Could it really be a scam?

The odd seating arrangements in Flight 11

The Boston Globe has a list of passengers and seat assignments for Flight 11. If their data is correct, the passengers were bunched up rather than scattered throughout the plane (Figure 8-1). Several rows were empty, while other rows were crowded with passengers. This is not the way seats are filled. Rather, airlines put a person in every row before they put strangers next to each other. The end result is that if a plane is half full of people, every row will have a person in it, and every person will have an empty seat next to him. There are two reasons the airlines do this. One is to distribute the weight evenly in the airplane. The other is that people are like birds that perch on telephone wires; we do not want to be touching strangers.

A scam makes more sense

A summary of the main reasons why the 9-11 attack appears to be a scam:

- **The destruction of the rubble.** The destruction proceeded at frantic rate, and most importantly, it was a violation of our laws to destroy the rubble.
- **An enormous amount of concrete turned to powder** and flew out of the building with a very high velocity. All steel beams in the building broke, mainly at their joints and welds. I think this required an energy source, such as explosives.
- **The steel beams from the towers dropped at the rate objects fall in gravity.** This means they did not encounter any resistance along the way, which means they never hit any of the concrete floors. This means the concrete floors shattered into powder without being touched by those beams. I think the floors were shattered by explosives, not by falling debris.
- **The overhanging section of the South Tower never fell out of the clouds of dust.** I think explosives were destroying the floors as fast as that overhanging section fell down.
- **The temperature of the rubble was above the melting point of aluminum** in some areas, even after it was sprayed with water. I think the explosives added a lot of heat to the rubble.
- **Nobody wants to investigate.** President Bush and Cheney wanted to “limit” the investigation; investigators were hampered; and the FBI, FEMA, and other agencies either refused to investigate, or they did only a minimal, pathetic investigation. Furthermore, most members of our media, who boast that they are “watchdogs,” have no interest in understanding what happened, nor do they care that our government violated our laws. Instead they encourage us to hate Al-Qaeda and support President Bush. This is not because these people never support investigations; after all, many of them demanded an investigation of the Clinton / Lewinsky affair. Why would these people not want an investigation of the 9-11 attack, which is the biggest crime the USA has ever experienced?
Explosives in Building 7 but not the towers?

Some people suspect that Building 7 was destroyed by explosives, but not the towers. There are also people who believe that the decision to blow up Building 7 was made after the towers were attacked. According to that theory, somebody decided to take advantage of the chaos that day by destroying Building 7.

However, anybody who suspects Building 7 was destroyed by explosives would have to come to the conclusion that explosives were used in the towers. To understand why, let's begin by considering the theory that somebody made the decision to blow up Building 7 after they saw the towers collapse.

This theory requires that several people get together and very quickly agree to a serious crime. At least one of them must have experience with demolitions in order figure out how many packages of explosives they needed. Then they would have to purchase the explosives, have them delivered, and install them in a 47-story building. All this would have to be accomplished within the span of a few hours. However, it was virtually impossible to drive a car into lower Manhattan after the planes hit, which means that it was virtually impossible for somebody to ask for a shipment of explosives to be delivered to the building by that afternoon. The only way they could acquire the explosives would be if there was a store within walking distance of Building 7 that sold packages of explosives for demolitions. Or, if a truck full of demolition explosives had been caught in the traffic jam near Building 7, they could break into the truck and steal the explosives.

As you can see, it is extremely unlikely that a group of people could have purchased (or stolen) enough explosives to bring down Building 7. If you respond that they could have used the diesel fuel that was already inside the building to manufacture their own bombs, that is even less likely. Making bombs with diesel fuel is not easy. More importantly, they could not use “bombs”; rather, they needed lots of small packages of explosives that could be controlled precisely.

So let's dismiss the possibility that somebody decided on September 11th to blow up Building 7. This leads us to the conclusion that they made this decision before September 11th. They purchased the explosives, wired them in the building while people were still working inside, and then waited for the attack.

This leads us to conclude that these people must have known that the attack was coming, although they may not have known which day. But how could they know the attack was coming? The only two groups of people who truly knew the attack was coming were the people involved in planning this attack, and the people who were spying on them. This leads us to the possibility that some agency, such as the CIA, discovered that this attack was coming but kept quiet about it rather than try to stop it.

This now leads us to the conclusion that whoever destroyed Building 7 was either part of the group that was planning the attack, or they had acquired information that the attack was coming and decided to take advantage of it. In either case they installed explosives in Building 7 in preparation for the attack. They then waited for the attack to occur. Their plan was to destroy the building and claim that the fire was the reason it fell down.

The question I have for you is: what would happen if the airplanes hit the towers but the towers did not fall down? Imagine the following scenario: The airplanes crash into towers; tremendous fires burn in the towers; after a few hours the fires are extinguished by the firemen and the towers remain standing; and then Building 7 collapses into a small pile of rubble.

Wouldn't it be suspicious if Building 7 crumbles from a fire if the towers survived much more severe fires? Remember, never in history has a fire caused a steel building to crumble. Therefore, if somebody blew up Building 7 with explosives and then claimed that a fire caused the collapse, the firemen would respond that fires do not cause steel buildings to collapse.

To better understand this issue, imagining yourself back in time to any year prior to 2001. Next imagine that a fire breaks out in Building 7, or some other steel building. Finally, imagine that after a few hours the small fires cause the entire building to crumble into a small pile of rubble. If such an event had occurred prior to 2001, it would have been the very first time a fire caused a steel-framed building to crumble. Such an unusual event would attract the attention of the entire world.

Scientists and engineers would want to analyze the steel beams to see how the fire did what no fire had done before. Universities would want information on the collapse so that they could use it in their engineering classes as an example of lousy engineering. Newspapers and television stations around the world would report it as the most bizarre fire anybody has ever seen. I also suspect that there would be thousands of lawsuits. Newspapers would be full of reports like those in Figure 8-2.

The point I am making is that it would not be safe to destroy Building 7 unless the towers collapse first. After the towers collapse, the collapse of Building 7 would appear to be just another weird event of that day's bizarre disasters. Therefore, whoever destroyed Building 7 would want to guarantee that the towers collapse first. This requires that they put explosives into the towers, also.

So now let's look at where we are with this scenario: A group of people have discovered that the attack is going to
occur, so they put explosives in both towers and Building 7, and then they patiently wait for the attack.

This brings us to a dilemma. Putting explosives into Building 7 and both towers requires a lot of time, effort, and money. Furthermore, they would be risking severe criminal charges. What if somebody catches them installing the explosives? What if they get caught after they blow up the buildings? Would anybody be willing to go to all this trouble and take such a risk when they have no guarantee that the attacks will even take place? What if the hijackers are caught before they get on the plane? Or what if the hijackers decide that they are not competent as pilots and switch to a simpler attack, such as leaving a truck bomb in front of a government building? Or what if the hijackers decide to switch from hitting the World Trade Center to hitting the US Capitol? Or what if the hijackers turn out to be so incompetent as pilots that they crash on the way to the World Trade Center, or they miss the towers and hit some other buildings?

It is also possible that the hijackers would abandon the suicide mission simply because they decided they did not want to die yet. Certainly there have been people who were angry enough to join a suicide plot, but after a few months their anger diminished and they decided they would rather remain alive.

An even more likely problem is that the hijackers get control of the aircraft, change course towards Manhattan, and then the FAA realizes that something is seriously wrong. The FAA contacts the military, and the military sends up a plane to investigate. The military would eventually realize that the plane is heading towards Manhattan office buildings at an altitude so low that it will hit one of the buildings. Even if they do not shoot the first plane down, they would be likely to shoot the second plane down after they see the first one hit a building.

So now let’s review where this scenario has taken us. If a group of people want to destroy Building 7, they must force the towers to collapse first, but they cannot collapse the towers unless the towers are hit by airplanes. Therefore, this plot to destroy Building 7 depends on some terrorists learning to fly commercial aircraft, getting control of those aircraft, and then flying into buildings without interference by the US military. This leads us to the conclusion that if somebody wants to destroy Building 7 they must also stop the FAA and military from interfering. This in turn requires at least some people in the military and FAA join this conspiracy.

So now this scenario has developed to the point at which a group of people are putting explosives into Building 7 and both towers, and some high ranking military and FAA personnel are involved. It also has the CIA and/or FBI observing the hijackers.

As you can see, a lot of people would have to be involved in this conspiracy simply to destroy Building 7. And this is just beginning. Whoever wants to blow up Building 7 and the towers must also be able to stop investigations. They must have the rubble destroyed immediately. However, it is

---

**Skyscraper crumbles to dust!**

Is your building safe? Yesterday in Manhattan, a 47 story tall, steel and concrete skyscraper collapsed into a small pile of rubble. What could cause such a total and complete destruction of a skyscraper? A nuclear bomb? An earthquake? An asteroid? No! According to experts, an ordinary fire! Diesel fuel used to power emergency generators caught on fire. Hospitals and many other buildings have backup generators and large tanks of diesel fuel. How many of these buildings will crumble if those tanks catch on fire? Is the building that you work in safe?

---

**New World Record!**

1 fire; 347,000 lawsuits!

Angry citizens are overwhelming the New York court system after a fire caused a steel building to crumble to dust! Most lawsuits have been filed against the designers of the building and the construction companies involved in the project, but the landlord has also been hit with thousands of lawsuits. The landlord is being accused of not properly maintaining the sprinkler system or the fireproofing. Lawsuits have also been filed against the New York City government for allowing unsafe buildings.

*Figure 8-2*  Headlines you would have seen in your newspapers if Building 7 collapsed before September 11, 2001
a violation of our laws to destroy that rubble. This requires that these people have a lot of influence over our government.

By the time we have taken this scenario all the way to completion, we end up with a very large conspiracy. Also, it shows that if Building 7 was destroyed with explosives, then this entire 9-11 attack was a scam of unbelievable proportions. Why would anybody go to such trouble simply to destroy Building 7? For the amount of money this scam would require, they could purchase Building 7 and then tear it down.

You can't be half pregnant

The point of this section is that there are some people who believe that Building 7 was destroyed by explosives, but they do not believe the towers were destroyed by explosives. What I am trying to show you is that if Building 7 was destroyed by explosives, then the entire attack was a very large scam. You can't have half a scam! It was either all scam, or no scam.

Therefore, if you do not want to believe the entire attack was a scam, you need to find a sensible reason for the collapse of Building 7. However, keep in mind that never in history has a fire caused a steel building to crumble. Therefore, your mission, if you choose to accept it, is to find a sensible explanation for an event that never occurred before. Good luck!

Were terrorists really flying those planes?

The only way to guarantee that the hijackers are proficient pilots would be to replace them with suicide pilots who truly know how to fly those planes. Or it requires getting control of the aircraft.

A few sites on the Internet claim those particular aircraft (the Boeing 767 and 757) are controlled by computer, and that it is possible for pilots on the ground to get control of those aircraft. Supposedly, the US government put this feature in some planes years ago to allow pilots on the ground to take control of hijacked aircraft (for the younger readers, years ago planes were hijacked on a frequent basis). This feature would also be of use during accidents, or when a pilot has a heart attack.

Thierry Meyssan believes a homing signal was broadcast from the World Trade Center a few hours before the planes hit, and that the airplanes had been modified so that they would follow the homing signal.

If the planes were being controlled by remote control, or if they were following a homing signal, then the hijackers could have been incompetent as pilots. Actually, the hijackers would not even have to be on the aircraft. Or, perhaps the hijackers had been provided with receivers that would pick up the homing signal.

“But the collapse didn't look like a demolition!”

When I first posted a document on the Internet in which I claimed that explosives were used to destroy the World Trade Center, a few people responded that the towers did not collapse in the manner that buildings are demolished, and therefore they could not have been destroyed by explosives. Rather than convince me that these buildings were not destroyed by explosives, they actually had the opposite effect. My reasoning was:

- The people making these remarks could not believe such a naive remark. Rather, they must be trying to divert attention away from explosives.
- Why would they want to divert our attention from explosives unless they knew that explosives were used?
- These people are more evidence that explosives were used.

Before I continue, let me explain why I consider the remark “But the collapse didn't look like a demolition!” to be a naive remark.

Let’s assume Joe decides to rob a bank. Joe is aware that banks have security cameras that monitor the people in the bank, so he decides to wear a hairpiece and a fake beard. He also hides his gun in a small paper sack. Joe walks into the bank in his disguise, shows the paper bag to the teller, and demands money. I then post a document on the Internet in which I suggest that Joe probably robbed the bank with his pistol. What would your reaction be if someone posts the following response to me:

“Joe did not rob the bank! First of all, the person who robbed that bank had different hair than Joe. Second, Joe does not have a beard. Third, the person who robbed that bank did not have a gun; rather, he had a paper bag.”

Certainly your reaction would be:

- The person who posted that remark could not possibly believe it; rather, he must be trying to convince us that Joe did not rob the bank. But why would he try to convince us of Joe’s innocence? If Joe is truly innocent he could offer evidence of his innocence.
- Joe must be guilty, and Joe or one of his friends must have posted that remark in an effort to divert our attention away from Joe.

Getting back to the complaint that the collapse of the towers did not look like a demolition, I was certain that the
people making those remarks were part of the cover-up squad and were merely trying to mislead us. Why else would anybody post such remarks on the Internet and send such remarks to me? (President Bush refers to the people who attacked the World Trade Center as part of the “Axis of Evil” so, for lack of a better name, I will refer to the people who gave us the 9-11 scam as the “Axis of Good.”) I assumed the Axis of Good was putting out as much misinformation as possible in the hope of confusing the public. I had visions of hundreds of them spending hours at their computer, monitoring web sites and news groups. I imagined them spending hours each day posting a variety of idiotic messages in attempts to mislead and confuse us, as well as try to divert attention away from the issue of explosives.

There were a few times when I decided to respond to some of my critics. I explained to them in more detail why I believed explosives were used. I was shocked when a few of them eventually understood my reasoning and agreed with me that explosives were probably used.

I now realize that some of the idiotic remarks about the World Trade Center attack are coming from ordinary citizens. Most people are lacking accurate information about the collapse; most have not bothered to spend much time analyzing the collapse; and some are so patriotic that they are resisting the possibility that the attack was a scam. My point is that we must be careful about assuming the Axis of Good is making the dumb remarks.

Do the professors believe their theories?

Bazant submitted his theory to the Journal of Engineering Mechanics on September 13th, and posted his theory at three different universities at about the same time. This means that he spent no more than two days writing his theory. Why did he spend only two days? Or, if he wrote his report during the evenings in his spare time, why only two evenings? How could he believe that he had enough information about such a unique collapse when the only information available at that time were the images from the Channel 4 Action Reporters? How could he consider himself knowledgeable about a subject after watching TV for a few hours? Would a real scientist insist on spending more than two days just gathering information about the collapse.

Furthermore, Bazant did not mention Building 7. Was that because he was unaware that Building 7 collapsed? If so, that would prove that he did not even bother to read the most simplistic of news reports before publishing his brilliant theory. Or, did he avoid Building 7 because he did not know how to explain its collapse? If he is incapable of explaining the collapse of Building 7, why should we believe he can explain the collapse of the towers? I would think that a professor who knows enough to explain the collapse of the towers would also know enough to explain Building 7.

Do these professors believe their own theories? Or are they merely trying to find a less depressing explanation than the scam possibility? Or did somebody push or pay these professors to write about the collapse, and then provide the professors with false information?

Why hasn’t Bazant bothered to correct the mistake about the towers falling like a stack of pancakes, or at least complete his theory so that we know what Figure 5-4C (page 42) would look like? Why did he rush to publish the theory but not bother to finish it at a later date?

I find it difficult to believe that a reputable professor would spend only a few days on a theory to explain something that nobody had ever seen before. I also find it difficult to believe that a professor would base his theory on a few television reports. Finally, I find it difficult to believe a professor would never bother to complete his theory when documents on the Internet are making fun of his Pancake Theory.

Perhaps the Pancake Theory had been prepared months before the attack. On September 11th somebody edited the document to fit the actual events and then looked for a professor to sign his name to it. This would explain why Bazant never finished his theory; i.e.; maybe it is not his theory.

University professors are regarded as experts simply because they are “professors.” However, how can they be experts when they do not adequately explain the collapse of the towers or Building 7? How can these people be considered experts on fires when they fail to acknowledge the possibility that the soot and the lack of flames may be an indication that the fires were choking on their smoke?

There are many ways to destroy a building with explosives

In a conventional demolition, the explosives are timed so that the bottom of the building collapses first. The reason is to make the building drop vertically rather than tip to one side. Also, the people paying for the demolition want to use as few explosives as possible in order to save time and money. The small quantity of explosives results in large chunks of building remaining; i.e., the building does not turn into powder. Powder is a side effect of a demolition, not the purpose. Demolition companies try to minimize the production of powder because powder creates a mess that must be cleaned up. Also, if the powder travels to neighboring buildings there will be lots of angry people.

The towers did not resemble a conventional demolition because they were not a conventional demolition. The explosives in the towers were trying to simulate a collapse of a building due to a fire and airplane crash.
Another reason the collapse of the towers did not resemble a conventional demolition is that the towers seemed to have a much larger quantity of explosives than a normal demolition. I suspect that extra explosives were used to pulverize the concrete into powder. There are two main advantages to pulverizing the concrete.

1) To eliminate the problem of giant chunks of the tower falling to the side. In a normal demolition the building is shattered when it is near the ground. The rubble does not fall through the air; rather, it simply collects at the ground. Since the Axis of Good was trying to simulate a building collapsing from an airplane crash, thousands of tons of rubble would be produced hundreds of feet in the air. This means that thousands of tons of rubble would have to fall hundreds of feet. If the explosives only broke the towers into pieces, large chunks of building would fall hundreds of feet. Chunks of the tower might collide with one another on the way down, which in turn could spread large pieces further out from the base of the towers. Some of those chunks might hit neighboring buildings and roads.

By using enough explosives to pulverize the concrete and break every steel beam at its joint, there is no concern about large chunks of the tower falling to the ground. The concrete would fall as a powder, which would hit the ground so gently that nothing would be destroyed by it. And the steel would fall as short beams rather than as large assemblies.

You might respond that the people destroying the towers would have no concern about the falling pieces of concrete, and therefore my reasoning is based on nonsensical assumptions. However, the purpose of this scam was not to kill people or destroy neighboring buildings. Rather, it appears that the Axis of Good went out of their way to reduce the number of casualties and destruction. They may be violent people, and some may suffer from serious mental problems, but they are human.

2) To simplify cleanup.

Instead of having to deal with large pieces of concrete and twisted assemblies of steel, the crews only had to pick up short pieces of steel. This allows them to more rapidly destroy the rubble.

Normally a demolition company is responsible for cleaning up the powder, so they do not want to produce powder. However, this 9-11 demolition was going to be blamed on Osama, so taxpayers would cover all costs for the cleanup of powder. Therefore, the Axis of Good did not have to worry about how they would clean up the mess. Rather, they were more concerned about destroying all evidence as quickly as possible. The destruction of the rubble would occur at a significantly faster pace if the cleanup crews did not have to deal with large pieces of concrete or steel assemblies.

Building 7 was not hit by an airplane, so there was no need to fake a complex collapse that starts high up in the building. Furthermore, this building would be demolished late in the afternoon when not many people were around to watch it, so there was less concern about simulating a believable collapse. Building 7 was demolished in a conventional manner with a smaller amount of explosives. This is why large chunks of Building 7 survived.

Incidently, when a building is as tall as the World Trade Center towers, there are a lot of different ways in which to demolish it with explosives so that it does not appear to be a conventional demolition. For example, explosives could destroy the tower from both the very top and the very bottom at the same time, leaving the center to be the last section to be demolished. It would also be possible to start the explosions at three different locations in the building at once. For example, explosives at the 40th, 80th, and 110th floor could be detonated at the same time. The explosives could then work their way from those floors downward. This would not resemble a conventional demolition, either.

It would also be possible to set the explosives off in a horizontal manner rather than a vertical manner. In other words, one side of the building would start exploding, which would explode every window on that side of the building. The explosives would then work their way over to the other side of the building. My point is that there are a variety of ways to destroy a building with explosives so that it does not resemble a conventional demolition.

Why did the airplane almost miss the South Tower?

An airplane hit the North Tower almost directly in the center, but the plane hit the South Tower near the edge. The common assumption is that the pilot almost missed the building. Even the people who insist that these planes were flown by remote control are under the impression that the people flying the planes almost missed the building due to the fact that these planes were not very maneuverable.
My initial reaction was also that the pilot almost missed the South Tower. However, this attack seems to be so well-planned, and everything seems to have been executed so perfectly, that this may not have been a mistake.

The CoStar Group, Inc., a company that provides information on commercial real estate, put together a list of tenants of the World Trade Center to help with the identification of the missing people.† While they point out that they cannot be 100% certain of the tenants on that particular day, their report shows the North Tower had most of its vacant space above the 79th floor, and half of that was above the 90th floor. The 102nd floor was half empty. Therefore, hitting the North Tower above the 90th floor would reduce casualties at the crash zone. Is it a coincidence the hijackers hit the North Tower at floors 94 through 98? Or is this a sign the Axis of Good was trying to reduce casualties?

Hitting the tower at a high level also reduces casualties because most of the people would be below the crash zone, so they would be able to escape. Another advantage to hitting the tower at a high level is that if it severs the top section from the rest of the tower, only that small section should fall down; the entire tower should not topple.

The South Tower did not have any large areas of vacant space, except below the 30th floor, so there was no good location to hit it to reduce casualties. The best way to reduce casualties was to hit only a corner of the building. Finally, hitting a corner avoids the possibility that the airplane destroys so many core columns that the tower breaks into two pieces. Compare the orientation of the core columns in Figures 4-3 and 4-5; there was only 11 meters of flooring to protect the columns in the South Tower, not 20 meters.

### Coincidental games and artwork

Ever since a truck bomb blew up at the base of the South Tower in 1993, millions of people have been wondering if somebody would attack the towers again. Therefore, the concept of attacking the towers could have popped up in the minds of artists when they wondered what to do for a new job. However, we should not dismiss such incidents as "coincidence" without investigating them. For example, a free game on the Internet called *Trade Center Defender* shows a photograph of the New York skyline as a background, with crude representations of the World Trade Center towers drawn on top (Figure 8-3). A jet flies across the screen towards the towers. The mouse is a cross hairs, and the object of the game is to click the cross hairs on the jet before it hits a tower. This game was supposedly available before September 11th, although by the time I discovered it the background photograph had been changed to show the collapse.

Since I do not play computer games I am not a good judge of whether a game is “good” or “bad,” but this game is so incredibly crude that I cannot believe that even a child would want to play it. Did somebody know this attack was coming and consider it amusing to create this game?

Almost all software, games, and documents on the Internet have a copyright notice, link to another site, or note that identifies the author. This game is one of the exceptions. This game doesn’t even have identification embedded within its data. It appears that the person who created this game does not want to take credit for it. Is this just a coincidence?

The Houston Chronicle reported that a Houston rap group called *Inner City Hustlers* released an album in July, 2001 with the title *Time To Explode*. It showed the New York skyline and the World Trade Centers in flames. This would not have attracted my attention except the director of the company that created the artwork told the Chronicle that the musicians originally wanted to use the Houston skyline. So why did they switch to a New York City skyline? Was somebody influencing them?

July was also when artwork for an upcoming album by the group *Coup* was posted on the Internet, even though the album would not be released until November. Most people assume the similarity to the actual attack (Figures 8-4 and 8-5) was merely a coincidence, and that it was posted in July for promotional reasons. But the two members of this band live in Oakland, California, not New York, and the device the man is holding has “Covert Labs” written on it, suggesting a secret government agency. Would rap musicians who condemn businessmen and government select such symbolism without influence? And how often do music groups post artwork for their album many months before the album is ready to sell?

† They also took those great photos of the small buildings of the World Trade Center in Chapter 1.
Did a few members of the Axis of Good think it would be amusing to convince music groups to put images of the upcoming attack on their album covers? If so, the Coup artwork was released in July because they were proud of themselves, not because they wanted to promote sales of a future album. Perhaps they passed the images and the Trade Center Defender game among themselves. (If it were possible to trace the flow of messages on the Internet, we might be able identify some members of the Axis of Good simply by looking at who received those images and games prior to September 11th.)

The Coup record label implies that the Axis of Good were so knowledgeable about physics that they could accurately predict the size and positions of the fireballs. They are obviously intelligent and educated. The only two mistakes they made are:

1) the fireballs are too dark.

2) There were no clouds in the sky that day.

Obviously, they are experts with explosives but no better at weather forecasts than TV newscasters.

Another interesting coincidence is that a television show called The Lone Gunmen was filmed in the year 2000 and shown in May 2001. The plot was about some government officials who use a laptop computer to take control of a passenger aircraft flying to Boston and crash it into the South Tower of the World Trade Center. The aircraft was going to hit the tower in almost the same location that Flight 175 hit it (Figure 8-6). Did a member of the Axis of Good write or influence the show?

**Was John O’Neill’s death a coincidence?**

O’Neill was one of the Deputy Directors of the FBI until a few weeks before the World Trade Center attack. He quit his job at the FBI to work as security manager for the World Trade Center. Supposedly the main reason he quit the FBI was because he was angry at the Bush administration. O’Neill investigated terrorism for the FBI, and he accused the Bush administration of interfering with investigations and making deals with both the Taliban and Osama. He supposedly described it this way:

“The main obstacles to investigate Islamic terrorism were US oil corporate interests, and the role played by Saudi Arabia in it...”
There were additional incentives to quit his job at the FBI, such as the job at the World Trade Center offered double his FBI salary (some reports say triple), and he had lost hope for getting significant promotions if he stayed with the FBI.

Late at night on September 10th, the day before O’Neill would start his new job, he met his friends Jerry Hauer and Robert Tucker to celebrate his new job. On September 11th he started working at his new job on the 34th floor of the North Tower. He was in the tower when the plane hit. He evacuated the tower like most other people, but he remained in the area. The last person to see O’Neill alive was an FBI agent, Wesley Wong. The two of them stopped to talk. At this time neither of the towers had collapsed. When O’Neill tried to make a call on his cell phone he had difficulty getting the phone to connect. He began walking away from Wong, towards one of the towers, perhaps to find a location with better reception. A few minutes later the South Tower collapsed. O’Neill’s body was found about a week later. The fact that his body was discovered is a sign that he did not go back inside the tower, as some reports assume. Did he die from falling debris?

O’Neill accused the Bush administration of interfering with investigations on terrorism. He also accused the Bush administration of making deals with the Taliban and with Osama. Is it a coincidence that such a person would die? How about the coincidence that he quit his job for the FBI and had just started to work at the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001?

I find it difficult to believe that the people who offered O’Neill the job as security director of the World Trade Center did not realize that World Trade Center would be destroyed. The security department would have to know about the scam in order to allow the explosives in the building. I suspect their intention was to become O’Neill’s employer only so they would have control over him, which in turn would make it easy for them to set him up to die in the attack. (I also wonder if the previous security director of the World Trade Center was offered the same high salary that O’Neill was offered, or if they deliberately offered O’Neill a very high salary to lure him out of the FBI.)

Jerry Hauer

O’Neill’s death becomes more interesting when you consider who the person was who offered him the job at the World Trade Center. The New Yorker magazine implies that his friend, Jerry Hauer, was involved in his hiring.

Hauer was director of the World Trade Center in 1999. Hauer seems to be the main person who pushed for putting an “Emergency Command Center” in Building 7 to protect the mayor in case of a terrorist attack. A 50,000 square foot section of Building 7 between the 23rd and 25th floors was converted into a reinforced bunker.

During the 1990’s there was paranoia that Saddam Hussein might attack America with anthrax, so this command center had the ability to resist biological attack, in addition to resisting attacks by conventional guns and bombs. It had its own air supply and 11,000 gallons of water. The windows and walls in this area were replaced and/or strengthened to be both bulletproof and bomb-resistant. CNN reports it was capable of resisting wind gusts of up to 160 miles per hour. It had three emergency generators and a 6,000 gallon diesel tank near the ground floor to power those generators. The bunker was finished in June of 1999 at a cost to taxpayers of about $13 million.

To get a better understanding of how ridiculous this bunker was, recall that the first five floors of Building 7 were almost completely taken up by transformers that were fed with 13,800 volts, and giant diesel tanks that held up to 42,000 gallons of fuel were placed near the transformers. The mayor puts a bunker above the transformers and the diesel fuel and considers himself safe from terrorist attack.

Despite what the FEMA report implies, Building 7 was not a conventional office building. Rather, Building 7 and this bunker belong in a Three Stooges movie. What were the people thinking when they designed this bunker? CNN quotes Hauer as saying:

“Particularly when it comes to biological terrorism, no city is where we’re at.”

This bunker was able to resist biological attacks because it had its own air and water supply. If terrorists spread anthrax in the city, perhaps a dozen of the millions of people in New York City would be allowed to gather inside this bunker. They would be able to breathe clean air, drink clean water, and have plenty of diesel fuel for electricity. The bulletproof and bomb-resistant bunker would also protect them in case somebody tried to attack them with conventional weapons. Of course, since this bunker was not a hotel, it would be inconvenient to stay overnight, so the anthrax had to be cleaned up quickly.

Of all the buildings in New York City to put an Emergency Command Center in, this had to be the most ridiculous. It made more sense to put it in the basement of a conventional building. Perhaps this was the only building at the time that had enough vacant space for such a gigantic bunker. Or perhaps this was the only building that had a landlord who was gullible enough to allow all the risky activities that were going on inside.

There was more than one person (and more than one fireman) complaining that putting a reinforced bunker high up in such a dangerous office building was ridiculous. How could Jerry Hauer support such a dumb proposal? Is Hauer an idiot? And was Hauer really a friend of John O’Neill?
The WTC Attack Command Center

I think the 23rd floor of Building 7 was converted into a reinforced bunker in order to serve as the command center to destroy the World Trade Centers. Because it was 23 floors above ground, the Axis of Good would be able to observe the entire area and make a determination of how and when to set off the explosives. The bomb-resistant windows and walls would protect them from falling debris. The bunker had its own air supply so they would not have to breathe the asbestos and concrete powder. The bunker was designed to withstand winds of 160 mph so it would handle the brutal surge of powder and debris when the towers collapsed.

I doubt that the people who built that bunker were so stupid that they could not see the foolishness of what they did. The firemen had warned them about the fire hazard, and other people had complained also. Nobody could be stupid enough to believe the bunker made sense.

I doubt that the bunker was ever intended to be an “Emergency Command Center”; rather, it was a “WTC Fake Terrorist Attack Command Center” from the day it was proposed.

The reason photos of Building 7 show only tiny fires in only a few of the windows is because a few fires were set deliberately to create the impression that fires were burning. The Axis of Good never allowed those fires to spread to the rest of the building because they were going to spend most of the day on the 23rd floor.

The employees of Building 7 were evacuated between 9 and 10 in the morning, which was before either of the towers collapsed. The Axis of Good then had the entire building to themselves. This allowed them to do as they pleased without interruptions.

The towers were destroyed during the morning, and the dust was terrible for the rest of the day. The Axis of Good stayed inside the bunker drinking clean water, breathing clean air. (They may also have some spectacular photos of the attack.)

By 4 PM the dust had settled enough for them to leave Building 7. If you recall, CNN has a time line in which a fire was reported in Building 7 at 4:10 PM. Also recall somebody mentioned to Tom Franklin and other people between 4 and 5 PM that they should get away from Building 7 because

---

Note: This map is not exact. Also, no two maps of the flight paths are exactly the same.

[Map diagram]

Figure 8-6  The actual flight paths and the possible alternates
it was going to collapse. My explanation of these events is that the Axis of Good left the bunker at about 4 PM. One of them made a phone call to the fire department to report the building on fire in order to create an official record that Building 7 was truly on fire. As they walked outside they made remarks to people in the area that they should stay away because the building was going to collapse.

Was Building 7 the source of a homing signal?

I doubt that real hijackers would care which direction they hit the towers. If I were a hijacker I would take the shortest route in order to minimize the time I was in the air. However, if the information Thierry Meyssan received is correct, a homing signal was used to control these aircraft. Meyssan believes that the homing signal was coming from “the World Trade Center” but it may have been coming from Building 7 rather than the towers. Also, the airplane’s computers may have been following the homing signal rather than the hijackers following the signals.

If Building 7 was the source of the homing signal, and if the airplane’s computers were flying the planes, both airplanes would try to get to Building 7 rather than the towers. This creates a problem. Specifically, if the destination is Building 7, the only way to make the planes hit the towers is to put them on a flight path in which the towers are directly in their way. Then, as the planes try to reach Building 7, they slam into the towers. However, this requirement severely restricts the possible flight paths. There is only one way to draw a line between the North Tower and Building 7, and there is only one line between the South Tower and Building 7. Each airplane must fly along those lines. The planes can fly the lines from either direction but, as shown by the faint airplanes (Figure 8-6), two of the directions are risky because it requires the planes pass very close to the other tower. The best flight paths are the ones that the hijackers coincidently decided to take.

The path of Flight 11 into the North Tower

Both planes started in Boston, which is north of New York City. Supposedly Flight 11 did not turn towards New York City until it was west of the city. In order to get on the path that would align it with both Building 7 and the North Tower it had to turn back towards the east, and then continue to fly east until it went past the city. Then it could turn towards the southwest. That would bring the plane directly over Building 7. As soon as it passed Building 7 the computer that was following the homing signal would notice the signal was getting weaker, so it would turn the plane around and head back towards Building 7, as shown by curve in the thin, black flight path in Figure 8-6. At 450 miles per hour, however, the plane would not have enough time to turn. Instead, it would hit the tower just after its wings started to tip to make the turn.

It certainly is an interesting coincidence that the published path of Flight 11 shows the hijackers taking a path that lines it up with Building 7. Also, the hole created by the airplane shows the wings were tilted because the plane was in the process of turning when it hit the tower, just as if it was following a signal.

The path of Flight 175 into the South Tower

The only practical way to hit the South Tower if a plane from Boston is actually trying to get to Building 7 is to have the plane go south of New York City and then turn around and head northeast. It would then slam into the South Tower just before it reached Building 7. What a coincidence that the published flight path shows the hijackers doing exactly that. The hole created by the plane that hit the South Tower shows that it was in the process of making a sharp turn. If it could have continued the turn (if the South Tower had not been in the way), it appears that it would have ended up at Building 7.

Is it a coincidence that the hijackers selected the only flight paths possible if they were following a homing signal from Building 7? Maybe, but perhaps one of the reasons for the diesel fuel and backup generators in Building 7 was to ensure those homing signal transmitters had power, as well provide power to all of the other electronics used in this scam. The explosives in the tower may have been detonated with electricity that came from Building 7, also.

Stewart International Airport

On 13 September 2001 the Telegraph, a Nashua, New Hampshire newspaper, reported that a person who works at the Nashua air traffic control facility mentioned that Flights 11 and 175 came close to each other near Stewart International Airport, at New Windsor, New York (Figure 8-6). He also mentioned that the controller at his facility who handled Flights 11 and 175 also handled Egypt Air’s Flight 990, which crashed for unknown reasons in the ocean off Massachusetts in 1999. (The official explanation for Flight 990 is that the pilot decided to commit suicide by crashing the airplane into the ocean.)

Is this New Hampshire newspaper reputable? Who is this unidentified FAA employee? The newspaper will only tell us that he “spoke on the condition of anonymity.” If this mystery employee is correct, we have some more amazing coincidences to consider. We have the coincidence that the controller in charge of the mysterious Flight 990 was also in control of the mysterious flights that crashed into the World Trade Center. (Flight 990 brings up a subject this book will not get into, such as whether it was practice for the 9-11...
scam). We also have the coincidence that the planes passed near each other over Stewart International Airport at the same moment in time.

What are the chances that two hijacked airplanes would cross each other’s paths at the same moment in time? This could be an indication that there was a homing signal at Stewart International Airport.

The Air Force has a windowless, four story concrete building at this airport. It opened in 1958 to monitor the sky for Russian missiles. It was abandoned in the late 1960’s when the technology became too obsolete to detect Russia’s newer missiles. The building has been vacant ever since. The 120,000 square feet in this building would provide plenty of room for electronic equipment to control these aircraft, and the lack of windows would make it impossible for people to realize that something was going on inside.

The Bumble Planes theory

A speculation on the Internet (The Bumble Planes) suggests that the pilots of all four flights were tricked into landing at an Air Force base, such as by telling the pilots that America is under attack and they must turn off their transponders and land. The planes became unidentified blips on the radar screens when the transponders were turned off. The military then sent an unidentified military plane to cross the path of each plane. The blips merged on the radar screens, and when they separated the controller watching the blips had no idea which blip was which plane.

After getting the four planes to the Air Force base, all passengers were loaded onto Flight 93, which had plenty of extra seats. Empty airplanes under remote control hit the towers and the Pentagon, and Flight 93 was flown to an area where it could be shot down.

Although I don’t see evidence that all four airplanes landed at the same location, the radar blips of Flight 11 and 175 may have merged over Stewart International Airport, and the planes may have landed there. Some variation of the Bumble Plane theory may explain what happened.

The seismic data from Building 7

If you recall, the graph of the seismic data for Building 7 (Figure 7-12) suggests that there were three phases to the collapse of this building. The third phase of the collapse is when the vibrations became larger, as if the building was collapsing for the second time. My explanation for that third phase is that the bunker had been loaded with explosives that were set to go off after the building had collapsed. This would guarantee that the bunker was completely destroyed. If a radio transmitter sent a homing signal to the airplanes, this second demolition would ensure the transmitter was destroyed, also.

Did the city want the towers destroyed?

Many reports claim that the World Trade Center was a financial burden on the city of New York. Some other people complained that the architecture of the World Trade Center was too bland and/or did not fit in with other buildings, and some landlords in the area complained that it had a negative effect on their income. This brings us to another area of mystery, secrecy, and rumors. Specifically, there are rumors that some New York City government officials wanted to demolish the World Trade Center many years ago.

The most affordable method to get rid of the World Trade Center is a conventional implosion in which small packages of explosives are used to shatter the building, which then drops vertically without hitting any other buildings. However, the insulation in the towers contained asbestos, and our environmental laws prohibit implosions of buildings that contain asbestos. Environmental laws require the asbestos to be removed before a building is imploded. The reason is that explosives pulverize a significant amount of the material in a building into a fine grained powder, but there are severe health risks involved with breathing powdered asbestos.

Many years ago some of the asbestos in the towers was encapsulated in plastic. In the early ‘80s much of the asbestos was supposedly removed. However, there was still asbestos in the building.

A couple of Internet sites claim that in September of 2000 the government asked for sealed bids on removing the remaining asbestos. It was referred to as:

Contract WTC-115.310 - “Removal and Disposal of Vinyl Asbestos Floor Tiles and Other Incidental Asbestos-Containing Building Materials” at the WTC, with bids due Tuesday, October 17, 2000.

That request to remove the asbestos is supposedly at the Internet site of The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, but I cannot get the link to work. Did the government delete the information because they considered it of no value to anybody? Or did they remove this information to reduce the chances that somebody would make a connection between their desire to destroy the towers and the subsequent destruction by a few terrorists? Or, am I misinterpreting the motives behind New York City’s attempt to remove the asbestos from the World Trade Center?

Supposedly, when the government discovered that it would be very expensive to remove the asbestos, they gave up on their ideas of imploding the World Trade Center. However, we should consider the possibility that many people in the New York area decided to circumvent our “ridiculous” environmental laws by exploding the buildings and pretending that it was due to a terrorist attack.

The attack on September 11 involved more than the destruction of the World Trade Center. There was an attack
on the Pentagon, and there was a plane that crashed in Pennsylvania. This leads us to conclude that the attack involved more than one group of people, and there was more than one motive. Some of the people in the New York area joined this scam to destroy the World Trade Center, while some military officials would have joined it in order to justify their budgets and wars. Since the attack would be blamed on Arabs, lots of Christians and Jews in different nations would have joined the scam simply to justify killing Arabs. Some people, including foreigners, may have joined the attack to remove the Taliban in an attempt to get oil pipelines to the Caspian Sea area. Other people may have joined this attack simply to profit from the sales of weapons.

**What caused the holes in Building 5 and 6?**

Christopher Bollyn of the *American Free Press* points out that the large hole in Building 6 (Figures 5-34, 6-4) is so deep (below ground level) that it was not likely to be from falling debris. It is also a clean hole, not a ragged hole (Figures 8-7, 8-8). Building 5 also has a peculiar hole.

The plane crashed into the North Tower at 8:46AM. Employees of Building 6 reacted to the crash by evacuating the building within a few minutes. Two police officers went to Building 6 to evacuate the building, but John Martuge of the US Customs insists that the employees decided to evacuate on their own, so the police were not needed. Let’s assume Martuge is correct that the employees were frightened and decided to evacuate on their own; this leads us to wonder why the police wanted to evacuate Building 6 so quickly. At the time only the North Tower had been hit by an airplane; nothing had hit the South Tower. Furthermore, there was no reason to believe the tower would fall down. Meanwhile, the people in the South Tower heard a message over their public address system that they had nothing to worry about and could remain inside. Why the rush to evacuate Building 6 but not the South Tower and other nearby buildings?

Several photos (Figure 1-1 is an example) show a plume of dust coming from near Buildings 5 and 6 as each tower collapsed (all cameras were too far away to determine the exact source of the dust). These plumes shot upwards with...
high velocity, while the rest of the dust spread outward. This implies the plumes of dust were under high pressure.

The collapse of the towers would have pushed dust and air into the underground passages, which would have increased the air pressure. Any explosives in the basement would have further increased the air pressure. The high pressure dust would have traveled underground, possibly causing damage to other buildings, utility lines, and subways. To minimize damage, a large vent to the underground area should be created. Is it just a coincidence that Building 6 shows a large hole that extends deep into the basement? Did the high pressure blow open that hole? Or did the Axis of Good put explosives in Building 6 to create a vent? If explosives created that hole, this could explain why the police rushed to evacuate Building 6.

Building 6 stood between the towers and Building 7, so if the Axis of Good was on the 23rd floor of Building 7, they might want to relieve the underground pressure before it reached Building 7. (Figure 3-1 gives a good view of the area) Perhaps the hole in Building 5 (Figure 6-4, page 69) was also a vent.

**Was Ramsi Yousef responsible for the 1993 bomb?**

The desire of the city to destroy the towers makes me wonder if the bomb that went off in 1993 at the bottom of the World Trade Center was a deliberate act to damage the World Trade Center so severely that the city would have justification to implode the towers. Did Ramsi Yousef really do that bombing? Or was he just a patsy?

Yousef supposedly wanted to topple one tower onto the other tower, but some reports mention that the bomb was not put in the correct location. Is this a coincidence? Was Yousef smart enough to make such a powerful bomb but too stupid to put it in the correct location? Furthermore, Salemeh was captured when he tried to get his deposit back on the van he rented to blow up the tower. How could he be both so stupid and so intelligent at the same time?

Perhaps the bomb was deliberately put in the wrong location because the Axis of Good did not truly want to topple the towers. Rather, they simply wanted to create such destruction that they had an excuse to get rid of the towers. And at the same time they would have an excuse to justify American involvement in the Mideast. However, just as the towers were so strong that they survived the airplane crashes in 2001, the towers were so strong that the 1993 bomb did not damage the towers enough to justify removing them.

**Why did the attack occur on September 11th?**

The military had been renovating a section of the Pentagon for years, and they wanted to hit that section in order to reduce casualties. However, by September of 2001 the renovation was almost complete. The military had only a few more weeks to do this scam.

September 11th was the day the residents of New York City were selecting candidates for a new mayor. Giuliani was going to be replaced. If Giuliani and/or his team were involved with this fake attack, the attack had to occur while they were in control of the city because the scam required control of the New York City police, fire, and other agencies in order to destroy the rubble.

After the attack Giuliani found reasons to extend his term as mayor during the period of emergency. He also struggled desperately to be important during this disaster, and for many months he was the center of attention. Time magazine gave him the honor of being “Person of the Year 2001” and “Mayor of the World.” Some people suggested that he become president. He was considered to be a great leader. At the other extreme, a book by Wayne Barrett (“Rudy!: An Investigative Biography of Rudolph Giuliani,” July, 2000) has a lot of information that Giuliani would probably want to remain a secret, such as his father was caught in the act of armed robbery, and after getting out of jail worked for a loan shark. The book also discusses aspects of Giuliani’s marriages and other relationships that a political candidate would prefer remain a secret.

**Why were the casualties so low?**

You do not need to know much about statistics to realize that something is unusual about the number of casualties. For example, the Pentagon is a very large building, and the portion that was being renovated was small. Therefore, the odds are that the terrorists would hit an area full of people, but they hit the section with the fewest people. Another example is that the terrorists hijacked four airplanes, and all four were extremely low on passengers, which is statistically unlikely. This implies that even the hijacking of the airplanes was a scam.

Only a couple thousand people died when the towers collapsed. Almost everybody in both towers evacuated. Hundreds–maybe thousands–of people had not arrived at work yet because some of the companies did not start work until after 8:45 in the morning. If the terrorists had decided to take a later flight, the buildings would have been full of people and tourists.

The low number of casualties is more evidence that the attack was a scam. The people who destroyed the towers deliberately waited until most of the people had evacuated. They knew when the buildings were evacuated because they were on the 23rd floor of Building 7. They could see the entire area, so they knew when people stopped coming out of the buildings. Sure, there were firemen inside the towers, but those firemen would be inside all day. They could not wait for the firemen to leave.
Figure 8-8  The interior of Building 6 and the rubble at the bottom of the hole.
Why did the South Tower collapse first?

The North Tower was hit by an airplane first, and its fires were the most severe. So why did the South Tower collapse first? My guess is:

- The collapses were supposed to appear realistic. This required the towers to collapse while the fires were burning. However, the fires in the South Tower were so small and there were so many firemen rushing in that there was a risk the fires would soon become insignificant. It would look suspicious if the fires vanished and then the tower crumbled.

- The Axis of Good waited for the people to evacuate the towers, and the South Tower was evacuated much sooner. One reason the South Tower was evacuated so quickly is that many people left it as soon as the plane hit the North Tower. The elevators were still working at that time, so they got out quickly. The people who remained in the South Tower until after the plane hit had to walk down the stairs, but because some people had already evacuated by elevator, there were fewer people trying to get down the stairs. This made it easier for them to get out.

By comparison, the stairways in the North Tower were so crowded with people that dozens or hundreds of people were still walking down the stairs when the South Tower collapsed.

Is our government too inept to be involved?

Some people complain to me the World Trade Center attack could not possibly be a scam because it would require too many people and too much effort. They point out that our government is so inept that they could not possibly have been involved with such a complex stunt.

Perhaps one of the best quotes to respond to these people comes from Mike Ruppert in interview on 19 April 2002:

"...the CIA, and FBI and all the intelligence agencies and the military are too incompetent to have pulled off this attack. But Osama bin Laden in a cave was capable of doing it?"

Ruppert points out a bizarre aspect of the attack that most people overlook. First, consider how devastating this attack was:

- Three expensive buildings crumbled; there was lots of damage to nearby buildings; the subway under the World Trade Center was damaged; and the electric substation in Building 7 was destroyed.
- A portion of the Pentagon was destroyed.
- Four airplanes were hijacked and destroyed.

Now consider that all this destruction is blamed on 19 Arabs, none of which were experienced pilots, and the mastermind is living in a cave in Afghanistan, and some rumors claim he is suffering from serious health problems. This small group of Arabs has such talent that they can create destruction in America that almost defies description.

Millions of Americans insist that 19 terrorists did all this by themselves, and at the same time they insist the attack was too complicated for Americans. However, if 19 Arabs could do this, 19 CIA agents could do it, also.

I think this attack required a lot more than 19 people. If it is truly possible for 19 people to do this much destruction, 500 people could destroy a complete state; 4000 people could destroy all of America, 10,000 people could destroy the world. You should hope that this attack was a scam, and that it required thousands of people, years of effort, and millions of dollars.

A lesson for architects

Every photograph of New York was dominated by the two, rectangular towers of the World Trade Center. Unfortunately, many people considered the towers to be architectural oddballs among the smaller buildings of lower Manhattan, some of which were much more decorative.

Ruppert points out a bizarre aspect of the attack that most people overlook. First, consider how devastating this attack was: