

The 9/11 Commission Didn't Believe the Government ... So Why Should We?

By [Washington's Blog](#)

Global Research, March 13, 2015

[Washington's Blog](#) 12 March 2015

Region: [USA](#)
Theme: [Terrorism](#)

GR Editor's Note

Published below is a review by Washington's Blog of recent statements by members of the 9/11 Commission.

In many regards, these statements by the 9/11 Commissioners are misleading. The report is loaded with distortions, fabrications and a deliberate coverup of the evidence. And the commissioners bear full responsibility for these lies and fabrications.

And now they are proposing to set up a new investigation. They say that they "Did Not Get the Full Story" and they blame the government and the CIA.

In fact what they did was to "fabricate a story" and unquestionably this was undertaken in complicity with US intelligence and the Bush administration.

Their recent statements outlined below should be put into context. Their unspoken mandate was to uphold the Big Lie, which consisted in presenting a fictitious narrative, namely that Muslims were behind the 9/11 attacks. And to this date, that narrative prevails.

"What happened on the planes" as described in their report is sheer fiction and fantasy and they bear full responsibility in that regard. Below is an excerpt from my earlier study on the 9/11 attacks (published in America's War on Terrorism, Global Research, 2005):

The [9/11 Commission's Report](#) provides an almost visual description of the Arab hijackers. It depicts in minute detail events occurring inside the cabin of the four hijacked planes:

In the absence of surviving passengers, this "corroborating evidence", was based on passengers' cell and air phone conversations with their loved ones. According to the Report, the cockpit voice recorder (CVR) was only recovered in the case of one of the flights (UAL 93).

Focusing on the personal drama of the passengers, the Commission has built much of its narrative around the phone conversations. The Arabs are portrayed with their knives and box cutters, scheming in the name of Allah, to bring down the planes and turn them "into large guided missiles" (Report, Chapter 1, http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report_Ch1.pdf).

The Technology of Wireless Transmission

The Report conveys the impression that cell phone ground-to-air communication from high altitude was of reasonably good quality, and that there was no major impediment or obstruction in wireless transmission.

Some of the conversations were with onboard air phones, which contrary to the cell phones provide for good quality transmission. The report does not draw a clear demarcation between the two types of calls.

More significantly, what this carefully drafted script fails to mention is that, given the prevailing technology in September 2001, it was extremely difficult, if not impossible, to place a wireless cell call from an aircraft traveling at high speed above 8000 feet:

“Wireless communications networks weren’t designed for ground-to-air communication. Cellular experts privately admit that they’re surprised the calls were able to be placed from the hijacked planes, and that they lasted as long as they did. They speculate that the only reason that the calls went through in the first place is that the aircraft were flying so close to the ground

(<http://www.elliott.org/technology/2001/cellpermit.htm>)

Expert opinion within the wireless telecom industry casts serious doubt on “the findings” of the 9/11 Commission. According to Alexa Graf, a spokesman of AT&T, commenting in the immediate wake of the 9/11 attacks:

“it was almost a fluke that the [9/11] calls reached their destinations... From high altitudes, the call quality is not very good, and most callers will experience drops. Although calls are not reliable, callers can pick up and hold calls for a little while below a certain altitude”

(http://wirelessreview.com/ar/wireless_final_contact/) (Michel Chossudovsky, What Happened on the Planes on September 11, 2001, August 10, 2004)

The Commissioners “express doubt” is the underlying theme. Doubt about what they wrote in report?

Were they deliberately misled as suggested below? Are they expressing doubts concerning their own lies?

The 9/11 Commissioners have stated that Pentagon officials lied to the Commission, yet many of these lies have been embodied in the report.

Michel Chossudovsky, March 13, 2015

* * *

The 9/11 Commission Didn’t Believe the Government ... So Why Should We?

by Washington’s Blog, March 13, 2015

9/11 Commissioners Admit They Never Got the Full Story

The 9/11 Commissioners publicly expressed anger at cover ups and obstructions of justice by the government into a real 9/11 investigation:

- 9/11 Commission co-chair Lee Hamilton says [“I don’t believe for a minute we got everything right”, that the Commission was set up to fail, that people should keep asking questions about 9/11, and that the 9/11 debate should continue](#)
- The 9/11 Commission chair said the Commission was [“set up to fail”](#)
- The Commission’s co-chairs [said](#) that the CIA (and likely the White House) [“obstructed our investigation”](#)
- 9/11 Commissioner Bob Kerrey said that [“There are ample reasons to suspect that there may be some alternative to what we outlined in our version . . . We didn’t have access”](#)
- 9/11 Commissioner Timothy Roemer said [“We were extremely frustrated with the false statements we were getting”](#)
- 9/11 Commissioner Max Cleland resigned from the Commission, stating: [“It is a national scandal”; “This investigation is now compromised”; and “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”](#). When asked in 2009 if he thought there should be another 9/11 commission, Cleland responded: [“There should be about fifteen 9/11 commissions”](#)
- The Senior Counsel to the 9/11 Commission (John Farmer) – who led the 9/11 staff’s inquiry – [said](#) “At some level of the government, at some point in time...there was an agreement not to tell the truth about what happened“. He also [said](#) “I was shocked at how different the truth was from the way it was described The tapes told a radically different story from what had been told to us and the public for two years.... This is not spin. This is not true.”

No wonder the Co-Chair of the congressional investigation into 9/11 – Bob Graham – and 9/11 Commissioner and former Senator Bob Kerrey are calling for either a [“PERMANENT 9/11 commission”](#) or a [new 9/11 investigation](#) to get to the bottom of it.

Some examples of obstruction of justice into the 9/11 investigation include:

- An FBI informant hosted and rented a room to two hijackers in 2000. Specifically, investigators for the Congressional Joint Inquiry [discovered](#) that an FBI informant had hosted and even rented a room to two hijackers in 2000 and that, when the Inquiry sought to interview the informant, the FBI refused outright, and then hid him in an unknown location, and that a high-level FBI official stated these blocking maneuvers were undertaken under orders from the White House. As the [New York Times notes](#):

Senator Bob Graham, the Florida Democrat who is a former chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, accused the White House on Tuesday of covering up evidenceThe accusation stems from the Federal Bureau of Investigation's refusal to allow investigators for a Congressional inquiry and the independent Sept. 11 commission to interview an informant, Abdussattar Shaikh, who had been [the landlord](#) in San Diego of two Sept. 11 hijackers.

- The chairs of both the 9/11 Commission and the Official Congressional Inquiry into 9/11 [said](#) that Soviet-style government "minders" obstructed the investigation into 9/11 by intimidating witnesses (and [see this](#))
- The 9/11 Commissioners [concluded](#) that officials from the Pentagon lied to the Commission, and considered recommending criminal charges for such false statements
- The tape of interviews of air traffic controllers on-duty on 9/11 was intentionally destroyed by crushing the cassette by hand, cutting the tape into little pieces, and then dropping the pieces in different trash cans around the building [as shown by this NY Times article \(summary version is free; full version is pay-per-view\)](#) and by [this article from the Chicago Sun-Times](#)
- As reported by [ACLU](#), [FireDogLake](#), [RawStory](#) and many others, declassified documents shows that Senior Bush administration officials sternly cautioned the 9/11 Commission against probing too deeply into the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001

Both the 9/11 Commission Investigation and 9/11 Trials Were Based on Unreliable Evidence Produced by Torture

The CIA [videotaped the interrogation of 9/11 suspects, falsely told the 9/11 Commission that there were no videotapes or other records of the interrogations, and then illegally destroyed all of the tapes and transcripts of the interrogations.](#)

9/11 Commission co-chairs Thomas Keane and Lee Hamilton [wrote](#):

Those who knew about those videotapes — and did not tell us about them — obstructed our investigation.

The chief lawyer for Guantanamo litigation - Vijay Padmanabhan - [said](#) that torture of 9/11 suspects was widespread.

And Susan J. Crawford - the senior Pentagon official overseeing the military commissions at Guantánamo [told](#) Bob Woodward:

We tortured Qahtani. His treatment met the legal definition of torture.

Indeed, some of the main sources of information were tortured [right up to the point of death.](#)

Moreover, the type of torture used by the U.S. on the Guantanamo suspects is of a special type. Senator Levin revealed that the [the U.S. used Communist torture techniques specifically aimed at creating false confessions](#). (and see [this](#), [this](#), [this](#) and [this](#)).

And according to [NBC News](#):

- Much of the 9/11 Commission Report was based upon the testimony of people who were tortured
- At least four of the people whose interrogation figured in the 9/11 Commission Report have claimed that they told interrogators information as a way to stop being “tortured”
- One of the Commission’s main sources of information was tortured until he agreed to sign a confession that he was NOT EVEN ALLOWED TO READ
- The 9/11 Commission itself *doubted the accuracy of the torture confessions*, and yet kept their doubts to themselves

If the 9/11 Commissioners *themselves* doubt the information from the government, why should we believe it?

The original source of this article is [Washington's Blog](#)
Copyright © [Washington's Blog](#), [Washington's Blog](#), 2015

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Washington's Blog](#)

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