There is considerable evidence that elements in the US government were complicit in the attacks of September 11, 2001. These facts are no mere “conspiracy theory.” According to a recent poll by the *New York Times* and *CBS News*, 53 percent of Americans believe the Bush Administration is hiding something about 9/11, and 28 percent believe it is lying. **Only 16 percent said that the Bush Administration is telling the whole truth about 9/11.**

Many reports in the news depict those who question the official account of 9/11 as “crazy conspiracy theorists.” To the contrary, many family members of 9/11 victims, first-responders, professors, activists and public officials have come out questioning the official story and demanding a new investigation. Here is an incomplete list:

- **Ed Asner**  
  actor, activist

- **Medea Benjamin**  
  activist, co-founder, CodePink

- **Philip Berg**  
  former Deputy Attorney General of Pennsylvania

- **Robert Bowman**  
  USAF Lt. Col. (Ret.), director of the "Star Wars" defense program under Ford and Carter

- **Francis Boyle**  
  professor of international law, University of Illinois

- **Gray Brechin**  
  professor of environmental history, UC Berkeley

- **Kristen Breitweiser**  
  widow of Ronald Michael Breitweiser, Family Steering Committee

- **James Brolin**  
  actor

- **Fred Burks**  
  presidential interpreter for Bush, Clinton, Cheney, and Gore

- **Ernest Callenbach**  
  author, Ecotopia

- **Patty Cassazza**  
  widow of John Cassazza, Family Steering Committee

- **Angana Chatterji**  
  professor of social and cultural studies, California Institute of Integral Studies

- **David Cobb**  
  Green Party Presidential Candidate, 2004

- **John Cobb**  
  theologian, co-author, *For the Common Good*

- **William Christison**  
  former CIA analyst

- **Kevin Danaher**  
  activist, co-founder, Global Exchange

- **Rachel Ehrenfeld**  
  author, *Funding Evil*, director, The American Center for Democracy

- **Daniel Ellsberg**  
  author, *Secrets: A Memoir of Vietnam and The Pentagon Papers*

- **Jodie Evans**  
  activist, co-founder, CodePink

- **Richard Falk**  
  professor emeritus of international law, Princeton
Catherine Austin Fitts  
Assistant Secretary of Housing under Bush Sr.

Monica Gabrielle  
widow of Richard Gabrielle, Family Steering Committee

Stan Goff  
US Army Delta Force (retired), activist, author, Full Spectrum Disorder

Melvin Goodman  
former CIA Senior Analyst, professor, National War College

Morton Goulder  
former Deputy Secretary for Intelligence and Warning under Nixon, Ford, Carter

David Ray Griffin  
professor emeritus of theology, Claremont School of Theology

Doris ‘Granny D’ Haddock  
activist, author, Granny D: You’re Never Too Old to Raise a Little Hell

Paul Hawken  
activist, author, The Ecology of Commerce, director, Natural Capital Institute

Randy Hayes  
activist, founder, The Rainforest Action Network

Richard Heinberg  
author, core faculty, New College of California

Van Jones  
founder, director, The Ella Baker Center for Human Rights

Faiz Khan  
9/11 first responder and triage physician

Mindy Kleinberg  
widow of Alan Kleinberg, Family Steering Committee

David Korten  
activist, author, When Corporations Rule the World

Michael Lerner  
rabbi, theologian, editor, Tikkun

John McCarthy  
president, Veterans Equal Rights Protection Advocacy

Ray McGovern  
former CIA analyst

Michael Meacher  
MP (Member of British Parliament)

Joseph Montaperto  
NYC Fire Department

Frances Moore Lapp  
author, Diet for a Small Planet, founder, Small Planet Institute

Mark Crispin Miller  
professor of media studies, NYU

Ralph Nader  
independent candidate for President

Jenna Orkin  
activist, founder, WTC Environmental Organization

Edward Peck  
former Chief of Mission and ambassador to Iraq

Peter Phillips  
professor of sociology, Sonoma State University

Henri Poole  
internet pioneer, founder, Civic Actions

John Rensenbrink  
co-founder, US Green Party, professor emeritus, Bucknell College

Paul Craig Roberts  
economist, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Reagan

Peter Dale Scott  
author, Drugs, Oil, and War, professor emeritus, UC Berkeley

Kevin Shea  
FDNY Hazmat Operations

Douglas Sturm  
professor emeritus, Bucknell College

Burns Weston  
professor emeritus of law, University of Iowa

Lorie Van Auken  
widow of Kenneth Van Auken, Family Steering Committee

Gore Vidal  
author and playwright

Howard Zinn  
author, A People’s History of the United States, professor emeritus, Boston University
On the pages that follow you will find a summary of just some of the evidence for US government complicity in 9/11. This is by no means an exhaustive account. For those interested in learning more, a list of resources can be found at the back of this booklet.

**Some Basic Questions Concerning 9/11**

Why did the Bush Administration fail to respond to over 20 specific warnings about the terrorist attacks given by 14 foreign intelligence agencies or heads of state?

Why were multiple FBI investigations into the hijackers’ activities blocked or hindered?

Why did the nation’s air defenses fail to intercept Flight 77, which struck the Pentagon over 80 minutes after the FAA first received indications of a hijacking?

Why did WTC Building 7 undergo a rapid and complete collapse on 9/11 when it was not hit by a plane?

Why did the 9/11 Commission Report fail to mention the financial ties between Al Qaeda hijacker Mohammad Atta and General Mahmood Ahmed, former director of the Pakistani ISI (Intelligence Agency), who reportedly wired Atta $100,000 shortly before the 9/11 attacks?

Why did the White House alter the EPA’s initial health and safety statements after 9/11, which found that the air at Ground Zero was toxic and unsafe to breathe?

Why did President Bush avoid or block an investigation into 9/11 for over 400 days?

Why was Philip Zelikow chosen to be the Executive Director of the 9/11 Commission, when he had served on the Bush-Cheney transition team and was a member of Bush’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board?
3.2 Insider Knowledge

3.3 Failed Investigations

4.1 The Collapse of WTC7

4.2 Failed Air Defenses
There are precedents for the US government’s support and use of terrorism against civilians. There is also strong evidence that Western intelligence agencies maintained ties with Al Qaeda through the 1980s and 1990s for strategic purposes. Therefore it is not inconceivable that the US government was complicit in acts of terrorism by Al Qaeda against its own civilians.
**OPERATION NORTHWOODS**

Operation Northwoods was a proposed intelligence operation outlined in a document titled “Justification for U.S. Military Intervention in Cuba,” composed and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and provided to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara on March 13, 1962.

The Top Secret memorandum describes potential operations to covertly engineer various pretexts that would justify a U.S. invasion of Cuba. These proposals included staging the assassinations of Cubans living in the United States, developing a fake “Communist Cuban terror campaign in the Miami area, in other Florida cities and even in Washington,” including “sink[ing] a boatload of Cuban refugees (real or simulated),” faking a Cuban airforce attack on a civilian jetliner, and blowing up a U.S. ship in Cuban waters and then blaming the incident on Cuban sabotage.  

James Bamford, an award-winning investigative journalist and expert on US intelligence agencies, summarized the document:

*Operation Northwoods, which had the written approval of the Chairman and every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, called for innocent people to be shot on American streets; for boats carrying refugees fleeing Cuba to be sunk on the high seas; for a wave of violent terrorism to be launched in Washington, D.C., Miami, and elsewhere. People would be framed for bombings they did not commit; planes would be hijacked. Using phony evidence, all of it would be blamed on Castro, thus giving Lemnitzer and his cabal the excuse, as well as the public and international backing, they needed to launch their war.*

The proposal was rejected by President Kennedy as too much a risk following the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Despite its rejection, **Northwoods shows that the intelligence community and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were ready use false-flag terrorism against US civilians** in order to create a pretext for war.

**RESOURCES**

**Books**
- NATO’s Secret Armies by Daniele Ganser. 2005.

**Videos**
- The Truth & Lies of 9/11 by Mike Ruppert. Available on Google Video. [video.google.com](http://video.google.com)

**Websites**
- Center for Cooperative Research. [www.cooperativeresearch.org](http://www.cooperativeresearch.org)
- 911Truth.org. [www.911truth.org](http://www.911truth.org)
- Nafeez Ahmed. [nafeez.blogspot.com](http://nafeez.blogspot.com)

**REFERENCES**

**Introduction**

1.1 **Operation Northwoods**

1.2 **Operation Gladio**
After WWII, NATO established a policy of recruiting and training secret "stay behind" armies in Western European countries to combat communist governments were they to come to power. These secret armies were responsible for aiding and executing terrorist attacks against civilians to manipulate the elections and politics of each country. The accounts of those involved in the operations suggest a high level of training and support from the CIA and MI-6. These examples represent only a fraction of the incidents caused by these secret armies:

**1969:** In Italy, the Piazza Fontana massacre in Milan kills 16 and injures and maims 80 [...]. During a trial of right-wing extremists General Giandelio Maletti, former head of Italian counterintelligence, alleges that the massacre had been carried out by the Italian stay-behind army and right-wing terrorists on the orders of the US secret service CIA in order to discredit Italian Communists.

**1985:** In Belgium, a secret army attacks and shoots shoppers in supermarkets randomly in the Brabant county killing 28 and leaving many wounded. Investigations link the terror to a conspiracy among the Belgian stay-behind SDRA8, the Belgian Gendarmerie SDRA6, the Belgian right-wing group WNP and the Pentagon secret service DIA.

Former CIA director Allen Dulles was instrumental in setting up and funding these secret armies. William Colby, another former CIA director, described the CIA’s role in his 1978 memoirs: “specialised equipment had to be secured from CIA and secretly cached in snowy hideouts for later use. In other set of countries, CIA would have to do the job alone or with, at best, ‘unofficial’ local help.”

To this day, despite efforts by the EU and other countries to uncover the truth behind potential CIA-Gladio ties, the CIA has refused to release any information.

Operation Gladio is a significant precedent in US sponsored terrorism against innocent Western European civilians, kept secret from the public for nearly half a century.
**US - AL QAEDA TIES**

While many people acknowledge that the CIA aided and funded mujaheddin fighters in Afghanistan during the 1980s, few people are aware that US support for Al Qaeda-sponsored terrorism extends all the way up to the present.

**Support for Al Qaeda in the Balkans**

During the Kosovo Conflict in the late 1990s, both American and British forces armed and trained militant Islamists in the KLA (Kosovo Liberation Army). As documented by Professor Cees Wiebes of Amsterdam University, the US maintained a "secret alliance between the Pentagon and radical Islamist groups from the Middle East designed to assist the Bosnian Muslims—some of the same groups that the Pentagon is now fighting in 'the war against terrorism'."¹

This policy continued through the 1990s despite the fact that the US State Department identified the KLA as a terrorist organization with connections to Al Qaeda in 1998, and a 1999 congressional report described the KLA as closely tied to:

> The extensive Albanian crime network that extends throughout Europe and into North America [...] and Terrorist organizations motivated by the ideology of radical Islam, including assets of Iran and of the notorious Osama bin-Laden—who has vowed a global terrorist war against Americans and American interests. ²

Others have noted direct connections between US forces and Islamic terrorists in the region through training and logistical support. For example, one report from London’s International Media Corporation (affiliated to the International Strategic Studies Association) points out that:

> The Mujahedin landing at Ploce are reported to have been accompanied by US Special Forces equipped with high-tech communications equipment, [...] the mission of the US troops was to establish a command, control, communications and intelligence network to coordinate and support Bosnian Muslim offensives—in concert with Mujahideen and Bosnian Croat forces. ³

---

**THE 9/11 COMMISSION**

The Commission was set up in late 2002, only after pressuring by victims’ families. In fact, Bush repeatedly blocked attempts at an investigation for over a year, in stark contrast to public investigations of Pearl Harbor, the Challenger disaster, and the Kennedy assassination, all of which began in a matter of weeks. Moreover, the investigation was initially given only $3 million in funds—a fraction of the budget allotted to investigating Challenger or the total costs of the Clinton impeachment hearings, both of which were over $50 million.

The Commission also experienced a lack of cooperation from the White House, which restricted access to documents and only gave limited interviews. In fact, President Bush only agreed to testify under several conditions, including that it would be in private, he would not be under oath, it would not be electronically transcribed or recorded, and he would be accompanied by Dick Cheney. Senator Max Cleland, who would resign from the commission, said,

> I cannot look any American in the eye, especially family members of victims, and say the commission had full access. This investigation is compromised.

Every single commissioner on the investigation had ties to either the airline industry, Saudi royalty and banks, or US intelligence agencies (and their previous scandals). But most importantly, the executive director Phillip Zelikow was essentially part of the Bush Administration. He was a member of Bush’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and a member of the Bush-Cheney transition team. One staffer reportedly said that the investigation was "completely controlled by Zelikow down in DC [...] Zelikow is calling the shots. He's skewing the investigation and running it his own way." ²

Thus, it is no surprise that the 9/11 Commission ommitted and distorted evidence as shown in previous sections of this booklet. For a full account of its failures, the reader is encouraged to consult David Ray Griffin’s *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions.*
Support for Al Qaeda in Chechnya

There is strong evidence to suggest that the US has encouraged an ongoing conflict in Chechnya in order to destabilize Russian power. The overarching US strategy has been to prolong the Chechen conflict in a manner parallel to the Soviet-Afghan conflict during the 1980s.

In 1996, President Clinton actively supported Russian engagement in Chechnya, and “reportedly ordered the CIA to supply Moscow top-secret electronic targeting devices that allowed the Russians to assassinate Chechen President, Dzhokar Dudayev, while he was conducting peace negotiations with Moscow on his cell phone.”

However, evidence shows that US officials have also supported mujaheddin in the Caucasus. Ongoing terrorism blamed on Chechen rebels has been sponsored and funded by Afghan war veterans and members of Al Qaeda, Shamil and Shirvani Basayev. Both have close ties to Osama Bin Laden and allegedly receive aid from him. Yet US congressional intelligence and security analyst Yossef Bodansky has affirmed that,

In mid-December 1999, [...] US officials participated in a formal meeting in Azerbaijan in which specific programs for the training and equipping of mujahed in the Caucasus [...] were discussed and agreed upon. This meeting led to Washington’s tacit encouragement of both Muslim allies [...] and US “private security companies” (of the type which did the Clinton Administration’s dirty job in the Balkans while skirting and violating the international embargo the US formally supported) to assist the Chechens and their Islamist allies to surge in the Spring of 2000 and sustain the ensuing jihad for a long time.

Support for Al Qaeda in Algeria & the Phillippines

For the sake of brevity, evidence of US involvement in Islamic terrorism in Algeria and the Philippines has been omitted. For the interested reader, Nafeez Ahmed’s presentation “Ties With Terror: The Continuity of Western-Al-Qaeda Relations in the Post-Cold War Period,” is an in-depth and readily available resource.
Immediately following 9/11, government officials began distorting facts surrounding the attacks and manipulating the public’s perception of events. While this booklet will focus on evidence of a coverup by the EPA and the 9/11 Commission, the reader is encouraged to engage further topics, especially the role of the corporate media.

Oil refinery, Turkmenistan. UNOCAL and other companies have repeatedly attempted to negotiate a deal with Afghan and Taliban officials since the early 1990s for a pipeline running through Central Asia.
Many people question whether elements in the US government would have any reason to be involved in 9/11. It is clear that 9/11 has been used as the justification for many of the Bush Administration’s policies, including two wars, expansion of the military budget, curtailment of civil liberties, and the use of torture on enemy combatants. But more importantly, there is significant evidence that \textbf{an event like 9/11 was desired in advance} by some members of the Bush Administration.
AFGHANISTAN

It is now widely known that the Bush Administration had plans to invade Iraq before 9/11. It is less well known that the Bush Administration was preparing for war in Afghanistan as well. UNOCAL (now part of Chevron) and Enron were both engaged in negotiations with the Taliban in order to secure a deal on a Central Asian pipeline running through Afghanistan. In fact, BBC News reported in 1997 that Taliban officials were in Texas for negotiations and UNOCAL employees were already training Afghans for work in construction and administration. When negotiations eventually fell through, US officials quickly sought a way to remove the Taliban from power and replace it with a new government.

Former Pakistani Minister of Foreign Affairs Niaz Naik, commenting on information he received in July 2001, predicted that:

Washington would launch its operation from bases in Tajikistan where American advisers were already in place.... if the military action went ahead it would take place before the snows started falling in Afghanistan, by the middle of October at latest. 3

BBC News further reported that "the wider objective, according to Mr. Naik, would be to topple the Taliban regime and install a transitional government of moderate Afghans in its place."

In fact, on September 9, 2001, President Bush was presented with "detailed military plans to invade Afghanistan and topple the Taliban." 4 Francis Boyle, professor of international law at University of Illinois, pointed out:

Just before September 11, the UK had put together what was billed as the "largest armada since the Falklands War" and had it steaming towards Oman, where now 23,000 UK troops are on maneuvers. This had been planned for at least 3 years. Also, the US "Bright Star" operation is currently going on in Egypt. 23,000 US troops plus an additional 17,000 from NATO and its associates. This had been planned for at least two years ago. Finally, NATO just landed 12,000 troops in Turkey. This had been planned for at least two years...

September 11 is either a pretext or a trigger or both. 5

The 9/11 Connection

Given the ISI's close involvement with Al Qaeda, it is not surprising to learn that there is strong evidence of ISI involvement in the 9/11 plot. Media reports soon after the attacks revealed that Mohammad Atta, called the ringleader of the hijackers, received $100,000 from Saeed Sheikh shortly before 9/11. Sheikh had close ties to Al Qaeda and had previously worked with the ISI. In fact, soon after Sheikh's role in 9/11 was revealed, it was discovered that he wired the money on the orders of Lt. General Mahmood Ahmed, director of the ISI. 9

The American media widely reported Ahmed's presence in Washington, D.C. after 9/11 to discuss Pakistan's role in the War on Terror with the Bush Administration. The media also discussed his dismissal in October as the result of his close ties to the Taliban. However, the story goes much deeper.

In fact, Gen. Mahmood Ahmed was in Washington on September 4, a full week before 9/11, and was at a breakfast meeting with Senator Bob Graham (D) and Rep. Porter Goss (R) on the very morning of the attacks. They reportedly discussed, "terrorism, specifically terrorism generated from Afghanistan." Rep. Goss would later go on to claim that there was no "smoking gun" indicating the government could have prevented the attacks.

In January 2002, Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl was kidnapped and murdered. The terrorists were reportedly interested in stopping his investigations into the ISI. His kidnapping was in fact directed by Saeed Sheikh, the same man who had wired money to Atta before 9/11. President Musharraf later said:

Perhaps Daniel Pearl was over-intrusive. A mediaperson should be aware of the dangers of getting into dangerous areas. Unfortunately, he got over-involved. 12

Given the ISI's clear connections to the Taliban, Al Qaeda, and US intelligence, it is remarkable that the 9/11 Commission failed to even mention its role in the attacks.
In September 2000, a neoconservative think-tank called The Project for a New American Century published a document titled "Rebuilding America’s Defenses." In it was a detailed account of America’s post-Cold War role and the need for a massive transformation of the nation’s military. They noted that

\[\text{the process of transformation [...] is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor.}\]

PNAC included several members of the Bush Administration, including Cheney, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, and Perle.

In his 1997 book, *The Grand Chessboard*, longtime foreign-policy adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski outlined America’s need to secure the oil resources of Central Asia. He noted that convincing the American people of this imperial policy would be unlikely, “except in the circumstance of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat.”

Philip Zelikow, member of Bush’s 2000-2001 transition team, speculated in *Foreign Affairs* (1998) what effects the 1993 WTC bombing would have produced had it actually destroyed the towers:

\[\text{Such an act of catastrophic terrorism would be a watershed event in American history. It could involve loss of life and property unprecedented in peacetime and undermine America’s fundamental sense of security [...] Like Pearl Harbor, the event would divide our past and future into a before and after.}\]

Zelikow was later named the executive director of the 9/11 Commission. After the 9/11 attacks, President Bush reportedly dictated into his diary that evening, “The Pearl Harbor of the 21st century took place today.” Thus, the idea that a catastrophic event of terrorism that would radically alter America’s future was neither expected nor in some cases invited by members of the Bush Administration is contradicted by much evidence. In fact, it now appears that many of its members were in surprising agreement about the need for such an event and how it would be interpreted.

**The ISI**

Since 9/11, the media has reported that Pakistan is an important ally in America’s War on Terror. What has gone largely ignored are the close ties that Pakistan’s Military Intelligence agency (the ISI) has maintained with the Taliban, Al Qaeda terrorist network, and US intelligence.

**The ISI and the Taliban**

The ISI has had long established ties with the US, going back to the Soviet-Afghan war in the 1980s. The CIA allegedly worked closely with Pakistani intelligence, funding the mujaheddin through an illicit opium trade. Others have noted the surprising influence the ISI commands over the region. *Time* magazine noted, “even by the shadowy standards of spy agencies, the ISI is notorious. It is commonly branded ‘a state within the state,’ or Pakistan’s ‘invisible government.’”

Through the mid-1990s, the ISI formed close ties with the Taliban. For example, CNN reported that “the Taliban are widely alleged to be the creation of Pakistan’s military intelligence [the ISI]. Experts say that explains the Taliban’s swift military successes.” Other sources have reported ongoing financial relations between Taliban officials and the ISI.

**Ties to Al Qaeda**

The ISI is linked to Al Qaeda in a number of different ways besides support through the Taliban. For example, several terrorist groups operate in Kashmir under the direction of the ISI, though the agency attempts to maintain public deniability. Similarly, it has harbored and protected Al Qaeda operatives and has helped Osama Bin Laden on a number of different occasions. As reported by the respected intelligence newsletter Jane’s Intelligence Digest

\[\text{It is becoming clear that both the Taliban and al-Qaeda would have found it difficult to have continued functioning—including the latter group’s terrorist activities—without substantial aid and support from [Pakistan].}\]

**“A NEW PEARL HARBOR”**
Former FBI translator Sibel Edmonds. Edmonds has reported misconduct by supervisors that may have prevented important intelligence from reaching counterterrorism investigations prior to 9/11. Former Attorney General John Ashcroft has denied Edmonds' case in court repeatedly, invoking the State Secrets Privilege. In 2005, Edmonds was again denied, barred from entering the courtroom during the proceedings of her own case.

Her account is consistent with that of Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta, who in open testimony to the 9/11 Commission described a conversation between Vice President Cheney and an aid at around 9:25 or 9:26:

*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?”*

Thus according to both the FAA and a member of the Bush Administration itself, both the military and the White House were aware of Flight 77’s approach well before it struck the building. An attempt to intercept the plane or at least evacuate the nearby buildings should have been possible.

The 9/11 Commission, however, inexplicably omits both of these testimonies and contradicts the NORAD account by claiming that military was alerted at 9:34, leaving only four minutes for the military to respond.

**War games and destroyed evidence**

At least four different military exercises were conducted on the morning of 9/11, contributing significant confusion to the initial response. For example, one exercise involved a simulated airplane hijacking. To further complicate matters, military radar included a multitude of simulated planes or “injects” that had to be distinguished from real life aircraft.

There is also compelling evidence of an official coverup. In fact, FAA managers destroyed a tape recording of six air traffic controllers’ accounts of their communications on 9/11. Had the failure on 9/11 been due to innocent mistake or error, such measures should not have been necessary.
FAILED AIR DEFENSES

Well before the attacks of September 11, the FAA and NORAD (North American Aerospace Defense Command) established a protocol for dealing with hijacked aircraft quickly and efficiently. In the year 2000, the FAA responded to 425 pilots that diverted from their flight plans or were unidentified. When problems were not immediately solved by flight controllers, NORAD “scrambled” jets in response to 129 of those cases.¹

A common misconception is that “intercepting” aircraft involves shooting a plane down. Instead, fighter jets use a graduated response, often tipping their wings to get an errant pilot’s attention. Interception does not require approval from government officials—in fact, it was done regularly prior to 9/11 without such approval. According to NORAD, once notified, military jets can tail problematic flights “within a matter of minutes [...] anywhere in the United States.”²

Given this existing procedure, many have questioned why the military failed to intercept any aircraft on the morning of September 11. For example, Commander in Chief of the Russian Air Force Anatoli Kurnokov was astounded at the lack of military response, saying,

> Generally it is impossible to carry out an act of terror on the scenario which was used in the USA yesterday [...] As soon as something like that happens here, I am reported about that right away and in a minute we are all up.³

Nearly 80 minutes passed between the FAA’s first reports of a hijacking and Flight 77’s strike on the Pentagon. The government has given at least three different accounts for the military failure, none of which are satisfactory.

Contradictory accounts and omitted evidence

A timeline issued by NORAD one week after 9/11 claimed that the FAA finally contacted the military about Flight 77 at 9:24, 14 minutes before the Pentagon was struck. NORAD claimed that they had scrambled jets immediately, but because the notification had been so late they were unable to intercept the planes in time.

This is, however, contradicted by FAA Deputy in Public Affairs Laura Brown. In a memo sent in 2003 to the 9/11 Commission, she stated that the FAA and NORAD had been sharing information specifi-
Evidence shows that the claims made by US officials—that they did not know who the terrorists were, what they would target, how they would attack, or when they would attack—are all false. While it is still possible that US Intelligence failed to "put the picture together" despite having all the relevant information, there is strong evidence that the failure was due to negligence or complicity rather than incompetence. Here we will focus on what US Intelligence knew, addressing the failure to act in a later section.

Planes as Weapons

The claim that US officials did not expect, nor could not expect terrorists to use hijacked airplanes as "weapons of mass destruction" is contradicted by much evidence. Condoleezza Rice claimed in a press briefing, "I don’t think anybody could have predicted that these people would [...] try to use an airplane as a missile, a hijacked airplane as a missile." Yet the plot was first revealed in 1995, when the FBI obtained information from Philippine intelligence of an operation named "Project Bojinka" by Al Qaeda members Ramzi Yousef (leader of the 1993 WTC bombing) and Khalid Shaikh Mohammed (the financier of the 9/11 attacks). The plot called for an Al Qaeda terrorist to

board any American commercial aircraft pretending to be
an ordinary passenger. Then he will hijack said aircraft,
control its cockpit, and dive it at the CIA headquarters. He
will use no bomb or explosives. It is simply a suicidal mis-
mission that he is very much willing to execute. 2

Further investigation revealed selected targets of the operation, which included the World Trade Centers and the White House among other prominent public buildings. These findings were even aired multiple times on television long before 9/11. CNN correspondent David Ensom commented, "the idea of using an airliner as a weapon, that idea at least, had already been aired. [...] We talked about it. We've done stories about it for years, frankly." 3

Incredibly enough, the 9/11 Commission Report failed to even mention the collapse of WTC7. If the collapse of WTC7 was indeed caused by a controlled demolition, officials owe the public an explanation of why the building was destroyed with such haste, and why an alternate explanation was given in its place.
THE COLLAPSE OF WTC 7

Few people are aware of the fact that World Trade Center Building 7, a 47-story skyscraper near the two World Trade Center towers, suffered a global collapse at 5:20 PM on September 11, 2001. WTC7 was never hit by a plane, had only moderate damage and fires, and was further removed from the towers than all the other World Trade Center buildings. These other buildings, despite suffering from heavier damage, did not collapse.

WTC7 was built in 1985, and housed a number of federal agencies and financial institutions. Its tenants included the IRS, Secret Service, SEC, Mayor Giuliani’s Office of Emergency Management, and the CIA. ¹ FEMA initially attributed the collapse of the building to the diesel fuel tanks located in the lower levels of the building. However, their findings were far from conclusive:

The specifics of the fires in WTC 7 and how they caused the building to collapse remain unknown at this time. Although the total diesel fuel on the premises contained massive potential energy, the best hypothesis has only a low probability of occurrence. Further research, investigation, and analyses are needed to resolve this issue. ²

NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) later issued a preliminary report that attributed the collapse to massive structural damage on the south face of the building. The extent of this damage has not been confirmed by any publicly available photographs and fails to account for several features of the collapse.

Indications of Controlled Demolition

WTC7 showed many characteristic features of controlled demolition, a method that employs explosives to bring down large buildings safely. First, the building’s collapse was symmetrical, with the center of the building collapsing first and the outer walls falling inwards. WTC7 produced a tight rubble pile that barely extended onto the sidewalk of neighboring buildings. A second feature of controlled demolition is a rapid, complete collapse, often at near free-fall speeds. Building 7 collapsed in just over 6 seconds, just over the time

local airspace and prepared anti-aircraft guns to defend against terrorists who might use airliners to attack the conference. ⁵ This was yet another warning to President Bush and US Intelligence, coming from Italian and Egyptian officials in person, of the possibility of a terrorist attack by plane.

Foreign Intelligence

In the years and months preceding 9/11, over a dozen different foreign intelligence agencies warned the US about the attacks that were to come. In June 2001, German intelligence warned the CIA of militants planning to hijack airliners and use them as weapons against prominent American symbols. ⁶ They also provided information about one of the hijackers in 1999, information the CIA did not follow up on until after 9/11. ⁷ In July 2001, Egyptian intelligence warned the CIA that 20 Al-Qaeda operatives were in the US and that some of their members had flight training. ⁸ In August 2001, Israeli intelligence passed on a list of 19 terrorists in the US, claiming that they were likely to carry out a terrorist attack in the near future. ⁹ At least four names from that list are known, and all match names of the 9/11 hijackers. Similar warnings were given up to the day of the attacks by intelligence agencies in France, Germany, Italy, Britain, India, Jordan, Israel, Afghanistan, Argentina, Egypt, Morocco, and Russia. Many commented after 9/11 that US officials seemed strangely disinterested or did not act with the appropriate urgency regarding their information.
INSIDER KNOWLEDGE

While it appears as though US officials failed to act on the intelligence gathered before 9/11, this is not entirely the case. There is evidence that at least some individuals knew of the specific nature of the attacks and engaged in insider trading. There is also evidence that high officials in the government acted on the warnings in order to protect themselves.

Stock Market Anomalies

In the days up to September 11, the stocks for United Airlines, American Airlines, and several financial companies that were tenants of the WTC saw unusually high volumes of purchases on put options. A put option is a bet that a stock will go down. For example, United saw put options at 285 times the usual volume. John Kinnucan, principal of Broadband Research said, "I saw put-call numbers higher than I've ever seen in 10 years of following the markets, particularly the options markets." The other stocks all saw similar trading. Estimates have put the profits made on these trades at anywhere between $100 million to $15 billion. Airline trading was particularly unusual prior to 9/11 because investments are generally consistent for all three major carriers when a decline in the industry is expected. In this case, Delta did not have any unusual activity while United and American Airlines did.

To this day, the individuals responsible for these extraordinary purchases have not been revealed, and the only explanation given for the trading is a bare assertion by the 9/11 Commission that the trading was "innocuous." (See a later section for more about the 9/11 Commission.) To the contrary, Allen Poteshman, professor of finance at the University of Illinois, affirms that "there is evidence of unusual option market activity in the days leading up to September 11 that is consistent with investors trading on advance knowledge of the attacks."

Thus, it is reasonable to suspect that some individuals attempted to profit from specific knowledge they had about the attacks on 9/11. A detailed and open public inquiry needs take place.
Pakistan. Lieutenant General Mahmood Ahmed with President Musharraf. Mahmood Ahmed, Director of the ISI, reportedly ordered the wiring of $100,000 to hijacker Muhammad Atta shortly before 9/11. Ahmed was in Washington on the morning of 9/11 meeting with Senate Intelligence Committee chairs Bob Graham, Jon Kyl, and Porter Goss.

Individual Protection

Certain officials and prominent public figures appear to have received protection prior to 9/11. CBS News reported in July 2001 that Attorney General Ashcroft stopped flying on commercial aircraft due to a threat assessment, but "neither the FBI nor the Justice Department would identify what the threat was." Ashcroft has failed repeatedly to respond to press inquiries about the information he had. Several days before the 9/11 attacks, author Salman Rushdie was banned by the FAA from taking internal US flights. Rushdie has been threatened by radical Muslims for years and received additional security measures from the FAA just prior to 9/11. Rushdie cited the reason for the additional security was, "intelligence of something about to happen." Finally, Newsweek reported shortly after 9/11 that

the state of alert had been high during the past two weeks, and a particularly urgent warning may have been received the night before the attacks, causing some top Pentagon brass to cancel a trip. Why that same information was not available to the 266 people who died aboard the four hijacked commercial aircraft may become a hot topic on the Hill.

The story was hardly followed up by the media, and no explanation has been given for the warning.

This evidence suggests that some members of the government were aware of the specific threat posed by Al Qaeda, and were willing to keep only themselves or others they knew out of harm's way on the morning of September 11.
The degree of negligence in many of these cases is grounds for criminal investigation. It is difficult to believe that these failures are the result of mere incompetence or innocent mistake. In fact, the hijackers appear to have been protected from the very first day they entered the US—an analysis of 15 of the visa-applications used by the terrorists show that all 15 should have been denied entry. As reported by Joel Mowbray for the National Review,

Six separate experts analyzed the simple, two-page forms [...]. All came to the same conclusion: Each of the 15 visa applications should have been denied on its face.

Even to the untrained eye, it’s not hard to see why. Consider, for example, the U.S. destinations most of them listed. Only one of the 15 provided an actual address—and that was only because his first application was refused. The rest listed such not-so-specific locations as “California,” “New York,” “Hotel D.C.,” and “Hotel.”

One terrorist amazingly listed his U.S. destination as simply “No.” But he still got a visa.

The experts—who scrutinized the applications of 14 of the 15 Saudis and one of the two from the United Arab Emirates—include four former consular officers, a current consular officer stationed in Latin America, and someone with extensive consular experience who is now a senior official at Consular Affairs (CA), the division within the State Department that oversees consulates and visa issuance.

All six strongly agreed that, even allowing for human error, no more than a handful of the visa applications should have managed to slip through the cracks. [...] Nikolai Wenzel, one of the former consular officers who analyzed the forms, declares that State’s issuance of the visas “amounts to criminal negligence.”

Despite best efforts of many FBI agents, multiple attempts to identify and investigate the hijackers prior to 9/11 were thwarted inexplicably. One of the best known cases is that of Minnesota FBI agent Coleen Rowley, who requested a FISA search warrant for the laptop of Zacarias Moussaoui in August 2001. Minnesota agents had strong reason to suspect Moussaoui’s involvement in a terrorist plot, based on French intelligence and their own investigations. However, the FISA application was rejected despite the fact that over the previous 20 years, not a single request out of 10,000 had been denied. Rowley and other FBI agents would go on to comment that the FBI headquarters, “almost inexplicably, [threw] up roadblocks.” Another agent claimed headquarters was “setting [the investigation] up for failure.”

Chicago FBI agent Robert Wright’s investigations were similarly blocked and eventually dismantled by FBI headquarters. For example, one lead Wright was following involved the founder and financier of computer software company PTech, which is responsible for much of the information technology in government agencies including the FAA, Pentagon, and Air Force. In fact, according to Wall Street IT consultant Indira Singh, PTech’s software was so integral to government operations that it could have had a significant effect on the FAA and NORAD response on the morning of 9/11 (see the later section titled “Failed Air Defenses”).

FBI headquarters assigned an unnamed agent to the PTech investigation, who according to Wright and fellow agent John Vincent, blocked the investigation simply by not working on it. Several of PTech’s financial backers, it is now known, had close ties to Al Qaeda and other sponsors of terrorism.

A number of other official investigations that were inexplicably ignored include Ken Williams’ Phoenix Memo, and informant Randy Glass’ Operation Diamondback. Attempts to thwart investigations have been reported by many different people, including former FBI translator Sibel Edmonds, who reported that supervisors repeatedly prevented the translation of documents that were essential for counter terrorism operations. Interested readers can find out more about these topics in the Resources section at the back of this booklet.