MANUFACTURED TERRORISM: THE TRUTH ABOUT SEPT 11

By Gerard Holmgren holmgren@nettrade.com.au April 18 2004.

There's just one problem with the official story of Sept 11 - it isn't true.

This article presents a summary of the evidence that the entire event was planned and carried out by the US govt and its agencies. The nature of a printed article means that references for the research which backs up the following information can't be included here. However - unlike the mainstream media which never provide any sources that one can verify - all of the information below is based upon meticulously researched and referenced material that can be sent via email to any who wish to view it. I encourage readers who have email to request the material by emailing holmgren@nettrade.com.au or viewing it at http://911closeup.com/index.shtml?ID=50 because I never expect anybody to believe unsourced hearsay, and I don't make public claims unless I can back them up with solid sources.

To start with, let's assume that the official story is basically true - that 19 Arabs hijacked four planes and crashed three of them into buildings and one into a field. As I'll demonstrate later, this is not what happened, but even if it were true, there is solid proof that the govt must have had prior knowledge and deliberately allowed it to happen. In order to understand this proof, one must first know the basics of the official story.

American Airlines flight 11, a Boeing 767, tail number N334AA, with 92 people aboard, including the hijackers, was hijacked by 5 Arabs, while on route from Boston to LA. It was known to be hijacked by 8.25 AM or earlier, and hit the North (Nth) tower of the WTC at 8.46.

United Airlines flight 175, a Boeing 767, tail number N612UA, with 65 aboard, including the hijackers, was hijacked by 5 Arabs while flying the same route as AA 11. It was known to be hijacked at about 8.55 AM and hit the South (Sth) Tower of the WTC at 9.03.

The towers later collapsed due to fire and /or impact damage.

American Airlines flight 77, a Boeing 757, tail number N644AA, with 64 aboard, including the hijackers, was hijacked by 5 Arabs while on route from Dulles airport (DC) to LA. It was known to be hijacked at about 8.55 and hit the Pentagon at 9.45.

United Airlines flight 93, a Boeing 757, tail number N591UA, with 45 aboard, including the hijackers, on route from Newark (New Jersey) to SF, was hijacked by 4 Arabs. It was known to be hijacked about 9.45, and crashed in PA at 10.10.

The incriminating anomaly in this timeline is that the US airforce did not scramble a single fighter jet to intercept any of the hijacked planes. A little research into aviation regulations and historical precedent demonstrates that every one of those planes should have been intercepted by jet fighters before it got anywhere near its crash destination. The failure to launch any intercepts is only explainable

by a systematic nation-wide stand down of routine air defense procedures. FAA regulations state that if any plane deviates from its flight path, and fails to respond to ATC commands or communications, it is automatically declared an emergency. This is because is it has become a hazard to other planes - even if no malicious intent is suspected. If ATC has any doubt as to whether an emergency exists, it is to be considered as one.

Once ATC has detected an emergency, a request is put through to NORAD for an escort of fighter jets to intercept the plane, investigate the problem, and guide it back to its correct course, via a set of clearly stated procedures. Should the pilot prove uncooperative, the regulations provide the fighter pilots with a graduated range of more aggressive responses, such as firing warning tracers, flying one each side, to force it into the desired flight path - or even shooting down in extreme circumstances. The fighter jets are either scrambled from nearby air bases or else by diverting pilots on training flights to the intercept. It takes only a few minutes to scramble fighter jets, and the process is so routine that in the year leading up to Sept 11, there was an average of 1.6 such incidents weekly across the US. A study of the location of air bases in relation to the flight paths of the hijacked planes, indicates that every plane should have been intercepted before impact. And yet nothing was even scrambled until after the Pentagon was hit.

The most spectacualr example is that of the Pentagon strike. Two planes had already hit the WTC by 9.03 and yet this plane was allowed to fly for another 42 minutes off-course towards Washington, untroubled by the world's most powerful air force. Only 10 miles from the Pentagon is Andrews Airbase, a huge installation which is responsible for air defence around the DC area, and maintains two squadrons of fighter jets on permanent standby for this very purpose, since the security of the White House, State dept, Capitol and the City of DC are also at stake. This was not an unforseen contingency. The Pentagon had twice in the last two years conducted drills specifically simulating a plane strike, and for decades, US security services had been wrestling with the potential problem of a hijacked airliner taking a suicide plunge into the White House.

On Sept 11, they had nearly an hour's warning of the Pentagon attack - and grounded the entire airforce - in violation of standard operating proceedures that are automatically implemented even in the case of a single plane accidentally deviating from its course with no obviously hostile intent.

On Sept 14, NORAD, after initially admitting that it failed to scramble anything - supposedly because it simply hadn't imagined such a situation - suddenly changed the story, claiming that it had scrambled fighters from Langley Airbase - 130 miles away - but they didn't get there in time. If fighters were really scrambled from Langley, then how could NORAD - which issues the scramble order - have been unaware of it until 3 days later? And according to the times given by NORAD on Sept 14, they would have had to be flown at less than 260 mph to have not got there in time - when the top speed of the fighters is about 1200mph. And why scramble from Langley, when Andrews had two squadrons just 10 miles away - specifically dedicated to the DC area? Then they tried to say that no fighters were available at Andrews that day, but

failed to explain how the non-existent fighters then miraculously appeared at Andrews to take to the skies a few minutes after the Pentagon was hit, to start flying protective cover over DC - while still not bothering to chase UA 93, which was supposedly heading for the White House by this time.

While the air force was doing nothing, the two officials most directly responsible for defense of the nation - Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Richard Myers and President/Commander-in-Chief, George W. Bush were displaying what can only be described as cavalier indifference to the horror that was unfolding. Myers was about to start a routine meeting with Senator Max Cleland when he heard that a plane had hit the WTC. He went ahead with the meeting as if nothing had happened. 18 minutes later, when the second plane hit, and NORAD knew that at least one more plane was hijacked, Myers and Cleland continued with the meeting. Then a plane hit the Pentagon. And still they chatted on about routine matters.

Meanwhile, Bush was in Florida, about to make a televised photo opportunity trip to an elementary school, to listen to second graders read, after which he was to give a speech about the reading program. Before he even got to the school, he knew about the first WTC crash, but continued with his arrangement. And then, still, before he arrived at the school, NORAD knew about two more hijackings, which means that Bush knew, but he continued to the school anyway - in spite of that fact that the school was only 5 miles from an international airport, and his movements were public knowledge in advance, which means that the school might have been a target - and then he pretended to know nothing about the attacks when he got there. Before he went into the classroom, it would have been clear to NORAD that a major terrorist attack was underway.

By 9.05 Bush was listening to a little girl read a story about her pet goat, and his Chief of staff, Andrew card came into the classroom and whispered in his ear that a second plane had hit the WTC and that "America was under attack." Bush nodded casually and continued with the reading class - for another 25 minutes, smiling, joking and cheering about the reading skills of the children. A reporter who suggested that he should be addressing himself to the situation in NY was sternly rebuked by Bush, who said that now was not the time to be talking about it. And remember, that at this time, Bush knew that there was at least one more plane at large - something which no-one else in the class knew.

At 9.30, with AA 77 still flying unescorted towards DC, Bush finished the reading class (on schedule) and then wasted more time with a pointless speech to the nation, already promising to "hunt down and punish those responsible", while showing no interest in doing anything about the plane which was still at large, a danger of which his audience was unaware. He left the school about the same time that the Pentagon was hit.

Later, in an attempt to cover up the fact that he'd still gone to the school in spite of being aware of the crisis, Bush lied about his movements on the morning, inventing a story that he was already at the school when the first crash occurred. This lie has worked its way into the popular mythology in the mainstream media. In the scramble to find

a cover story for his movements that morning, Bush also carelessly claimed that he'd seen the first crash live on TV at the school and had thought it was an accident. This is also a lie because the first crash was never broadcast live. No footage appeared until the following day.

Immediately after the attacks, US TV networks reported that investigators were looking into massive insider trading on airline stocks in the last few days before the attacks - indicating that the terrorists profited from foreknowledge of their actions. Then the story simply vanished from the mainstream media. Investigative and regulatory authorities could easily find out who placed those trades, but nearly three years later, there has been no investigation, no charges laid and deafening silence about the trades from both govt and media.

Although the govt claimed to be completely taken by surprise, it somehow had no trouble in naming the alleged perpetrator - Osama Bin Laden - within hours, and immediately threatened to invade Afghanistan. What they neglected to mention was that the decision to invade Afghanistan had already been made by July 2001, and the specific war plans arrived on Bush's desk on Sept 9.

It a common myth that Bin Laden has claimed responsibility for the attacks but this simply isn't true. He has vigorously denied any involvement and according to some reports has condemned the attacks as un-Islamic. The myth of his confession is based entirely upon a video tape produced by the Pentagon which claims to show the bearded fiend laughing about how many innocent people he has killed. This tape is almost certainly a fake, and the Pentagon's translation has been attacked by independent translators as misleading and incomplete. In response, the Pentagon effectively admitted as much, saying "it is not a verbatim translation of every word spoken at the meeting, but it does convey the messages and the information flow." The Dept of defense defended the translation thus: "The translation is what it is. We never said it was a literal translation."

Incriminating as all of this is, it only scratches the surface. The FBI managed to name the 19 Arabs involved within a few days, and their names, faces and biographies were promptly splashed across the mainstream media. Supposedly, their passports and suicide notes were found at the crash scenes in spite of fiery crashes which completely incinerated the planes - including the normally indestructible flight recorder boxes, and all the occupants. In another miraculous stroke of good luck for the evidence hunters, the luggage of alleged ringleader, Mohammed Atta, was somehow left behind at Logan airport and just happened to contain instructions to his fellow conspirators. And it seems that they learned how to fly the giant Boeings at the last minute by reading flight manuals on the way to the airport - because they conveniently left the manuals - in Arabic of course - in the cars they had rented.

How embarrassing for the FBI when the alleged hijackers started turning up alive, protesting their innocence! And even more embarrassing when the passenger lists provided by the airlines to CNN did not contain a single Arabic name. And none of the names on the passenger lists are alleged to be aliases for any of the Arabs. How did they get on the flights without being on the passenger lists, and if they were using false names, how were these traced to their real ID's and why have none

of the other names on the lists ever been identified as hijackers' aliases?

19 obviously Arabic men got on to planes with non-Arabic false ID, with a 100% success rate? And why is there no airport security footage of them? Within a few weeks of "identifying" the hijackers, the FBI was then forced to admit that they actually had no idea who the hijackers were. In spite of this, the same 19 names and faces have been splashed across the mainstream media unchanged, as if this admission had never been made. And in subsequent statements, the FBI buried this admission with an avalanche of increasingly ridiculous spin about the sinister pre-Sept 11 activities of the 19 Arabs, seemingly forgetting that they admitted these IDs to be fictitious.

For example, the FBI rather stupidly claimed that 9 of the fictitious Arabs had actually been searched before boarding because they looked suspicious. If they were using false names when they were searched, then surely the FBI must know which of those 9 people on the passenger lists were actually the hijackers incognito? Nope. And if they were not using false IDs, can we know why they're not on the passenger lists? Nope. Clearly, the 19 Arabs are complete fiction.

Some critical thinking about how the hijacking is supposed to have taken place also reveals the story as a bad cartoon script. In the event of a hijacking, the crew only has to punch in a four-digit hijacking code - accessible from several different places - to alert ATC to a hijacking. So if 5 men were to try to take over a plane by the crude method of threatening people with boxcutters, while it might be possible for them to be able to gain control of the plane, to do so without ATC first receiving a distress code is almost impossible. We are supposed to believe that they achieved the impossible 4 times out of 4.

In one of the phone calls allegedly made from AA 11, it was said that the crew locked themselves in the cockpit, and the hijackers attempted to lure them out by shooting and stabbing passengers. This is said to have gone on for 25 minutes. Why then, no distress code from AA 11? Furthermore, the timeline of the alleged phone call indicates that the plane had already turned off course before the hijackers got into the cockpit!

But it wasn't only the hijackers which were fiction. So were the hijackings. We all think that we saw a big plane hit the WTC live on TV, so there must have been hijacked planes, right? A closer look reveals it as an elaborate illusion. First, let's take AA77, the plane which is supposed to have hit the Pentagon. This is one of the most heavily surveillanced buildings in the world, and yet somehow they can't come up with any footage of the crash. Because it never happened. Something hit the Pentagon but it wasn't a Boeing 757 or anything anywhere near that size. There are numerous photos of the aftermath and nowhere is to be seen any evidence of wreckage of such a plane.

A 757 has a wingspan of 125 ft, a tail height of 40 ft and a length of 155 ft. The hole in the Pentagon wall was about 40 ft wide, 25 ft high and collapsed only the first ring of the building - about 40 ft deep. There is no sign of any Boeing debris anywhere. No wings, no tail, no protruding fuselage. The tail couldn't fit through the hole even if the

plane was sliding along the ground. And because the grass outside is smooth, green and undamaged, even that is impossible. And because the angle of entry of the mystery object was about 45 degrees, a 125-ft wingspan would cause an impact about 180 ft wide. A giant aircraft has supposedly passed through a hole many times smaller than itself, without breaking off any parts, and then totally vanished. Furthermore, official aviation records from the US Bureau of Transportation say that the alleged AA 77 flight did not exist. The BT keeps a record of details about every flight ever scheduled from a US airport - even cancelled flights. No such record exists of AA 77 on Sept 11. Early reports said that the incident at the Pentagon was caused by a truck bomb.

Now consider AA 11, the plane alleged to have hit the Sth tower at 8.45. This is not the plane shown in the dramatic, often replayed crash video, but the less frequently shown crash. Whatever the object is, it is certainly not a Boeing 767 or any kind of large passenger jet. When one views the video at full speed, one can only see a brief flash and then the explosion. Since we are always being told that it's AA 11, the natural tendency is to think that it's just too fast to see on the video. However a frame by frame analysis shows a fuzzy small, rather squat looking triangular shaped craft - nothing like a Boeing 767 and way too small, which divebombs into the tower in a manner which would appear to be impossible for a large airliner. Neither is there a single witness report to a large jet. All early reports say that it was a small plane, and it only became a large plane, after American Airlines issued a statement saying that it had lost AA11 in the crash. The BT database also says that there was no uch flight as AA 11 on Sept 11.

Now the Nth tower crash, the one shown live on TV. Surely this was a real Boeing 767 because we saw it live, and at superficial viewing it certainly appears to be a large jet. However, a frame by frame examination of the video reveals that it is not a 767 or any kind of conventional aircraft. The anomalies are too many to go into in this article, but in summary it was definitely not UA 175. Furthermore, aviation records from the FAA show that although UA 175 existed as a flight, unlike AA 77 or AA 11, the plane to which this flight was assigned - N612UA - is still registered and valid. In other words, it never crashed. So we don't know where it went, but we do know that it didn't hit the WTC.

And finally UA 93 - alleged to have crashed in PA. Like UA 175, this was a bona-fide flight, but the plane - N591UA is also still registered as valid. Interestingly, FAA records do show the planes to which AA11 and 77 were allegedly assigned - N334AA and N644AA as destroyed - but not until Jan 14 2002, when the FAA regulations state that the deregistration must be reported on the day that a plane is totally destroyed. So most likely these planes were ready for retirement and were taken away somewhere to be scrapped.

Now to the question of the collapse of the WTC towers. The official story that they collapsed from fire and/or impact damage is a physical impossibility. Video of the event shows that the towers did not collapse - they exploded in mid-air, and one can see clear evidence of explosive charges running down the buildings. There are numerous

scientific studies which demonstrate that it's impossible for them to have collapsed in the pancaking manner cited in the official story.

Firstly, all of the concrete in the towers was totally pulverized into fine dust. The amount of energy needed to achieve this task is quantifiable, and so is the amount of potential energy available in a gravitational collapse. It's insufficient to achieve this pulverization, which means that only an added input of energy (such as explosives) can balance the energy equation.

Secondly, a simple application of the laws of gravity demonstrate that the towers collapsed in a time which was impossible had the top floors been smashing through the lower floors. Excluding air resistance, any object free falls at 9.81m/s sq, regardless of weight. An object dropped from the top of the WTC would have hit the ground in 9.2 secs (a little longer for air resistance). The towers supposedly collapsed by the method of the top floors smashing through the lower floors, meaning that at each stage of the 110-story collapse, the falling rubble would have its acceleration significantly slowed by this resistance. But the towers collapsed in 11 secs, virtually a free fall. Although there are too many variables to calculate the exact minimum time possible for a pancake collapse, it would have to be more than 20 seconds. A pancake collapse in 11 seconds is impossible under the law of gravity.

This proves that the entire structure was suddenly and simultaneously converted into a free falling collection of disconnected rubble, something only achievable through the co-ordinated use of demolition explosives. There are also witness reports from firefighters who say that they heard bombs going off in the buildings. Furthermore, the media likes to gloss over the similarly neat, vertical, and lightening quick collapse of WTC building 7, a 47- story building which was not hit by anything but also disappeared in a manner identical to that of a classic controlled demolition.

Apart from Sept 11, no steel-framed skyscraper has ever totally collapsed from fire - and then we allegedly get 3 in one day. On Sept 14, a demolition expert who works for the Pentagon, professor Van Romero, obviously unaware of the political minefield into which he was stepping, said that upon his viewing of the collapse videos, he believed that it was a controlled demolition. Prof Romero later retracted his statement in mysterious circumstances, refusing to say why and refusing to offer any alternative scenario, simply saying that he wasn't prepared to say what did or didn't happen, and didn't want to talk about it anymore.

The early spin from the media was that the ferocious heat of the burning jet fuel melted the structural steel of the skyscraper. Unfortunately, jet fuel, which is basically kerosene, typically burns at about 450 degrees C, and steel melts at about 1500C.

Scientific calculations of the maximum amount of heat which could have been even theoretically generated by the maximum amount of fuel that the mythical planes could have been carrying show that it could not have contributed more than 280C to the temperature – even if all the fuel was confined to one floor. Each floor of the WTC was about 4,000 sq metres. The maximum amount of fuel which the plane could have

carried was about 8000 gallons. So even claiming that all of this fuel burnt within one floor, that's about 2 gallons per sq metre - supposedly melting steel construction beams.

Neither does the myth of a ferocious fire in the WTC stand up to the scrutiny of witness or video evidence. Firefighter tapes describe some "isolated pockets of fire" which they could "knock out" with two hoses. And the black smoke drifting from the building indicates an oxygenstarved fire.

Even if the mythical inferno were true, far more ferocious fires have been experienced in other skyscrapers - sometimes burning out of control for as long as 20 hours, and never has one of these buildings collapsed.

Why would they want to demolish the WTC? It had been losing money for years. It's the most valuable piece of real estate in the world, but the buildings themselves were a disaster. Under- tenanted, beset by asbestos problems, the owner, the NY Port Authority, had received warnings that it was sitting on a legal and financial timebomb. And of course, they couldn't be demolished because of all the asbestos dust that would go into the air of NY.

The NYPA had been trying to sell the buildings for years, and understandably, nobody was interested. In early 2001, the NYPA went to court in a test case, and tried to get its insurance company to pay for asbestos renovations. The case was thrown out. This should have made the buildings even more unsaleable. However, immediately after this, Manhattan property developer Larry Silverstein, who sits on the board of Westfield America, stepped in with a consortium worth \$US3.2 billion for a 99-year lease on the site.

Westfield Australia directly contributed \$A840 million for control of the shopping plaza. Silverstein insured himself for \$US3.5 billion per terrorist attack, and Westfield fully insured itself against terrorism and loss of rental income. Immediately upon signing the deal, Westfield announced that it would double the rents, causing much scratching of heads in financial circles, since the buildings were already so undertenanted.

Silverstein, and Peter Lowy from Westfield were handed the keys in a take-over ceremony on Sept 10, and the very next day, the troublesome things conveniently disappeared in a terrorist attack - along with building 7 of the complex - solving the asbestos problem, leaving Silverstein with a clean building site on the best real estate in the world, and Westfield with a rental income which would have been unsustainable in a real trading environment, and no law suits over all the asbestos dust released into the air of Manhattan. Silverstein's insurer has agreed to the \$3.5 billion pay out, but Silverstein is claiming that it was two terrorist attacks and wants \$7 billion, which is currently the subject of a court case.

Very early media reports had the two fictitious AA flights as the planes to hit the WTC. AA 77 was only switched to being the Pentagon plane hours later. UA 175 was the last plane to be "confirmed" as involved. At 9.17, the FAA started diverting all flights. Early reports show wild discrepancies in terms of which allegedly hijacked plane went

where. The fictitious AA77 is particularly volatile from one report to another, at one stage saying that it hit the WTC, then that it didn't even take off for a half hour after the second crash, then that after taking off at 9.33, it somehow flew 700 miles out to Ohio and back, in just 5 minutes, to hit the Pentagon. One report had UA 93 landing at Cleveland due to a bomb scare. What is clear is that they were making it up as they went along, and the final cover story about which planes crashed where, didn't settle down for hours.

In summary, this is most likely how the morning of Sept 11 really played out. There was no need to issue an order for the air force to stand down routine intercept procedures, because it appears that there actually weren't any hijackings.

Two unconventional objects were fired into the WTC. The impacts were blamed on the two fictitious AA flights. At this time UA 93 and 175 were flying normally. Then the FAA begins diverting flights – including the two UA flights. The BT database tells us of any flights which are diverted, but doesn't tell us where they are diverted to. So we don't have an official record of where the two UA flights landed. Later, AA 77 becomes the Pentagon plane, and UA 175 becomes the Sth tower plane as the official cover story settles down. Thus of the four allegedly hijacked planes, two didn't exist, and the other two were diverted to safe landings somehow, while another fake plane crash was manufactured at the Pentagon. Most likely the PA crash was a drone craft of some kind, and there is evidence that the substitute craft was shot down.

This is only a brief summary of the evidence. Much material had to be left out due to space constraints. I encourage all readers to request by email, or read on line the documentation and full evidence kit for this summary.

URL for this article is http://911closeup.com/index.shtml?ID=51

Evidence Kit Evidence Kit - Important Links Flight 11 No Hijackings Media Published Fake Passenger Lists Pentagon Analysis Did F77 hit the Pentagon? Eyewitness accounts examined INTRODUCTION PLANE SPECIFICATIONS ESTIMATIONS OF HOLE DIMENSIONS ENTRY CALCULATIONS ENTRY IMPACT CALCULATIONS EXPLOSION ANALYSIS FUEL LOAD ANALYSIS Laws of Physics 'BUT WRECKAGE WAS FOUND.' DNA TESTING THE HOLE IN THE OTHER SIDE OF THE WALL WHAT ABOUT THE EYEWITNESSES? Salter Debates SALTER DEBATES -- Part 1

SALTER DEBATES -- Part 2 SALTER DEBATES -- Part 3