

All You Need to Know about 9/11 to Prove it was an “Inside Job”

Why You Should Care, and What You Can Do

By [Community](#)

Theme: [Terrorism](#)

Global Research, September 13, 2011
[aircrap.com](#) 13 September 2011

“The commission had to subpoena the F.A.A. for documents, had to subpoena NORAD for documents and they will never get the full story. That is one of the tragedies. One of these days we will have to get the full story because the 9/11 issue is so important to America. But this White House wants to cover it up.” [1] -Max Cleland, 9/11 Commission member

Today is the 10 year anniversary of the September 11, 2001 tragedy. Regarding the events of that fateful day, we can be certain of one thing: we have not been told the truth. Many of the 9/11 Commission members, who authored the official *9/11 Commission Report* [2], have admitted as much. In addition to the above statement by Max Cleland about a White House cover up, commission members have revealed that they “were setup to fail,” [3] [4] the “CIA obstructed our investigation,” [5] the statements made by NORAD officials “was just so far from the truth,” [6] that they were “extremely frustrated with the false statements we were getting,” [7] and they “don’t believe for a minute that we got everything right.” [8]

This report provides compelling and incontrovertible evidence showing that the events on September 11, 2001 did not occur as documented in the *9/11 Commission Report* [9] and in the *World Trade Center Disaster Study* [10]. Furthermore, we will show that both reports were falsified to cover up the real truth: the attacks on the World Trade Center complex and the Pentagon were orchestrated by factions within the government of the United States. In addition, we provide documented evidence of motive for the attacks, why you should care, and suggestions for what you can do to help prevent another 9/11 from happening.

Blind Belief in Authority

“Blind belief in authority is the greatest enemy of truth.” — Albert Einstein

For many, doubts still remain about the accuracy of the official reports of 9/11 regarding what happened and who was responsible. In a recent poll, nearly half (48%) of New Yorkers support a new investigation into the collapse of World Trade Center Building 7 [11]. Another recent poll indicated that 15% of Americans believe that the U.S. government staged the attacks [12].

Yet for many others, the suggestion that the U.S. government orchestrated the attacks is both ridiculous and repugnant, which is understandable. What is not understandable is that so many people blindly believe the official 9/11 reports and refuse to entertain that

possibility that they have been lied to. Instead, they turn a deaf ear to (and often ridicule) the many thousands of highly intelligent people who have been trying for years to wake them up to the truth – people like [Scholars for 9/11 Truth](#), [Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#), [Pilots for 9/11 Truth](#), [Political Leaders for 9/11 Truth](#), [Medical Professionals for 9/11 Truth](#), [Military, Intelligence and Government Patriots](#), and many other highly credible people. [13]

This report is for those of you who either believe the official story, aren't sure what you believe, or think it doesn't matter what you believe.

Why You Should Care about 9/11

“Those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it.” – George Santayana

The false flag strategy (attacking your own people and blaming it on someone else) has been used numerous times throughout history to justify war and the murder of innocent people. [14] In this report, we will provide compelling evidence that the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 were a false flag operation. Please take time to review the evidence carefully. It is of the utmost importance that you do so, not only for yourself, but for your family, friends, and future generations.

Only weeks after 9/11, plans were in place to “take over” Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, and Iran

Within weeks after 9/11 and after bombing had begun in Afghanistan, plans to “take over” seven countries in five years (Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, and Iran) were shown to 4-Star General Wesley Clark. Watch Clark describe how he got this information in the video below:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9LTdx1nPu3k>

George W Bush used the Weapons of Mass Destruction lie [15] to invade Iraq in 2003. (We will provide substantial evidence in the motive section below to show that the invasion of Iraq was the top priority of George W Bush from day one of his administration.) Until recently, none of the other countries mentioned by Wesley Clark have been attacked. However, Libya has been bombed in recent months (based upon lies that were used to justify the bombing) [16]. And, just last week, there was a call for NATO intervention in Syria. [17]

What if the plans that Clark saw in 2001 are still in the works? Recent events would suggest that at least some version of those plans is still being implemented. How many more times are we going to fall for the lies and allow the U.S. and NATO to continue murdering people in the name of justice? How many more lives have to be lost before we wake up and take action to stop the killing of innocent people?

Would you save the life of an innocent child if given the chance?

What if you were presented the opportunity to save the life of an innocent child? Wouldn't you do everything that you could to save that child?

What if you could save the lives of 1,000 children? Would that be enough to motivate you to take action?

In the Iraq war alone, it is currently estimated that 1.46 million Iraqis have died due to the U.S. invasion. [18] Certainly, many of those deaths have been innocent men, women, and children.

Of course, let us never forget the many thousands of U.S. military that have died in Iraq and Afghanistan in addition to the 3,000 innocent people who died on 9/11 and the hundreds of first responders that have died since.

Protect others to protect yourself

“All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.” — Edmund Burke

History will continue to repeat itself until we do something to stop it. There is a line in the movie *The Seven Samurai* that seems appropriate: “You have to protect others to protect yourself.” By taking action to prevent another 9/11, another Afghanistan, another Iraq, and another Libya, the lives that you will be helping to save might just include your own.

Please see the “What You Can Do” section at the end of this report.

The Evidence that Shows 9/11 Was an Inside Job

“Based on my 11 year experience as an FAA air traffic controller, I knew within hours of the attacks, it was an inside job.”[19] – Robert Hordon, former FAA Air Traffic Controller, Boston

The evidence provided herein consists mostly of video clips (so that you can see and judge for yourself) and includes testimony from leading experts in their fields, eyewitnesses, and high-ranking officials including President George W Bush, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, Treasury Secretary Paul O’Neill, Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta, Senator John Kerry, 4-Star General Wesley Clark, Major General Albert Stubblebine III (former head of US Army Intelligence), Nobel Prize winner Dario Fo, and architect Richard Gage.

The evidence is divided into and presented in four sections:

- (1) Evidence that Explosives Brought Down WTC Buildings 1, 2, and 7
- (2) Evidence that No Plane Hit the Pentagon on 9/11
- (3) Evidence that Flight 93 Was Shot Down
- (4) Motive for 9/11

If you are pressed for time, we suggest that you start with the following two videos:

- *AE911Truth’s Blueprint for Truth:*
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-3zBGL40orc>
- *Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon:*
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h0R8b3MuFk>

Evidence that Explosives Brought Down WTC Buildings 1, 2, and 7

The Blueprint for Truth

In February of this year, we reported that Richard Gage, the founder of Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth, changed the opinions of 24 out of 25 (96%) of the individuals in the audience that previously believed the official story: that the impact of the planes plus the ensuing fires caused the collapse of the twin towers and WTC building 7. [20]

The 33-minute video below, titled *AE911Truth's Blueprint for Truth* contains, to a large extent, the exact same info that was presented at the expo. Watch as Richard Gage provides a crystal clear explanation of how the three World Trade Center buildings were brought down. Gage takes you through scientific forensic evidence proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the destruction of the three WTC buildings was accomplished with explosives and could not have possibly been a result of fire:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-3zBGL40orc>

For even more evidence and background information, see the extended 2 hour Research Edition:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OOgVCj7q49o>

Recap of the above video, from ae911.org website: [21]

WTC Building #7, a 47-story high-rise that was not hit by an airplane, exhibited all of the characteristics of a classic controlled demolition with explosives:

1. [Rapid onset](#) of collapse
2. [Sounds of explosions](#) at ground floor – a second before the building's destruction
3. Symmetrical “structural failure” – through the path of greatest resistance – [at free-fall acceleration](#)
4. [Imploded](#), collapsing completely, and landed in its own footprint
5. Massive volume of expanding [pyroclastic-like clouds](#)
6. [Expert corroboration](#) from the top European controlled demolition professional
7. [Foreknowledge](#) of “collapse” by media, NYPD, FDNY

In the aftermath of WTC7's destruction, strong evidence of demolition using incendiary devices was discovered:

1. FEMA finds rapid oxidation and [intergranular melting](#) on structural steel samples
2. Several tons of [molten metal](#) reported by numerous highly qualified witnesses
3. Chemical signature of the [incendiary thermite](#) found in solidified molten metal, and dust samples

WTC7 exhibited none of the characteristics of destruction by fire:

1. Slow onset with large visible deformations
2. Asymmetrical collapse which follows the path of least resistance (laws of conservation of momentum would cause a falling, to the side most damaged by the fires)
3. [Evidence](#) of fire temperatures capable of softening steel
4. [High-rise buildings](#) with much larger, hotter, and longer lasting fires have never collapsed.

The Twin Towers' destruction exhibited all of the characteristics of destruction by explosives:

1. [Destruction](#) proceeds through the path of greatest resistance at [nearly free-fall acceleration](#)
2. Improbable symmetry of debris distribution
3. Extremely rapid onset of destruction
4. Over 100 first responders reported [explosions and flashes](#)
5. Multi-ton steel sections [ejected laterally](#)
6. [Mid-air pulverization](#) of 90,000 tons of concrete & metal decking
7. Massive volume of expanding [pyroclastic-like clouds](#)
8. [1200-foot-diameter](#) debris field: no "pancaked" floors found
9. Isolated [explosive ejections](#) 20-40 stories below demolition front
10. [Total building destruction](#): dismemberment of steel frame
11. Several tons of [molten metal](#) found under all 3 high-rises
12. Evidence of [thermite incendiaries](#) found by FEMA in steel samples
13. Evidence of [explosives](#) found in dust samples

The Twin Towers exhibited none of the characteristics of destruction by fire:

1. Slow onset with large visible deformations

2. Asymmetrical collapse which follows the path of least resistance (laws of conservation of momentum would cause a falling, intact, from the point of plane impact, to the side most damaged by the fires)
3. [Evidence of fire temperatures](#) capable of softening steel
4. [High-rise buildings](#) with much larger, hotter, and longer-lasting fires have never collapsed.

Larry Silverstein, lease-holder of the WTC complex, admits WTC7 was pulled down (via control demolition)

Larry Silverstein was the lease-holder of the WTC complex who made over 7 billion dollars on insurance claims due to the destruction of the WTC buildings. [22] During an interview in 2002 for the PBS documentary [America Rebuilds: A Year at Ground Zero](#), Mr. Silverstein said this about the fate of Building 7 on 9/11:

“I remember getting a call from the fire department commander, telling me that they were not sure they were gonna be able to contain the fire, and I said, ‘We’ve had such terrible loss of life, maybe the smartest thing to do is pull it.’ And they made that decision to pull and then we watched the building collapse.”

Note that the word ‘pull’ is industry jargon for taking a building down with explosives. Here’s the video clip of Silverstein making the above statement:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-jPzAakHPpk>

A Parable about Larry Silverstein and his Insurance Policy on the WTC Complex

“To put these events in perspective, imagine that a person leases an expensive house, and immediately takes out an insurance policy covering the entire value of the house and specifically covering bomb attacks. Six weeks later two bombs go off in the house, separated by an hour. The house burns down, and the lessor immediately sues the insurance company to pay him twice the value of the house, and ultimately wins. The lessor also gets the city to dispose of the wreckage, excavate the site, and help him build a new house on the site.” [23]

Senator John Kerry: Building 7 Was Brought Down in a Controlled Fashion

Senator John Kerry was questioned about Silverstein saying WTC 7 was “pulled” by members of Austin 9/11 Truth Now at an event in Austin Texas. Kerry responded:

“I think they made the decision based on the danger that it had in destroying other things, that they did it in a controlled fashion.”

Watch Kerry admit that WTC 7 was brought down via a controlled demolition in the video below:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rjsjYwYOAA>

The NIST conclusion that WTC 7 was brought down by fire is a lie

The NIST report on the cause of the collapse of WTC 7 and titled [*Final Report on the Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7*](#) concluded that: “the fires that followed the impact of debris from the collapse of WTC 1 (the north tower) led to the collapse of WTC7.” [24]

However, as we’ve seen above, WTC7 exhibited none of the characteristics of destruction by fire, and instead exhibited all of the characteristics of a controlled demolition. In addition, both Larry Silverstein and John Kerry confirmed that Building 7 was “pulled” down in a “controlled fashion.”

For an analysis of the NIST investigation and report, watch the video below titled *NIST Report on WTC7 is Unscientific and False*:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2V0WQFztLyg>

Why Would NIST Lie About WTC 7?

It likely would have taken several months to rig the 47-story WTC 7 for controlled demolition. Most certainly, WTC 7 could not have been rigged in a few hours on the day of September 11, 2001. That means that the destruction of Building 7 was planned months in advance.

If NIST admitted that WTC 7 was brought down with explosives, many people would conclude that explosives were also used to bring down the twin towers and therefore must have also been planned and installed in advance. In other words, if NIST told the truth about WTC 7, people would realize that 3,000 people were murdered in a false flag operation to justify killing tens of thousands, if not millions more.

The BBC Reports Collapse of WTC 7 (Solomon Building) Fifteen Minutes Before it Happens

If you have any doubts about the destruction of Building 7 being pre-planned, then watch the BBC’s Jane Standley report the collapse of WTC7 (Solomon Building) fifteen minutes before it occurred, while it appears standing behind her in this news clip:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6mxFRigYD3s>

How could have the WTC buildings been rigged with explosives?

Obviously, al-Qaeda terrorists could not have obtained access to the buildings for the enormous number of hours it would have taken to plant the explosives. But, it turns out that there is a very simple explanation: Marvin Bush (the brother of George W Bush) and Wirt Walker III (Bush’s cousin) were the principals of the company in charge of security for the WTC. [25] If the president was involved (which we will establish below), then it’s not a stretch to believe that he had some influence on his brother and cousin.

Evidence that No Plane Hit the Pentagon on 9/11

“With all the evidence readily available at the Pentagon crash site, any unbiased rational investigator could only conclude that a Boeing 757 did not fly into the Pentagon as alleged.”[26] – Col. George Nelson, Aircraft accident investigator, U.S. Air Force

CNN Reporter: "There is NO Evidence of a Plane Having Crashed Anywhere Near the Pentagon"

Jamie McIntyre, CNN's senior Pentagon correspondent at the time, was at the Pentagon shortly after it was hit. Here's what he reported:

"From my close-up inspection, there is no evidence of a plane having crashed anywhere near the Pentagon... The only pieces left that you can see are small enough that you could pick up in your hand. There are no large tail sections, wing sections, a fuselage, nothing like that anywhere around which would indicate that the entire plane crashed into the side of the Pentagon and then caused the side to collapse. Even though if you look at the pictures of the Pentagon you see that the floors have all collapsed, that didn't happen immediately, it wasn't until almost about forty-five minutes later that the structure was weakened enough that all of the floors collapsed."

Watch McIntyre's CNN report:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SFz7gLz7CVk>

USAF Witness: There was "a strange lack of visible debris...moments after impact"

In case you are thinking that McIntyre arrived on the scene after the massive amount of Boeing 757 debris had been removed, Karen Kwiatkowski, PhD, U.S. Air Force (retired) wrote that there was a lack of debris moments after impact. Kwiatkowski, who was an Air Force Lieutenant Colonel employed at the Pentagon on 9/11, was a contributor to a book titled *9/11 and American Empire Intellectuals Speak Out*, in which she wrote that there was "a strange lack of visible debris on the Pentagon lawn, where I stood only moments after the impact. . . . I saw . . . no airplane metal or cargo debris." [27]

9/11 Commission "failed to produce a believable and unbiased summary"

In the book *9/11 and American Empire Intellectuals Speak Out*, Kwiatkowski also wrote:

"I believe the Commission failed to deeply examine the topic at hand, failed to apply scientific rigor to its assessment of events leading up to and including 9/11, failed to produce a believable and unbiased summary of what happened, failed to fully examine why it happened, and even failed to include a set of unanswered questions for future research."[28]

You Can't Fit a Boeing 757 into Hole that is Only 16 Feet Wide

Watch this 10-minute segment of the outstanding Italian documentary titled *Zero: An Investigation into 9/11*, which addresses many of the serious problems with the official account of what happened at the Pentagon:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KMvJUjZ8rIM>

The discrepancies that are addressed in the above video include the following:

- There is no airplane debris visible anywhere in front of the Pentagon. Examples of what you would expect to see at a plane crash site are shown. Captain Russ Whittemberg, a pilot with over 30 years in military and civil aviation, said: "I have been at some accident investigation sites in the Air Force. And I have never

come across any accident scene where there is no tell-tale evidence of the plane that crashed.”

- There is no evidence that either the airplane engines or the wings impacted the building. Instead, we are supposed to believe that the 38 meter (125 feet) wide Boeing 757 fit into a hole that is only 5 meters (16 feet) wide. We are supposed to believe that the wings folded up like those of a dragon fly and squeeze into the 5 meter wide hole.
- Major General Albert Stubblebine: “One of my experiences in the Army was being in charge of the Army’s Imagery Interpretation for Scientific and Technical Intelligence during the Cold War. I measured pieces of Soviet equipment from photographs. It was my job. I look at the hole in the Pentagon and I look at the size of an airplane that was supposed to have hit the Pentagon. And I said, ‘The plane does not fit in that hole’. So what did hit the Pentagon? What hit it? Where is it? What’s going on?”
- One theory is that the Boeing 757 was vaporized due to the speed and the force of the crash. The engines are made of a titanium steel alloy that would not vaporize unless they hit a temperature of 3,286 degrees Centigrade. That did not happen. Plus, the engines would have caused significant damage upon impact. Yet, there is no indication that the engines impacted the Pentagon.
- After a period of time, various photos of airplane debris began to appear in newspapers and on the web did not appear in any photos shown in the days following the event.
- The Pentagon had numerous cameras that had complete and separate recordings of the incident. The FBI was immediately on the scene and confiscated many video tapes from the Pentagon and nearby buildings. Yet only four videos were released after 2006 when FOIA requests compelled them to release them. Only two showed any useful information. But most experts believe the white image in the videos is too small to be a 757.
- The story of how the plane arrived at the Pentagon is absurd, making a 270 degree turn at a speed of 800 kilometers per hour.

It’s aerodynamically impossible to fly a Boeing 757 at 20 feet above the ground for half a mile

Please continue watching the next segment of the documentary *Zero: An Investigation into 9/11*:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0OPxDSKY2pE>

- According to the official account, the Pentagon was struck by AA Flight 77, under the control of al-Qaeda hijacker Hani Hanjour. Hanjour was known as “a terrible pilot,” [29] who could not even fly a small airplane.

- An experienced pilot with thousands of hours would probably require 10-20 attempts to pull off the maneuver that was performed with the Boeing 757 on its way to the Pentagon. “You just can’t do that with one of those big airplanes.” –Robin Hordon, flight controller and flight instructor
- AA Flight 77 was [lost from radar as early as 8:56](#) a.m. and then allegedly reappeared 36 minutes later at 9:32 am. According to Danielle O’Brien, an air traffic controller at Dulles International Airport, the plane that showed up on the radar was not Flight 77: “*The speed, the maneuverability, the way that it turned, we all thought in the radar room, all of us experienced air traffic controllers, that it was a military plane.*” [30]
- The official report of the final half mile of Flight 77 before it allegedly hit the Pentagon is aerodynamically impossible. “I challenge any pilot, any pilot anywhere: give him a Boeing 757 and tell him to do 400 knots 20 feet above the ground for half a mile. CAN’T Do. It’s aerodynamically impossible.” – Nila Sagadevan, pilot and aeronautical engineer.
- The alleged hijackers had difficulty flying small aircraft, which means that there is a zero possibility that they could pull off an impossible maneuver on the first try.

Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11

A video titled [Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon](#), by the Citizen Investigation Team, proves that no plane hit the Pentagon and that the low-flying plane seen approaching the building merely flew past the Pentagon and took off immediately after explosions were heard. Furthermore, it proves that the five downed light poles near the Pentagon could not have been caused by Flight 77, was pre-planned, and staged.

We know from the above videos and the testimony of air traffic controller Danielle O’Brien that Flight 77 disappeared from the radar for over 30 minutes and that the plane that showed up on the radar was not a Boeing 757. We also know that there is absolutely no evidence that a 757 or any or any other plane actually hit the Pentagon.

In 2006, members of the Citizen Investigation Team travelled to Arlington, VA to speak with eyewitnesses who had a good view of the final seconds of the plane in flight before it allegedly impacted the building. The purpose of their investigation was to establish the true flight path of Flight 77. If the plane did not fly where the physical damage to the Pentagon and the government-supplied data says it did, then it did not hit the building.

Multiple witnesses confirm flight path of plane seen approaching the Pentagon was not as described in the “official” reports

Information provided by multiple, credible witnesses from five different vantage points near the Pentagon proves that the actual flight path of the plane seen approaching the Pentagon was significantly different from the “official” path described by the 9/11 commission and the alleged “black box” data released by the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) in 2006 (nearly five years after the event).

The “official” flight path described by 9/11 commission report and the alleged black box data is necessary to explain the physical damage to the Pentagon and the alleged knocking over of a five light poles by Flight 77 as it approached the Pentagon. However, the testimony by the witnesses contradicts the “official” flight path.

Multiple witnesses saw the low-flying plane fly past the Pentagon

In addition, multiple witnesses reported seeing a commercial plane fly past the Pentagon at an extremely low altitude, immediately after the explosion, and then fly away.

The light poles that were allegedly knocked over by Flight 77 were STAGED

Finally, the video proves that the light pole that allegedly went through the windshield of a taxi (after allegedly being knocked over by Flight 77 as it approached the Pentagon) was both staged and pre-planned, which was admitted by the taxi driver himself.

The video is broken into eight 10-minute segments for airing on YouTube. You can download the full video (for free) from the Citizen Investigation Team website:

<http://www.citizeninvestigationteam.com/getnsa.html>

Analysis of data from the alleged Flight Data Recorder shows that the plane was flying too high to have hit the Pentagon

Although not mentioned in the video, it is worth noting that Pilots for 9/11 Truth, an international organization of pilots and aviation professionals, obtained a data file from the NTSB via the Freedom of Information Act that is allegedly derived from Flight 77’s Flight Data Recorder (FDR). Scientific analysis of that data by Pilots for 9/11 Truth determined that the data contradicted the 9/11 Commission Report in several significant ways [31]:

- The altitude of the aircraft would have been at least 300 feet too high to have struck the light poles.
- The altitude of the aircraft would have been at least 100 feet too high to have struck the Pentagon.

Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11, part 1 of 8:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h0R8b3MuFk>

Part 1 of the video contains a review of some of the reasons for questioning the official story of Flight 77:

- Lack of debris, plus what a crash site should look like
- No damage to foundation
- Aeronautically impossible
- No evidence that a plane actually hit the Pentagon

Next, the official version of the Flight 77 flight path (as specified by the 9/11 commission and the alleged “black box” data released by the NTSB in 2006) is established as being south of the Navy Annex and south of the former CITGO gas station. This is key information that has to be true in order to explain the angle of entry that caused the physical damage to the Pentagon.

Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11, part 2 of 8:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yinRBkGX0Bc>

An animation of the Flight 77’s alleged south side approach to the Pentagon

In part 2, we are shown images and animation of the path that the plane must have taken in order to knock over five light poles and damage the Pentagon in the manner that it did, which is the official story. The location of the downed light poles is important because it establishes the required location and trajectory of the plane down to the foot.

Multiple witnesses provide evidence of a north side approach to the Pentagon

Part 2 also contains interviews with the first two witnesses (Edward Paik and Terry Morin), who were positioned on the south side of the Navy Annex (vantage point #1) as the plane flew over. Both Edward and Terry saw the plane fly directly over the Navy annex to the north of the “official” path. Of particular significance is the interview with Morin, an aviator and a program manager for SPARTA Inc at the Navy Annex. Initially, Morin was between the wings of the Navy annex, so he could only see the plane as it “flew over the top of me.” Morin then ran over to get a better view and watched the plane for 13-18 seconds. Morin, as an aviator, disputed the official report that the plane was flying 460 knots. Instead, Morin says that the plane was only flying at a speed of around 350 knots.

Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11, part 3 of 8:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L5mT8Jbcd-A>

Part 3 contains interviews with three witnesses who were at the CITGO gas station (vantage point #2) on 9/11 when a low-flying plane flew by.

Robert Turcios, CITGO station employee, saw the plane on the north side of the station and initially thought the plane was going to crash onto the street between the station and the Pentagon, but saw the plane “lift and go up a little bit.” He did not see the plane hit the Pentagon.

In addition, Pentagon Police officers Chadwick Brooks and William Lagasse each confirm that the low-flying plane flew by on the north side of the CITGO station.

Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11, part 4 of 8:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_K9SfCwWzFI

Morin and Lagasse independently draw a nearly identical, flight path lines showing an approach to the north of the CITGO station.

Next, an interview with a witness who was located on the north side of the Navy Annex (vantage point # 3) on 9/11 is shown. William Middleton Sr., an Arlington Cemetery

employee, said that he plane was coming straight down Southgate road on the north side of the Navy annex. Middleton also said that he could see the plane dropping in altitude and that it came so close to where he was standing that he could feel the heat from the plane. In addition, Middleton said that the plane was travelling at a “slow” rate of speed, corroborating what Terry Morin had said.

After the interview with Middleton, interviews with Arlington Cemetery employees Darrell Stafford and Darius Prather, who were positioned at the Arlington Cemetery maintenance buildings (vantage point # 4) on 9/11 are shown. Both said that a plane was coming directly at them and that after barely clearing the Navy Annex building, the plane continued descending and at the same time was banking to the right. The banking of the plane to the right is irreconcilable with NTSB data, physical damage to the Pentagon, and the Pentagon security video.

Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11, part 5 of 8:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SujoyK7UZmpM>

This video segment starts with an interview of another Arlington Cemetery employee, Donald Carter, who was also positioned at the Arlington Cemetery maintenance buildings (vantage point # 4) on 9/11. Carter’s testimony is similar to that of his co-workers, Stafford and Prather.

Next, an interview with Sean Boger is shown. Boger, a heliport air traffic controller, was in the Pentagon heliport tower that is located directly in front of the Pentagon (vantage point # 5) on 9/11. Boger said: “I just happened to be looking out the window. And, as I was looking out the window, I could see a plane... The plane was coming directly at us... You know I fell to the ground and I covered my head.”

Boger stated that he saw a plane come over the Navy Annex and bank right toward the Pentagon. Based on the amount of time he watched the plane after he first saw it, the plane was travelling significantly slower than 460 knots.

From five vantage points, 13 eyewitnesses independently and unanimously confirm a north side approach. A drawing is shown depicting the paths drawn by the witnesses. The eyewitness testimony contradicts the official reports that are required to make the official story plausible.

All of the eyewitnesses have worked in the area for many years and are therefore very familiar with the topology and landmarks. Since the release of their interviews in the public domain, all have been made aware of the implications yet stand by their stories as reported. None have claimed that their accounts have been misrepresented.

Most of the witnesses could not see the alleged impact point due to the complex topography and landscape, and admit to running, dropping, or flinching for cover. This explains why they did not see the plane fly away and assumed that it had hit the Pentagon because of the explosion.

The independent and unanimous placement of the plane on the north side and banking to the right amounts to proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the plane did fly away without hitting the building because the damage to the Pentagon required a south side approach.

Although the witnesses presented so far did not see the plane fly away, some did (and are documented in the next video segment).

Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11, part 6 of 8:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nZIUZ1pvOn8>

Witnesses see plane fly past Pentagon and then fly away

Pentagon police officer Roosevelt Roberts Jr. saw the plane fly away immediately after the explosion. He was at the Pentagon south parking lot loading dock, only a few steps inside the building during the explosion. After hearing an explosion, he ran outside, looked up, and saw a plane flying around the south parking lot. Roosevelt describes seeing a commercial jet that was banking and flying away at less than 100 feet above the ground within 10 seconds after the explosion.

Roosevelt could have only seen the same banking plane that all of the other witness reported seeing on the north side flight path.

There is additional evidence that more people saw the plane continue past the Pentagon. Arlington National Cemetery employee Erik Dihle was officially recorded by the Center for Military History on December 13, 2001. Although he personally did not see the plane, he said the first thing that other people reported was that a bomb went off and that a jet flew by and kept on going:

"A number of us were working building 123 right after the explosion... We got up and ran outside... Some people were yelling that a bomb had hit the Pentagon and a jet kept on going."

The five downed light poles were preplanned and staged

Multiple witnesses have testified to seeing a banking, low-flying plane approach the Pentagon from the north side of the former CITGO gas station. This means that the damaged light poles, of which one allegedly went through the windshield of a taxicab, had to have been staged. Although there are photos of a bent pole laying on the ground and a broken windshield, not a single photograph exists showing the 40 foot, 247 pound pole inside the cab.

Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11, Part 7 of 8:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k2Shn7b90pY>

Taxi cab driver, Lloyd England, initially claimed that a silent stranger helped him remove the light pole from his car. A 247 pound light pole knocked over by a 90 ton Boeing 757 traveling 530 miles per hour certainly would have caused massive damage had it hit Lloyd's taxi. However, the only visible damage to the taxi is the broken front windshield. Otherwise, the taxi was unscratched. This makes absolutely no sense.

However, don't forget that testimony from multiple witnesses has proven that none of the downed light poles could have been knocked over by the incoming plane. Therefore, the lack of damage to the taxi does make sense.

After Lloyd was confronted with the information provided by the witnesses indicating a

north side approach (and that therefore the downed light poles must have been staged), he had a very strange reaction. Loyde then changed his story and refused to admit that his taxi was on the bridge next to the downed light pole, where it appears that photos of both Loyde and the taxi were taken.

Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11, Part 8 of 8:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gyGxjOHASAO>

Loyde goes on to explain that history has nothing to do with the truth and that he was used by people who have money. He then essentially admitted that the staging of the light pole was pre-planned. But, he was cautious not to outright confess. He distanced himself from the planners while admitting that the staging was planned.

Conclusion: The Pentagon was hit by a MISSILE not hit by a plane

The lack of any evidence that a plane hit the Pentagon, eyewitness testimony of a banking, north side approach, eyewitnesses who saw a low-flying “jet” fly past the Pentagon that “kept on going,” plus Loyde’s confession that the downed light pole was preplanned and staged all provide ample evidence proving that a Boeing 757 did not hit the Pentagon, but instead a smaller “jet” merely flew past the Pentagon seconds after it was hit by a missile in order to appear as though a plane did the damage.

How can we be sure that a MISSILE was used on the Pentagon?

Both Donald Rumsfeld (Secretary of Defense) and Timothy Roemer (9/11 Commission member) said that the Pentagon was hit by a missile (see below). Plus, there was an abnormally high radiation reading near the Pentagon and there were eyewitness accounts.

Donald Rumsfeld said that a MISSILE was used to damage the Pentagon

If no plane hit the Pentagon, then what did? In an interview with Parade Magazine in October 2001 ([of which a transcript was posted on the U.S. Department of Defense website, defense.gov](#)), Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld was asked “How did a war targeting civilians arrive on our homeland with seemingly no warning?” Rumsfeld replied:

“There were lots of warnings... It is a truth that a terrorist can attack any time, any place, using any technique and it’s physically impossible to defend at every time and every place against every conceivable technique. Here we’re talking about plastic knives and using an American Airlines flight filled with our citizens, and the missile to damage this building and similar (inaudible) that damaged the World Trade Center. The only way to deal with this problem is by taking the battle to the terrorists, wherever they are, and dealing with them.”
[32]

Note that Rumsfeld indicated that both a plane and a missile were used on the Pentagon, which matches up perfectly with evidence presented the above video, *Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11*.

Timothy Roemer, Former 9/11 Commission Member, said that the Pentagon was “pried open by a MISSILE”

In an interview in September 2006 with CNN’s Miles O’Brien, former 9/11 Commissioner

member, Timothy Roemer, says that a missile caused the damage to the Pentagon and then quickly corrects himself to line up with the official story.

O'Brien: *"At any point during this day were you just, in a very base way, afraid?"*

Roemer: *"There was — there were many times, Miles, that you were afraid. You were — you were worried, especially when I was standing in front of the Pentagon that night, seeing one of our fortresses pried open by a missile, an airplane, thinking about the number of people that probably died on the plane and on the ground..."*

Click on the link below to see the above exchange between O'Brien and Roemer:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cUmr9dFbf2c>

Expert claims that a high radiation reading near Pentagon indicates that a "depleted uranium warhead may have been used"

The missile hypothesis is supported by physical evidence. Dr. Janette Sherman, a well-respected radiation expert, used a Geiger counter to measure radiation levels from about 12 miles downwind of the Pentagon shortly after the attack on 9/11. Sherman reported that the Geiger counter reading was extremely high, 8-10 times greater than normal. [33]

Although Sherman's findings are not conclusive, Dr. Leuren Moret, formerly a scientist at the Livermore Nuclear Weapons Laboratory, stated:

"I'm not an explosives or crash site expert, but I am highly knowledgeable in causes and effects related to nuclear radiation contamination. What happened at the Pentagon is highly suspicious, leading me to believe a missile with a depleted uranium warhead may have been used." [34]

The missile theory was echoed by retired Army Maj. Doug Rokke, a PhD educational physics and former top military expert:

"When you look at the whole thing, especially the crash site void of airplane parts, the size of the hole left in the building and the fact the projectile's impact penetrated numerous concrete walls, it looks like the work of a missile. And when you look at the damage, it was obviously a missile." [35]

Pentagon Witness: I was convinced it was a missile.

Lon Rains, who was an Editor for Space News at the time, happened to be driving his car near the Pentagon when it was hit by a missile on 9/11. In an article titled *Eyewitness: The Pentagon*, published on June 30, 2005, Rains wrote:

"That morning, like many others, the traffic slowed to a crawl just in front of the Pentagon. With the Pentagon to the left of my van at about 10 o'clock on the dial of a clock, I glanced at my watch to see if I was going to be late for my appointment. At that moment I heard a very loud, quick whooshing sound that began behind me and stopped suddenly in front of me and to my left. In fractions of a second I heard the impact and an explosion. The next thing I saw was the fireball. I was convinced it was a missile. It came in so fast it sounded nothing like an airplane." [36]

Analysis of Pentagon video indicates that it was faked

While we are not 100% convinced that this analysis of the Pentagon footage is irrefutable, it is worth watching. Below is an analysis of the video footage that allegedly shows Flight 77 exploding as it impacts the Pentagon. The frame-by-frame analysis shows the fuselage is still in view when the explosion occurs. Watch it here:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mnzh-EyxKwc>

FBI: Alleged Phone calls from Flight 77 on 9/11 by Barbara Olson to Ted Olson did NOT happen

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vut2spY-i4U>

The FBI has confirmed that the calls that Ted Olson allegedly received from his wife, Barbara Olson, from the hijacked Flight 77 were a fabrication. The alleged call from Barbara Olson was the only source of information that mentions terrorists with box cutters. Late on 9/11, Olson reported to CNN that his wife had *“called him twice on a cell phone from AA Flight 77,”* saying that *“all passengers and flight personnel, including the pilots, were herded to the back of the plane by armed hijackers. The only weapons she mentioned were knives and cardboard cutters.”* [37]

Ted Olson’s report was critical because it provided the only evidence that AA Flight 77 was still airborne after it had disappeared from FAA radar shortly before 9:00 am.

Barbara Olson was a well-known commentator on CNN. The reports of her death in a plane that was hijacked by Arab Muslims and subsequently crashed into the Pentagon were a key factor in gaining support for Bush’s “war on terror.”

Ted Olson’s story was shown to be a lie in 2006 at the trial of Zacarias Moussaoui, the alleged 20th hijacker. In the FBI report on phone call from American Flight 77, the FBI report attributed only one call to Barbara Olson and it was an “unconnected call,” lasting “0 seconds.” Therefore, according to the FBI, Ted Olson did not receive a single call from his wife from either a cell phone or a phone onboard the plane. [38]

9/11 Commission Omits Testimony of Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta and Alters Timeline to Protect Vice President Dick Cheney, Who Allowed the Attack on the Pentagon and Failed to Issue an Order to Evacuate the Pentagon

AA Flight 77 allegedly struck the Pentagon at 9:37 am (we know that it was actually a missile and that another plane merely flew past the Pentagon to appear as though it had crashed). Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta testified before the 9/11 Commission that he was in the Presidential Emergency Operations Center (PEOC) and he personally witnessed Vice President Dick Cheney do absolutely nothing while a plane was tracked for over 50 miles as it headed towards the Pentagon. Cheney didn’t even try to alert the Pentagon about the impending attack so that people could have evacuated.

Mineta’s important testimony was omitted from the official 9/11 Commission Report. Even more incredulous is that the Commission lied about the time that Cheney entered the PEOC to make it appear as though Cheney did not enter the PEOC until 20 minutes after the Pentagon was hit. The 9/11 Commission Report claimed that Cheney did not enter the PEOC until “shortly before 10:00, perhaps at 9:58.” [39]

Watch Mineta testify under oath as he is questioned by Lee Hamilton, who was co-chair of the 9/11 Commission:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bDfdOwt2v3Y>

Here's what Norman Mineta, Secretary of Transportation, said, under oath:

"During the time that the airplane was coming in to the Pentagon, 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 . . . said, 'Of course the orders still stand. Have you heard anything to the contrary?'"

Mineta's testimony contradicts the official story regarding why the Pentagon was not evacuated. In explaining why the Pentagon was not evacuated before it was struck, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld's spokesman claimed that "the Pentagon was simply not aware that this aircraft was coming our way." [40]

Mineta's testimony proves that Cheney knew about an approaching aircraft and that there would have been at least 12 minutes for the Pentagon to be evacuated.

The omission of Mineta's testimony and obvious falsification of Cheney's arrival time at the PEOC provides reason to suspect that the 9/11 Commission lied about Cheney's activities to protect him from being found negligent and possibly even complicit in the attack on Pentagon and the resulting deaths.

So, why didn't Cheney call for an evacuation of the Pentagon? One logical reason is that he did not want to have hundreds of people witness the missile strike and see the low-flying decoy plane fly past the Pentagon.

Evidence that Flight 93 Was Shot Down

Rumsfeld said that the 9-11 plane was 'shot down' over Pennsylvania

The official story regarding United Airlines Flight 93 has been that passengers on the plane rushed the hijackers to prevent them from crashing the plane into a strategic target. However, during a surprise Christmas Eve trip to Iraq in December 2004, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld referred to the flight as being shot down [41]. Here is what Rumsfeld said:

"I think all of us have a sense if we imagine the kind of world we would face if the people who bombed the mess hall in Mosul, or the people who did the bombing in Spain, or the people who attacked the United States in New York, shot down the plane over Pennsylvania and attacked the Pentagon, the people who cut off peoples' heads on television to intimidate, to frighten - indeed the word 'terrorized' is just that."

Here's a video of Rumsfeld's making the above statement:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vcR2MGzmn3o>

Investigators find no debris from Flight 93 larger than a phone book and debris is

spread over many miles

The video clip below includes several reports of Flight 93 including a female reporter, near the end of the clip, who stated:

“The debris here is spread over a 3 to 4 mile radius which has now been completely sealed off, and is being treated according to the FBI as a crime scene. This is one of those cases where the pictures really do tell the story . . . one of the most horrifying aspects of this is how little debris is visible . . . that’s all you see, just a large crater in the ground, and just tiny, tiny bits of debris . . . the investigators out there, and there are hundreds of them, have found nothing larger than a phone book.”

See the reporter plus more about Flight 93 including reports of debris 6.9 miles from the crash:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ypi_J4E7IFM

Motive for 9/11

“It’s been painfully obvious the administration not only [fought the creation](#) of the commission but that their objective was the war in Iraq, and one of the notions that was built on was there was a direct connection between al Qaida and 9/11 and Saddam Hussein. There was not. So therefore they didn’t want the 9/11 commission to get going. What you have is the fear from the White House that the commission would uncover pretty quickly the fact that one of four legs that the war stood on was nonexistent.”– Max Cleland, former member of the 9/11 Commission [42]

Motive 1: The Establishment of a Military Presence in Central Asia to Maintain American Primacy

In Zbigniew Brzezinski’s 1997 book, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy And Its Geostrategic Imperatives*, Brzezinski stated that the establishment of military bases in Central Asia would be critically important for “America primacy”, partly due to the large oil reserves near the Caspian Sea.

Knowing that the American public “supported America’s engagement in World War II largely because of the shock effect of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor,” Brzezinski suggested that Americans today would support military operations in Central Asia only “in the circumstance of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat.” [43]

For an interesting analysis of some the key ideas presented in Brzezinski’s *The Grand Chessboard*, watch this video with Michael Ruppert titled *Playing The Pawns On The Grand Chessboard: The Deception Of Geopolitics*:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SeP8ZuuxKy0>

Motive 2: Afghan Oil Pipeline

In *The Grand Chessboard*, Brzezinski also describes a “pipeline war” as part of the motivation to invade Afghanistan. President George W Bush and Vice-president Dick Cheney backed UNOCAL’s Afghan pipeline plans. However, the Taliban was an obstacle to achieving that goal. At a meeting in Berlin in July of 2001, representatives of the Bush administration gave the Taliban an ultimatum: “Either you accept our offer of a carpet of gold, or we bury

you under a carpet of bombs.” [44]

Since the Taliban did not go along with the plan, the U.S. needed an excuse to attack Afghanistan. 9/11 gave them the excuse that they needed. On the evening of 9/11, President George W. Bush addressed the nation regarding the terrorist hijackings, and the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon:

“Today, our fellow citizens, our way of life, our very freedom came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts.... Today our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature... The search is under way for those who are behind these evil acts. I’ve directed the full resources of our intelligence and law-enforcement communities to find those responsible, and to bring them to justice. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts, and those who harbor them.” [45]

Does Bush REALLY want justice for “those who are behind these evil acts”?

Within three weeks after 9/11, Bush ordered the bombing of Afghanistan because they were allegedly harboring Osama bin Laden. But, one has to wonder how serious Bush was about finding those who were “behind these evil acts” and bringing them to justice. Bush waited a full 441 days to reluctantly establish the 9/11 Commission and then made sure that it was virtually impossible for the Commission to perform a thorough investigation. In fact, the first chapter of a book written by the co-chairs of the 9/11 Commission, Thomas Kean and Lee Hamilton, is titled “Set Up to Fail,” [46] in which they explain why they believe that was the case:

1. The late establishment and start of the commission itself. It took 441 days after the attacks and a Congressional mandate to force the Bush administration into a formal investigation.
2. There were numerous complications in obtaining security clearances for Commissioners and staff.
3. There was a short deadline for completion that did not allow for enough time to fulfill their mandate.
4. The commission was severely underfunded. Only \$3 million dollars was initially allocated, though two months later the Bush Administration reluctantly increased the total to \$12 million.
5. The commission had restricted access to important documents and witnesses. According to Hamilton, “... we were fighting the question of access right up to the end of the Commission’s work.”
6. False testimony was given by NORAD officials, and
7. The commission encountered obstruction by the CIA, and possibly the White House, over access to prisoners accused of having a role in the 9/11 plot.

Motive 3: The Pearl Harbor of the 21st century

The Project for a New American Century (PNAC) is a neo-conservative think tank that had numerous key members that were also part of the [Bush administration](#) including, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, and Lewis “Scooter” Libby. The PNAC advocated a war in Iraq to get rid of Saddam Hussein, build a military presence, and “control the oil.”

The December 1, 1997 issue of the Weekly Standard, a conservative magazine, headlined its cover with the directive: *Saddam Must Go: A How-to Guide*. Two of the articles were written by Bush administration officials Paul D. Wolfowitz and Zalmay M. Khalilzad, who wrote: “*We will have to confront him [Saddam Hussein] sooner or later—and sooner would be better.*” [47]

Wolfowitz and Libby contributed to the PNAC’s report titled *Rebuilding America’s Defenses: Strategy, Forces, and Resources for a New Century* released in September 2000, which reiterated the idea of a permanent military presence in the Gulf region. In that report, the PNAC suggested that the road to rebuild American defenses “will likely be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event like a new [Pearl Harbor](#).” [48]

On the night of 9/11, [Bush noted](#) in his daily diary, “The Pearl Harbor of the 21st century took place today.” Also, Bush characterized 9/11 as “a great opportunity.” [49]

Donald Rumsfeld added that 9/11 created “the kind of opportunities that World War II offered, to refashion the world.” [50]

This idea of 9/11 providing “opportunities” then showed up in The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, issued by the Bush administration in September 2002:

“The events of September 11, 2001, fundamentally changed the context for relations between the United States and other main centers of global power, and opened vast, new opportunities.” [51]

Only three days after 9/11, “Congress approved \$40 billion to help mend and avenge the victims of Tuesday’s terrorist attacks.” [52]

Motive 4: Bush Sought Way To Invade Iraq from Day 1 of His Administration

In Lesley Stahl’s [60 Minutes interview with Bush’s first Treasury Secretary, Paul O’Neill](#), which aired in early January, 2004, O’Neill revealed that Saddam Hussein and Iraq were Bush’s main focus from the very beginning of his administration. See the transcript below and the video link below that.

Stahl: “And what happened in President Bush’s very first National Security Council meeting is one of O’Neill’s most startling revelations.”

O’Neill: “From the very beginning, there was a conviction that Saddam Hussein was a bad person and that he needed to go.”

Stahl: “He said that going after Saddam was topic ‘A’ 10 days after the inauguration – eight months before Sept. 11.”

Ron Suskind (author of the book “The Price of Loyalty” in which O’Neill was a significant

contributor. O'Neill gave Suskind 19,000 internal documents): "From the very first instance, it was about Iraq. It was about what we can do to change this regime"

Stahl: "Now everybody else thought that grew out of 9/11."

Suskind: "No"

Stahl: "But this book says it was day one of this administration."

Suskind: "Day one, these things were laid and sealed."

Stahl: "As treasury secretary, O'Neill was a permanent member of the National Security Council. He says in the book he was surprised at the meeting that questions such as 'Why Saddam?' and 'Why now?' were never asked."

Stahl (quoting O'Neill from the book): "It was all about finding a way to do it. That was the tone of it. The president saying 'Go find me a way to do this.'"

O'Neill: "For me, the notion of pre-emption, that the U.S. has the unilateral right to do whatever we decide to do, is a really huge leap."

Stahl: "And that came up at this first meeting?"

O'Neill: "It did."

Stahl: "O'Neill told us that the discussion of Iraq continued at the next National Security Council meeting two days later. He got briefing materials under this cover sheet." (Note: the cover sheet is shown in the video below)

Suskind: "There are memos. One of them marked, secret, says, 'Plan for post-Saddam Iraq.'" (Note: the memo is shown in the video below)

Stahl: "Nation Building?"

Suskind: "Absolutely."

Stahl: "So, they discussed an occupation of Iraq?"

Suskind: "In January and February of 2001."

Stahl: "Based on his interviews with O'Neill and several other officials at the meetings, Suskind writes that the planning envisioned peacekeeping troops, war crimes tribunals, and even divvying up Iraq's oil wealth."

Stahl: "Suskind obtained this Pentagon document, dated March 5, 2001, entitled 'Foreign Suitors for Iraqi Oilfield Contracts.' It includes a map of potential areas for exploration." (Note: the document is shown in the video below)

Note: for much more information regarding Maps and Charts of the Iraqi oil fields, visit the link below:

<http://www.judicialwatch.org/story/2002/mar/maps-and-charts-iraqi-oil-fields>

Suskind: "It talks about contractors around the world from, you know, 30-40 countries. And

which ones have what intentions...”

Stahl: “On oil.”

Suskind. “On oil in Iraq.”

Six months before 9/11, there were already plans for how the Iraqi oil fields would be divided up, and which contractors would do the work.

Here’s the link to the 60 Minutes interview with O’Neill:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gpaq3Vr95oU>

Bush Makes a Big Joke about WMDs Never Being Found

In addition to the 9/11 lies, we also know that the Bush administration lied about the presence of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) in Iraq. [43] At a White House Correspondents Dinner in 2004, after the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, President George W Bush made a big joke about the fact that no WMDs were ever found:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nKX6luiMINQ>

Question: Who are Bush and his audience laughing at here?

Answer: The joke is on us. They are laughing at us. And, they will continue laughing as long as we allow them to stage false flag events and use their lies in order to dictate foreign and domestic policy.

What You Can Do

“He who passively accepts evil is as much involved in it as he who helps to perpetrate it. He who accepts evil without protesting against it is really cooperating with it.” ~ [Martin Luther King, Jr.](#)

Please take some positive action to raise awareness. Here are some suggestions.

1. Copy and distribute this report. You have our permission and are encouraged to copy and email this report to friends and family, and post on other sites. We have intentionally refrained from embedding images and videos to make it easy to copy as it contains only text and links.
2. Show either the [short](#) or [long](#) version of the video *AE911Truth’s Blueprint for Truth* to friends and family. Also, try to get the long version of the video aired on your local cable stations. The AE911truth.com website contains a list of other strategies: <http://ae911truth.org/en/take-action.html>
3. Similarly show the video *Undeniable Proof a Plane did NOT Hit the Pentagon on 9/11* to friends and family and try to get the video aired on your local cable stations. You can also download the video from the citizeninvestigationteam.com website, make copies, and distribute the video. The citizeninvestigationteam.com website also contains a list of strategies: <http://www.citizeninvestigationteam.com/strategy.html>

Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge and thank all of the patriots and truthers who produced the videos and documents referenced in this report. We also acknowledge the many thousands of others worldwide who have spent countless hours in the pursuit of 9/11 truth. We have included only a small fraction of the evidence that has been collected over the years. But, we do believe that the artifacts that we have assembled, and the logical fashion in which they are presented, will convince any reasonable person that the official accounts (the 9/11 Commission Report and the NIST study) are complete fabrications to cover up the truth.

Featured image source: [cliff1066™'s photostream](#)

Notes

[1] *"The White House Has Played Cover-Up" -Former 9/11 Commission Member Max Cleland Blasts Bush*

http://www.democracynow.org/2004/3/23/the_white_house_has_played_cover

[2] *9/11 Commission Report*

<http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/index.htm>

[3] *9/11 Commission Co-Chair Explains Need for New Investigation*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fEkMnbpXKQs>

[4] Lee Hamilton, Vice Chairman, 9/11 Commission

<http://www.patriotsquestion911.com/>

[5] Thomas Kean and Lee Hamilton (co-chairs of the 9/11 Commission), *Stonewalled by the C.I.A.*

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/02/opinion/02kean.html?ref=opinion>

[6] Lee Hamilton, Vice Chairman, 9/11 Commission

<http://www.patriotsquestion911.com/>

[7] 9/11 panel distrusted Pentagon testimony, CNN, August 2, 2006

<http://www.cnn.com/2006/POLITICS/08/02/9-11panel.pentagon/index.html>

[8] Lee Hamilton, Vice Chairman, 9/11 Commission

<http://www.patriotsquestion911.com/>

[9] 9/11 Commission Report

<http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/index.htm>

[10] World Trade Center Disaster Study

<http://www.nist.gov/el/disasterstudies/wtc/>

[11] New Poll of New Yorkers Finds Lingering Doubts about Official Explanation of 9/11 Attacks, Including Third Tower's Collapse

<http://rememberbuilding7.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Building-7-Poll-Results-Website-Release.pdf>

[12] 1 in 7 believe US government staged the 9/11 attacks

<http://www.indianexpress.com/news/1-in-7-believe-us-govt-staged-the-9-11-attacks-poll/838857/>

[13] Establishment Prepares 9/11 Official Story Onslaught (scroll down to section titled *Highly Credible People Question 9/11*)

<http://www.infowars.com/establishment-prepares-911-official-story-onslaught/>

[14] Factual History of False Flag Events

http://www.truthusa.info/?page_id=17

[15] CIA confirms Bush lied about WMDs

<http://whitehouser.com/war/cia-confirms-bush-wmd-lie/>

[16] Andrew Gavin Marshall, *Lies, War, and Empire: NATO's "Humanitarian Imperialism" in Libya*

<http://andrewgavinmarshall.com/2011/08/26/lies-war-and-empire-nato%E2%80%99s-%E2%80%99Chumanitarian-imperialism%E2%80%9D-in-libya/>

[17] Calls in Syria for weapons, NATO intervention, The Washington Post, August 28, 2011.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle-east/calls-in-syria-for-weapons-nato-intervention/2011/08/26/gIQA3WAsI_story.html

[18] Iraq deaths

<http://www.justforeignpolicy.org/iraq>

[19] Statement of Robin Hordon

<http://patriotsquestion911.com/Statement%20Hordon.html>

[20] Greg Scott, *Panel Demolishes Official 9/11 Story While Proposing State Initiatives for Justice*, February 17, 2011

<http://consciouslifeneeds.com/panel-demolishes-official-911-story-los-angeles/114984/>

[21] Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth website (in the right-hand column on the home page)

<http://www.ae911truth.org>

[22] *Controlling Interests: Ownership, Control, and Insurance of The World Trade Center*

<http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/background/owners.html>

[23] Ibid.

[24] *Final Report on the Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7*, NIST, August 2008

http://www.sustainable-design.ie/fire/NIST-NCSTAR-1A_Final-Report_WTC-7-Collapse.pdf

[25] Griffin, *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*, 31-32.

[26] George Nelson, Colonel, USAF (ret.), *Aircraft Parts and the Precautionary Principle*

<http://physics911.net/georgenelson>

[27] Karen Kwiatkowski, PhD, USAF (ret), *9/11 and American Empire Intellectuals Speak Out*, Edited by David Ray Griffin and Peter Dale Scott, 2006

[28] Ibid.

[29] *The 9/11 commission Report* (pages 225-226, 242)

[30] *Air Traffic Controllers Recall September 11*

<http://911review.org/Wget/september11.natca.org/NewsArticles/DaniellOBrien.htm>

[31] *Pilots for 9/11 Truth, Outlining Anomalies Found in NTSB Data*

<http://pilotsfor911truth.org/techpaperAA77>

[32] Secretary Rumsfeld Interview with Parade Magazine, News Transcript, October 12, 2001

http://web.archive.org/web/20041118063828/http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/2001/t11182001_t1012pm.html

[33] Greg Szymanski, *Radiation Expert Claims High-Radiation Readings Near Pentagon After 9/11 Indicate Depleted Uranium Used; High-Ranking Army Officer Claims Missile Used at Pentagon, Not Commercial Airliner*, August 18, 2004

<http://web.archive.org/web/20060111183631/http://www.arcticbeacon.com/18-Aug-2005.html>

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Lon Rains, *Eyewitness: The Pentagon*, Space News, June 30, 2005

http://web.archive.org/web/20060210130450/http://www.space.com/news/rains_september11-1.html

[37] *The Account of Box Cutters as Weapons*, Jan 2005

<http://www.sf911truth.org/monographs/Box%20cutters%20-%20Who%20Got%20the%20Call,%20with%20Postscript%20%5B4-page%5D.pdf>

[38] *FBI: 9/11 cell phone calls from jets did not happen*

<http://www.zimbio.com/Ted+Olson/articles/6gELkGIBsd7/FBI+9+11+cell+phone+calls+jets+not+happen>

[39] *The 9/11 Commission Report*, page 40

<http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/index.htm>

[40] *Air Attack on Pentagon Indicates Weaknesses*, Newsday, Sept. 23, 2001

[41] *Rumsfeld says 9-11 Plane was 'shot down' in Pennsylvania*, Dec. 27, 2004

<http://www.wnd.com/?pagelid=28200>

[42] Eric Boehlert, *The president ought to be ashamed*, Nov 21, 2003

<http://dir.salon.com/story/news/feature/2003/11/21/cleland/index.html>

[43] Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*, published Sep. 18, 1998, pages 24-25, 35-36, 212

[44] Julio Godoy, *U.S. Taliban Policy Influenced by Oil*, Inter Press Service, Nov. 16, 2001.

[45] *President George Bush: 'Today our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature'*, September 11, 2001

<http://www.cnbcfix.com/bush-speech-ovaloffice-911.html>

[46] Thomas Kean and Lee Hamilton, *Without Precedent: The Inside Story of the 9/11 Commission*, published August 15, 2006

[47] Glenn Kessler, *U.S. Decision on Iraq Has Puzzling Past: Opponents of War Wonder When, How Policy Was Set*, Washington Post, January 12, 2003

<http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/45/222.html>

[48] A Report of the Project for the New American Century, *Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces, and Resources for a New Century*, page 51, September 2000

<http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>

[49] Dan Balz and Bob Woodward, *America's Chaotic Road to War: Bush's Global Strategy Began to Take Shape in First Frantic Hours After Attack*, Washington Post, January 27, 2002

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A43708-2002Jan26>

[50] Secretary Rumsfeld Interview with the New York Times, October 1, 2001

<http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=2097>

[51] *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, pg. 28, September 2002

http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/nss/nss_sep2002.pdf

[52] The Dallas Morning News, *Bush OKs calling up reservists; Congress approves \$40 billion fund*.

<http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-78291355.html>

[53] CIA confirms Bush lied about WMDs

<http://whitehouser.com/war/cia-confirms-bush-wmd-lie/>

Further Reading



[THE 9/11 "BIG LIE". WHEN FICTION BECOMES FACT](#)

- by Global Research - 2011-09-11

Articles and documentation on 9/11 from Global Research

The original source of this article is aircrap.com

Copyright © [Community](#), aircrap.com, 2011

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Community](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca