

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 entire event was planned and carried out by the US govt and its agencies.

The research and documentation to support the charges made in this article can be found [here](#)

To start with, lets 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 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 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 air force 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 defence 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 it has become a hazard to other planes - even if no malicious intent is suspected. If ATC is 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 unco-operative, 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 spectacular 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 unforeseen 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 Whitehouse.

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

NORAD, after initially admitting that it failed to scramble anything - supposedly because it simply hadn't imagined such a situation - suddenly changed the story a week later, claiming that it had scrambled fighters from Langley air-base - 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 a week later? And according to the times given by NORAD , the Langley fighters

would have had to 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?

Even more curious is that CBS news was the first to publish the claim about Langley, producing it without any source at all on Sept 14. On Sept 16, Vice President, Dick Cheney was still defending the lack on any scramble prior to the pentagon strike, and NORAD didn't pick up the CBS spin and incorporate it until Sept 18.

Then they tried to say that no fighters were available at Andrews that day, but failed to explain how the non existent fighters then somehow appeared at Andrews to scramble a few minutes after the Pentagon was hit, but still didn't bother to chase UA 93, which was supposedly still at large and heading towards DC.

While the air force was doing nothing, the two officials most directly responsible for defence 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 continued with the meeting.

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 strike, but continued with his arrangement. And then, still, before he arrived at the school, NORAD -- according to its own timeline, 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 about 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 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 WTC strike happened. 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 strike was never broadcast live.

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 more than 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's 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 him laughing about how many innocent people he's killed. This tape is a fake. In at least some of the clips, the person is not Bin Laden.

The US military conveniently "found" the tape in Afghanistan.

The Pentagon's translation was immediately 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, Mahommed 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 some of 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?

As the cover story quickly unravelled 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. The farcical "911 commission" treated the 19 Arabs as a fact, waffling about "missed intelligence warnings" in relation to their pre-Sept 11 activities.

And in subsequent statements, the FBI buried the admission of doubt about the hijackers identities with an avalanche of increasingly ridiculous spin about the sinister pre- Sept11 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? And if they were not using false IDs, can we know why they're not on the passenger lists? 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 has only 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 box cutters, 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 , lets take AA77, the plane which is supposed to have hit the Pentagon. This is one of the most heavily monitored and defended 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 16 ft wide, 12 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 , 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. Witness reports are confused and contradictory, but some mention a missile or small fighter jet.

Now consider AA 11, the plane alleged to have hit the Nth tower at 8.46. This is not the plane shown in the dramatic, often replayed crash video, but the less frequently shown first crash - not broadcast until later, when the official story of four large planes had already been put into the public's mind. 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 its AA 11, the natural tendency is to think that its just too fast to see on the video. However a frame by frame analysis shows a very strange looking object, more like a flying pig than a plane. Certainly nothing like a Boeing 767 and way too small. It dive-bombs into the tower in a manner which would appear to impossible for a large airliner.

Neither is there any witness evidence to support a large jet. All early reports say that it was a small plane or missile, or people who were looking right at the explosion and simply didn't see any 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 such flight as AA 11 on Sept 11. A close examination of the passenger lists published by the media for the alleged AA11 proves them to be fabricated, because there are impossible contradictions between the lists published by different media outlets.

Now the Sth 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 real plane. It shows impossible physical characteristics and behaviour. It passes through the wall like a ghost without making a hole and without breaking off any parts. The hole only appears well after the plane has entirely disappeared without disturbing the building. It exceeds the maximum speed of a Boeing 767 at low altitude while banked sharply and flying in the opposite direction to that in which its banking. It hip hops across the screen regularly alternating ,frame by frame, between supersonic speed and hovering motionless. It has a strange anomaly in the shape of the belly.

It is a fake. The plane is simply a movie. There are several shots of the cartoon plane that were aired by news agencies at the time One is undoubtedly a crudely faked video. In relation to the others, argument continues over whether they are also conventional faked videos or whether they are real footage of some kind of kind of holographic projection. Whichever is the case, it is not a real plane, because real planes don't pass through walls without making holes and without breaking off any parts.

Witness evidence for a large plane hitting the Sth tower is as elusive as for the Nth Tower and the Pentagon. There is a police transcript of a report of someone firing missiles.

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.

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, and neatly chopped storey length pieces of steel girder being ejected as far as 70 metres from the building. There are numerous scientific studies which demonstrate that its 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. Its 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^2 , 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 storey 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 fire-fighters who say that they heard bombs going off in the buildings.

The media likes to gloss over the similarly neat, vertical, and lightening quick collapse of WTC building 7, a 47 storey 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 there were allegedly 3 in one day. The steel debris from the towers was rushed away for recycling with indecent haste, before any investigation could be conducted into the remains.

On Sept 14, a demolition expert who works for the Pentagon, professor Van Romero, 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 1550C.

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 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. Fire-fighter 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 oxygen starved 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. Its the most valuable piece of real estate in the world, but the buildings themselves were a disaster. Under tenanted and beset by asbestos problems, the owner, the NY Port Authority had received warnings that it was sitting on a legal and financial time bomb. 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 insured itself against terrorism and loss of rental income.

Not long after, when the WTC conveniently disappeared in a terrorist attack - along with building 7 of the complex - it solved 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 probably 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 Sth Tower strike ,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 , although there is some evidence that UA 93 actually landed at Cleveland. Later, AA 77 became the pentagon plane, and UA 175 became the Sth tower plane as the official cover story started to settle down.

Thus of the four allegedly hijacked planes , two didn't exist, and the other two were diverted to safe landings.

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 not to uncritically accept this at face value , but to avail themselves of the full documentation <http://members.iinet.net.au/~holmgren/truth.html> for this summary.

URL for this article is

<http://911closeup.com/index.shtml?ID=51>

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the articles posted on this website are distributed for their included information without profit for research and/or educational purposes only. This website has no affiliation whatsoever with the original sources of the articles nor are we sponsored or endorsed by any of the original sources.