

Were the 9/11 Aircraft Electronically Hijacked and Remotely Controlled?

By [Dan Hanley](#)

Global Research, November 20, 2022

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Law and Justice](#),
[Terrorism](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the **Translate Website** button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

According to the global grassroots organization 9/11 Pilot Whistleblowers website (<https://911pilots.org/>), there were no Muslim hijackers at the controls of the 9/11 aircraft but that these aircraft were electronically hijacked and remotely controlled through employment of a system called the [uninterruptible autopilot](#) that enables a remote source to take complete control of the aircraft autopilot and flight management computer and remotely guide it to its target destination. Once engaged, the pilots cannot disconnect this system.

According to the 9/11 Commission, the [alleged hijackers](#) had never flown the sophisticated B-757 and B-767 aircraft in their lives but were mainly trained in light, [single engine Cessna 172s](#) and the like.

This would be akin to only having driven your family automobile and climbing into a huge 18-wheeler semi-tractor trailer that you had never driven before, getting it up to a very high speed, and driving it through a garage without scraping the sides of the truck or hopping into a formula one race car that you hadn't driven before and keeping it on the track at a very high speed.

Just because one can pilot a Cessna 172 does not qualify one to pilot a large commercial jet aircraft at very high speeds. It just doesn't work that way.

A comparison of the [cockpit layout](#) of these types of aircraft will demonstrate the ludicrousness of the official story. There is no way the hijackers could have climbed into the cockpits of the jet aircraft, interpret the instrumentation and flight navigation systems, and fly the aircraft to their designated targets.

So how did three of four aircraft flies from the point at which they were hijacked to where they flew with cruise missile precision into buildings on the first attempt in New York City and Washington, DC?

One must first review the origin and history of the remote control of large airborne aircraft before we continue.

Over 75-years ago, in 1944, toward the end of World War II, the US Army Air Corp launched [Operation Aphrodite](#) in Europe wherein old B-24 bomber aircraft were gutted out to lighten the weight of the aircraft, loaded with 30000 pounds of highly incendiary compound called Torpex, and remotely flown into targets in Europe. Pilots were required to make the takeoff but once airborne, they bailed out of the aircraft.

It should be noted that Joe Kennedy, JFK's older brother, died on one such [top secret missions](#) when the aircraft exploded due to a malfunction before he could bail out of the aircraft.

There are other such examples of remote control of aircraft, but we will jump ahead forty years to 1984 where NASA and the FAA conducted a joint crash test experiment in a remote location using a large four engine B-720 commercial jet aircraft loaded with only crash dummies and video cameras to test crew and passenger survivability in the event of a crash landing. The aircraft was flown by remote control several times around the traffic pattern before being [intentionally crash landed](#).

Jumping ahead yet another ten years or so to the mid-90s, the uninterruptible autopilot system previously described was developed and produced as a device capable of remotely taking control of an airborne hijacked commercial jet and guiding to an auto landing at one of many airports in the world.

(The fact that this technology existed in the mid-90's years before 9/11 is given by the [testimony of an avionics technician who](#) actually worked on this system that was installed on a B-757 aircraft).

Let us now take for example the hijacker of American Airlines flight 77 supposedly flown by 29-year-old Saudi Arabian hijacker Hani Hanjour who was described as a [very poor student](#) pilot that could barely speak English, a requirement to obtain a pilot license.

AA77 took off from Washington Dulles airport headed for the west coast. After leveling off at cruise altitude for a while, the aircraft made a U turn heading back towards Washington in a descent. According to the official narrative, at 7000 feet the aircraft commenced a 330-corkscrew turn descended to just a few feet off the surface without skidding it at over 500 mph to strike the Office of Naval Intelligence with military precision on its first attempt!

Digressing, in August 2001, just one month prior to 9/11. Hanjour attempted to rent a small, single-engine Cessna 172 from the Freeway airport in Maryland but was denied rental by the chief flight instructor there, Marcel Bernard, because he could not handle the aircraft! And yet, Hanjour was able to accomplish this amazing aerial feat on his first try.

Given that the alleged hijackers were unqualified to fly the aircraft that day, one must ask how the aircraft were hijacked and flown into buildings as reported by the 9/11 Commission?

The only viable explanation that can be offered is through employment of the uninterruptible autopilot system. How else could this have been accomplished? You be the judge.

In August, 2020, a Federal Aviation Administration whistleblower report was filed via the FAA Hotline by the 9/11 Pilot Whistleblowers members alleging the use of the uninterruptible autopilot on 9/11.

Initially, this federal aviation oversight agency was very receptive to the vast evidence provided and even assigned a Seattle-based FAA aeronautical engineer to handle the case until it was recognized the depth and breadth of the allegations being made.

[Communications all but ceased](#) with the exception of a few emails from the FAA that weakly attempted to refute these claims. Freedom of Information Act requests for relevant information indicated that the FAA was being less than truthful in their responses before communications ceased by this agency and the stonewalling began.

Consequently, over the next two years, letters and emails were sent, and phone calls were made to every relevant government office in Washington, including to the [FAA Administrator](#), [Secretary of Transportation](#), [Department of Transportation Inspector General](#), [US Attorney General](#), [Director of National Intelligence](#), [FBI Director](#), [the House Government Oversight Committee leadership](#) even [President Biden](#) and many others without responses!

Subsequently, appeals have been made to the [Pakistani](#), [Chinese](#), and [Russian](#) governments to review evidence and possibly commence an investigation into the lies of 9/11. If the US government is uninterested in investigating our assertions then perhaps a foreign government will.

Hani Hanjour could not fly a Cessna 172, never mind a B-757, a fact that was [known by the 9/11 Commission and the FBI](#) but totally ignored. One must ask why the US federal government continues to ignore this case. Again...you be the judge.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

This article was originally published on [The Intel Drop](#).

[Captain Dan Hanley](#) had a 35-year combined flying career in US naval aviation/United Airlines as a pilot and currently serves as Director of 9/11 Pilot Whistleblowers. He lives in Islamabad, Pakistan and may be reached at captaindanhanley@gmail.com.

Featured image is from The Intel Drop

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Dan Hanley](#), Global Research, 2022

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: **Dan Hanley**

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