

Chris Hanrahan

English 101.10

Andrew McCarthy

12/11/07

The Collapse of Logic: A Study of the Events of 9/11

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, author of the short story collection *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*, once shared his view on guessing. “I never guess,” he wrote in *A Scandal in Bohemia*. “It is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data. Insensibly one begins to twist facts to suit theories, instead of theories to suit facts.” I wish to present an argument about one of the most pivotal events in the history of our country. You may or may not have heard of “9/11 Conspiracy Theories” and you may or may not have instantly discredited their merit, as many want to do. The reason why I ask for you to reconsider alternative theories about the events of September 11, 2001 lies in the great possibility that the official theory which we have been told to accept is incomplete and omits important facts and analysis. In this essay, I will explain my alternative hypothesis, while using scientific and deductive reasoning. I will conclude that many Americans have discounted alternative 9/11 conspiracy theories which employ scientific reasoning and common sense in favor of those based on political agendas because of the general lack of communication and discussion which continues to exist in what we hold as our most trusted source of information – the media.

I originally became interested in learning about the anomalies which surround the events of September 11 after seeing the mainstream documentary *Fahrenheit 9/11* by Michael Moore. During the past year, I have researched the topic of September 11 extensively. I therefore feel I am better qualified to discuss the alternative theories about the events of 9/11 than most Americans can explain the theory that has been prescribed to them. My research far exceeds the

scope of this paper and includes having read countless publications and documents, both in print and online. I have taken such an interest in the events of 9/11 that I own a number of “official reports” published by government organizations, and alternative theories written by accredited individuals in various professional fields of study. I have included a fully annotated bibliography which outlines the more useful sources I have come across, and those I have used in writing the present essay.

Let me begin by defining a key term that is used throughout this essay. *Conspiracy Theory* is the term assigned to theories which attempt to unseat the status quo of public opinion, and is defined by the Merriam-Webster dictionary as “a theory that explains an event or set of circumstances as the result of a secret plot by usually powerful conspirators.” As is the case with any field or topic of discussion, crazy theorists do exist. However, this fact does not provide reason for the sensible ones to be discredited. Accredited *Conspiracy theorists* such as professors and scientists, as well as those who previously held military or government positions should not be discounted as crazy, but should instead be acknowledged as possible sources of credible information.

In my search for sources which contain a more government bias instead of those which outline the omissions and distortions present in them, I came across *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission On Terrorist Attacks Upon The United States*. This commission took over a year to gain government approval. The final report took three years to be published, and is now the most widely known publication about the events leading up to and surrounding 9/11. Compare this delay of three years to some other crucial events which warranted official reports, and you might be surprised. When the Titanic sunk in 1912, only six days passed before an official report came out. Nine days after the attack on Pearl Harbor, a report was issued to the public. Only seven days after the assassination of JFK was a report on

that matter released. By the time that *The 9/11 Commission Report* was released, the topic had fallen from the realm of serious discussion to a widely disregarded matter. And whereas reports having to do with the sinking of the Titanic relied on the discovery of the crash site, and subsequent science and engineering based investigations ensued, *The 9/11 Commission Report* was written by politicians and incorporates neither science nor engineering based conclusions. In fact, the report does not even detail the design of the Twin Towers, and the architecture which made the buildings so unique – the incorporation of 47 steel core columns which supported the floors. The report explains the collapse concisely and without the use of a single mathematical model, proclaiming that a “pancake effect” similar in nature to a “domino effect” was responsible for the collapse of the Twin Towers.

The preface of *The 9/11 Commission Report* includes some startling notions as to the completeness of its contents. On page xvii, it discredits itself to this effect. It reads, “We want to note what we have done, and not done.” The authors then go on to admit that they “have not interviewed every knowledgeable person or found every relevant piece of paper. New information inevitably will come to light.” Nowhere in the entire report do the commissioners say that they have interviewed conspiracy theorists and invalidated their claims. In its conclusion, the authors make a startling claim as to the purpose of the report. On page xviii of the preface it says, “We hope our report will encourage our fellow citizens to study, reflect, and act.” Much of what I have chosen to research is *completely omitted* from the official report. The commission’s report has greatly encouraged me to study, reflect, and act.

Upon opening up any high school physics book, and turning to the section about freefall in a vacuum, we can begin to draw some conclusions about the collapse of the Twin Towers. Let us forget, for a moment, that hydrocarbon fires can only burn so hot, and that as they cool down their smoke darkens in color. Let us just assume that the skyscrapers somehow achieved high

enough temperatures for their massive steel structures to be weakened, and for uniform collapses to come as a result. Any high school physics book includes the equation that describes the behavior of an object in freefall while in a vacuum; $D=1/2gt^2$, where D is Distance, g is the constant acceleration due to gravity (32 feet per second per second), and t^2 denotes time squared. This can be rearranged to yield the formula $t^2=2D/g$. On page 305 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, it states that “At 9:58:59, the South Tower collapsed in ten seconds, killing all civilians and emergency personnel inside.” Out of curiosity, let us calculate the time that an object dropped 1,362 ft, from a building such as the South Tower (WTC 2) would take to reach the ground. Due to the simplicity of our model, we are assuming that terminal velocity of this object would not be approached – that is, it would continue to accelerate at a constant rate for the duration of the freefall. The result of our calculation follows that,

$$t^2=2(1362\text{ ft})/(32\text{ ft/sec})$$

$$t^2=84.68$$

$$t=9.2\text{ seconds}$$

meaning that an object dropped from 1,362 feet in a vacuum environment will reach the ground in 9.2 seconds. Comparing this value to 10 seconds (the time it took for WTC 2 to collapse) yields a difference of only 0.8 seconds. One might object to the validity of this calculation, claiming that the commissioners did not mean for “10 seconds” to be a precise figure. However, this admission alone would illustrate inherent scientific incompetence on the part of the authors of the report. Should you wish to verify this figure of 10 seconds, simply view the first 20 minutes of *September 11 Revisited* and use a stopwatch to make this measurement yourself. I have found it to be very accurate.

It is an extremely difficult task to explain how a building with hydrocarbon fires burning on a group of floors is caused to collapse all at once at near freefall speed. One further struggles for possibilities when it then becomes an implied requirement for that explanation to account for the simultaneous loss of all structural integrity.

The asserted explanation called the “Pancake Theory” claims that each floor collapsed individually, and in turn caused the one below it to collapse. However, this simply does not add up as the equivalent of only 0.8 seconds of resistance was met during the collapse of the 110 story skyscraper. Even the preliminary facts clearly show that the theory which has been offered to us by our government is not possible. The only mainstream theory in existence, which even the PBS show NOVA subscribes to, seems to blatantly ignore the laws of space and time. In fact, these laws are so blatantly ignored that any high school physics student would be able to point out these inconsistencies. It is such a nonsensical theory that in the course of all my research, and even in venturing to *Wikipedia.org*, I was unable to locate *anything* which resembled an attempt to explain the “Pancake Theory.”

It follows that we consider the reasons that the American people never seem to hear about alternative theories through what we call “trusted sources”. These, of course, include members of the mainstream media, such as The New York Times and CBS. Take, for example, the case of Dr. Morgan Reynolds, former Professor Emeritus at Texas A&M University where he was an active faculty member for 28 years. Reynolds also served for 16 months as chief economist at the US Department of Labor in 2001-2002. Author of chapter seven of *9/11 and American Empire*, his critical article entitled “Why did the Trade Center Sky Scrapers Collapse” was picked up by the Drudge Report, UPI, and the *Washington Times* and published in June 2005. The President of Texas A&M, Dr. Robert M. Gates, released a statement saying that “The American people know what they saw with their own eyes on September 11, 2001. To suggest

any kind of government conspiracy in the events of that day goes beyond the pale” (Texas A&M University – Prospective Students). Universities are supposedly about the life of the mind, but it would be hard to craft a more anti- intellectual statement than that of Robert Gates (9/11 and American Empire, 102). In his book *Towers of Deception: The Media Cover-up of 9/11*, Barrie Zwicker outlines for the reader the process of media censorship, and the history of false- flag psychological warfare operations. Maybe we should think twice about who we hold as trusted sources. The several hundred academics and professionals who have emerged from the limitations of media censorship to voice their claims relating to 9/11 have to this point been widely discredited because they are not a “trusted source”. As we can see with the case of Dr. Reynolds at Texas A&M, there often times exists more credibility and integrity in the raising of alternative conspiracy theories than there does in the way they are discredited, ignored, and kept out of the mainstream media.

Over six years after the attacks on our country, many Americans do not even know how many World Trade Centers on Manhattan Island *completely collapsed at freefall speed* as a result of the attacks. The North and South Twin Towers, WTC 1 and WTC 2 respectively, fell at nearly freefall speed after being weakened by hydrocarbon fires fueled by commercial jets and kerosene. Many have accepted the *9/11 Commission Report's* official account which is over 500 pages long yet fails to mention the nearby 47 story steel building called WTC 7 which also collapsed at freefall speed into its own footprint at 5:20 PM EDT on the evening of 9/11/2001 due to “structural failures” involving fire and debris from the collapse of the twin towers. This omission alone, which presumably exists due to the sheer lack of a probable explanation for the collapse of the skyscraper, provides valid rationale for the consideration of alternative theories associated with its collapse. Never before had steel framed buildings been caused to collapse in any fashion due to fire, led alone at freefall speed which indicates that all support trusses

simultaneously gave out (September 11 Revisited). It follows that if the unprecedented collapse of WTC 7 is to be further investigated, that the collapse of towers 1 and 2 of the World Trade Center complex should be investigated as well. See Figure 1 in the appendix for an illustration of the layout of the World Trade Center complex. As you can see, WTC 7 was located behind the WTC 6 building, which did not collapse, and was demolished by AMEC construction days after 9/11. Perhaps the most basic piece of evidence warranting an investigation of the collapse of WTC 7 is the video footage taken by news cameras on September 11th. Footage taken by CBS which was broadcasted live on 9/11 has at this point faded in the minds of Americans.

In the DVD entitled *September 11 Revisited*, footage of September 11, 2001 is brought back before the eyes of the viewer. The first twenty minutes of the movie consist primarily of raw live news footage accompanied by commentary by newscasters. Without viewing this movie, one would have to possess a great memory to recall the disconcerting frequency with which members of the news media expressed their skepticism on that day. The words “controlled demolition” are heard countless times in the footage. Authorities in fields such as architecture, physics, and controlled demolition called in throughout the day and can be heard expressing a great amount of disbelief at what was already being called the first steel buildings to ever collapse due to fire (9/11 and American Empire; September 11 Revisited; The Great Conspiracy). Take, for example, a newspaper article which appeared less than twelve hours after the attack. In article, entitled *Explosives Planted in Towers, N.M. Tech Expert Says*, Van Romero, Vice President for research at New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology makes the following claim. It should be noted that Romero is also a former director of the Energetic Materials Research and Testing Center at Tech, which “studies explosive materials and the effects of explosions on buildings, aircraft and other structures.”

“The collapse of the buildings appears too methodical to be a chance result of airplanes colliding with the structures. My opinion is, based on the videotapes, that after the airplanes hit the World Trade Center there were some explosive devices inside the buildings that caused the towers to collapse.”

The end of the article states that the Energetic Materials Research and Testing Center in New Mexico “often assists in forensic investigations into terrorist attacks, but had not been asked to take part in the investigation.”

No sooner than September 21, 2001 was a contradictory claim made by Romero. The article, entitled *Fire, Not Extra Explosives, Doomed Buildings, Expert Says*, was printed before any investigation of the collapses took place. “Certainly the fire is what caused the building to fail,” he stated in the first of the only two quotations printed in the article. The article goes on to say that Romero “supports other experts, who have said the intense heat of the jet fuel fires weakened the skyscrapers’ steel structural beams to the point that they gave way under the weight of the floors above.” The journalist then explains that this “set off a chain reaction, as upper floors pancaked onto lower ones.”

A peculiar shift of the media’s opinion was seen in the days and weeks that would follow, when no attempt to truly discredit these initial gut instincts was made. Most of these gut instincts were withdrawn without adequate substantiation and would simply dissolve into what would become one of the most conflicting periods of time that many Americans had ever endured. Others that had not been withdrawn were put on the back burner as the main focus of the media shifted as they began covering the military’s invasion of Afghanistan.

It is presently six years after the attacks of 9/11/2001. Many have forgotten that the reason we are in Iraq stemmed from the terrorist attacks. Many have even stopped talking about

our presence in Iraq altogether. Many have not so much as raised an eyebrow at the fact that the official reason we are invading foreign countries has constantly evolved. The government claimed that we invaded Afghanistan in order to kill or capture Osama bin Laden, and then witnessed our President stating in a press conference that “terror is bigger than one person and he’s uh, he’s just he.. he’s a person who’s now been marginalized so I – I don’t know where he is. Nor do I, ya know, I just don’t spend that much time on him, I’ll even be honest with ya” (Fahrenheit 9/11, min. 48). While bin Laden’s name remains at number one on the FBI’s Most Wanted list, which can be viewed on the official FBI website, our president has decided that we have bigger fish to fry now that we have invaded foreign countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq.

There are four chief theories that can at this point be adopted. The Official Theory suggests that nineteen fanatical Muslim terrorists, led and funded by Osama bin Laden, caught all of the U.S. intelligence, military, and political establishments totally off guard and carried out the largest terrorist attack in American history. The Incompetence Theory suggests that some form of intelligence had been received by U.S. agencies but that the attacks were enabled to proceed due to the incompetence of the U.S. government. The third theory, called the Let It Happen On Purpose (or LIHOP) theory suggests that U.S. agencies had prior knowledge of terrorism plots, which they chose to ignore because of the political and military incentive of having a precursor to the invasion of Afghanistan. This precursor would provide rationale of the invasion not only for the American people but internationally as well. The fourth theory, called the Make it Happen On Purpose (or MIHOP) theory suggests that 9/11 was an inside job, carried out by some branch of the U.S. government or military, whereby carefully orchestrated controlled demolition was used to bring down the World Trade Centers (Zwicker, preface VI). This final theory suggests that the planes were used to mask the root cause of the collapse of the

Twin Towers, and that the debris from these collapses was then used to mask the cause of the collapse of WTC 7.

With that in mind, it becomes necessary to analyze the probability of each theory, using a non-biased and logical approach. If the Official Theory is factual, then our government failed us. It then follows that The Incompetence Theory must be adopted, as the government should have been able to acquire some intelligence about the threat of attacks on our country. Upon further research into the second theory, I was able to locate the Presidential Daily Briefing from August 6, 2001, which is entitled “Bin Laden Determined To Strike in US” (Presidential Daily Briefing on bin Laden). The document, which I have attached at the end of this essay, outlines FBI intelligence having to do with “suspicious activity [of ‘Al-Qa’ida’ members] in this country consistent with preparations for hijackings or other types of attacks, including recent surveillance of federal buildings in New York.” The Problem with these first two theories is that assuming either of them are to be confirmed, there remains a great question as to who has been held accountable in our own government as a result of the implied failure to protect America from terrorist attacks.

As long as we acknowledge that the government had prior specific intelligence of the hijacking of commercial airliners, we should not dismiss the third and fourth theories as possibilities. The present essay has outlined an integral scientific anomaly that raises questions about the nature of the collapse of three of the World Trade Center skyscrapers. Pending a scientific report outlining the “Pancake Theory” or any other explanation for the unprecedented collapse of these three skyscrapers, there is no reason to not suspect the worst. I therefore strongly believe that the government not only ignored the warnings that they are known to have received, and not only let the terrorist attacks happen, but that members of the government itself are implicated as suspects of the attacks of 9/11. No evidence of foreign infiltration of the

buildings at question has been discovered, whereby explosive devices could have been planted by members of Al Qaida. We are not being granted access to any real evidence that disproves government compliance and assistance in a controlled demolition of these three skyscrapers. The only evidence necessary to support this claim is present in the analysis of footage of documented controlled demolitions, and the analysis of available footage of the collapse of the Twin Towers and WTC 7. There are no previous or subsequent documented instances of the complete structural failure and collapse of a steel- framed skyscraper due to hydrocarbon fires. This of course leaves us only with highly incriminating evidence should we choose to view it. This evidence exists in the DVD *September 11 Revisited*, which can also be viewed online for free. Many will choose not to take the time to follow this suggested course of action. Many are more afraid to begin to see the truth about 9/11 than to continue believe the lie.

Many may regrettably admit that they believe “what you don’t know can’t hurt you.” Many may believe that this topic of discussion lacks merit. Six years after the attacks on our country, many may believe that the events of 9/11 are no longer important. When memorials for the victims of 9/11 likely cost more to construct than the commission assigned to investigate the events of that day, maybe we have set our priorities wrong from the beginning.

In closing, and in the words of the *9/11 Commission Report*, I hope that my report “will encourage our fellow citizens to study, reflect, and act.” The purpose of this essay has been to illustrate the necessity for further investigation into the events surrounding 9/11. Many Americans discount alternative 9/11 conspiracy theories based on scientific reasoning and common sense in favor of those based on political agendas because they are afraid to discover that their government is corrupt and that we have invaded foreign countries under false pretenses. I cannot prove at this point that 9/11 was an inside job. However, I can claim with confidence that there exists a multitude of evidence which warrants examination, and has to this

point been widely ignored. I have, in the present essay, outlined a number of verifiable facts surrounding the events of 9/11. I have reached the conclusion that the fourth theory, in which the government is at some level implicated in the terrorist attacks of 9/11, is the most probable when considered from a scientific and political point of view. The government has published a report telling you what to believe. I submit that their report is inherently a conspiracy theory, whereby nineteen hijackers carried out the largest terrorist act our country has ever seen. It is ultimately up to you – *the reader, the individual, and the American* – to decide which of the conspiracy theories to adopt.

I have chosen to include many items which range from government sources, media sources, video footage, and sources which inspired my further research of conspiracy theories. It is recommended that the reader view certain video clips after reading the preceding essay. Some visual pieces of evidence have been included in the annotated bibliography.

Annotated Bibliography

Editors of Popular Mechanics. Debunking the 9/11 Myths: Special Report – Popular Mechanics.

2 Dec 2007

<http://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/military_law/1227842.html>

This article attempts to debunk “16 of the most common claims made by 9/11 conspiracy theorists.” It was a useful document in that it provided me with more incentive to research the chief theories which are widely ignored in this attempt at debunking “common conspiracy theories.” The following is a direct quote which in my view reflects the fashion with which the article was written. Taken from the introduction of the article, the statement below effectively puts their own foot in their mouth, and there can be seen a blatant triple standard.

“In fact, many conspiracy advocates demonstrate a maddening double standard.

They distrust every bit of the mainstream account of 9/11, yet happily embrace the flimsiest evidence to promote their wildest notions: that Osama bin Laden attacked the United States with help from the CIA; that the hijacked planes weren't commercial jets, but military aircraft, cruise missiles or remote-control drones; that the World Trade Center buildings were professionally demolished.”

Fahrenheit 9/11. Dir. Michael Moore. Dog Eat Dog Films, 2004.

An eye opening documentary which scrutinizes the government, and does not make direct

claims about conspiracy theories, but instead points out connections between Al Qaida and the Executive branch of the US Government. Had Moore made a film about conspiracy theories, it would not have been accepted by a large audience. Winner of Best Picture at the 2004 Cannes Film Festival, this documentary is meant to be an eye opener, and leaves the viewer wanting to investigate further. Met with high controversy, this documentary has become the most widely known on the topic of 9/11.

Federal Bureau of Investigation Most Wanted Terrorists. Federal Bureau of Investigation. 5 Dec 2007 <<http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/terrorists/fugitives.htm>>

This webpage lists the Most Wanted Terrorists. It includes "Usama bin Laden" as its number one wanted terrorist. There is a link to "Usama's" Wanted Poster which curiously makes no direct mention of the attacks of September 11, 2001. It merely says:

"Usama Bin Laden is wanted in connection with the August 7, 1998, bombings of the United States Embassies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and Nairobi, Kenya. These attacks killed over 200 people. In addition, Bin Laden is a suspect in other terrorist attacks throughout the world."

Fleck, John. "Fire, Not Extra Explosives, Doomed Buildings, Expert Says." Albuquerque Journal 21 Sept 2001.

Direct quotations found in essay.

Griffin, David Ray, Peter Dale Scott, ed. 9/11 and American Empire: Intellectuals Speak Out. Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press, 2007.

This is a highly useful source which includes essays by 13 professionals in the fields of Economics, History, Sociology, Theology, Philosophy, Physics, Theology, International Law,

Quality Engineering, Chemistry, and English. One of them has worked for the government at the Pentagon, and includes her eye witness account of the incident at that site on September 11, 2001. The subject of the Pentagon and its evidence has not been addressed in my essay. This book is comprehensive and is a highly recommended read.

Griffin, Davin Ray. The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions. Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press, 2005.

As the title of this source indicates, this book outlines omissions and distortions present in the official 9/11 Commission Report. It includes claims based on the topics outlined in the present essay, and those based on further evidence about other things having to do with 9/11.

Kean, Thomas H., et al. The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc, 2004.

Publishing date not in front cover. Retrieved “release date” of report from official website – July 22, 2004. This official publication was published nearly three whole years after September 11, 2001. The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States was founded over a year after September 11, 2001. It contains political recommendations for future prevention of terrorist attacks, and explains the necessity for some of the human rights of Americans to be sacrificed so that our nation does not suffer another terrorist attack. While it does point fingers at the shortcomings of the FBI, FAA and CIA, it fails to make any recommendation about change in command or protocol of these government organizations. This report was censored by the Executive Branch of the government, and 23 pages were taken out. See description of official website of this commission for further details.

Presidential Daily Briefing On bin Laden, August 6, 2001. PDF file. [Findlaw Legal News and Commentary](#). 6 Aug. 2001. Declassified and Approved for Release 10 Apr. 2004. 6 Dec. 2007. < <http://fl1.findlaw.com/news.findlaw.com/hdocs/docs/terrorism/80601pdb.pdf>>

This document illustrates prior knowledge of terrorist hijacking plots by bin Laden, and warns its reader – the president and select few others – of the imminent threat.

Declassified and Approved
for Release, 10 April 2004

Bin Laden Determined To Strike in US



Clandestine, foreign government, and media reports indicate Bin Laden since 1997 has wanted to conduct terrorist attacks in the US. Bin Laden implied in US television interviews in 1997 and 1998 that his followers would follow the example of World Trade Center bomber Ramzi Yousef and "bring the fighting to America."

After US missile strikes on his base in Afghanistan in 1998, Bin Laden told followers he wanted to retaliate in Washington, according to a [REDACTED] service.

An Egyptian Islamic Jihad (EIJ) operative told an [REDACTED] service at the same time that Bin Laden was planning to exploit the operative's access to the US to mount a terrorist strike.

The millennium plotting in Canada in 1999 may have been part of Bin Laden's first serious attempt to implement a terrorist strike in the US. Convicted plotter Ahmed Ressam has told the FBI that he conceived the idea to attack Los Angeles International Airport himself, but that Bin Laden lieutenant Abu Zubaydah encouraged him and helped facilitate the operation. Ressam also said that in 1998 Abu Zubaydah was planning his own US attack.

Ressam says Bin Laden was aware of the Los Angeles operation.

Although Bin Laden has not succeeded, his attacks against the US Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 demonstrate that he prepares operations years in advance and is not deterred by setbacks. Bin Laden associates surveilled our Embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam as early as 1993, and some members of the Nairobi cell planning the bombings were arrested and deported in 1997.

Al-Qa'ida members—including some who are US citizens—have resided in or traveled to the US for years, and the group apparently maintains a support structure that could aid attacks. Two al-Qa'ida members found guilty in the conspiracy to bomb our Embassies in East Africa were US citizens, and a senior EIJ member lived in California in the mid-1990s.

A clandestine source said in 1996 that a Bin Laden cell in New York was recruiting Muslim-American youth for attacks.

We have not been able to corroborate some of the more sensational threat reporting, such as that from a [REDACTED] service in 1998 saying that Bin Laden wanted to hijack a US aircraft to gain the release of "Blind Shaykh" Umar 'Abd al-Rahman and other US-held extremists.

continued

For the President Only
6 August 2001

Declassified and Approved
for Release, 10 April 2004

Declassified and Approved
for Release, 10 April 2004

Nevertheless, FBI information since that time indicates patterns of suspicious activity in this country consistent with preparations for hijackings or other types of attacks, including recent surveillance of federal buildings in New York.

The FBI is conducting approximately 70 full field investigations throughout the US that it considers Bin Laden-related. CIA and the FBI are investigating a call to our Embassy in the UAE in May saying that a group of Bin Laden supporters was in the US planning attacks with explosives.

September 11 Revisited: Extended Version 2. Dir. Dustin Mugford. DVD. Distributor not listed, 2006.

*This DVD is also available for viewing online at <http://www.911revisited.com>. The director has made the movie fully re-distributable, so that it may reach as many television sets as possible. Some of what is presented in the book *9/11 and American Empire: Intellectuals Speak Out* is outlined in this movie. I therefore recommend that the reader view it online. At the very least, as far as video evidence is concerned, there are countless YouTube videos covering the collapse of WTC 7 which serve to provide the basis for the viewer to form his/her own opinion about the cause of its collapse. Chief among these small video clips is one titled "This is an orange". I have not formally included it in my annotated bibliography because it is only to be viewed by the reader who does not wish to view a movie in an effort to more fully absorb the claims that this essay makes, but instead wishes only to view a brief video clip.*

Texas A&M University – Prospective Students. Cached from Texas A&M U. 2 Dec 2007

<<http://www.911blimp.net/cached/DrGates-stmtTAMU.htm>>

Cached form of Texas A&M website. The University subsequently removed the statement by Robert Gates from its official website.

The Great Conspiracy. Narr. Barrie Zwicker. DVD. Upstream Media, 2004.

*This movie is narrated by the author who wrote *Towers of Deception: the Media Cover-up of 9/11*. It contains some of the information found in the book, and very few further facts. It does, however, include video evidence.*

The Joint Chiefs of Staff. Justification for US Military Intervention in Cuba. PDF File. NSA

Archives. 13 Mar. 1962. Declassified and Approved for Release Apr. 2001. Accessed 1

Dec. 2007. <<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20010430/northwoods.pdf>>

Operation Northwoods was released by the National Security Archive during the summer of 2001. It is one of the largest known government conspiracies ever exposed. Like most strategy-of-tension operations, many years went by before the public learned about it. Here are some excerpts from the unclassified document, available online from the NSA Archives.

3. This plan, incorporating projects selected from the attached suggestions, or from other sources, should be developed to focus all efforts on a specific ultimate objective which would provide adequate justification for US military intervention. Such a plan would enable a logical build-up of incidents to be combined with other seemingly unrelated events to camouflage the ultimate objective and create the necessary impression of Cuban rashness and irresponsibility on a large scale, directed at other countries as well as the United States. The plan would also properly integrate and time phase the courses of action to be pursued. The desired resultant from the execution of this plan would be to place the United States in the apparent position of suffering defensible grievances from a rash and irresponsible government of Cuba and to develop an international image of a Cuban threat to peace in the Western Hemisphere.

UNCLASSIFIED

5

Appendix to
Enclosure A

2. A series of well coordinated incidents will be planned to take place in and around Guantanamo to give genuine appearance of being done by hostile Cuban forces.

a. Incidents to establish a credible attack (not in chronological order):

- (1) Start rumors (many). Use clandestine radio.
- (2) Land friendly Cubans in uniform "over-the-fence" to stage attack on base.
- (3) Capture Cuban (friendly) saboteurs inside the base.
- (4) Start riots near the base main gate (friendly Cubans).

7

Annex to Appendix
to Enclosure A

UNCLASSIFIED

~~TOP SECRET SPECIAL HANDLING NOFORN~~

- UNCLASSIFIED
- (5) Blow up ammunition inside the base; start fires.
 - (6) Burn aircraft on air base (sabotage).
 - (7) Lob mortar shells from outside of base into base. Some damage to installations.
 - (8) Capture assault teams approaching from the sea or vicinity of Guantanamo City.
 - (9) Capture militia group which storms the base.
 - (10) Sabotage ship in harbor; large fires -- naphthalene.
 - (11) Sink ship near harbor entrance. Conduct funerals for mock-victims (may be lieu of (10)).

United States. National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States. The 9/11

Commission Report. By Thomas H. Kean et al. 3 Dec. 2007 <<http://www.9-11commission.gov/>>

This web site was “frozen” on September 20, 2004. This means it is now an archived site. It includes, on its home page, a statement by Al Felzenberg, Deputy for Communications of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States posted the day before the Commission “close[d] its doors.”

“We have often said that the Commission’s success will be measured by the implementation of our recommendations. While the Commission will cease to exist as a government entity, we and the other eight former Commissioners will continue to work as an independent, bipartisan group to educate the country about our report and monitor the implementation of our recommendations.”

“We are heartened that Americans are talking about the report and debating the recommendations with their families, friends, and coworkers. Our nation’s political leadership is responding with prompt attention. We fully endorse deliberation on these important questions, but not delay. We believe terrorism is the national security challenge of our generation, and now is the time to meet it. Not as Republicans or Democrats, but together, united, as Americans.”

Uyttebrouck, Oliver. “Explosives Planted in Towers, N.M. Tech Expert Says.” Albuquerque Journal 11 Sept. 2001.

Direct quotations found in essay.

Zwicker, Barrie. Towers of Deception: The Media Cover Up of 9/11. Canada: New Society

Publishers, 2006.

Book outlined in essay.



Figure 1. World Trade Center Complex as of 9/11/2001

An identical diagram is given on page 279 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*. This diagram illustrates the vicinity of WTC 7 to the Twin Towers (WTC 1 and WTC 2). Recall that all three of these buildings collapsed – WTC 1 and WTC 2 after being struck by planes, and WTC 7 due to auxiliary fires, and that WTC 6 remained standing days after 9/11 and would later be demolished.