



*PLANES WITHOUT PASSENGERS:
THE FAKED HIJACKINGS OF 9/11*

Third Edition

Copyright 2020 © by Dean T. Hartwell
All rights reserved

OTHER BOOKS BY THIS AUTHOR

Truth Matters: How the Voters Can Take Back Their Nation

Dead Men Talking: Consequences of Government Lies

Planes without Passengers: The Faked Hijackings of 9/11

Facts Talk but the Guilty Walk: The 9/11 No Hijacker Theory and Its Indictment of Our Leaders

Planes without Passengers: The Faked Hijackings of 9/11 (2nd Edition)

A Fan's Folklore: Six Seasons of Triumph, Tragedy and Tough Luck

St. Peter's Choice: A Novel

Rumors Fly, Truth Walks: How Lies Become Our History

Questions I Wasn't Supposed to Ask

Was 9/11 a Movie?

Mythology 9/11: Dead Men Do Tell Tales

PREFACE

What does the phrase “planes without passengers” mean? There are several explanations.

For one, it succinctly states my point of view that planes were used in the commission of events on that day as props. No passengers were needed to defraud the public.

Also, I implore the reader not to take the study of current events or history for granted. We may be told, for example that a plane is present, but we do ourselves no favor by assuming that the plane has passengers in it, or that a gun was necessarily loaded or that people like Osama bin Laden are necessarily terrorists.

Ultimately, the plane is a metaphor, a tool that takes us from one place to another.

What concerns me deeply is that our nation is wasting lives and money in order to benefit a very small percentage

of the population that does not need the money, anyway.

The United States has been fighting wars of choice in Afghanistan and Iraq for almost twenty years. And it imposes its will on other parts of the world as well.

Someday I hope we no longer fight wars as I have come to believe we only arrive at them through lies. Big lies that help corporations and which bury innocent people.

It will be a long trip from here to there. We all can make this journey but we need to first do the most basic and most important thing that we can do: think.

As you read on, be prepared to think about why you believe as you do. It is your worldview and the importance you place upon facts and your willingness to listen to new information in turn shapes the world that we all live in.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO 3RD EDITION	7
THERE WERE NO PASSENGERS	10
CROSS-EXAMINATION	26
THE NO PASSENGERS TIMELINE	82
THE NO PASSENGERS THEORY	92
THE OFFICIAL THEORY IS A LIE!	95
HISTORICAL CONTEXT TO 9/11	101
CONCLUSION	135
APPENDIX	139
END NOTES	153

INTRODUCTION TO 3RD EDITION

This book updates my previous work in the first two editions of *Planes without Passengers: The Faked Hijackings of 9/11*. The last edition came out in 2012 and I wanted to present my case with all of the facts I have ascertained, old and new, in a new arrangement.

First, I make my case that there were no passengers nor any hijackings nor any plane crashes on September 11, 2001. I give the facts for my case and the sources for these facts. It is the same case I made in the original edition.

Next, I summon over a dozen of the questions I have most frequently heard in opposition to my case. This part of the book is a serious cross-examination, which I think every good argument benefits from.

I then include one coherent timeline of the day's events to illustrate how the hoax of 9/11 took place.

After that, I provide a context for the lies we were told about 9/11. Or better yet, a narrative.

The government and media lying about events is nothing new at all. The reader will be taken back to the events as far back as 1963, such as the framing of Lee Harvey Oswald as an assassin, the “October Surprise” of 1980 and the election of 2000, in which our leaders willfully misled the public for the same reasons they misled the public about 9/11. Recollection of the facts of these events helps us to shape a better worldview moving forward.

Just as we should never give up our right to make up and speak our mind, we should never be afraid to change it. I have changed my mind on 9/11 and other events. We all have a worldview, but our refusal to change it in the face of facts that stare right us would be the equivalent of living in a world where we are no longer know whether or not we are free.

THERE WERE NO PASSENGERS

As one who has long doubted the official 9/11 theory, I have frequently heard the question, “So, what happened to the passengers?”

The question is fair. But it is also premature. It leads the listener away from plausible answers.

The best introductory questions do not lead, but instead encourage the listener to engage with an open mind. Leading questions will be asked on cross-examination in a later chapter.

With that said, this summary will ask and answer the question, “Were there passengers?”

Facts

In order to answer this question effectively, we must ascertain all of the available facts connected to the issue of passengers. A fact is “a truth known by actual experience or observation.”¹

I dread the thought of living in a society where facts are disputed or placed secondary to belief. Without facts, the basis of truth, nothing would mean anything. We could not debate in a fair manner nor solve any problem effectively.

For example, let's say that told me you would meet me at First and Main Street in Capitol City tomorrow at 3:00 PM. If I did not accept facts, I might dispute that you told me that or believe that you meant it as a joke and then decide not to show up.

It could get worse.

People could dispute the authority of police officers or of the law itself. Neighbors could disregard a boundary

for their property set forth by the government. They might even proclaim that if they saw something on television, then it must be true.

Some may say we are already there. But I am saying “Not so fast.”

We can ask ourselves if our worldview threatens our understanding of evidence. According to Michael Shermer, “People seem to double down on their beliefs in the teeth of overwhelming evidence against them. The reason is related to the worldview perceived to be under threat by the conflicting data.”²

I do not always agree with Shermer, but he got that right. If we stick to the facts, if we understand why we view them as such and if we listen to new information with an open mind, we can stop from “doubling down” on a wrong belief.

We cannot prevent others from ignoring or distorting facts, but that is another issue. So, let’s start with the facts of 9/11.

Here are my five most important facts about the events of 9/11:

- The flights of American Airlines 11 and American Airlines 77 did not fly on September 11, 2001.
- The flights of United Airlines 175 and United Airlines 93 were in the air long after media reports of their “crashes.”
- None of the alleged crash sites yielded airplane parts positively connected to the planes that allegedly crashed there.
- Cell phone calls made at the heights passenger planes reach would be highly unlikely, if not impossible, to connect to recipients on the ground.
- There is no credible evidence passengers boarded any of the planes.

1. American Airlines 11 and 77 did not fly on that day

The Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS) Table shows: “on-time arrival and departure data for non-stop domestic flights by month and year, by marketing network, marketing carrier that reports and regional code-share group, by origin and destination airport. Includes scheduled and actual departure and arrival times, canceled and diverted flights, taxi-out and taxi-in times, causes of delay and cancellation, airtime, and non-stop distance.”³

The BTS Table for September 11, 2001 originally did not show any American Airlines Flights numbered 11 or 77 as having been scheduled or having taken off that day. The late researcher Gerard Holmgren identified this fact and made it public on November 13, 2003.⁴

You may see the original BTS table for each of the airports that the four alleged planes were said to take off from in the Appendix.

By 2004, the BTS records showed something completely different about these flights. The new explanation said the following:

“On September 11, 2001, American Airlines Flight #11 and #77 and United Airlines #93 and #175 were hijacked by terrorists. Therefore, these flights are not included in the on-time summary statistics.”⁵

Why should we rely upon the BTS records?

These records are the best evidence on the issue of what commercial planes flew on that day, or any given day. Put simply, if we want to know if a commercial plane flew on September 11, 2001, we should look to them because they are more reliable and more consistent than other sources.

Here is why:

Bureau of Transportation Statistics records were filed contemporaneously with the events of that day and every day

commercial planes fly. This evidence is highly reliable because it (1) involves records routinely kept by a government agency that (2) were unaccountably altered in a way that appears to cover up a fact incongruent with the official story.

The reliability of this evidence makes it one of the first things a real investigation would have looked at in studying the case. This evidence also trumps so-called “passenger lists” or “manifests” which could much more easily be faked.

The alteration of evidence suggests the consciousness of guilt, and the availability of the original records to the public has been hampered by those with the duty to reveal them.

It is a fact that the best evidence available shows that neither American Airlines 11 nor American Airlines Flight 77 flew on September 11, 2001.

2. United Airlines 175 and 93 flew on that day, but neither crashed

Airplane Communications and Reporting System (ACARS) messages were sent to Flight 175 that indicate that the plane was heading far away from its “crash” scene. ACARS is “In aviation, an acronym for aircraft communications addressing and reporting system) is a digital datalink system for transmission of short messages between aircraft and ground stations via air band radio or satellite.”⁶

Pilots for 9/11 Truth discovered that ACARS had tracked Flight 175 in western Pennsylvania fifteen minutes after it allegedly struck the World Trade Center. The plane is identified clearly as N612UA.⁷ Pilots also found that ACARS had tracked United 93 over Champaign, Illinois, at the same time as its alleged crash in Shanksville. It is identified clearly by the ACARS as N591UA.⁸

Why should we rely upon ACARS records?

These records are best evidence on the issue of communications from a specific aircraft and the precise time those communications took place. They are done with no form of discrimination and are done consistently.

The ACARS information was recorded contemporaneously and traced to the plane's serial number, which is unique only to that aircraft. Use of a serial number is a more accurate way to identify a plane than by its flight number as flight numbers may repeat and are thus not unique.

United Airlines 175 and 93 flew well beyond the time they were said to have "crashed" and likely landed safely in the Midwestern part of the United States.

3. No Airplane Parts Match Said Airplanes

Every part of each airplane has a serial number on the part that identifies several things about the part such as when it is time for that part to be replaced and which specific plane that part is on.

With crashes alleged at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and Shanksville, there should have been several opportunities for investigators to identify such plane pieces. For example, Col. George Nelson, USAF (ret.) commented that had United 93 crashed in Shanksville, “there would have [been] literally hundreds of serially-controlled time-change parts within the hole that would have proved beyond any shadow of doubt the precise tail-number or identity of the aircraft.”⁹

However, no debris from any “crash” scene has ever been traced by serial number to any plane that allegedly flew on 9/11 as Flight 11, Flight 175, Flight 77 or Flight 93.¹⁰

4. Cell Phone Calls Did Not Come from the Sky

David Ray Griffin explains the utter lack of consistency in the official explanations of phone calls on the planes associated with 9/11. He does an excellent job of explaining how the FBI at first remained silent (in 2001) as to what phones were used on the planes.¹¹

He then discusses the chronology of A.K. Dewdney's report, which made it clear that cell phone calls were then only reasonably possible at altitudes of less than 2,000 feet. Griffin notes that the subsequent FBI report for the 2006 Zacarias Moussaoui trial changed identification of all but two calls from cell to air phone.¹²

From Griffin's analysis of the work of researchers like Dewdney, we can easily surmise that the official story on the number of cell phones changed drastically after it became known publicly the difficulty in getting cell phones to work at typical airplane altitudes.

Furthermore, at the Moussaoui trial, the prosecution and the defense both stipulated to the phone call findings. That is to say, they never debated the veracity of the calls or the phone records, meaning that we cannot use the court system to determine whether the calls really took place.

Cell phone calls may have been made by alleged passengers, but not from the sky.

5. There is No Evidence of Passengers Having Boarded any of the Planes

Noted researcher Elias Davidsson names the evidence that the government should have revealed if it really had a case that could be proven as to the people that boarded the planes:

In order to prove that particular individuals actually boarded the aircrafts and died at the known crash sites, at least three types of evidence could and should have been produced: Authenticated passenger lists (flight manifests) displaying their names, identification of any of the passengers as they boarded the aircraft, and identification of their bodily remains from the crash sites.¹³

What is the best evidence of the presence of passengers on an airplane?

Manifests. And where are the manifests for these flights?

What some refer to as “manifests” simply refer to lists of passengers brought up at the aforementioned Moussaoui trial five years after the events of 9/11. It is worthwhile to ask where these “manifests” had been for that time and why we should consider them to be authentic. Previous lists of passengers were provided by the media shortly after the day. The media has never been forthright as to how they obtained those lists.

The absence of manifests, plus the lack of any other reliable information that anyone boarded the planes in question, rules out the presence of passengers altogether.

HYPOTHESIS ESTABLISHED

These facts tell us that two of the flights did not take off and two others flew but did not crash. They also make clear that phone calls were not made from any flight, either. A hypothesis can be formed that there were no passengers involved in the events of 9/11.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

This hypothesis should be cross-examined in order to test its validity. I leave my mind open to the possibility that I missed something and I resolve that issue in this chapter.

Again, leading questions are allowed. Here are commonly asked questions about alleged passengers and my responses to them:

Wasn't there Surveillance Camera footage of hijackers at the airports?

A blog written in 2017 purports to “debunk” the claim that a closed-circuit television (CCTV) recording of Dulles airport has no authenticity. It shows pictures from a video that depict two men who allegedly hijacked American Airlines 77 and a woman who allegedly boarded the plane.¹⁴

The blog identifies the “hijackers” as Khalid al-Mihder and Majed Moqed and the “passenger” as Mari-Rae Sopper. The three are shown going through the screening process.

A picture, they say, tells a thousand words. But the full picture of proving there were passengers requires far more words than what we see here.

For the sake of argument, we could excuse the lack of a time stamp and agree that the videotape and the pictures taken from it are indeed from September 11, 2001. We could also assume that the place in question is Dulles Airport. We could even assume that the people in the picture are who the blogger says they are.

But the pictures cannot possibly prove that al-Mihder or Moqed hijacked the plane. This assertion relies upon assumptions about phone calls made from airplanes and lists of hijackers provided by the FBI.¹⁵

It also pales as evidence in comparison to official, contemporaneous records that American 77 did not fly. The same evidence also outweighs the assertion that Sopper actually boarded American 77.

There is a better explanation for the pictures: they were used to frame people for a crime that never happened. Even the blogger makes mention of how easily the authorities “found” these hijackers on the tape: “...others recalled how the feds came and seized the security video and were able to fast forward quickly enough and identify the hijackers.”¹⁶

How did the federal officials get to the pictures of “hijackers” so quickly? They were incredibly prescient and lucky or they were told where to look.

There is no credible evidence of any surveillance footage of anyone said to be a passenger on any of the flights associated with 9/11.

Didn't Investigators Find DNA Evidence of Passengers?

This belief is apparently a common one.

I ran across an article printed in the *Daily News* exactly one year after 9/11. It contains the statement:

“DNA extractions were done on every one of the 19,906 remains, and 4,735 of those have been identified. As many as 200 remains have been linked to a single person. The 1,401 people identified include 45 of those aboard the hijacked planes...”¹⁷

Is it really that simple? Members of a policy forum on the lessons of the attack said this about the DNA search:

“The condition of the remains ranged from a few nearly complete bodies to multitudes of tiny fragments of charred bone, often difficult to distinguish from inorganic material. The fires affected the remains with temperatures exceeding 1000°C that burned for more than 3 months.

The towers’ collapse fragmented and commingled victim remains and admixed building material. Many tissue fragments were retrieved months after the crashes, and bacterial and other processes further compromised the DNA. These factors

made it difficult to isolate and genotype the DNA from the specimens.”¹⁸

This compromise of the DNA causes problems with attempts to identify victims: “when DNA is damaged, as it often is through exposure to moisture or extreme temperatures, only some of these markers will be available, and forensics teams will generate a partial profile. Put simply, if a DNA profile is a complete description of a person’s appearance, a partial profile might describe only one of their traits—hair color, for instance.”¹⁹

Furthermore, the sample material was limited. The New York City Office of Chief Medical Examiner (OCME), responsible for the identification of victims at the World Trade Center, did not have enough preexisting (pre-9/11) sample collections to make much of a difference in identifying human remains. Often, the investigators had to use DNA profile of those claiming to be relatives of the victims, which is not as accurate.

According to Naomi Elster of the JSTOR Daily, “Partial profiles will match up with many more people than a full profile. And even full profiles may match with a person other than the culprit. Further complicating matters, a single DNA profile might be mistakenly generated when samples from multiple people are accidentally combined. It’s a messy world.”

This discussion pre-supposes that DNA of any passengers were actually located at the alleged crash sites. And unlike the search for plane wreckage, DNA testing is done privately. If fraud is involved, or those collecting samples make mistakes, no one sees it. And it certainly helped those looking for DNA matches to have a ready list of “passengers” available and a public willing to accept its findings without much question.

An interesting thought: how did the investigators fail to find the plane pieces but manage to find DNA samples?

Another interesting thought: if the “family” of the “passengers” are in on the hoax, then the “matches” would have been easy to find. Just provide the “family” DNA samples and tie them to imaginary passengers!

DNA has not been used to prove the existence of any passenger.

What about the people who made phone calls from the airplanes?

The public learns of names of people said to have crashed in the airplanes and hears of recordings attributed to the same people. Many conclude, “Voila! These people must have been passengers.” But a close check of the evidence of these people and the calls says otherwise.

Betty Ong

A researcher, known as “loopDloop,” wrote an article called “Fog, Fiction and the Flight 11 Phone Calls” that appears on the *Let’s Roll Forums* website.²⁰ The article reveals the presence of two

recordings of the same phone call from flight attendant Betty Ong.

One recording sounds as though it covers up discussion the public was not supposed to hear. The author identifies this and other actions as evidence destruction.

The recording, which can be heard on YouTube [here](#)²¹, reveals Ong (or someone pretending to be Ong) speaking calmly during a reported hijacking. Amazingly, no screams or other signs of passenger panic can be heard.

Ong uses the term “Flight 12” and states “We’re on Flight 11 *right now*,”²² comments that suggest a conscious effort to use the wrong flight number.

She may have been used as someone to alert the world that an attack was underway. Though some would be surprised of the serenity of this heroine in danger, others saw it as a sign of strength.

Ong's story becomes that of an airline attendant on Flight 11 who speaks calmly for four minutes telling her airline about a hijacking, a stabbing and mace used on her flight. It sounds riveting at first but it is not real.

How do we know that she is a character?

As noted earlier, American Airlines 11 never flew on September 11, 2001. There were thus no Flight 11 passengers or crew that day.

A four-minute tape recording of a phone call allegedly from Betty Ong was played in 2004 at the 9/11 Commission, where American Airlines Operations supervisor Nydia Gonzalez testified.²³ Ong's performance was crucial as it became the only recording from a "hijacked" plane to be played to the public.

The story of Betty Ong helped get the "United States is under enemy attack" message spread all over the world. Because of its importance, I am going to list the whole transcript of this conversation with my comments:

Betty Ong: I'm Number 3 in the back. The cockpit's not answering. Somebody's stabbed in business class and—I think there's mace—that we can't breathe. I don't know, I think we're getting hijacked.

- As noted, there was mace floating around on the plane. Why isn't she coughing? How does she speak so calmly? Why is there no coughing in the background?

Male Voice: Which flight are you on?

Betty Ong: Flight 12.

- Funny thing. There was no American flight 12 that day. In fact, Flight 12 was the return flight from Los Angeles to Boston, which, because of subsequent events, did not happen.

Operator: And what seat are you in? Ma'am, are you there?

Betty Ong: Yes.

Male Voice: What seat are you in?

Female Voice: Ma'am, what seat are you in?

Betty Ong: We're—just left Boston, we're up in the air.

Female Voice: I know, what—

Betty Ong: We're supposed to go to LA and the cockpit's not answering their phone.

Female Voice: Okay, but what seat are you sitting in? What's the number of your seat?

- Why did the others have to ask Ong five times before she finally answered?

Betty Ong: Okay, I'm in my jump seat right now.

Female Voice: Okay.

Betty Ong: At 3R.

Female Voice: Okay.

Male Voice: Okay, you're the flight attendant? I'm sorry, did you say you're the flight attendant?

Betty Ong: Hello?

Female Voice: Yes, hello.

Male Voice: What is your name?

Betty Ong: Hi, you're going to have to speak up, I can't hear you.

Male Voice: Sure. What is your name?

Betty Ong: Okay, my name is Betty Ong. I'm number 3 on Flight 11.

Male Voice: Okay.

Betty Ong: And the cockpit is not answering their phone, and there's somebody stabbed in business class, and there's—we can't breathe in business class. Some-body's got mace or something.

Male Voice: Can you describe the person that you said—someone is what in business class?

Betty Ong: I'm sitting in the back. Somebody's coming back from business. If you can hold on for one second, they're coming back.

Betty Ong: Okay. Our number 1 got stabbed. Our purser is stabbed. Nobody knows who stabbed who, and we can't even get up to business class right now 'cause nobody can breathe. Our number 1 is stabbed right now. And who else is?

Male Voice: Okay, and do we—

Betty Ong: And our number 5—our first-class passengers are—galley flight attendant and our purser has been stabbed. And we can't get into the cockpit, the door won't open. Hello?

Male Voice: Yeah, I'm taking it down. All the information. We're also, you know, of course, recording this. At this point—

Nydia Gonzalez: This is Operations. What flight number are we talking about?

Male Voice: Flight 12.

Female Voice: Flight 12? Okay. I'm getting—

Betty Ong: No. We're on Flight 11 right now. This is Flight 11.

Male Voice: It's Flight 11, I'm sorry Nydia.

Betty Ong: Boston to Los Angeles.

Male Voice: Yes.

Betty Ong: Our number 1 has been stabbed and our 5 has been stabbed. Can anybody get up to the cockpit? Can anybody get up to the cockpit? Okay. We can't even get into the cockpit. We don't know who's up there.

Male Voice: Well, if they were shrewd they would keep the door closed and—

Betty Ong: I'm sorry?

Male Voice: Would they not maintain a sterile cockpit?

Betty Ong: I think the guys are up there. They might have gone there—jammed the way up there, or something. Nobody can call the cockpit. We can't even get inside. Is anybody still there?

Male Voice: Yes, we're still here.

Female Voice: Okay.

Betty Ong: I'm staying on the line as well.

Male Voice: Okay.

Nydia Gonzalez: Hi, who is calling reservations? Is this one of the flight attendants, or who? Who are you, hon?

Male Voice: She gave her name as Betty Ong.

Betty Ong: Yeah, I'm number 3. I'm number 3 on this flight, and we're the first—

- What did Ong mean when she said, “we’re the first”? Was it a Freudian slip about being the first simulation?

Nydia Gonzalez: You're number 3 on this flight?

Betty Ong: Yes, and I have—

Nydia Gonzalez: And this is Flight 11? From where to where?

Betty Ong: Flight 11.

Nydia Gonzalez: Have you guys called anyone else?

Betty Ong: No. Somebody's calling medical and we can't get a doc—

With that, the portion of the tape played at the commission hearing ended. Then, the commission heard a recording of a second phone call, the call Nydia Gonzales placed to American Airlines' emergency line. Gonzales was still on the phone with Betty Ong as well. She relayed what Ong was telling her to the emergency operator.

Male Voice: American Airlines emergency line, please state your emergency.

Nydia Gonzalez: Hey, this is Nydia at American Airlines calling. I am monitoring a call-in which Flight 11—the flight attendant is advising our reps that the pilot, everyone's been stabbed.

Male Voice: Flight 11?

Nydia Gonzalez: Yep. They can't get into the cockpit is what I'm hearing.

Male Voice: Okay. Who is this I'm talking to?

Nydia Gonzalez: Excuse me. This is Nydia, American Airlines at the Raleigh Reservation Center. I'm the operations specialist on duty.

Male Voice: And I'm sorry, what was your name again?

Nydia Gonzalez: Nydia.

Male Voice: Nydia. And what's your last name?

Nydia Gonzalez: Gonzalez— G-o-n-z-a-l-e-z.

Male Voice: (Inaudible)—Raleigh Reservations. Okay, now when you—

Nydia Gonzalez: I've got the flight attendant on the line with one of our agents.

Male Voice: Okay. And she's calling how?

Nydia Gonzalez: Through reservations. I can go in on the line and ask the flight attendant questions.

Male Voice: Okay. I'm assuming they've declared an emergency. Let me get ATC on here. Stand by.

Nydia Gonzalez: Have you guys gotten any contact with anybody? Okay, I'm still on with security, okay, Betty? You're doing a great job, just stay calm. Okay? We are, absolutely.

Male Voice: Okay, we're contacting the flight crew now and we're, we're also contacting ATC.

Nydia Gonzalez: Okay. It seems like the passengers in coach might not be aware of what's going on right now.

Male Voice: These two passengers were from first class?

Nydia Gonzalez: Okay, hold on. Hey Betty, do you know any information as far as the gents—the men that are in the cockpit with the pilots, were they from first class? They were sitting in 2A and B.

Male Voice: Okay.

Nydia Gonzalez: They are in the cockpit with the pilots.

Male Voice: Who's helping them, is there a doctor on board?

Nydia Gonzalez: Is there a doctor on board, Betty, that's assisting you guys? You don't have any doctors

on board. Okay. So, you've gotten all the first-class passengers out of first class?

Male Voice: Have they taken anyone out of first class?

Nydia Gonzalez: Yeah, she's just saying that they have. They're in coach. What's going on, honey? Okay, the aircraft is erratic again. Flying very erratically. She did say that all the first-class passengers have been moved back to coach, so the first-class cabin is empty. What's going on your end?

Male Voice: We contacted Air Traffic Control, they are going to handle this as a confirmed hijacking, so they're moving all the traffic out of this aircraft's way.

Nydia Gonzalez: Okay.

Male Voice: He turned his transponder off, so we don't have a definitive altitude for him. We're just going by—they seem to think that they have him on a primary radar. They seem to think that he is descending.

Nydia Gonzalez: Okay.

Male Voice: Okay, Nydia?

Nydia Gonzalez: Yes dear, I'm here.

Male Voice: Okay, I have a dispatcher currently taking the current fuel on board.

Nydia Gonzalez: Uh, huh.

Male Voice: And we're going to run some profiles.

Nydia Gonzalez: Okay.

Male Voice: To see exactly what his endurance is.

Nydia Gonzalez: Okay.

Male Voice: Did she—

Nydia Gonzalez: She doesn't have any idea who the other passenger might be in first. Apparently, they might have spread something so it's—they're having a hard time breathing or getting in that area.

What's going on, Betty? Betty, talk to me. Betty, are you there? Betty? (Inaudible.)

Okay, so we'll like—we'll stay open. We—I think we might have lost her.

[End of transcript]

The public never hears the remaining twenty minutes of her conversation, an omission never explained.

Whether Betty Ong was a real person or not, the fact remains that the conversation attributed to her was not about a real hijacking.

There are plenty of red flags that something was amiss here, but the Ong

conversation served to push the “panic” button that serves to wake some people up, but also serves to shut off critical thinking as well.

Perhaps the plotters decided that more panic was needed and they also may have wanted to paint a clearer picture of the antagonists of the story that was developing.

Whatever the case, Betty Ong was not a flight attendant on 9/11 on a hijacked plane.

Amy Sweeney

Fellow flight attendant Amy Sweeney also made a call, although no recording is known to exist. This call became known to the public through records of FBI interviews.

Her call allegedly went to American Airlines Flight Service at Boston Logan Airport and interview transcripts apparently show that she identified where hijackers were located on the plane.²⁴

She told a manager for American Airlines that “Flight 12 at Gate 32” had two flight attendants stabbed.²⁵

But Gate 32 was the gate that Flight 11 was supposed to have departed from.

American Airline employee Elizabeth Williams told the FBI that she had gone down to Gate 32 after hearing of Sweeney’s comment. And found an empty plane matching the description of Flight 11!²⁶

Like Ong and the others listed here, it appears Sweeney or someone using her name made telephone calls pretending to be on a hijacked plane.

Barbara Olson

The most well-known person allegedly on any of the planes was Barbara Olson. Theories range as to her whereabouts. Some say she was killed off by the plotters, while others say she went away, perhaps to come back later with a new identity.

According to Ted Olson in an interview with Larry King days after the “crash,” Barbara had originally planned to fly from Virginia to Los Angeles on Monday, September 10th. She changed her mind and decided to take the flight on September 11th so that she could spend time with Ted as his birthday was that day.²⁷

In the same interview, Ted relates that Barbara stayed overnight with him and awoke with him Tuesday morning. He says that he went to work “very early in the morning, before 6” and that she “left shortly after that to go to the airport.” Again, in the same interview, Ted tells of a brief conversation the two of them had, in which he apparently thought she was boarding or about to board a plane.

Do we know for sure that Barbara stayed over the night of the 10th? Has anyone found the vehicle by which she got to the airport, or stated that they saw her on it?

And what about the alleged calls?

The story went that she, the pilot, and others on American Flight 77 were rounded up by three or four hijackers using box cutters and knives and sent to the back. Barbara Olson called Ted twice for advice on how to handle the situation.

I never could understand why the hijackers allowed her to make a call appealing for help. Nor could I determine why the pilot, Charles Burlingame (a weightlifter and boxer), while in the cockpit, could not have fought off the hijackers or why they did not kill him on the spot. But it got stranger.

Ted Olson changed his story at least twice as to what type of phone his wife used to make the calls. At first, he said she used her cell phone to call collect, but he changed his mind about that when he realized she did not have her credit cards.

Then he stated that she must have used an “air phone” found on the back of some of the seats, but that story did not work because the air phone could not likely

have stretched to the back of the plane where Barbara supposedly made the call and because she would have had to use a credit card to initiate it. He then went back to saying it was a cell phone even though studies have shown the exceptional difficulty of making cell phone calls at high altitudes.

A note about the possibility of air phones on flight 77: There is serious doubt that any of the American Airlines Boeing 757 planes had air phones.²⁸ David Griffin cites several sources, including representatives from American Airlines, the airline flight maintenance manuals and pilots, that make it clear that Boeing 757s, of which American 77 was one, did not have functioning onboard phones in September 2001.

All of these facts still did not cause me to believe a story about Ted Olson faking the calls was not likely to be true. Perhaps in the shock of learning of his wife's imminent demise, he forgot about some of the details. And I had trouble imagining a public official willing to lie

about something during what should have been a mourning period.

But new facts emerged when Zacarias Moussaoui went on trial in 2006 and the government had to produce evidence or let the case against one of the alleged masterminds get away. At some point, the prosecutors needed proof that passengers were really on board the flight and the FBI turned over its phone records to them. The records indicated phone calls by other passengers, but the only call from Olson was “unconnected.”²⁹

If the FBI, part of the same Department of Justice in which Ted Olson once served as a leader, would not cover for him and protect the story, it sounded like a rare admission from our government that there was a crack in the official story. But there was one more piece of the puzzle.

A study by GlobalResearch.ca points out that carrier AT&T records do not show proof of alleged passenger Barbara

Olson making a call to her husband Ted Olson, the then-Solicitor General, though the government “routinely” keeps such records.³⁰

Why would someone make up the phone calls? Could it be that Barbara Olson was the only person who allegedly said anything about the terrorists’ use of box cutters? The official story, as carried by politicians and the media at the time of the attacks, and the reports done later, speaks at length about the box cutters.

It thus appears more likely than not that Ted Olson, either on his own but more likely at the request of others, made up the calls and inserted “facts” to put a face on the grief and to advance the official story of how terrorists put down anyone who challenged them.

The alleged calls, from Olson, and from other passengers, did not come from American 77 and were instead a part of a propaganda campaign to convince the public of the claims that Olson supposedly made—that there were

terrorists with box cutters who hijacked and crashed the flight.

The plot specifically needed her account of box cutters as they were legal then to bring on board a plane and would relieve the airlines from some liability.

Barbara Olson was a real person who had an image as a television commentator on political issues. Whether she is dead or alive is an interesting question but one that need not be answered. She was not on a hijacked plane on September 11, 2001.

Todd Beamer

No alleged passenger achieved more fame than Todd Beamer. According to the legend spread through the media, Beamer, confronted by terrorists on United 93, shouted the battle cry "Let's Roll!" He inspired other passengers to fight back and forced the terrorists to crash the plane in a field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Beamer worked for Oracle Corporation selling systems applications and software.³¹ Shortly before September 11, 2001, Beamer took a trip to Italy with his wife, Lisa, as a reward from Oracle for his excellence in salesmanship.

Like Barbara Olson, Todd Beamer apparently had the choice of taking a Monday, September 10th flight to get to his destination (San Francisco) or taking the Tuesday flight. A Pittsburgh Post-Gazette article in October 2001 noted that Beamer chose to stay at home on the 10th to be with his family.³²

Like Ted Olson, Lisa Beamer apparently did not see her spouse leave the house that day or at least does not say in what vehicle he may have left.³³ She acknowledges she knew little about the details of his itineraries and in fact thought at first he took a flight on Continental Airlines.³⁴

These details may well be insignificant, but they also leave room open for legends to be written.

Beamer made his alleged shout “Let’s Roll” into a telephone that Verizon operator Lisa Jefferson would later say she heard. For several days after this event, Jefferson supposedly was the only person to know of Beamer’s call and the story of a passenger uprising against hijackers.

However, Oracle CEO Larry Ellison sent out a memo to his employees long before the call became public. His memo read:

“We know Todd Beamer is dead. We believe he died when he and other passengers aboard Flight 93 tried to recover the hijacked airplane from the terrorists.... Considering the devastation wrought by the other aircraft, it is unquestionable that Todd’s brave actions, and [those] of his fellow passengers, saved countless lives on the ground.”³⁵

Lisa Beamer would later write in her book about Todd, *Let’s Roll!: Ordinary People, Extraordinary Courage*:

“How did Larry know that? The FBI hadn’t made any announcement to that effect. Todd’s name had not shown up in any reports indicating that he might have been involved in some way.”³⁶

Could Ellison have known about Beamer’s story through Oracle’s connections to the CIA? Evidence shows that the company got its start as a CIA-run project involving some of the people who would later become its leaders.³⁷

Strangely, Jefferson said later in her own book, *Called: Hello, My Name Is Mrs. Jefferson. I Understand Your Plane Is Being Hijacked. 9:45 Am, Flight 93, September 11, 2001*, that she offered to put Beamer through to his wife. Todd inexplicably refused, instead spending the last few minutes of his life on the phone with a stranger!

Consensus 9/11 lists several other reasons to doubt the validity of the alleged call from Todd Beamer to Lisa Jefferson, such as the fact Jefferson had never before heard Beamer’s voice,

Jefferson failed to record the call, and the last call went on for 65 minutes, long after the “crash”!³⁸

But perhaps the most intriguing issue is that the FBI did not mention Beamer’s famous battle cry “Let’s Roll” in the summary of their interview with Jefferson on September 11, 2001.³⁹ This phrase did not go public until an article written by Jim McKinnon of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette five days later. McKinnon claims that Lisa Beamer told him that Todd had likely used the phrase.⁴⁰ The phrase that just happened to become the national battle cry against the “terrorists.”

So where was Todd Beamer on that day?

As with Olson, we have only a spouse’s claim of the “passenger” staying overnight before a postponed trip. We have no way to verify how he got to the airport. We can also state without reservation that any call he may have made was not about real hijackers or a real crash.

Todd Beamer likely took the approach I have outlined above for Barbara Olson. He never boarded any plane. Someone from Oracle could have provided personal information about Beamer to whoever made the call.

The caller could have given enough personal information to convince Jefferson and Lisa Beamer that Todd indeed made the call. With his company's CIA connections, he could easily have assumed a new identity after the "crash."

Writing in *Called*, Jefferson says she believes that she spoke with Todd Beamer and believes that he was on a hijacked airplane. But Jefferson may have unwittingly provided a hint of doubt. She writes in her introduction about the events of September 11, 2001:

We can live our days trying to make sense of the senseless, or we can trust God...and trust sometimes

requires unanswered
questions.⁴¹

Such a belief, especially put forth by the powers in our society who used Jefferson's story to sell the official story, stymies reasonable inquiry.

Is Lisa Jefferson letting questions go unanswered or is she unwilling to reveal answers to those questions?

Here is the chronology of the media discussion of Barbara Olson and Todd Beamer:

9/11/01 – Late in the day, CNN posted a story that Ted Olson said that his wife, Barbara, had called him from the plane (American 77)⁴²

9/13 – Larry Ellison, CEO of Oracle, Todd Beamer's employer, sends a memo to his employees praising Beamer's bravery on United 93.⁴³

9/14 – Lisa Beamer, wife of Todd, learns for first time that Todd made a phone call from United 93 to a GTE/Verizon

operator who gave the call to her supervisor, Lisa Jefferson, contacts Beamer by letter telling her she is available to talk to her.⁴⁴ Lisa Beamer receives “synopsis” of the conversation between Todd Beamer and Lisa Jefferson this evening.⁴⁵

9/16 – The phrase “Let’s Roll” is quoted in print for the first time by Jim McKinnon of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.⁴⁶

The facts of Todd Beamer’s story do not add up to his legend. His name was likely used by his company to help spread fear of terrorism.

Cee Cee Lyles

Flight 93 had another alleged call that became famous: the one made by Cee Cee Lyles, said to be a flight attendant. She made a call that wound up on her husband’s voice mail, telling him about the hijacking, how much she loves him, how she hopes to see him again, etc.

A comment at the end of the tape, which can be heard here on YouTube⁴⁷, has

caught the attention of many 9/11 researchers: “It’s a frame” (according to some) or “You did great” (according to others).

It does not matter which version (or any other) is correct or who actually made the comment. The statement can be best interpreted by the context surrounding it.

If she really were a flight attendant somehow able to use a phone, she would have contacted the authorities to tell them all she could about the flight position in order to assist a rescuing plane. That is what flight attendants do in an emergency.

The comment at the end is authored by those who authored the whole official story of 9/11. Someone let her use the phone and directed the call. She was on the ground spreading misinformation.

Lyles was not a flight attendant or a passenger or a hero. She was a prop, used by others to direct us away from the truth.

Weren't there hijackers?

The official theory tells us that Osama bin Laden trained members of al-Qaeda and sent them to the United States for flight training, but it fails to show proof that these members were on the planes. A videotape has emerged of Mohammed Atta and Abdulaziz Al-Omari at the Portland, Maine, airport, but the video shows two separate times. Another videotape purportedly shows other hijackers at the Dulles Airport in Washington, DC, but it gives no date or time.

According to the *9/11 Commission Report*, Atta left his baggage behind at Boston's Logan airport with incriminating evidence, including the names of all hijackers and his own will. If Atta intended to fly a plane to his death, he could not possibly have expected his will to remain intact after the crash. It is possible that he could have arranged for his bags to miss his flight (and completely fool the airline staff).

However, Atta himself had reportedly told his fellow hijackers to “check all of your items—your bag, your clothes, knives, your will, your IDs, your passport, your papers. . . . Make sure that nobody is following you.”⁴⁸

Between the two possibilities of Atta leaving an easy trail of evidence to help investigators solve the crime or someone using his name to frame him and mislead investigators, the latter appears more likely. The first scenario seems too simple to be true, like a murderer publicly announcing his next victim.

The FBI posted the names and other identifying information such as birthdays, place of birth, and home city about the 19 hijackers promptly after 9/11. When confronted with evidence that some of the hijackers listed were actually alive, the FBI Director Robert Mueller at first admitted that there was “no legal proof to the identities of the suicidal hijackers”⁴⁹ and then reverted back to his original position that the FBI had it right all along.

If these 19 men truly intended to hijack planes and crash them into buildings, they would probably use their real names since they might not fear capture and would want others to remember them. But the official theory ignores this problem. Their only reasonable remedy to the problem of the living people identified in error as participants would be to acknowledge negligence.

Barring a stunning coincidence that several sets of people from the same city have the same name, birthplace, and birthday, the FBI listed a number of names of people not connected to the attacks.

To clear up this discrepancy and dispel rumors of alleged FBI involvement (at least after the fact), the Bureau should correct its list of suspects and provide an explanation as to its initial mistake. Its failure to do so raises doubts about the true identities of the hijackers and hints at a cover-up of the true participants.

The FBI has also claimed that it has identified at least 10 of the hijackers by matching their remains to known DNA samples. Where did the samples come from?

Ellen Barakove, a spokeswoman for the New York Medical Examiner's office, said the FBI took the samples from “locations such as the scene of the crashes, a hotel, or other places where the hijackers stayed” the night before.⁵⁰ But the same article fails to mention what the samples were matched to!

What about the black boxes found?

On another subject, there have also been conflicting reports about black boxes (which include cockpit voice recorders and flight data recorders that record the last thirty minutes of a plane's voices and noises) recovered for Flights 11 and 175. The official theory reports that no black boxes were found for either plane, which is extremely unusual.⁵¹ In fact, the *Philadelphia Daily News* said that “Federal aviation officials—blaming the

massive devastation—have said the World Trade Center attacks seem to be the only major jetliner crashes in which the critical devices were never located.”⁵²

But *Counterpunch* magazine reported on December 19, 2005, that sources have said the FBI actually has these boxes from both flights.⁵³ No official has yet commented on the tapes or revealed their contents.⁵⁴

As for United 93, there is no doubt that the last three minutes of the cockpit voice recording are missing⁵⁵. The government has refused to admit to this discrepancy, leading many others to believe that something is missing from the tape, which ends with passengers yelling frantically and apparent hijackers alternating shouting, “cut off the oxygen” and “Allah is the greatest.”⁵⁶ What could have happened during the missing three minutes that followed?

Better yet, why should we believe in the credibility of the tape to begin with?

If planes did not bring the World Trade Center Towers down, what did?

It was NOT American Airlines 11 or United Airlines 175. That alone speaks volumes.

It says that one of the key points of the official story is wrong.

It says that the true reason for the towers' fall is withheld from the public.

It suggests that witnesses who insisted they saw American or United flights were planted witnesses.

When the facts about the amount of asbestos in the towers emerge, it becomes obvious that a planned demolition of the towers was likely. *9-11 Research* suggests that “the cost of its removal might have rivaled the value of the buildings themselves.”⁵⁷

With the myth of planes hitting the towers prevailing, a demolition would have been easy to slide by. The official narrative set

in and could not be undone even by someone talking.

I hope we get the truth about what specifically happened to the Towers someday. But even without those details, we can call out the official myth and replace it with facts.

Didn't a plane strike the Pentagon?

Whatever happened, it was NOT United Airlines 77. The plane did not fly that day.

Numerous cameras surrounded the Pentagon that day, but none of them have apparently captured an airplane hitting it!

Petrus Feddema points out in his book, *Disclosed 9/11 Details Obvious Clues*, that thousands of what appeared to be silver plane pieces were found later that day on a lawn at the Pentagon. Just two weeks prior to 9/11, the plane now known as American Airlines 77 was positively photographed as *blue*! There was no

chance for a paint job in those two weeks!⁵⁸

As with the World Trade Center towers, the Pentagon was struck with something other than what the official narrative tells us.

What about the passengers' personal effects found at the crash sites?

The plotters were a group willing and able to create an illusion to direct public outrage against innocent people. To make an illusion work, plotters must convince the audience (the public) that the illusion is real. They cast a shadow over the truth while they construct their lies.

To create the illusion of crashed commercial planes, the plotters, among other things, planted personal effects at the crash sites.⁵⁹

They got the effects in the same place one usually gets another's personal effects - from the people who owned the

effects. This could have happened by theft, coercion, counterfeit or agreement.

What about the pilots and the flight crew?

There is something about the way in which they got their assignments that should tell us something.

Half of the pilots and most of the crew got their assignments shortly before 9/11.⁶⁰ In many cases, they “bumped” other people who had signed up to work the flights

The selection of personnel was done carefully, in such a manner that those who were “bumped” did not have much of a chance to figure out why they were bumped. It also gave no one any time to make any connections about the pilots and crew members suddenly asked to work.

Those bumped likely did not fit into the plot. The “right” pilots and crew, those

who would work the simulations, got into position.

Some of them were probably fictitious. A plot where flights are faked should not require too many pilots and crew members.

What about reports of bodies reported and people jumping out of the towers?

Anyone can report a body. A better question is whether anyone WITNESSED a person dying or if anyone could explain how they identified matter at the scene as part of a specific person.

No one jumped out of the towers that day. Faked photos and video footage showed people jumping from the towers.⁶¹

There should be no need for fakery if people really died. No official sources denounced this fraud, which was used to help sell the “War on Terror.”

If it wasn't Bin Laden, then who was behind this operation?

To answer that, it is important to identify the ingredients to this operation that made it work effectively.

Intelligence was one. The plotters had to know what was scheduled to happen when. They had to know what planes were supposed to take off from what city to what city, for instance. United 93 was flying for the first time on a Tuesday that day. And several of the “passengers” were originally scheduled to fly on a later flight, United 91.⁶²

Certain people have intelligence, or information not known to the public. They need not belong to an agency, like the CIA. But they develop connections, or confidences with other people who give them information.

They don't have a sign on their face and their place of employment will not necessarily reveal them to you. Typically, the organizations for whom

they work give them high security clearances.

Typically, these people become known as people who do not reveal secrets. That is the way anyone obtains information not generally known to the public. It involves protecting the source of the information.

The plotters had to be people who can persuade other people to do something without necessarily telling them what the plan is. Persuaders have authority or the ability to coerce, or both.

This authority may be legal. Consider the FBI agents who showed up at Shanksville and the Pentagon and who began to control the investigation at the scene. They could persuade others to either enter the crime scene or leave it, depending on the level of trust they felt towards those people.

Also, a person who coerces others could be called upon to persuade, perhaps with threats. Whoever ran the DNA “tests”

that supposedly matched remains from the “crash” sites to relatives was likely coerced to “fix” the matches. And those who planted personal effects at the scenes.

These people also had access.

Someone had to convince those who follow flights on screens that American 11 and American 77 really flew and that United 93 and United 175 really flew back east. And transcripts of flight observers and pilots had to be manufactured. This takes access to those screens and transcripts.

At the very least someone at the airlines would have had to provide help. And some people

Communication with the media. The intelligence people probably handled communication with the media. The media gathers intelligence and filters what their corporate bosses will allow them to say.

But if you are looking for names of the masterminds, rest assured that they don't use names. They work in the shadows and they pull the strings of people like the occupants of the White House and Congress. They use coercion and encourage the occupants to use authority.

If foreign terrorists were not out to get us, then what was the purpose of this operation?

The purpose of the myth of 9/11 was to draw the United States into wars in the Middle East fighting for a cause everyone would agree was worthy. The events of 9/11, as reported to the public, served as a match to light the fires of war.

We should ask questions about war as early as we can. Someday the public may take notice that all wars stem from faulty reasoning.

What about Social Security Death Index records of the victims?

These records are not helpful to establish whether a given alleged passenger is dead.

I once checked to see if the names of passengers are the names of people on the Social Security Death Index (SSDI), which boasts an 85 percent accuracy rate.

In *Rumors Fly, Truth Walks: How Lies Become Our History*, I located 59 names from the 9/11 passenger lists on the SSDI of a total of 246 alleged passengers from the four alleged flights: American 11 and 77 and United 93 and 175. This comes out to a little less than 24 percent of the total. What is the significance of this finding?

To answer that question, here are important guidelines to consider in judging the accuracy of the SSDI:

The Social Security Death Index consists of an online

searchable database. It only includes the names of deceased individuals whose deaths were reported to Social Security. This index is a master index file of deaths reported to the Social Security Administration. It has been kept since 1962, when operations were computerized. The index includes about 50 percent of deceased persons from 1962 to 1971 and about 85 percent of the deceased persons from 1972 to 2005. It also includes a few deaths from 1937 to 1961. Current as of September 30, 2012.⁶³

Eighty-five percent! So, who does NOT make the list?

The SSDI does not include death records for everyone who has been issued a Social Security Number (card). Common reasons for

exclusion include the following:

The death was not reported to the Social Security Administration (SSA).

The death occurred before the Death Master File was maintained in a computer database. About 98 percent of the deaths in this database occurred between 1962 and the present.

The person did not participate in the Social Security program. [Author's Note: Non-U.S. citizens who do not work in the United States usually do not have Social Security Numbers.]

Survivor death benefits were (are) being paid to dependents or spouse.

A recent death may not be indexed yet.

*Human error.*⁶⁴

Who receives survivor death benefits?

Certain family members may be eligible to receive monthly benefits, including the following:

—A widow or widower age 60 or older (age 50 or older if disabled);

—A widow or widower at any age who is caring for the deceased's child under age 16 or disabled;

—An unmarried child of the deceased who is: younger than age 18 (or up to age 19 if he or she is a full-time student in an elementary or secondary school) or age 18 or older with a disability that began before age 22;

—A stepchild, grandchild, step grandchild, or adopted child under certain circumstances;

—Parents, age 62 or older, who were dependent on the deceased for at least half of their support; and

—A surviving divorced spouse, under certain circumstances.”⁶⁵

I re-reviewed the names on the United 93 passenger list and their background stories. I then categorized the names as well. Those with relatives who could still receive survivor benefits were listed as having QUALIFYING SURVIVORS.

There may have been “passengers” who had qualifying survivors in September 2001 but do not have them now. This is because their children may have reached the age of 18, their widows and widowers may have passed on, etc. How can the proper interpretation of the SSDI help us to understand the people whose names are on the passenger lists? Here is one example of how to interpret the facts.

One of those “passengers,” Todd Beamer, appears on the list for United 93 and on the SSDI. However, the date of death shown is “June 10, 1997.” Also, his middle initial on the SSDI is “E,” and the Beamer associated with Flight 93 is said

to have had the middle initial “M” for the name Morgan.⁶⁶

What is the significance of these facts?
Probably nothing.

Todd Morgan Beamer allegedly died on September 11, 2001, leaving behind a widow, Lisa, two young sons, aged three and one, and a daughter born after his death. With his widow still (at the time of this writing) eligible to receive death benefits, his Social Security number would still be in use, and, therefore, it should be no surprise he is not on the SSDI.

In summary, I now acknowledge that the SSDI does little good to either prove or disprove the life or death of anyone on the passenger lists.

FAILURE OF CROSS-EXAMINATION

None of the questions on cross-examination should cause any reasonable doubt to the No Passenger hypothesis. To further illustrate the events of the day, here is a timeline:

THE “NO PASSENGERS” TIMELINE

Source: www.911timeline.net unless otherwise noted. All times Eastern

8:00 AM—Forty-four people, including seven crew members, allegedly board United 93, a Boeing 757-200 with registration number N591UA at gate A17 at Newark International Airport.⁶⁷

8:13 AM—What is later said to be the pilots' last radio communication is made from the pilots to ground control: "twenty right American eleven."⁶⁸

8:14 AM—At Boston's Logan Airport, 65 people, including nine crew members, allegedly board United 175.⁶⁹

8:14 AM—United 175 allegedly takes off with Los Angeles as its destination.

8:15 AM—Boston Air Traffic Control begins unsuccessful attempts to contact the pilots of American 11 after the plane fails to respond to an order to climb.⁷⁰

8:21-8:46—Amy (Madeline) Sweeney, one of the Flight 11 attendants, calls Michael Woodward from airline's field services from a phone on the ground.⁷¹

8:21-8:46—Betty Ong, another Flight 11 attendant, calls Vanessa Minter at the airline's reservations with an air phone on the ground.⁷²

8:23 AM—United 175 takes off from Boston Airport (Bureau of Transportation Statistics)

8:24 AM—The following transmission is reportedly received from Flight 11: *We have some planes. Just stay quiet and you'll be okay ... we are returning to the airport....Nobody move. Everything will be okay. If you try to make any moves, you'll endanger yourself and the airplane. Just stay quiet...Nobody move please we are going back to the airport ... don't try to make any stupid moves.*⁷³

8:28 AM—controllers reportedly watch American 11 make a 100-degree turn toward the south.⁷⁴

8:28 AM—United 93 takes off from Newark Airport with San Francisco as its destination (Source: Bureau of Transportation Statistics).⁷⁵

8:41 AM—A United 175 pilot reports that he has overheard a transmission (presumably from by-then-hijacked Flight 11):

ya we figured we'd wait to go to you center ah we heard a suspicious transmission on our departure out of Boston ah with someone ah, ah sound like someone sound like someone keyed the mike and said ah everyone ah stay in your seats.

Shortly thereafter, the last radio communication is made from the pilots and air traffic control: "that's ah cut out ... did you copy that?"⁷⁶

8:42 AM—United 175 veers off its planned course and begins flying south.⁷⁷

8:42 AM—United 93 takes off from Newark Airport with San Francisco as its destination (according to mainstream media sources).⁷⁸

8:43 AM—The FAA notifies NORAD that United 175 has been hijacked.⁷⁹

8:43 AM—United 93 takes off from Newark Airport (MSNBC)⁸⁰

8:46 AM—United 175 stops transmitting its transponder signal.⁸¹

8:52 AM—Lee Hanson alleges he first received phone calls from his son, Peter, said to be a passenger on United 175.⁸²

8:56 AM—The jet's transponder is reportedly shut off.⁸³ The pilots' last transmission is "ah direct FALMOUTH American seventy-seven thanks." No radio communications from the flight indicate distress.⁸⁴

9:03 AM—United 175 allegedly strikes World Trade Center south tower, killing all aboard.⁸⁵

9:12 AM—Flight 77 attendant Renee May calls her mother from the ground.⁸⁶

9:12-9:26 AM—Barbara Olson or someone impersonating her attempts calls from the ground to Ted Olson during this period of time, alleging that Barbara Olson is on American 77, a hijacked plane.⁸⁷

9:16 AM—The FAA informs North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) that United 93 may have been hijacked.

9:22 AM—United Airlines sends advisory to dispatchers that United 175 was involved in an “accident” in New York (History Commons)

9:23 AM—ACARS message receipt shows United 175 still flying near Pittsburgh, PA (Pilots for 9/11 Truth)

9:27 AM—Several communications with air traffic controllers later opine that Flight 93 is hijacked at around this time.⁸⁸

9:30 AM—Cleveland air controllers mistakenly conclude that Delta 1989 has been hijacked (History Commons)

9:30 AM—The transponder signal of United 93 ceases. At about this time, the plane apparently reverses direction and begins flying toward the capital.⁸⁹

9:30 AM—Deena Burnett reports later that she received a call from husband,

Thomas Burnett, Jr., alleged passenger on United 93.⁹⁰

9:33 AM—FAA believes United 93 is a hijacked aircraft (History Commons)

9:36 AM—Sandra Bradshaw, flight attendant, allegedly calls United Airlines from United 93.⁹¹

9:36—Alice Hoagland later reports call at this time from son, Mark Bingham, alleged passenger on United 93.⁹²

9:37 AM—Jeremy Glick later said to make call from United 93 at this time.⁹³

9:37 AM—Thomas Burnett, Jr. later alleged to call residence from United 93 at this time.⁹⁴

9:39-9:43—Lauren Grandcolas later reported to have made several calls during this time period from United 93.⁹⁵

9:40 AM—Secretary of Transportation Mineta orders all planes to land.

9:41 AM—Mark Bingham later alleged by his mother to have called a second time from United 93.

9:42 AM—Joseph DeLuca later reported to have made call from United 93.

9:43 AM—Joseph DeLuca later alleged second call from United 93.

9:43 AM—Todd Beamer reportedly calls GTE operator from United 93.

9:44 AM—Thomas Burnett, Jr. allegedly calls residence third time from United 93.

9:46 AM—Linda Gronlund allegedly calls from United 93.

9:47 AM—Cee Cee Lyles, flight attendant, calls her residence from the ground, claiming to be on hijacked United 93.

9:49 AM—Marion Britton allegedly makes phone call from United 93.

9:49 AM—Sandra Bradshaw, flight attendant, allegedly calls residence from United 93.

9:52 AM—Sandra Bradshaw, flight attendant, allegedly calls residence again from United 93.⁹⁶

9:53 AM—Honor Elizabeth Wainio allegedly calls her parents from United 93.⁹⁷

9:58 AM—Cee Cee Lyles, flight attendant, allegedly again calls her residence from United 93.⁹⁸

9:58 AM—Edward Felt allegedly makes phone call from United 93.⁹⁹

10:10 AM—ACARS message receipt shows United 93 still flying near Champaign, IL (Pilots for 9/11 Truth)

10:10 AM—The FAA orders all planes to land at nearest airports

10:15 AM—United acknowledges to employees that aircraft has landed near Jonestown, PA and “believed that this was Flight 93” (History Commons)

10:17 AM—United Airlines notifies its employees of “crash” of Flight 93 (History Commons)

10:45 AM—Mystery plane arrives in Cleveland Airport. (Local Cleveland Media)

11:00 AM—Cleveland Mayor White reports that a Boeing 767 made an emergency landing in Cleveland due to bomb threats. (No bomb was ever found.) He said the plane was going from Boston to Los Angeles.

11:26 AM—United Airlines publicly reports that Flight 93, en route from Newark, New Jersey, to San Francisco, has crashed in Pennsylvania, southeast of Pittsburgh.

11:43 AM—WCPO radio of Cincinnati posts an AP article that quotes Mayor White as identifying the aircraft as a Boeing 767 out of Boston. The article says that United had identified the plane as United 93. The AP quotes United as saying it was “deeply concerned” about United 175.¹⁰⁰

11:53 AM—United Airlines confirms that Flight 175, from Boston to Los Angeles, has crashed with 56 passengers and nine crewmembers aboard.

THE NO PASSENGER THEORY

Which of the following hypotheses about passengers best explains the facts?

The official hypothesis of passengers boarding all four planes, which then get hijacked and crashed, fails for several reasons. There is no credible proof of anyone boarding any of the four airplanes nor of any of the planes crashing.

The alternative hypothesis that passengers were swapped to other planes lacks evidentiary support. What other planes? Where were they flown?

The alternative hypothesis of no passengers agrees with the fact of American 11 and 77 not taking off. And it does not contradict the takeoffs of United 175 and 93 and their respective flights to the Midwest.

The no passengers hypothesis thus best explains the facts.

Furthermore, the ability of this hypothesis to withstand the strongest contradictory evidence offered should help it to gain

acceptance by those who research the events of 9/11. It is now properly known as the “no passenger theory.”

THE OFFICIAL THEORY IS A LIE!

Why do people accept lies?

It has to do with needs. If one determines that they need something, they tend to hold on to it more tightly than something they could do without. This attitude is simple human nature.

According to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, a person's first set of needs are the most basic: we all need to breathe, drink water, eat food, etc. If we are dependent upon someone else to provide these necessities, we would not likely question that person or antagonize them. We could be saying goodbye to our lives!

Once a person achieves this first set of needs, this theory tells us, they move to the next set, which is about the security of one's person, employment, health, etc. If one does not feel secure about themselves and about their position in society, they will not be able to move up the "ladder" of the hierarchy and make friends or feel self-confidence.

“Rocking the boat” and questioning those who provide security, such as agents of our government, jeopardizes one’s ability to become a confident and social person. It may not be the same as being deprived of water, but one who openly doubts those charged with providing security risks social suicide!

How does one tell a lie convincingly?

They often start by tapping into our emotions by telling us about people and things with which we typically side with like victims.

A little digression to see how this works:

We are repeatedly told by our media that the events of 9/11 constituted the worst terrorist attack on United States soil in its history. Part of the story goes something like this:

“At the orders of Osama bin Laden, nineteen hijackers boarded four different planes, American 11, American 77, United 93 and United 175, killed pilots and passengers and took control of those

planes. They then used the planes as weapons to knock down the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York, the Pentagon in Virginia and very nearly the Capitol Building in Washington, D.C.

In one flight, United 93, a brave passenger named Todd Beamer teamed with other passengers to force the plane to crash in a remote area away from the public. In another flight, American 77, Barbara Olson, wife of the Solicitor General of the United States, called her husband to ask for help on what to do about a hijacking on her flight.”

The events of 9/11 played to the public on television screens with searing images of towers falling and people who made scripted statements to media figures like Larry King. From this point of view, the plot, the actors and the message are easy to discern.

Every good story needs a villain to focus the plot around.

The plotters needed a villain the public would react negatively to. Like someone who had already been accused of masterminding terrorist plots previously.

They really needed someone whose culpability in this plot would be plausible and who would be unable to deny it.

Enter Osama bin Laden. Alleged mastermind of United States embassy bombings in Africa in August 1998.

By 2000, bin Laden suffered from kidney disease¹⁰¹ and needed dialysis.¹⁰²

He had connections to the CIA. How else could the plotters have anticipated his whereabouts and plan to frame him as the villain?¹⁰³

With bin Laden's condition worsening right around the time of the big event, he could not effectively deny his role. Then he died in December 2001¹⁰⁴, something most of the public never learned.

The plotters carry on as though bin Laden is still a threat. The public

responds favorably to “getting” bin Laden.

In the end, his name serves to stir up enough reason to go to war against anyone our nation needs to fight.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT TO 9/11

Public debate about issues like guns (especially in light of recent reported shootings in the national news) or budget (like the perpetual debate of how much money to devote to the military) starts off with a false belief. In short, the debate gets it wrong IN THE FIRST PLACE.

Be a part of a public that reasonably questions what we hear. Disregard those who state beliefs but do not back them up. This is how we collectively will get these questions answered.

How do we, the informed portion of the public, counter the power of the story tellers – especially the government and the media - and get the debate RIGHT IN THE FIRST PLACE?

To find our voice, we need to create a coherent message. To do that, we must first need to understand how the story tellers function. One function is to cause events to happen. Then these events become results when someone translates it for the public, who do not see the events first-hand.

Allow me to provide a context with which to understand 9/11 by examining the historical events surrounding it:

Dallas 1963. An assassination with multiple shooters in Dealey Plaza got translated by our media into the action of a “lone nut.” The government made sure no real investigation would take place and covered up the truth with a report written by a commission of (coerced) well-respected leaders.

The media lauded the report even though few bothered to read it. And the media attacked anyone who seriously challenged the report.

Here’s a series of questions that destroys the official theory:

If Oswald participated, why didn’t he admit it? With so many flights of stairs to go down from where he allegedly fired shots to the place he was seen a little over a minute later, he couldn’t possibly count on luck in getting out easily. He would have known ahead of time the trouble of escaping and the strong

possibility of getting caught. Why not take an easier shot from the plaza and give himself up?

If he had no intentions of confessing his crime, why did he write his post office box down on a mail order? The police had no trouble connecting Oswald to the “murder rifle” as soon as they traced the rifle via its serial number. Oswald likely knew he could have gone to any gun shop in Dallas and bought a rifle with no questions asked of him.

If Oswald had a rifle, why is there no evidence that he ever practiced with it? Even Marina Oswald, so useful to the Commission to provide incriminating evidence on her late husband, could not provide any account of this activity.

If Oswald acted, how could he count on being able to take the rifle up from the first floor where he entered that Friday all the way to the sixth floor without anyone noticing or asking questions? If he hid the rifle before the shooting on the sixth floor, he could not have known whether other

people would discover it or not (it certainly did not take the police long to find the rifle after the shooting). Of course, if someone provided the rifle for him, then he did not act alone.

If Oswald handled the cardboard boxes that contained his palm and fingerprints as a way of making the “sniper’s nest,” why didn’t he wear gloves? Leaving his prints made him an easy suspect, which he surely wanted to avoid if he did not want to get caught.

If Oswald wanted to escape, why did he use public transportation? How could he count on the police not checking his bus for him? In fact, the Commission tells us that he narrowly missed this happening.

Why did Oswald, according to the Commission, walk several blocks after leaving the taxi to get to the boardinghouse and then, upon getting there, why did he suddenly rush? As with so much of what the Commission says, this inconsistency does not represent an account of a true incident, but rather a

theory crafted out of convenience. The account of the walks likely represents a time period in which the Commission cannot account for his whereabouts. The rush Oswald supposedly went into represents an attempt by the Commission to get him ready for an encounter with Officer Tippit.

Why did Officer Tippit stop Oswald? The bulletins that the police put out regarding someone allegedly connected to Kennedy's murder were so vague that officers could have stopped literally hundreds of young men in Dallas. How could Tippit have gathered enough suspicion about Oswald to stop him?

Why did Oswald hide in the movie theater if he really shot Kennedy and Tippit? He could have caught a bus out of Texas if he had wanted to escape. And again, if there was no intent to escape, why did he not just surrender?

If Oswald killed Kennedy and Tippit and he wanted to protect himself with a revolver, why would he choose one that

did not work? The revolver that the police claimed to have confiscated from him at the theater was defective and it is highly improbable it could have been used against Tippit.

If Oswald shot Kennedy, why did he express surprise at the police station that Governor Connolly had also been hit? Was he that good an actor? No one who witnessed his reaction to the news has claimed that he faked it.

If Oswald was motivated by Marxism, why didn't he express his opinions when he had microphones and a huge television audience in front of him? Instead, he kept insisting that he did not shoot anyone.

These questions illustrate the difficulty in believing the official theory that Oswald acted alone. Very few of his actions follow the logic a lone assassin would employ to plan and carry out the crime, including either making an escape or surrendering.

These allegations of mixed intentions by the Commission cannot be readily explained by the usual theories. For instance, there is no evidence that Oswald suffered from insanity or delusional thinking. Furthermore, he had an IQ of 118, above-average intelligence.

A better explanation for these allegations is that they represent a cover story given by those who planned the crime to people who would disseminate it to the public. The mainstream media, led by the *New York Times*, took the bait and called Oswald the “President’s assassin” though no trial ever proved that.

DID SOMEONE IMPERSONATE OSWALD?

Though Commission supporters scoff at the suggestion of an impersonator, the *Report* itself hints at the possibility of a second person pretending to be Oswald. It recounts a number of statements made by people who claimed to have encountered Oswald, some of them at places and times where the Commission

had already concluded the real Oswald was not present. Repeatedly, the Commission summarizes each instance by stating that its investigation showed that the person in question was not Oswald.¹⁰⁵ What they apparently failed to investigate was whether the person was someone pretending to be him.

And, in a phone conversation with President Lyndon Johnson, FBI director J. Edgar Hoover discussed Oswald's supposed visit to the Soviet Union Embassy in Mexico City about two months before the assassination. Hoover admits that "it appears that there is a second person who was at the Soviet Embassy down there."¹⁰⁶

As to why anyone plotting the assassination would use an imposter and perhaps blow the cover of the conspiracy, the Tippit crime scene provides a reason why. Eyewitnesses may well have mistaken a look-alike for Oswald.

Furthermore, the phone conversation between Hoover and Johnson demonstrated that some people may concede privately what they will not say publicly. By keeping this matter to themselves (this phone call was not revealed until many years later), the two leaders shut off a possible leak of a conspiracy.

According to the Commission, Oswald ran from the Tippit crime scene towards the Texas Theater. He left his jacket at a parking lot. The police found it two hours later and though Marina Oswald identified it as Oswald's,¹⁰⁷ others said the jacket was too dark.¹⁰⁸ The *New York Times*, which stated that Oswald committed the crimes, dismissed the value of the jacket as evidence.¹⁰⁹

Furthermore, the value of such evidence becomes less and less certain if another person is involved. Even if it was Oswald's, a double could have planted it.

Then, the Commission places Oswald at the Texas Theater between 1:35 to 1:40

PM. A shoe store manager, Johnny Brewer, saw a man in a hurry rush by and go into the theater without paying for his ticket. He recommended to the theater clerk, Julia Postal, that she call the police. At least fifteen police officers responded and came to the scene.¹¹⁰

The problem with this Commission account is that other witnesses, including concession attendant Butch Burroughs and moviegoer Jack Davis, said they saw Oswald in the theater by **1:00 PM**, which was the start time for the movie playing.¹¹¹ If true, this fact would preclude Oswald's involvement with the 1:07-1:16 PM Tippit murder. It also would rule out an Oswald trip to the boardinghouse estimated by Roberts at 1:04 PM.

Bernard Haire, a hobby store manager two doors away, heard the police sirens and went to the alley behind the theater. He saw somebody being dragged to a police car and driven away. Haire was shocked when he soon learned that the real Oswald was taken out front.¹¹²

Could the other man have been an imposter? If he was, the possible ploy of sending in a decoy after Oswald to attract police attention and get the arrest of Oswald for doing nothing wrong worked brilliantly. Even better was that the Commission used Brewer as a witness but not any of the others.

In any case, the public believed the “lone nut” narrative provided by the Warren Commission and the nation received a new Commander in Chief, Lyndon Johnson.

And the military, under Johnson, increased the intensity of war in Viet Nam, colluding with the government to lie about the incident in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Officially, the communist North Vietnamese fired first on United States soldiers, giving President Johnson no other choice but to retaliate.

The reality is that the United States provoked the attack, which led to widening of Viet Nam War.

In 1964, President Lyndon Johnson sent two destroyers from the Navy, the *USS Maddox* and the *USS Turner Joy*, to the Gulf of Tonkin close to Viet Nam. Although some fighting had taken place on the mainland of Viet Nam between the United States and its allies in South Viet Nam and the North Vietnamese, up to this point, there had been no clashes at sea.

On the nights of August 2nd and 4th of 1964, the North Vietnamese fired upon the two destroyers, according to the Pentagon. President Johnson soon made a televised speech after the second incident in which he called for retaliatory action after “renewed” attacks.

Within weeks, Congress passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to give the president the authority “to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.”¹¹³

Since the United States did not officially declare war on North Viet Nam, this

resolution amounted to such a declaration and a justification for our escalation of troops in that area of the world. For many years, some historians questioned this official theory of these attacks but lacked solid evidence of official wrongdoing.

However, in recent years, a National Security Archive briefing confirmed that the second attacks never occurred and that intelligence had been fixed by the National Security Agency to support the claim.¹¹⁴

The late James Stockdale, a former vice-presidential candidate and a Navy pilot squadron commander at the Gulf of Tonkin on August 4th, said, “Our destroyers were just shooting at phantom targets” that night.¹¹⁵

As for the first attack, on August 2nd, the original story given by Johnson that the *Maddox* was on a “routine patrol” has been disproved by scholars such as Daniel Hallin, who said the *Maddox* was

working “in sync with coordinated attacks on North Viet Nam” on the 2nd.¹¹⁶

If the North Vietnamese did not instigate the first attacks, it seems possible that the Johnson Administration pursued a policy of pre-emptive attacks, an idea that carried over into the George W. Bush Administration. Given these recent revelations, it appears likely that the National Security Agency willingly gave false information to President Johnson about the second attacks.

This misinformation, Johnson’s refusal to give full disclosure about the reason for the Maddox’s presence in the Gulf of Tonkin, and the media’s willingness to accept “official” Pentagon and presidential statements as fact without checking them, led us into a disastrous war in which over 58,000 U.S. soldiers and over two million Vietnamese lost their lives.

The lie about the Gulf of Tonkin incident was not seriously challenged until many years after the war had ended.¹¹⁷

When leaders opposing the war got to be too popular and thus became a threat to the institutions, they got the same treatment. And the same cover-up. And the war went on and on.

When the Viet Nam War ended in the mid-1970s, the military needed new places to fight and new excuses to get weapons from the government via taxpayers and defense contractors. The public wasn't ready for an overt war, so the Central Intelligence Agency and President Carter secretly provoked the Soviet Union to invade Afghanistan in 1979.¹¹⁸

But the media did not report that. Instead, President Carter feigned outrage over the Soviet invasion¹¹⁹ and led an international boycott of the 1980 Olympics held in Moscow. The media bounced the anger against the familiar foe.

The media also missed the increases in defense spending that began under Carter and continued under the next

president, Ronald Reagan.¹²⁰ It did not tell of the deal struck between the Reagan campaign and the religious leaders who ruled Iran to delay the release of United States hostages Iran had taken in November 1979.¹²¹

President Carter faced a difficult primary challenge from Massachusetts Senator Edward “Ted” Kennedy in 1980. While Carter emerged with enough delegates to claim his party’s nomination for a second term, the attacks by the Kennedy campaign, combined with a popularity steadily dropping from the Iranian takeover of the United States embassy in Tehran and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, made Carter vulnerable, allowing Ronald Reagan to score an easy victory in November.

This is the popular memory of the election. And it rings true, for the most part. But Elizabeth Drew, who covered presidential elections, recently brought up something often forgotten:

“People think of the 1980 election as this huge landslide for Reagan, which in terms of the numbers, it was. But I saw the numbers on the Friday before the election -- and both sides will tell you this -- it was a tie.”¹²²

During a debate just one week prior to the election, Carter gave detailed answers to the panelists’ questions, while Reagan came up with the sound bite of the evening. When Carter reminded the audience of Reagan’s prior opposition to Medicare, Reagan opened his rebuttal by saying, “There you go again.”¹²³

Interestingly, the phrase does not appear in the transcripts available online.¹²⁴

At another point in the debate, Reagan called for an investigation of the Carter Administration’s handling of the hostage crisis in Iran:

“What I do think should be done, once they are safely here with their families, and that tragedy is over - we've endured this humiliation for just lacking one week of a year now - then, I think, it is time for

us to have a complete investigation as to the diplomatic efforts that were made in the beginning, why they have been there so long, and when they came home, what did we have to do in order to bring that about - what arrangements were made?"¹²⁵

Though Republican pollster Richard Wirthlin thought the debate clinched the election for Reagan, Carter pollster Patrick Caddell said, "It was all related to the hostages and events overseas."¹²⁶ The Iranian parliament had finally given their conditions for the hostages' release on November 2, just two days before the election.¹²⁷

If most polls showed Reagan leading Carter from May (shortly after a failed attempt by Carter to rescue the hostages in Iran), was there anything Carter could have done?

The late William Safire had an answer straight from the mouth of Ronald Reagan:

On Oct. 1, an Associated Press reporter asked candidate Reagan if he expected President Jimmy Carter to take some action to try to influence the election, and Reagan replied, "I'm just bracing myself for an October surprise."¹²⁸

The phrase, by its context, refers to an incumbent official acting to give themselves an advantage right before an election. But incumbents have the right to use their authority under the law.

I wonder if Reagan, and others associated with this campaign, simply deviated from their usual talk of patriotism and spoke candidly. A real patriot would want the hostages brought home at once, regardless of who took the credit for it. But, of course, candidates typically want more than anything to win.

Reports have since surfaced that the Reagan CAMPAIGN, as private citizens, intervened to talk Iran into keeping the hostages until after the election in exchange for the promise of weapons (a big deal, as Iran was fighting Iraq in what

would be an eight-year war). One source for these reports has been the president of Iran at the time, Abolhasan Bani-Sadr:

“It is now very clear that there were two separate agreements, one the official agreement with Carter in Algeria, the other, a secret agreement with another party, which, it is now apparent, was Reagan. They made a deal with Reagan that the hostages should not be released until after Reagan became president. Then in return, Reagan would give them arms. We have published documents which show that US arms were shipped, via Israel, in March, about 2 months after Reagan became president.”¹²⁹

Others, including Barbara Honegger, who worked for the Reagan-Bush campaign and the Reagan Administration, and Gary Sick, who worked in the Ford, Carter and Reagan Administrations, have alleged the Reagan campaign’s interference with the release of the hostages.

A Congressional taskforce met for a few months and rejected the “October Surprise” theory, though the chairperson, Lee Hamilton, thought the conclusion would have been different had the committee been given suppressed information verifying that Reagan campaign director William Casey had made a trip to Madrid to make a deal with the Iranians.¹³⁰

Reagan appointed Casey to be his CIA director.

A few months after one of Reagan’s advisors started to spill the beans about the deal¹³¹, another “lone nut” assassin shot at Reagan. The public may never learn if there was any connection between the two events, but other facts, such as the fact that the official attempted assassin had also stalked President Carter and had connections to the Vice President’s family¹³², came out sometime later. In any event, the nation almost got a former CIA director, George Bush, as president eight years ahead of schedule.

During the Reagan-Bush years, the military scored easy “victories” by invading Grenada and Panama and bombing Libya using the cover stories of “communism,” “drug trafficking” and “terrorism” to justify these actions. The media failed to look into these cover stories very closely and by the time the public figured that out, most people had expressed confidence in the military.

President Bush responded to an invasion of Kuwait in 1990 by Iraq by declaring “This will not stand.”¹³³ He called the Iraqi dictator, Saddam Hussein, another “Hitler.” The media failed to inform the public that the United States, under Reagan and Bush, had SUPPORTED Hussein¹³⁴ and that Kuwait had agitated Iraq by “slant drilling” for oil in Iraqi reserves.¹³⁵

But the public, for the most part, bought the government line that our nation needed to check aggression. The attention went to the economy, which was failing. Bush, after twelve years of

his party's control of the White House, had no one else to blame.

The economy improved under the new President, Bill Clinton. Before his presidency became satirized by impeachment proceedings for statements he made under oath about an affair, two events captured public attention. One was the bombing in Oklahoma City, blamed on yet another "lone nut," Timothy McVeigh. The other was the shootings at Columbine High School. Fear of terrorism and of gun violence increased.

By 2000, there was too much peace and prosperity for the military. And a big hoax to scare the public into supporting war was set to go off in September 2001. A new president was needed to do nothing and look the other way to make the hoax work.

That was George W. Bush. Never mind he had avoided service in Viet Nam¹³⁶ and got suspended from the Air National Guard.¹³⁷ The military embraced him and

many retired members of the military supported his candidacy. So did the media, which ignored his many gaffes and substandard English. The media also picked up many criticisms of opponent Al Gore, accusing him of exaggeration by exaggerating grossly themselves.

The Presidential Election of 2000 is best known for the lengthy process of recounts and court decisions which eventually gave the White House to George W. Bush. But in reviewing the two candidates, one should reasonably wonder why the election was so close. The real reason why should concern us.

Al Gore, who had served two terms as the Vice President of the United States, ran as the Democratic nominee. The issue voters tend to value most, the economy, favored Gore. So did the relative peace. Gore had tons of experience in public policy – not only through his time as the Vice President, but eight years in each of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The Republicans nominated Governor George W. Bush of Texas. He had little public policy experience, just his six years as the governor. But even then, the Texas Legislature only met on odd numbered years and the state Constitution gave much power to the Lieutenant Governor. Before his time in elected office, Bush had run a number of failed businesses.

As the impeachment of President Clinton had taken place just a year before, Bush frequently made mention of how he would bring back “honor and dignity” to the White House. The Clinton scandal for his lie under oath about an affair he had with an intern harmed Gore, but not to a great extent.

Gore should have won in a landslide. But he had to claw in the last few days to catch up to Bush, thanks mostly to Bush’s belated confession that he had been guilty of driving under the influence a number of years before.

WHY WAS THIS ELECTION SO CLOSE?

Some observers point out that Gore ran a lackluster campaign. A *Slate* magazine article¹³⁸ which appeared shortly after Election Day elaborated and called Gore out for his stiff personality, his distancing from Clinton and his “angry” populist tone.

But how much of the defeat can be attributed to these problems? So, Gore did not always appear to be at ease. He could also be funny. He came across as a much deeper person intellectually than Bush, which I would hope most voters would prefer.

It would have been great for Gore to appear frequently with Clinton, probably the best campaigner of his generation. But if Gore, as reports¹³⁹ from insiders have indicated, was indeed furious at Clinton for his behavior, he should be given credit for his sincerity.

He stood by Clinton when it was difficult and shunned him when it would have

helped. This speaks well of his convictions and shows he was not a “fair weather” friend.

His focus on attacking corporations may have turned some people off. The *Slate* article cites Michael Kinsley’s comment on Gore’s tone, that the voters “have never had it so good, and I’m mad as hell about it.”

What these three complaints of the Gore campaign suggest is a candidate who did things the hard way. Talking about peace and prosperity all the time would have been much easier. Swallowing his pride and getting Clinton out campaigning for him more frequently could not have been so hard to take, knowing it would have made the difference,

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED?

The fact is, there is no way that Gore could win. Not even losing the popular vote stopped Bush from taking office.

On Election Day, thousands of voters were turned away at the polls because their names had not been added to the voter rolls by Kathleen Harris, Florida's Secretary of State. She also happened to be a co-chair of Bush's campaign.¹⁴⁰ Other voters were turned away because they were wrongly labeled as felons. These kinds of problems happened quite a bit in Democratic-leaning districts.

George Bush's cousin convinced Fox News to call the election prematurely for him and the rest of the media fell in line, guaranteeing his "win" in public opinion.¹⁴¹ Members of the military attacked Gore for saying that ballots from people overseas that came in late should not be counted.¹⁴² Gore's recounts were stopped in the courts, ultimately by a Supreme Court consisting of five Republicans. The vote went 5-4 for Bush.

The real story of the 2000 Election makes sense if we start with an event that took place just eight months after Bush took the presidential oath of office. Popularly

known as “9/11,” a group of people who control popular opinion staged a hoax¹⁴³ and convinced a majority of the public that a group of terrorists had attacked the United States by hijacking airplanes and crashing them into buildings, including the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

The media repeated that “planes hit the towers” and followed the lead of government experts in blaming Al-Qaeda for a terrorist attack planned out years before by insiders. The refrain of “3,000 deaths” convinced the public that the solution for this hoax was to fight two wars for the next decade plus.

The hoax plotters could not afford a president who might have noticed the deception played and told the public. They needed someone who would take orders, blame the patsies he was told to blame and otherwise not cause any trouble to the plan to make war. They found their man in George W. Bush.

Gore's behavior of doing things the hard way makes sense from this point of view as well. The mere fact that Bush led him in the polls¹⁴⁴ at all was probably a sign to Gore that he was not going to get the job.

Simply put, as I pointed out in a recent article¹⁴⁵ about the 1980 Presidential Election, the people whom we elect are not running this country. We may not know their names, but we know they want war and will do anything to get it.

With the military, the media and the churches (embracing his pro-life and other political positions) supporting Bush, not even losing the vote could prevent his installment into the White House. The institutions used a number of tactics on his behalf.

THE USA POST-9/11

In recent years, a war of sorts has been brought home to us. We keep hearing in the media about incidents of gun-related violence. Because of the media coverage of Sandy Hook and other

events, the public perceives these shootings as commonplace. Some politicians, including President Barack Obama, called for tougher gun control, while others call for less or even none.

Facts get lost in the shuffle. The organization FactCheck.org called out Representative Donna Edwards for overstating the number of school-related incidents, Rep. Louie Gohmert for misleading statements about gun-concealment laws and Dan Gross, head of the Brady Campaign, for overlooking the fact that gun-related murders have gone down.¹⁴⁶

The debate over guns gets played over and over in the media and few, except for organizations like FactCheck, bother to challenge all sides. Why is that?

Someone is winning the real “debate” here. “Almost as many guns – 26.1 million – were produced during Democrat Barack Obama’s first term as president as during the entire eight-year presidency of his Republican

predecessor, George W. Bush, the ATF data show,” says Bloomberg.com.¹⁴⁷

Townhall.com states that “The FBI has released new statistics on NICS background checks showing 2013 gun sales hit a new record.”¹⁴⁸ After noting that Obama has used executive orders to attempt to implement gun control, Townhall goes on to note that “President Obama is indeed the best gun salesman in U.S. history.”

Obama, a two-term president, was a successful politician. Was he a puppet for the interests of power, wealth and war, like the gun sellers? Hoaxes often ask us to ignore facts and respond instead to perception, like the 9/11 hoax’s use of “phone calls” from relatives in passenger planes.

And who is Donald Trump? The rhetoric is different. Here we have a president without any semblance of manners or tact. The policies are different: the focus of this Administration is tax cuts and military might.

But the result hasn't changed. We are still at war overseas. And the public still fears victimization at home, school and work.

The same people – the “war party” of defense contractors, private armies, gun dealers and anyone else in the business of inspiring fear, rake in the profits.

CONCLUSION

We need to take our history and our current events seriously. No one else is going to do it for us. Not the government, not the media, not the smug people always willing to interject any conversation about either topic with the phrase, “Conspiracy theorists!”

I have said what I believe about what causes big events to happen but I am willing to adjust my worldview. Here are some ideas I ponder as this book goes to press:

I cannot help but wonder why President Carter failed to protest the Reagan campaign’s interruption of his foreign policy, which is tantamount to treason? Did he “stand down” and allow Reagan to win? Did Al Gore do the same?

If that is true, then who are what are we really electing, anyway? Elections perhaps are just staged events.

I have also dug deep about the John Kennedy assassination and am discovering more about them that I had not previously considered. Like maybe

they were staged events, as well. By that, I mean that I see the possibility that John (and maybe Robert) Kennedy may have faked his death.

Is that really unthinkable, given what we know about events like 9/11?

To better demonstrate the difficulty of proving even what we think we know, I recommend the works of Miles W. Mathis¹⁴⁹ and the Clues Forum.¹⁵⁰

If John Kennedy faked his death, did he go underground somewhere, as Mathis suggests? We may have our real government completely away from the public.

We can stop saying that “the government would not do that” or that “someone would have talked.” We can stop our luxury of sacred cows like the Kennedys or Reagan.

We can catch the people who perpetrate fraudulent news stories. Or if we cannot catch them, perhaps we can catch the

enablers who repeat stories they know to be false.

How do we do that?

We can cross-examine. We can look for theories that differ from the government and the media tell us. We can stop assuming that the big media gives us all the news “fit to print.”

But most of all, can improve our worldview any time we wish to by simply listening.

Planes without passengers. We all need to unload the baggage of lies we choose to believe before we can board the flight to a better future.

APPENDIX

“American 11”

Airline On-Time Statistics

Summary Statistics Detailed Statistics
Special Reports

Detailed Statistics > Departure Statistics

Departure Statistic(s): Actual Departure
Time

Airport(s): BOS

Airline(s): AA

Month(s): September

Day(s): 11

Year(s): 2001

Airport: Boston, MA - Logan
International (BOS)

Carrier Code	Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Flight Number	Destination Airport	Actual Departure Time
AA	09/11/2001	0145	UNKNOW SJC	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0153	N232AA ORD	8:29
AA	09/11/2001	0163	UNKNOW LAX	0:00

AA	09/11/2001	0181	UNKNOW LAX	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0189	N3BMAA SEA	8:43
AA	09/11/2001	0193	UNKNOW SFO	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0195	UNKNOW SFO	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0197	UNKNOW SFO	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0223	UNKNOW LAX	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0225	UNKNOW SAN	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0259	UNKNOW SJC	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0269	N636AA SJC	7:57
AA	09/11/2001	0277	UNKNOW SAN	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0363	UNKNOW AUS	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0401	UNKNOW SJU	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0449	UNKNOW MIA	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0461	N255AA DFW	6:39
AA	09/11/2001	0489	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0583	UNKNOW DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0645	N3BLAA JFK	6:01
AA	09/11/2001	1011	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1019	N078AA SJU	7:00
AA	09/11/2001	1025	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1079	UNKNOW DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1101	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1115	UNKNOW MIA	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1117	UNKNOW DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1121	UNKNOW DFW	0:00

AA	09/11/2001	1135	N2CFAA	ORD	6:51
AA	09/11/2001	1141	UNKNOW	ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1285	UNKNOW	DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1353	UNKNOW	ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1367	UNKNOW	MIA	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1547	N321AA	MCO	7:26
AA	09/11/2001	1555	N3BBAA	ORD	5:54
AA	09/11/2001	1629	UNKNOW	ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1633	UNKNOW	ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1663	N521AA	DFW	7:05
AA	09/11/2001	1711	N061AA	MIA	6:04
AA	09/11/2001	1757	N3CLAA	ORD	7:37
AA	09/11/2001	1797	UNKNOW	DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1811	N2CBAA	DCA	6:37
AA	09/11/2001	1813	UNKNOW	DCA	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1821	UNKNOW	ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1837	UNKNOW	DCA	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1849	UNKNOW	ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1857	N630AA	DFW	8:14
AA	09/11/2001	1859	UNKNOW	DCA	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1861	UNKNOW	DCA	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1887	UNKNOW	DCA	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1901	UNKNOW	MIA	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1971	N5EPAA	SJU	8:09
AA	09/11/2001	1983	N3BRAA	FLL	6:32

AA	09/11/2001	2027	UNKNOW DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	2055	UNKNOW DFW	0:00

“American 77”

Airline On-Time Statistics

Summary Statistics Detailed Statistics
Special Reports

Detailed Statistics > Departure Statistics

Departure Statistic(s): Actual Departure
Time

Airport(s): IAD

Airline(s): AA

Month(s): September

Day(s): 11

Year(s): 2001

Airport: Washington, DC - Washington
Dulles International (IAD)

Carrier Code Date (MM/DD/YYYY)

Flight Number Tail Number

Destination Airport Actual

Departure Time

AA	09/11/2001	0075	UNKNOW LAX	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0135	UNKNOW LAX	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0143	UNKNOW LAX	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0371	UNKNOW DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0397	UNKNOW DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0510	UNKNOW DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0573	UNKNOW DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	0599	N871AA DFW	7:49
AA	09/11/2001	0771	N3BFAA SJU	6:57
AA	09/11/2001	0975	N3CAAA MIA	7:34
AA	09/11/2001	1217	N2ANAA ORD	6:26
AA	09/11/2001	1223	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1229	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1247	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1309	UNKNOW DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1319	UNKNOW DFW	0:00
AA	09/11/2001	1361	N493AA DFW	6:17
AA	09/11/2001	1787	UNKNOW ORD	0:00

“United 93”

Airline On-Time Statistics

Summary Statistics Detailed Statistics
Special Reports

Detailed Statistics > Departure Statistics

Departure Statistic(s): Actual Departure
Time

Airport(s): EWR

Airline(s): UA

Month(s): September

Day(s): 11

Year(s): 2001

Airport: Newark, NJ - Newark
International (EWR)

Carrier Code Date (MM/DD/YYYY)

Flight Number Tail Number

Destination Airport Actual

Departure Time

UA	09/11/2001	0031	UNKNOW DEN	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0075	UNKNOW SFO	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0077	UNKNOW SFO	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0079	UNKNOW SFO	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0081	N520UA SFO	6:56
UA	09/11/2001	0083	N402UA LAX	6:54
UA	09/11/2001	0085	UNKNOW LAX	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0087	UNKNOW LAX	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0089	UNKNOW LAX	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0091	UNKNOW SFO	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0093	N591UA SFO	8:01
UA	09/11/2001	0419	UNKNOW DEN	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0425	UNKNOW DEN	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0521	N523UA DEN	6:40
UA	09/11/2001	0545	UNKNOW DEN	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0635	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0637	N815UA ORD	5:57
UA	09/11/2001	0639	N450UA ORD	7:12
UA	09/11/2001	0641	N952UA ORD	8:10
UA	09/11/2001	0643	N7297U ORD	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0645	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0647	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0649	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0651	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0653	UNKNOW ORD	0:00

UA	09/11/2001	0657	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0659	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0661	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0663	UNKNOW ORD	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	0665	N942UA ORD	6:26
UA	09/11/2001	0907	UNKNOW DEN	0:00
UA	09/11/2001	1007	UNKNOW ORD	0:00

“United 175”

Airline On-Time Statistics

Summary Statistics Detailed Statistics
Special Reports

Detailed Statistics > Departure Statistics

Departure Statistic(s): Actual Departure
Time

Airport(s): BOS

Airline(s): UA

Month(s): September

Day(s): 11

Year(s): 2001

Airport: Boston, MA - Logan
International (BOS)

Carrier Code Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
 Flight Number Tail Number

	Destination	Airport		Actual
Departure	Time			
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0051	UNKNOW	LAX
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0159	UNKNOW	SFO
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0161	UNKNOW	SFO
UA	09/11/2001	0163	N526UA	SFO 6:57
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0167	UNKNOW	SFO
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0169	UNKNOW	LAX
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0171	UNKNOW	SFO
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0173	UNKNOW	SFO
UA	09/11/2001	0175	N612UA	LAX 7:58
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0177	UNKNOW	LAX
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0199	UNKNOW	IAD
UA	09/11/2001	0211	N463UA	IAD 7:39
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0223	UNKNOW	IAD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0317	UNKNOW	IAD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0420	UNKNOW	ORD

UA	09/11/2001	0503	N314UA ORD	5:52
UA	09/11/2001	0505	N431UA DEN	7:52
UA	09/11/2001	0507	N564UA ORD	7:28
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0509	UNKNOW	ORD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0515	UNKNOW	ORD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0519	UNKNOW	ORD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0523	UNKNOW	ORD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0531	UNKNOW	ORD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0575	UNKNOW	ORD
UA	09/11/2001	0583	N433UA DEN	5:57
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0595	UNKNOW	ORD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0701	UNKNOW	DEN
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0883	UNKNOW	ORD
UA	09/11/2001	0895	N461UA ORD	8:24
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0987	UNKNOW	JFK
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	0999	UNKNOW	SFO
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	1015	UNKNOW	DEN

UA 0:00	09/11/2001	1051	UNKNOW	IAD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	1119	UNKNOW	DEN
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	1153	UNKNOW	IAD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	1411	UNKNOW	IAD
UA	09/11/2001	1439	N356UA ORD	6:26
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	1607	UNKNOW	DEN
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	1685	UNKNOW	IAD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	1690	UNKNOW	ORD
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	1789	UNKNOW	ORD
UA	09/11/2001	1877	N556UA IAD	6:39
UA 0:00	09/11/2001	1879	UNKNOW	IAD
UA	09/11/2001	1947	N435UA IAD	0:00

END NOTES

¹ <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/fact>

² Shermer, Michael. "How to Convince Someone When Facts Fail: Why Worldview Threats Undermine Evidence"; *Scientific American* 1/1/2017.

³ https://www.transtats.bts.gov/Tables.asp?DB_ID=120&DB_Name=Airline+On-Time+Performance+Data&DB_Short_Name=On-Time

⁴ Hendrie, Edward. *9/11: Enemies Foreign and Domestic*; Great Mountain Publishing; Garrisonville VA; 2011; 9. See also <http://thewebfairy.com/holmgren/1177.html>

⁵ http://www.serendipity.li/wot/pop_mech/bts_doctoring.htm

⁶ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ACARS>

⁷ <http://pilotsfor911truth.org/ACARS-CONFIRMED-911-AIRCRAFT-AIRBORNE-LONG-AFTER-CRASH.html>

⁸ <http://pilotsfor911truth.org/MORE-ACARS-CONFIRMATION.html>

⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁰ <http://physics911.net/georgenelson/>

¹¹ <http://goo.gl/oacM8V>

¹² *ibid.*

¹³ <https://aldeilms.net/english/no-evidence-that-muslims-hijacked-planes-on-911/>

¹⁴ <https://911skepticsvstruth.wordpress.com/2017/05/24/911-dulles-airport-cctv-of-flight-77-hijackers-has-no-authenticity-debunked/>

¹⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hijackers_in_the_September_11_attacks

¹⁶ <https://911skepticsvstruth.wordpress.com/2017/05/24/911-dulles-airport-cctv-of-flight-77-hijackers-has-no-authenticity-debunked/>

¹⁷ http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/planes/evidence/dailynews_halfvictimssid.html

¹⁸ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7474405_DNA_Identifications_After_the_911_World_Trade_Center_Attack

¹⁹ <https://daily.jstor.org/forensic-dna-evidence-can-lead-wrongful-convictions/>

²⁰ <http://goo.gl/2J0X0B>

²¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=icfkIH3j-nk>

²² <http://goo.gl/jJUKPO>

²³ <https://www.encyclopedia.com/politics/energy-government-and-defense-magazines/transcript-flight-attendant-betty-ong>; Transcript of Flight Attendant Betty Ong - Dictionary definition of Transcript of Flight Attendant Betty Ong | Encyclopedia.com: FREE online dictionary

²⁴ <http://goo.gl/gWEoMS>

²⁵ <http://letsrollforums.com/showpost.php?p=234124&postcount=5>

²⁶ <https://www.scribd.com/document/18775594/T7-B10-FBI-302s-Olsen-Fdr-302s-Re-Michael-Woodward-372>

²⁷ <https://goo.gl/mScm1I>

²⁸ <https://www.globalresearch.ca/phone-calls-from-the-9-11-airliners/16924>

²⁹ <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=8514>

-
- ³⁰ <http://goo.gl/8fuJaU>
- ³¹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Todd_Beamer#cite_note-AmNatBiography-3
- ³² <http://old.post-gazette.com/headlines/20011028flt93beamerbiop8.asp>
- ³³ Beamer, Lisa and Ken Abraham. *Let's Roll! Ordinary People, Extraordinary Courage*; Alive Communications; Colorado Springs; 2002; 2.
- ³⁴ Ibid, 5.
- ³⁵ <http://goo.gl/XbZnvx>
- ³⁶ Beamer and Abraham, 195.
- ³⁷ <http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/Oracle-s-coziness-with-government-goes-back-to-2820370.php>
- ³⁸ <http://www.consensus911.org/point-pc-1/>
- ³⁹ <http://goo.gl/vY6KeV> (Intelwire.com)
- ⁴⁰ <http://goo.gl/4DcFvU>
- ⁴¹ Jefferson, Lisa and Felicia Middlebrooks. 17.
- ⁴² <http://goo.gl/7GU4Y>
- ⁴³ <http://goo.gl/GK0DV5>
- ⁴⁴ Jefferson, Lisa and Felicia Middlebrooks. *Called: "Hello, My Name is Mrs. Jefferson. I Understand Your Plane is Being Hijacked."*; Northfield Publishing; 2006; 78
- ⁴⁵ Davidsson, 189
- ⁴⁶ <http://goo.gl/4DcFvU>
- ⁴⁷ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fUrxsrTKHN4>
- ⁴⁸ <http://goo.gl/zFRgLH>
- ⁴⁹ <http://goo.gl/ZPwG7s>
- ⁵⁰ <http://goo.gl/qnn1NX>
- ⁵¹ Morgan and Henshall, *9/11 Revealed*, p. 115
- ⁵² <http://www.pnionline.com/dnblog/extra/archives/001139.html>
- ⁵³ <http://www.counterpunch.org/lindorff12202005.html>
- ⁵⁴ <http://911research.wtc7.net/planes/evidence/blackboxes.html>
- ⁵⁵ <http://www.911review.org/Wiki/Flight93.shtml>
- ⁵⁶ <http://www.cnn.com/2006/LAW/04/12/moussaoui.trial/index.html>
- ⁵⁷ <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/asbestos.html>
- ⁵⁸ Feddema, Petrus. *Disclosed 9/11 Details Obvious Clues* (Revised Edition); Amazon.com Services LLC September 2019
- ⁵⁹ <http://www.rense.com/general68/mrev.htm>
- ⁶⁰ <http://goo.gl/b27OyC>
- ⁶¹ <http://goo.gl/Yb1i5T>
- ⁶² <http://911review.org/inn.globalfreepress/First-Flight-93.html>
- ⁶³ <https://goo.gl/rbGEVD>
- ⁶⁴ <http://helpdesk.rootsweb.com/ssdi/index.html#reasons>
- ⁶⁵ <http://www.ssa.gov/planners/survivors/>
- ⁶⁶ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Todd_Beamer
- ⁶⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Airlines_Flight_93
- ⁶⁸ <http://goo.gl/ZrGgfP>

69 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Airlines_Flight_175
70 <http://goo.gl/2Gsu5c>
71 <http://goo.gl/1dmRv1>
72 Ibid
73 <http://goo.gl/sA0zIb>
74 <http://911research.wtc7.net/planes/attack/flight11.html#ref7>
75 <https://goo.gl/Vp7S45>
76 <http://goo.gl/w7woZi>
77 <http://goo.gl/9lrPS>
78 Ibid.
79 <http://911research.wtc7.net/planes/attack/flight175.html>
80 <http://goo.gl/x8r34P>
81 <http://goo.gl/2Gsu5c>
82 <http://911research.wtc7.net/planes/evidence/phonecalls.html>
83 <http://goo.gl/9lrPS>
84 <http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB196/doc02.pdf>
85 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Airlines_Flight_175
86 <http://goo.gl/1dmRv1>
87 Ibid
88 <http://www.cnn.com/2001/US/09/16/inv.hijack.warning/>
89 <http://911research.wtc7.net/planes/attack/flight93.html>
90 <https://goo.gl/qcfZwv> - as noted earlier, this is the source for all calls
alleged from United 93
91 <https://goo.gl/qcfZwv>
92 ibid
93 <https://goo.gl/qcfZwv>
94 ibid
95 ibid
96 <https://goo.gl/qcfZwv>
97 ibid
98 ibid
99 ibid
100 <http://goo.gl/3P0Fvt>
101
<http://web.archive.org/web/20010212010328/http://www.cbsnews.com/now/story/0,1597,172666-412,00.shtml>
102
<http://web.archive.org/web/20011007021426/http://www.saag.org/papers3/paper266.html>
103 https://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/nov/01/afghanistan_terrorism
104 <http://www.foxnews.com/story/2001/12/26/report-bin-laden-already-dead.html>
105 <http://www.jfk-assassination.de/warren/wcr/page315.php>
106
http://demopedia.democraticunderground.com/index.php/Lee_Harvey_Oswald
107 <http://www.jfk-assassination.de/warren/wcr/page175.php>
108 <http://www.jfk-assassination.de/warren/wcr/page176.php>
109 Savage, Leo; *The Oswald Affair*

-
- ¹¹⁰ <http://www.jfk-assassination.de/warren/wcr/page178.php>
¹¹¹ <http://scribbleguy.50megs.com/intrigue.htm>
¹¹² Ibid
- 113 <http://www.fair.org>
114 <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB132/index.htm>
115 <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines02/0805-09.htm>
¹¹⁶ <http://www.fair.org>
¹¹⁷ <http://www.usni.org/magazines/navalhistory/2008-02/truth-about-tonkin>
118 <http://www.fair.org/blog/2014/03/21/hawks-want-obama-to-be-more-like-jimmy-carter/>
119 <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=32911>
120 <http://mediamatters.org/research/2007/01/23/rosen-distorted-defense-spending-during-carters/140752>
121 <http://www.nlpwessex.org/docs/irancontra.htm>
¹²² <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/general-article/carter-election1980/>
¹²³ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qN7gDRjTNf4>
¹²⁴ <http://www.debates.org/index.php?page=october-28-1980-debate-transcript>
¹²⁵ Ibid
¹²⁶ http://www.nytimes.com/1980/11/05/politics/05REAG.html?_r=0
¹²⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_the_Iran_hostage_crisis
¹²⁸ <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/15/magazine/the-way-we-live-now-9-15-02-on-language-perp-walk.html>
¹²⁹ <http://history.eserver.org/the-october-surprise.txt>
¹³⁰ <http://consortiumnews.com/2013/06/08/second-thoughts-on-october-surprise/>
131 <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article3862.htm>
132 <https://flyingcuttlefish.wordpress.com/2011/10/19/why-john-hinckley-jr-almost-assassinated-reagan/>
¹³³ <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/110704>
134 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2402174/CIA-helped-Saddam-Hussein-make-chemical-weapons-attackIran-1988-Ronald-Reagan.html>
135 <http://www.sheppardsoftware.com/Middleeastweb/factfile/Unique-facts-MiddleEast10.htm>
136
http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=George_W._Bush's_military_ser_vice
137 <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/08/this-day-in-politics-aug-1-1972-95023.html>
¹³⁸
http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/ballot_box/2000/11/why_gore_probably_lost.html
¹³⁹
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/1321720/Gore-blamed-Clinton-for-his-defeat-in-election.html>
¹⁴⁰ <http://www.michaelparenti.org/stolenelections.html>
¹⁴¹ <http://www.commondreams.org/views/111500-106.htm>
¹⁴² <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2001/07/vote-j19.html>

¹⁴³ <http://deanhartwell.weebly.com/911.html>

¹⁴⁴

http://uselectionatlas.org/USPRESIDENT/GENERAL/POLLS/2000/pe2000poll_0930.html

¹⁴⁵ <http://deanhartwell.weebly.com/essays/the-1980-election-how-the-reagan-campaign-made-history-and-foreign-policy>

¹⁴⁶ <http://www.factcheck.org/2012/12/gun-rhetoric-vs-gun-facts/>

¹⁴⁷ <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-02-20/record-u-s-gun-production-as-obama-demonized-on-issue.html>

¹⁴⁸ <http://townhall.com/tipsheet/katiepavlich/2014/01/07/2013-saw-record-gun-background-checks-n1772931>

¹⁴⁹ https://www.academia.edu/14445007/The_JFK_Assassination_-_A_Manufactured_non_Event_by_Miles_W_Mathis

¹⁵⁰ <http://cluesforum.info/viewtopic.php?f=28&t=75>