

CONSENSUS 9/11:

THE 9/11 BEST EVIDENCE PANEL



The 9/11 Consensus Points

Consensus911.org

Factual Evidence Contradicts the Official Story

The official account of the events of September 11, 2001, has been used:

- to justify the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq; which have resulted in the deaths of [millions](#) of people;
- to authorize torture, military tribunals, and extraordinary rendition; and
- to suspend freedoms guaranteed by the American Constitution such as *habeas corpus* in the USA, and similar freedoms in Canada, the UK, and other countries.

The official claims regarding 9/11 are contradicted by facts that have been validated by a scientific consensus process, and which include the following points of "best evidence":

Point 1: A Claim Regarding Osama bin Laden

The Official Account

Osama bin Laden [was responsible](#) for the 9/11 attacks.

The Best Evidence

The FBI [did not list](#) 9/11 as one of the terrorist acts for which Osama bin Laden is wanted.

When asked why, Rex Tomb, when he was the head of investigative publicity for the FBI, [stated](#) that the FBI had [no hard evidence](#) connecting Bin Laden to 9/11.

Also, although Secretary of State Colin Powell, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, and the 9/11 Commission [promised](#) to provide evidence of Bin Laden's responsibility for the 9/11 attacks, they also [failed](#).

Point 2: A Claim about the Destruction of the Twin Towers: Impact, Jet Fuel, And Fire Only

The Official Account

The Twin Towers were [brought down by](#) airplane impacts, jet fuel, and office fires.

The Best Evidence

Experience, based on physical observation and scientific knowledge, shows that office fires, even with the aid of jet fuel, could not have reached temperatures greater than 1,800 degrees Fahrenheit (1,000 degrees Celsius).

But multiple [scientific reports](#) show that metals in the Twin Towers melted. These metals included steel, iron, and molybdenum - which normally do not melt until they reach 2,700°F (1482°C), 2,800°F (1538°C), and 4,753°F (2,623°C), respectively.

Point 3: A Claim about the Destruction of the Twin Towers: Impact, Fire, and Gravity Only

The Official Account

The Twin Towers were destroyed by three and only three causes: the impacts of the airliners, the resulting fires, and [gravity](#).

The Best Evidence

During the destruction of the Twin Towers, huge sections of the perimeter steel columns, weighing many tons, were ejected horizontally as far as 500 to 600 feet, as seen in multiple [photographs](#) and [maps](#). These high-speed ejections of heavy structural members cannot be explained by the fires, the pull of gravity, or the airplane impacts (which had occurred about an hour earlier).

[Human bone fragments](#) approximately 1 cm long were found in abundance on the roof of the Deutsche Bank following the Towers' destruction, which further points to the use of explosives. Pancaking or tamping of floors from above would tend to trap bodies, not hurl splintered bones over 500 feet horizontally.

Point 4: A Claim Excluding Explosions in the Twin Towers

The Official Account

NIST [wrote](#) as if no one – including members of the Fire Department of New York – gave evidence of explosions in the Twin Towers.

The Best Evidence

Over 100 of the roughly 500 members of the FDNY who were at the site that day [reported](#) what they described as explosions in the Twin Towers. Similar [reports](#) were given by journalists, police officers, and WTC employees.

Point 5: A Second Claim Excluding Explosives in the Twin Towers

The Official Account

On 9/11, the Twin Towers came down because of damage produced by the impact of the planes combined with fires ignited by the jet fuel. After burning for 101 and 56 minutes,

respectively, the north and south towers came down rapidly but [without the aid](#) of explosives.

The Best Evidence

The Twin Towers were [built](#) to withstand the impacts of airliners having approximately the size and speed of those that struck them. And office fires, even if fed by jet fuel (which is essentially kerosene), [could not have weakened](#) the steel structure of these buildings sufficiently to collapse as suddenly as they did.

Only the top sections of these buildings were damaged by the impacts and the resulting fires, whereas their steel structures, much heavier towards the base, were [like pyramids](#) in terms of strength. So the official account, which ruled out explosives, cannot explain why these buildings completely collapsed.

Point 6: The Claim that WTC 7 Collapsed from Fire Alone

The Official Account

NIST [originally suggested](#) that WTC 7 was brought down by structural damage combined with a raging fire fed by diesel fuel. However, in its [Final Report](#) (of November 2008), NIST declared that neither diesel fuel nor structural damage played a role in this building's collapse, and that this building, which was not struck by a plane, was brought down by fire alone.

The Best Evidence

Before or after 9/11, [no steel-frame high-rise building](#) had ever collapsed due to fire. If fire were to cause such a building to collapse, the onset would be gradual, whereas the videos show that WTC 7, after being completely stable, suddenly came down in virtual free fall. This building's straight-down, symmetrical collapse, with the roofline remaining essentially horizontal, shows that all 82 of WTC 7's support columns had been eliminated by the time the top started down.

Point 7: The Claim in NIST's Draft Report that WTC 7 Did Not Come Down at Free Fall Acceleration

The Official Account

Having denied for years that WTC 7 came down at free fall acceleration, NIST repeated this position in August 2008, when it issued a [report](#) on WTC 7 in the form of a *Draft for Public Comment*.

Shyam Sunder, the head of NIST's WTC project, [said](#) – speaking within the framework of its claim that the building was brought down by fire – that free fall would have been physically impossible.

The Best Evidence

[Scientific analysis](#) by mathematician David Chandler shows that WTC 7 came down in absolute free fall for a period of about 2.25 seconds. NIST's *Draft for Public Comment* had been challenged by Chandler and Dr. Steven Jones in a public review, and NIST then re-analyzed the fall of WTC 7.

In its [Final Report](#), NIST provided a detailed analysis and graph that conceded that WTC 7 came down at free-fall acceleration for over 100 feet, or about 2.25 seconds, consistent with the findings of Chandler and Jones.

Point 8: The Claim in NIST's Final Report that WTC 7 Came Down in Free Fall Without Explosives

The Official Account

In its [Final Report](#) on WTC 7, issued in November 2008, NIST finally acknowledged that WTC 7 had entered into free fall for more than two seconds. NIST continued to say, however, that WTC 7 was brought down by fire, with no aid from explosives.

The Best Evidence

[Scientific analysis](#) shows that a free-fall collapse of a steel-framed building could not be produced by fire, that is, without explosives (a fact that NIST's lead investigator, Shyam Sunder [acknowledged](#) in his discussions of NIST's Draft Report for Public Comment in August 2008).

Point 9: The Claim that the World Trade Center Dust Contained No Thermite Materials

The Official Account

Although NIST [did not perform](#) any tests to determine whether there were incendiaries (such as thermite) or explosives (such as RDX and nanothermite) in the WTC dust, it [claimed](#) that such materials were not present.

The Best Evidence

Unreacted nanothermitic material, "which can be [tailored](#) to behave as an incendiary (like ordinary thermite), or as an [explosive](#)," was found in four [independently collected](#) samples of the WTC dust (as [reported](#) in a multi-author paper in a peer-reviewed journal).

Point 10: A Claim Regarding Hijacked Passenger Jets

The Official Account

The *9/11 Commission Report* [holds](#) that four airplanes (American Airlines flights 11 and 77, and United Airlines flights 93 and 175) were hijacked on 9/11.

The Best Evidence

Pilots are trained to "squawk" the universal [hijack code \(7500\)](#) on a transponder if they receive evidence of an attempted hijacking, thereby notifying FAA controllers on the

ground. But [leading newspapers](#) and the [9/11 Commission](#) pointed out that FAA controllers were not notified.

A [CNN story](#) said that pilots are trained to send the hijack code "if possible." But entering the code takes only two or three seconds, whereas it took hijackers, according to the official story, [more than 30 seconds](#) to break into the pilots' cabin of Flight 93.

The fact that [not one](#) of the eight pilots performed this required action casts serious doubt on the hijacker story.

Point 11: The Claim That Flight 93 Crashed near Shanksville, Pennsylvania

The Official Account

The 9/11 Commission [reported](#) that United Flight 93, having been taken over by an al-Qaeda pilot, was flown at a high speed and steep angle into a field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

In response to claims that United Airlines Flight 93 was shot down, the US military and the FBI said that United 93 was *not* shot down.

The Best Evidence

Residents, the mayor, and journalists near Shanksville reported that [no airliner was visible](#) at the designated crash site; that contents were found as far as [eight miles](#) from the designated crash site; and that parts – including a [thousand-pound engine piece](#) – were found over a mile away.

Point 12: The Claim Regarding Hani Hanjour as Flight 77 Pilot

The Official Account

The *911 Commission Report* [holds](#) that American Flight 77, a Boeing 757, was flown by al-Qaeda pilot Hani Hanjour into the Pentagon. After disengaging the autopilot, he executed a 330-

degree downward spiral through 7000 feet in about three minutes, then flew into Wedge 1 of the Pentagon between the first and second floors at 530 mph.

The Best Evidence

Several former airliner pilots have [stated](#) that Hanjour could not possibly have maneuvered a large airliner through the trajectory allegedly taken by Flight 77 and then hit the Pentagon between the first and second floors without touching the lawn.

Point 13: The Claim about the Time of Dick Cheney's Entry into the White House Bunker

The Official Account

Vice President Dick Cheney took charge of the government's response to the 9/11 attacks after he entered the PEOC (the Presidential Emergency Operations Center), a.k.a. "the bunker".

The *9/11 Commission Report* [said](#) that Cheney did not enter the PEOC until almost 10:00 AM, which was at least 20 minutes after the violent event at the Pentagon that killed more than 100 people.

The Best Evidence

Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta [told](#) the 9/11 Commission that, after he joined Cheney and others in the bunker at approximately 9:20 AM, he listened to an ongoing conversation between Cheney and a young man, which took place when "the airplane was coming into the Pentagon."

After the young man, having reported for the third time that the plane was coming closer, asked whether "the orders still stand," Cheney emphatically said they did. The *9/11 Commission Report*, by claiming that Cheney did not enter the PEOC until long after the Pentagon was damaged, implies that this exchange between Cheney and the young man – which can most naturally be understood as Cheney's confirmation of a stand-down order – could not have occurred.

However, testimony that Cheney was in the PEOC by 9:20 was reported not only by Mineta but also by [Richard Clarke](#) and White House photographer [David Bohrer](#). [Cheney himself](#), speaking on "Meet the Press" five days after 9/11, reported that he had entered the PEOC before the Pentagon was damaged.

The 9/11 Commission's attempt to bury the exchange between Cheney and the young man confirms the importance of Mineta's report of this conversation.

References:

Millions:

G. Burnham, R. Lafta, S. Doocy, and L. Roberts, "[Mortality after the 2003 invasion of Iraq: A cross-sectional cluster sample survey](#)," *Lancet*, October 11, 2006: 21;368 (9545):1421-28.

Source: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore. This epidemiological study estimated 654,965 excess deaths in Iraq related to the war, or 2.5% of the population, through the end of June 2006.

Dr. Gideon Polya, author of *Body Count: Global Avoidable Mortality Since 1950*, estimated by January 2010 that more than four million Afghans died (from both violent and non-violent causes) since the 2001 invasion, who would not have died without the invasion. See: "[January 2010 - 4.5 Million Dead in Afghan Holocaust, Afghan Genocide](#)."

Dr. Gideon Polya, "[Iraqi Holocaust: 2.3 Million Iraqi Excess Deaths](#)," March 21, 2009.

Was responsible: [The 9/11 Commission Report](#) (2004).

Did not list: Federal Bureau of Investigation, "[Most Wanted Terrorists](#)."

Stated: Ed Haas, "[FBI says, 'No Hard Evidence Connecting Bin Laden to 9/11'](#)" *Muckraker Report*, June 6, 2006.

No hard evidence:

Federal German Judge Dieter Deiseroth, in a December 2009 statement, stated that [no independent court](#) has verified the evidence against bin Laden.

"[Bush rejects Taliban offer to hand Bin Laden over](#)," *Guardian*, October 14, 2001. The Taliban said they would turn bin Laden over if the US provided evidence of his guilt.

"[Taliban Met With U.S. Often](#): Talks centered on ways to hand over bin Laden," *Washington Post*, October 29, 2001. The Taliban asked for evidence of bin Laden's guilt but it was not forthcoming.

"[The investigation and the evidence](#)," *BBC News*, October 5, 2001. "There is no direct evidence in the public domain linking Osama Bin Laden to the 11 September attacks."

Promised:

Powell: "[Meet the Press](#)," NBC, September 23, 2001.

Blair: Tony Blair: Office of the Prime Minister, "[Responsibility for the Terrorist Atrocities in the United States](#)," *BBC News*, October 4, 2001

Failed:

Powell: "[Remarks by the President, Secretary of the Treasury O'Neill and Secretary of State Powell on Executive Order](#)," White House, September 24, 2001.

Seymour M. Hersh, "[What Went Wrong: The C.I.A. and the Failure of American Intelligence](#)," *New Yorker*, October 1, 2001.

Blair: Tony Blair: Office of the Prime Minister, "[Responsibility for the Terrorist Atrocities in the United States](#)," *BBC News*, October 4, 2001. The government's document stated that it "does not purport to provide a prosecutable case against Osama Bin Laden in a court of law."

[9/11 Commission Report](#) (2004). All statements of bin Laden's responsibility were based on interrogations of KSM, under torture. See *9/11 Commission Report* notes at Ch. 5, notes 1, 10, 11, 16, 32, 40, and 41.

Brought down by: NIST, [Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers](#), September 2005, p. 15. Regarding airplane impacts, see pp. 150-51; Jet fuel, pp. 24, 42; Fires, pp. 91, 127, 183.

Scientific reports:

RJ Lee Group, "[WTC Dust Signature Study: Composition and Morphology](#)," December 2003, p. 21.

RJ Lee Group, "[WTC Dust Signature](#)," Expert Report, May 2004, p. 12.

Heather A. Lowers and Gregory P. Meeker, US Geological Survey, US Department of the Interior, "[Particle Atlas of World Trade Center Dust](#)," 2005.

Steven E. Jones et al., "[Extremely High Temperatures during the World Trade Center Destruction](#)," *Journal of 9/11 Studies* 19 (January 2008).

For discussion and summary, see David Ray Griffin, *The Mysterious Collapse of World Trade Center 7*, pp. 39-44.

Gravity: NIST, [Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers](#), September 2005, 144-45.

Photographs: The Scientists for 9/11 Truth website shows a [photo](#) of "Impaled Steel Columns at the 20th Floor of the World Financial Center Building 3 (WFC3)."

See also [video one](#) and [video two](#) showing horizontal ejections.

Maps: In addition to WFC 3 (American Express Building), the [FEMA Report, "7. Peripheral Buildings"](#), shows that similar debris hit the Winter Gardens, 500-600 feet distant, and includes a map showing the location of these buildings:

Human bone fragments: "[Remains bring hope, frustration for 9/11 families](#)," *USA Today*, April 20, 2006.

Wrote: NIST, "[Answers to Frequently Asked Questions](#)," August 30, 2006, Question 2.

Reported: Graeme MacQueen, "[118 Witnesses: The Firefighters' Testimony to Explosions in the Twin Towers](#)," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, Vol. 2/August 2006, 47-106.

Reports by journalists, police officers, WTC employees: David Ray Griffin, "[Explosive Testimony: Revelations about the Twin Towers in the 9/11 Oral Histories](#)," 911Truth.org, January 18, 2006.

Without the aid: "NIST found no corroborating evidence for alternative hypotheses suggesting that the WTC towers were brought down by controlled

demolition using explosives planted prior to September 11, 2001." NIST NCSTAR 1, [Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers](#), September 2005, p. xxxviii.

Built:

Federal Emergency Management Agency, (2002), [World Trade Center Building Performance Study](#): Data Collection, Preliminary Observations, and Recommendations.

["Towers collapse shocks engineers,"](#) *MedServ*, 9/11/01.

["Twin Towers Engineered To Withstand Jet Collision,"](#) *Seattle Times*, February 2, 1993.

Could not have weakened: ["Twin Tower Fires Not Hot Enough to Melt or Weaken Steel."](#)

Like pyramids: Architect Mario Salvadori explains: "The load on the columns increases with the number of floors of the building, and their weight must vary in the same proportion." (Dr. Mario Salvadori, "Why Buildings Stand Up" [New York: W.W. Norton, 1980], p. 117). The lower the floors, the stronger the steel structures. So even if the impacts and fires had caused the top sections of these buildings to collapse, the collapses would have been arrested by the lower floors.

Originally suggested:

FEMA, World [Trade Center Building Performance Study](#), Ch. 5, Sect. 6.2, "Probable Collapse Sequence."

Debunking 9/11 Myths: Why Conspiracy Theories Can't Stand Up to the Facts: An In-Depth Investigation by Popular Mechanics, ed. David Dunbar and Brad Reagan (New York: Hearst Books, 2006), 53-58. This semi-official book contained quotations from NIST showing what it was thinking at the time.

Final Report: NIST NCSTAR 1A, [Final Report on the Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7](#) (brief report), November 2008, xxxv. In NIST's words, the collapse of WTC 7 was "the first known instance of the total collapse of a tall building primarily due to fires."

No steel-framed high-rise building: See a [discussion](#) of other skyscraper fires, and see videos [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#).

Report: NIST NCSTAR 1-9, [Structural Fire Response and Probable Collapse Sequence of World Trade Center Building 7. Draft for Public Comment](#). August 2008.

Sunder said: "...you had a sequence of structural failures that had to take place. Everything was not instantaneous" ("WTC 7 Technical Briefing," NIST, August 26, 2008). Although NIST originally had a video and a transcript of this briefing at its Internet website, it removed both of them. However, the video is now available [elsewhere](#). Also available is its transcript, under the title "[NIST Technical Briefing on Its Final Draft Report on WTC 7 for Public Comment](#)."

Scientific analysis: David Chandler, "[WTC7: NIST Finally Admits Freefall](#)," Part I, December 7, 2008, at 9:07. Chandler's report of free fall was supported by NIST itself: NIST NCSTAR 1A, [Final Report on the Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7](#) (brief report), November 2008, p. 45.

Final Report: NIST NCSTAR 1A, [Final Report on the Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7](#) (brief report), November 2008, p. 45.

Final Report: NIST NCSTAR 1A, [Final Report on the Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7](#) (brief report), November 2008, p. 45.

Scientific analysis: Chandler, "[WTC7: NIST Finally Admits Freefall \(Part III\)](#)," January 2, 2009, at 1:19 minutes.

This analysis has been confirmed by NIST itself, in "Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation," NIST, August 2008 (originally at www.nist.gov/public_affairs/factsheet/wtc_qa_082108.html). This version of the document, which was posted at NIST's website at the time its Draft version of its WTC 7 report was published, has been replaced by a version that was updated [September 17, 2010](#), in which NIST continues to acknowledge a 2.25-second stage of "gravitational acceleration (free fall)."

Acknowledged: Sunder said: "[A] free fall time would be [the fall time of] an object that has no structural components below it. . . . [T]he . . . time that it took . . . for those 17 floors to disappear [was roughly 40 percent longer than free fall]. And that is not at all unusual, because there was structural resistance that was provided in this particular case. And you had a sequence of structural failures that had to take place. Everything was not instantaneous" ("WTC 7 Technical Briefing," NIST, August 26, 2008). Although NIST originally had a video and a transcript of this briefing at its Internet website, it removed both of them. However, the video is now available [elsewhere](#). Also available is its transcript, under the title "[NIST Technical Briefing on Its Final Draft Report on WTC 7 for Public Comment](#)."

Did not perform: NIST, [Answers to Frequently Asked Questions](#) (August 30, 2006), Question 12.

Claimed: NIST conducted only a hypothetical experiment and "found no evidence of any blast events." NIST NCSTAR 1-9. [Structural Fire Response and Probable Collapse Sequence of World Trade Center Building 7, Draft for Public Comment](#). August 2008, p. 357.

Tailored: The quoted phrase is from Dr. Niels Harrit, Associate Professor of Chemistry at the Nano-Science Center, University of Copenhagen. Email to Elizabeth Woodworth, copied to Dr. David Ray Griffin, June 19, 2011.

Explosive: [The Amptiac Quarterly Newsletter](#) from the Spring of 2002 said: 'The 221st National Meeting of the American Chemical Society held during April 2001 in San Diego featured a symposium on Defense Applications of Nanomaterials. One of the 4 sessions was titled Nanoenergetics. This session featured speakers from government labs (DOD and DOE) and academia. . . . A number of topics were covered, including . . . Metastable Intermolecular Composites (MICs), sol-gels, and structural nanomaterials. . . . At this point in time, all of the military services and some DOE and academic laboratories have active R&D programs aimed at exploiting the unique properties of nanomaterials that have potential to be used in energetic formulations for advanced explosives and propellant applications. . . . [N]anomaterials, especially nanoenergetics, could be used for improving components of munitions. . . . [N]anoenergetics hold promise as useful ingredients for the thermobaric (TBX) and TBX-like weapons, particularly due to their high degree of tailorability with regards to energy release and impulse management"' (pp. 43-44).

Independently collected: Dr. Steven Jones discusses the "chain of custody" of the dust samples in "[9/11: Explosive Testimony Exclusive, Part 1](#)," at 3:30 and 7:58 minutes, and at 0 minutes at [Part 2 of 2](#).

Reported: Niels H. Harrit, Jeffrey Farrer, Steven E. Jones, Kevin R. Ryan, Frank M. Legge, Daniel Farnsworth, Gregg Roberts, James R. Gourley, and Bradley R. Larsen, "[Active Thermitic Material Observed in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe](#)," *The Open Chemical Physics Journal*, 2009, 2: 7-31.

Holds: [9/11 Commission Report](#) (2004), Chapter 1.

Hijack code (7500):

Ref: "To facilitate NORAD tracking, every attempt shall be made to ensure that the hijacked aircraft is squawking Mode 3/A, code 7500." Source: Federal Aviation Administration, "[Order 7610.4J: Special Military Operations, Chapter 7. ESCORT OF HIJACKED AIRCRAFT](#)," July 12, 2001.

Ref: "[Hijack Code a Secret Signal of Distress](#)," ABC News, June 3, 2005.

Leading newspapers: The *Christian Science Monitor* reported the failure to squawk as an "anomaly" (Peter Grier, "[The Nation Reels](#)," *Christian Science Monitor*, September 12, 2001).

9/11 Commission: [The 9/11 Commission Report](#) itself acknowledged the failure: "FAA guidance to controllers on hijack procedures assumed that the aircraft pilot would notify the controller via radio or by "squawking" a transponder code of "7500" – the universal code for a hijack in progress," p.17.

CNN Story: "Flight 11 was hijacked apparently by knife-wielding men. Airline pilots are trained to handle such situations by keeping calm, complying with requests, and if possible, dialing in an emergency four digit code on a device called a transponder. . . . The action takes seconds, but it appears no such code was entered." ("[America Under Attack: How could It Happen?](#)" CNN Live Event, September 12, 2001).

More than 30 seconds: According to the purported tapes from the cockpit recorder of United 93, it took over 30 seconds for the intruders to break into the pilot's cabin (Richard A. Serrano, "[Heroism, Fatalism Aboard Flight 93](#)," *Los Angeles Times*, April 12, 2006). Flight 11's failure to squawk is discussed [here](#). It clearly would have been "possible" for the pilots to have squawked the hijack code. According to a famous Sherlock Holmes story, the theory about an intruder in a racing stable was disproved by "the dog that didn't bark." The intruder theory about the 9/11 airliners, one could say by analogy, is disproved by the pilots that did not squawk.

Not one: For discussion, see David Ray Griffin, *The New Pearl Harbor Revisited*, 2008, pp. 175-79.

Reported: [9/11 Commission Report](#), 2004, p. 14.

No airliner was visible:

["9/11 Flight 93 Shanksville: Mayor Says No Plane Crashed."](#)

["9/11 Flight 93 Shanksville: No Plane, No Crash."](#) A 1994 US Geological Survey showed the same crater and scar that was allegedly left by the crash of Flight 93.

["Flight 93 Crash Exposed: Rare Footage Never Again Seen on TV."](#)

"Nothing there except a hole in the ground."

Eight miles:

Bill Heltzel and Tom Gibb, "[2 Planes Had No Part in Crash of Flight 93](#)," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, September 16, 2001: "Debris from the crash has been found up to 8 miles from the crash site."

"[America Under Attack](#): FBI and State Police Cordon Off Debris Area Six to Eight Miles from Crater Where Plane Went Down," CNN, September 13, 2001.

Debra Erdley, "[Crash Debris Found 8 Miles Away](#)," *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review*, September 14, 2001.

[Thousand-pound engine piece](#): Richard Wallace, "[What Did Happen to Flight 93?](#)" *Daily Mirror*, September 12, 2002.

For further discussion, see David Ray Griffin, *The New Pearl Harbor Revisited*, 2008, pp. 120-21.

[Holds](#):

[9/11 Commission Report](#) (2004), pp. 225, 334.

National Transportation Safety Board, "[Flight Path Study – American Airlines Flight 77](#)" (February 19, 2002). The NTSB video is available on [YouTube](#).

[Stated](#):

See [Commanders Ted Muga and Ralph Kolstad](#), where Pilots and Aviation Professionals Question the *9/11 Commission Report*, at "Patriots Question 9/11."

Russ Wittenberg, who flew large commercial airliners for 35 years after serving in Vietnam as a fighter pilot, says it would have been "totally impossible for an amateur who couldn't even fly a Cessna" to have flown that downward spiral and then "crash into the Pentagon's first floor wall without touching the lawn."

"[Former Vietnam Combat and Commercial Pilot Firm Believer 9/11 Was Inside Government Job](#)," *Lewis News*, January 8, 2006.

Ralph Omholt, a former 757 pilot, said: "The idea that an unskilled pilot could have flown this trajectory is simply too ridiculous to consider."

[Said](#): [9/11 Commission Report](#) (2004), note 213, p. 464.

[Told](#): "[911 Commission: Trans. Sec. Norman Mineta Testimony](#)"

[Richard Clarke](#): Richard Clarke, *Against all Enemies* (New York: Free Press, 2004), pp. 2-5.

[David Bohrer](#): See "[9/11: Interviews by Peter Jennings](#)," *ABC News*, September 11, 2002.

[Cheney himself](#): "[The Vice President Appears on Meet the Press with Tim Russert](#)," *MSNBC*, September 16, 2001.