations, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* informs its readers that: "The 1993 truck bomb at the World Trade Center in which approximately a half ton of explosives was detonated in the parking garage of the North Tower, was not detected seismically by a monitoring station less than 10 miles away." (page 51) A little later on in the same book, one is provided with the following information: "the truck bomb detonated by Timothy McVeigh outside the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building released about 28 times as much energy as the explosions used in the later demolition of the building, according to a

1996 article in American Geographical Union. Yet, on the day of the bombing, the seismograph operator originally ignored the minor disturbance on the chart, attributing it to local traffic.” (page 52) The section on ‘Seismic Spikes’ ends with another quote from Arthur Lerner-Lam: “Demolitions are typically very small explosions. And you wouldn’t record them anyway because they’d typically be aboveground, and too small to observe.” (page 52)

If the 1993 truck bombing was not seismically detectable in an observatory just ten miles from the north tower of the WTC, why should one necessarily assume that if explosions had taken place in any of the sub-basements of the WTC, then they would have been detectable by an observatory twice as far away? Of course, maybe the quality of seismographic technology being used in 2001 was more advanced than the seismographic technology available in 1993, or, perhaps, the equipment being used at the Lamont-Doherty observatory in 2001 was superior to the equipment being used in 1993 at the observatory that was ten miles away from the WTC north tower, or, maybe the technicians and scientists working at Lamont-Doherty were more competent than were their counterparts working at the other observatory in 1993.

Nonetheless, one can’t help but wonder that if there had been subterranean explosions in the sub-basements of the north and south tower, would these necessarily have been seismically detectable at the Lamont-Doherty. I don’t know what the resolution to such wondering might be, but it seems to be an issue well worth exploring.

In addition, given that the sizable aboveground explosion in Oklahoma City barely registered on a local seismograph and were initially mistaken for normal automobile traffic, and given that Arthur Lerner-Lam indicates that demolitions are typically above ground “and too small to observe”, then it seems entirely plausible to entertain the possibility that if charges had been set at any of the three World Trade Center buildings that collapsed, these would not have given off any tell-tale seismic signatures or could have been interpreted as road traffic in and around the WTC buildings. Certainly, on the basis of what the seismologist, Arthur Lerner-Lam, says above, this would be the case with respect to aboveground explosions that might have occurred within any of these buildings, but, this aspect of seismic invisibility might also occur in conjunction with certain sizes of subterranean explosions such as the one (or ones) that were

reported on September 11, 2001 by people working in the sub-basements of the north tower and that, like the 1993 subterranean explosion in the parking garage beneath the north tower of the WTC, might have been undetectable.

One also wonders if the seismographic readings taken at the Lamont-Doherty observatory on 9/11 could have contained within them any sort of seismic activity signature that might have been generated by explosions and that one would be able to determinately and reliably differentiate from the rest of the seismic activity going on as the buildings collapsed. As previously noted, Arthur Lerner-Lam has gone on record with: “there’s nothing in the signal [of 9/11] that suggests an explosion,” but if, by his own admission, demolition charges tend to give off seismic signatures that are “too small to observe”, then just what would one be looking for in a seismograph that would permit one to distinguish or differentiate the very small seismic signature of demolition explosions from the seismic signature given off by a collapsing building?

Probably, with appropriately sensitive equipment and the right kind of program, one might be able to establish a means for identifying sub-harmonics within a seismic signal which would demonstrate that in addition to the seismic activity created by a collapsing building, there was another undertone of seismic activity created by explosions. I just don’t know if such technical capabilities existed at the Lamont-Doherty observatory on 9/11.

The aboveground explosion at the Federal Building in Oklahoma City released 28 times as much energy as did the demolition explosions used to bring down the rest of the Federal Building later on. Yet, the former explosion was barely detectable, and, therefore, presumably, the demolition charges used to bring the rest of that building down after the original bombing – demolition charges that released only 1/28th the energy of the Oklahoma City truck bomb – might not have been detectable at all. Moreover, the existence of such a fact in conjunction with the Oklahoma bombing does nothing but lend credence to the possibility that explosive devices might have been used to bring down the WTC buildings and, nonetheless, still not have left any kind of seismic signature for people such as Arthur Lerner-Lam to notice or recognize.

-----

On page 144 of the NIST document, NC STAR 1 -- or, as it also is known, *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers* -- one finds the following information:

“One principle step was the determination of those variables that most affected the outcome of the various computer simulations. Sensitivity studies and examination of components and subsystems were carried out for the modeling of aircraft impact, the fires, and the structural response to impact damage and values were identified. Further computations refined the selection of these values. The computations also were improved to include physical processes that could play a significant role in the structural degradation of the towers.

“The Investigation team then defined three cases for each building by combining the middle, less severe, and more severe values of the influential variables. Upon a preliminary examination of the middle cases, it became clear that the towers would likely remain standing. The less severe cases were discarded after the aircraft impact results were compared to observed events. The middle cases (which became Case A for WTC 1 and Case C for WTC 2) were discarded after the structural response analysis of major subsystems were compared to observed events. The more severe case (which became Case B for WTC 1 and Case D for WTC 2) was used for the global analysis of each tower.

“Complete sets of simulation were then performed for cases B and D. To the extent that the simulations deviated from the photographic evidence or eyewitness reports, the investigation adjusted the input, but only within the range of physical reality. Thus, for instance, the observed window breakage was an input to the fire simulations and the pulling forces on the perimeter columns by the sagging floors were adjusted within the range of values derived from the subsystem computations.

“The results were a simulation of the structural deterioration of each tower from the time of the aircraft impact to the time at which the building became unstable, i.e., was poised for collapse. Cases B and D accomplished this in a manner that was consistent with the principle observables and the governing physics.”

Taking this last paragraph first, one is somewhat surprised to learn that, despite its title -- namely, *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*-- NIST's *Final Report* doesn't actually explain the collapse of the WTC buildings. Instead, what the report seeks to do -- and what has been quoted

above from the NIST report – is to provide a simulation or model that, theoretically, accounts for how certain structural instabilities might have manifested themselves at some point high up in the buildings (namely, in and around the floors most directly impacted by the plane crashes and fires). The report then proceeds no further – at least as far as providing any kind of technical explanation is concerned about why, for example, the two towers fell at near free- fall speeds, or why the building collapses were, for the most, symmetrical rather than asymmetrical, or why each of the buildings landed largely in their own footprint, or why the top 30 stories, or so, of the south tower tipped at an angle of approximately 22 degrees and, then, explode, or why the bottom portion of the south tower would collapse if the tipping top part had disappeared in a cloud of exploding dust and, as a result, not have been exerting any further downward stresses to be able to bring about a progressive collapse in the remainder of the building that was still standing after the top 30 stories somehow had been obliterated into a cloud of pulverized residue.

The answer to all of these latter questions are merely presumed to follow from, and, therefore, are assumed to be answerable in terms of the structural instabilities that NIST's *Final Report* attempts to model. However, assumptions should not be accepted as a legitimate substitute for a rigorous, technical explanation of building collapse, and if NIST expects people to go along with such a substitution, then perhaps, its *Final Report* should be re-named: '*Assumptions Concerning the Collapse of the World Trade Towers*'.

Another disturbing feature encompassed by the previous extended quote from NIST's *Final Report* concerns the issue of methodology. NIST has assembled all the major variables concerning the airplane impacts, the fires, as well as the structural properties of the building, and these variables have been classified into categories of 'less severe' values, 'middling severe' values, and 'more severe' values.

These different values were fed into their global computational simulations or models, and this produced three scenarios or cases for each building – a less severe case, a middle case, and a more severe case. As the foregoing extended quote from NIST's *Final Report* indicates: "Upon a preliminary examination of the middle cases, it became clear that the towers would likely remain standing." This is very interesting.

What reason is there to believe that the variable values at work in the actual WTC buildings following jet impact on 9/11 did not involve such

middle cases? Well, one reason – although it is not really a very good one – is that if the middle class of values were operative within the twin towers on 9/11, then NIST doesn't even have a viable theory for how significant structural instabilities might have arisen within the two buildings, let alone have an explanation for what caused the towers to collapse.

The NIST report goes on to indicate: "The less severe cases were discarded after the aircraft impact results were compared to observed events." Even if one were to accept, for the sake of argument, that simulated aircraft impact results did not reflect observed realities, how does one know that the rest of the model/simulation variables involving, say, fires and structural integrity issues did not reflect actual conditions on 9/11?

We don't. Consequently, the less severe baby might have been thrown out with the aircraft impact bath water when the NIST investigators decided to jettison the entire set of less severe values simply because one part of those values – the aircraft crash results – didn't coincide with observed realities.

Why do something like this? One possibility is that by assigning less severe values for a variety of variables other than the aircraft impact results, one risks having the twin towers still standing after the simulation has been completed, and if this were the case, one is faced with a potentially huge problem – the same one that is associated with the middling severe case – namely, if one's model doesn't explain what is going on, one is still left with the problem of determining what might account for the collapse of the twin towers.

There also seems to be something implied in the NIST statements concerning the middle and severe cases. More specifically, the reason why the less severe set of variables were shown the methodological exit sign is because it produced results that did not correspond with observed facts.

However, the reason why the middling severe set of variable values were thrown out is not because it produced results that were at odds with what was observed – for, if it did, then presumably, the NIST researchers would have indicated as much, just as they did with the less severe set of variable values. Rather, the middle set of values were rejected because it left the NIST investigators with a very sensitive problem ... if the actual conditions within the twin towers following the airplane crashes were of a middling variety, the NIST investigators have no way to explain why the twin towers collapsed.



The reason that NIST gives for getting rid of the middle case set of variable values is as follows: “The middle cases (which became Case A for WTC 1 and Case C for WTC 2) were discarded after the structural response analysis of major subsystems were compared to observed events.” What does this mean?

Presumably, the “observed events” being compared with the “structural response analysis” refers to the issue of how the structural integrity of the buildings allegedly came to be compromised to such an extent that in the view of the investigators it would have led to a total progressive collapse of the buildings. Since the middling severe case for the “structural response analysis” didn’t lead to such a progressive collapse of the buildings, then, obviously, according to the investigators, those values can’t be right because if they were, the investigators would have no plausible explanation for why the twin towers collapsed.

In other words, the reason why the middle severe and less severe cases are thrown out is not necessarily because those models didn’t accurately capture an array of factual characteristics concerning the actual conditions and events in the twin towers on 9/11. Rather, the reason why the two cases were thrown out was because they didn’t produce what the investigators wanted to see – namely, the creation of the sort of instabilities that might lead to a progressive collapse.

If someone is committed to a certain kind of answer, then the driving force in constructing a theoretical model becomes the nature of the answer to which one is committed rather than factual considerations. Anything that produces a result other than the end result one is seeking gets jettisoned irrespective of what might be factually true.

Finally, we come to the matter of the more severe case in which a set of variables were taken and assigned high-end or low-end values (depending on the nature of the variable) relative to the other two case scenarios (i.e., less severe and middling). Is there any good empirical reason for assigning such a severe set of variable values? Not really.

If there were good empirical reasons for assigning such severe values to begin with, the researchers wouldn’t have wasted time fooling around trying to construct less severe and middling severe cases. The reason why the researchers did bother with building those models is precisely because they didn’t have enough reliable empirical data based on the real world events of

9/11 to be able to directly measure and quantify those variables and plug such values into their simulations. Because the investigators didn't have high-quality, direct empirical data through which to specify the values of the variables they were using, they created a range of value possibilities and spun their severe case scenario from there.

Now, let's take a look at what the researchers did with their set of severe variable values in conjunction with the global simulation collapse analysis concerning the twin towers. According to NIST: "To the extent that the simulations deviated from the photographic evidence or eyewitness reports, the investigation adjusted the input, but only within the range of physical reality."

In essence, the foregoing assertion indicates that the researchers kept adjusting the values being assigned to different variables within their global simulation model of the structural integrity of either of the twin towers until that simulation manifested structural instabilities of a kind that the researchers believed eventually would lead to the progressive collapse of the buildings. "Adjustment" means that the values of variables being assigned to the severe case scenario would be increased or decreased according to whatever value would push the researcher's model in a more severe direction and, thereby, possibly, result in the sort of instabilities that might lead to a progressive collapse of the buildings.

If the substitution of a given set of variable values didn't generate the kind of instabilities believed to be necessary to explain the collapse of the twin towers, a new set of variable values would be substituted and a new simulation based on these newer 'adjustments' would be run. The results of that simulation would be compared with various pieces of photographic evidence and eyewitness testimonies, and if such simulations didn't appear to correspond with that data, then a new round of variable values would be assigned for a new simulation.

What photographic evidence and eye witness testimonies were used to guide the various rounds of variable value substitutions? The reader can't be certain because NIST doesn't tell one precisely what data was taken into consideration during the various rounds of 'adjustment'.

Is it possible that during their different rounds of adjustment that the NIST researchers might have taken into account eyewitness testimonies from firefighters, police officers, emergency medical personal, journalists, and employees of the twin towers who reported

having had experiences that were consistent with the presence of explosions in the WTC building? If those researchers did take such testimony into account, their *Final Report* does not reflect it, and if those researchers didn't take such data into account in relation to their various adjustments, then why were those researchers, in effect, cherry-picking that eyewitness reports they took into consideration – because, surely, every single researcher working for NIST heard one, or more, of the many reports concerning the issue of explosions that arose out of the events of 9/11.

One of the points that is entailed by the adjustment issue discussed above is that there was not just one severe case scenario examined by the NIST researchers. In fact, there were many. How many of these severe case scenarios existed, at one time or another, is unknown since NIST's *Final Report* doesn't specify how many rounds of variable value adjustment were conducted.

When only certain portions (namely, those involving the jet crash modeling process) of the less severe set of variable values were shown to be inconsistent with photographic evidence, the less severe case scenario was thrown out. Apparently, no further exploration took place concerning what might have happened if one made the variable values assigned to the jet crash more severe, but retained less severe variable values for other parts of the modeling process.

When the middling severe variable value assignments didn't generate the kind of structural instabilities that might have resulted in a progressive collapse of the twin tower buildings, the middling severe case was discarded. Evidently, the researchers decided not to pursue the idea of adjusting variable values for the middle case scenario so that some of them could have been assigned a more severe value than others, while other values were kept in a middling range, in order to see what might happen during simulations based on such variable value substitutions.

However, in the matter of the severe case scenario, the researchers continued to fool around with (i.e., adjust) the variable values being assigned to the severe case's global model and its subsystems until they were able to produce a simulation that led to the kind of structural instabilities in their models of the twin tower buildings that might have led to a progressive collapse of the two buildings – or, perhaps more correctly, led to a progressive collapse in the researchers' models of the two real world

buildings. The researchers kept substituting new sets of variable values until their model failed – in other words, they kept adjusting different variables along increasingly severe directions until substantial structural irregularities showed up in the simulations.

How justifiable and/or plausible are such increasingly severe variable adjustments? According to NIST, values were adjusted “only within the range of physical reality.”

NIST gave two examples of what it meant by “within the range of physical reality”. “Thus, for instance, the observed window breakage was an input to the fire simulations and the pulling forces on the perimeter columns by the sagging floors were adjusted within the range of values derived from the subsystem computations.”

Not everyone agrees there would have been “pulling forces on the perimeter columns by the sagging floors” – at least not via some of the mechanisms being proposed in NIST’s *Final Report*. In a presentation (*Arup’s Fire Presentation regarding tall buildings and the events of 9/11* – given at the April 12, 2005 NCE conference) Barbara Lane and Susan Lamont indicated that “core columns cannot pull the exterior columns in via the floor simply as a result of column shortening.” (Page 9) In addition, NIST, itself, states in its *Final Report* that “it had contracted with Underwriters Laboratories, Inc. to conduct tests to obtain information on the fire endurance of trusses like those in the WTC towers. ... The tests established that this type of assembly was capable of sustaining a large gravity load, without collapsing for a substantial period of time relative to the duration of the fires in any given location on September 11.” (pages 142-143)

In the light of the foregoing considerations, what does it actually mean to say values were adjusted “only within the range of physical reality”? The reader is left largely in the dark because NIST – despite its 10,000 pages of documentation concerning the collapse of the World Trade buildings – doesn’t walk one through what took place during those adjustments.

Furthermore, even if one grants, for the sake of argument, that the adjustments were “within the range of physical reality” one has no way of knowing how to gauge the plausibility of such adjustments. Consequently, one has no way of determining how reasonable or likely any of these adjustments might have been.

A supernova is “within the range of physical reality”, but it is a relatively rare occurrence when measured against the backdrop of the ‘billions and billions’ of stars that populate the different galaxies. Similarly, the NIST researchers might have come up with severe case variable values that were “within the range of physical reality”, but this doesn’t automatically mean such possibilities were likely to have occurred within the twin towers on 9/11.

One needs to continue to keep in mind that there is a distinction to be drawn between a computer simulation and the real world system that that simulation seeks to model. The fact one can get a simulation to do something does not necessarily mean that what transpires within the simulation is an accurate reflection of what transpired within the twin towers on September 11, 2001.

The set of variable values that are being used to make adjustments in the NIST severe case model are, for the most part, not based on actual, direct, on-site measurements of the internal structural conditions within the twin towers on 9/11. Rather, those variable values are based on inferences concerning possibilities that are, at best, suggested by, or, might be somewhat consistent with, photographic evidence and eyewitness testimony.

My presence near a murder scene might lead a police detective to believe that such presence suggests the possibility, or is consistent with the possibility, that I might be the murderer. However, there are – or should be – a lot of other forensic factors that need to be taken into consideration before an arrest is made ... and even an arrest does not necessarily mean that a conviction will be forthcoming.

There is a lot of forensic evidence missing from the conditions surrounding the collapse of the twin towers (and, perhaps, this is as good a time as any to remind the reader that someone seemed to believe that it was perfectly okay to remove and dispose of almost all the evidence related to an area that officially had been designated as a crime scene). The NIST researchers are engaging in a certain degree of speculation and conjecture when it comes to the manner in which they produce their different sets of variable values that are being fed into their global simulation model of the twin tower collapses.

On the one hand, this kind of technical speculation and conjecture might well be “within the range of physical reality”. On the other hand, such

severe case variable values might be entirely irrelevant and immaterial when it comes to the actual conditions within the twin towers on 9/11. Until NIST publically specifies the precise character of these variable values as well as explains the reasoning underlying the making of such value assignments within its simulation program and various subsystems, one has great difficulty in assigning any degree of positive credibility to the NIST simulation process.

In the light of the foregoing considerations concerning the ‘adjustments’ that were made within the severe case scenario that was explored by the NIST researchers, let’s revisit an issue that was discussed earlier – namely, the statements from the NIST *Executive Summary* indicating that 43 of 47 core columns were stripped of fireproofing insulation in the WTC 1 building, while 39 of 47 core columns were stripped of insulation in the WTC 2 building. Aside from the points raised earlier concerning such statements, there are, now, new questions that need to be asked.

In the less severe and middling severe cases, were the same kind of statements made? Are the foregoing figures a reflection of just the severe case scenario? How many ‘adjustments’ had to be made before arriving at those figures? How realistic – even if “within the range of physical reality” -- are such ‘adjustments’? What considerations led to the making of such ‘adjustments’? What actual, real-world evidence is there which could justify the making of such ‘adjustments’?

When someone – say a journalist or your ‘average’ citizen – reads or hears statements that 43 of 47 columns were stripped of their insulation in one building, while 39 of 47 buildings were stripped of their insulation in the other building, this sounds pretty significant. Wow, scientists and engineers have established that the damage to the fireproofing insulation in the towers was very extensive ... these are important facts.

Except one is not necessarily dealing with facts. One is dealing with theoretical constructions that, in part, are based on unverifiable data, or unsubstantiated conjectures, or arbitrarily derived possibilities that might be “within the realm of physical reality” but are, nonetheless, arbitrary ... which, in effect, means there was no good reason for selecting such values in the first place.

All of the foregoing theoretical constructions, along with many others, are molded together by a computer program that generates a global computer

simulation model or visualization allegedly relating to the collapse events of 9/11. However, even this might not be the case.

More specifically, a variety of fire and structural engineers in different parts of the world have been urging NIST to release its computer simulations that allegedly model the collapse events at the WTC twin towers. For some reason, NIST has resisted responding to that interest in a constructive fashion.

The October 6, 2005 edition of *New Civil Engineering*, a journal in England, ran an article by Dave Parker entitled: "WTC Investigators Resist Call For Collapse Visualization". In this article, Colin Bailey, a professor of structural engineering at the University of Manchester, states: "NIST should really show the visualizations, otherwise the opportunity to correlate them back to the video evidence and identify any errors in the modeling will be lost."

As noted earlier, NIST's *Final Report* is quite prepared to indicate that both the less severe and middling severe case scenarios were discarded because they could not be reconciled with certain observed realities. Consequently, one is puzzled by the apparent reluctance of NIST investigators to hold their severe case simulation scenario to a similar kind of standard.

Part of the problem here, of course, is that NIST has not really produced a model that simulates collapsing buildings. What NIST has done is to construct a simulation that might, or might not, account for the emergence of structurally compromised elements within its model that might serve as an explanation of the circumstances that might have led to the induction of a progressive collapse in the twin towers.

What NIST has actually done in the way of computer visualized simulation might not be able to explain a number of observed facts. For example, why did the south tower tip in the way it did; or, why did the 30 stories, or so, that tipped suddenly seem to disappear in a tremendous cloud of pulverized materials; or, after apparently exploding and, thereby, eliminating gravitational and other kinds of stresses that might have led to the progressive collapse of the remainder of the building, why, nonetheless, did the remainder of the building experience a progressive collapse; or, why did both of the twin towers, with the exception of the top portion of the south tower, display such symmetrical collapses (especially given that the tipping of the top of the south tower by 22 degrees indicated

that asymmetrical forces were at work in at least some parts of those buildings); or, why did the buildings fall in near free-fall times?

With respect to this last question – the one about free fall – NIST’s *Final Report* states: “The structure below the level of collapse initiation offered minimal resistance to the falling building mass at and above the impact zone. The potential energy released by the downward movement of the large building mass far exceeded the capacity of the intact structure below to absorb that through energy of deformation.

“Since the stories below the level of collapse initiation provided little resistance to the tremendous energy released by the falling building mass, the building section above came down essentially in free fall, as seen in the videos. As the stories below sequentially failed, the falling mass increased, further increasing the demand on the floors below, which were unable to arrest the moving mass.” (page 146)

The foregoing account seems problematic on at least several levels. First of all, the above explanation doesn’t really reflect the conditions surrounding the collapse of the south tower. As indicated previously, the upper third of the south tower was tipping over and, then, appeared to explode and disperse in a variety of directions other than just straight down.

Consequently, the remaining portions of the south tower below the top portion were not necessarily subjected to the “potential energy released by the downward movement of the large building mass” because due to the apparent mid-air explosion, much of that potential energy had been released in directions other than straight down. How much of the potential energy of the upper third of the building was directed as a downward vector is hard to quantify because dust obscures a great deal of what might have been transpiring below the tipping-exploding upper third of the south tower. Consequently, one is not in a position to say – other than as a conjecture – that whatever the downward vectored gravitational load might have been it “far exceeded the capacity of the intact structure below to absorb that through energy of deformation.”

Secondly, even when a falling building mass releases a tremendous amount of potential energy via its downward movement, and even when the resistance offered by the remaining floors below the collapsing portion might be relatively small, and even when a large building mass far exceeds “the capacity of the intact structure below to absorb that through energy of deformation”, the fact of the matter is that “little resistance” does not



constitute “no resistance”. *Debunking 9/11 Myths* speaks about how the World Trade Center towers “look massive but they are mostly air” (page 30), and, therefore, an impression is given of the WTC towers being almost suspended in free fall, just waiting for the right initiating trigger to set that potential free fall in motion.

An atom is mostly air, but this reality doesn’t automatically make it either fragile or incapable of offering up various forms of resistance under different kinds of stress. There are forces in place within the atom that sometimes relegate its airiness to insignificance.

This is also was true of the World Trade Towers. Those buildings might have been mostly air, but the core columns, perimeter columns and complex floor truss assemblies within the building represented a set of forces that would have been capable of giving a certain amount of resistance to the collapsing building mass that is converting potential to kinetic energy through the downward pull of gravity.

This resistance has a name. Under the conditions of a collapsing building, such resistance goes by the name of the principle of the conservation of momentum.

In fact, it seems somewhat foolish to, on the one hand, talk about the twin towers as if they were nothing but air, and, then, on the other hand, to speak of “the tremendous energy released by the falling building mass”. In order for that energy to be released, the principle of conservation of momentum inherent in potential energy must be preserved but reformulated, in part, as kinetic energy.

In other words, a variety of events are happening as the conversion of potential energy to kinetic energy takes place during the collapse of a building under the sway of gravitational pull. One of those events involves factoring the conservation of momentum into the process that affects, to a degree, the rate at which that conversion process from potential to kinetic energy takes place.

The principle of the conservation of momentum guarantees that a normal building not being brought down through, say, controlled demolition will not collapse at the same rate as free-fall velocity. The principle of the conservation of momentum introduces an added temporal factor that will distinguish (1) the rate with which a body under free-fall conditions will descend through a given distance and (2) the rate with which a building

collapsing without the assistance of controlled demolition will descend down through the same given distance. The two rates of descent will not be the same, and the difference between the two can be accounted for by the manner in which the principle of momentum conservation operates.

There is no evidence that I have seen which indicates that the NIST report takes into account this issue of the conservation of momentum in a building collapsing without benefit of controlled demolition. Such a non-'controlled demolition' building will not collapse at free-fall speeds, and the explanation that NIST gives concerning the free-fall speeds of the collapsing towers – and that I have quoted earlier – doesn't really make much sense.

In addition, the principle of the conservation of momentum is also likely to introduce a certain amount of asymmetry into a collapsing building. Different thicknesses of steel columns will resist in different ways. Collapsing column assemblies might twist and turn one way rather than another, or they might stay intact, or they might be ripped apart.

There is no reason to suppose that when the gravitational collapse of a building begins that the initial collapsing floors will all disassemble in the same way or that all of the moorings, angle clips, bolts, and welds will disassemble simultaneously or in the same way or to the same extent. Prior to the time when a collapsing building's sheer mass becomes the predominant vectoring factor, one needs to be able to explain why there is symmetry, rather than asymmetry in the initial part of the collapse.

There was considerable asymmetry in the initial part of the collapse of the south tower. Why?

On the other hand, there was no asymmetry in the collapse of the bottom part of the south tower. However, given that most of the potential energy of the upper third of the building might have been vectored in other directions, one wonders why the lower portion of the south tower collapsed at all, and one also wonders why that lower portion collapsed in a symmetrical fashion when the events that were occurring above it were very asymmetric.

There was much less asymmetry (the antenna on top of the building seemed to sink first) in the initial part of the collapse of the north tower? Why?

The NIST report has a possible explanation for why the antenna assembly north tower might have gone first. Nonetheless, NIST does not seem to have a plausible explanation for why the rest of the initial part of the

collapse proceeded in a symmetrical manner or why the initial asymmetry of the tower collapse didn't lead to further asymmetries manifesting themselves in the rest of the building's response to that initial asymmetry.

Perhaps NIST is resisting release of its simulated visualization of the collapse event because it has no easy way – and, perhaps, no way at all – to reconcile its global simulation model with the actual character of the collapse of the north and south towers. Perhaps NIST is resisting release of its simulated visualization because to do so would demonstrate that its *Final Report* leaves all too many questions unanswered and issues unaddressed.

-----

The *Final Report* states: “NIST found no corroborating evidence for alternative hypotheses suggesting that the WTC towers were brought down by controlled demolition using explosives planted prior to September 11, 2001.” (page 146) Understanding what NIST means by the idea of “corroborating evidence” is not a straightforward proposition.

For instance, as previously has been discussed at some length earlier in the present chapter, there were many firefighters, emergency medical personnel, journalists, and WTC workers who reported either hearing, or seeing, or feeling, or being knocked about by what seemed to have been explosions. Why aren't these firsthand accounts treated as potential corroborating evidence? Why isn't such testimony even explored or discussed in either NIST's *Final Report* or within *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

A second candidate for consideration with respect to the issue of NIST's failing to find corroborating evidence concerning some variation of a controlled demolition hypothesis is the fact that the theory advanced by NIST in an attempt to explain the collapse of the twin towers is laden with a great many problems, assumptions, conjectures, and questionable methodology. Stated more briefly, NIST's own collapse theory, in and of itself, constitutes a very good reason to induce someone to look elsewhere for a plausible and defensible hypothesis for what caused the twin towers to collapse.

Either NIST researchers are going to have to come up with a better, more plausible, less problematic model than the one they have, or, perhaps, researchers ought to begin to probe an alternative hypothesis for what caused the buildings to collapse – for example, controlled demolition. To be

sure, the latter hypothesis is not without its own missing pieces of forensic evidence and difficulties, but there is a certain amount of evidence that supports such a possibility.

Firsthand testimony – including the hearing of demolition ring-like events (i.e., explosions that go off in sequence in a belt-like loop of a given floor and were reminiscent of what takes place during the controlled demolition of a building) gives expression to some of the evidence that supports a controlled demolition hypothesis. The near free-fall rates of descent of the building collapses, along with the largely symmetrical character of those collapses into their own footprint, is consistent with – although not necessarily proof of – the possibility of controlled demolition. The manner in which the squibs that were generated during the collapses contained steel columns weighing many tons that were horizontally ejected large distances might be more consistent with idea of the explosive force creating such squibs rather than just air pressure creating those kinds of squib. The observed disintegration of the top third of the south tower as it tipped some 22 degrees is more consistent with a controlled demolition hypothesis than with the NIST theory. The fact there were a number of evacuations in the twin towers in the weeks leading up to 9/11 and, as well, there was a 36-hour power-down in more than two-thirds of the south tower during the weekend prior to 9/11 might have provided people with an opportunity to plant explosives – although the existence of such an opportunity does not necessarily mean that someone took advantage of that opportunity and planted demolition charges. The fact that – apparently – someone, somehow had some degree of foreknowledge concerning the collapse of the south tower and communicated this to Rudy Giuliani in Building 7's Office of Emergency Management does not necessarily demonstrate that controlled demolitions were used to bring down the twin towers, but such information is consistent with such a possibility, yet it is not addressed in either the NIST *Final Report* or *The 9/11 Commission Report*. The fact that the twin tower building materials were all pulverized in a way that cannot be accounted for by the amount of kinetic energy that would have been released by an unassisted collapse, as well as the fact that many of the steel columns appeared to be sliced into lengths that are similar to what one finds with buildings brought down by controlled demolitions, are both more consistent with a theory of controlled demolition than such facts are consistent with the 'official' theory of collapse.

What, precisely, NIST means by “corroborating evidence” is unclear. However, the existence of the foregoing data would seem to indicate that NIST might not have put forth much in the way of a diligent, rigorous, good faith effort with respect to its alleged search for such corroborating evidence because there is quite a bit of information – as noted above – that is both supportive of, and consistent with, the hypothesis that the twin tower collapses, as well as the collapse of Building 7, might have been due to causes other than what NIST claims is the case.

The foregoing considerations might not constitute “corroboration” for an alternative hypothesis involving controlled demolition. However, they do raise a variety of questions that should not be dismissed out of hand as the ravings of a group of conspiracy theorists because – and this is the real issue rather than that of conspiracy theories – the NIST report has not adequately addressed any of the foregoing issues.

One set of data that has been put forth by some individuals as indicating that controlled demolitions might have taken place at the WTC is the existence of pools of molten steel that were reportedly found at the sites of the collapsed remains of all three buildings (i.e., Buildings 1, 2 and 7). The argument employed by such people is that because steel melts at around 2800 degrees Centigrade and because the fires in the twin towers were not likely to have been more than 500-650 degrees Centigrade, then the question arises – what caused the steel to melt?

The answer offered by some individuals is that the use of explosives must have brought about the melting of the steel. There are, however, a few potential problems surrounding that sort of account.

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* relates how Mark Loizeaux, of Controlled Demolitions, Inc., indicates the foregoing thinking is not correct. In his interview with *Popular Mechanics*, Loizeaux points out that while “charges provide intense heat, he says, the velocity of detonation is too fast – 28,000 feet per second – to melt steel. When an explosive is detonated, it cuts through steel with force; it does not burn through it with heat” ... “I can put a shaped charge on a steel column for a test shot and then walk right up and put my hand on the column. There’s no heat [because it burns too fast].” (pages 42-43)

In *Debunking 9/11 Myths* Richard Fruehan, a professor of metallurgical engineering at Carnegie Mellon University, critiques those people who claim that high-temperature charges involving thermite reactions

could have caused the pools of molten metal that were found at Ground Zero. Professor Fruehan claims: “The thermite reactions could have occurred with aluminum metal and any oxide that happened to be near it. Or oxygen could have reacted with aluminum as well. There was a lot of aluminum in the building itself – the windows etc, plus the airplane’s aluminum. That could have caused a thermite reaction and produced a small amount of molten iron.” (page 42)

On the other hand, during a paper discussed earlier in this chapter, Eagar and Musso stated: “Some reports suggest that the aluminum from the aircraft ignited, creating very high temperatures. While it is possible to ignite aluminum under special conditions, such conditions are not commonly attained in a hydrocarbon-based diffuse flame. In addition, the flame would be white hot, like a giant sparkler. There was no evidence of such aluminum ignition, which would have been visible even through the dense soot.” These points by Eagar and Musso don’t necessarily support the idea of controlled demolition, but they do serve as a counter, of sorts, to Professor Fruehan’s foregoing contention that if thermite reactions did take place at the World Trade Center, then this easily could have occurred naturally under the conditions existing at Ground Zero. Furthermore, the Eagar/Musso statement indicates that if such naturally occurring thermite reactions took place, there would be tell-tale signatures of such a reaction that should have been readily evident but for which there is no evidence to support the above-noted conjecture by Professor Fruehan.

Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, a few other experts have referred to the melting pools of steel as something of a red-herring. People interviewed by *Popular Mechanics* reported in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* that the: “debris pile sat cooking for weeks with the materials at the bottom of the pile getting increasingly hot because the fires were confined and lost minimal heat to the atmosphere. As a result, the fires could easily have reached temperatures sufficient to melt steel, not to mention most of the other metals found in the buildings.” (page 41)

If fires at the bottom of the heap of debris at Ground Zero were so contained that they “lost minimal heat to the atmosphere”, one wonders what was serving as an air supply for those fires. Furthermore, one also wonders what materials might have been fueling such fires.

There were newspaper accounts (e.g, a November 19, 2001 edition of the *New York Times*) indicating that the fires at Ground Zero were still

burning more than two months after September 11, 2001. So, what would have fueled such fires for a period of months?

Five days after 9/11, NASA flew a plane over Ground Zero to gather data for the construction of a thermal map of that area. In all there were eight hot spots that showed up on the thermal map. Two of the hot spots were associated with the area of the south tower; two of them were associated with the north tower; two of them were associated with the general area surrounding the twin towers, and two of the hot spots were associated with Building 7.

The temperatures of these hot spots ranged from a low of 427 degrees Centigrade to a high of 727 degrees Centigrade. Presumably, these spots had been much hotter prior to the day of the data gathering, five days after 9/11, because firefighters had been spraying the piles on a continuous basis for the previous four-plus days.

There is no ready empirically verifiable explanation for the existence of such hot spots or their longevity. Whatever the answer to these mysteries might be, in the absence of additional evidence which might change my sense of things, I am inclined to accept the possibility that the molten pools of metal found at Ground Zero were not caused by thermite reactions from the use of high-powered explosives such as RDX because if Mark Loizeaux – who was quoted earlier – is correct, then shaped charges of such explosive materials use brute force not brute heat to cut through steel and would not necessarily lead to the formation of pools of melted metal.

However, there is another aspect of this discussion that might be much more relevant to the controlled demolition hypothesis. In Appendix C of the FEMA report: World Trade Center Building Performance Study, an indication is given that some of the samples obtained from Building 7 and one of the twin tower buildings showed signs of sulfidation. Moreover, in a letter: 'An Initial Microstructural Analysis of A36 Steel from WTC Building 7' by ER. Barnet, R.R. Biederman, and R.D. Sisson, Jr. – which was published in the December 2001 issue of the *Journal of the Minerals, Metals and Materials Society* -- the authors state: "Rapid deterioration of the steel was a result of heating with oxidation in combination with intergranular melting due to the presence of sulfur. The formation of the eutectic mixture of iron oxide and iron sulfide lowers the temperature at which liquid can form in the steel. This strongly suggests that the

temperatures in this region of the steel beam approached 1,000 degrees Centigrade ...”

What is the possible significance of the foregoing information? Thermate, which is a more powerful version of thermite and was originally discovered by individuals working for the military, is a high-powered cutting explosive that contains a mixture of sulfur, iron oxide, aluminum powder and barium nitrate. Consequently, one possibility is that the sulfidation observed in some of the column samples from the twin towers and Building 7 might have been generated through a thermate explosion.

There are other sources of sulfur that might have been involved in the sulfidation of the aforementioned column sample. For example the gypsum which was used in the box structures that helped lend a certain amount of fireproofing protection for the core columns could have served as a possible source for sulfur.

One still would have to come up with a physical mechanism that would account for how, say, a gypsum-based source of sulfur ended up as part of a sulfidation process in steel columns. Some people have suggested that, perhaps, the pools of molten metal that existed at the bottom of the debris piles might have served as an incubator, of sorts, for the sulfidation reaction. However, at least several of the column samples studied reportedly came from near the top of the debris pile, and, therefore, under such circumstances it becomes more difficult to provide a plausible explanation of how gypsum and the steel columns might have hooked up to create a sulfidation area in the steel columns that showed signs of having been subjected to temperatures of about 1,000 degrees Centigrade ... considerably hotter than anything that is likely to have occurred in the hydrocarbon fires within the twin towers.

Is thermate or gypsum (or some other source of sulfur) responsible – given the right set of circumstances – for the observed sulfidation in the column samples? No one knows, and since – as noted several times earlier -- almost all of the evidence was removed from the crime scene, we might never know the answer to the above puzzle.

Sulfidation of steel columns is consistent with the hypothesis of controlled demolition. Sulfidation of steel columns is also consistent with a number of other possibilities that don't involve the presence of thermate.



Does sulfidation of steel columns samples from the WTC constitute “corroborating” evidence for the controlled demolition hypothesis? Not necessarily, but when the issue of sulfidation is added to all the other previously discussed evidence that appears to be in support of, or consistent with, a hypothesis of controlled demolition, then the idea of controlled demolition occurring in conjunction with the WTC buildings on 9/11 cannot automatically be assigned to the category of conspiratorial delusions of the lunatic fringe. There might be as much evidence – perhaps more -- which can be cited that leans in the direction of the controlled demolition hypothesis as there is evidence that could be cited in support of, or consistent with, the so-called ‘official theory’ which indicates that the three buildings collapsed through normal principles of engineering science that were not assisted by any form of controlled demolition.

I would like my hypothetical grand jury to call as witnesses every last researcher who worked on the NIST report. I believe those researchers have a lot of explaining to do above and beyond what was offered through any of their various documents concerning the World Trade Center. There is much of what they have done and claimed in the NIST reports that is not at all clear and/or convincing and/or even plausible.

In addition, I would like my hypothetical grand jury to call a variety of other, non-NIST experts. For example, I would like to hear from Barbara Lane and Susan Lamont who, in their aforementioned April 12, 2005 presentation at the NCE conference, indicated that the NIST report did not seem to address the issue of thermal expansion and wondered if this phenomenon might have played a significant role in the collapse of the WTC buildings.

I also would like to listen to people like Professor Colin Bailey, the structural engineer from the University of Manchester. Professor Bailey was critical of NIST’s resistance to provide a visualization of their simulation so that the NIST model could be compared with the actual, observed collapses of the WTC buildings in order to determine if there were problematic discrepancies, errors, or unresolved issues.

I believe that the methodologies used by NIST during their research and simulation-construction need to be more critically examined. Professor Bailey’s insights raise questions about certain aspects of that methodology, but I believe there are many other questions that need to be raised, as well.

I also would like to hear from individuals such as Bill Manning, editor of *Fire Engineering* magazine, who complained about the destruction of evidence in conjunction with the three World Trade Buildings. To quote his words: “I have combed through our national standard for fire investigation, NFPA 921, but nowhere in it does one find an exemption allowing for the destruction of evidence for buildings over ten stories tall.”

I am sure there are many other experts who might be found who could help my hypothetical grand jury to revisit all of the issues surrounding the collapse of the two towers – many of which have been outlined throughout the discussions contained in this chapter. This needs to be done because, as things stand, the NIST theory concerning the collapse mechanism for the WTC buildings seems rather empirically-challenged, problematic, unsatisfying, and lacunae-laden.

I don’t know what the truth of any of these various issues might be. However, I do know that the efforts put forth by NIST and the 9/11 Commission in this regard have, in all too many ways, been insufficiently robust – no matter how many pages might have been written on their behalf, and no matter how many people were involved in their research, and no matter how many millions of dollars might have been spent.

-----

## 9 - Tora! Tora! Tora!

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* states: “hundreds of witnesses saw a Boeing 757 hit the building.” (page 59) The ‘building’ being referred to is the Pentagon.

While it might, or might not be true, that hundreds of people witnessed a Boeing 757 strike the Pentagon on 9/11, a blanket claim attesting to that is not sufficient for my hypothetical grand jury. Of course, I can’t speak for other fellow members of the grand jury, but I, for one, would want the names of the hundreds of individuals being alluded to by *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, and, as well, I would like an opportunity to explore, in detail, what those people might have seen, heard, or experienced on 9/11 that might be of relevance to understanding what did, and did not, happen at the Pentagon on that day.

There is almost no account in *The 9/11 Commission Report* concerning the events at the Pentagon other than to indicate that the Commission researchers are of the opinion that the Pentagon was, indeed, struck by Flight 77, a Boeing 757, on 9/11. However, to whatever extent the Commission might have conducted interviews of Pentagon witnesses, that information has not been made available to the public in any detailed format, and this is unacceptable.

Presumably, the testimony of such people would not compromise national security in anyway, and, therefore, there really is no reason to prevent the American people, or the world, from learning about what those individuals witnessed on September 11, 2001. On the other hand, if there is something in the testimony of those people that might, in some remote way, carry implications for national security and that is not being released due to such a possibility, then this might be seen to serve as prima facie evidence that what the ‘official story’ claims to have happened on 9/11 in conjunction with the Pentagon is, in some yet to be determined way, not truthful or accurate.

The best and easiest way to stop conspiracy theories is to provide all of the facts and, then, to demonstrate how such facts plausibly and reliably cohere to provide a complete, consistent account of what went on at the Pentagon on 9/11. If one does not do this, one is merely part of the problem, and, as such, the failure to provide complete disclosure on evidential matters concerning 9/11 merely serves to aid and abet all manner of speculation, conjecture, and ill-considered thinking.

The events of 9/11 have been seared into the hearts, minds, bodies, and souls of people across the United States. American citizens are all entitled to every last piece of information concerning 9/11. Consequently, anyone who obstructs, undermines, thwarts, delays, prevents, or resists providing the American people with such information is doing a grave injustice to the evidence, to the people who died on 9/11, to the people who died as a result of the ramifications of 9/11, to the American people, and to democracy.

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* is very selective in the testimony that it presents with respect to the events at the Pentagon. For example, the book provides testimony from, say, Frank Probst and Don Mason, but not from, for instance, April Gallop or Don Perkal.

According to the account related in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, Frank Probst, a Pentagon employee, “was walking outside the office building on his way to a 10:00 a.m. meeting as the plane approached; it was flying so low that Probst actually dove to the ground because he thought the plane might hit him. After the plane passed, Probst, a West Point graduate and decorated Vietnam War veteran, turned and saw the right wing smashing a portable 750-kilowatt generator that was set on a concrete pad outside the Pentagon. ... Probst also saw the left engine strike a ground-level external vent positioned just outside the exterior wall of the Pentagon.” (page 67)

A few pages earlier in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, mention had been made of the fact the Boeing 757 allegedly was traveling at 780 feet per second. As a result, I’m having a certain amount of difficulty picturing things in relation to the testimony of Frank Probst.

He said he was walking outside the Pentagon. Obviously, he was somewhere on the west side of the Pentagon that is the segment struck by something or other on 9/11.

Moreover, he had to be somewhere along the southwest area of the Pentagon because Flight 77 is alleged to have come in on a flight path that was somewhat diagonal along a northeasterly heading (coming from the southwest) toward the front facade of the west face of the Pentagon. At some point, he noticed that the object was almost on top of him and was flying so low that he thought it was going to hit him, and, therefore, he hit the deck.

The part that I am having trouble visualizing is how someone could dive to the ground, wait for the plane to pass, and, then turn around to see several incidents in detail when the plane was traveling at 780 feet a second – fast enough to cover more than the length of 2 1/2 football fields in one second. Where, exactly, was Mr. Probst in relation to the Pentagon when he had his experience?

The plane was flying so low and was so close to him that he thought it was going to hit him and, as a result, he dove to the ground. Yet, he had time to dive to the ground, wait for an indeterminate period of time for the plane to pass, turn, and still see several events take place before the aircraft slammed into the Pentagon.

How many seconds are we talking about? Possibly 5 or 6 seconds, at a minimum, would have had to elapse for a person to react, dive, hit the ground, wait, and then turn. Five times 780 feet is 3900 feet (13 football fields), and since Mr. Probst still had time to see several events take place (namely, the right wing hitting a generator and the left engine hitting a ground-level external vent placed just outside the Pentagon wall), we need to tack on a certain amount of footage to calculate, roughly, how far away Mr. Probst was from the Pentagon and to enable Mr. Probst sufficient time to see what he claimed to see prior to the aircraft hitting the Pentagon.

4,000 feet, or more, is certainly outside the Pentagon, but it is not exactly near the Pentagon. Where was the meeting being held to which Mr. Probst was going? Was it at some non-Pentagon location? And, if it wasn't, then where, exactly, was he walking to and how far away from the Pentagon was he?

There might be legitimate answers for all of the above issues, but, as it stands, Mr. Probst's testimony is incomplete and needs considerable elaboration. Without these additional facts, it is difficult to visualize where Mr. Probst was when he had his 9/11 encounter and to determine what he might have been able to see or what he might not have been able to see.

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* says that "Probst's observations are bolstered by one of his colleagues, Don Mason, who was stuck in traffic just west of the Pentagon, and who saw the plane clip three light poles on its approach. He watched Probst dive to the ground, and then saw a small explosion when the plane hit a portable generator." (pages 67- 68).

Presumably, the traffic in which Mr. Mason was stuck was somewhere on Route 27. This is a six-lane highway, three lanes of which, I believe, proceed in a westerly direction, and three lanes of which proceed in an easterly direction.

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* doesn't say where Mr. Mason was stuck in traffic. Apparently, wherever it was, he allegedly had a clear view of both Frank Probst and the west facade of the Pentagon.

Again, I am having a certain amount of difficulty trying to visualize whether, or not, Mr. Mason would have been in a position to do both. If he was on the side of Route 27 furthest from the Pentagon (and depending where, precisely, he was stuck in traffic) it is difficult – although not necessarily impossible-- to understand how he would have been able to see both the events at the Pentagon as well as his colleague dive to the ground. There are potentially similar problems – again depending on where he was stuck in traffic -- if he was stuck in traffic on the side of Route 27 nearest to the Pentagon.

-----

The foregoing uncertainties do not necessarily mean that Mr. Mason has not given an accurate description of what he witnessed. On the other hand, there is a certain amount of doubt that lingers about his words – doubt that can only be cleared up by further information and evidence.

There is one thing noticeably absent from many reports about the Pentagon crashes. Namely, there were no widespread reports of jet blast or wake turbulence as the aircraft reportedly came in over Route 27 and headed for the Pentagon.

The absence of such reports is especially puzzling because Frank Probst said the plane was so close to the ground that he thought it was going to hit him. In addition, the official Pentagon account indicates that the Boeing was flying at a speed of about 530 miles per hour and was just two feet off the ground.

If these statements are accurate, the noise should have been deafening. Moreover, with a Boeing 757 that close to the ground, one would have expected that either some people or cars might have been adversely affected by the wake turbulence being created through the passage of the commercial jet.

Yet, as far as I have been able to determine, no one seemed to make mention of how deafening the sound of the jet engines were. In addition, there were no reports of wake turbulence damage.

The deafening sound of a Boeing 757 flying two feet above the ground is inconsistent with the reports of many other people. For example, Don Wright, Lon Rains, Michael DiPaula, Kirk Milburn, Tom Seibert, and John O'Keefe provided very different accounts.

John O'Keefe said "the aircraft went 'pff. It wasn't what I would have expected for a plane that was not much more than a football field away from me." Don Wright stated: "It sounded like a two-engine commercial jet coming from the south real low." Lon Raines indicated: "I heard a very loud, quick whooshing sound ... I was convinced it was a missile. It came in so fast, it sounded nothing like an airplane." Tom Seibert said: "We heard what sounded like a missile." Michael DiPaula also said: "It sounded like a missile." Kirk Milburn stated: "It was like a WHOOSH, whoosh ... then there was fire and smoke ... then I heard a second explosion."

Steve Patterson, 43, who has an apartment on the 14<sup>th</sup> floor of a building in Pentagon City, was watching coverage of the World Trade Center when he saw a silver commuter jet fly by his window. The jet was not big enough to hold more than eight to twelve people. He described the plane as having the high-pitched squeal of a fighter jet.

Although Flight 77 had vanished from radar screens some forty- five minutes before the Pentagon strike, just prior to the incident at the Pentagon, an unidentified aircraft showed up on the radar screens over Washington. Despite the absence of any corroborating evidence, some people later identified this aircraft as Flight 77.

During the early part of 9/11, Danielle O'Brien was on duty as an air traffic controller at Dulles Air Port. She has gone on record as saying: "The speed, maneuverability, the way that he turned, we all thought in the radar room, all of us experienced air traffic controllers, that it was a military plane."

None of the foregoing first-hand accounts are consistent with the manner in which a Boeing 757 either maneuvers in the sky or with the sort of sounds that are made by a Boeing 757 flying just a few feet off the ground. None of the foregoing reports are consistent with the testimony of Frank Probst and Don Mason.

Who should one believe? Whoever one believes, the fact of the matter is that one does not encounter the above sort of information in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, and, consequently, there is a total absence of any critical exploration with respect to the manner in which such information tends to run contrary to the 'official story'.

-----

The experiences of some people who were near the section of the Pentagon that was struck on 9/11 also offer some testimony that is inconsistent with certain parts of the 'official story' concerning the Pentagon incident. For instance, April Gallop, a Pentagon employee with Top Secret security clearance and who was working in the Pentagon's west wing on 9/11, reports hearing an explosion and being buried beneath rubble, but she reports there was no all-consuming fire as had been reported in the 'official story' concerning the Pentagon.

Later, when she was in the hospital (Her son, whom she was in the process of taking to daycare when the explosion occurred, had been seriously injured), there had been more than one occasion Ms. Gallop indicates when she was visited by men who were dressed in suits but who did not identify themselves to her. These men told her that she should keep her mouth shut about anything she had experienced during the Pentagon incident, and they repeated over and over again that a plane had hit the Pentagon – even though Ms. Gallop indicates: "I was there, and I never saw a plane or even debris from a plane."

A number of people at the Pentagon – including Gilah Goldsmith, John Bowman, Mike Slater, and Don Perkal – all reported hearing one, or more, explosions. Lisa Burgess of *Stars and Stripes* reported hearing "two large booms – one large and one small". Furthermore, several of the foregoing individuals – for example, Don Perkal and Mike Slater -- indicated that they had smelled cordite from explosives and not fumes from a hydrocarbon (i.e., jet fuel) fire.

Initial reports by officials and the media indicated that the Pentagon was struck around 9:43 a.m. Eventually, the 'official time' for the Pentagon event was fixed at 9:37 a.m..

However, eyewitness accounts indicate that a plethora of battery-operated wall clocks in the Pentagon's west section had stopped at 9:32 a.m. by an extremely violent event of some kind. This time of 9:32 was confirmed



by Per Stig Moller, from Denmark, who was in a Washington, D.C. building from which the Pentagon was clearly visible and reported hearing an explosion and seeing smoke rising from the Pentagon.

He looked at his watch, and it read 9:32 a.m. This is what he reported in his September 12, 2001 morning interview with Denmark Radio P3.

A short while ago, I mentioned the testimony of Kirk Milburn who had heard several explosions at the Pentagon. The first one might have been at 9:32 a.m., and the second might have been at 9:37, the 'official time' of the alleged crash of Flight 77 into the Pentagon.

Whatever the times of these several explosions might have been, the explosion at 9:32 a.m. was not caused by anything crashing into the Pentagon. In fact, according to a September 11, 2001 *Washington Post* article, there were eyewitnesses who reported seeing windows first expand outwardly and, then, move inwardly. If true, such testimony - involving cordite, time of the initial violent event, and eye-witness accounts of the behavior of the windows - is at odds with the official account of events at the Pentagon.

None of the foregoing information appears in *The Pentagon Building Performance Report*. None of the foregoing information appears in *The 9/11 Commission Report*. None of the foregoing information appears in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*.

-----

According to *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, video footage of the Pentagon impact was recorded by a security camera located on the north side of the building. However, because the video camera was set at a slow- frame rate of 1 frame per second, while the Boeing 757 was flying at around 780 feet per second, the camera was not able to capture much detail of the crash - little more than a blur and, then, the fireball.

In May of 2006, following the trial and conviction of Zacharias Moussaoui, two videos that had been used in the trial were released to the public by the Pentagon. The videos did not appear to show the presence of a Boeing 757. On the other hand, those frames might not have shown that a Boeing 757 was absent either since the quality of the video was too poor, seemingly, to either prove or disprove that a Boeing was, or was not, in the video footage.

I will return to this video footage a little while later because there are elements in the video that might entail very significant ramifications for the point-counterpoint of what happened, or didn't happen, at the Pentagon on 9/11. In the meantime, there are some additional considerations concerning video footage that should be examined.

In addition to the video footage from the security cameras on the north side of the Pentagon, there were also at least three other sources of video footage that had relevance to the Pentagon events on 9/11. These additional sources of video footage were from a security camera located at a gas station that had visual access to the west facade of the Pentagon; from rooftop cameras at the Sheraton National Hotel, as well as from video cameras administered by the Virginia Department of Transportation that overlooked portions of Route 27 that ran past the west facade of the Pentagon and had a clear line of sight to that section of the building.

In a December 11, 2001 article by Bill McKelway in the *Richmond Times Dispatch* – and similar information also was reported in the *National Geographic News* – Jose Velasquez, who was working at the aforementioned gas station, reported that only minutes after the Pentagon incident, FBI authorities showed up at the gas station and confiscated the video as part of their on-going investigation. That video footage has gone missing in action.

Bill Gertz, of the *Washington Times*, wrote an article about how employees of the Sheraton National Hotel had retrieved the video footage taken from its rooftop cameras and had watched it a number of times before the FBI showed up and confiscated the video.

Apparently, what the hotel employees saw on the video horrified them. However, if the quality of the video was as poor as the quality of the video from the security camera on the north side of the Pentagon, one wonders what there was on the video that horrified them, and one wonders why this video has never been released to the public.

The video footage from the cameras overlooking Route 27 was also confiscated by the FBI from the Virginia Department of Transportation. This information, like the other video footage of the Pentagon events on 9/11, has not been released.

One has great difficulty trying to imagine any possible valid reason why such video footage should not be viewed by the public. If the video footage shows a Boeing 757 crashing into the Pentagon, then the government

should release such evidence and silence at least those myths having to do with what did, or did not, take place at the Pentagon. On the other hand, if the videos do not show a Boeing 757 crashing into the Pentagon, a great many questions would arise in the light of such a revelation, and, perhaps, this is why officials appear to be unwilling to make such video footage public. In either event, keeping the public in the dark is a decision that is not conducive to a healthy democracy.

-----

According to *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, "all but five of the 189 people who died on the aircraft and in the Pentagon were later identified through DNA. The five hijackers were positively identified." (page 63)

The latter statement is directly contradicted by evidence uncovered by Dr. Thomas R. Olmstead, a psychiatrist and ex-Naval line officer, who wrote an article for the *Sierra Times* on July 6, 2003. Under the Freedom of Information Act, Dr. Olmstead made a request for the pathologist's autopsy list of individuals identified as having been killed at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. The list contains no Arab names, and, therefore, the aforementioned claim in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* to the contrary, apparently the five alleged Arab hijackers have not been positively identified.

The Armed Forces Institute of Pathology indicates that of the 189 people killed at the Pentagon on 9/11, 125 of them were either employees at, or working with, the Pentagon. 64 of the deceased were identified as passengers of Flight 77, but none of these 64 names matches the names of the individuals identified by the FBI as having been allegedly responsible for the hijackings, and none of the names seem to be of obvious Arab ethnicity.

Interestingly enough, the initial list of passengers for Flight 77 that was released by American Airlines only contained 56 names. A further list that was released contained 58 names.

None of the names released by American Airlines matched any of the alleged hijackers of Flight 77. None of the passengers listed by the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology carried a name indicating Arab ethnicity, but the AFIP list did reveal that six names not listed by American Airlines apparently were, according to the AFIP, passengers on Flight 77.

Either the American Airlines Flight passenger manifest list is wrong or the AFIP autopsy list is incorrect because the latter organization is listing six

people as passengers that have not been acknowledged by American Airlines in relation to Flight 77. Is it possible that American Airlines was wrong about how many people were on Flight 77, or is it possible that there were six people in the Pentagon who were flying below the radar on 9/11 and, therefore, are absent from any 'official' Pentagon list of employees or contractors and, as a result, were misidentified by the AFIP as American Airline passengers?

Whatever the answer to the above mystery might be, both the American Airline flight passenger manifest and the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology appear to agree on one point. As indicated earlier, there were no Arab names on either the passenger manifest list or the autopsy list, and if this is the case, then *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is 100 % wrong in its assertion that "the five hijackers were positively identified".

Aside from the foregoing considerations, one might also experience a certain amount of puzzlement with respect to -- if what *Debunking 9/11 Myths* says above concerning positive identification were true -- how the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology might have gone about securing an original sample of the hijackers DNA against which the Institute could compare the remains of the deceased who were allegedly found in the Pentagon. There might be a plausible way of resolving such puzzlement, but, if so, the answer is not readily visible, and, certainly, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* has done nothing to help one out in this respect.

-----

A reporter at a Department of Defense Pentagon news briefing that took place not too long after the events of 9/11 is reported to have said: "One thing that's confusing -- if it (i.e., Flight 77) came in the way you described, at an angle, why, then, are not the wings outside? I mean the wings would have shorn off. The tail would have shorn off, and, yet, there's apparently no evidence of the aircraft."

On page 63 of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* one finds the following information:

"It is true that after the crash, only pieces of the plane were recovered: the landing gear, bits of the fuselage, and the flight data recorder among others. Much of the airline was pulverized due to the combination of the plane's mass and velocity and the dense interior structure of the Pentagon. 'As the plane penetrated through the building, it was literally

encountering a forest of columns. The plane disintegrated on itself' says Paul Mlakar, a senior research scientist with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, who was team leader for *The Pentagon Building Performance Report*, released in January 2003." (pages 63-64)

The foregoing information does not really answer the question raised by the aforementioned news reporter. Although, clearly, Paul Mlakar is claiming that once the plane penetrated into the interior of the building, the aircraft disintegrated in upon itself, nonetheless, the issue about the angular manner in which the plane came with respect to the exterior of the Pentagon is still left unaddressed. Why weren't there pieces of the plane's tail, wings, and engines on the front lawn outside the points of impact?

During a Pentagon news debriefing held on September 12,2001, Ed Plaughner, the fire chief for the Arlington County Fire Department, reported that he had not seen any large portions of a 757 Boeing in the fire debris at the Pentagon. However, some six months later, Mr. Plaughner's recollection of things apparently changed, and he subsequently said that he remembered seeing portions of wings, fuselage, engine, landing gear, seats, and one of the two black boxes from the airplane.

Of course, there was a relatively small piece of fuselage that was found on the lawn a short distance from the area where some sort of explosive event happened at the Pentagon. This fragment of wreckage had some of the same colors that are on American Airlines aircraft, and this seemed to be consistent with the idea that Flight 77 hit the Pentagon. But, on the other hand, people had difficulty trying to figure out what part of an American Airlines aircraft the photographed piece of wreckage might have been ripped off from since no matter with what part of an American Airlines Boeing 757 it was compared, the piece did not seem to match up with any of the areas of comparison, and, of course, now that bit of evidence has disappeared into an official/government-like Bermuda Triangle, never, apparently, to be seen again. Furthermore, the aforementioned piece of fuselage bore no evidence of having been exposed to any form of a hydrocarbon fire as one might expect in the case of a commercial jet loaded with fuel and that exploded on impact or very shortly thereafter.

Moreover, if this one item -- which was light enough to be picked up by one person -- could have been shorn off from the plane, then, why weren't other, heavier portions, such as the engines, shorn off as well? Apparently, a

number of people reported that there was a lot of debris on the lawn outside the Pentagon, but with the exception of the above- noted piece of fuselage, all the other pieces of wreckage seemed to be very, very small.

Eventually, inside the Pentagon some portions of landing gear, bits of the fuselage, the flight data recorder, and a light beacon were found. What happened to the rest of the plane?

*Debunking 9/11 Myths* reports “... a jet doesn’t punch a cartoon-like outline into a concrete building upon impact, says Mete Sozen, the Kettlehut Distinguished Professor of Civil Engineering at Purdue University. According to Sozen, who was one of four civil engineers that ASCE sent to study the damage to the Pentagon, the energy load of the plane – not its shape or structure – is the critical factor determining its effect on a building in a crash. This was revealed in Purdue’s computer simulation, which adapted software typically used to evaluate auto crashes to the scenario of a 757 airplane, the mass of which is mostly fluid fuel traveling at 531 miles per hour and striking a building filled with reinforced concrete columns. Sozen says the resulting energy load rendered the exterior of the plane “like a sausage skin” that crumbled upon impact. What was left of the plane flowed into the structure in a state closer to a liquid than a solid mass ... .” (page 69)

Before moving on to discuss the theory that is being advanced in the above quote, I would like to point out that contrary to what is said above in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, the mass of a Boeing 757 flying at 531 miles per hour is not “mostly fluid fuel”. According to the *Pentagon Building Performance Report*, a Boeing’s 757’s “maximum takeoff weight was 255,000 lb, including up to 11,275 gal of fuel” (taken from page 138 of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, Appendix C, which provides a summary of the foregoing report). In addition, the maximum takeoff weight would include 200 passengers and 1,670 cubic feet of cargo.

The weight of aviation gasoline or Jet A is 6.84 lbs/gallon. This means that at maximum takeoff weight, jet fuel would account for approximately 77,121 lbs. of the total of 255,000 pounds, and, so, at maximum takeoff weight, the fuel does not constitute the majority of a Boeing 757’s weight.

Empty, a Boeing 757 weighs about 60 tons or 120,000 pounds. Consequently, even if one took nothing else into consideration, a Boeing 757 fully loaded with jet fuel does not exhibit a weight that would be capable of

verifying the contention that the mass of such a plane consists mostly of jet fuel.

About 3,500 gallons of gas are consumed by a Boeing 757 during a cross-country trip, and Flight 77 was headed for Los Angeles. However, given that Flight 77 took off at 8:20 a.m. and allegedly crashed at around 9:30 a.m. . Since it takes roughly  $4 \frac{1}{3}$  hours to cover the 2,308 miles between Washington, D.C. and Los Angeles at a speed of, say, 531 miles per hour, and since the plane was in the air for over an hour before it supposedly crashed, I am assuming that approximately  $\frac{1}{4}$ th of the 3,500 gallons was already consumed by the time the plane allegedly hit the Pentagon.

This means that roughly 875 gallons of gas had been used up. At 6.84 lbs per gallon, this works out to be almost 6,000 lbs that would have to be subtracted from the initial fuel load of 77,121 lbs, and, therefore, once again, most of the mass of a Boeing 757 flying at 531 miles per hour does not consist of jet fuel.

Of course, one also can factor in the weight of about 60 passengers and the flight crew from American Airlines 77, plus the weight of their collective luggage, along with an unknown amount of cargo tonnage. All of this will add to the amount of non-fuel weight, and, therefore, this will lower the relative percentage of fuel load to total takeoff weight.

Consequently, no matter how one calculates things, the foregoing statement in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is just wrong. The mass of a Boeing 757 flying at 531 miles per hour is not “mostly fluid fuel”.

The above process of running through various arithmetical calculations concerning the relative weight of jet fuel to the overall weight of a Boeing 757 passenger jet might seem like a small point. However, throughout *Debunking 9/11 Myths* the contributors to that book go to great lengths to indicate how technically challenged all of the so-called conspiracy theorists are, and, yet, the people who wrote and edited *Debunking 9/11 Myths* often can't even seem to get simple, technical details right. What's the saying about people who live in glass houses not throwing something or other?

Mete Sozen, the aforementioned civil engineer from Purdue University who was part of the team studying damage to the Pentagon after 9/11, indicated that “the energy load of the plane – not its shape or structure – is the critical factor determining its effect on a building in a

crash.” *Debunking 9/11 Myths* goes on to state that: “This was revealed in Purdue’s computer simulation, which adapted software typically used to evaluate auto crashes to the scenario of a 757 airplane ... Sozen says the resulting energy load rendered the exterior of the plane “like a sausage skin” that crumbled upon impact. What was left of the plane flowed into the structure in a state closer to a liquid than a solid mass ... .”

Now, in certain respects, the foregoing perspective is somewhat puzzling. It begins with a statement that the kind of effect that a Boeing 757 will have on a building is determined by the ‘energy load’ of the plane but, then, ends up with a statement about the impact that the building had on the plane.

In reality, the energy load is a product of two broad sets of forces. On the one hand, there are the dynamic forces brought by, allegedly, a Boeing 757 traveling at some 531 miles per hour. On the other hand, there are the static forces given expression through the structure of the Pentagon.

To some extent, we know the dimensions of the foregoing set of dynamic forces. However, we do not know the quantitative dimensions of the static forces because the nature of the precise architecture and construction specifications of the newly re-furbished west wing of the Pentagon are, for security reasons, classified.

In the previous chapter of the present book -- *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition* -- Colin Bailey, a professor of structural engineering at the University of Manchester, indicated that it really was necessary to have a visualization of the collapse of the twin towers so that one could compare that visualization against observed events to determine whether, or not, the computer simulation contained any errors which indicated that the model needed to be revamped in some way. Similarly, one needs a visualization of the Purdue University computer simulation of the Pentagon crash to be able to check for possible anomalies between the model and actual empirical data.

In addition, one needs to be able to check the variable values being fed into that Pentagon computer simulation in order to be able to determine what relation to physical reality such variable substitutions might have. For instance, as previously discussed in the last chapter, when one began to closely examine what NIST did with respect to its modeling process and how the underlying methodology that was used to generate sets of variable values that were fed into the alleged collapse mechanism simulation



constructed by NIST entailed many questions surrounding the reliability and propriety of such methodology when seeking to generate a plausible, theoretical explanation for the twin tower collapse mechanism.

Consequently, one also needs to know more about the computer simulation crash model that was developed at Purdue in order to help provide a theoretical account of the damage report at the Pentagon – a computer simulation that was adapted from a car crash simulation model. In addition, one not only needs to know what sets of variable values were used in arriving at their final simulation version, one also needs to know what decisions were made, and why, with respect to the accepting or rejecting of any given set of variable values that were used in the calculations that led to the simulation model on which part of the Pentagon report is based.

Since structural details from the Pentagon side of things are classified, then, really, as far as the public is concerned, the whole explanation for the Pentagon crash is something of a mystery into which known data (e.g., the airplane energy load distribution) are fed into several black boxes. These black boxes consist of (1) a crash simulation program along with (2) information concerning the structural character of the Pentagon, and out of the interface of knowns and unknowns involving the plane, the building, the programs, variable values, and methodology, there, then, arises a theory.

Since the section of the Pentagon's newly refurbished west facade was struck, significant portions of that section were destroyed and had to be rebuilt, one wonders how the release of structural specifications for that portion of the building that already had been destroyed would have put either the Pentagon or its inhabitants at risk. Presumably, the Department of Defense would not have been so foolish as to merely rebuild after 9/11, according to the same specifications as the newly (pre-9/11) refurbished section of the building, a structure that clearly had not survived intact from the alleged Boeing 757 impact on 9/11. One might anticipate that some improvements would have been made in the rebuilding of the Pentagon's west facade that would have rendered the previous, pre-9/11 specifications a thing of the past.

Well, whatever, the reasoning on the part of the Department of Defense might have been for keeping structural information on the damaged section of the Pentagon classified, my fellow grand jury members and I are

faced with a problem. This problem revolves around the degree of credibility that should be assigned to the foregoing sorts of testimony.

For example, I think it would be appropriate to know why certain people, and not others, were selected to participate in putting together the *Pentagon Building Performance Report*. I also believe it would be important to know how many of the selected people were employees of the Pentagon, or had contracts -- either at the time of running studies for the Pentagon, or during the time when the report was being assembled, or prior to 9/11. Is it possible that those individuals who took part in the Pentagon report might have let the prospect of not receiving any further promotions or defense contracts possibly influence their research and findings? How many of the foregoing people might have been visited by individuals in suits who -- as apparently was done with another Pentagon employee, April Gallop -- sought to intimate the report participants or apply pressure to them in some way, directly or indirectly?

In addition to the foregoing sort of considerations that, possibly, could bear on the credibility of testimony, one also might take into account other kinds of independent testimony that might be inconsistent with what the Pentagon report indicates. Potentially, such inconsistent testimony could be of relevance to the problem of trying to assess the credibility of the people who put together the *Pentagon Building Performance Report*.

Thus, one might wish to consider the testimony of Pierre-Henri Bunel who is not only a graduate of the French officers academy at Saint-Cyr, as well as former artillery officer with an array of expertise in explosives, but who did a tour of duty in the first Gulf war and served with General Schwartzkopf. Mr. Bunel constructs a very different picture with respect to part of what went on at the Pentagon than does the *Pentagon Building Performance Report* (All of the following material is drawn from Mr. Bunel's article: 'The Effects of a Hollow Charge').

More specifically, Mr. Bunel differentiates between a detonation and a deflagration. Both involve explosions, but a detonation is an explosion that propels generated gases with a progression, or speed of gas propagation, that exceeds 6000 feet per second, whereas a deflagration exhibits a progression, or speed of gas propagation, of less than 6000 feet per second.

A detonation occurs in relation to the triggering, via a detonator, of certain kinds of explosive devices. On the other hand, a deflagration takes

place when such things as hydrocarbons or gunpowder are ignited. However, Mr. Bunel further notes that even when a jet plane crashes, although the fuel might burn, the fuel does not necessarily deflagrate.

Mr. Bunel indicates that in detonations there often will be a cloud of white smoke that is visible near the point of detonation even before the appearance of a flame. This white cloud signifies the rapid compression of water vapor in the air prior to the point when the air can be propagated outwardly.

Mr. Bunel also describes the character, color, and shape of the explosive propagation that are associated with denotations and deflagrations. In a detonation, the flame tends to be pale yellow at the point of explosion and, then, progresses to, first, orange, followed by red, as the shockwave moves away from the point of detonation. The shock wave displaces itself so rapidly as it undergoes progression that the shape of the flame assumes a certain appearance of rigidity, and, furthermore, the explosion tends to rise upward through whatever target has been subjected to this blast.

Mr. Bunel contrasts the foregoing overview of a detonation with what happened at the World Trade Center when hydrocarbons were involved. In the latter case, following impact, the flames were yellow and tended to drift downward as they were carried by the falling jet fuel.

In addition, the smoke associated with denotations is due to the manner in which dust is lifted up by an explosion and begins to burn within the fierce temperatures generated by the explosion. This form of fire and smoke is described as being quite dissimilar to the thick plumes of dark smoke given off by a hydrocarbon fire such as occurred at the World Trade Center shortly after impact.

Having provided the foregoing background (with far more detail than is provided here), Mr. Bunel proceeds to analyze five frames of video that were released by CNN on May 8, 2002. This video footage was verified by the Pentagon as having come from the security camera on the north side of the Pentagon – video footage that was discussed briefly earlier in the present chapter.

With respect to the initial frame of explosion that is being analyzed, Mr. Bunel points out that there are traces of white smoke that is consistent with what would take place when a detonation-- and not a deflagration -- occurs. In

addition, however, red flames are also present, and this is characteristic of what happens when air is rapidly heated by the explosive pressure of a detonation's shockwave but which does not occur in relation to deflagration.

Mr. Bunel also indicates that in the CNN video footage there is evidence to show that the detonation has begun from within the Pentagon. To support this claim, he refers to the appearance of an energy ball that appears above the roof but which has not, yet, transformed into a fireball. Moreover, at this point, the white cloud of compressed air vapor has disappeared as a result of having been burned off by the extreme heat that is present in the developing explosion.

In summary, all of the features discussed by Mr. Bunel in relation to the CNN Pentagon video footage are consistent with a detonation not a deflagration. In other words, the characteristics of the explosion at the Pentagon seem to suggest that the properties of the explosion were due to something other than what one would expect if a Boeing 757 slammed into the Pentagon.

When Mr. Bunel examined officially sanctioned photographs of the damage to the exterior of the Pentagon's west facade, he noted several things that tend to support his theory that damage at the Pentagon was due to some form of high-yield denotation that was triggered on 9/11 rather than due to the crash of a Boeing 757.

For instance, based on his analysis of the photographs, he believes that the soot on the front of the Pentagon is more characteristic of that which would be generated through a combination classic fire together with what could have been produced by the shockwave of a high-yield explosive device. The soot on the front of the Pentagon is not at all what one would have anticipated if it had been created through a jet fuel fire.

Moreover, based on his analysis of the photographs, Mr. Bunel argues that the following fact is of significance – namely, the majority of windows on the west facade remain unbroken while most of the ones that are broken appear to be near the point of explosion. He explains that one would find such a combination of broken and unbroken windows if the shockwave of the blast had been propagated along the corridors of the Pentagon west wing. In other words, initially, before being channeled by the walls and ceiling of the corridors, the force of the shockwave would break windows – even in the case of double- glazed, specially constructed windows like those that had been built into the design of the newly refurbished west wing of

the Pentagon -- but once the force of the explosion was channeled by the corridors, the shockwave would propagate its force in a manner that was less likely to break windows at points distant from the point of impact.

To further support his theory concerning what hit the Pentagon, Mr. Bunel analyzes an officially released photograph of a hole in the third ring of the Pentagon's west wing. This hole is about seven feet in diameter.

Some people indicate that the hole was made by the nose of Flight 77 before the plane came to rest. Others say that the seven foot hole was made by the damaging effects of a flying, high-momentum landing assembly, a portion of which reportedly was found in the space between Rings C and B.

The first hypothesis – namely, that the seven foot hole in the first floor of Ring C was caused by the nose of the Boeing 757 – cannot be supported by the empirical data. To begin with, the nose of a Boeing 757 consists of a radome made of carbon fiber. If a Boeing 757 actually hit the Pentagon, it is not likely to have survived the first set of walls at the Pentagon, let alone remain intact until the third set of walls.

In addition, there are black smudges above the seven-foot hole but not anywhere else. If the interior side of Ring C had been subjected to a hydrocarbon fire, the entire wall would have been covered with soot, and those smudges would not been restricted to a few areas around the top of the hole.

On the other hand, black smudges on the interior wall above the seven-foot hole in Ring C -- but nowhere else -- are consistent with another possibility. According to Pierre-Henri Bunel, the properties of the hole in the wall are characteristic of what might be the result if an anti-concrete hollow charge explosive device had been used.

Among other things, a hollow charge detonation propels a jet consisting of a combination of melted materials and hot gas at a temperature of several thousand degrees centigrade and traveling at a velocity of a couple of thousand feet per second. This jet would not only be capable of penetrating through the three sets of walls that make up Rings C, D, and E, but, as well, since heat rises, the black smudges above the seven-foot hole could be the result of the heat that is given off by the foregoing sort of jet that had just begun to cool down from very high temperatures.

The second hypothesis noted above – namely, that the seven-foot hole in Ring C was caused by part of the landing-gear assembly – also is

challenged by the facts. First, one can point out that this second hypothesis has the same sort of difficulty as does the hypothesis involving the nose of the plane – that is, it can't explain the smudges above the hole.

Secondly, one has to be able to match the properties of the Ring C hole with the properties of the landing-gear assembly. How did the landing-gear near the nose of the plane create the precise dimensions and nearly circular character of that hole?

Furthermore, if the landing-gear assembly had become dislodged from the rest of the plane, would it have had the necessary energy load to penetrate through the Ring C wall? Since the Pentagon will not release information that would permit people to make the sort of calculations that would let one know what sort of force would have been necessary to penetrate the final Ring C wall, all one can do is ask the foregoing kinds of question while simultaneously noting that Pierre- Henri Bunel has a possible explanation for the Ring C hole that is backed up by argument and facts, whereas the Pentagon has an explanation for the Ring C hole that is backed up by neither argument nor facts – just assertion enveloped in the impenetrable secrets of classified documents.

The foregoing testimony of Pierre-Henri Bunel directly contradicts the findings of the *Pentagon Building Performance Report*. Who is one to believe?

Mr. Bunel's data, reasoning, and arguments are all transparent. Anyone can consider, analyze, reflect on, and critique what he has to say.

The data, reasoning, and arguments of the Pentagon report are almost totally opaque. One is being asked to accept what the Pentagon has to say without any opportunity to examine the empirical evidence and despite the fact that the findings of the *Pentagon Building Performance Report* are contradicted by evidence from a variety of other, independent sources.

If true, the foregoing analysis of Pierre-Henri Bunel carries implications beyond the aforementioned Pentagon report. More specifically, if Mr. Bunel's analysis is accurate, those individuals who reported they positively saw a Boeing 757 slam into the Pentagon on the morning of September 11, 2001 either misunderstood and misinterpreted what they saw or they are intentionally not telling the truth.

The point here is not to embarrass anyone. Eyewitness testimony is not always as reliable as is commonly supposed, and there is a great deal of literature in psychology, sociology, and legal theory that explores just how inaccurate such eyewitness testimony can be under a variety of circumstances. We are far more susceptible to an array of forces that can shape, color, distort, and influence our interpretation of experience than we might suppose.

The moral of the foregoing is this: Sound forensic evidence trumps eyewitness testimony. People can claim whatever they like, but if the forensic evidence clearly shows that what has been claimed cannot be true, then whatever the underlying motivations or causes of erroneous sensory experience might be, it is hard evidence that tends to carry greater probative value than does eyewitness testimony.

Is the expert testimony of Mr. Bunel true and accurate with respect to what happened at the Pentagon on 9/11? I don't know the answer to that question, but as long as no other independent medium of evidence and analysis comes along that persuasively can demonstrate the ways in which Mr. Bunel's findings do not accurately reflect what transpired at the Pentagon on the morning of September 11, 2001, then I find his testimony more credible than the testimony of people who claimed they saw a Boeing 757 hit the Pentagon.

There is additional video footage from the rooftop camera at the Sheraton Hotel, the Virginia Department of Transportation, and several other locations that is being held 'incommunicado'. No statement has been issued by the government that specifies, clarifies and justifies the reasons why such video footage should not be released to the public for further, independent study.

Such video footage could be used to corroborate Mr. Bunel's analysis of the five frames of video released by CNN, or such footage could be used to demonstrate that Mr. Bunel is in error. Whatever the character of that video footage might be, all of America would benefit, and, consequently, a great disservice is done not only to the people who died on September 11, 2001 as well as to their families, but, in addition, a great disservice is done to all Americans by not sharing such video evidence with the public.

-----

There are further pieces of evidence upon which to reflect. According to the *Pentagon Building Performance Report*, Flight 77 struck the ground floor of the west wing of the Pentagon. However, there are certain aspects of this scenario that I am having a certain degree of difficulty trying to visualize or make sense of.

Upon impact, the report states: “The right wing was below the second floor slab at the fuselage but above the second floor slab at the tip, and the left wing struck the building entirely below the second floor slab.” (page 143 - Appendix C of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*) The description in the Pentagon report at this point is, quantitatively speaking, rather amorphous.

Although the report says that the right wing, near the fuselage, was below the second floor slab, the report doesn’t say how much of the wing was below the second floor slab, nor does the report indicate how much of the tip was above the second floor slab. However, the term “tip” doesn’t seem to suggest that much of the wing was above the second floor slab.

The Pentagon is a five-storey building, some 77 feet in height, but there is a wall above the fifth storey windows. Each storey is, I am guestimating, about 14 feet.

Earlier in the *Pentagon Building Performance Report* one finds the following: “When it [i.e., the plane] was approximately 320 ft from the west wall of the building (0.42 seconds before impact), it was flying nearly level, only a few feet above the ground.” (page 139 – Appendix C of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*) Presumably a few feet is just that – a few feet – and, presumably, by this, one means that the bottom of the engines were a few feet above the ground. If so -- and it is difficult to know what else might be meant by the idea of a “few feet above the ground” -- the foregoing characterization of things would place the bottom of the wings about eleven feet off the ground.

The Pentagon report continues on with: “The aircraft flew over the grassy area next to the Pentagon until its right wing struck a piece of construction equipment [a 750-kilowatt generator] that was approximately 100 to 110 ft from the face of the building (0.10 seconds before impact). At that time the aircraft had rolled slightly to the left, its right wing elevated. After the plane had traveled another 75 ft, the left engine struck the ground at nearly the same instant that the nose of the aircraft struck the west wall of the Pentagon.” (pages 139-140 Appendix C of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*)



The Pentagon report doesn't provide any of the specifics, but a 750-kilowatt generator weighs quite a few thousand pounds and usually is less than seven feet tall (even when placed on a concrete pad as it supposedly was near the Pentagon). If the right wing of the plane struck such a generator, I wonder how this happened without the right engine (which is 9 feet tall) simultaneously dragging on the ground. I also wonder about where, exactly, on the wing the collision took place, and, as well, where on the generator the wing hit, and I wonder about what might have transpired as a result of striking such a hefty piece of machinery and whether, or not, a portion of the right wing could have been ripped off at the point of impact and ended up on the lawn in front of the west facade of the Pentagon, and if this did not happen, then why didn't it occur – how did the wing survive the impact?

On the other hand, I also wonder what happened to the generator? That is, what was the nature of the damage it sustained? Was that damage consistent with what one might expect if the generator had been struck by the wing of a Boeing 757 traveling at 531 miles per hour?

In any event, the wing span of a Boeing 757 is 124 feet 10 inches long. The height of the engines are nine feet. The distance from the top of the fuselage to the bottom of the engine is approximately 18 feet.

If – as was quoted previously from the Pentagon report – a Boeing 757 is flying relatively level just a few feet off the ground (which means that the bottom of the fuselage is about 3-4 feet above the ground and the top of the fuselage is about 20 feet off the ground) and, then, rolls slightly to the left, how far can the plane roll within 100 feet and in less than one-tenth of a second, so that the tip of the right wing will be above the second floor slab, while the area of the right wing near the fuselage will be completely below the second floor slab, and still strike the Pentagon primarily on the first floor of the building with the fuselage of the aircraft but without digging a substantial furrow in the lawn with the left engine and the tip of the left wing over the last 75 feet before impact?

If the left engine (nine feet below the wing) is just hitting the ground as the nose is striking the west facade of the building, the top of the fuselage should be some 18 feet above the ground – well into the second storey, and, yet, according to the Pentagon report, the fuselage of the plane supposedly struck the first floor. If one lowers the top of the fuselage so that it can fit within the first floor, then the left engine and left wing seemingly

would have made deep furrow marks across the lawn, but none of the officially released photographs show evidence of such furrow marks.

Somehow, as currently described by the Pentagon report, a certain amount of its data does not seem to be fitting together in a coherent or easily visualized format with other available evidence. Perhaps, given another go at things, the authors of the report might rework their description of events in a way that would be capable of tying all the pieces of information together without raising some of the foregoing questions.

Unfortunately, a lot of the aforementioned questions cannot be answered. As was true with respect to investigating the collapse of the three buildings at the World Trade Center -- and as I have noted previously -- so too, in the case of the Pentagon events on 9/11 much evidence has disappeared.

There is an additional factor concerning the issue of flying close to the ground that should, in passing, be mentioned. More specifically, I have been told that when a low-winged plane flies very close to the ground something called the "ground effect" occurs that consists of a decrease in drag along with an increase in lift.

If a pilot were attempting to bring an airplane in close to the ground by flying just a few feet above the surface in order to, say, hit the first storey of the Pentagon, that pilot probably would have to deal with the foregoing phenomenon and effectively counter it in order to be able to maintain the plane on a steady, level keel so close to the surface. I wonder if such a "terrible" pilot as Hani Hanjour, who was the alleged hijack pilot for Flight 77, would have known what to do in order to cope with the 'ground effect' phenomenon -- and, presumably, a pilot would have had to contend successfully with this effect in order to be able to crash the Boeing into the 1<sup>st</sup> floor of the Pentagon.

This leads to another question. Why would a pilot expose his "mission" to unnecessary risk by taking additional time -- during which fighter planes could disrupt one's assignment -- and decide to pursue a very difficult descent that ended up only a few feet above the ground and, in the process, at some point encounter the ground effect? Why wouldn't a terrorist pilot just dive bomb into the top of the Pentagon that provides a much bigger target, takes far less time, requires far less flying skill, and, probably, would have ended up doing much more damage?

Someone could, of course, respond that under the stress of the terrorist mission, the pilot might not have been thinking too clearly or had become rattled to some degree and, as a result, might have made some quick decisions that might not have been optimal. Or, one might respond with ‘who knows what ridiculous things go on in the mind of a terrorist’?

However, I have difficulty reconciling the foregoing sorts of response with the seemingly incredible level of flying skills that were allegedly exhibited by the pilot of Flight 77 prior to skimming along the grass in front of the west facade of the Pentagon. One might never know the answer to the apparent inconsistency between incredible flying skills and why someone who could fly so well would make such dubious decisions concerning how and where to engage the Pentagon target, but I do know that if Pierre-Henri Bunel is correct, then such mysteries dissipate because what struck the Pentagon might have been a Global Hawk, or a Predator drone, armed with a hollow charge explosive device.

On the other hand, this latter possibility leads to a problem even as it resolves other difficulties. If a Global Hawk or Predator drone hit the Pentagon on 9/11, then, what happened to Flight 77?

I don’t know the answer to the foregoing question. However, since the purpose of this book is not necessarily to answer questions concerning 9/11 in any definitive way but, rather, to explore, reflect on, and critically evaluate a variety of possibilities, problems, and data, I can acknowledge the legitimacy of the above question without feeling obliged to provide an answer – satisfactory or otherwise. In fact, the existence of such unanswered questions merely points to the need for my hypothetical grand jury to make further inquiries into such matters – something that the 9/11 Commission, the editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, and the authors of the Pentagon report stopped doing quite some time ago.

-----

There are other points and questions that could be raised concerning the events of 9/11 at the Pentagon. However, the foregoing discussion provides enough of a taste with respect to the issues, problems, controversies, and challenges surrounding the 9/11 Pentagon event that it would make sense for the members of my hypothetical grand jury to request that subpoenas be issued to a variety of people – both expert and otherwise – to offer testimony and be questioned concerning their understanding of things.

*The 9/11 Commission Report* has not adequately addressed such matters or raised the appropriate sorts of question. Moreover, as various segments of the preceding discussion have indicated, *Debunking 9/11 Myths* certainly has not engaged such issues with anything remotely resembling a rigorous, full, and impartial critical analysis. In addition, the *Pentagon Building Performance Report* tends to raise more questions than it answers in relation to the themes pursued in this chapter – especially since that report requires the acceptance of conclusions that cannot be verified as a result of, among other things, both the underlying secrecy that constrains a full and independent investigation into the Pentagon events, as well as due to the disappearance and/or destruction of evidence that has taken place in conjunction with those events.

-----

## 10 - Residual Comments

Sibel Edmonds and Colleen Rowley share something in common besides having been employed by the FBI. The efforts of both women to assist in the defense of the United States might have been effectively thwarted by certain administrators within the hierarchy of the FBI.

The two women share something else in common. Their testimonies have been relegated to the status of a single footnote in *The 9/11 Commission Report* – Sibel Edmonds, page 473, footnote 25; Colleen Rowley page 540, footnote 94 ... and, apparently, the report can't be bothered to even spell Ms. Rowley's first name correctly).

Ms. Edmonds started work as a translator in late September of 2001. She was fired in March 2002. In between these two dates events of significance might have taken place.

One of the tasks assigned to Ms. Edmonds was to translate some conversations involving a Middle Eastern group whose conversations had been wiretapped by the FBI. Initially, she was concerned because one of the other individuals in her section – Melek Can Dickerson, who had been granted Top Secret clearance (which permitted her to examine the most sensitive of materials related to terrorism) and who, as well, apparently, had been appointed to head up the translation project – had been making statements indicating that she [Melek Can Dickerson] was a member of the very Middle Eastern group whose communiqués had been wiretapped – communiqués that were being translated by the FBI translation unit in which they both worked.

Ms. Edmonds also relates that there had been another woman translator in the unit whose husband was a military officer. Both of these latter individuals allegedly paid a visit to Ms. Edmonds at her home on December 2001 and sought to induce Ms. Edmonds to become a member of a Middle Eastern group being investigated by the FBI while informing Ms. Edmonds how beneficial and lucrative being a member could be and, as well, threatening her by indicating that her refusal to join would put members of Ms. Edmonds' family in harm's way.

In an open letter of August 1, 2004 that Ms. Edmonds sent to Lee Hamilton and Thomas Kean of the 9/11 Commission, she charged that Melek Can Dickerson actively interfered with, delayed and obstructed attempts to translate documents concerning the Middle Eastern organization to

which the latter individual allegedly belonged. Furthermore, according to Ms. Edmonds, Ms. Dickerson also stamped hundreds, possibly thousands, of documents concerning the Middle Eastern group as being 'Not Pertinent' even as Ms. Dickerson attempted to prevent other individuals in the FBI unit from translating those documents.

Ms. Edmonds continues on in her open letter to the Commission co- chairs with further allegations. "Melek Can Dickerson, with the assistance of her direct supervisor, Mike Feghali, took hundreds of pages of top secret documents outside of the FBI to unknown recipients. Melek Can Dickerson, with the assistance of her direct supervisor, forged signatures on top secret documents related to certain 9/11 detainees. After all of these incidents were confirmed and reported to FBI management, Melek Can Dickerson was permitted to remain in her position, to continue the translation of sensitive intelligence received by the FBI."

Ms. Edmonds provides additional data concerning the aforementioned FBI employee, Mike Feghali. In October of 2001 an unspecified field agent sent a document to the Field Office in Washington for re-translation. The FBI agent initiating this request had reason to believe that the document might contain material relevant to the 9/11 attacks and that, possibly, certain points had been missed during the first translation efforts.

Once the document was translated, it appeared that the agent's sense of things was correct. The document did contain important, additional material that had not shown up in the initial translation (including the involvement of certain Middle East embassies in the illegal procurement of visas, along with evidence of bribery) and, as a result, the document in question could prove to be of considerable value to future terrorist investigations.

However, once re-translated, Mike Feghali, the field supervisor in charge of middle eastern languages, sat on the re-translation. In other words, he did not return the re-translated document to the FBI agent who initially had made the request for the document to be re-translated. Instead, Mr. Feghali forwarded a note to the FBI agent that said that the original translation had been correct.

Although apparently nothing was done by anyone in FBI management concerning the Melek Can Dickerson case or the problems surrounding Mike Feghali and the re-translated document issue, this does

not mean that nothing happened. On the one hand, Ms. Edmonds reports that Ms. Dickerson, along with certain targets of investigation by the FBI, suddenly left the United States in 2002. On the other hand, Mike Fhegali -- Ms. Dickerson's immediate supervisor -- was promoted to being the head of the Arabic translation unit within the FBI's counter-terrorism and counter-intelligence section.

During her open letter to the 9/11 Commission, Ms. Edmonds also addressed another issue, this time involving some translated documents involving a long-term intelligence asset of the FBI (since the early 1990s). The translator in this case was not Ms. Edmonds but another individual by the name of Behrooz Sharsar who had been present during the April 2001 interview/debriefing/interrogation of the Iranian intelligence asset.

Ms. Edmonds indicates that Mr. Sharsar had attempted to alert upper-level management in the FBI about the situation when Thomas Frields, Special Agent in Charge of Counter-terrorism at the Washington Field Office, took no action on the translated material from the Iranian intelligence asset and when Mr. Sharsar, among others, was told to keep his mouth shut about the interview material. This incident was also written about in the July 21, 2004 edition of the *Chicago Tribune*.

According to the Iranian being interviewed and translated by Mr. Sharsar during April 2001, the agent -- via contacts in Afghanistan -- had discovered four very significant pieces of information. First, 'Usama bin Laden was planning a set of terrorist attacks in the United States involving some 4-5 cities. Secondly, the attack would feature the use of airplanes. Thirdly, some of the participants in these planned attacks were said to already be in the United States. Finally, the attack supposedly was going to take place within a few months of April 2001.

All of the foregoing information had been known by the Counterterrorism and Counter-intelligence Field Office in Washington, D.C. well before 9/11. Yet, no action was taken in relation to that information except to sit on it and to tell people like Behrooz Sharsar to keep his mouth shut about the matter.

-----

As part of the FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force in Minnesota that was, among other things, investigating Zacharias Moussaoui's flight- school training activities, Colleen Rowley was upset that various aspects of the Minneapolis investigation appeared to be actively thwarted by a Supervisory

Special Agent in the FBI's Washington headquarters. After Moussaoui had been taken into custody on August 15, 2001 for INS violations, the Minneapolis office sought a FISA warrant to search Moussaoui's laptop, and one of the functions of a Supervisory Special Agent is to assist FBI field operatives to obtain FISA authorization for such a search.

This warrant was based on several pieces of information including the fact that the French intelligence service indicated that Moussaoui had known terrorist connections. Moreover, although Ms. Rowley did not know it at the time, Kenneth Williams of the FBI's Phoenix Office had, several weeks earlier, written to Washington headquarters to alert appropriate managers and supervisors about the possibility that al-Qaeda operatives might be pursuing flight-school training in different parts of the country, as seemed to be the case in Arizona, and, perhaps, this issue should be investigated further.

According to *The 9/11 Commission Report* (see page 272), the Radical Fundamentalist Unit at FBI headquarters never saw the Williams memo until after September 11, 2001. However, the Commission's report provides no explanation concerning the circumstances around this claim of ignorance or whether, or not, it is accurate.

In any event, after the Minneapolis Office of the FBI received no cooperation on the Moussaoui matter from Washington headquarters, the Minneapolis agents sought to bypass the Washington FBI Supervisory Special Agent with whom they had been dealing and, instead, directly approach the CIA's Counter Terrorist Unit. Subsequently, the Minnesota agents were criticized by FBI headquarters for not going through proper channels.

Based on certain e-mails and communiqués between the Washington headquarters and the Minneapolis Office, Ms. Rowley alleges that certain FBI supervisors in the Washington headquarters had altered various affidavits concerning the Moussaoui case. Furthermore, she suspects that certain elements within the Washington headquarters, along with the aforementioned Supervisory Special Agent, might have not properly presented the case for probable cause in the Moussaoui matter by downplaying a variety of intelligence when seeking a FISA warrant to gain access to Moussaoui's laptop.



Moreover, Ms. Rowley seemed to suggest that the motivation for someone's not making a rigorous appeal to the FISA court might have been because one of the people involved might have perceived the issue as one that could be threatening to a future career at the FBI. This someone was the Supervisory Special Agent who, according to Ms. Rowley, had been playing an obstructionist role throughout the whole Moussaoui investigation. In fact, even after September, 11, 2001, this same Supervisory Special Agent was trying to argue that any connection between Moussaoui and the events of 9/11 were purely coincidental.

In a May 27, 2002 article in *Time* magazine, the foregoing Supervisory Special Agent is identified. The article states: "Law enforcement and congressional sources told *Time* that both reports [i.e., the one from Kenneth Williams and the ones from Colleen Rowley – note added] landed on the desk of Dave Frasca, the head of the FBI's radical-fundamentalist unit. The Phoenix memo was buried; the Moussaoui warrant request was denied."

Surprisingly – or perhaps not – the name 'Dave Frasca' doesn't appear in *The 9/11 Commission Report*. One wonders about this because earlier I indicated that the Commission report stipulates that the Kenneth Williams memorandum was never seen by the Washington Office until after September 11, 2001. However, if the above quoted *Time* article is true, how could the Commission report just stipulate, without discussion or justification, to the alleged truth of such an assertion concerning that Phoenix memorandum without speaking to Dave Frasca, and, if the Commission did interview Mr. Frasca, why doesn't his name appear in the report ... even as a footnote?

Just as Sibel Edmonds and Colleen Rowley share certain things in common, so, too, do Mike Feghali and Dave Frasca. Just as Mike Feghali was promoted by the FBI despite the allegations being made against him, Dave Frasca was also promoted.

Both of these promotions lead to the question of why? The biggest 'why' has to do with the failure of the 9/11 Commission to rigorously pursue and investigate such issues.

-----

In a September 16, 2001 article in the *Daily Telegraph*, one is informed that in August 2001 several high-ranking Mossad officials had been

dispatched to Washington to warn the FBI and CIA that a terrorist cell was planning a large scale, imminent operation involving targets within the United States. Included in the package of information were the names of four of the alleged hijackers, yet, none of these individuals was arrested.

MI-6 claims that in 1999 it had warned the United States that al-Qaeda was planning to use commercial airplanes as weapons against the United States. A similar warning also had been issued in 1999 by a U.S. National Intelligence Council report indicating that possible targets were the Pentagon, the White House, and CIA headquarters. MI-6 indicates that it repeated the same 1999 warning, coupled with additional information, in August 2001.

In addition to the communiqués from Israel and England, there were a number of other warnings that had been given to the United States throughout the summer of 2001 concerning specific warnings about imminent attacks from numerous countries. These warnings were from Jordan, Egypt, India, Russia, the Cayman Islands, Italy, Morocco, France, and Germany. Many of these warnings contained specific information about hijacked airplanes being used as weapons against targets such as the Pentagon and the World Trade Center.

Even the Taliban government in Afghanistan got into the act. In July of 2001, Wakil Ahmed Muttawakil, the Taliban Foreign Minister, dispatched an emissary to inform, among others, the U.S. Counsel General that bin Laden was preparing to conduct an imminent, large- scale attack within the United States.

According to a September 26, 2001 article in *Ha'aretz*, an Israeli newspaper, approximately two hours prior to first attack on the north tower of the World Trade Center, several employees who were working in Herzliya, Israel, for an Israeli company, Odigo – an instant messaging service – received a message indicating that a terror attack on New York City was about to take place. Odigo has an office in New York City close to the World Trade Center.

Although the Odigo instant message was not made public, the information was passed on to the FBI. On the basis of whatever information is available to the public, neither the FBI nor the 9/11 Commission chose to follow up on this lead and find out what, if anything, such an instant message might have been based on and who was the source for that information.

The warnings being received by the United States were not restricted to what was being communicated from overseas. Within the United States government there were important indications that some people had access to a lot of very specific information concerning the coming attacks.

For example, David Schippers – who might best be known to some as the lead investigative and prosecuting counsel for the House of Representative’s impeachment proceedings against William Jefferson Clinton – reported in an October 13, 2001 story run by the *Indianapolis Star* that nearly a month and a half prior to 9/11, he [Mr. Schippers] had spoken with several FBI agents who were hoping for some legal advice.

The article describes how the two agents disclosed they had reliable information specifying that lower Manhattan was to be a target in a terrorist attack that would involve the use of hijacked airplanes as weapons. The information they had included targets, dates, and funding pathways.

The reason for their speaking with Mr. Schippers is that they both had been taken off the investigation and threatened with being prosecuted under the National Security Act if they spoke out about what they knew. Apparently, according to the two FBI agents, the threats and obstruction came from FBI headquarters in Washington.

During the interview, Mr. Schippers claimed that on a number of occasions, some six weeks or so prior to 9/11, he had tried, without success, to get in touch with Attorney General Ashcroft in order to pass on the information that Mr. Schippers had learned through the two FBI agents. The Attorney General did not return any of Mr. Schippers’ calls to the former’s office.

Finally, one of the friends of the Attorney General who had been contacted by Mr. Schippers in relation to this information got back in touch with the Chicago lawyer. The friend of the Attorney General said that John Ashcroft had received the information and would call Mr. Schippers the next day.

The next day Mr. Schippers did receive a call but not from the Attorney General. According to Mr. Schippers, someone else, calling on behalf of the Attorney General, said that the matter would be investigated, and following that investigation, Mr. Schippers would be informed of what had been discovered and/or done.

Mr. Schippers passed on his information to the Attorney General approximately a month before the events of 9/11. Nonetheless, as of the October 2001 interview date, Mr. Schippers had not been contacted by the Attorney General with respect to the very detailed information concerning the September 11, 2001 attacks..

At least Sibel Edmonds and Colleen Rowley were worth a footnote in *The 9/11 Commission Report*. Nowhere does one find the name of David Schippers ... not even in a footnote. Moreover, nowhere does one find any indication within *The 9/11 Commission Report* that Attorney General Ashcroft was questioned by the Commission about such allegations.

William Grigg, in a March 11, 2002 edition of *The New American* reported that three FBI agents interviewed by him maintained that the specific sorts of information about which Mr. Schippers spoke in this interview with the *Indianapolis Star* was widely known throughout the FBI, and, indeed, the FBI agents being interviewed claimed that prior to 9/11 a number of veteran agents had outlined, in startling detail, much of what actually did transpire on September 11, 2001.

There are a couple of other names besides those of Mike Feghali, Dave Frasca, and Thomas Frields that should be added to the list of FBI employees who might have been rigorously and carefully questioned by the 9/11 Commission but, apparently, were not. The names to be added are: Dale Watson, the head of counter-terrorism prior to 9/11, and the Acting Director for the FBI, Thomas Pickard, who took over for Louis Freeh and served during the summer of 2001 prior to the time when Robert Mueller was appointed as Director of the FBI and took office just before 9/11.

Although the names of Mr. Watson and Mr. Pickard do -- unlike those of Frasca, Feghali, and Frields -- appear 2-3 times in *The 9/11 Commission Report*, there is no information accompanying such inclusions that suggests that Mr. Watson and Mr. Pickard were anything but ignorant of what, supposedly, was common knowledge amongst many within the FBI concerning the forthcoming attacks that would use hijacked planes as weapons.

-----

If Mr. Pickard and Mr. Watson were ignorant of what allegedly was -- at least in relation to some facets of the FBI -- common knowledge,

and if this 'knowledge' actually was legitimate knowledge, then such ignorance suggests a certain level of gross incompetence on the part of the two gentlemen noted above. On the other hand, what needs to be determined is whether, or not, either Mr. Pickard or Mr. Watson (along with Mr. Frields, Mr. Feghali, and Mr. Frasca) knew a great deal more than was uncovered by the 9/11 Commission ... which, seemingly, was not all that much.

The term anthrax appears once in *The 9/11 Commission Report*. This occurs on page 151 when the report breezes through an account of how an American-educated individual by the name of Yazid Sufaat allegedly sought to cultivate anthrax for al-Qaeda when, in 2001, he supposedly set up a laboratory near the Kandahar airport.

Most people do not associate anthrax with the events of 9/11. However, there might be some connections.

The first anthrax-laced letter was received about a week after 9/11 by a tabloid paper in Florida. Anthrax-laden letters were also received by Senators Tom Daschle and Patrick Leahy, as well as by the *New York Post* and NBC News.

Very shortly, thereafter, the FBI began to withdraw resources that were being used to investigate 9/11 and re-assigned those resources to the anthrax investigation. Within a week of the beginning of the FBI's investigation, scientists at the University of Iowa in Ames were contacted.

DNA analysis of the anthrax spores received by, among others, Tom Daschle and Patrick Leahy indicated that the spores were of the Ames strain. The University of Iowa not only supplied laboratories around the U.S. with anthrax spores for purposes of medical research, but, as well, the Ames laboratory provided strains of anthrax to some laboratories that were interested in producing weapons-grade anthrax spores.

Every laboratory that produces weapons-grade anthrax tends to use their own system of weaponizing the spores. This method of production leaves chemical and/or biological signatures that can identify such weapons-grade materials as being produced in one laboratory rather than another.

If the Ames strain that had been sent out in the letters were to be matched against the collection of samples that the Ames laboratory had been maintaining for almost 70 years, then some important clues might

have been discovered concerning the identity of the laboratory where the Ames strain had been weaponized.

Somewhat mysteriously, one week after being contacted by the FBI, the collection of anthrax strains that had been stored at the Ames laboratory for seven decades was destroyed. This prevented anyone from being able to compare the Ames strain used in the letters with the collection of Ames strains that – up until then – had been maintained in the University of Iowa laboratory.

Why the University of Iowa laboratory sought to destroy the collection of anthrax strains is not clear. Why the FBI did not object to the destruction of that collection is not clear either.

This destruction of possible evidence in the anthrax case is eerily reminiscent of what happened in conjunction with evidence at the twin towers, Building 7, and the Pentagon. However, the destruction of the microbiological evidence took place prior to the destruction of the 9/11 evidence.

In all of these cases, there might be perfectly valid reasons for the disposing of evidence. But, if there are such reasons, I have, yet, to hear them – although excuses and rationalizations have been offered in the place of such reasons.

An analysis of the anthrax spores contained in the letters to various individuals revealed that the anthrax in question consisted of a certain concentration (measured in spores per gram), together with the unmilled nature of those samples (marked by the absence of debris that is characteristic of milled anthrax), as well as the presence of a particular kind of silica. All of these are indices that the weapons-grade anthrax used in the letters were made in America and produced in accordance with a formula that does not exist anywhere else in the world.

Although the FBI identified Stephen Hatfield early on as “a person of interest” (and I believe this is the first time that phrase – which is not a legal term -- was used), nothing came of the interest. In fact, nothing came of any part of the FBI’s investigation into the matter, just as nothing much came of the FBI’s work either leading up to 9/11 or following 9/11.

As with the unresolved questions surrounding 9/11, there is not necessarily any smoking gun pointing to specific individuals within the U.S. government, the corporate community, or particular

microbiological laboratories, who might be held accountable with respect to the anthrax attacks. However, like the 9/11 issues, there is enough evidence to indicate that a person or persons unknown was involved in the attack because the official story cannot stand very close scrutiny without raising a whole host of very troubling questions concerning the fact that such attacks did take place (both on 9/11 and in relation to the anthrax), and those attacks could not have been carried out solely by the people who have been identified as the 'people of interest' – in the case of 9/11, 19 hijackers plus bin Laden, and in the case of the anthrax attacks, Scientist 'X'.

Interestingly enough, President Bush, Vice President Cheney, as well as other White House staff members were started on a regimen of Cipro – which is used to counter the effects of anthrax -- prior to the first case of anthrax even surfacing. While it is a good thing that they had the benefit of such treatment, one wonders why the treatment process was begun and on what basis someone decided to take such a medical step.

Presumably, as has been the case with so many aspects of the events of 9/11, information about the foregoing anthrax issue is likely to never be shared with the American people. Unfortunately, this is so because there are people now, as there have been such individuals throughout the history of the United States, who are confused about the nature of democracy and, as a result, suppose that citizens exist for the sake of the government rather than the other way around. People are not protected nor is freedom enhanced by forging chains of ignorance to bind the citizenry.

-----

On page 146 of *The 9/11 Commission Report* there is a disclaimer of sorts. It states, in part, that:

“Chapters 5 and 7 rely heavily on information obtained from captured al-Qaeda members. A number of these “detainees” have firsthand knowledge of the 9/11 plot.

“Assessing the truth of statements by these witnesses – sworn enemies of the United States – is challenging. Our access to them has been limited to the review of intelligence reports based on communications received from the locations where the actual interrogations takes place. We submitted questions for use in the interrogations, but had no control over whether, when, or how questions of particular interest would be asked. Nor were we allowed to

talk to the interrogators so that we could better judge the credibility of the detainees and clarify ambiguities in the reporting. We were told that our requests might disrupt the sensitive interrogation process.”

Chapters 5 and 7 of the Commission’s report lay out a great deal of the information in which much of the storyline of the official position concerning 9/11 is rooted. In these two chapters details are provided concerning all facets of the alleged U.S. operation allegedly conducted by al-Qaeda and no one else – the operation for which Khalid Shaykh Mohammad was said to be the mastermind but that, supposedly, had been authorized by ‘Usama bin Laden.

In an earlier chapter, I already discussed the fact that ‘Usama bin Laden is not wanted by the FBI in conjunction with the events of 9/11. Instead, ‘Usama bin Laden is wanted for other alleged activities. The foregoing fact does not necessarily mean the FBI believes bin Laden to be innocent in relation to 9/11, but it does suggest that the FBI has no hard evidence tying bin Laden to 9/11, and with respect to this little matter of an absence of hard evidence tying bin Laden to 9/11, Robert Mueller, the present Director of the FBI, has publicly stated there is no paper trail leading back to, among others, ‘Usama bin Laden.

The purpose of the foregoing remarks is not to suggest that ‘Usama bin Laden is innocent with respect to 9/11. The fact of the matter is that I really don’t know whether, or not, ‘Usama bin Laden is guilty as charged with respect to his alleged role in the events of 9/11.

As was noted in an earlier chapter, there were two occasions following 9/11 in which ‘Usama bin Laden made public statements indicating that he had nothing to do with 9/11. In one of these statements printed in a Pakistani newspaper, he said:

“I have already said that I am not involved in the 11 September attacks in the United States. As a Muslim, I try my best to avoid telling a lie. I had no knowledge of these attacks, nor do I consider the killing of innocent women, children and other humans as an appreciable act. Islam strictly forbids causing harm to innocent women, children and other people. Such a practice is forbidden even in the course of a battle.”

Khalid Shaykh Mohammad and other ‘detainees’ have implicated ‘Usama bin Laden in the events of 9/11. ‘Usama bin Laden has denied such involvement.



Who, if anyone, should one believe? Should one believe the individuals who are detainees and to whom no one but a select few interrogators are allowed access, or should one believe 'Usama bin Laden to whom relatively few people have direct access?

How does one assess credibility when one cannot see the witness as he or she gives testimony? How does one assess the credibility of a witness' statements when one cannot directly cross-examine the witness concerning those statements? How can one assess the credibility of a given witness when one does not know how information has been extracted or if one does not know what methods were used in the acquiring of such alleged information or if one does not know whether, or not, techniques of undue influence were used to alter a person's recollection of events or beliefs concerning those events? How does one assess credibility when one does not know what inducements might, or might not, have been used to incline a person to tell one kind of a story rather than another? How can one assess the credibility of a witness when one does not know what misinformation and disinformation were fed to the witness that might have shaped and colored the witness' perception of events? How can one assess the credibility of a witness when one does not know whether, or not, the person being interrogated was told that the torture would stop when the detainee started telling the interrogators what they wanted to hear?

On the other hand, why would 'Usama bin Laden twice deny having any involvement in the events of 9/11 – especially in light of the fact that people who commit such acts or who are in support of such acts are inclined to proclaim to the world that this is their handiwork, and it is 'justified', according to their delusional way of thinking, because such terrible acts are in the service of 'liberating brothers and sisters or countries x, y, or z from the oppressive and exploitive presence of some wielder of imperialistic or colonialist power'? Why would 'Usama bin Laden publicly deny responsibility for an act that, unfortunately, would have made him a hero in the eyes of many misguided and ignorant Muslims in different parts of the world? If 'Usama bin Laden is a blood-thirsty, fanatical, delusional sociopathic terrorist who is seeking to not only unite, but lead, the Muslim world in a jihad against the interloping infidels of the West, then why would he let an opportunity for such 'infamy' slip through his fingers by denying he had anything to do with those events?

Should we suppose that after months and years of meticulous planning concerning the events of 9/11, he suddenly saw the full brutality and horror of what he had done and could not handle the truth and, therefore, went into denial concerning the matter – trying to publicly distance himself from such barbarity and slaughter ... something that few, if any, terrorists, ever actually do? Should we suppose that he thought that if he admitted responsibility for the 9/11 tragedy, then he would become a fugitive whom the Americans would try to hunt down and kill – would this make sense given that prior to 9/11 bin Laden already was, supposedly, a fugitive being hunted down by Americans who were, allegedly, trying to kill him?

Contrast bin Laden's denial of involvement in relation to the events of 9/11 with the reported sentiments of another person mentioned in *The 9/11 Commission Report*. More specifically, on pages 163-164 of the report, one learns about Mohammad Haydar Zammar, an individual well-known to both the German Muslim community, as well as U.S. and German intelligence agencies.

According to the *The 9/11 Commission Report*, Mr. Zammar is described as someone who extolled "the virtues of violent jihad". In addition, the report describes Mr. Zammar as someone who, following the events of 9/11 "took credit for influencing not only Binalshibh but the rest of the Hamburg group" (which included Mohammad Atta).

Mohammad Haydar Zammar appeared to revel in the events of 9/11 and sought to take a degree of credit for influencing – with respect to the performance of violent, murderous acts – some of the individuals who, allegedly, played major roles on 9/11. 'Usama bin Laden not only sought to disconnect himself from the whole affair, but in his own way actually condemned the attacks of 9/11 as not being in accordance with the teachings of Islam.

One also might consider the foregoing issues against the following backdrop. In October of 2001, *Le Figaro*, a French daily newspaper, and Radio France International broke a story which maintained that bin Laden – a man who the United States government wanted to either kill or bring to trial for alleged terrorist acts – had received medical treatment at the American Hospital in Dubai in the United Arab Emirates.

The story indicated that the medical treatment was administered by American medical personnel from July 4<sup>th</sup> to the 14<sup>th</sup> in 2001. During this

period of time, the paper reported that the local CIA agent, Larry Mitchell, whose identity was known to many in Dubai, was seen visiting with bin Laden in the hospital.

On July 14<sup>th</sup> 'Usama bin Laden exited Dubai on his private jet and experienced no interdiction by the United States. The *Le Figaro*/Radio France International story goes on to say that the CIA agent in question had boasted to some friends about his visits with bin Laden and that on July 15<sup>th</sup> the agent was, for unspecified reasons, recalled by CIA headquarters.

On November 11, 2001, *Guardian* also wrote about the above set of alleged circumstances. The *Guardian* article claims that both *Le Figaro* and Radio France International have sources in French intelligence that likes to tweak the nose, so to speak, of their American counterparts by divulging, from to time and according to its inclinations, the CIA's often nebulous roles in world affairs. In addition, the *Guardian* article indicates that besides CIA agent Larry Mitchell, bin Laden was also visited by a second, unidentified CIA agent, as well as by Prince Turki al-Faisal, head of Saudi intelligence – and, we should remember that Saudi Arabia previously had declared 'Usama bin Laden as persona non grata.

How does a man who, allegedly, is wanted by authorities so badly that the U.S. government is willing – and has, supposedly, tried on several occasions – to assassinate him should the opportunity arise ... how does such a man get to stay in a facility staffed with Americans and have conversations with the local representatives of the CIA as well as with the head of Saudi intelligence? Why is such a wanted 'criminal' permitted to leave without being detained and, then, extradited to the United States to stand trial?

The CIA, of course, denies the foregoing Dubai incident ever took place. On the other hand, the CIA also has denied that it subjected people to the process of extreme rendition (kidnaping, removing to another country, and, if necessary, torturing them) – a denial that has been shown to be incorrect by an array of evidence, including the testimony of individuals who have been participants on the giving and receiving ends of torture.

None of the foregoing information/evidence conclusively demonstrates that 'Usama bin Laden is an innocent man with respect to the events of 9/11. On the other hand, such information does create some serious questions to bubble about in my brain and heart concerning the issue of his alleged complicity.

Someone might wish to point out that, for years, the CIA and FBI have been issuing intelligence communiqués, memoranda, and reports about bin Laden's alleged terrorist activities. The problem with this is that I am no longer prepared to accept at face value anything that the CIA or FBI has to say.

Undoubtedly, there are good, decent individuals working in both agencies. However, I don't know who those people are, and, therefore, I have to try to weigh and evaluate the credibility of any reports or pieces of information that are publicly released through those agencies.

Someone from either of the foregoing agencies might issue a report concerning bin Laden, and whatever it says might be true. Then, again, someone from either of the aforementioned agencies might issue a report about bin Laden and the material contained in that report might consist of little more than disinformation that is being floated to serve some covert strategy, operation, or agenda. Or, possibly, the FBI and CIA are receiving their information from an informant who is running his or her own intelligence game, and even though the FBI and/or CIA might believe in the reliability of the source and information, they often make mistakes and trust the wrong people.

-----

There is a great deal of conflicting information concerning what might, or might not, have occurred in Shanksville, Pennsylvania with respect to Flight 93. There are reports that debris from the plane was strewn over many miles, suggesting that the aircraft might have been shot down. There are other reports indicating that the foregoing claims cannot be, or have not been, substantiated.

There are reports about fighter planes being seen in the general area where Flight 93 is alleged to have crashed, and there are counter-reports that such reports are false. There are claims about a mysterious white corporate-like jet possibly having played some sort of role in the crash of Flight 93, and there are claims which says that the jet played no role in the crash of Flight 93 except to verify the location of the crash.

There are reports that a shoot-down order had been given and carried out. There also are reports that although such a shoot-down order had been issued, it never was executed.

There are reports that the shoot-down order was given much earlier than the government claims is the case. There are counter-reports saying that such is not the case.

There is inconclusive information that has been released based on the alleged last minutes of Flight 93—information that supposedly was derived from the cockpit voice recorder. There is much more information contained on the remainder of the cockpit recovered voice recorder of Flight 93, but, for unknown reasons, the authorities will not release that information.

There are reports that in the technological environment of 2001, cell phones would not have been able to effectively function above 8,000 feet – suggesting that some of the alleged phone calls from flight 93 might have been bogus. On the other hand, there are counter-reports concerning why cell phones could work under certain circumstances – circumstances that might have existed on 9/11, and, therefore, there is nothing untoward about such calls. Apparently, no one thought to check the cell phone records for the passengers on Flight 93 to determine, once and for all, who might be relating more accurate information concerning those cell phone calls.

There are reports questioning the fact that, apparently, Flight 93 vaporized upon impact. There are other reports which claim that this kind of vaporization was to be expected in relation to such a crash.

Claims and counter-claims. Reports and counter-reports.

Whatever the truth is with respect to the foregoing controversies, and however tragic the loss of life might have been that is associated with the destruction of Flight 93 (and this is very tragic), I do not consider the crash of Flight 93 to be part of the essence of 9/11 except to the extent that the flight raises many questions about the inability of the military to effectively track, intercept, and effectively deal with that plane. In my opinion, the essence of 9/11 is inherent in the collapse of the World Trade Center buildings in New York (all three of them), the character of the destruction at the Pentagon, the manner in which the FAA and the military responded to the four hijackings, as well as the seemingly impervious character of certain elements within the FBI hierarchy to take advantage of the ‘common knowledge’ within the agency that specified buildings were going to be attacked on September 11, 2001 by individuals who would use hijacked planes as tactical weapons.

I believe the foregoing four sets of events are essential because through their careful analysis – as I have attempted to do in this book – one can establish a great deal of quality evidence that appears capable of going a long way toward demonstrating that the official story is not tenable as it stands. This is not to say that 19 individuals might not have been involved in the hijacking of four planes on 9/11 (I am still unclear about this given the absence of the names of the alleged suspects on any the four passenger manifest lists, and given the absence of any Muslim names on the official autopsy report at the Pentagon, and given that five to seven of the alleged hijackers are reported to be alive and well in different parts of the Middle East), but, rather, it is to say something else – namely, the three sets of data noted above tend to strongly indicate that the official story which holds that in the United States 19 specific individuals, and only those 19 individuals, were responsible for bringing about the collapse of the twin towers and Building 7 at the World Trade Center, and were responsible for causing the damage at the Pentagon, and were responsible for causing the FAA, NORAD, and the Department of Defense to act in the ways they did on 9/11 – that such an official account does not stand up very well, if at all, to the available evidence.

A combination of planes, debris, and fire do not appear to be able to plausibly account for the collapse of three buildings in New York. The crash of a Boeing 757 does not appear to be able to plausibly account for the events and experiences at the Pentagon. Acts of incompetence, miscommunication, and the presence of stress while facing an unprecedented situation do not appear to plausibly account for the problems encountered by the FAA and the military on 9/11. An intelligence ‘board’ that was “blinking red” but, nevertheless, no one had any information with sufficient specificity to be able to take steps to protect America seems rather unbelievable with almost zero credibility.

Questions concerning all aspects of the events of 9/11 have not been adequately and satisfactorily addressed by any of the ‘officially’ sanctioned research teams. The investigations carried out by Congress, the 9/11 Commission, NIST, FEMA, various noted scientists and engineers, the Pentagon, *Popular Mechanics*, and the FBI are all woefully problematic and unacceptable.

There is a need for a new, rigorous, independent citizens – not government -- investigation into the events of 9/11. This is the finding of

my hypothetical grand jury. This is the conclusion to which one is led by the essence of the events that took place prior to, on, and following September 11, 2001.

-----





## 11 – Ending Points

Senator John McCain wrote a 5 1/4 page ‘foreword’ to *Debunking 9/11 Myths*. In his foreword he praises the researchers at *Popular Mechanics* for exhibiting an “old-fashion approach to facts. It [that is, *Popular Mechanics*] relies on reporting, evidence, and eyewitnesses, and rejects speculation, falsehood, and conspiracy.”(page xv)

Unfortunately, in all too many instances, the researchers at *Popular Mechanics* -- like, among others, their counterparts in the 9/11 Commission, NIST, the Pentagon report, and the FBI -- were very selective (and I do not mean this in a laudatory sense) in what they chose to report, what evidence they considered, and which eyewitnesses they chose to interview.

Furthermore, Senator McCain’s foregoing statement to the contrary, the researchers at *Popular Mechanics* did not exactly reject speculation, falsehood, and conspiracy, but rather – based on their ventures into speculation, falsehood, and conspiracy (and, the official story is a conspiracy theory) tried to advance a perspective that seemed to suggest that anyone who didn’t agree with the analysis and findings of *Popular Mechanics* was guilty of perpetrating speculation, falsehood, and conspiracy of the worst kind.

The dominant mantra throughout *Debunking 9/11 Myths* is “conspiracy theorists”. The term is used so many times in that book one can’t help but wonder if its authors and editors are attempting to engage in some sort of exercise of undue influence in which readers of the book are faced with the intimidating prospect that if such readers do not accept the arguments, data, information, and perspective being put forth in *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, then the reader runs the risk of being labeled and ridiculed as a conspiracy theorist.

The authors and editors of *Debunking 9/11 Myths* have not demonstrated an “old-fashion approach to facts”. They have not just stated their methods, data, facts, analysis, interpretation, and conclusions and let matters rest there. They often have engaged in something that is quite removed, in a very unfortunate way, from such an “old-fashioned approach to facts”.

The kindest thing that can be offered concerning Senator McCain in the foregoing context is to say: ‘Forgive him for he knows not what he does or

says in relation to the events of 9/11.' It is startlingly obvious that Senator McCain would not have praised the researchers of *Popular Mechanics* in the way he did if he had closely read what was said in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* and, as well, had detailed knowledge concerning the evidence that is readily available with respect to the events of 9/11.

If Senator McCain actually read, for himself, all of the evidence that has been gathered in conjunction with 9/11, as well as read significant portions of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, or perused through various NIST analyses, or scanned the FEMA documents, or looked at the Pentagon report, or went through some of the research papers written about the building collapses at the World Trade Center, and, then, critically reflected on these matters, he might have realized there are a great many problems and unanswered questions permeating that research, just as there are even more problems and questions swirling about the 'research' (and I use this term somewhat loosely here) conducted at *Popular Mechanics* with respect to 9/11. His relatively blind, apparently unreflective, and considerably uninformed, endorsement of the research of the *Popular Mechanics* material on 9/11 suggests that Senator McCain is familiar with only a very, very limited portion of the evidence concerning 9/11, and much of what he espouses in this regard is simply not tenable.

-----

During a section entitled 'Afterword' toward the end of *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, James B. Meigs, editor-in-chief for *Popular Mechanics*, provides an account of some of the abusive treatment – mostly in the way of name-calling – which was directed its way by people upset with the content and character of the *Popular Mechanics* article on 9/11. People at the magazine were referred to as 'cowards' 'traitors', 'a CIA front organization', 'puppet boys' 'friend of the Mossad', and so on. Apparently, there were various kinds of threats hurled their way as well.

I feel badly that the people at *Popular Mechanics* were abused in the way they were. However, I am not convinced that the manner in which *Popular Mechanics* has chosen to respond to that treatment (e.g., in the form of Mr. Meigs' Afterword or the constant use of "conspiracy theorist" that appears throughout *Debunking 9/11 Myths*) are very constructive.

There was one epithet – namely, "evil scumbag" – that was indirectly lobbed toward the people at *Popular Mechanics* and mentioned by Mr. Meigs in his Afterword. This particular term did have a

certain element of resonance with some of what I have gone through with respect to publishing things from my own perspective. More specifically, after publishing a number of 'Did You Know' segments on my blog and web site (See the four sections in the chapter following the present chapter) through which a variety of questions were raised concerning different aspects of 9/11, I received the following comment:

Conspiracy Smasher said...

"I'm not surprised that another muslim scumbag wants to blame someone other than his co-religionists for this massacre, but you at least need to get your facts correct.

Every single one of your factoids has been debunked. Every one."

-----

At 11/22/2006 2:46 PM, Bill W. said...

"I am always amused by individuals who so bravely, but anonymously, go into name-calling diatribes about other human beings whom they do not know and, yet, about whom they have formed biases, prejudices and assumptions that are so firmly rooted in nothing but declarative sentences devoid of any evidence. You claim that every single one of the factoids that appear in the recent posting to my blog have been debunked, but you offer absolutely nothing in the way of proof or argumentation or logic or persuasive reasoning or even any reference to a work of scholarship within the framework of your diatribe that would corroborate what you are claiming.

Apparently, everyone should accept what you say because you have proclaimed yourself to be the "Conspiracy Smasher". I wonder if your self-appointed title comes with an appropriate super hero outfit -- perhaps with CS on the chest as well as a secret decoder ring that permits one to invent cryptic codes as ways of translating and distorting that which has not been said in posts that you wish to reject because they are inconsistent with your own brand of dogmatism.

More specifically, if you bothered to read the recent posting that has so unnerved you that you feel it necessary to give expression to incivility -- and your remarks make it very clear that you have not read much, if anything, of what was said in my posting with very much reflective care or judicious deliberation -- then you would have noted that at no point did I either try to blame anyone -- whether Muslim or non-Muslim -- or excuse anyone from

consideration with respect to the tragic events of 9/11. Instead, I asked a lengthy number of questions that are informed by a substantial amount of research which suggests that whatever you -- and others who think like you -- might believe, the full truth of 9/11 is something other than it has been depicted to be by people -- in the government, the media, or academia -- who ought to know better.

Perhaps, you are subscriber to *Scientific American* or *Popular Mechanics* who both came out with woeful attempts to debunk what they label as myths concerning 'the 9/11 truth movement'. In reality, all they managed to do is to demonstrate that some people who purport to be scientists or who are influenced by the scientific method are not very rigorous or objective in their alleged search for the truth of a matter, and that like some of the so-called scientists who sometimes represent certain pharmaceutical companies, or who lobby the FDA or the EPA or who work for tobacco companies or the chemical industry, all their debunking activities do is to embarrass themselves as well as betray their own integrity as human beings with a concomitant duty of care that is owed to others.

You have done yourself proud. I am sure there might be some who find what you are doing heroic, but I don't see much value in the way you have substituted bombast for intelligent conversation and dialogue.

If you want to have a real debate about 9/11 issues, then, let us argue the facts, and this means that you will have to stop hiding behind name calling and do something more than allude to alleged facts and proofs that remain completely unspecified."

-----

At 2/07/2007 4:44 PM, Jack B. kgrffzb said...

"Did you know---That I worked in an office building at 1655 Fort Myer Drive on the 10th floor and was sitting at my desk and actually saw a 757 or 767 hit the Pentagon--saw the fire ball and lost a friend on the flight?? You are an idiot!!!"

At 2/09/2007 5:28 PM, Anonymous said...

"AS AN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY EMPLOYEE I COULD LOOK ACROSS THE STREET AT THE PLANE THAT HAD CRASHED INTO THE PENTAGON FOR DAYS. ON THE DAY OF THE CRASH, EVERYONE SAW THE PLANE AS IT BURNED. WE COULD SMELL THE FIRE. SOME OF THE

EMPLOYEES ACTUALLY SAW THE PLANE CRASH. THEY HIT THE GROUND BECAUSE THE PLANE WAS SO CLOSE THEY THOUGHT THEY WERE GOING TO GET HIT. I HAVE PICTURES. AMERICA A PLANE CRASHED INTO THE PENTAGON ON SEPTEMBER 11.”

-----

At 2/13/2007 9:01 PM, Bill W. said... “Dear Jack,

I have a bit of problem knowing what to make of your comment. My problem is this.

There are quite a few other people who also have given direct 'I-was-there' testimony concerning the events at the Pentagon on 9/11, and their testimony tells a different story than you do.

I don't know you, Jack, and I don't know those people. But, this I do know, someone is not telling the truth -- either intentionally or due to the sort of unintentional errors that occur everyday in courts all over the country with respect to eye-witness testimony.

Some of the people who have given direct testimony were war veterans who knew the difference between the smell of cordite and the smell of burning jet fuel. These were people who were near those portions of the Pentagon that were damaged at the time of the 'incident' [or, possibly, incidents since there is some evidence that several explosions might have taken place rather than just one], and these people said they smelled cordite not jet fuel.

In addition, although the video that was released through CNN concerning the 5 frames that, allegedly, showed part of what happened at the Pentagon on 9/11, nonetheless, that video did not show any trace of either a commercial jet liner or any other kind of rocket and/or plane, nonetheless, the flames in those frames have been analyzed by an explosives expert who says the shape, color, and rate of expansion of the fire ball were all consistent with a high-yield explosive device but not consistent with the sort of explosion one gets from a plane crash in which jet fuel ignites.

In addition, there is a lot of further contradictory evidence concerning the Pentagon event. Some people say one thing, and other people say something else.

So, the problem remains ... whose testimony does one believe? This is the sort of issue that could have been openly and rigorously explored in

hearings concerning 9/11, but, unfortunately, this is just one of many things which should have happened in that regard but did not.

Moreover, even if one were to agree that Flight 77 flew into the Pentagon, there is still a huge problem surrounding the issue of whether Hani Hanjour could have flown that plane in the way that it was supposedly observed to fly by flight traffic controllers at Dulles. Your alleged eye-witness testimony does absolutely nothing to clear up that problem -- and this issue remains a huge matter of contention because if Hani Hanjour did not fly the vehicle that hit the Pentagon, then, the question becomes: Who did fly it? If someone besides Hanjour flew it, this leaves open the possibility that there might be more people involved in the events of 9/11 than the 19 who were identified by the FBI.

If it makes you feel better, you are perfectly welcome to refer to someone like me as an "idiot", but you should know that there are many people who lost friends and loved ones on 9/11 -- both at the Pentagon as well as elsewhere -- and these people are interested in finding out the answer to some of the same questions and issues that are being raised here and that many of them believe have not, to date, been adequately answered by anyone. So, I take it that by referring to someone like me -- who simply has asked a few questions -- as an idiot, then, by implication, you also are referring to those people who lost loved ones on 9/11 and also are asking questions as idiots as well, and if you are, then, you should be ashamed of yourself.

You are not the only one who had something about which to grieve on 9/11. Moreover, your point of view is not the only one in existence that was based on 'I-was-there' considerations concerning the events of 9/11 involving the Pentagon."

-----

The moral of the foregoing segments from my blog is intended to suggest that there might be ways to respond to issues that don't require one to negatively and derogatorily label one's antagonist as the editors and Afterword-author in *Debunking 9/11 Myths* often do -- although, to be sure, from time to time, I do throw in a satirical zinger here and there. However, critiquing, in a relatively civil way, what someone does is not at all the same thing as attempting to attribute some kind of negative quality as an inherent characteristic of the person who is doing the acting. I might engage in the former, but I try to stay away from the latter as much as I can.

-----

Well, the foregoing 'ending points' brings this portion of things to a close. I am sure there are some factual mistakes in what I have written in the pages of this book, but I have tried to keep those to a minimum ... although, unfortunately, sometimes these mistakes do, for whatever reason, elude detection.

This book is, in no way, a definitive account of the events leading up to, on, or following 9/11, nor was this my intention. There are many issues, facts, ideas, problems, and questions that could have been pursued in conjunction with 9/11 but that have not been included in the present volume – not because those possibilities don't entail important considerations but because I wanted to try to stay as focused as possible on what I believe to be the essential nature of 9/11.

The purpose of this book was to present a non-partisan case for reopening, in a sense, a meaningful public discourse on the topic of 9/11. To that end, many things that might have been explored have been left on the sidelines to be pursued, perhaps, on another occasion.

I also realize that it is entirely possible that the arguments put forth in this book -- over time and through the uncovering of additional evidence or in the light of further study – might, at some juncture, be shown to be faulty or erroneous. If this turns out to be the case, then, God willing, I pray I will have the strength of character and necessary integrity to admit as much, accommodate myself to the new evidence, and seek to transform my understanding to reflect what has been newly discovered.

Until such time as that occurs, I am inclined to stick by what I have said in the foregoing pages. Moreover, on the basis of what has been said during the course of this book, I will state, once again, that there needs to be a new, rigorous, non-partisan, independent, public, nongovernmental investigation into the events of 9/11 because the current 'official position' does not stand up to scrutiny.

The foregoing is the essential finding of my hypothetical grand jury – namely, to recognize that more than enough verifiable evidence exists to warrant the impaneling of a real world grand jury as soon as possible that possesses the power to look into all matters concerning the events of 9/11 as well as to subpoena whatever documents and/or witnesses might be deemed necessary in order to determine the true nature of the events

leading up, occurring, on, and following September 11,2001. Moreover, if the essential finding of the present work—as well as the findings of the research of many other individuals concerning these matters – is not heeded, I fear we will be faced with a clear and present danger to the viability of the United States as a democracy in any sense other than a nominal one.

-----



### **12- Did You Know? - Part 1**

- Did you know that prior to, and following, the September 11, 2001 destruction of the north and south towers of the World Trade Center (along with the 47-storey Building 7--some 350 feet away) there has not been one high-rise, steel-framed building anywhere in the world that collapsed due to burning?

- Did you know that according to the "official, government" account of the events of September 11, 2001 all three of the foregoing steel-framed buildings had metal pilings that were weakened due to extreme heat, and these weakened pilings led to the eventual 'pancake' collapse of all three World Trade Center buildings?

- Did you know that both the north and south towers of the World Trade Center were constructed using a set of 47 massive steel columns running around the inner core of these buildings and, in addition, there were 236 steel columns running along the perimeter of each of these buildings?

- Did you know that Building 7, a 47 storey-building and part of the World Trade Center complex, was constructed with 24 massive steel columns running around the core of the building, together with 57 perimeter steel columns?

- Did you know that Building 7, which was some 350 feet from the twin towers, was not struck by an airplane, but it collapsed?

- Did you know that the "official" government story is that the diesel fuel stored in Building 7 somehow caught fire and engulfed the building in a raging inferno?

- Did you know that according to photographic evidence, the fires that were burning at Building 7 were not substantial and were limited to scattered areas on only a few floors?

- Did you know that in the report prepared by FEMA concerning, among other things, the collapse of Building 7, very little credibility was given to the idea that the diesel fuel being stored in Building 7 caught fire and caused the building to collapse, and part of the reason for the low credibility of that hypothesis is no one has advanced a plausible explanation about how the diesel fuel stored in the building caught fire?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission did not explore the circumstances surrounding the collapse of Building 7?

- Did you know that very few of the perimeter steel columns of either of the twin tower buildings were lost due to the impact of the planes and that the buildings were specifically designed to retain their structural integrity by means of the remaining, intact perimeter and core columns in the event of damage due to commercial airline crashes, hurricanes, and other calamities?

- Did you know that steel starts to melt around 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit, but hydrocarbon fires arising from, say, burning jet fuel would not reach more than 1,700 degrees Fahrenheit.. or 1,100 degrees Fahrenheit less than what would have been necessary to melt any one section of the 47/24 core columns of the three respective buildings, or the 236/57 perimeter columns of the three buildings, let alone all 47/24 of the core columns or all 236/57 of the perimeter columns of the three World Trade Center buildings?

- Did you know that in order for steel to melt, the steel would have to be exposed to a sustained source of, at least, 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit ... brief or very limited exposure to such high temperatures is not enough?

- Did you know that some experts who support the government's "official story" concerning the events of 9/11 say that if steel is heated to a temperature of 1,300 degrees Fahrenheit, the steel will lose 80 percent of its strength? But, did you know that these same experts tend to leave out the fact that one would have to subject such steel to a very, very high source of heat for a considerable period of time in order to heat even one portion of a massive column of steel to 1300 degrees Fahrenheit?

- Did you know if one were to heat one section of a steel column that heat transfer would tend to radiate away some of the heat from the section being heated, thereby, making it harder to attain and sustain 1,300 degrees Fahrenheit at any given point?

- Did you know that in 2004 a fire raged for 17 hours in a 54-story steel-frame building in Caracas, Venezuela and that the intensity of the fire was such that it completely gutted the top 23 stories of the building, and, yet, the building did not collapse?

- Did you know that in 1991 a fire burned in a steel-structure building (One Meridian Plaza) in Philadelphia for 18 hours with such intensity that 8 out of 38 stories were gutted and even though many of the building's beams and girders sagged and twisted due to being exposed to the intense heat for such a long period of time, yet, the building did not collapse?

- Did you know that less than 15 minutes after the second of the twin towers was hit, photographs of the towers, as well as the testimony of both firefighters and people temporarily trapped in those buildings, indicate that the fires in the buildings were only scattered and slight, as well as not being even sufficiently hot, in most places, to either melt or break the exterior glass of the buildings?

- Did you know that although the south tower of the WTC was hit second, suffered less structural damage than the north tower, and exhibited fewer fires than the north tower, nonetheless, the south tower collapsed first, some 56 minutes after being struck by the airplane?

- Did you know that the north tower collapsed 1 hour and 42 minutes after being struck?

- Did you know that tests were carried out in Great Britain during the 1990s in order to investigate the extent of damage that might occur if steel beam structures were enveloped in high-intensity heat (1500 - 1700 degrees Fahrenheit) for many hours (4), and no collapse of the steel beams was observed in any of these experiments?

- Did you know that video and photographic evidence indicates that when the south tower started to collapse, the collapse began at a point much lower than the point where the airplane struck the building and much lower than where fires were burning?

- Did you know that there was a rumor (started by whom?) circulating in conjunction with the events of 9/11 at the World Trade Center that the fuel from the commercial jets that struck the buildings leaked into the pit formed by the core of the building and started intense fires throughout the twin towers, and, yet, there is not any evidence supporting this rumor or any evidence to indicate how the fuel was ignited on the lower levels or how the fire escaped from the core into the interior of the buildings or what the fire fed on until it could find its way into the offices on the lower levels?

- Did you know that even if it were the case that some steel pilings -- whether perimeter or core -- were heated sufficiently so that they lost a substantial portion of their strength and, as a result, buckled, thereby, starting a pancake-domino effect that brought the buildings down, nonetheless, the pancaking would not have been symmetrical (which would require that all 47 core and all 236 perimeter steel columns weakened and buckled at precisely the same time and in precisely the same way) but would have been

highly asymmetrical and that this is direct contradiction of the video evidence with respect to the collapse of the twin towers?

- Did you know that there is absolutely no evidence that any of the 47 or 24 massive core columns in the three WTC buildings that collapsed were subjected to the sort of intense heat for extended periods of time that would have been necessary to weaken those columns?

- Did you know that of the 16 perimeter beams from the World Trade Center that were examined, only three showed evidence of having been subjected to temperatures higher than 482 degrees Fahrenheit (far below the 1,300 degrees Fahrenheit needed to structurally weaken steel provided that the steel is heated for a sufficiently long enough period at such an elevated temperature) and, in addition, there is absolutely zero evidence that any of the core steel columns were subjected to temperatures even as high as 482 degrees of Fahrenheit?

- Did you know that criminal evidence was removed from the World Trade Center complex (and ramming two commercial jets into buildings resulting in substantial lost of life is a criminal offense many times over) when the metal wreckage from the buildings was carted away and sold to companies overseas before the evidence could be rigorously analyzed to be able to reconstruct exactly what did cause the WTC buildings to collapse?

- Did you know that all three of the World Trade Center buildings that collapsed did so at very close to free-fall rates of speed (i.e., free fall would occur if one were to drop an apple off the top of any of these buildings and there was nothing, but air, resisting the fall of this body)?

- Did you know that if the pancake theory of collapse for the three buildings were correct, the steel frame and concrete materials below each collapsing floor should have provided resistance to the collapse and, thereby, produced a rate of collapse slower than what was actually observed and recorded by video with respect to each of the WTC buildings?

- Did you know that when tall, many-storied buildings fall at, or very near, to a free-fall rate that this is evidence for concluding that the building might have collapsed due to "implosion", or controlled demolition, rather than as a result of a random, pancaking effect due to fire-weakened, buckling beams and girders?

- Did you know that there are only a few companies in the world with the experience and expertise necessary to collapse tall skyscrapers in a

controlled way that directs the building to collapse straight down into its own "footprint" -- that is the area circumscribed by the buildings foundation?

- Did you know that part of the art and science of implosions or controlled explosions in relation to collapsing skyscrapers is to set the explosive charges so that they go off in a precise sequence that removes the concrete, steel girders and beams from the floor below the one that is collapsing in order that the collapsing floor will meet with neither resistance (and, thus, the free-fall-like signature of imploding skyscrapers) nor anything that would interfere with the symmetrical collapse of each floor (and, thus, the symmetrical collapse into the building's footprint)?

- Did you know that the report issued by the NIST (National Institute for Standards and Technology) put forth a theory -- entirely unsupported by any forensic evidence -- that the destruction of the twin towers came about as collapsing floors tugged on the perimeter columns of each of these buildings, resulting in a structural instability in these peripheral beams that increased the overall gravity load on the core columns, thereby leading to a 'global' collapse of the buildings?

- Did you know that besides lacking any actual evidence to substantiate the NIST theory for building collapse, the NIST theory cannot explain either the quality of near free-fall speeds of the collapse of the three WTC buildings nor can that theory explain the symmetrical footprint property of all three collapsing WTC buildings -- in fact, the NIST theory would only be consistent with a non-free-fall-like collapse that was very asymmetrical ... neither of which was observed in the collapsing WTC buildings?

- Did you know that if the government's "officially-adopted pancake theory" were true, there very likely would have been massive, largely intact, steel columns -- both core and perimeter -- that still would be standing (albeit, possibly, bent and twisted a little) from the 110 storey original structures and that these steel columns would likely extend upward many, many stories into the sky rather than having collapsed into a relatively small, compact, several storey-high heap of wreckage?

- Did you know that in controlled demolitions of skyscrapers high explosives such as RDX are used in order to slice through the steel beams and girders like a hot knife through butter and, in the process, cut the beams and girders into much smaller manageable lengths of steel that will both take away resistance to the free-fall-like collapse of the building and, as

well, help bring the building down in a symmetrical way within a relatively well-defined, compact footprint landing area?

- Did you know that the same high explosives that are used to slice up the core and peripheral steel columns of a skyscraper are powerful enough to reduce all non-metallic components of the building (such as poured concrete) into powder?

- Did you know that a certain amount of evidence concerning the presence of evaporation as well as sulfidation of steel was found amidst the wreckage of the World Trade Center and that both of these findings are consistent with the idea that there was a detonation of high explosives in the three WTC buildings but inconsistent with a pancake theory driven entirely by the theory that allegedly weakened beams and girders created instability that led, in turn, to a global, gravitational-based collapse of the buildings?

- Did you know that the "official" pancake theory adopted by the government would not have reduced the concrete portions of the three WTC buildings to powder but, instead, would have yielded much larger chunks of concrete because the energy generated through the force of gravity of uncontrolled collapsing buildings would not have been sufficient to be able to produce pulverized powder particles?

- Did you know that for the most part, evidence indicates that the non-metallic portions of the three WTC buildings that collapsed were pulverized into relatively small particles rather than the much larger chunks of concrete one would expect to find if the "official" story concerning the collapsed buildings were true?

- Did you know that there were a large number of independent reports (many from firefighters who were familiar with such phenomena) indicating that people heard a collection of explosions, along with flashes, prior to the collapse of the twin towers -- reports that are consistent with what is known as a "demolition ring" -- that is a series of explosions running around a building during a controlled demolition or implosion?

- Did you know that many of the foregoing reports came from an oral history of 9/11 (consisting of some 503 firefighters and medical workers who responded to the World Trade Center tragedies) compiled by the New York City Firefighters (FDNY) that was released to the public on August 12,

2005 but only after a suit was brought, under the Freedom of Information Act, against Mayor Michael Bloomberg's administration in 2002 by *The New York Times*, together with a number of the families who lost loved ones on 9/11, and only after the New York Court of Appeals sided with the *Times*/9/11 families following a three- year legal tug of war concerning the public release of the oral histories?

- Did you know that on the weekend of September 8th and 9th prior to September 11, 2001, there was a power down in the south tower of the WTC so that there was no power from floor 50 to the top of the building (over half of the tower) which means that this portion of the building was entirely without surveillance cameras or other forms of electronic security, and for about 35-36 hours there were many 'engineers' and 'technicians' who were going in and out of the building for some sort of 'upgrading' of the tower?

- Did you know that in the weeks prior to September 11, 2001, both of the twin towers were evacuated on a number of occasions?

- Did you know that the company that is in charge of security for the World Trade Center is now called Stratesec, but from 1993 until 2000, this company was known as Securacom, and Marvin Bush, brother of President Bush, was on the Board of Directors for this company, while from 1999 until 2002, Wirt Walker III, a cousin of President Bush, was the CEO of Stratesec, and, yet, none of this appears in *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that the "official story" of the government concerning the collapse of the World Trade Center buildings on September 11, 2001 was that an entirely random pancake collapse of three skyscrapers took place, producing near-free-fall rates of collapse (meaning a complete lack of resistance from the floors below), as well as a symmetrical footprint (meaning that there was absolutely nothing skewing the fall and preventing the collapse from proceeding straight down -- including the 70 to 80 floors below where the planes crashed that had none of its beams and girders melted or weakened by the heat from alleged, intense fires in these buildings)?

- Did you know that the "official story" of the government requires one to believe that on one and the same day, within a matter of hours of one another, and within a few hundred yards of one another, three buildings at the World Trade Center collapsed, independently of one another, due to a

"perfect" storm of chance factors and collapsed in such a way that, in the entire history of humankind, such results have, heretofore, only been able to be generated by very, very highly skilled and expert technicians in a meticulously planned and precisely controlled fashion?

- Did you know there is both video and photographic evidence showing that heavy steel beams were ejected from the collapsing twin towers in a variety of directions -- ranging up to several hundred yards -- and these directions of ejection included both horizontal and upward lines of trajectory ... something that a building which was collapsing in accordance with the pancake theory could not replicate since the only force at work in the pancake theory is gravitation that pulls things downward and does not push material horizontally outward or in an upward direction for hundreds of feet?

- Did you know that the law of conservation of momentum states that a rotating body will continue to rotate at the same speed and with the same direction of rotation unless acted upon by an external torque force, and, yet, although, initially, when the south tower began to collapse, the floors above where the airplane impacted the south tower of the WTC began to move and rotate in a direction toward the hole created by the airplane, nonetheless, subsequently, video evidence shows that, first, the speed and rotation of this portion of the building collapse began to decelerate as well as reverse its direction of rotation (both of which violate the law of conservation of momentum unless one posits a force outside of gravity that caused this), and, then, all of the floors above the point of impact turned into pulverized powder in mid-air, allowing the building to collapse relatively symmetrically into its foundational footprint?

- Did you know that both photographic and eyewitness testimony indicate that whatever struck the Pentagon on 9/11, it was not a Boeing 757 (American Airlines Flight 77, which supposedly struck the Pentagon on 9/11, is a Boeing 757) because the size of the hole created in the Pentagon is not big enough to be consistent with being hit by a 757 jet liner, and the nature of the debris created by the impact is not consistent with the wreckage of a Boeing 757?

- Did you know that within minutes of the Pentagon being hit, video tapes from surveillance cameras positioned on various buildings on the west side of the Pentagon were confiscated by the FBI and with the exception of



about 5-6 seconds of totally inconclusive, ambiguous footage (as far as the 'official' position is concerned), has never been released to the public?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission did not use its powers of subpoena to gain access to this video material?

- Did you know that unlike the airplane crashes at the World Trade Center towers, the impact at the Pentagon did not produce any significant or noticeable seismic signature, and, yet, supposedly, large commercial airliners were involved in each incident?

- Did you know that Hani Hanjour, the al-Qaeda member who allegedly piloted the Boeing 757 that supposedly struck the Pentagon, was, according to all evidential accounts, a terrible pilot who had difficulty operating even small planes, and, yet, this fledgling pilot was reported to have performed a 270-degree downward spiral while lining up to strike the Pentagon, something that even seasoned, expert pilots are not likely to be able to accomplish?

- Did you know that Flight 77, the Boeing 757 that supposedly hit the Pentagon, was, apparently, able to go undetected through U.S. airspace for roughly 40 minutes despite the fact that the U.S. military is reported to have the most sophisticated and advanced radar systems in the world and that during this 40 minute undetected period the jet airliner turned around somewhere in the Midwest, headed back to Washington, D.C., and performed its final aerial acrobatics before slamming into the Pentagon?

- Did you know that Philip Zelikow was appointed as the executive director of the 9/11 Commission -- a position that was authorized to direct the research of 75 Commission staff members and, as such, was responsible for determining what issues would, and would not, be pursued by that staff -- or how rigorously -- and what 'facts' and witnesses would, and would not, be examined by the commissioners who conducted public hearings?

- Did you know that Philip Zelikow had previously worked with Condoleezza Rice in the National Security Council during the presidency of George H. W. Bush and later co-authored a book with her during the '90's, and, then, helped Rice organize the National Security Council during the presidency of George W. Bush, and, then, was appointed to the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board where he was the primary author of NSS 2002 (The National Security Strategy of the United States of America) which laid out, in detail, the position first enunciated by

President Bush at West Point in June of 2002 concerning the alleged right of the United States to attack anyone who was perceived to represent a potential threat to U.S. interests even if such countries, states, or groups did not currently constitute a 'clear and present danger' to the integrity of the continental United States and had not attacked America or Americans and, and, therefore, Philip Zelikow had a vested interest in ensuring that the 9/11 Commission reached conclusions that were consonant with NSS 2002 ... which is exactly what happened?

- Did you know that prior to his position as executive director of the 9/11 Commission, Philip Zelikow had a number of conversations with Richard Clarke, the former National Security Counter-terrorism director in 2000 and 2001, about al-Qaeda and 'Usama bin Laden, but Philip Zelikow was never called as a witness by the 9/11 Commission concerning the nature of those discussions?

- Did you know that at least half of the ten commissioners, both Democrats and Republicans who conducted the televised public inquiries, had the sort of associations, ties, histories, and conflicts of interest (either with oil companies, Saudi Arabia, George Tenet, the intelligence community, the Iran-Contra cover-up scandal, the Bush administration, or who were active proponents for attacking Iraq long before 2003) which should have precluded them from serving as members of such an inquiry ... especially, if one wanted to avoid even the appearance of impropriety and, thereby, eliminate the possibility of questions being raised in relation to the integrity of the conclusions and findings of such a commission?

- Did you know that on many occasions, official commissions are often not meant to arrive at the truth but are, instead, a political tool used to give the impression of seriousness without much underlying substance?

- Did you know that such commissions are often exercises in misdirection away from root problems and causes so that vested interests will remain protected despite an illusory veneer of critical investigation and thoroughness?

- Did you know that every theory, without exception, concerning the causes of the events of 9/11 is a conspiracy theory, including the "official" theory of the U.S. government which maintains that 19-plus individuals conspired together as members of al-Qaeda to attack the United States on September 11, 2001, and, therefore, the task of any such conspiracy

theory is to be able to plausibly account for all or the vast majority of the available data and evidence?

- Did you know that the official theory of the United States government concerning the events of 9/11 cannot plausibly and reasonably account for all of the foregoing facts and evidence in a way that is consistent with their theory?

- Did you know that 40% of those who view Fox television on a regular basis still believe that Saddam Hussein was behind 9/11 and/or conspired with al-Qaeda to set the events of 9/11 in motion despite the fact that after much disinformation, misinformation, hemming, hawing, and evasion from members of the Bush administration, even President Bush finally admitted in a September 2006 interview with Brian Williams of NBC that the President knows that Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11?

-----



### **Did You Know? - Part 2**

- Did you know that prior to September 11, 2001 there were 682 hijackings in the United States, all of which were responded to appropriately with respect to FAA regulations and Department of Defense protocols covering such situations?

- Did you know that in the year leading up to 9/11, there were at least 56 instances (and by some accounts 67) in which jet interceptors were scrambled within minutes of air emergencies being detected?

- Did you know that the White House does not have to give approval for such interceptions to take place and, instead, all such air emergencies are automatically handled by a set of established procedures?

- Did you know that all commercial air flights must adhere to what are called Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) and that all such flights are required to file a flight plan prior to takeoff?

- Did you know that if an air traffic controller determines that radio contact is lost with a flight, or if the flight deviates from its flight plan, or if the transponder for the flight is turned off or becomes inactive, then the air traffic controller is to immediately contact a superior in the air traffic control center?

- Did you know that if any of the foregoing three problems cannot be resolved within a few minutes, the air traffic control center is supposed to contact NORAD and request that jet fighters be scrambled to investigate the matter further and determine by visual contact and on-site (i.e., in-air) inspection the nature of the problem?

- Did you know that if a flight deviates from a filed flight plan by, for example, taking a wrong turn at designated 'fix' points along the flight plan or if such flights deviate from their flight plan by as little as two miles, then air traffic controllers will contact the plane to advise them of such deviations or to inquire why such deviations have occurred?

- Did you know that if contact with the deviating flight is not established, the next step is for the relevant air traffic control center to request that jet fighters be scrambled to make a direct, close, on-site (that is, in-air) inspection of the problematic flight?

- Did you know that once a scramble order is given, F-15s can reach an altitude of 29,000 feet within 21/2 minutes and attain speeds of over 1,800 mph?

- Did you know that response times of the military to air emergencies will vary with the perceived seriousness of the emergency, and, generally speaking, the more restricted the air space in which an emergency occurs, the faster will be the military's response time?

- Did you know that the airspace over, for example, New York and Washington, D.C. is designated as 'prohibited airspace' that constitutes the highest level of restricted airspace, and in incidents involving restricted air space the military response to errant flights in such sectors is supposed to be within minutes?

- Did you know that the FAA usually has a defense liaison officer attached to NORAD (North American Aerospace Defense Command) headquarters whose responsibility is to help coordinate and facilitate communications between the FAA and the military in order to properly handle air emergencies?

- Did you know that the FAA also has a hijack liaison officer (consisting of a Director of the Office of Civil Aviation Security ... or his or her designate) stationed in Washington, D.C. and who directly requests the National Military Command Center (NMCC) of the military to scramble jet fighters in the case of confirmed hijackings?

- Did you know that with the exception of situations requiring an immediate response (that is, situations in which lives are likely to be lost, or considerable property damage might occur, or human suffering is likely to ensue, or there is some imminent threat), then FAA requests made to NMCC are passed on to the Department of Defense for further processing by the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other relevant officials?

- Did you know that upon intercepting an errant flight that is non-responsive to radio contact, a jet usually will fly a little above, in front of, and to the left of the errant flight, followed by a rocking of the fighter plane's wings, which is the established sign that the commercial flight has been intercepted and that the appropriate response is for the plane being signaled to rock its wings acknowledging that it has been intercepted?

- Did you know that if the commercial flight responds properly, the jet fighter will perform a slow left turn and will escort the plane back to a proper heading?

- Did you know that if an errant flight does not properly respond to its jet fighter escort's signals, there are a set of graduated responses that have been established to induce compliance, such as: making passes in front of the errant plane, firing tracer bullets across the flight of the errant flight, and, under certain conditions, downing the errant flight with a missile?

- Did you know that American Airlines Flight 11 took off at 7:59 a.m. and that United Airlines Flight 175 took off at 8:14 a.m., both out of Boston's Logan Airport (each headed for the twin towers), while American Airlines Flight 77 out of Dulles Airport took off at 8:20 a.m. (and would, supposedly, eventually target the Pentagon) and United Flight 93 took-off around 8:42 a.m.?

- Did you know that American Airlines Flight 11 crashed into the north side of the north tower at 8:46 a.m., and United Airlines Flight 175 struck the south tower at 9:02, and American Airlines Flight 77 allegedly hit the Pentagon at 9:38 a.m.?

- Did you know that according to *The 9/11 Commission Report*, American Airlines Flight 11 missed its first air controller mark at 8:13 when it was instructed to climb to 35,000 feet and did not respond?

- Did you know that according to *The 9/11 Commission Report*, American Airlines Flight 11 turned off its responder (which identifies a plane's location and altitude) at 8:21 a.m. and that Air Traffic Manager Glen Michael indicated they thought at the time that the

turning off of the transponder might have been an indication of a hijacking?

- Did you know that that by 8:24 a.m. the first radio communications were heard by the Boston air control center that Flight 11 had been hijacked?

- Did you know that Boston air traffic control center finally-- after initially failing to follow established FAA protocol-- made contact with the military's NEADS at 8:37 a.m. requesting that planes be scrambled (and according to some NORAD accounts, notification was actually given as early as 8:31 a.m.)?

- Did you know that even after American Flight 11 had not responded to an air traffic control directive, had turned off its identification responder, had given radio communication evidence that the plane was being hijacked, and even after the Boston center had informed the military that a hijacking was in progress, nonetheless, no jets were scrambled to intercept the commercial flight until approximately 8:46 a.m. (and 8:53 a.m. according to the Commission's report) when jets were scrambled from Otis Air Force Base, some 9-15 minutes (depending on whose time line one follows) after being informed that a hijacking was in progress in prohibited air space?

- Did you know that Otis Air Force Base is in Cape Cod, Massachusetts, but there are a number of Air Force bases much closer to New York such as McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey?

- Did you know that according to *The 9/11 Commission Report* Colonel Robert Marr of the New England Air Defense System had to phone General Larry Arnold, head of NORAD's Continental Region Center, in order to obtain permission to scramble jets, and, yet, the 9/11 Commission referred to a document from the Department of Defense which stipulates that anyone in the chain of command might authorize the scrambling of jets in response to an air emergency when a request for assistance is made by civil authorities?

- Did you know that the American Airlines headquarters in Fort Worth, Texas has master tapes of the transmissions concerning Flight 11 that have been listened to by some of the families who lost loved ones on 9/11 and which indicate that authorities knew of multiple hijackings considerably before authorities officially acknowledged that such knowledge existed and in contradistinction to the findings of the 9/11 Commission?

- Did you know that John Ogonowski, the captain of American Airlines Flight 11, apparently had activated a 'push-to-talk' switch undetected and that as early as 8:14 a.m. air traffic controllers in Boston were hearing voices from Flight 11 speaking in Arabic and heavily accented English saying, among other things, that "We have more planes. We have other planes"?

- Did you know that the FAA superiors of the aforementioned air traffic controllers in Boston forbade the latter to talk to anyone about what they had heard from Flight 11?



- Did you know that, based on the foregoing, by 8:14 a.m. the FAA had evidence that at least one plane, and possibly more, had been hijacked, that the multiple hijackings might be connected, and all of this evidence conflicts with the findings of the 9/11 Commission?

- Did you know that prior to being ordered not to talk with anyone about what they (the air traffic controllers at the Boston center) had heard in conjunction with Flight 11, some of those air traffic controllers contacted a manager at Systems Operation Control about what had happened and, yet, several of the managers at SOC indicated that they were going to sit on this information?

- Did you know that if steps had been taken at 8:14 a.m. to authorize commercial flights still on the ground to delay take-off in order to try to counter other possible hijackings, at least two, and possibly three, of the other flights involved in the events of 9/11 might have been advantageously affected since Flight 77 out of Dulles (which allegedly hit the Pentagon) did not take off until 8:20 a.m., and United Flight 93 (which crashed in Pennsylvania), did not lift off until 8:42 a.m., and even United Flight 175, which took off at 8:14 a.m., could have been authorized to return to the airport?

- Did you know F-15 jet fighters were ordered scrambled from Otis Air Force base at 8:46 a.m., and because NEADS supposedly did not know where to direct these fighters (because NEADS officials claimed that the transponder for Flight 11 had been turned off) and, inexplicably, directed the fighters to not only take up a holding pattern off the coast of Long Island but to avoid the New York City area altogether despite the fact that one plane already had crashed into the north tower of the WTC?

- Did you know that transponders are actually not needed to either locate or track a plane by radar?

- Did you know that a number of NORAD officials who were on duty the morning of September 11, 2001 --including Col. Robert Marr, Lt. Col. Dawne Deskins, and Major General Larry Arnold -- indicate that word of a possible hijacking had reached NORAD between 8:31 and 8:34 a.m. -- some 12-15 minutes before any planes were scrambled from Otis?

- Did you know that according to *The 9/11 Commission Report* NORAD did not have knowledge of the hijacking of United Flight 175 until 9:03 a.m., when a phone call reportedly came into NEADS from the New York air traffic

control center, and, yet, according to Master Sargent Maureen Dooly, a NORAD official on duty during the morning of September 11, 2001, she and other technicians with her were both tracking Flight 11 as well as connected with the Boston center and were aware by no later than 8:43 a.m. that United Flight 175 had been hijacked, some 20 minutes before the time stated by *The 9/11 Commission Report* -- and that Maureen Dooly's account is backed up independently by other reports to NORAD by the FAA concerning the hijacking of Flight 175?

- Did you know that F-15s have the capability of reaching speeds of 1,875 miles per hour and, therefore, could have reached New York City in as little as six minutes and, consequently, could have arrived as much as four minutes before the crash of Flight 175 into the south tower of the WTC?

- Did you know that according to NORAD's data, the F-15s were still 71 miles away at the time of the second crash into the WTC

buildings, and these fighters were 71 miles away because they had been ordered not to fly over New York City and because they had been diverted to a holding pattern off the coast of Long Island?

- Did you know that if jet fighters had been scrambled as soon as there was evidence planes were being hijacked with a heading toward New York City (which was between 8:31 and 8:34 a.m.) both of the WTC-headed flights could have been intercepted prior to reaching their targets?

- Did you know that President Bush was aware of the first airplane hitting the north tower of the WTC prior to going to the elementary school in Florida ( around 8: 53 a.m.), and he was aware that it was a commercial flight, and, yet, when Andrew Card later came into the classroom and whispered in the ear of President Bush that a second plane had hit the WTC and that the country was under attack, the President did nothing for approximately 10 to 20 minutes – even as he knew that the United States was being threatened – except to remain in the classroom?

- Did you know that, apparently, despite knowing that the World Trade Center had been hit twice (according to Vice President Cheney, the Secret Service had established open communications with the FAA as early as 8:46 a.m.) and that the President of the United States was in a vulnerable position, nothing was done by the Secret Service to whisk the President away to a safe and secure location?

- Did you know that according to Richard Clarke at 9:10 a.m. on September 11, 2001, senior officials (including, among others, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, George Tenet, Director of the CIA, Richard Armitage, Deputy Secretary of State, Jane Garvey, FAA Administrator, Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, Richard Myers, Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Robert Mueller, Director of the FBI, and officials from NORAD) were hooked up in a video conference to deal with the on-going crisis, and, yet, despite having over 36 minutes to deal with Flight 77, which allegedly crashed into the Pentagon around 9:38 a.m., and nearly an hour to deal with Flight 93, which crashed in Pennsylvania somewhere between 10:03 and 10:10 a.m., this select group of leaders was, apparently, able to accomplish little or nothing with respect to defending the United States?

- Did you know that American Airlines Flight 77, which eventually is supposed to have struck the Pentagon at 9:38 a.m., lifted off from Dulles at 8:20 a.m. and that the last transmission from Flight 77 was at 8:50 a.m. when the pilot for that flight acknowledged a directive from air traffic control to climb to a higher altitude?

- Did you know that at 8:56 a.m. Flight 77 was detected deviating from its filed flight plan and moving in a southwesterly direction?

- Did you know that the transponder for Flight 77 went off at around 8:56 a.m.?

- Did you know that according to *The 9/11 Commission Report*, the radar information concerning Flight 77 was not being displayed to air traffic controllers for a period supposedly lasting at least from 8:56 a.m. to 9:05 a.m., and, therefore, air traffic controllers would not have seen Flight 77 turn back toward Washington, D.C.?

- Did you know that according to the 9/11 Commission, Flight 77 traveled through US airspace undetected by FAA radar for some 36 minutes, and, yet, no request for assistance was directed to NORAD, which is reported to have the most sophisticated and advanced radar system in the world, and, in addition, NORAD was not able to detect the fact that there was an unidentified bogey (which is what a plane without an active transponder would be) that was flying toward Washington, D.C.?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission explains the 'disappearance' of Flight 77 as a matter of software problems that were causing

radar information to not be properly processed, but the 9/11 Commission has no evidence to back up its assertion concerning the existence of software problems, and, furthermore, the Commission has no explanation for -- nor did it pursue the matter -- of how both FAA primary radar and NORAD's independent radar system were simultaneously having the same kind of 'technical' problems?

- Did you know there is independent evidence (including radar reconstructions that took place after 9/11) from both the FAA and NORAD that are in contradistinction to the 9/11 Commission's

declaration that no one knew that Flight 77 had turned back toward Washington and was en route to that city and that, in point of fact, both FAA and NORAD had been tracking most, if not all, of Flight 77's flight path for the entire period that the 9/11 Commission claims that Flight 77 had dropped off the radar screen?

- Did you know that there are some reports indicating that, at the very least, the FAA re-established radar contact with Flight 77 as it flew east over West Virginia, a full 28 minutes before its alleged rendezvous with the Pentagon -- and in contradistinction to the 9/11 Commission's assertion that NORAD was not informed about Flight 77 until 4 minutes prior to impact (that is, 9:42 a.m.)?

- Did you know that following the testimony of Jane Garvey -- the, then, Administrator for the FAA -- to the Commission, an official statement was read out which indicated that NORAD had been apprised of the hijacking of Flight 77 at 9:24 a.m., a full 10 minutes before the time stated by the Commission, and that, in addition, the FAA had been fully disclosing information to NORAD about events even prior to the 9:24 a.m. point in the time line?

- Did you know that despite the fact that radio contact with Flight 77 had been lost, and despite the fact that Flight 77 deviated from its filed flight plan, and despite the fact that the transponder for Flight 77 was no longer on, and, despite the fact that, according to *The 9/11 Commission Report*, radar contact with Flight 77 'disappeared' altogether for a period of 32 minutes, no jet fighters were scrambled to investigate the matter, all in contravention of established protocols for dealing with such emergencies?

- Did you know that F-16s were finally ordered by Major James Fox to scramble from Langley at 9:30 a.m. but were not given a specific target to

intercept and, instead, were directed to fly toward Baltimore (not Washington, D.C.) which is the opposite direction from which they should have been flying?

- Did you know that the pilots involved in this scramble order somehow interpreted their mission to be one of going into a holding pattern some 60 miles out to sea rather than fly to Baltimore?

- Did you know that by the time the Pentagon was struck at 9:38 a.m., the F-16s from Langley were 150 miles away from being able to protect Washington, D.C.?

- Did you know that Andrews Air Force base in Maryland is much closer to Washington, D.C. (10 miles) than is Langley Air force Base in Virginia?

- Did you know that unlike the airplane crashes at the World Trade Center towers, the impact at the Pentagon did not produce any significant or noticeable seismic signature, and, yet, supposedly, large commercial airliners were involved in each of the three incidents?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission states that Vice President Cheney was in the Emergency Operations bunker below the White House at 10:00 a.m.?

- Did you know that in contradistinction to the unsubstantiated claim of the 9/11 Commission, both Richard Clarke, Head of Counterterrorism at the White House, and Norman Mineta, the Secretary of Transportation, place Vice President Cheney in the bunker below the White House some 35 minutes earlier than the 10:00 a.m. time line of *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that at 9:25 a.m., after receiving clearance from the White House (in all likelihood Vice President Cheney), Jane Garvey, then Administrator of the FAA, issued a national ground stop order that directs all aircraft -- whether private, commercial, military, or police enforcement -- to land as quickly as is feasibly possible or to refrain from taking off?

- Did you know that the air ban on military fighters was only retracted at 10:31 a.m. September 11, 2001?

- Did you know that according to a 9/11 Commission staff report (17), Vice President Cheney received an order from President Bush to shoot down any hostile aircraft, commercial or otherwise, sometime between 10:10 a.m. and 10:15 a.m., after all four hijacked planes had crashed?

- Did you know that while the 9/11 Commission claims that Richard Clarke did not receive the shoot-down order until 10:25 a.m., Richard Clarke, himself, reported that he had received a shoot-down authorization somewhere between 9:45 and 9:50 a.m.?

- Did you know that according to the standard operating protocols of the Department of Defense and the FAA, it is not necessary to receive an authorization from the President in order for jet fighters to either intercept 'deviant' flights or to proceed through the graduated set of established steps for responding to an air emergency such as a hijacking?

- Did you know that Federal Aviation Deputy Chief Monty Belger was monitoring a target on radar approaching Washington, D.C. and that a young man was communicating this tracking information to both Cheney and Rice in the Emergency Operations Center beneath the White House, and, yet, no orders were given to evacuate any buildings including the White House, the Capitol building, or the Pentagon?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* claims that no one in the government knew that an aircraft was approaching the Pentagon until 9:36?

- Did you know that Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta, who was in the Emergency Operations Center beneath the White House with Vice President Cheney, testified before the 9/11 Commission that he witnessed a young man continue to update the Vice President about the manner in which the incoming craft was fast approaching Washington, D.C., and Secretary Mineta furthered witnessed the young man ask the Vice President "Do the orders still stand?", to which the Vice President responded by turning his neck around in order to face the man and said: "Of course the orders still stand. Have you heard anything to the contrary?" and this conversation took place between 9:25 a.m. and 9:26 a.m.?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* apparently simply ignored this testimony of Secretary Mineta in its final report?

- Did you know that the Secret Service who was accompanying the President on his trip to Florida has some of the most advanced telecommunications equipment in the world, and, despite this, the President did not issue his shoot-down order until more than an hour and a half after knowledge that hijackings had occurred was well established by both the FAA and NORAD?

- Did you know that NORAD was notified at 10:07 a.m. by the FAA that Flight 93 had been hijacked, but air traffic controllers had known that the plane had been hijacked since at least 9:30 a.m. (CNN reported that the FAA passed on this information as early as 9:16 a.m., and this was corroborated by both the FAA and NORAD), and no one, including the 9/11 Commission, was able to determine why there was a delay of between 37 and 47 minutes in both communicating this information and following established procedures with respect to hijackings?

- Did you know that without evidentiary justification, the 9/11 Commission simply dismissed the 9:15 a.m. timeline with respect to the Flight 93 hijacking as being "incorrect"?

- Did you know that Flight 93 is reported to have crashed at 10:06 a.m.?

- Did you know that Major David Nash, one of the pilots who had been dispatched from Otis Air Force base in Massachusetts to fly to New York City, indicated that upon returning to base he was informed that an F-16 had shot down an airliner over Pennsylvania?

- Did you know that secondary debris and human remains, as well as part of a jet engine, were found scattered along a path of up to eight miles from the alleged crash site in Pennsylvania of Flight 93, facts that are not consistent with a plane having crashed in a field as passengers fought for control of the plane, but, on the other hand, such facts are consistent with a plane having been shot down in mid-air?

- Did you know that the *Nashville Register* reported that an air traffic controller, despite being instructed to say nothing, stated that there had been an F-16 on the radar screen that was circling, and within visual range of, Flight 93 at the time of its crash in Pennsylvania?

- Did you know that as of September 12, 2006, the Data Recorder for Flight 93 had not been released to the public and that the voice recorder, to which some members of the 9/11 families have listened, is inconclusive as to whether, or not, passengers actually were able to gain access to the cockpit prior to the time of the flight's reported crash?

- Did you know that on a consistent basis with respect to each of the four hijackings that took place on 9/11, jet fighters were either not scrambled in a timely fashion, or they were not given the position of the targets that they were suppose to intercept, or were inexplicably sent to air space where they

would be ineffective, or they were ordered to stand down, or they were authorized to shoot down a commercial aircraft that the military insists did not take place despite the fact there is considerable evidence that runs counter to the military's position?

- Did you know that there are at least three official stories concerning what happened in relation to the scrambling of jets on September 11, 2001: (1) the one put forth by General Richard Myers, then acting chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Mike Snyder, a spokesperson for NORAD, that no military aircraft were scrambled until after the crash at the Pentagon; (2) the version officially released by NORAD on September 18, 2001 that claimed the FAA failed to inform NORAD in a timely fashion about any of the hijackings and, thereby, made interception of the hijacked planes impossible; and, (3) the position of *The 9/11 Commission Report* that places much of the responsibility for failure to scramble on the incompetence of the FAA -- but all three of these versions are contradicted by established facts?

- Did you know that on September 11, 2001, the intelligence community and the military were engaged in at least three war game scenarios -- such as Vigilant Guardian and Northern Vigilance -- which were probing various logistical and strategic themes that had to do with hijackings, air attacks, and terrorism and were designed to, among other things, test American readiness to effectively deal with such threats?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission refused to explore the possibility that any of these war games might have interfered, to varying degrees, with the ability of the FAA and the military to efficaciously respond to the 'real' threats of 9/11 -- especially in light of the fact that some of these war games were using scripted software that would produce simulated attacks on radar screens and in light of the fact that both the FAA and NORAD had reports of several 'phantom' planes that appeared on the radar screens during the interval between 8:45 a.m. and 10:15 a.m.?

- Did you know that these war games were planned and implemented despite the fact that both the intelligence community and the Department of Defense were receiving multiple indications from numerous countries (such as Britain, Italy, Germany, France, Russia, Israel, Egypt, Morocco, and Afghanistan) that a terrorist threat was imminent in early September 2001?

-----



### **Did You Know? – Part 3**

- Did you know that, initially, the military listed the time of impact of Flight 77 at the Pentagon as around 9:43 a.m. on September 11, 2001, and although this initial time of impact has been pushed back to 9:37 a.m. (*The 9/11 Commission Report*), the actual time of the Pentagon event might actually be 9:32 a.m. because that is when a number of battery-operated wall clocks in the west wing of the Pentagon, as well as a clock at the heliport near the Pentagon's west wing, stopped due to a violent event of some kind?

- Did you know that the official government account of what happened at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 is that the west side of the building was struck by Flight 77, a hijacked American Airlines 757 Boeing airplane?

- Did you know that the US military maintains that Flight 77 hit the ground floor of the Pentagon?

- Did you know that although a number of lamp standards near the Pentagon were knocked down because they were allegedly in the flight path of the Boeing 757, there were other objects (for example, a construction site surrounded by a high chain-link fence and tall spools of wire) in the same projected flight path of the Boeing 757 that were untouched?

- Did you know that there are photographs of the Pentagon showing that the rear portion of the first and second floor are still intact while the upper three floors were demolished?

- Did you know that the Pentagon is a concrete -- not steel-framed -- building that is five stories or 77 feet tall at the highest point of the roof?

Did you know that a Boeing 757-200, the American Airlines version that supposedly hit the Pentagon, is 155 feet long, has a wingspan of 125 feet, and measures 18 feet from the bottom of the engine to the top of the fuselage, with a fuselage that is 13 feet in diameter, engines that are nine feet in diameter, and there is a distance of 45 feet from the bottom of the engine to the top of the tail?

- Did you know according to the US military and press reports, the object that struck the Pentagon hit at an oblique, 45-degree angle, which, if true, means that the surface area of the Pentagon that allegedly was impacted by a Boeing 757 would have increased to about 177 feet?

- Did you know that even if the engines of a Boeing 757-200 were dragging along the grass, the plane is tall enough that it would have impacted at least two floors of the Pentagon?

- Did you know that there is absolutely no evidence of a Boeing 757 having made contact with any portion of the grass that is in front of the Pentagon, and this means, depending on how high off the ground the Boeing was when it allegedly hit the building, more than two stories of the Pentagon should have been impacted by the plane?

- Did you know that the impact hole in the front exterior of the Pentagon building was estimated to be between 15 and 18 feet wide – that is, not even as wide as the collective diameter of two jet engines, and, more importantly, not as wide as the collective width of such engines plus the portions of the wings and the fuselage that separate the engines from each other?

- Did you know that even after a portion of the Pentagon collapsed from the collective forces of fire and firefighting techniques, the collapsed section, which is broader than the original impact hole, only measures half of the wing width of a Boeing 757?

- Did you know that there are photographs of the Pentagon that were taken just after the collision showing an intact wall, approximately 25 feet above the ground, which is just over the point of impact on the west side of the Pentagon, and this intact wall shows no evidence of having been struck by the tail of a commercial jet (and the distance from the bottom of the engine to the tip of the tail is 45 feet) traveling at some 500-plus miles an hour?

- Did you know that Francois Grangier, who is an expert on air crashes and who examined photographs of the Pentagon crash site, has stated that a Boeing 757 airplane did not cause the observable damage to the façade of the west wing of the Pentagon?

- Did you know that a Boeing 757 weighs some 60 tons when empty and that luggage and human beings add many more tonnage to the weight of the plane?

- Did you know that there was, with one exception, no evidence of any debris resembling engines, wings, fuselage, luggage, or body parts to be found outside of the Pentagon near the point of impact (although there was an

abundance of very small pieces of debris of some kind that has been reported)?

- Did you know that one piece of airplane skin, bearing some of the colors of an American Airlines vehicle, was supposedly recovered on the lawn outside the Pentagon but the manner in which this coloring appears to be configured cannot be made to match any portion of the exterior of an actual American Airlines Boeing 757?

- Did you know that the aforementioned piece of debris shows none of the black coating, soot, or fire damage that should have been characteristic of an object that had been exposed to a jet fuel fire?

- Did you know that while the official government account of the Pentagon event maintains that the Boeing 757 completely disintegrated on impact, there is absolutely no plausible or technical explanation that is provided that would account for how the above mentioned piece of fuselage debris would have been able to escape the disintegrating fate that befell the rest of the 60 ton Boeing plane and, thereby, would have been available to be found all by itself on the lawn of the Pentagon?

- Did you know that a photograph was published in conjunction with the Pentagon event of 9/11 that purportedly depicted the turbofan of a 757, but, subsequently, a team of researchers, led by Karl Schwartz, identified the photographed item as a front-hub assembly of a front compressor from an IT8D turbojet A3 Skywarrior jet fighter, which is much smaller than a 757?

- Did you know that prior to 9/11, A3 Skywarriors, although normally a piloted plane, were retrofitted at the Fort Collins-Loveland Airport in Colorado to serve as remote-controlled, missile-carrying aircraft?

- Did you know that there is a photograph of a nearly round exit hole along the ground, which measures about seven feet in width, that appears in an interior ring of the Pentagon – a hole that the US military claims marks the point of innermost penetration of Flight 77?

- Did you know that the nature of the exit hole seems to indicate it was pierced not smashed?

- Did you know that there are no scorch marks surrounding the hole as one might anticipate from a jet fuel fire?

- Did you know that the size of this hole is too small to be caused by a jet engine or the fuselage?

Did you know that the nose of a Boeing, referred to as the radome, contains electronic navigation gear, and it is made of carbon fiber so that it can permit passage of electronic waves?

- Did you know that the radome is far too fragile and lacks the sort of density that could have penetrated a succession of concrete ring- walls at the Pentagon to have caused the above mentioned exit hole in the interior Ring C of the Pentagon?

- Did you know that following the Pentagon collision, there were a group of about 20 uniformed men, none of whom were from the National Transportation Safety Board, who were photographed scouring the grass in front of the west wing of the Pentagon and, eventually, taking away a large, but relatively light, tarpaulin-covered object?

- Did you know that in the case of all air crashes, the National Transportation Safety Board has primary jurisdiction and that removing evidence from a crash site constitutes grounds for a felony prosecution?

- Did you know that despite being a crime scene in which hundreds of people were murdered and millions of dollars of damage inflicted, all forensic evidence was removed from the scene of the crime, in and around the Pentagon, within a matter of days?

- Did you know that because the Pentagon is situated in Arlington County, Virginia, jurisdiction for fighting the fire should have belonged to the Arlington County Fire Department, but their firefighters were not permitted to get near to the primary impact site and, instead, had to fight the fire from a distance?

- Did you know that the Arlington County firefighters were kept away from the location where the airliner wreckage was supposed to have been, and the group that kept them away was the Urban Search and Rescue Team of FEMA?

- Did you know that within a very short period following the Pentagon event on 9/11, all external surveillance videos covering the west façade of the building were confiscated by the FBI?

- Did you know that with the exception of five frames of a video released by CNN on March 8, 2002, purportedly showing the Pentagon crash event of 9/11, none of the confiscated video has been released to the public by the FBI?

- Did you know that the five released frames show an incorrect date stamp of September 12, 2001 and, as well, the time stamp for the released frames indicates a time of 17:37 rather than 9:38 a.m. or 9:32 a.m. when the actual event took place?

- Did you know that Pierre-Henri Bunel, an artillery and explosives expert who served as an ally with General Schwartzkopf during Desert Storm, has examined the foregoing video footage, as well as other photographic evidence concerning the Pentagon event, and has concluded that the Pentagon event gave evidence (such as the color, indicating temperature of the fireball, its manner of expansion, the kind of fire equipment used in combating the fire) of a high-yield explosive denotation at the Pentagon and not the sort of deflagration that would have arisen from a jet fuel fire caused by the impact of a large commercial airliner?

- Did you know that during the press conferences held at the Pentagon between September 12<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>, 2001, no one reported seeing any large pieces of evidence (such as fuselage, engines, or the like) indicating that the Pentagon had been struck by a Boeing 757?

- Did you know that the voice and flight data recorders that were purportedly from Flight 77 were found on September 14, 2001, along with a light beacon, but that, allegedly, the two recorders were too severely damaged by the fires to yield recoverable data?

- Did you know that Ed Plaughter, the fire chief for the Arlington County Fire Department who originally reported (between September 12<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>, 2001) seeing no large portions of a 757 Boeing in the fire debris at the Pentagon, subsequently (some six months after September 11, 2001), changed his account to say that he recollects having seen portions of wings, fuselage, engine, landing gear, seats, and one of the two black boxes from the airplane?

- Did you know that according to some accounts of the Pentagon strike on 9/11, the impact was of such intensity that not only did the plane disintegrate but the aluminum portions of the plane melted when, reportedly, the temperature of the fire reached more than 1,050 degrees Fahrenheit?

- Did you know that there has been no plausible technical explanation forthcoming of how the foregoing disintegration would have occurred and still have produced a small exit hole in the interior, third ring of the Pentagon?

- Did you know that when 60-plus tons of melted plane were not found at the Pentagon event, the story began to circulate that at 5,400 degrees Fahrenheit, aluminum turns into a gas, and, so, one would not find much aluminum tonnage remaining?

- Did you know that no one has come up with a plausible explanation of how temperatures of 5,400 degrees were reached, let alone sustained for a sufficiently long period of time, to gasify the aluminum from the alleged Boeing plane?

- Did you know that even if someone were to come up with a plausible explanation for the generation of such sustained temperatures, there is no concomitant explanation for why this sort of extensive temperatures and heat did not do more damage to the rest of the building surrounding the hole of impact or why the grass outside of the west side of the Pentagon remained un-singed?

- Did you know that there are photographs of office equipment that is visible near the point of impact and that should have been incinerated if there were temperatures in the building that were high enough to gasify all, or large portions, of the 60 tons of aluminum and metal portions of the plane as some have tried to argue?

- Did you know that even if someone were to come up with a plausible explanation for the generation of sustained heat capable of liquefying and gasifying 60 tons of aluminum, nevertheless, they have not been able to account for how – given the presence of such heat – authorities were supposedly able to identify some of the people who died in the wreckage from their fingerprints?

- Did you know that despite the accounts of disintegration, liquefying, and gasifying of the Boeing 747, the FBI claims that it was able to recover a large portion of the 757 debris and that this all has been marked with the serial number of Flight 77 and has been stored in a warehouse, although pictures of this catalog of debris have never been released to the public?

- Did you know that there were witnesses to the Pentagon event who claim that there were identifiable pieces of debris some hundred yards, or so, from the Pentagon that were supposedly photographed, but until this day, few of these alleged photographs have been made public – one exception being a photograph by Mark Faram that was of the

aforementioned piece of American Airline-like colored portion of airplane skin, a piece of debris that has problems surrounding it concerning its authenticity?

- Did you know that one of the first people to claim that a plane had hit the Pentagon was Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld who claimed that he walked the 2,000 feet from the east side to the west side of the Pentagon to examine the damage and who, supposedly, saw thousands of pieces of debris that were identifiable as from an airplane?

- Did you know evidence presented by Richard Clarke in his book *Against All Enemies*, as well as during his testimony before the 9/11 Commission, directly contradicts the foregoing account given by Secretary Rumsfeld, because, according to Clarke, Rumsfeld was participating in a teleconference with him during this time?

- Did you know that on the day before 9/11, Secretary Rumsfeld reported that several trillion dollars were missing from the Pentagon accounts?

- Did you know that the Pentagon's west wing contained the financial management sections, accountants, financial data that were to be used in trying to track down the missing trillions?

- Did you know that April Gallop, who had top secret security clearance and who was employed by the Army in the administrative section situated in the west part of the Pentagon, testified that she heard and felt a bomb go off, smelled no jet fuel, and saw no debris from an air crash inside the Pentagon?

- Did you know that when April Gallop was recovering in the hospital, she was visited by men who never identified themselves but who strongly suggested that she take the package from the Victim Compensation Fund, keep her mouth shut, and who emphasized again and again that a plane had hit the Pentagon?

- Did you know that an Army employee, who was on temporary assignment in accounting at the Pentagon and who was just returning to a south wing office that was adjacent to the west wing, stated that a number of people came running by yelling "bombs" and a "bomb went off"?

- Did you know that a number of Pentagon witnesses indicated that they heard two explosions on the morning of 9/11?

- Did you know that a number of witnesses at the Pentagon indicated that they smelled cordite [Explosive powder (nitroglycerin and guncotton and petrolatum) dissolved in acetone and dried and extruded in brown cords – used in many conventional explosive devices] following the initial explosion?

Did you know that it is possible that an initial explosion could have produced a heat signature that could have served as a homing device for a subsequent heat-seeking, guided missile?

- Did you know that on 9/11 there was a taxi driver who was one of the last people to gain access to I-395 that overlooks the west face of the Pentagon before the highway was closed by police, and this taxi driver said that he saw no evidence of either an airplane crash that had impacted the Pentagon or visible plane debris on the grounds in front of that building?

- Did you know that there are conflicting eyewitness accounts of whether what was seen and/or heard near the Pentagon on the morning of September 11, 2001 was an American Airlines Boeing 757, a small 10-seater jet plane, possibly with American Airlines-like coloring, or a missile?

- Did you know that Defense Secretary Rumsfeld referred to the object that hit the Pentagon as a “missile” during an interview with *Parade* magazine?

- Did you know that Major General Larry Arnold, commander of NORAD, had ordered a fighter jet that was in the vicinity to fly over

the west face of the Pentagon shortly after the explosion on September 11, 2001, and the pilot indicated there was no evidence that a plane had struck the Pentagon?

- Did you know that some people might have confused the aforementioned fly-by of a fighter jet with Flight 77, and this could be why *The 9/11 Commission Report* cites 9:37 a.m. as the time of impact rather than the time of 9:32 a.m. which is indicated by the battery-operated wall-clocks in the west wing of the Pentagon that stopped at the latter time due to a violent event of some kind?

- Did you know that no one seems to have asked Major General Arnold the following question, namely: If there was a jet fighter close enough to inspect damage just shortly after 9:32 a.m. on the morning of September 11, 2001, then why was this plane not able to shoot the Boeing 757 down



prior to the latter's hitting the Pentagon since the Boeing allegedly did not crash into the building until five minutes later?

- Did you know that according to *The 9/11 Commission Report* the Pentagon did not know it was under attack until 9:36 a.m., and, therefore, just a minute or two before impact?

- Did you know that according to military officials since they only had one or two minutes of prior notification before the Pentagon event at 9: 37 a.m., and, since, apparently, the only asset in the vicinity at the time was an unarmed C-130H cargo airplane, it was ordered to locate, identify, and track the suspicious object appearing on the radar screens?

- Did you know that, apparently, none of the military officials specified where in the air, precisely, this cargo plane was in relation to the Pentagon or Washington D.C., or, how, all within a minute or so, the pilot of the cargo plane was able to locate, identify, follow, and watch the crash of a plane that was doing a 270-degree downward spiral through 7,000 feet?

Did you know that, apparently, none of the military officials have been able to reconcile the reports of this C130H cargo plane pilot watching a plane crash into the Pentagon at 9: 37 a.m. with the report of the Major-General-Arnold-ordered-fly-by of a jet fighter over the west wing of the Pentagon shortly after 9:32 a.m., and why the jet fighter, rather than the cargo plane, was not ordered to pursue the approaching object, or why nothing was said by either the C130H cargo plane pilot or the jet fighter pilot about the existence of one another, since they would have been flying near the west wing of the Pentagon at about the same time?

- Did you know that American Airlines Flight 77 originally went off course and displayed other characteristics of a possible hijacking as early as 8: 46 a.m.?

- Did you know that, supposedly, all civilian contact with Flight 77 was lost around 9:09 a.m.?

- Did you know that the US military is not dependent on the FAA to know the whereabouts of planes within US air space?

- Did you know that the Pentagon was reportedly hit at 9:43 a.m. (and later 'fixed' at 9: 37 a.m. by *The 9/11 Commission Report*), and this is nearly an hour after Flight 77 displayed characteristics of an airplane that required

investigation from both the FAA and NMCC (National Military Command Center)?

- Did you know that the transponder for Flight 77 was turned off more than 40 minutes prior to the Pentagon event, and that by cutting off the transponder, this accomplished two things: (1) it drew attention to Flight 77 as very likely constituting a hijacking that needed to be intercepted by jet fighters; (2) when a flying object is missing a transponder signal, it becomes an automatic object of interest to the military?

- Did you know that no one has been able to explain why the transponder was shut off, because this would not have prevented either the military or the Secret Service from being aware of the plane's location via radar systems, which are far superior to those of the FAA?

- Did you know that radar logs indicate that the object which was reported to be Flight 77 performed a downward spiral of roughly 270 degrees that dropped approximately 7,000 feet in 21/2 minutes before skimming along the top of the grass prior to allegedly striking the Pentagon on the first floor?

- Did you know that this sort of aerial maneuver would have been a challenge for even the most experienced of pilots?

- Did you know that well-experienced air controllers who were watching the Pentagon-related object on radar said that the pivot of the object was so tight that it reminded them of a maneuver that might be made by a jet fighter?

- Did you know that Hani Hanjour, the purported hijacking pilot of Flight 77, was, by all accounts, a terrible pilot who, after several lessons at the Sorbi Flying Club in San Diego, was advised by the instructors to quit because he had no understanding of what he was doing in a cockpit and was subject to panic attacks while in the cockpit?

- Did you know that according to reports filed by *The Prince George's Journal* in Maryland, Hani Hanjour had visited the Bowie Maryland Freeway Airport in mid-August of 2001 in order to be permitted to rent an airplane, but on three different occasions he was judged by those at the airport who checked him out to be too clumsy and inept a pilot even in relation to a Cessna 172 (which is minuscule compared to a Boeing 757 and far easier to operate) to be given rental privileges at the Bowie Maryland Freeway airfield?

- Did you know that Flight 77 was reported to have flown for 35 minutes through US air space on a heading for Washington, D.C. without being detected?

- Did you know that despite the fact that the transponder for Flight 77 was not turned off until the plane had made a U-turn from west to east, nonetheless, air traffic controllers continued to hunt for Flight 77 on the radar screens in a westerly direction rather than in an easterly direction?

- Did you know that whatever problems the FAA might have been having with their secondary radar systems -- which cannot track planes whose transponders have been turned off-- nevertheless, the FAA also has primary radar systems distributed around the country that are able to track aircraft irrespective of whether their transponders are on or off, and, as well, NORAD and the Secret Service radar systems also can track air traffic quite independently of transponder identification?

- Did you know that Norman Mineta, the Secretary of Transportation, testified that he witnessed reports being given to Vice President Cheney as early as 9:25 or 9:26 a.m. in the Presidential Emergency Operations Center beneath the White House in relation to an approaching aircraft headed for Washington, and, that, therefore, rather than a mere moment or two of prior notification, officials in the government had some 12 minutes, or so, of advanced warning concerning the in-coming flight even if one were to accept the rather implausible account that previous to its detection near Washington, D.C., Flight 77 was able to fly across the United States for 35 minutes undetected by the military?

- Did you know that Secretary Mineta's testimony was not included in the final report of the 9/11 Commission?

- Did you know that the autopsy reports for the body remains found in the Pentagon show no evidence of there being any individuals who were found amidst the ruins of the Pentagon who displayed genetic markers indicating Arab descent?

- Did you know that there supposedly are batteries of anti-aircraft missiles deployed around the Pentagon?

- Did you know that, apparently, these missiles were not triggered by an in-coming aircraft despite the fact that this plane's transponder was supposedly turned off and, therefore, could not be identified as a friendly craft by the electronic identification program of the missile system?



#### **Did You Know? - Part 4**

- Did you know that some 50 million dollars were spent on investigating the Challenger Space Shuttle disaster in which seven people died but only 11 million dollars were authorized by the White House to be spent on the 9/11 Commission inquiry in which some 3,000 people died?

- Did you know that some 40 million dollars were spent on the report produced by independent counsel Kenneth Starr concerning Whitewater and the Clinton sex scandal in which no one died, while, initially, President Bush wanted to spend only 3 million dollars on the 9/11 Commission investigation -- but to which, and only grudgingly, another 8 million dollars were added on later, despite the fact the death toll from the events on September 11, 2001 were approximately 3,000 people?

- Did you know that the White House resisted instituting an investigation into the events surrounding 9/11 and only did so after being pressured by families of the victims of 9/11, as well as due to some questions about some of the issues that arose out of the Congressional Joint Inquiry concerning 9/11?

- Did you know that even after the White House reluctantly agreed -- several years after the fact -- to a public inquiry into the events of 9/11, nevertheless, the White House actively resisted the activities of the 9/11 Commission by refusing to grant security clearances to certain Commission members as well as failing to co-operate in the release of documents requested by the Commission, and even when the White House did release such documents they insisted, in many cases, that only a few of the Commissioners would be able to see these documents and that such individuals would not be able to take notes while looking at those documents?

- Did you know that the White House resisted having members of the White House being required to give testimony under oath -- and, in fact, neither President Bush nor Vice President Cheney did give testimony under oath -- and, as well, the White House insisted that when members of the White House did give testimony such people should be accompanied by 'handlers' who would monitor what they said?

- Did you know that the Executive Director of the Commission, Philip Zelikow had total control over seven of the Commission's eight investigative teams (the eighth team was under the control of John Farmer, a former

attorney general for New Jersey who had close ties to Thomas Kean, a former governor of New Jersey, and also the Chairman of the 9/11 Commission), and who had near absolute control over what was (and was not) investigated, who investigated it, how it was investigated, as well as being responsible for the writing and editing of the Commission staff reports that would (or would not) make their way into the final report? Did you know that Philip Zelikow had a long, intimate past history with the White House, including the following: He had been on the National Security Council during the administration of George H. W. Bush; he had been a director of the Aspen Strategy Group whose active participants were, among others, Paul Wolfowitz, Dick Cheney, and Condoleezza Rice; he co-authored a book with Condoleezza Rice; he was part of the National Security Council's transition team when George W. Bush took over following President Clinton's departure, and that shortly after 9/11, he was appointed by the President Bush to be a part of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board?

- Did you know that at one point, after encountering obstruction from the government with respect to turning over documentation, Commission Chairman Thomas Kean, said: "Any document which has to do with this investigation cannot be beyond our reach", and, yet, by and large, the promise of these words was not fulfilled with any degree of completeness, thoroughness, or independence despite the fact that in the preface to *The 9/11 Commission Report*, it is maintained that the purpose of the Commission was "to provide the fullest possible account of the events surrounding 9/11" and that the "Commission sought to be independent, impartial, thorough, and nonpartisan"?

- Did you know that there was an open letter sent to the US Congress on September 13, 2004, following the release of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, which was signed by 25 individuals who had been interviewed by the 9/11 Commission and who were associated with such agencies as the FAA, CIA, FBI, and Customs and who, collectively, were very critical of the fact that none of their testimony was reflected in the final report of the Commission even though they testified about a variety of problems involving public safety, national security, and the intelligence community in relation to 9/11?

- Did you know that Richard Labeviere, a seasoned journalist from Switzerland, reported that in July 2001 -- when 'Usama bin Laden was among America's 'most wanted' list and had a 5 million dollar bounty attached to his

capture, dead or alive – ‘Usama bin Laden stayed for two weeks in the American Hospital in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, where he is alleged to have received treatment from a Dr. Terry Callaway and, in addition, was visited by a local agent of the CIA by the name of Larry Mitchell, and even though the hospital and the CIA denied there was any truth to the story and while Dr. Callaway had a 'no comment' concerning the report, nonetheless, *The 9/11 Commission Report* contains no discussion of this story to determine the truth of the matter?

- Did you know that there is an account written by Gerald Posner dealing with the interrogation of Abu-Zubaydah, alleged to be a major al-Qaeda operative and who was captured in March 2002, in which the claim is made that Zubaydah said he had been working on behalf of certain officials from Saudi Arabia, that these officials knew there was going to be some kind of attack on America on September 11, 2001 (although they did not, apparently, know any further details of the attack) and, as a partial confirmation of his story, he gave the phone numbers of three Saudi officials: Prince Ahmad bin Salman (who is better known in America as the owner of War Emblem that won the Preakness and Kentucky Derby in 2002), Prince Fahd bin Turki, and Prince Sultan bin Faisal?

- Did you know that all three of the aforementioned members of the Royal family who Zubaydah claimed had foreknowledge of the precise date of the 9/11 tragedy in the US died within an eight-day period in July of 2002 under questionable circumstances (Prince Ahmad died of a heart attack at age 41, Prince Sultan died in a car crash on his way to attend the funeral of Prince Ahmad, and Prince Turki, who was only 21 years old, died of thirst in the desert) and, yet, *The 9/11 Commission Report* contains no discussion of these issues although the Report does contain nearly 40 paragraphs detailing various kinds of information concerning Zubaydah?

- Did you know that the aforementioned Prince Ahmad – one of the people whom Zubaydah, in his April 2002 interrogation, indicated had some foreknowledge of 9/11 -- was one of the estimated 150 to 300 Saudis, including many members of bin Laden's family, who were permitted by the Bush administration to leave the U.S. shortly after 9/11, but there is no indication in *The 9/11 Commission Report* of whether, or not, Prince Ahmad had been closely questioned or interrogated by the FBI or other government authorities with respect to any information or knowledge Prince Ahmad might have had concerning the events of 9/11 even though

the theory being pushed at the time of the Saudi exodus from the US was that most of the hijackers came from Saudi Arabia?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* provides absolutely no specific information about who among the departing Saudis were questioned by authorities, what they were asked, how rigorous the questioning was, or whether there were individuals – such as, perhaps, Prince Ahmad -- who might not have been questioned at all?

- Did you know that according to Gerald Posner, Zubaydah also was reported to have disclosed during the foregoing interrogation that Mushaf Ali Mir, a high-ranking military officer in Pakistan who was said to have close ties with both the ISI (Inter-Services Intelligence) of Pakistan and al-Qaeda, was indicated to have had foreknowledge of the 9/11 attack, and approximately seven months following this disclosure by Zubaydah, a military airplane carrying Mir, his wife, and a number of close aides crashed in good weather, despite the fact the aircraft had been recently serviced and was, supposedly, in good running order, and, yet, this further strange 'accident' or related allegations by Zubaydah were not pursued by *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that General Mahmoud Ahmad, who was head of Pakistan's ISI in 2001, had been meeting with George Tenet, Director of the CIA, as well as Porter Goss, Bob Graham, and other members of various congressional intelligence committees, along with Richard Armitage, Deputy Secretary of State, in the days just before, during, and following 9/11, and that General Mahmoud has been implicated as the person who gave orders to Saeed Sheikh, an ISI agent, to wire \$100,000 to Muhammad Atta on September 10, 2001, and, yet, none of this is explored in *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that the *Times of India* ran a story (also verified, discussed and quoted in a *Wall Street Journal* editorial entitled 'Our Friends the Pakistanis') about the retirement of General Ahmad on October 8, 2001 (less than two years after his appointment by General Musharraf as a reward for having helped Musharraf gain power in Pakistan), in which the article stated that the reason for the unexpected retirement was because Indian intelligence officials had provided the US government with compelling evidence that it had been General Mahmoud, director of Pakistan's ISI, who had ordered an ISI agent to transfer \$100, 000 to Mohammed Atta, the



alleged ring leader of the 9/11 plot, on September 10, 2001, and, yet, none of this is discussed in *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that immediately following 9/11, President Bush sought to invoke Article 5 of the North Atlantic Pact that required other member nations in NATO to assist any member nation that had been attacked from outside the aggrieved member country (in this case, supposedly, the United States), and although the other member nations of NATO unanimously approved the resolution, nevertheless, according to a December 13, 2001 statement by Helmut Schmidt, former Defense Minister and Chancellor of Germany, he indicated that the resolution should not have been passed because Article 5 requires proof be given that such an attack had been committed by a force external to a given country, and, such proof was never given to the NATO members at the time of the 2001 resolution and, to date, such proof has not been given?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* failed to note that there were no Arabic names – and certainly none of the names of the alleged 19 hijackers -- appearing on any of the publicly-released passenger manifests for flights that were involved in the events of 9/11: namely, American Airlines 11, United Airlines 175, American Airlines 77 or United Airlines 93?

- Did you know that sometimes there are changes to preliminary passenger flight manifests as people cancel a ticket or book a flight at the last minute, but these final passenger manifests have not been made public by American Airlines and United Airlines and that they, to date, have refused to release the details of these final passenger flight manifest lists?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission had subpoena power, but the Commission did not exercise this power in order to acquire the finalized versions of the passenger manifest lists from the two airlines?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* offers absolutely no evidence that indicates how the FBI was able to identify the 19 terrorists who supposedly were involved with the events of 9/11 when the names of these individuals were nowhere to be found on the flight manifests that have been released to the public?

- Did you know that according to post-9/11 interviews conducted by David Harrison, a reporter for the *Telegraph* newspaper located in London, 6 of the alleged hijackers on 9/11 are still alive, but this information did not

appear in *The 9/11 Commission Report* – these individuals include: Salem al-Hazmi, Saeed al-Ghamdi, Waleed alShehri, Abdulaziz al-Omari, Ahmed al-Nami, and Mohand al-Shehfi?

- Did you know that at least four of the foregoing individuals who are still alive were involved in airline-related activities: Abdulaziz alOmari was a pilot for Saudi Airlines; Waleed al-Shehri lived in Casablanca and was employed as a pilot by Royal Air Maroc; Ahmed al-Nami served as an administrative assistant for Saudi Arabian Airlines; and, Saeed al-Ghamdi had been in Tunis at the time of 9/11 learning how to fly an airbus?

- Did you know that the coroner's report concerning the Pentagon attack on 9/11 indicated that none of the bodies carried genetic markers indicating Arab descent?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* depicts Mohammed Atta as being a fanatical sort of fundamentalist devout Muslim but that investigative journalism pursued by David Hopsicker, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and *Newsweek* have uncovered evidence indicating that Atta consumed substantial amounts of alcohol, used cocaine, ate pork, frequented strip clubs, was the recipient of lap top dances, and lived with a prostitute – all at odds with what any devout Muslim would do?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* offers no plausible explanation for how the north and south towers of the World Trade Center could have collapsed so quickly?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* offers absolutely no explanation – reasonable or otherwise – of why, and how, Building 7 (in the World Trade Center complex) -- which was not hit by an airplane on 9/11 -- collapsed around 5: 30 p.m. in nearly a free-fall manner?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* does not contain any account of, or inquiry into, the fact that Larry Silverstein, who had leased many of the buildings in the World Trade Center prior to 9/11 had stated in a September 2002 video documentary entitled “America Rebuilds”, aired on PBS television, that he had a conversation with the fire department commander about 'pulling' Building 7 and that, according to Silverstein, the commander decided to go ahead and do some sort of 'pulling' process with respect to Building 7?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* offers no explanation of why Buildings 5 and 6 in the World Trade Center were, despite

tremendous damage from fire, able to retain their structural integrity, and, yet, neither the North and South Towers nor Building 7 were able to do accomplish this despite having been constructed with numerous features of redundancy that were knowingly intended to permit those buildings to survive strikes by large commercial airliners and/or hurricane force winds?

- Did you know that although *The 9/11 Commission Report* notes how the South Tower “collapsed in 10 seconds” it provides no reasonable explanation of the manner in which either a plane crash, or a fire, or some combination of the two, could have resulted in such a near free-fall collapse of the building?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* totally mischaracterizes the structural features of the north and south towers by: (1) claiming that the interior of these buildings consisted of a “hollow steel shaft, in which elevators and stairwells were grouped”, and (2) that the exterior of the walls of the two buildings “bore most of the weight of” the two buildings – and, in doing so, fails to indicate that not only did the core of the building consist of 47 massive steel columns (at their base these columns were 4 inch-thick, 14-by-36 inch steel shafts, and the thickness gradually tapered off to about 1/4 of an inch thick, 14- by-36 inch shafts as one neared the top of the 110 story buildings) which were connected to each other and to the 236 exterior columns by a grid work of steel trusses, but that it is the core columns that anchor these buildings?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* offers no discussion or reasons why nowhere in the world prior to, or since, 9/11 did any steel-frame high-rise building collapse due to fire despite burning for many, many hours more than did the fires in the either of the twin towers or Building 7 (e.g., consider the fire at 1 Meridian Plaza in Philadelphia, or the high-rise fires in Madrid, Spain and Caracas, Venezuela)?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* contains no account of why evidence in a criminal act – for example, the killing of nearly 3000 people and the destruction of buildings worth tens of millions of dollars – were removed from a crime scene (such as the Twin Towers and Building 7) and not stored (with a proper chain of evidence maintained) for subsequent testing and analysis by scientists but, instead, were quickly sold and shipped overseas?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* did not investigate why authorities in New York (e.g., Mayor Rudolph Giuliani) would

designate the World Trade Center disaster site as a crime scene when it came to prohibiting people from taking pictures of the World Trade Center Complex while, simultaneously, authorizing the removal of evidence from such a crime scene with absolutely no regard for maintaining a proper chain of evidence for the material that was removed?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission failed to rigorously pursue the statement by Mayor Rudolph Giuliani that described how when he and others were working out of the Emergency Command Center on the 23rd floor of Building 7 of the World Trade Center complex on 9/11 someone told them “that the World Trade Center was going to collapse, and it did collapse before we could get out of the building”?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission failed to determine, and report on, the identity of the person, or persons, who conveyed this information to Mayor Giuliani in the Emergency Command Center and that the Commission failed to establish just how this person, or persons, knew that the World Trade Center was going to collapse?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* contained no indication that the security company, Securacom (which has since changed its name to Stratesec), which was responsible for security not only at the World Trade Center, but, as well, at United Airlines (involved in the hijackings of 9/11), and Dulles Airport (from which Flight 77 departed), had a CEO by the name of Wirt Walker III, who, reportedly, is a cousin of President Bush and that this company had among its investors, KuwAm – a Kuwaiti/American investment firm with strong ties to the royal family in Kuwait ... the same royal family that arranged for one of its members – a fifteen year old girl, Nayirah – to perjure herself before the US Congress in the lead up to Desert Storm when she claimed that she had been an eyewitness to the murder of babies in incubators being smashed on the floor of a hospital by Iraqi soldiers although the incident never occurred?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* failed to reflect the fact that Ed Plaugher, the fire chief for the Arlington County Fire Department, made totally contradictory statements concerning what he allegedly saw at the Pentagon on 9/11 in which, initially – on September 12, 2001 -- Plaugher indicated he reportedly saw some pieces of an aircraft, but he indicated there were no large pieces such as a fuselage and that sort of thing, and, yet, some six months later he said he had seen “pieces of the fuselage, the

wings, the landing gear, pieces of the engine, seats ... I can swear to you that it was a plane”?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* fails to report, discuss, or question the fact that there is a direct contradiction between, on the one hand, the statement of former Defense Secretary Rumsfeld who claimed to have been in his office in the east side of the Pentagon at the time of the explosions, and, then, stated that he went to the site of the crash on the west side of the Pentagon and was able to identify plane wreckage, and, on the other hand, the testimony of Richard Clarke, chief of counterterrorism at the White House, which stipulates that the Secretary was not in his office but in a special room where there was a teleconference hookup with Clarke and other top officials at the time former Secretary Rumsfeld claims to have been elsewhere?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* contained no discussion of why the missile defense system that is reportedly in place around the Pentagon was not activated despite the fact that the transponder for Flight 77, which allegedly crashed into the Pentagon, had been turned off and, therefore, should have been identified as an unidentified and, presumably, hostile craft by the missile system?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission failed to exercise its subpoena power to acquire all the videotapes that had been confiscated by the FBI shortly after the Pentagon event from the gas stations, businesses, and hotels on the west side of the Pentagon?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* contains no mention of the name, Bill McKelway who reported on the FBI confiscation of the videotapes, nor does the *Report* mention the name of Jose Velasquez who was the attendant at the gas station that had a clear line of sight with respect to the west wing of the Pentagon and from which videotape had been confiscated by the FBI?

- Did you know that Philip Zelikow, executive director of the 9/11 Commission, stated categorically how it was “indisputable” that American Airlines Flight 77 had struck the Pentagon and, yet, when asked whether he was aware of any unreleased photographs of the Pentagon-event that would be able to convince skeptics, he indicated there were no such photographs

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* reflects none of the expert testimony-- such as Pierre-Henri Bunel, who was an artillery and explosives expert who served as an ally with General Schwartzkopf during Desert Storm -- which indicates that the five frames of publicly released video that allegedly depict the crash of Flight 77 into the Pentagon provide evidence not of a plane crash but of a high-yield explosion that could not possibly have come from a crash of a commercial jet in which jet fuel ignited?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* omitted testimony by Transportation Secretary, Norman Mineta given to the Commission on May 23, 2003, (although this testimony did appear in one of the Commission staff reports) in which he indicated that he had been in the Presidential Emergency Operations Center with Vice President Cheney, and during this time, he observed an on-going exchange taking place between the Vice President and a young man who kept giving the Vice President revised closing distance figures (e.g., 50 miles, 40 miles, 30 miles, etc.) of an unidentified flying object in relation to Washington, and these updates were taking place at least 12- 15 minutes earlier than the military's claim that it first came to know about Flight 77 heading for the Pentagon at 9:36 a.m., just a minute, or so, before something crashed into the Pentagon?

- Did you know that on page 9 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, a time of 9:34 a.m. was given as when the Secret Service became aware of the incoming unidentified object heading for the Pentagon, but on pages 27 and 34 of the Report, a time of 9:36 a.m. is given for this event, whereas in the *Commission Staff Report* of June 17,2004, a time of 9:32 a.m. was given for this same event?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* provides no detailed account to the public concerning the reason(s) as to why the Commission decided to fix 9:36 a.m. as the 'official' time of awareness about the existence of a UFO heading for the Pentagon?

- Did you know that there is an article by William Scott in a 2002 edition of *Aviation Week and Space Technology* which stipulates that after the south tower of the WTC had been hit (which was shortly after 9: 00 a.m.), calls from a variety of fighter unit groups in different parts of the US -- especially in the northeast region of the US -- started pouring into NORAD and section headquarters in which offers of assistance were given by these fighter units, and, yet, NORAD left the capital of the United States completely

unprotected because there was no air cover over Washington, D.C. until after the Pentagon had been hit despite having offers of assistance from fighter groups more than one half hour prior to the Pentagon event, and, yet, *The 9/11 Commission Report* makes no mention of any of this?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* fails to reflect a memorandum of May 22, 2003 by Laura Brown, the Deputy of Public Affairs at the FAA, which was sent to the Commission following the earlier testimony of Jane Garvey, the Director of the FAA, in which Ms. Brown specifically states that within minutes (approximately 8:50a.m.) after the north tower of the WTC having been struck by Flight 11, the FAA had established a phone bridge with, among other governmental agencies, the Department of Defense, the Secret Service, the FAA command center, as well as FAA field offices, and, during this phone bridge real-time information was shared with all governmental agencies concerning the unfolding events of 9/11, yet, the Commission insists that the reason the military was not able to respond to the other three hijackings in a timely fashion was because the military had not been given appropriate notice or relevant information by the FAA and that the FAA did not contact the military until 9:20 a.m.?

- Did you know that the sole piece of evidence cited by the Commission for fixing the time of the above-noted teleconference at 9:20 a.m., is a FAA record entitled: "Chronology ADA-30 September 11, 2001" that had to be turned over by the FAA to the FBI -- rather than to the National Transportation Safety Board which is normal procedure, and that there has been no official inquiry into the validity of the chain of custody of that document or why it is contradicted by other data available to the 9/11 Commission, or why it was in the possession of the FBI rather than the NTSB?

- Did you know that the testimony of Richard Clarke also directly contradicts the aforementioned ADA-30 document since he indicates that Jane Garvey, Director of the FAA, was actively and fully participating in a teleconference, in which the Pentagon and Department of Defense were also participating, that had been established significantly in advance of the 9:20 a.m. time fixed by the Commission as to when the FAA first contacted authorities about the hijackings, and a teleconference in which, according to Richard Clarke, Jane Garvey had been an active participant for at least 30-35 minutes prior to the time of 9:40 a.m. which *The 9/11 Commission Report* claims Garvey joined that teleconference?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission could have subpoenaed the videotapes from the aforementioned conference in order to ascertain, once and for all, who did, and did not, participate in this video conference, as well as the times when such people participated in that conference, but the Commission failed to do this?

- Did you know that even if the ADA-30 document were proven to be valid with respect to the chronology of FAA events on 9/11, the military and the Secret Service are both reported to have radar systems that are far superior to those of the FFA, and, consequently, either the military and/or the Secret Service should have been able -- entirely on their own and without assistance from the FAA -- to detect the fact that there were at least four flights in US airspace that were without proper transponder identification and, therefore, should have been identified as flying objects with possible hostile intent -- and all of this should have taken place prior to the north tower of the WTC having been hit?

- Did you know that David Schippers -- who was the Chief Investigative Counsel for the US House of Representatives Judiciary Committee in 1998 and was also the chief prosecutor for the impeachment of President Clinton in 1999 -- has made public statements indicating that more than six weeks prior to 9/11 a number of FBI agents approached him and provided him with detailed, precise, and accurate information concerning the date, time, funding, and location of a terrorist attack to take place in lower Manhattan and that these same agents informed Schippers that their investigations were being obstructed by FBI headquarters and that David Schippers was further informed by the FBI agents that they had been threatened by headquarters with prosecution if they should go ahead and make the results of their investigation public, but nowhere does either the name of David Schippers or a description of this account appear in the pages of *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that David Schippers further indicates how some six weeks prior to the 9/11 attacks, he called the office of Attorney General John Ashcroft in order to inform him about the foregoing matter, but John Ashcroft never returned his calls?

- Did you know that Attorney General John Ashcroft discontinued taking commercial flights in the weeks leading up to 9/11 due to threat assessments he had received from the FBI, and, yet, there is no mention made of this forewarning in *The 9/11 Commission Report* in relation to any of its entries



concerning John Ashcroft, nor is there any discussion in the Report of why, if the FBI report was serious enough to alter the flying arrangements of the Attorney General, the public was not also notified about this potentially serious threat?

- Did you know that the FBI headquarter officials being referred to by the aforementioned FBI field agents who talked with David Schippers included Acting Director Thomas Pickard and Counterterrorism Director Dale Watson, but, *The 9/11 Commission Report* makes no mention of any specific forewarnings about 9/11 in conjunction with the testimonies of Pickard and Watson, despite the fact that three FBI agents who spoke with the author of an article that appeared in *The New American* indicated the information that had been given to David Schippers by FBI field agents was both widely known within the FBI as was the information that the reports concerning the coming attack were being suppressed by FBI headquarters in Washington, D.C.?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* did explore, to some degree, the fact that there were some suspicious stock market activity in the week prior to 9/11 involving put options (which are, in effect, like bets that a given stock is going to plummet in value) for both United and American Airlines (which were involved in the 9/11 hijackings), as well as Morgan Stanley Dean Witter (which occupied some 22 floors at the World Trade Center), but the Commission claimed that after considerable investigation there was absolutely no conceivable tie to al-Qaeda, but what the 9/11 Commission apparently failed to investigate is whether, or not, the individuals making the put- options could have foreknowledge of the forthcoming 9/11 attacks quite apart from al-Qaeda, nor did the Commission give any explanation of what the particulars of the investment strategy were that would have led someone to make put options on United, American, and Morgan Stanley Dean Witter at that particular time?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* does make references to an FBI briefing and a Securities Exchange Commission memo concerning the foregoing issue, as well as alludes to certain interviews concerning the suspicious stock market activity, but the Commission provides no specific evidence or data or documents that can be publicly examined, and, so, ultimately, all one has is a series of declarative sentences from the Commission that the suspicious put options of the week leading up to 9/11 are all entirely innocuous?

- Did you know that an FBI agent in Phoenix by the name of Kenneth Williams issued a memorandum in July 2001 to FBI headquarters indicating there was evidence that individuals associated with 'Usama bin Laden had been taking flight lessons and, as a result, it might be a prudent measure to institute some kind of official tracking program to determine whether, or not, there might be other people associated with 'Usama bin Laden who were taking flight lessons in other parts of the US?

- Did you know that according to *The 9/11 Commission Report* the reason why Agent Williams' suggestion was never acted upon was because no one at FBI headquarters read his memorandum until after September 11, 2001, but the *Report* fails to provide any evidence to corroborate its claim that no one at FBI headquarters read the Williams memorandum, nor does the *Report* explore, even if its 'no-one- knew explanation' were true, why authorities at the FBI headquarters would not have read the Williams memorandum prior to 9/11?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission never interviewed FBI agent Kenneth Williams?

- Did you know that *The 9/11 Commission Report* fails to explore the fact that Colleen Rowley, an FBI legal officer working out of the Minneapolis office, had written a thirteen page letter to both the Senate Intelligence Committee, as well as to FBI Director Robert Mueller, in which Agent Rowley asserts, among other things, that David Frasca, manager of the Radical Fundamentalist Unit at FBI headquarters, was 'privy' to the Williams memorandum prior to 9/11 -- contrary to the claims of FBI headquarters that it had no knowledge of this memo before 9/11 -- and, yet, according to Agent Rowley, Frasca had never bothered to inform the FBI agents in Minneapolis about the Phoenix memorandum as part and parcel of his apparent attempt to obstruct and interfere with the FBI's Minneapolis investigation into Zacarius Moussaoui's attempt to obtain flying lessons in Minnesota?

- Did you know that the 9/11 Commission did not interview Colleen Rowley and that the only reference to her in the *Report* is in relation to an interview of her by the Department of Justice's Inspector General during July 2002 -- a reference that makes no mention of Rowley's differences with FBI headquarters relation to the Moussaoui issue?

- Did you know that the name of David Frasca does not appear in *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that in 1998 Robert Wright, an FBI agent in Chicago, had begun to investigate possible terror connections in that city because he had come across evidence indicating that a Saudi multimillionaire might have been involved in funding the terror attacks against US embassies in 1998, and despite his contention that the evidence for building his case had become more compelling by January 2001, his investigation was closed down by FBI headquarters, and in May 2002 Wright proclaimed that he was going to sue the FBI for refusing to give him permission to write a book about his investigation, and, yet, apparently, the 9/11 Commission did not even bother to interview Robert Wright, nor does one discover Wright's name in the contents of *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that following the release of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, Sibel Edmonds, an American citizen of Turkish descent who had been hired by the FBI to do translation work during the aftermath of 9/11, wrote an open letter to Thomas Kean, Chairman of the 9/11 Commission, in which she complained that the final Report contained nothing of the eight points she had made to the Commission staff members during her interview including charges that Mike Feghali, a supervisor in the translation division in the Middle Eastern Division, had, in conjunction with another translator (Melek Can Dickerson), taken hundreds of pages of top-secret intelligence documents outside of the FBI offices, and that Mr. Feghali had, in conjunction with the same translator (Melek Can Dickerson), forged signatures on top-secret reports concerning various detainees in relation to 9/11, and that Mr. Feghali had lied to another FBI agent about the accuracy of a translation that Ms. Edmonds had sent to the Washington Field Office of the FBI for re-translation because she believed the original translation had made some critical mistakes and following the re- translation, Mr. Feghali failed to send this document to the Special Agent who originally had requested the translation in relation to an investigation that agent was conducting?

- Did you know that the aforementioned Sibel Edmonds also informed Thomas Kean that her testimony before Commission staff members revealed there was evidence that a long-time FBI informant, who had been a high-ranking intelligence officer from Iran dealing with Afghanistan, gave testimony to two FBI agents and a translator more than four months prior to 9/11 stipulating that 'Usama bin Laden was going to conduct a strike against the United States sometime during the next several

months, and this attack would involve airplanes, and, yet, when the FBI agents who had been interviewing the informant passed on this information to their superior, Thomas Frields, who was the Special Agent in Charge of Counterterrorism, the latter agent not only sat on the information but instructed the agents and translator to not discuss the information with anyone else?

- Did you know that there is no mention of Thomas Frields or Mike Feghali in *The 9/11 Commission Report*, nor is there any indication that they were interviewed by Commission staffers?

- Did you know that although there is evidence that Behrooz Sarshar, the translator in the aforementioned affair, testified before Commission staffers for some 2½ hours, there is no mention in the Report of the interview that had been passed on to Thomas Frields and about which Sibel Edmonds informed Thomas Kean?

- Did you know that when Sibel Edmonds informed other officials in the FBI about the Mike Feghali and Thomas Frields incidents but failed to get any response, she sent a letter to the Department of Justice and was subsequently fired?

- Did you know that then Attorney General John Ashcroft invoked a 'state secrets' rule in seeking, and obtaining, a gag order that precludes Edmonds from divulging any information she might have acquired while working for the FBI?

- Did you know that despite having testified before 9/11 Commission staffers for more than 3½ hours the only mention of Sibel Edmonds in *The 9/11 Commission Report* is in the title of a footnoted- review conducted by the Department of Justice's Inspector General concerning Sibel Edmonds' unspecified allegations in relation to the FBI?

- Did you know that despite *The 9/11 Commission Report's* statement that “the threat of terrorists hijacking commercial airlines within the United States – and using them as guided missiles – was not recognized by NORAD prior to 9/11” and despite the infamous statement of Condoleezza Rice before the Commission that prior to 9/11 no one could have imagined someone hijacking planes and flying them into buildings, the *Report*, itself, actually contains a great deal of information which suggests that both NORAD and Rice should have known better, and, yet, the Commission does not take exception with Rice or NORAD with respect to

their 'failure of imagination'? For example, did you know that during the time of the millennium terrorist alert in 1999-2000, Richard Clarke held a meeting of the Counterterrorism Security Group and specifically explored scenarios involving airplane hijackings by al-Qaeda; even more concretely, Richard Clarke oversaw an exercise in conjunction with the 1996 Atlantic Olympics that had terrorists hijacking a Lear jet, loading it with explosives, and, then, flying the airplane into targets in Washington, D.C.; moreover, in July of 2001, the Italian government, in response to intelligence concerning a terrorist attack, had fighter planes flying over the city of Genoa, where the G-8 Summit (which President Bush attended) was being held and, in addition, had set up anti-aircraft batteries around the Genoa airport; and, in August of 1998, intelligence had been uncovered that a Libyan group was planning to hijack an airplane and fly it into the World Trade Center ... nor is anything mentioned in *The 9/11 Commission Report* about the emergency drill conducted by the Pentagon in October 2000 with respect to a hijacked airplane crashing into the Pentagon, or the July 2001 drill of NORAD in which airplanes hijacked in the US would be flown into various targets, including the World Trade Center?

-----



### **Did You Know? - Part 5**

- Did you know that if Flight 77 -- the Boeing 757 jet that is alleged by some to have crashed into the Pentagon on September 11th, 2001 -- were to have been flown, as estimated by the Pentagon Performance Report, at around 400 miles per hour less than 20 feet above the ground [which would have been necessary if the plane were to have hit the first floor of the Pentagon as claimed], then such aerodynamic factors as downwash reaction, ground effect energy, jet-blast effects, vortex compression, and wake turbulence would have come into play, and such forces would have made accomplishing such a feat [that is, crashing into the first floor of the Pentagon] impossible to do?

- Did you know that forces such as tip vortices, downwash sheet, and the compressibility effect that would be created by a 200,000 pound commercial jet flying close to the ground at approximately 400 miles per hour [the claimed speed of the Flight 77 when it allegedly hit the Pentagon] would prevent such an aircraft from getting any closer to the ground than about 60 feet, or roughly half the distance of the commercial aircraft's wingspan?

- Did you know that due to the foregoing set of aerodynamic forces, a commercial jet the size of Flight 77 could not possibly have crashed into the first floor of the Pentagon as claimed by the Pentagon officials unless there were a substantial reduction in the 400 mile per hour speed of a commercial 757 aircraft, and, yet, the Pentagon Performance Report insists that Flight 77 struck the Pentagon on the first floor while traveling at a speed of around 400 miles per hour?

- Did you know that the aforementioned minimum height of 60 feet above the ground would have caused the body of a Boeing 757 to crash into the third, fourth and fifth floors ... not the first floor as claimed by the Pentagon?

- Did you know that although there is damage on the upper floors of the Pentagon, there is no evidence that a 200,000 pound 757 Boeing traveling at 400 miles per hour struck the upper floors of the Pentagon?

- Did you know there are a number of eyewitnesses who claim to have seen an American Airlines Boeing 757 fly into the first floor of the Pentagon on September 11th, 2001?

- Did you know that such alleged eyewitness testimony is directly contradicted by considerations involving powerful aerodynamic reactive forces such as ground effect energy, vortex compression, and downwash reactions that would have been in play with a 200,000 pound aircraft flying at 400 miles per hour less than 20 feet above the ground?

- Did you know that when forensic evidence or scientific evidence contradicts eyewitness testimony, then one must look to psychological factors involving misperception, illusion, false memory syndrome, the misinformation effect, undue influence, confabulation, bias, expectation, suggestibility, framing, and so on to explain why people might not have seen what they believed they saw or were led to believe they saw?

- Did you know that there is an embankment which falls off a number of feet separating the Pentagon lawn from the highway running past the Pentagon and that experienced airline pilots say it would have been impossible for a 200,000 pound commercial jet flying at 400 miles per hour to be maneuvered so that it would drop four or five feet in order to be able to line up with the first floor of the Pentagon in the relatively short space encompassed by the edge of the highway, the embankment drop off, and the area of the lawn leading to the Pentagon?

- Did you know that although there were five lamp posts that were believed to have been knocked down by whatever hit the Pentagon on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, there are a number of other lamp posts that would have been within the area covered by the 125 foot wingspan of a Boeing 757 and that were along the alleged flight path of the about to crash commercial jet, and, yet, these lampposts were left untouched?

- Did you know that there were large, overhead, Department of Transportation traffic signs on the portion of highways running near the Pentagon that were along the alleged flight path of Flight 77 as it approached the Pentagon, and, yet, these traffic signs were not hit by whatever hit the Pentagon?

- Did you know that there were several very large 6 foot tall cable spools being used in the construction project at the Pentagon that were directly in front of the section of the Pentagon struck by 'whatever' and, yet, these cable spools were not hit or damaged by a



200,000 pound jet flying at 400 miles an hour which, supposedly, went right through the area occupied by the spools?

- Did you know that a jet crashing into the Pentagon would generate an aviation-fueled fireball, but this fireball [which does not involve any shock wave] is not remotely like the blast created by a explosive device that does generate a subsequent shock wave?

- Did you know that there are significant differences between blast and burn injuries – burn injuries would occur in the event of a fuel-air fire such as would occur if a Boeing 757 crashed into the Pentagon, whereas blast injuries are due to the way a blast wave that is created by an explosion causes bodily damage [often internal] as a result of the manner in which compressed air from the explosion's shock wave strikes the body?

- Did you know that Captain Stephen S. Frost of the Medical Corps stated: “We saw many blast injuries” [such as pulmonary injuries, gastrointestinal blast injuries, concussions, secondary (being hit by debris propelled by shock wave) and tertiary blast injuries (being injured as a result of being thrown by the force of a blast's shock wave] at the Pentagon on September 11th, 2001?

- Did you know that Runway 15 of Regan National Airport is less than a mile south of the Pentagon and that the Pentagon lies directly under the flight path for Runway 15?

- Did you know that Runway 19 of Regan National Airport is just to the east of the Pentagon?

- Did you know that less than 10 minutes prior to something hitting the Pentagon, there had been a national grounding order given by the FAA and that any planes in the vicinity of Regan National Airport would have been ordered to land?

- Did you know that when some people claimed to see low flying Boeing commercial jets near the Pentagon, they might have been seeing a jet that was responding to the national grounding order and coming in for a landing at Regan National Airport?

- Did you know that a airplane coming in for a landing in response to the grounding order would not show up on primary radar because its altitude would be below the tracking capabilities of primary radar equipment?

- Did you know that although following 9/11 Donald Rumsfeld claimed no one could possibly have foreseen commercial airplanes crashing into the Pentagon, nonetheless, 10 months prior to 9/11, the Office of the Secretary of Defense ran an extensive exercise in which a commercial airliner crashed into the Pentagon “killing” 341 people?

- Did you know that on April 18th, 2004 USA Today ran a story which reported that NORAD had run numerous exercises prior to 9/11 featuring drills involving hijacked aircraft being used as weapons?

- Did you know that one of the exercises run by NORAD involved hijacked jets crashing into the Pentagon and that such exercises entailed “track detection and identification” , “scramble and interception”, “hijack procedures”, “internal and external agency coordination”, and “communications security procedures”?

- Did you know that one of these NORAD exercises had been planned in July 2001 and was supposed to run on September 11th, 2001 and involved jet planes that had been hijacked from Washington State and Utah?

- Did you know that in early June of 2001 – a little over three months prior to 9/11 -- NORAD ran an exercise called Amalgam Virgo that, among other things, featured the following details: (1) an 'Usama bin Laden terror theme; (2) terrorist hijacking of a commercial jet; (3) use of the hijacked planes in a suicide attack; (4) coordinated attacks on multiple targets; (5) attacking cities, large buildings and civilian targets?

- Did you know that in May of 2001, the Arlington County Fire Department ran an exercise that involved a Boeing 757 commercial jet crashing into the Pentagon?

- Did you know that April Gallop was working in the E-Ring (outermost) section of the West portion of the Pentagon on the morning of 9/11 and was within 40 feet of the place where the commercial jet allegedly struck the building?

- Did you know that after April Gallop pulled herself out from beneath the debris that was on top of her as a result of the Pentagon event and after finding her infant son beneath the rubble and after helping uncover some other people who also were buried beneath the debris that as she walked out of the Pentagon near where the

destructive event had occurred that she saw no metal parts of a plane, she saw no luggage, and she saw no plane seats -- she just saw office equipment such as computers, papers, chairs?

- Did you know that April Gallop reported that there were no fires burning in her area of the building as she made her way out of the Pentagon very near the devastated sections that had been caused by the Pentagon events?

- Did you know that April Gallop indicates that none of the things she touched was hot and none of the things on which she walked [she was in bare feet because she had lost her shoes when covered in debris] was hot as she carefully worked her way through the debris while leaving the building?

- Did you know that April Gallop reported that there was no jet fuel on her or her child or on any of the people she helped from the building?

- Did you know that April Gallop's wrist watch was stopped at 9:30 a.m. that is two minutes earlier than when all of the wall clocks in the devastated area stopped as a result of the violent Pentagon event and that this time is 7-8 minutes earlier than when *The 9/11 Commission Report* claims that a commercial jet airliner hit the Pentagon?

- Did you know that although the Pentagon knew two planes already had struck the Twin Towers and that although they knew another hijacked plane was supposedly being tracked as heading for Washington, April Gallop heard no alert, heads-up, or alarm to exit the building even though nearly a half hour had passed since the second of the Twin Towers had been struck?

- Did you know that on the morning of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, both Sgt. William Lagasse and Sgt. Chadwick Brooks of the Pentagon Police Force were at the CITGO station about a quarter of a mile away from the West face of the Pentagon?

- Did you know that Sgt. Lagasse and Sgt. Brooks quite independently of each other both provided eyewitness testimony that completely contradicts *The 9/11 Commission Report* claim concerning the flight path of the plane that supposedly hit the Pentagon?

- Did you know that according to Sgt. Lagasse and Sgt. Brooks the large jet that they saw, flew across an area completely on the north

side of the CITGO gas station and that in order for *The 9/11 Commission Report's* account of the alleged flight path for American Airlines 77 to be correct, the plane would have had to have flown diagonally toward the Pentagon across an area on the south side of the CITGO station?

- Did you know that the account given in the *Pentagon Performance Report* concerning the damage to the Pentagon is consistent with the account given in *The 9/11 Commission Report* concerning the alleged flight path of the commercial jet that supposedly hit the Pentagon?

- Did you know that the testimony of Sgt. Lagasse and Sgt. Brooks places the plane they saw on a course to strike the Pentagon in a manner that is completely at odds with and, therefore, contradicts the damage report that was detailed in the *Pentagon Performance Report* and, therefore, as well, their testimony contradicts the account of Flight 77 given in *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that Robert Turcios who was working at the CITGO gas station on the morning of September 11th, 2001 independently confirms the description given by Sgt. Lagasse and Sgt. Brooks -- namely, that a large jet plane was flying low and approaching the Pentagon's West face across an area on the north side of the CITGO gas station and was not flying across an area on the south side of the CITGO station as described by *The 9/11 Commission Report* and the *Pentagon Performance Report*?

- Did you know that the testimony of Robert Turcios, Sgt. Lagasse, and Sgt. Brooks all indicates that the plane they saw could not possibly have knocked down the five light poles that were claimed by the "official story" to have been knocked down by Flight 77 because the latter light poles were nowhere near the flight path of the plane that was described by Turcios, Lagasse, and Brooks?

- Did you know that although the "official story" claims that a C-130 military plane was ordered to follow and observe the commercial jet flying near the Pentagon, none of the foregoing individuals [that is, Robert Turcios, Sgt. Lagasse, and Sgt. Brooks] reports seeing any other plane in the vicinity or seeing any other plane flying near the Pentagon in the seconds that followed the fireball they saw erupt at the Pentagon?

- Did you know that a number of veteran commercial pilots of 757/767 Boeing jets have done experiments with jet simulators seeking to recreate the conditions of flying a commercial jet into a target like either of the twin towers and that more than two-thirds of these fully qualified pilots who tried to find ways of making the transition from the observed flight paths of the 9/11 hijacked planes to the final task of lining up the planes to hit the targets [i.e., the twin towers] failed to accomplish their objective?

- Did you know that on February 13th, 1975 there was a substantial fire that broke out in the North Tower of the World Trade Center?

- Did you know that this fire spread over at least 65% of the 11th floor of the North Tower [including the core area], and, as well, the fire spread down to the ninth floor and as far up as the 19th floor?

- Did you know that this 1975 fire raged for more than three hours ... which is more than twice as long as the fire that burned in the North Tower on September 11th and more than three times as long as the fire that burned in the South Tower on September 11th?

- Did you know that the 1975 fire in the North Tower burned at temperatures more than 700 degrees Celsius that is hotter than any hard evidence shows that the fires burned in the twin towers on September 11th?

- Did you know that as a result of these 700 degree Celsius temperatures windows broke during the 1975 fire but on September 11th no windows were observed to have broken as a result of the fires and, therefore, this indicates that the temperatures of the twin tower fires on September 11th were less than 700 degrees Celsius temperatures of the 1975 fire?

- Did you know that despite the 1975 fire burning for over three hours -- which was substantially longer than what occurred on September 11th, 2001 -- and despite the 1975 North Tower fire burning at temperatures that were higher than evidence indicates the fires burned in the twin towers on 9/11, there was no structural damage to the North Tower in the 1975 fire -- including the floor trusses -- and nothing in the steel-framed structure portions of the building needed to be replaced as a result of that 1975 fire?

- Did you know that during the Fall of 1999, General Hugh Shelton, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, directed General Peter Schoomaker, head of Special Operations Command, to establish an intelligence program through which to monitor the activities of al-Qaeda and that this operation was given the code name 'Able Danger'?

- Did you know that in January/February 2000, Able Danger was able to establish the identities of five different al-Qaeda cells including one in Brooklyn, New York?

- Did you know that the Brooklyn cell was said to include Muhammad Atta, the alleged hijack pilot of Flight 11, Marwan al-Shehhi, the alleged hijack pilot of Flight 175, Nawaf al-Hamzi, an alleged participant in the American Airlines 77 hijacking, and Khalid Almihdhar, another alleged hijacker on Flight 77?

- Did you know that more than a year prior to 9/11 that James D. Smith, a contractor connected to the Able Danger operation [he worked for Orion Scientific Systems], was able to establish a link between Mohammed Atta and Sheikh Omar Abdul Rahman who was convicted in association with the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and was also able to obtain a picture of Atta via a private researcher in California who specialized in finding such information?

- Did you know that James D. Smith prepared a flow chart for Able Danger concerning the links among various al-Qaeda cells discovered to be working in the United States?

- Did you know that on August 28, 2005, James D. Smith indicated on Fox News that Mohammed Atta was a part of the flow chart that he had prepared for Able Danger prior to 9/11?

- Did you know that a Naval commanding officer, Scott Philpott, who was the leader of Able Danger, stated he clearly recalls that Mohammed Atta had been identified by Able Danger by January/February of 2000?

- Did you know that Lt. Colonel Shaffer, a core member of Able Danger, contacted FBI agent Xanthig Magnum to set up a meeting between representatives of Able Danger and the FBI concerning what had been uncovered with respect to al-Qaeda activities in the United States?

- Did you know that on three separate occasions, meetings between members of Able Danger and the FBI had been arranged via the efforts of Shaffer and Magnum, and, yet, on each occasion the meetings were cancelled by the Pentagon's Major General Geoffrey Lambert?

- Did you know that Lt. Colonel Anthony Shaffer indicated that a two-star general threatened to take punitive action against Shaffer if Able Danger did not stop looking into the activities of Mohammed Atta?

- Did you know that Erik Kleinsmith, a former Major in the Army who had been a part of the Able Danger operation, was ordered by the Pentagon to destroy all the charts, information, and data collected through Able Danger?

- Did you know that some of the information acquired by Able Danger prior to 9/11 was summarized in the Presidential Daily Briefing of August 6, 2001 – the one titled “Bin Laden Determined to Strike in the US”?

- Did you know that Lt. Colonel Anthony Shaffer met with Philip Zelikow, the Executive Director of the 9/11 Commission on October 21, 2003 at Bagram Air Base in Afghanistan to speak about the findings of Able Danger?

- Did you know that when Lt. Colonel Shaffer tried to contact Philip Zelikow again in January 2004, the Executive Director did not respond?

- Did you know *The 9/11 Commission Report* did not include a discussion of the material presented to the Commission by Lt. Colonel Anthony Shaffer and the Commission claimed, without explanation or factual support to justify such an assertion, that the Able Danger material was “historically insignificant”?

- Did you know that Lt. Colonel Shaffer has had his security clearance withdrawn and that the Pentagon threatened to cancel his family health insurance?

- Did you know that all charts, data, and material associated with Able Danger were ordered destroyed by the Pentagon?

- Did you know that although some 9/11 skeptics believe the Able Danger operation was nothing more than an intelligence community

Psy-Op meant to lend support to the official government narrative concerning 9/11, the fact of the matter is that irrespective of the ultimate motives underlying the creation of Able Danger, the members of the Able Danger program have clearly established that well before 9/11 the government had specific knowledge about al-Qaeda activities within the United States and not only failed to exercise due diligence with respect to that information but, prior to 9/11, there were elements within the Pentagon that sought to disrupt the Able Danger operation, and, furthermore, following September 11th, 2001, there were elements within the 9/11 Commission – such as Philip Zelikow -- that sought to suppress such information by failing to include it in *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that prior to 9/11, Ptech, which has changed its name to GoAgile, was a small software company in Quincy, Massachusetts that specialized in artificial intelligence programs?

- Did you know that among the clients of Ptech were the FAA, FBI, NATO, the Secret Service, the Air Force, and the Department of Navy?

- Did you know that in the two years prior to 9/11, Ptech was working in conjunction with a company called Mitre Corporation at the FAA, and their collective task was to study and come up with solutions concerning improving the quality of the interaction between the FAA and NORAD during emergencies?

- Did you know that some of the Ptech software enabled one to monitor the operations of a computer system as well as to be able to make changes in those operations without anyone knowing of one's presence in the system?

- Did you know that before 9/11 Indira Singh was working on a security surveillance software program for JP Morgan, and Singh had been told by various sources that Ptech might be able to provide an artificial intelligence core that would help her surveillance software program to operate effectively?

- Did you know that during a meeting at her bank with the Ptech software company people she became suspicious with respect to some of what was going on during her interaction with the Ptech personnel?



- Did you know that she began to investigate Ptech and discovered that one of the founders and principal financial backers of Ptech was Yassin al-Qadi who was placed on a US terror list in October 2001?

- Did you know that Indira Singh tried to bring this information to the attention of the 9/11 Commission?

- Did you know that her expertise is not given expression in *The 9/11 Commission Report*?

- Did you know that the Ptech founder and financier Yassin al-Qadi had been investigated by Chicago-based FBI agent Robert Wright during the 1990s in relation to money laundering operations involving various terrorist organizations?

- Did you know that Agent Robert Wright considered Yassin al-Qadi to be bin Laden's "banker"?

- Did you know that Agent Wright's research concerning Yassin al-Qadi and the founders/financers of Ptech led him to discover that Ptech was backed by a financial organization known as BMI that was shown to have ties with both Hamas and al-Qaeda?

- Did you know that these financial investigations by Agent Wright were shut down by the FBI in the late 1990s?

- Did you know that Agent Wright's frustration with, and concern about, the FBI's failure to act on his pre-9/11 intelligence, as well as the interference he encountered during his investigation as a result of the activities of certain individuals within the FBI, led Agent Wright to author a 500-page manuscript entitled: *Fatal Betrayals of the Intelligence Mission* that Wright is being prevented by the FBI from releasing to the public?

- Did you know that in a May 2002 press conference, Robert Wright stated: "Knowing what I know, I can confidently say that until the investigative responsibilities for terrorism are removed from the FBI, I will not feel safe."

- Did you know that nearly twenty minutes before President Bush ever stepped into the classroom at the Emma T. Booker Elementary School in Sarasota, Florida, the Secret Service already knew one hijacked commercial airline had crashed into the North Tower and that another commercial jet had been hijacked and was heading toward New York, and, yet, the Secret Service did nothing to stop the

President from going into the classroom and did nothing to move the President to safety or take the school children out of harms way [by removing the President] and did nothing to move the President to a command center where the President might have had the opportunity to effectively assess or respond to the situation as it was unfolding?

- Did you know that when the Secret Service permitted the President to stay in the classroom after Andrew Card notified the President about a second tower being hit and that "America was under attack" that this was a completely separate failure of due diligence on the part of the Secret Service than the due diligence it failed to exercise prior to the President's entering into the classroom?

-----

### 13 - 'C' Is For Conspiracy

If one were asked to think of a word or phrase beginning with the letter "c" that is most associated with the issues surrounding September 11, 2001, the overwhelming response is likely to be "conspiracy". Starting with President Bush's edict: "Let there be no outrageous conspiracy theories" concerning the events of 9/11, and continuing on with an array of media gurus, both left and right, who have sought to ridicule, dismiss, and marginalize anyone who so much as hints at the possibility that the narrative being promulgated by, say, *The 9/11 Commission Report* is fundamentally and essentially flawed, the one word that has been used to try to frame and control the discussion about 9/11 has been the term "conspiracy".

Of course, one can point out that *The 9/11 Commission Report* is, from beginning to end, nothing but a conspiracy theory. However, when one does this, the response is likely to lead to some form of cognitive dissonance in which the person who previously has been railing away at the "conspiracy nuts" will pause for a second as his or her mind seeks to find a way out of a conundrum in which the term "conspiracy" no longer seems to apply to just the people who reject the "official story" concerning 9/11 but applies, as well, to the proponents of the "official theory" about September 11, 2001. This pause in the conversation will go on until the person caught-up in the conundrum can find a way to re-frame the discussion in terms more favorable to the individual or until that individual can invent a suitable form of rationalization or evasion as to why her or his form of "conspiracy" is so much more acceptable to the light of reason than the childish fantasies of the usual bunch of conspiratorial rabble.

Oftentimes, the people in such an emotional conundrum enter into some form of dissociation because they are cognitively unable to deal with the information concerning 9/11 that is being placed before them. Because the condition of dissociation in which such people tend to find themselves is very, very disconcerting as a result of the feelings of de-realization, de-personalization, anxiety and stress that permeate that state, quite frequently, these people become angry since they feel their basic sense of identity and worldview is being called into question.

In any event, one of the factors why the term "conspiracy" has such a powerful regulatory hold on any discussion concerning the

events surrounding September 11<sup>th</sup> is because there are a considerable array of "undue influence" techniques being used by almost every facet of the media, educational institutions, and the political spectrum to oppress people in the United States by preventing the latter from thinking about 9/11 in an open, rigorous, and critically reflective manner. Undue influence entails all processes that give expression to social, cognitive, and emotional methods and tactics that are used with the intention of restricting, directing, undermining, impeding, confusing, or stopping people from examining information that might lead such people in a direction other than what is desired by the people who are exercising the techniques of undue influence.

More precisely, techniques of undue influence are used to induce people to cede their moral, intellectual, and spiritual authority to another individual, group, political organization, or corporate entity so that the latter might make all moral, political, and spiritual decisions on behalf of those who have been led to believe, through techniques of undue influence -- that the latter have no inherent right to make up their own minds and hearts about any given issue while simultaneously holding that the so-called "leaders" have every right to strip people of such a right.

In short, with only a small set of exceptions here and there, the media, educational institutions, and politicians (both federal and local) in America are all engaged in using the very same kinds of technique as are religious or political cults who seek to influence the members of such a cult in ways that will prevent those members from ever having access to data that might interfere with the attempts of the cult to keep people thinking, feeling, and doing precisely what the cult wishes its members to think, feel, and do.

Among other things, the media, educational, and political cult leaders in America use emotional terms like "freedom", "democracy", "patriotism", "terrorism" and /or "conspiracy" as conceptual weapons or branding irons. Thus, if a person seeks to communicate information about, say, 9/11, to other human beings -- information that is in opposition to the desires of the cult leaders in the United States, -- then, the purveyors of such information are branded as anti-

democratic, unpatriotic, terrorist sympathizers, and/or conspiracy nuts.

If the political, educational, and media cult leaders of America have their way, then, the conversation concerning 9/11 is never intended to go beyond the application of epithets leveled against the informational miscreants who wish to critically explore the issues surrounding the events leading up to, during, and following 9/11. Once labeled, people are dealt with in accordance with those labels, and, consequently, quite apart from whatever the merits of the information being communicated by such an individual might be, that information can be ignored because the operative factor in the affair becomes the label with which the individual has been branded by the cult leaders who head the media, political offices, and educational institutions.

Moreover, once a few people have been crucified in this manner and strung up along the pathways of educational, political, and media activity, then, as was the case with the Roman imperial cult leaders of old, the appropriate message of fear has been delivered to anyone else who might be so foolish as to seek to communicate anything about such taboo subjects as 9/11 to other individuals. Furthermore, like the Roman imperial cult leaders of old, although the cult leaders of the media, political office, and educational institutions in the United States are the actual oppressors and terrorists, these perpetrators of domestic terror and oppression have re-framed the situation to give the impression that only those who seek to throw off the yolk of oppression of the occupying forces of the educational, media, corporate, and political cults that rule America are the ones with whom fault should be found.

The previous comments serve as something of a prologue to that which is to follow. What comes next is an exercise, of sorts, to show how, in reality, there are a lot of other words and phrases beginning with "c" that are appropriate to use in conjunction with issues concerning 9/11.

In fact, some of these c-words already have surfaced in the foregoing prologue -- for example, "cognitive dissonance", "cult", "conundrum", and "crucify". However, let's not bring the exercise to an end before surveying a variety of other possibilities.

-----

Censorship : Naturally, the media cult leaders in America, whether left or right, will never admit that what they are engaged in are vigorous forms of censorship concerning 9/11. Instead, they will seek to re-formulate the issue in terms of having a duty to maintain standards of journalistic integrity such that the information that comes to their attention is properly vetted to ensure that the public has access to only the very best information available.

This sounds nice, but, in truth, the vetting process that takes place consists of a radical censoring of anyone who poses a threat to the vested interests -- whether left or right -- that the media helps to keep in place and in power. One hears almost nothing in the media about the many commercial pilots, architects, scientists, engineers, scholars, ex-military personnel, and everyday common people who are talking about "facts", "information", "data" and reasoned arguments concerning 9/11 that often cannot be credibly countered by the "official" narrative of the power elite in relation to September 11th.

The media will respond with something along the lines of: The reason why you hear nothing about such pilots, architects and the like is because what they have to offer is not credible. However, the public never gets to witness a fair airing of the alleged reasons why such testimony is not credible. Rather, the public tends only to hear the unelaborated conclusions /judgments about the matter (like the Supreme Court rejecting a case without comment) or the public gets a very unfair, biased, and one-sided characterization of the data and arguments that run counter to the "official" government conspiracy theory.

When the media is unwilling to put forth the various sides of an argument in a judicious manner, then, the media is engaged in censorship. They can try to re-frame what they are doing in any way they care to in order to try to make themselves look good, but they have become, in effect, censors for the power elite.

-----

Career: While many of the political, media, and educational cult leaders in America will try to convince the public that they have only

the noblest of intentions with respect to their handling of the matters surrounding 9/11, the ugly fact of the matter is that many of these cult leaders are preoccupied with self-serving intentions in relation to maintaining their careers, along with the comfortable perks entailed by such careers such as substantial paychecks, retirement benefits, health care, social status, fame, power, and so on.

Unfortunately, while engaged in finding ways to perpetuate their own careers, many of these power elite cult leaders are not at all averse to sacrificing truth, justice, or the public in their attempt to survive in the style to which they have become accustomed. They further try to shore up their shaky sense of integrity by, sometimes, arguing that if others were in their shoes, they would be doing the same thing.

However, such a contention is not true. There have been many people who have been trying to communicate with the public concerning 9/11 who have lost their jobs as engineers, scientists, and educators because of their willingness to treat the search for truth and justice as having a greater priority than that of career.

I once had an animated discussion with an individual who rejected the idea of there being any other account of 9/11 that is true except that of the "official" power elite. The person in question argued that there are so many media people who hate the existing government administration that such people would be dancing in the streets if they had an opportunity to bring down the present government with any kind of scandal involving 9/11. And, given the fact there are no such people who are dancing in the streets, this is prima facie evidence that there aren't any credible arguments capable of disproving the official narrative of the power elite.

The aforementioned individual is, to say the least, a little naive when it comes to the sort of calculus that people employ when their lives and career might be at stake. There are very few, if any, media types -- whether left or right -- among established newspapers, magazines, radio stations, television stations, or scholarly journals who are willing to pursue matters concerning 9/11 because, both individually and collectively, they understand that such an undertaking likely would lead to career suicide in one form or another.

Journalists and columnists are answerable to editors. Editors are answerable to senior editors and editorial boards. Editorial boards are answerable to media lawyers, owners and/or boards of directors. They are all answerable to advertising revenues.

In these sorts of environment, there are many points of entry through which vested interests can make the weight of their interests known. People who work in such environments are acutely aware of who butters their bread, and they quickly learn how to work in accordance with the degrees of freedom existing in those environments or they find themselves out of a job or they find themselves losing advertising revenue.

There are any number of "left-leaning" media people who refuse to rigorously pursue the issues surrounding 9/11 because they fear being labeled as card-carrying "conspiracy nuts" or "terrorist enablers" or members of the "lunatic fringe". Once labeled in this manner, they believe this would cast a shadow over, or doubt upon, everything else they do or report or about which they write ... which is just another way of saying that they are worried about their career as leftists.

Many of these so-called left-leaning or liberal or progressive media types will gladly engage in any manner of administration-bashing -- and, quite frequently, with considerable justification -- for whatever constitutional, economic, or political sin is the soup de jour that has been concocted by the various chefs of the current administration. However, those same media types will not venture into the tricky waters of 9/11 because they fear the labeling process that is likely to ensue and which would tend to marginalize all that they have to say about other matters of importance as their entire body of work is reduced down to "why, he or she is just one of those conspiracy nuts, or one of those terrorist lovers, or one of those unpatriotic people who hates freedom and America."

Good-bye credibility. Good-bye Career. Good-bye influence. Good-bye paycheck. Good-bye perks.

However, one is likely to get very limited and limiting truths from someone who is more concerned about her or his reputation and career than such an individual is concerned with matters of truth and justice. Unfortunately, the issues of truth and justice that are caught up



in the actual nature of 9/11 underlie virtually every problem in which the United States is currently embroiled -- from: Iraq and Afghanistan, to: energy policy, military spending, the deficit, health care, the "intelligence community", public debt, education, the Constitution, civil liberties, and the economy.

Currently, there is no more important topic to explore than the realities of 9/11. Yet, while educational institutions, the media elite, as well as elected and unelected officials are willing to explore a vast array of issues, nonetheless, the one topic -- namely, 9/11 -- which is not critically pursued encompasses a set of forces which is relentlessly destructive in relation to democracy, the Constitution, human rights, freedom, truth, justice, and the economy.

-----

Courage: There are all too many individuals in the media, in government, and in education who lack courage concerning the events of 9/11. Apparently, they feel or believe that if they can continue to ignore the problems surrounding and permeating the "official" account of 9/11 as communicated through documents like *The 9/11 Commission Report*, NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers*, and *The Pentagon Performance Report* then, perhaps, they will be able to avoid ever having to put their life, reputation, and job on the line for the sake of truth and justice.

The line that comes to mind with respect to a lot -- but not necessarily all -- of the foregoing individuals is from the movie *The Rainmaker* based on a John Grisham book of the same name. During a meeting intended to generate some depositions, the Matt Damon character, Rudy Baylor, a lawyer for the plaintiff, asks a question of the big corporate lawyer played by Jon Voight whose firm is representing a life insurance company that is refusing to pay out on a claim made by the plaintiff. After continuously being given the run-around by Jon Voight's character, the Matt Damon character poses the following question: "Do you even remember when you first sold out?"

Do the individuals who do the nightly news on television and who are news television commentators and opinion makers, or do the columnists and editorial page writers, or do the individuals who are running for the presidency of the United States or for other political

offices in the forthcoming elections, or do the individuals who are supposedly educating the youth and hope of tomorrow even remember when they first sold out to the myth makers of 9/11? Unfortunately, the sordid condition of American public life is such that, for the most part, only those who lack the courage to serve truth and justice are permitted to have ready access to the rest of the American people so that the latter might become infected with the same sort of cowardice that governs the former.

Many from the media, political life, and educational institutions have become like Jayson Blair, the disgraced journalist who was fired from the New York Times because, among other things, he fabricated data and failed to do his own, independent investigations on any number of stories while, instead, uncritically borrowing from the work of others. Similarly, all too many media representatives, educators, and politicians have failed to exercise due diligence with respect to 9/11. Their critical, investigative skills, along with their moral integrity, appear to have gone on an extended hiatus, and they tend to just go with whatever they are told by "official" sources concerning 9/11, and, in the process, they all have betrayed the public.

There might be a variety of reasons why the people being alluded to above have decided it is in their best interests to betray the public's trust on the 9/11 issue. However, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that many of the people involved fail to do due diligence in relation to their jobs because they lack the courage to stand up and fight on behalf of the citizens of the United States rather than on behalf of the members of the power elites who wish the matter of 9/11 to be understood in a way that advances their own self-serving goals rather than the public good.

-----

Complicity: One doesn't have to resort to the word "conspiracy" in order to understand the nature of the failure of educational institutions, the media and elected officials to critically, thoroughly, competently, and rigorously investigate the issues surrounding 9/11 [and neither The 9/11 Commission Report, NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers*, The *FEMA Report*, *The Pentagon Performance Report*, nor the *Popular Mechanics'* article/book are critically competent, thorough, or rigorous efforts]. For the most part,

these various sectors of the power elite did not gather together to conspire about anything. Rather, they are all, each in its own idiosyncratic manner, complicit in, among other things, the on-going censorship with respect to almost all of the important facets of 9/11.

All of the individuals and groups making up the collective power elite have their own individual vested interests, agendas, values, goals, needs, and resources. At some point, the issues of 9/11 impinge upon their activities, and they make individualized judgments about how to handle such issues.

They look at what different branches of the government are doing. They examine the current political landscape. They consider the activities of the military. They assess the activities of various competitors or players in the business and corporate world. They take the pulse of the media and educational institutions. They poll the public or do marketing research. They reflect on their resources, liabilities, and needs. They do risk assessments concerning an array of political and economic situations in various regions of the world. They think about the future. They make assessments about the meaning, nature, and significance of 9/11.

They take all these factors and run them through their models, formulas, and methodologies. The result is a judgment about how to proceed.

For a variety of reasons virtually all of the players who participate in the collective power elite have -- somewhat independently of one another -- arrived at very similar and, in certain respects, overlapping decisions. They believe that the easiest, least problematic way for them -- as individuals, groups, institutions, parties, or organizations -- to move forward is to avoid looking at the events of 9/11 too closely.

Arriving at such a decision is not because they have definitive evidence that the "official" government narrative concerning 9/11 is true or viable. Most of these people have never read The 9/11 Commission Report, nor have they gone through and reflected on NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers*, nor have they perused *The Pentagon Performance Report*, nor have they read the book *Debunking 9/11 Myths* issued through Popular Mechanics, nor have they read the 20 or 30 other major works that

critique all the foregoing, nor have they viewed the many videos that critically examine the available data entailed by 9/11.

Furthermore, arriving at such a decision is not because they have sat around in some boardroom or participated in a teleconference or met clandestinely with fellow conspirators and worked out a narrative for 9/11. In fact, in many ways, these individuals and groups probably don't care, one way or the other, about the realities of 9/11, but, instead, they just want to know how they effectively can use or adapt to whichever way the political, economic, and judicial winds seem to be swirling with respect to that issue in order to be able to successfully advance their individual agendas, goals, aspirations, programs, and bottom lines.

Are such individuals, organizations, corporations, institutions, and so on complicit in, among other things, maintaining an environment of censorship concerning the realities of 9/11? Of course, they are.

However, they didn't have to conspire with one another in order to reach such an arrangement. All they had to do is arrive at a decision in which it was considered prudent to leave 9/11 alone and run with the "official" government version of the matter.

Various members of the media, as well as an array of educators and political officials (both elected and unelected), might be complicit in wrongdoing linked with 9/11. Various members of the media, as well as an array of educators and political officials (both elected and unelected), might be complicit in many different kinds of injustice linked with 9/11. Various members of the media, as well as an array of educators and political officials (both elected and unelected), might be complicit in the censorship that has gone on in relation to 9/11. Various members of the media, as well as an array of educators and political officials (both elected and unelected), might be complicit in the oppression that has arisen in relation to 9/11. Various members of the media, as well as an array of educators and political officials (both elected and unelected), might be complicit in the shredding of the American Constitution and its Bill of Rights that have taken place in conjunction with the events of 9/11.

None of the foregoing, however, necessarily means that those who are complicit in the ways indicated are conspirators. On the other hand, there might be some individuals -- not yet definitely identified --

who are hidden among those who are complicit in matters concerning 9/11 and who actually are conspiring against Americans -- including some of the individuals and groups that are merely complicit -- and, perhaps, quite unknowingly involved -- in helping such conspirators to achieve their aims and ambitions.

-----

Confabulation: In psychological terms, to confabulate is to create a memory of a supposed past event that, in point of fact, did not necessarily take place. Alternatively, if the event on which the confabulated memory is based did take place, then, the act of confabulation might mean that the event did not actually occur in the way in which one remembered it as happening.

Sometimes confabulation occurs in the context of what is known as a "flashbulb memory". A flashbulb memory is an extremely vivid and clear recollection of a purported past event.

Sometimes, however, one might not have had the necessary experience or could not have been in a position to be able to have a reliable and true memory of whatever event one clearly and vividly is remembering. In such a case the flashbulb memory episode is an instance of confabulation in which the content of the "clear and vivid" memory, has been invented, either partially or wholly.

For example, Jean Piaget, the famous Swiss developmental psychologist, had a vivid memory of having been kidnapped as a child. He carried this memory with him for many years until the nanny who looked after him finally confessed that the kidnapping event never occurred.

Elizabeth Loftus, who has done a lot of groundbreaking research involving eyewitness accounts and false memory syndrome, also had a vivid recollection of seeing a dead relative floating face down in a backyard pool. The problem was, as she found out years later, the event that she remembers so clearly and vividly never took place.

President Bush had a confabulated flashbulb memory with respect to the North Tower of the World Trade Center in relation to September 11, 2001. He reports -- and I have seen the video news coverage of his speech -- that he had been waiting outside the elementary classroom

in Florida where he was scheduled to meet with children and hear them read from a now famous book about a pet goat. He recalled that he had been watching a television set that was located outside the classroom, when he saw the first plane fly into the North Tower and, recalls himself at the time making a remark to the effect of: "boy, that was one bad pilot."

The problem with the foregoing recollection is that he could not possibly have been in a position to witness what he claimed to have remembered. The only video/film coverage of the North Tower event was by the Naudet brothers of France who were in Manhattan on September 11, 2001 doing a documentary on New York fire fighters.

The Naudet brothers' video/film footage of the North Tower September 11th event was not released until September 12, 2001. Consequently, President Bush could not possibly have witnessed what he claimed to remember while waiting to go into the elementary classroom on the morning of September 11, 2001.

Was there a television set outside the elementary classroom? I don't know.

Was President Bush watching television before he entered the classroom? I don't know.

However, irrespective of whether there was or was not a television outside the classroom and irrespective of whether he was or was not watching the television, the one indisputable fact is that he could not possibly seen what he claimed to have seen on the morning of September 11, 2001 because the film/video concerning the crash of Flight 11 into the North Tower of the World Trade Center was not released until September 12, 2001.

Similarly, there are many people who claimed to have seen, on the morning of September 11, 2001, a large commercial jet plane flying between 10 and 50 feet off the ground knocking over lampposts along the highway as the airplane approached the Pentagon, skimmed over the grassy area in front of the west facade of the Pentagon, hitting a construction transformer truck, before slamming into the Pentagon. The Pentagon Performance Report seems to corroborate such accounts because the report indicates that the airplane struck the first floor of the Pentagon going at more than 500 miles per hour.

The problem with all of the foregoing is that due to aerodynamic factors such as "the ground effect", wing-tip vortex effects, and so on, it is not physically possible for a 2000-ton plane flying at 500 miles per hour to follow a relatively level flight path that permits such a plane to get closer than about 65 feet above the surface of the ground -- in contradistinction to eyewitness accounts that positioned the plane as being between 10 and 50 feet off the ground over the last two to four hundred yards before allegedly striking the Pentagon. What people claimed to have seen in this respect is in violation of known laws of physics, and, therefore, one suspects that, to varying degrees, what one is dealing with in relation to these kinds of report involves some form of confabulated memory.

Just as President Bush, Jean Piaget and Elizabeth Loftus all claimed to have clear memories of something that did not or could not have happened, so too, many of the eyewitnesses who claimed to have seen a large commercial plane flying at some 500 miles an hour (according to *The Pentagon Performance Report*) and running between ten and fifty feet above the ground as it approached the Pentagon on 9/11 were providing an account that could not have happened in the way in which they remember. Furthermore, physical laws of aerodynamics are such that what *The Pentagon Performance Report's* claims to have been the case -- namely that the commercial plane that hit the Pentagon did so on the first floor of the building -- also could not have been true because a 2000-ton plane traveling at 500 miles per hour would not have been able to strike the first floor in the manner in which the Report claimed due to the aforementioned aerodynamic factors.

Were the people who gave such accounts lying? Not necessarily. The fact of the matter is -- and this is a well-established phenomenon in courtrooms across America -- eyewitness testimony is often inaccurate, and part of the reason for this is a direct result of the human tendency to confabulate, to varying degrees, with respect to our memories of past events.

In addition, there is a further problem with many of these eyewitness accounts in relation to the precise direction from which the alleged plane was coming as well as in relation to the nature of the angle of the plane when it allegedly hit the Pentagon. More specifically,

there is detailed, videotaped testimony from three individuals -- namely, two Pentagon police officers (Chadwick Brooks and William Lagasse) as well as Robert Turcios who was working at the Citgo gas station about a quarter of a mile away from the west facade of the Pentagon -- which directly contradicts the testimony of a number of eyewitnesses concerning the flight path of a large commercial airliner that appeared to strike the Pentagon.

The issue has to do with the location of the commercial jet in relation to the Citgo station when it flew over that area as the craft headed for the Pentagon. Did the plane fly to the north of the Citgo station or did the plane fly to the south of the Citgo station?

If the commercial jet in question flew to the south of the Citgo station as it headed for the Pentagon, then, this would be consistent with a flight path in which lamp posts were allegedly knocked down along the highway running past the Pentagon, -- one of which supposedly fell on a taxi and punched a hole in the car's windshield as the plane made its way toward the Pentagon. Such a flight path also would be consistent with The Pentagon Performance Report that purportedly reconstructed what would have been necessary with respect to the plane's flight path in order to be able to account for the pathway of damage inside the Pentagon.

However, if the plane's flight path took the craft across an area to the north of the Citgo gas station, then, at least two things are not true. First, the individuals who claim they saw the plane follow a flight path to the south of the Citgo gas station are mistaken (possibly another case of memory confabulation), and, as a result, this leaves one in need of an explanation for what knocked down the lampposts because those lampposts are in a location that is entirely away from any flight path that went along a line to the north of the Citgo gas station. Secondly, if the plane that allegedly hit the Pentagon followed a flight path to the north of the Citgo gas station, then, The Pentagon Performance Report is incorrect with respect to its account of what caused the pathway of internal damage in the Pentagon because its report requires a plane that came at the Pentagon from a direction that was to the south of the Citgo station ... not the north side of the Citgo gas station.



Finally, irrespective of who is correct in her or his memory of what transpired on the morning of September 11, 2001 in relation to events at the Pentagon, the foregoing discussion indicates that there are those among the witnesses who are enveloped in confabulated or invented memory, in part or in total, with respect to the flight path of the plane in question. The large commercial jet that people claimed to see hit the Pentagon on 9/11 could not simultaneously have approached the Pentagon on both the north side and the south side of the Pentagon.

Although the two Pentagon police officers who, independently of one another, claim to have seen a commercial plane traveling toward the Pentagon on the north side of the Citgo gas station both believe that the plane in question did strike the Pentagon, there is some other information that might be inconsistent with the striking part of their account. First, although The 9/11 Commission Report claims that Flight 77 hit the Pentagon at 9:37-38 a.m., there is evidence that the Pentagon was struck by an earlier event that had a sufficiently violent shockwave to stop all battery operated clocks in and around the so-called "crash" area at 9:32-33 a.m., some five minutes before the alleged plane crash took place.

Furthermore, April Gallop, an employee at the Pentagon with top security clearance, was seated at her desk within 60 feet of the alleged crash site. As she hit the start-up button for her computer, there was a tremendous explosion that buried both her and her infant child who she was going to be taking to daycare shortly after starting up her computer.

After pulling herself and her daughter out of the rubble, as well as helping a few other people who had been buried during the blast, she exited the Pentagon via the hole that had been created by whatever the nature of the event was that had caused the explosion. She was in her bare feet because she had lost her shoes during the explosion.

She reports that there were no fires. Nothing was hot to the touch. There was no plane wreckage -- not fuselage, not people, not luggage, not engines.

Were there fires later on? Yes, there were. Nonetheless, despite whatever might have caused those subsequent fires, initially, the explosion that April Gallop lived through involved no fires and no plane wreckage.

Secondly, a number of military personnel who were caught up in the initial Pentagon blast indicated that they smelled cordite, not jet fuel, and these individuals had sufficient training and experience to know the difference. Cordite is associated with the explosion of munitions not jet plane crashes. Consequently, irrespective of whatever else might have happened at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, there was at least one, and possibly two, explosions at the Pentagon that were munitions-related and not jet crash-related.

Finally, exploding jet fuel does not cause blast injuries. Yet, the medical first-responders at the Pentagon reported that they had been treating a lot of blast injuries as well as burn injuries on the morning of September 11, 2001. For example, Captain Stephen S. Frost of the Medical Corps stated: "We saw many blast injuries" -- such as pulmonary blast injuries, gastrointestinal blast injuries, concussions, as well as secondary (being hit by debris propelled by a shock wave) and tertiary blast injuries (being injured as a result of being thrown by the force of the blast's shock wave.).

-----

Credibility: A document such as The 9/11 Commission Report that fails to include the testimony of, among others: Sibel Edmonds, Coleen Rowley, Kenneth Williams, and Robert Wright -- all of the FBI and all of whom had vital information about the events transpiring before, during, and following 9/11-- or a document that fails to include the testimony of David Schippers, William Rodriguez, Norman Mineta, Pierre Bunel, April Gallop, and Indira Singh -- all of whom had relevant testimony concerning the events leading up to and/or transpiring on 9/11, or, as well, a document that fails to include the testimony of Lt. Colonel Anthony Shafer or former Army Major Erik Kleinsmith (both of the Abel Danger project that had been gathering data relevant to terrorist cells in the United States) fundamentally undermines its own claims, and those of others on its behalf, concerning the issue of credibility. A document like The 9/11 Commission Report that fails to interview the FBI's David Frasca, Mike Feghali, and M.F. "Spike" Bowman [all of whom seemed to play major roles in obstructing investigations into terrorist activity by other FBI agents both before and after 9/11], or a document that fails to interview Kevin Delaney of

the Federal Aviation Administration who destroyed taped interviews concerning the events of 9/11 by five flight controllers who were on duty that day fundamentally undermines its own claims, along with those of others, to possessing credibility. A document like The 9/11 Commission Report that fails to investigate why thousands of tons of evidence in Manhattan pertinent to a criminal investigation had been destroyed undermines its own claims to, or the claims of others on its behalf, concerning credibility. A document like The 9/11 Commission Report which bases many of its pages on the testimony of captured individuals who endured torture such as water-boarding before giving "testimony" concerning 9/11 and who were not made available for questioning by the 9/11 Commission researchers does not deserve to be thought of with any sense of credibility concerning its findings. A document like *The 9/11 Commission Report* that completely fails to investigate what was behind the message received by the Secret Service on 9/11 which not only said that "Angel was next" ["Angel" being the code word for the President on 9/11] but gave substantial indication, as well, of having hacked into many of the top security codes of the government/military does not deserve to be considered a credible account of 9/11.

A document like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that consumes some 10,000 pages and still cannot provide a plausible, coherent, consistent, rigorous explanation for why basic laws of physics -- such as the law of conservation of energy or the law of conservation of angular momentum -- can be violated and permit three supposedly pancaking buildings [namely World Trade Center 1, World Trade Center 2, and World Trade Center 7) to collapse in nearly free-fall time is not deserving of any sense of credibility. Quantity is no substitute for quality, accuracy, or evidence.

A document like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that throws out experimental results because such data constitute problems for the specific theory that the scientists at NIST wish to support -- due to political and not scientific considerations -- is not deserving of any sense of credibility. A report like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that fails to pursue, rigorously investigate, and report on the more than 118 witnesses (fire fighters, police officers, journalists, WTC employees, and medical

personal) who claim to have been witnesses to explosions within the twin tower complex on 9/11 does not deserve to be considered as a credible document. A report like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* which claims that the perimeter columns in WTC Buildings 1 and 2 were pulled in toward the center of the buildings and this led to a progressive collapse of the buildings due to a failure in the floor assemblies in the buildings, despite the fact that Underwriters Laboratory proved that such floor assemblies would not have failed under the conditions existing on September 11, 2001, is not deserving of any sense of credibility. A document like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that has no plausible, evidence-based, explanation for why, or how, Building 7 collapsed in nearly free-fall time -- despite the fact that the building had not been hit by an airplane, and despite the fact there is no empirical evidence of substantial fires having spread throughout the building, and despite the fact that no steel-framed building anywhere in the world had ever collapsed due to fire, despite evidence in a number of these cases that some buildings burned for as long as 17 hours without causing the structures to collapse -- is not deserving of being considered credible. A document like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that has no explanation for why so much symmetry was present in the way the three World Trade Center buildings collapsed on September 11, 2001-- that is, pretty much straight down into its own "footprint" -- rather than in the sort of asymmetric manner one would have anticipated if the three buildings actually had collapsed as a result of the pancaking of floors whose assemblies, bolts and rivets are not likely to simultaneously have come apart -- such a report is not deserving of being considered credible. A document like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that completely ignores the obvious video data showing that World Trade Buildings 1 and 2 did not just collapse but, rather, exploded and disintegrated is not deserving of being considered credible.

A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that completely ignores the considerable evidence that explosions ripped through the Pentagon and were munitions-based, rather than jet-fuel based, is not deserving of being considered credible. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that completely ignores the fact that many of the injured at the Pentagon suffered from the primary, secondary and

tertiary effects of munitions-based explosions not jet-fuel explosions (which do not carry a shock wave that has concussive-properties) is not deserving of being considered credible. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that completely ignores the testimony of April Gallop, an individual with top security clearance, who said that following the explosion, there were no fires and there was no plane wreckage despite the fact that she was 60 feet from where the plane supposedly entered the Pentagon is not deserving of being considered credible. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that seeks to put forth an account that ignores the fact that -- due to aerodynamic properties such as "the ground effect", wing-tip vortices, and so on -- a 2000-ton commercial jet flying at speeds in excess of 500 miles per hour could not possibly have struck the ground floor as *The Pentagon Performance Report* claims -- such a report is not deserving of being considered a credible document. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that cannot plausibly or adequately explain how the hole in the building's Ring C could have the characteristics and singe pattern it did is not deserving of being considered a credible document. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that does not consider or discuss the fact that there are major contradictions among eye-witness testimonies concerning the flight path of the alleged jet that supposedly crashed into the Pentagon's west facade -- contradictions that carry major ramifications concerning the tenability of *The Pentagon Performance Report* -- then, such a document is not deserving of being considered a credible report. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that fails either to explore or provide an explanation as to why an array of battery-operated clocks in the west wing of the Pentagon stopped at 9:32-33 a.m. -- some five minutes prior to the time when the official time of a jet impact with the Pentagon allegedly took place -- such a document is not deserving of being considered a credible report. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that fails to investigate the reports of trained, experienced military personnel that they smelled cordite after the explosion at the Pentagon and not jet fuel is not deserving of being considered a credible report.

-----

Casualties: The count begins at around 3,000 individuals. This encompasses the approximate number of people who died on, or about, 9/11 due to the events at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

However, many thousands more individuals will have to be added to the foregoing number. For example, there are an increasing number of people who are exhibiting symptoms from an array of debilitating, if not lethal, diseases that have arisen as a result of the numerous toxic substances released into the environment on 9/11 through the events at the World Trade Center. These substances include: asbestos, benzene, dioxins, cadmium, polycyclic aromatics, PCBs, lead from computers, mercury from florescent light bulbs, and Freon [which when vaporized becomes phosgene gas].

Many first responders -- such as firefighters, police, medical personnel -- as well as those involved in the cleanup of Ground Zero have already become seriously ill with diseases that can be linked to 9/11. An increasing number of individuals are dying from such diseases.

Some believe that in the not-to-distant future there will be epidemics in the greater New York area -- such as mesothelial cancer (related to asbestos) -- due to, among other things, the numerous kinds of carcinogens that were spread all across Manhattan and other parts of New York City on September 11, 2001. In fact, some medical professionals believe that the number of deaths resulting from environmental contamination on 9/11 will exceed the number of immediate casualties of 9/11 by one, or more, orders of magnitude.

To the foregoing must be added the more than 4,000 soldiers who have, to date, died in Iraq and Afghanistan, along with the roughly 15,000 seriously wounded soldiers whose lives will never again be the same. One must also add in to the total the increasing number of suicides that are being committed by soldiers who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the epidemic of cases involving posttraumatic stress disorder that might have adverse, destructive ramifications for the individuals, their families, and their communities in the near future.

One must also add in to this running total the tens of thousands of innocent Iraqis and Afghanis [and estimates run anywhere from

80,000 to 600,000) who have perished as the result of conflicts that are said to be the advanced front of the "war on terror". This is a war on terror that moved into high gear as a direct result of the way in which the events of 9/11 have been interpreted and propagandized by most of the media, government officials [both elected and unelected], and so-called educators.

There is, of course, terrorism in the world. For example, there are the amateur terrorists like al-Qaeda, and, then, there are the professional terrorists such as the United States government and all too many multi-national corporations.

It is a well-established fact that elements of the United States government established, funded, and supported the individuals who now are collectively referred to as al-Qaeda [even though, in reality there are a disparate set of independent individuals and groups that are included under this umbrella term]. In the beginning, what is now known as al-Qaeda was used against the Soviets in Afghanistan, and, now, what is referred to as al-Qaeda is being used as the *raison d'être* for being in both Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as being in other geographical locations around the world.

Again and again the American public has been, and is being, told by the media, as well as government officials, that al-Qaeda was responsible for 9/11. Yet, the white paper that Colin Powell promised to make available to the United Nations that would prove such claims has never been released, and when the Taliban indicated that it was prepared to hand over 'Usama bin-Laden to the U.S. if the latter would provide the Taliban with the evidence demonstrating bin-Laden's involvement with 9/11, the United States had nothing to show them, and even Rex Tomb, Chief of Investigative Publicity for the FBI, and Robert Mueller, Director of the FBI, both have said that there is no evidence to link 'Usama bin-Laden with 9/11.

While there might (or might not) have been individuals who were linked, in some way, with al-Qaeda and who had roles to play with respect to 9/11, what also is becoming increasingly clear -- at least to all but the self-serving obtuseness of various dimensions of the media, government officials, and educators -- is that to whatever extent individuals associated with al-Qaeda might have been part of the tragedy of 9/11, those individuals received considerable financial,

tactical, and strategic assistance from treasonous elements within the United States power elite. Former FBI agent Robert Hanssen, and former CIA agent Aldrich Ames, and former United States Naval civilian intelligence analyst Jonathan Pollard all constitute recent exemplars indicating that some U.S. citizens are quite willing to betray their country and fellow citizens in order to serve their own treasonous agenda. Consequently, and most unfortunately, one is not broaching an unthinkable and impossible topic to argue that when the total body of available evidence concerning 9/11 is taken into consideration, there is an overwhelming portion of that evidence that strongly suggests there are traitors -- as of yet, unidentified in any definitive manner -- that are in our midst and who are responsible, in part or in whole, for the events of 9/11.

If such individuals are permitted to get away with 9/11, one can be sure of one thing. There will be more 9/11-like events, and these subsequent 9/11s will bring with them an unknown number of individuals -- both in the United States as well as in other parts of the world (for example, possibly in Iran and Pakistan) who will have to be added to the casualty list that began to be tabulated on September 11, 2001.

One might also want to add a few other items to the casualty list. For example, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, democracy, and America's moral compass all have been casualties because of the way in which the events of 9/11 have been propagandized, and out of such institutional casualties much collateral damage to human beings is likely to ensue.

-----

Corporatism: There can be little doubt that many corporations are complicit in helping to maintain the ascendant dominance of convenient fictions concerning the events of 9/11. These corporations range from: the media conglomerates which seek to ensure that disconcerting facts about 9/11 do not reach the ears, eyes, minds, hearts and souls of the American public, to: the defense contractors, oil companies, and private military contractors that are earning record profits all stemming from the fabrications, distortions, and untruths that have been promulgated concerning the actual facts surrounding



9/11. Such corporations also include many educational institutions of higher (and lower) learning that either fire individuals who wish to speak out on the issues surrounding 9/11 or that seek to muzzle/censor those who would speak out about such matters by failing to grant tenure to them or by trying to deride such individuals -- as Robert Gates sought to do in relation to Professor Emeritus Morgan Reynolds when the former individual was the President of Texas A & M prior to becoming Secretary of Defense.

All of the foregoing sorts of corporation have a vested interest in preventing representatives of the media, government officials (both elected and unelected), as well as professors and other educators from exploring the complex terrain of 9/11. All of the foregoing sorts of corporation seek to intimidate, bully, marginalize, isolate, contain, and/or penalize any threat to the status quo vis-a-vis the "officially sanctioned" narrative concerning 9/11.

Corporations like the foregoing have polluted the landscape of American democracy. They have been permitted to do this by politicians, both elected and unelected, as well as a judiciary at all levels that has illegitimately conferred a legally enforceable status of "personhood" upon corporations.

The precedent for entitling corporations to be treated as persons allegedly stems from an 1886 Supreme Court decision between Santa Clara County and the Southern Pacific Railway. However, in point of fact, the Supreme Court decision in relation to that case did not confer "personhood" on corporations but explicitly excluded such matters from consideration despite the attempts of lawyers for the railroad to argue that corporations should be considered as people who had rights under, for example, the 14th Amendment.

Unfortunately, subsequent jurists have failed to differentiate -- conveniently so it would appear -- that there is a difference between the head notes that are written by the court reporter transcribing the proceedings (in this case, J. C. Bancroft Davis) which have absolutely no legal weight and might not even be true (and in this case the head notes were incorrect), and the actual body and content of the Supreme Court decision. It was the court reporter, J.C. Bancroft Davis, a former railroad executive, who added, entirely on his own, initiative, that the case in question involved the fact that "The defendant Corporations

are persons within the intent of the clause in section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which forbids a State to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." [see Volume 118 of the United States Reports: Cases Adjudged in The Supreme Court at October Term 1885 and October term 1886, published in New York in 1886 by Banks and Brothers Publishers and written by J.C. Bancroft Davis).

The Supreme Court did not rule in 1886 that Corporations are persons. Since that time however an egregious legal fiction has been established that has continued to permit corporations to be treated as if they were the equivalent of human beings and should have all rights attendant thereto -- which has led, in turn, to the undermining of a great many facets of democracy.

The events of 9/11 are like the 1886 case between Santa Clara County and the Southern Pacific Railroad. The truths of these respective matters have been replaced by fictions that serve vested and well-entrenched interests.

-----

There are a lot of other c-words that come to mind with respect to the events of 9/11 and especially in relation to the manner in which the power elite is complicit in helping to perpetuate myths, fictions and false narratives concerning those events. For example, criminal, cynical, comatose, corrosive, churlish, conceited, childish, closed-minded, callous, craven, crude, cold-hearted, careless, cavalier, confused, creepy, crazy, controlling, catastrophic, cruel, catatonic, cancerous, connivance, counterfeit, cupidity, and callow are all appropriate terms to apply to what the power elite among the media, government officials (both elected and unelected) and educational institutions is, and has been doing, in relation to 9/11.

However, based on what already has been said in the previous pages with respect to the more lengthy c-entries, readers will, I believe, be able to intuit the drift of where my commentary might go in conjunction with such additional c-entries. Consequently, I will leave you with one final unelaborated c-entry with respect to my feelings about whatever the power elite might have to say in response to the foregoing material: caveat emptor -- let the buyer beware -- a term

that should have guided the thoughts of many individuals before, during, and after the events of 9/11.

-----



#### **14 - Communicating With Fearful Hearts**

The document that follows this introduction served as a covering letter for a book -- namely, *The Essence of September 11th* -- which was sent out to a variety of individuals ... mostly in Maine, but some were sent to people outside of Maine as well. The individuals to whom the packages were sent constituted a cross-section of people from a variety of backgrounds ranging from: editors of student newspapers, to: editors and publishers of community newspapers, a few professors, a couple of publishers, several heads of activist groups, along with some members of Congress.

I received back one brief response from the 35-40 books that had been mailed out. That letter of response thanked me for sending a copy of the book, acknowledged the commitment underlying the book's production, and indicated that, yes indeed, there were still many unanswered questions surrounding the tragic events of 9/11.

The other 39 individuals to whom the books were sent are, evidently, quite happy with the current situation and, apparently, are very comfortable with the fact that so many unanswered questions continue to swirl about the murder of some 3000 individuals on September 11th, 2001 -- murders that led to the further murder of tens of thousands of other innocents, at a cost of nearly a trillion dollars (and counting) ... victims who also had nothing to do with the perpetrating of the terrible acts of 9/11.

The failure of the people to whom I sent the following covering letter to respond to me, or to engage me, or to even acknowledge that a very serious problem is eating away at the moral and political fabric of democracy in America due to the many unanswered questions that continue to exist at the heart of 9/11 suggests two things to me: (1) the lack of moral integrity that serves as the core of so-called democracy in America; and, (2) just how fearful so many Americans are when it comes to not only facing questions that raise the specter that, perhaps, America is not as great as they assume it to be, but, in addition, just how fearful so many Americans are to even speak out against the many forms of injustice that are entailed by the institutional, media, academic, and governmental failure to rigorously pursue answers to the unsolved murders of 9/11.

-----

January 7, 2008

Hello,

More than six years have passed since the events of 9/11. Based on the results of a May, 2006 poll conducted by Zogby, it is estimated that 70 million voting-age citizens of the United States do not accept the 9/11 Commission's version of what transpired before, during, and after September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001. 45% of the Zogby sample felt there should be a new investigation into the events of 9/11. A Scripps Howard/Ohio University poll conducted in August of 2006 asked a different set of questions from the aforementioned Zogby poll in relation to 9/11 but came up with somewhat similar results indicating that approximately 36% of the American people not only reject the findings of *The 9/11 Commission Report* but, as well, harbor deeper anxieties concerning whom they believe might have been responsible, in part or in full, for the tragic events of 9/11.

On the basis of my own experience -- as well as according to the reports of an array of other individuals who have made the effort to exercise due diligence with respect to the matter of 9/11 -- many, if not most, of the people who have accepted the findings of the 9/11 Commission as being definitive (and this includes various facets of the media) have done so in a largely passive manner. That is, many of the supporters of the perspective given expression through the work of the 9/11 Commission have arrived at their position of support by, more or less, uncritically accepting the ideas and data being advanced by the 9/11 Commission while studiously eschewing any kind of rigorous, detailed, critical examination of either *The 9/11 Commission Report* or any of the other attempts (whether by government officials, members of academia, representatives of the media, or people claiming to have studied the matter scientifically) to lend credence to the aforementioned report.

Unfortunately, much of the current discussion revolves around one term: "conspiracy theories". Irrespective of whether, on the one hand, an individual is a proponent of the 9/11 Commission story in which 19 Arab hijackers conspired together with 'Usama bin Laden to

attack America, or, on the other hand, a person is an advocate of some other kind of conspiracy theory, both sides of this conspiracy theory discussion are caught up in their respective conspiracy paradigms, and, as a result, I believe they are focusing, to varying degrees, on the wrong set of issues. Consequently, such discussions all too frequently seem to be generating conflict-laden confrontations, rather than peaceful reconciliation, in relation to their collective concerns.

Before jumping to conclusions about who the perpetrators for 9/11 might be, perhaps we should consider concentrating on the following question: Do we actually know what happened with respect to 9/11? This might seem like a ludicrous proposal to advance at this stage of things, more than six years after 9/11 and with so much of the media convinced it has done due diligence on this matter despite a demonstrably woeful failure on the part of all too much of the media to judiciously investigate the available data concerning 9/11. However, the reality of the 9/11 situation is that no one (in relation to whatever side of this matter one considers) has come up with a defensible, empirically backed, rigorous understanding of 9/11. Instead, we are confronted with many questions in search of a unified, persuasive explanation.

My 'proof' of the foregoing claim is based upon the fact that there are far too many essential questions concerning 9/11 that have been left without satisfactory answers – questions that are outlined, documented, and explored in *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>* book accompanying this letter. The questions I have in mind are not the sort of small set of anomalies that often tend to be left over after, say, a good scientific investigation has been brought to a conclusion but which, nonetheless, leaves such residual matters unaddressed because the unanswered questions to which those marginal matters allude do not appreciably affect the principle conclusions of an investigation that is solidly rooted in evidence existing independently of such anomalous trivialities. Rather, the unanswered questions alluded to above have to do with a multiplicity of critical themes that plague absolutely every facet of the scenario that has been constructed by *The 9/11 Commission Report* (as well as many other treatments of 9/11) – from the Commission's account of the events taking place before 9/11, to

the Commission's account of the events occurring on 9/11, to the Commission's account of the events that have transpired since 9/11.

I have always believed in the importance of tackling any issue with a methodical rigor that searches for whatever truths might be unearthed in relation to an issue being explored. I believe in the value of empirical data, and I also believe in the need to subject all such data to a scrupulous, impartial, objective examination that will bring out the strengths, problems, and lacunae inherent in that data.

*The 9/11 Commission Report* has not conducted such an investigation. In fact, in many ways *The 9/11 Commission Report* is colored more by what it excludes, as well as the mistakes it makes in relation to what it does include, and both factors give a rather disconcerting hue of empirical and methodological sloppiness to that document.

The final *NIST Report* (National Institute of Standards and Technology, a division of the Department of Commerce) that purports to provide an explanation for why several steel-framed buildings at Ground Zero came down on 9/11 has not conducted such an investigation. This is true in spite of its 10,000 pages of charts, graphs, experimental results, and analysis by an array of government-sponsored engineers and scientists.

Moreover, for nearly two years, NIST has been promising to release a report that supposedly explains how Building 7 at the World Trade complex came down. However, NIST has failed to live up to its promises in this respect.

To be sure, NIST has released some preliminary material concerning its ideas about what they believe might have happened in conjunction with Building 7. Nonetheless, their narrative is little more than a general description of the issue – a description that is almost totally devoid of any substantive data capable of demonstrating the reasonableness or even plausibility of such an account.

The *FEMA Report* on the destruction of the World Trade Towers has not conducted the sort of investigation into the destruction of World Trade buildings that is conducive to having confidence in its conclusions with respect to such matters. In addition, the FEMA report is largely baffled by the problem of explaining how Building 7 at the



World Trade Center complex came down and comes up with an account that, by its own admission, has only a very low probability of being a viable explanation for the collapse of Bldg. 7.

*The Pentagon Building Performance Report* concerning events at the Pentagon on 9/11 has not conducted an investigation capable of convincing anyone other than the ones who participated in the report that it constitutes a reliable and credible study. Indeed, aside from being obscured by a lack of transparency concerning many facets of its research, the report fails to address a number of issues and questions that bear upon the issue of providing a viable account of what took place at the Pentagon.

A Popular Mechanics study-- compiled and updated as the book *Debunking 9/11 Myths* -- did not give expression to anything remotely resembling a rigorous investigation. In fact, the finished 'study' by Popular Mechanics resembles something more akin to what might be produced through junk science than anything that should inspire confidence in an individual attempting to exercise some modicum of independent, critical reflection.

In contrast with all of the foregoing studies and reports, my book, *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>*, attempts to achieve just one basic goal. More specifically, the accompanying book seeks to demonstrate why there are an abundance of important questions that have not yet been -- and, therefore, still need to be -- satisfactorily answered before the matter of 9/11 (together with the lives that were lost on 9/11 and the families who lost loved ones on 9/11) can be laid to a just resting place.

I don't have a theory about who the guilty parties were on 9/11 (and you might, or might not, be surprised by the fact that if you go to the FBI website you will discover that 'Usama bin Laden is not wanted by the FBI in conjunction with 9/11, although he is wanted for other events, and that, in a separate context, Robert Mueller, the director of the FBI, has stated there is no paper trail connecting bin Laden to 9/11). Nevertheless, I do believe there needs to be a new, non-partisan (which is quite different concept from bi-partisan), methodical, and rigorous investigation into the events surrounding 9/11. I believe a new publicly-funded inquiry into 9/11 -- one with full subpoena power (which unlike the 9/11 Commission is actually

exercised) and that is fully transparent to America and the world -- needs to be established in order to accomplish what none of the aforementioned 'official reports' were able to do... namely, to find the truth concerning 9/11 ... or, at least, as much of the truth as can be ascertained at this stage of things. I believe such an inquiry must be carried out by people who -- unlike all of the reports and studies mentioned previously -- have no conflicts of interest that might interfere with, or be perceived by the public as being capable of interfering with, the ability of such investigators and researchers to carry out a thorough, objective, and exacting inquiry into all facets of 9/11.

*The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>* is my contribution toward providing some of the rationale for establishing such a new investigation. This work is not a definitive treatment of everything having to do with 9/11, but the book accompanying this introductory letter does raise an array of questions that I believe need to be addressed by all Americans.

I hope you will read this entire book in a critically reflective manner. I don't purport to have 'the' answers, but I do have a lot of questions ... questions that I feel any member of this democracy ought to be asking and concerning which, hopefully, responsible citizens ought to be seeking defensible, satisfactory resolution.

I am not asking you to take sides with respect to whose -- if anyone's -- conspiracy theory should be championed, and this is true irrespective of whether such theories are promulgated by the government or by those who stand in opposition to the government's own version of a conspiracy theory concerning 9/11. What I am asking you to do is to be an advocate for establishing truth and justice concerning 9/11 so that the controversies surrounding such conspiracy theories -- controversies that are helping to tear this country apart -- will be brought to a felicitous end. I believe that reading *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>* might be as good a place as any through which to begin a healthy, constructive, and just journey to final closure with respect to such a goal.

Anab Whitehouse

-----





**15 -Explosive Questions For 9/11**

Have you heard about the living-dead who  
Move among us as a corrupted moral  
Essence ... though several commissions have tried  
To mask their presence?

Did you heed the call of ideology  
To stay clear of outrageous theories of  
Conspiracy which was shamelessly spun  
From defective yarns?

Did you know there are engineers whose souls  
Show fault lines that placed humanity at  
Risk by setting evil free to commit  
more atrocities?

I have many questions about that day.  
For instance I would like to hear what they  
Have to say concerning Building Seven.  
Explosive questions that won't go away.

Do you proudly hail members of Congress  
Whose hearts suffer from a malady of  
Conscience that has left them deaf, dumb, and blind  
to September crimes?

Are you informed, now that the media  
Has confused propaganda with facts while  
Urging us to adopt paranoia  
As a way of life?

Did you salute the cool bravery of  
Military leaders who completely  
Shirked their duty toward an enemy both  
Foreign and home-grown?

I have many questions about that day.  
For instance I would like to hear what they  
Have to say concerning Pierre Bunel.  
Explosive questions that won't go away.

Have you been properly enlightened  
By professors who arbitrarily  
Treat duplicity as a quality  
Of truth and justice?

Do you feel safer from the terrorists  
Who roam freely within halls of justice ...  
Guilty not of failed intelligence but  
failed integrity?

Does your heart not soar on taxed wings of the  
Heirs to nine-eleven – more war, torture,  
Tyranny, and an obscenely healthy  
Defense industry?

I have many questions about that day.  
For instance I would like to hear what they  
Have to say concerning David Schippers.  
Explosive questions that won't go away.

## 16 - Methodical Perspective

[I began researching 9/11 in 2004-2005. There were a variety of reasons why I was late to the process ... some of which have been outlined toward the beginning of the present book.

I didn't come across the Methodical Series of books by Rebekah Roth until about a year ago. Although written in a fictional format, there is a great deal of important information woven into the pages of her story -- information that bears directly on a number of the chapters of this book -- and, therefore, I decided to include a chapter that provides something of an overview of her own research and, in the process, help update (and complement) some of the material in the present book. ]

Rebekah Roth is the nom de plume for an individual who had been a flight attendant for more than thirty years. She called upon the knowledge and expertise she had garnered from all those years in the aviation industry to serve as a resource for acquiring, and, then, sharing, insight into various aspects of 9/11.

More specifically, over a period of several years -- with research beginning somewhere around 2007 -- she began to write the first volume of the *Methodical* trilogy (*Methodical Illusions*, *Methodical Deception*, and *Methodical Conclusion*). The trilogy is a fictionalized story that is utilized as a method for introducing readers to an array of facts and ideas concerning the events of 9/11.

Once written, the manuscript gathered dust on a shelf for several years while she tried to figure out how to proceed. At some point a few years later, as another 9/11 anniversary approached, she had a two-hour conversation with a retired New York City firefighter.

During the ensuing conversation, the person with whom she was speaking indicated how many of the bodies of the more than 300 firefighters that had been recovered from the World Trade Center had been almost completely disintegrated. To degrade the human body to that degree requires a great deal of heat and pressure -- much more than could be generated by the sort of fires that, according to the official story, occurred at the World Trade Center on 9/11 -- and, such information, along with other facets of the foregoing conversation,

induced Rebekah Roth to try to find a way to publish her already completed manuscript.

Some people have objected to the fictional format in which Rebekah Roth embedded the 9/11 information. However, she went about things in the literary manner she did – and quite legitimately I believe -- in an attempt to engage readers in a way that many people might find more amenable to their style of thinking about various issues and, perhaps, as a result, her readers found the relevant data somewhat less intimidating than might have been the case if she had written some didactic exposition encompassing the events of 9/11..

Jean Paul Sartre, a French philosopher of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, once indicated that he felt novels, plays, short stories, and the like had a potential for exploring existential issues in a way that might be difficult to convey through a non-fictional format. Consequently, Rebekah Roth's *Methodical* trilogy is not without its justification for assuming the form it does.

Other people seem to have taken exception with the fact that Rebekah Roth's efforts have been commercially successful ... as if there were some unwritten rule of the universe that stipulated how commercial success and searching for the truth were inherently incompatible with one another. I, for one, am happy about her success because that success means a lot of people who might not otherwise have begun to think critically about the issues of 9/11 have started to do so as a result of reading the *Methodical* trilogy.

Although I had been seeing references, now and again, to the work of Rebekah Roth for a couple of years, I was busy with other projects and, therefore, was unable to begin to investigate her research until a few months ago. However, during the month of Ramadan, I took the time to read the *Methodical* trilogy, as well as to listen to and view a half dozen, or so, presentations and interviews that she had done in conjunction with those books.

Reading fictional stories and engaging information about 9/11 might not seem very spiritual in character. Nonetheless, I believe that seeking the truth is always an exercise in spirituality.

The following material does not exhaust what Rebekah Roth has to offer and is only intended to serve as a very brief overview of, or



introduction to, her research. Therefore, for those who have not already done so, I would urge readers of the present chapter to go to any of Rebekah Roth's websites and/or read her trilogy in order to get a fuller, more detailed account of her understanding of 9/11.

Before purchasing her trilogy series, and as indicated earlier, I listened to, and watched, a number of presentations and interviews she did. The first recording to which I listened started off with a bang.

Toward the beginning of the that presentation, Rebekah Roth indicated how, based on Freedom of Information requests (she has over a terabyte of such information now), she was able to access, among other things, an mp3 recording that had been uploaded to the FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C. on 9/11. The recording featured the voice of Mohammed Atta – one of the supposed leaders of the 19 Arabs who, allegedly, hijacked planes on 9/11 and flew those craft into three high-profile targets in America.

The aforementioned recorded voice had an Israeli accent, and Mohammed Atta's parents – who, following 9/11, had been interviewed by a journalist from Britain -- indicated during the interview that not only did their son work for Mossad (the Israeli national intelligence agency) but, as well, the parents related that they had spoken to him following 9/11 (on the 12<sup>th</sup> of September) and, therefore, despite the alleged demise of Flight 11 on 9/11, its supposed hijack pilot – Mohammed Atta – was still alive ... at least at that time. The words Mohammed Atta allegedly spoke on the mp3 being referenced above were: "We have some planes. We're going back to the airport."

One of the intriguing aspects of the foregoing mp3 recording is that according to the meta-data associated with the recording, the short statement was uploaded to FAA headquarters at 6:27 a.m. on the morning of September 11, 2001. This was approximately an hour prior to the time when American Airlines Flight 11 was slated to push back from the terminal and begin to taxi toward its appointment with 'wheels up'.

Another interesting aspect of the foregoing recording is that the FAA had the material copyrighted. Why someone at the FAA would pursue such a course of action raises a lot of issues that deserve answers ... especially given that the recording obviously had been put

together in a place and at a time that was well-before any alleged hijacking of Flight 11 had taken place.

Prior to becoming the first woman administrator for the FAA in 1997 (her term ended in 2002), Jane Garvey had been the director of Boston's Logan Airport. As the director of Logan, she would have known that her facility – along with many others -- was subjected to a yearly review process by the FAA so that the operation could be endorsed as a certified airport, and, consequently, she likely would have known, based on her personal experience at Logan, that the airport had not, yet, installed security cameras.

Among other things, this meant there was no video footage at Logan that was capable of identifying the hijackers who, supposedly, boarded Flights 11 and 175 at that airport on the morning of September 11, 2001. Since nearly half of the alleged hijackers supposedly went through Logan on 9/11 and despite the fact that, within 72 hours of the hijackings, the FBI had released photos and names revealing the alleged identity of the hijackers, nonetheless, there were at least 9 of the 19 hijackers whose identity could not possibly have been known by the FBI in any factual manner ... especially in light of the fact that the names of the so-called hijackers did not appear on any of the original (unaltered) passenger manifests for Flights 11 and 175.

In the aforementioned presentation, Rebekah Roth informs her viewing audience that after the first book in her *Methodical* trilogy had been published, many flight attendants got in touch with her to let her know that Mohammed Atta was a million-mile passenger. Aside from being recognized by, and known to (including one's name), all of the regular flight attendants for American Airlines, one of the perks associated with being a million-mile passenger was that regardless of circumstances (such as showing up at Logan airport at the last minute as, supposedly, Mohammed Atta did on the morning of 9/11 -- due to an alleged side-trip to Portland, Maine), the luggage of a million-mile passenger would never be left off a flight as occurred in the case of Mohammed Atta.

In other words, the implication of Rebekah Roth's foregoing point is that the luggage of Mohammed Atta's that, after 9/11, was uncovered at Logan airport was meant to be found. She considers the

luggage to be a plant that had been intended to implicate Mohammed Atta as an active participant in the events of 9/11 ... much as the slightly-worse-for-wear passport for Mohammed Atta that was later “found” on a street near the destroyed World Trade Center in New York seems to have been a plant.

Moreover, three of the individuals who were identified by the FBI as having been aboard the hijacked Flight 11 on 9/11 – including someone who was working in Florida as a flight instructor -- later turned out to be alive and kicking elsewhere in the world . This is a rather remarkable fact given that those individuals supposedly had died when their plane allegedly crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center on 9/11, while a fourth, alleged hijacker identified by the FBI as having been on Flight 11 was discovered to have died in a small plane crash precisely one year prior to 9/11.

The FBI was batting 0 for 5 in relation to establishing the identity of alleged hijackers on Flight 11. Yet, the FBI never changed its stance concerning who it considered responsible for hijacking Flight 11 or it considered responsible for any of the other alleged hijacked flights that supposedly took place on that day despite the fact that its information concerning the alleged identity of individuals purportedly involved in the latter hijackings also suffered from the same sort of reliability issues as did the information concerning the alleged hijackers of Flight 11.

Rebekah Roth spends a great deal of time in the various presentations and interviews that I watched going over the details of the statements and actions of various flight attendants who, supposedly, made calls from their respective airplanes while flying at altitude on 9/11. Because she had been a flight attendant for more than three decades, Rebekah Roth was very familiar with the FAA protocols and training that form the woof and warp of a flight attendant’s professional life, and, one of the many things that bothered her about the events of 9/11, is that although the media were describing the flight attendants as heroes and heroines, the fact of the matter was that none of the flight attendants who had been recorded on 9/11 were operating in accordance with the FAA protocols for hijackings, nor were they behaving in a way that reflected what their professional training should have inclined them to be doing.

To say that something peculiar was going on in conjunction with the comportment of flight attendants in relation to Flights 11, 175, and 93 on 9/11 would be a gross understatement (there are no recordings involving flight attendants on Flight 77). However, as will be pointed out shortly, Rebekah Roth began to look more closely at such behavior, and this became one of the keys that helped her grasp what might have taken place on the morning of 9/11.

Another red flag concerning the official account of 9/11 that surfaced for Rebekah Roth during her research involved the 302 witness statements that had been taken by the FBI in conjunction with various aspects of that day's events. Among other things, she discovered information had been removed and/or altered in relation to a number of 9/11-related 302s.

Rebekah Roth first began to dig into anomalies concerning various FBI 302 statements in conjunction with the Zacharias Moussaoui trial that had taken place a few years earlier. She discovered that a number of those reports had been altered after the fact, and she began to find similar sorts of anomalies in relation to the FBI's 302 statements involving certain aspects of the alleged events of 9/11.

For example, Betty Ong was a flight attendant on American Airlines Flight 11. The FBI had statements concerning phone calls that, allegedly, she had made while flying above 2,000 feet, and Rebekah Roth found evidence indicating that different aspects of those statements subsequently had been altered by the FBI.

According to some of the statements being alluded to, Betty Ong had been using an air phone that was located near the jump seat she said she was occupying at 3-right (which is situated toward the rear of the airplane). The only problem with the foregoing claim is that Rebekah Roth stipulates that all such air phones had been de-activated by American Airlines as of January 31, 2001 ... more than seven months prior to September 11, 2001.

In addition, Betty Ong couldn't possibly have made the foregoing phone calls using a cell phone at altitudes approaching 20,000 feet or above - which is where she would have been at the times her recorded calls supposedly were made on the morning of 9/11. So, whether one is talking about air phones or cell phones, Betty Ong couldn't have made phone calls while aloft on American Airlines Flight 11, yet,

Rebekah Roth found that a number of the FBI's 302 statements for 9/11 indicated how various aspects of the conversations that supposedly came from the four hijacked planes were being altered after the fact ... something that, theoretically at least, should not be happening in conjunction with those kinds of statements.

Similarly, irrespective of the multiplicity of conflicting versions given by Ted Olson -- he was Solicitor General for the United States at the time -- concerning the events that took place on the morning of 9/11, nonetheless, his wife, Barbara Olson -- who, supposedly, was a passenger on American Airlines 77 that allegedly hit the Pentagon on 9/11 -- could not have phoned him by means of an on-board air phone. As indicated previously, those phones had been de-activated by American Airlines some seven months earlier.

Moreover, Barbara Olson could not have called her husband via cell phone either. The calls she supposedly made would have had to have occurred when she was above 2,000 feet, and, therefore, in light of the cell phone technology that was available in 2001, Barbara Olson would not have been able to contact her husband from altitude.

Calls, of one kind or another -- some by flight attendants and some by passengers -- were allegedly made from all four of the hijacked planes on 9/11. For a variety of reasons -- which Rebekah Roth explores at length during various presentations and interviews she has given -- the available evidence seems to indicate that all those calls could not have been made while any of the, allegedly, hijacked airplanes were in the air but, were likely made, while at some location on the ground.

Rebekah Roth used the information (involving, for instance, the times and length of phone calls) that she obtained through FOI requests -- either her own or those of others -- to begin to piece together a picture of what might have happened on the morning of 9/11. For example, by combining information concerning the timing of all of the foregoing calls and juxtaposing that data with other FOI information she obtained concerning Flights 11, 175, 77, and 93, she was able to deduce that all four flights could have been taken -- without being detected by radar -- to Westover Air Force Base in western Massachusetts (the location from which Rebekah Roth believes the various calls from the "hijacked" planes were actually made) since that

base was the only candidate – within the requisite flight distance for all four “hijacked” planes -- that had the necessary minimum length runway (10,000 feet) to land large commercial jet planes and, in addition, possessed hangars that were sufficiently large to be able to hide four commercial jets since the hangars at Westover Air Force base normally were used to house C-5 military transports that are much larger than commercial jets.

Aside from the fact that the times of the alleged phone calls were consistent with the idea that all four planes could have been diverted to Westover Air Force Base within the temporal and logistical parameters that were fixed by an array of events on the morning of 9/11, there were four other pieces of information that are consistent with, or relevant to, Rebekah Roth’s identification of Westover Air Force Base as being the likely destination for the four hijacked flights of 9/11. To begin with, since the release of the first two installments of the *Methodical* trilogy, Rebekah Roth indicates that independently of one another, several individuals have come forward in western Massachusetts and reported that on the morning of 9/11 they observed a large commercial jet that flew so low to the ground near Westover Air Force Base that the individuals thought the planes were going to crash.

In each case the planes being identified seemed to be different from one another (i.e., the two individuals did not appear to be talking about the same plane). The planes to which the individuals were referring also appeared to fit the description of American Airlines Flight 11 and United Airlines Flight 175.

In addition to the foregoing eye-witness accounts, Rebekah Roth also heard from members of the Massachusetts National Guard following the publication of *Methodical Illusions*. Those individuals reported for duty at Westover Air Force Base on the morning of 9/11 in response to the events of that morning.

However, those individuals were not permitted to enter Westover Air Force Base. Instead, without any explanation being given, they were billeted in local hotels for a number of days.

Thirdly, Rebekah Roth relates an incident in which she was contacted by the son of one of the flight attendants who, supposedly, died on 9/11. According to the young man – who was just a young boy

in 2001 – his father took him on a drive prior to 9/11 and told his son that he (i.e., the father) was going to take the job that had been offered to him by the CIA ... a possibility about which his child previously had been informed by his father.

The father went on to tell the boy that when he (the father) took the job, he would never be able to see his son again. Rebekah Roth claims that this sort of scenario is only likely if a person's death were going to be faked at some point in the future.

Apropos of the foregoing information, Rebekah Roth indicates that following the publication of *Methodical Conclusion* (3<sup>rd</sup> book in the trilogy), she was contacted by a variety of flight attendants indicating that being recruited by the CIA was a fairly common occurrence among flight attendants and other aviation personnel. Apparently, the CIA liked airline employees because the jobs of the latter individuals not only offered a great cover for off-book assignments but, in addition, flight attendants often had schedules containing a lot of free time during which the flight attendants would be able to carry out CIA assignments.

Prior to being contacted by the son of one of the flight attendants that, supposedly, had died on 9/11, Rebekah Roth had not been willing to entertain the possibility that individuals employed by the airlines industry might be willing participants in the perpetration of a deception of the American people. Nevertheless, her contact with the son of a flight attendant who had told her about the conversation he had with his flight attendant father prior to 9/11 helped her to overcome her resistance to, and cognitive dissonance toward, the idea that airline employees might be willing to betray their fiduciary responsibilities to the airline company for which they worked as well as be willing to betray their duties of care involving passengers.

The foregoing anecdote involving a boy whose flight attendant father appears to have taken a job with the CIA prior to 9/11 and, as a result, seemed to know that he (i.e., the father) was going to have to disappear – and, then, actually did disappear (all four “hijacked” planes supposedly disintegrated on 9/11, leaving no trace behind) -- does not directly link with the Westover Air Force Base. Nonetheless, it does provide evidence suggesting that people within the airline industry might have been willing to participate in a CIA operation that

had something to do with their jobs as flight attendants and, therefore, had something to do with the “hijacking” incidents that took place on 9/11.

Finally, it turns out that, apparently, the sheriff for the county that surrounds the northern, northwestern, and western borders of Westover Air Force Base was married to someone whose name we have heard previously. More specifically, the sheriff for the foregoing areas in Western Massachusetts on 9/11 that are of potential interest to Rebekah Roth’s investigation was reported to have been married to Jane Garvey, who -- on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 -- was administrator for the FAA.

Of course, the foregoing might be apropos of nothing. On the other hand, such information might be worthy of a thorough investigation in order to determine whether there is something more to such connections than coincidence.

The FAA also is connected to another set of anomalous events on 9/11 that makes Rebekah Roth’s “spidey-sense” tingle. This involves Delta Flight 1989.

As the foregoing flight – which was heading to Los Angeles -- is approaching Cleveland on the morning of 9/11, the FAA contacts the captain of the plane and informs him that not only does he have a hijacker on board but there is also a bomb present on the craft. Rebekah Roth has recordings and transcripts of the Captain’s conversation with the FAA concerning the foregoing set of events, and the Captain is reported as saying to FAA officials: “We’re not having a hijacking, we’re having breakfast ... the flight attendants are serving breakfast ... there’s nothing going on.”

However, the FAA officials in Washington, D.C. continue to insist that there is a hijacker and bomb on board of Flight 1989. The Captain is ordered to land the plane in Cleveland ... which he does.

Rebekah Roth indicates that the foregoing sequence of events is not the way things take place. Officials from FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C. would never contact the captain of a commercial flight and inform him or her about a hijacking that is supposedly going on in the captain’s plane.



Flight attendants are the first individuals to know about a hijacking that is taking place on a commercial airline. They inform officers in the cockpit, and, the officers relay that information to flight controllers on the ground, and, then, that information is passed on to other FAA officials, and, eventually, after going through a couple of dozen steps, such information finds its way to FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Upon investigating further, Rebekah Roth discovered that Delta Flight 1989 was listed as having crashed on 9/11. However, the plane wasn't involved in any kind of accident on that day but, instead, landed safely in Cleveland.

Nonetheless, the foregoing incident could be linked to another reported accident on 9/11 that also never occurred. More specifically, around 10:20 or 10:30 a.m. that morning, a purported member of the Secret Service supposedly called CNN to inform the news agency that a commercial plane had crashed at Camp David.

To begin with, Secret Service protocol does not involve notifying news agencies about plane crashes. Moreover, no plane actually crashed at Camp David.

Rebekah Roth believes that, conceivably, just as Flights 11 and 175 were scheduled to “crash” into the Twin Towers (but did not) and just as Flight 77 was scheduled to “hit” the Pentagon (but did not), so, too, Flight 1989 was supposed to “crash” near Camp David. Apparently, something went awry with the latter plan.

According to Rebekah Roth, several years before 9/11, flight termination systems -- sometimes referred to as flight interruption systems -- were installed on commercial jets, including the planes associated with Flights 11, 175, 77, and 93 that, allegedly had been hijacked on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001. Delta Flight 1989 might have been another plane that was scheduled for “hijacking” on 9/11 that had had a flight termination system installed at some previous point in time.

Various models of those termination systems have been around since at least the early 1990s (the system is used in drone technology). In the event of various kinds of in-air problems -- such as a hijacking -- the flight termination process could be activated, and this enabled

people on the ground to take over control of such craft and land them safely at designated airports.

The flight termination system is turned on much like a phone operates. In other words, each plane has a specific activation frequency associated with it, and, when that frequency is sent out, the flight termination system for that plane is turned on, and this enables pilots on the ground to take over control of the plane.

However, from time to time, as a result of some kind of mechanical or electrical problem with a plane, a last-minute switch is made, and another craft is used. When this occurs, the radio frequency for activating the flight termination system changes, and, consequently, if the people trying to activate that system were not aware of the last-minute switch in aircraft, then, a commercial plane that was scheduled to have a “crash” – say at Camp David – would not do so, and other people who also were not aware of the switch – say, purported Secret Service personnel -- would report that a crash had occurred when this was not the case.

Rebekah Roth believes that someone at FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C. became aware -- possibly through either of the two companies (P-Tech or MITRE) that were in the basement of the FAA’s headquarters on 9/11-- that this part of the operation had to be scrubbed. As a result, the captain of Delta Flight 1989 was contacted by someone from FAA headquarters who told Delta’s Captain a story about hijackers and a bomb being on board and ordered the Captain to land in Cleveland so that handlers on the plane – who were supposed to end up at Westover Air Force Base – would be able to deplane and disappear.

When the flight termination system is activated, it shuts down all communications within the plane as well as between the plane and the ground. In addition, it prevents pilots from activating the 7500 responder code that notifies flight controllers that a plane has been hijacked.

The foregoing factors tend to provide a context for a number of statements made by some of the flight attendants who were aboard some of the ill-fated flights on 9/11. For instance, one of the flight attendants had been recorded as saying that she had not been able to contact pilots in the cockpit, and this would have been consistent with

a scenario in which a flight termination system had been activated and, consequently, communication between the cabin and the cockpit would have been cut off.

On the other hand, if, as Rebekah Roth believes, the phone calls that were recorded in conjunction with the “hijacked” airplanes actually took place on the ground rather than in the air, then, one is not entirely certain what to make of some of the content that occurs in those recorded calls. For example, if the flight termination system already had brought the “hijacked” planes to a successful landing at, say, Westover Air Force Base, then, why provide information that could serve as an important clue concerning the possible role that flight termination systems actually might have played in the events of 9/11?

Then, again, the flight termination scenario could lend significance to the following possibility. More specifically, despite the fact that on the morning of 9/11 all four “hijacked” planes were being flown by seasoned pilots of many years experience, not one of those pilots activated the foregoing code. Given that all of the pilots on the hijacked planes had failed on that day to follow standard protocol (as far as activating the four-digit responder signal – 7500 -- indicating that a hijacking was in progress), such a universal failure could be explained by the possibility that before any of the pilots knew what was happening to their airplane, the flight termination systems on those craft had been activated by a person, or by persons, unknown and, as a result, the pilots were prevented from contacting air traffic controllers, either via radio or via the previously noted four-digit emergency code.

Another interesting dimension to the flight termination system aspect of things is that, apparently, the technology was invented by a company known as SPC. The CEO of that company, Rabbi Dov Zackheim, just happened to be the same individual who was Comptroller of the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 and was being investigated by the Army Audit Office of the Pentagon as well as the Office of Naval Intelligence in conjunction with 2.3 trillion dollars in the Pentagon budget that couldn't be accounted for and that had been announced as being MIA by Donald Rumsfeld on the day before 9/11 ... and, oh yes, the offices of both of the foregoing investigatory units were among those that were blown up at the Pentagon on 9/11.

There is a section of the first book in her trilogy – namely, *Methodical Illusions* – in which one of the primary characters – Vera Hanson – has a conversation with a character by the name of Gary Gill who, among other things, informs her about his experiences in relation to 9/11. Rebekah Roth maintains that the foregoing conversation actually occurred, and the person to whom the Gary Gill character alludes really exists, but his name has been changed in the book to protect his identity.

According to the real-world individual behind the Gary Gill character, he had been inside and outside the Pentagon on the morning of 9/11. He saw no evidence that a 757 commercial jet actually crashed into the Pentagon on that day [and this corroborates the testimony of another military witness – April Gallop – who also indicated that although she had been at Ground Zero when explosions occurred at the Pentagon on 9/11, she saw no evidence (in the form of wreckage, fuselage, engines, tail, luggage, or bodies) of a plane crash as she left the building].

Rebekah Roth remembers the 9/11 reports of Jamie McIntyre -- at the time he was Senior Pentagon correspondent for CNN – who indicated that he did not see any evidence of a plane crash at the Pentagon. As a flight attendant, Rebekah Roth had gone through years of training in relation to the issue of plane crashes, and, therefore, she knows what they look like, but on the morning of 9/11, there didn't seem to be – as there should have been -- any parts of a 757 that were visible at the Pentagon or in the field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

During the same aforementioned conversation that was being given expression through the voice of the fictional character, Gary Gill, the actual special forces soldier whose story is being told by Rebekah Roth also relates how a few weeks following 9/11, he had been deployed to Afghanistan and saw 'Usama bin Laden on several occasions. However, the real-life Gary Gill – along with his comrades – had been given specific orders by people very high up in the chain of command not to shoot bin Laden ... apparently because bin Laden was more valuable to the war effort as a live "terrorist" than as a dead one.

There are an additional set of connections that are mentioned by Rebekah Roth that have to do with the military. For instance, she

identifies Colonel Robert Marr as a person of interest in her investigation.

Prior to 9/11 he had been called out of retirement to be the head of NEADS (The Northeast section of NORAD). On 9/11 he became entangled in the whole fiasco surrounding the scrambling of air defense forces.

Before assuming his duties at NEADS, he had been working with Phoenix Air that, among other things, was involved in the rendition of prisoners. Somewhat more intriguingly, Phoenix Air also was associated with Hoffman Aviation.

According to the government's version of things, Hoffman Aviation was the place where Mohammed Atta and Waleed al-Shehri supposedly received flight training. Rebekah Roth finds it interesting that there could be a possible link (via Phoenix Air and Hoffman Aviation) between Colonel Robert Marr, who played a role on 9/11 with respect to the numerous problems surrounding the scrambling of jets on that day, and the training of the aforementioned two alleged terrorists.

In addition to the Betty Ong phone calls, Rebekah Roth also looked into another set of calls that were supposedly made at altitude from American Airlines Flight 11. These calls involved Amy Sweeney who also was a flight attendant.

During her calls, Amy Sweeney identified the hijacker as someone who had been sitting in 9B. According to the passenger manifest, the person in 9B was an American-Israeli dual citizen by the name of Daniel Lewin.

After doing some research, Rebekah Roth discovered that Daniel Lewin was a member of Sayeret Matkal, a special-forces unit of the Israeli Defense Forces that has expertise in, among other things, hostage rescue and hijackings.

Amy Sweeney described Lewin as someone who spoke perfect English. He also spoke Hebrew and Arabic.

The official story has Lewin sitting directly in front of two of the alleged hijackers of Flight 11. That same story also indicates that Lewin was killed by the two aforementioned, alleged hijackers when they decapitated him by using a plastic box cutter.

However, Lewin was well-trained in martial arts. People who knew him in Israel said he was the best of the best ... someone that could kill anyone and do so with nothing more than a credit card and a pen.

Yet, two Arab hijackers who were 5 feet 6 inches, or so, in height -- that, also, were armed with just flimsy plastic box cutters that would have had, difficulty cutting a piece of chicken -- supposedly overpowered someone who was highly trained in martial arts, as well as overpowered someone who was an expert in hostage rescue and disruption of hijacking scenarios. At best, the official story seems highly unlikely at this point if not rather preposterous sounding.

One's skepticism concerning the foregoing portion of the official story tends to deepen when one learns that among the passengers of the four "hijacked planes" there were individuals who were, about, 6-2, 225 lb., (including: a judo champion, a hockey player, a rugby player, as well as a number of other individuals who were gym-rats and, therefore, quite fit), and, yet, none of these individuals challenged some Arabs who were diminutive in stature, armed, for the most part, with nothing more than box cutters.

In addition, the cockpit of every commercial aircraft is equipped with a crash ax. Why didn't the pilots -- all of whom were ex-military -- use those weapons to fight off the hijackers with box cutters?

Another mysterious dimension of 9/11 pointed out by Rebekah Roth concerned the activity of the cell phone that belonged to Flight 93's Todd Beamer -- the media hero of "Let's roll" fame. More specifically, according to phone records that were subsequently obtained by investigators, on 9/11, Todd Beamer's cell phone continued to make and receive calls until between 8:00 and 9:00 p.m. that night, ten to eleven hours after the commercial jet supposedly disintegrated upon impact at Shanksville, Pennsylvania (but, quite coincidentally, the plane did not disintegrate before ejecting the non-titanium passport of Ziad Jerrah, one of the alleged hijackers).

An additional red flag for Rebekah Roth involved the ELT system on airplanes. This is the Electronic Locator Transmitter that is activated when a plane crashes and enables search crews to quickly find the downed aircraft.

On September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, the ELT system for American Airlines Flight 11 was activated at 8:44 a.m. However, this presents something of a problem because the time of the ELT's activation is two minutes before something -- allegedly Flight 11 -- crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center.

One might also keep in mind that two companies were in the basement of the FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C. on the morning of 9/11. They were involved in various facets of the 37, or more, war games that were being orchestrated on that day.

Those companies were P-Tech and MITRE. They had the technical capabilities to create bogies on the radar screens of both military and civilian flight controllers, and those two companies also had the capacity to remove blips from radar screens as well as alter the information (such as operating velocity) that was associated with those blips.

There was a considerable amount of bogie creation, blip disappearance, and information altering that was taking place in conjunction with radar monitoring during the morning of September 11, 2001. Such events were creating a great deal of confusion on both the civilian as well as the military sides of things, and, on more than one occasion during the morning of 9/11, various people were asking whether what was being reported or "seen" on radar screens was real world or virtual world in nature.

Incidentally, several of the many facets of government that come under the supervision of the MITRE organization are the FAA and NIST. NIST is the government agency that -- to be kind -- severely botched the investigations into the cause of the collapse of three buildings at the World Trade Center on 9/11, and the FAA seems to be intimately connected -- both directly and indirectly -- with a great many problematic events that took place on 9/11.

With help from a variety of aviation experts (air traffic controllers and pilots), Rebekah Roth, eventually, uncovered another piece of information amidst the terabyte of FOI information she had acquired. This information had to do with the operational status of a number of east coast radar facilities since, for one reason or another, many of those installations (including long-distance radar facilities) ranging

northward from Cape Cod and extending up toward Bangor, Maine were not functional on 9/11.

Given all of the foregoing information, an obvious question to ask Rebekah Roth is what happened to the people on the “hijacked” flights that, according to her, were transported to Westover Air Force Base. The answer is fairly simple and straightforward.

The individuals on those planes (whether flight attendants, pilots, or “passengers”) who were part of the 9/11 operation were, within a relatively short period of time, placed on another plane and whisked away to a life of anonymity somewhere else in the world. However, the individuals on those planes who were not part of the operation were eliminated ... just as thousands of people in the World Trade Center had been eliminated and just as many people at the Pentagon had been eliminated.

Amidst the data on the terabyte of FOI material obtained by Rebekah Roth is information indicating that on the evening of 9/11, 3 medevac planes (DC 9s) flew into Andrews Air Force Base in Maryland at 9:40 p.m. Apparently, these planes all came in from the same area – possibly from Westover -- and had a landing sequence that was spaced out at 3 to 6 minute intervals.

Medevac planes are used to transport dead bodies and injured soldiers. The only military personnel that lost their lives on 9/11 were at the Pentagon and, consequently, there would have been no reason to use medevac planes to transport those individuals to Andrews.

According to Rebekah Roth, the foregoing three medevac planes were used to transport the bodies of dead passengers to Andrews from the four “hijacked” planes that, initially, had been taken to Westover Air Force Base. She believes the reason why Andrews was selected is because there is a crematorium at Bethesda, and, presumably, the perpetrators would have wanted to make sure that no one could ever recover the bodies of the hijacked passengers and, thereby, be able to discover what had happened to them.

The information presented in this chapter – together with other information that has been presented in previous chapters -- needs to be investigated further. Rebekah Roth wants such an investigation to



take place and so do I ... but neither one of us wants the government to have oversight into, and control of, such an investigation.

At some point, a person reaches a potential tipping point and, as a result, is confronted with the decision of whether, or not, to treat all of the anomalous events that were occurring on the morning of 9/11 as being merely coincidental oddities or whether those events are part of some larger pattern. For individuals such as Rebekah Roth (as well as myself and a variety of other researchers), the sheer number of problematic dimensions entailed by the events of 9/11 cannot be dismissed out of hand as sheer coincidence and, instead, are worthy of being critically engaged in an objective, diligent, rigorous fashion ... something that, among others, FEMA, the United States Congress, the 9/11 Commission, NIST, the Pentagon Performance Report, and the media have not done.



### Sources

The foregoing chapters have largely focused on the analysis of a limited number of works such as: *Debunking Myths, The 9/11 Commission Report*, as well as various NIST documents (e.g., *Final Report on the Collapse of The World Trade Center Towers* and *Executive Summary of the Final Report*). However, from time to time, other works also have been analyzed [for example, the articles by Eagar and Musso (*JOM: Journal of the Minerals, Metals, & Materials Society, 2001*) or Bazant and Zhou ('Why Did The World Trade Center Collapse – A Simple Analysis', *Journal of Engineering Mechanics, 2001*) or *The Pentagon Building Performance Report*].

The following works constitute the major sources from which background material has been drawn for the writing of the present book. There also have been other source materials (usually consisting of stories or articles from newspapers, magazines, television and the internet) that are cited within particular chapters but which have not been listed below.

Although I am indebted to the efforts of many people for much of the factual information contained in this book (and listing the following sources is an acknowledgment of this indebtedness), the analysis, perspective, and conclusions expressed during this book are, for the most part, my own.

*Debunking 9/11 Myths: An In-Depth Investigation by Popular Mechanics*, Edited by David Dunbar & Brad Reagan, 2006.

*The 9/11 Commission Report*, Edited by Philip Zelikow, 2004- PDF file [In addition, I have read the *New York Times* edition of *The 9/11 Commission Report*].

*Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers*, NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology), 2005.

*The Pentagon Building Performance Report*, Paul Mlakar and Donald O. Dusenberry, 2003.

*World Trade Center Building Performance Study*, FEMA, 2002.

*Against All Enemies*, Richard A. Clarke, 2004, Free Press.

*Why America Slept*, Gerald Posner, 2003, Ballantine Press.

*The War on Freedom*, Nafeez Mosaddaq Ahmed, 2002, Media Messenger Book.

*The War On Truth*, Nafeez Ahmed, 2005, Olive Branch Press.

*Crossing the Rubicon*, Michael C. Ruppert, 2004, New Society Publishers.

*The New Pearl Harbor*, David Ray Griffin, 2004, Olive Branch Press.

*The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*, David Ray Griffin, 2005, Olive Branch Press.

*Christian Faith and the Truth Behind 9/11*, David Ray Griffin, 2006, Westminster John Knox Press.

*9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made In the USA*, Webster Griffin Tarpley, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, 2006, Progressive Press.

*Painful Questions: An Analysis of the September 11<sup>th</sup> Attack*, Eric Hufschmid, 2002.

*The Terror Conspiracy*, Jim Marrs, 2006, The Disinformation Company.

*Towers of Deception: The Media Cover-up of 9/11*, Barrie Zwicker, New Society Publishers.

*Pentagate*, Thierry Meyssan, 2002, Carnot Publishing.

*9/11 and American Empire: Intellectuals Speak Out*, edited by David Ray Griffin and Peter Dale Scott, 2007, Olive Branch Press.

*America's "War On Terrorism"*, Michel Chossudovsky, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 2005, Global Research.

*True Lies*, Anthony Lappe and Stephen Marshall, 2004, A Plume Book.

The Methodical series of books by Rebekah Roth (*Methodical Deception* (2015), *Methodical Illusion* (2015), *Methodical Conclusion* (2016), *Methodical Exposure* (2018), KTYS Media