



No Hijackings

Whether there was actually a stand down centres around one unknown piece of info.

Was the airforce actually told in real time that there were hijacked planes at large?

Later in this mail, I'll present the evidence that there were no hijacked planes. But just for the moment, go with me on that and assume I'm right, and that the govt and media told us a retrospective lie about fictitious planes and fictitious flight paths.

If this is true, then the important question is:

Was the airforce told - in real time - the same lies that we were told retrospectively, about the sequence of hijackings? If they were, then the airforce must have been stood down. If they were not told, then there would have been nothing to scramble to. After its all over, and they've heard the same retrospective lies we have, then they all stand around scratching their heads wondering why there wasn't a scramble.

We have no direct evidence of either scenario, but I'm guessing the latter. If there's no hijacked planes, why complicate things by telling the airforce that there is, and then having to issue a stand down order to try to try to override standard intercept procedures, if specific info was given about the non-existent planes, or alternatively override what should have been a sensible reaction to a general alert, if non-specific info was given? Much simpler to just not tell them anything, and then leave them afterwards to wonder what went wrong, and feed them a whole lot of cover stories and excuses.

This is why I favour the idea of no stand down being necessary, although I am still open to the idea that there might have been, if someone can present some evidence for it.

But what needs to be realized is that no evidence has been presented for a stand down. The only serious research done on this was by TENC. That research was excellent as far as it went. But it was based entirely on deduction. It never presented a shred of direct evidence for such an order - or even any speculatively plausible mechanism for how such an order would have been formulated and implemented.

It simply deduced that because the gap between what should have happened and what did happen was so huge, that a stand down was the only reasonable explanation. This deduction was based on one important assumption. That there were actually hijacked planes. If there were none, then all the evidence for the stand down collapses.

TENC demonstrated that the official story in total was impossible to believe and that still stands. However, in retrospect, once one has established that, then TENC should have worked through all possibilities.

Possibility 1). There were hijacked planes, and the airforce was stood down.

2). There were no hijacked planes.

TENC made a fundamental error, in not even considering the second possibility. I'm not having a go at them, because at that time, no-one thought to consider that possibility - no one had conceived of how big the lie was, and they were at the cutting edge of analysis.

But in retrospect, a fully critical mind would have considered it, before jumping to the conclusion that the planes and hijackings were an indisputable fact.

The stand down conclusion is based entirely upon this assumption.

Subsequent research has shown it not to be the case.

Lets have a look at that.

Firstly, here's the documentation that AA11 and 77 did not exist. Its quite a short article so read that before continuing with the remaining points.

http://sydney.indymedia.org/front.php3?article_id=36354&group=webcast

OK, you've read that? So if AA 11 and 77 didn't exist, then its axiomatic that they can't have been hijacked. Now go to the FAA site and find the aircraft registry. Type in a search for the tail numbers that the planes were alleged to be. AA11 = N334AA, AA 77 = N644AA.

Both planes are registered as destroyed, but not until Jan 14 2002., when the FAA regulations state that this must be done on the date that they are totally destroyed. Sorry, no link for that offhand, but I've got one somewhere.

So the best deduction is that these two planes were ready to be retired. Whatever their method of destruction, and whatever the exact date of it, the official records say that they did not fly on Sept 11.

Now type in the tail numbers for the two UA planes. UA 93= N591UA, UA 175= N612UA.

Both planes are still registered as valid. Therefore , they've never crashed anywhere. Also the video of the 2nd WTC strike shows quite clearly that it was not a 767. Whatever your position on whether its a real plane or not, there is no case for it being a 767. The body shape is all wrong.

So there is not a shred of evidence that any of these planes followed anything like their alleged flight paths on the day. Therefore all the second hand stuff we have recieved through the media about alleged radar data is a pack of lies.

All we know is that AA11 and 77 didn't fly, and that UA93 and 175 did fly and didn't crash.

Now check these early reports before the cover story had settled down. You'll see that in respect of AA 77, they were making it up as they went along. It changed from type of plane "unknown" (p-leeze ! AA knows one of its planes is missing, and knows the flight number, but doesn;t know what kind of plane it is?), to a 767, to a 757.

Its variously reported to have hit the WTC, not even taken off until 1/2 hour after the second hit, and then to have hit the pentagon at 9.38 (which gives it about 8 minutes

to take off and fly 700 miles on its way to the pentagon.) The final story on it doesn't settle down for hours.

Note that early reports have it hitting the WTC. Note that UA 175 is the last plane to be "confirmed" as involved.

So the earliest information released was that AA 11 and 77 - two non-existent flights had hit the WTC and that 175 was unaccounted for.

At 9.17, I believe, the FAA started diverting flights. This would have included 175 and 93. We know they weren't crashed, so there is no reason to believe that they were hijacked.

So they would have been diverted to wherever it was, and landed safely - just like every other plane that was in the air at the time. Nothing was ever hijacked.

http://www.boston.com/news/packages/underattack/news/planes_reconstruction.htm

While little is known about what happened aboard Flight 175, because there wasn't the array of radio transmissions or cellphone calls, one member of the crew managed to get a message to the ground.

Around 8:50, Rich "Doc" Miles, the manager of United's system operations center in Chicago, received a call from an airline maintenance center in San Francisco that takes in-flight calls from flight attendants about broken items.

The mechanic said a female flight attendant called and said: "Oh my God. The crew has been killed, a flight attendant has been stabbed. We've been hijacked." Then the line went dead.

Miles, who by that time was aware of the American hijacking, answered, "No, the information we're getting is that it was an American 757."

The mechanic insisted, "No, we got a call from a flight attendant on 175."

Note the confusion in the cover story here. An "American 757" can only refer to AA 77. They are arguing over whether its 175 or 77.

And here it is more explicitly. AA 77 hit the WTC, 175 is missing.

<http://www.angelfire.com/home/pearly/htmls1/terror911.html>

- American Airlines told CNN that it lost two planes in "tragic accidents : " Flight 11 from Boston with 81 passengers and 11 crew aboard and Flight 77 from Washington Dulles airport with 58 passengers and six crew aboard. Both planes were en route to Los Angeles
- About an hour later, a plane crashed into the Pentagon, part of which later collapsed.
- United Airlines Flight 93 airliner headed from Newark, New Jersey, to San Francisco, crashed near Somerset, Pennsylvania -- police said initial reports indicated no survivors. It was not known if this was connected to the attacks. United

also said it was "deeply concerned" about Flight 175 from Boston to Los Angeles.

And even more explicit.

<http://www.b93.com/main.html?view=terror>

Flight 175 from Boston to LAX hijacked, status unknown Two United planes hijacked, one of them a 757 from Newark to San Francisco, crashes in Pennsylvania Two American Airlines planes were hijacked, both struck the World Trade Center, lost total of 156 people.

(Note 156 = 92 (Alleged AA11 numbers) + 64 (Alleged AA77 numbers))

<http://home.planet.nl/~mujje000/newyork/>

11:59 a.m.: United Airlines confirms that Flight 175, from Boston to Los Angeles, has crashed with 56 passengers and nine crew members aboard. It hit the World Trade Center's south tower.

Note the time of confirmation for 175 - Mid-day.

<http://www.cnn.com/2001/US/09/11/worldtrade.crash/>

A half-hour after the second crash, American Flight 77 took off from Washington, D.C.'s Dulles Airport en route to Los Angeles, California, carrying 58 passengers and six crew members -- but crashed into the Pentagon instead.

Impossible. That has it taking off at 9.33. So how did it fly all the way to Ohio, and back in 5 to 12 minutes, depending on which of the many varying times we are given about the pentagon strike? Some confusion is understandable, but they are clearly making this up as they go along.(BTW, why cant they make up their minds about whether the pentagon strike was at 9.38, 9.40,9.42, 9.43 or 9.45 ?)

http://traderplane.hypermart.net/public_html/archive01/01-09-07.htm

Both the aircraft in the attack on the WTC were American Airlines flights - Flight 11 a Boeing 767 with 81 on board from Boston to Los Angeles and Flight 77, aircraft type unknown, with 58 on board from Dulles to Los Angeles. ...

One hour after the first attack in New York, another airliner was flown into the section of the Pentagon building

At the same time it was reported that another aircraft, also a large commercial jets, had "crashed" - and United Airlines has confirmed that their Flight 175, a Boeing 757, from Boston to Los Angeles, crashed in Somerset County, Pennsylvania.

So now its 93 into the pentagon - at about 10.00 - and 175 in PA.

http://www.wcpo.com/specials/2001/americaattacked/news_local/story14.html

A Boeing 767 out of Boston made an emergency landing Tuesday at Cleveland Hopkins International Airport due to concerns that it may have a bomb aboard, said

Mayor Michael R. White.

White said the plane had been moved to a secure area of the airport, and was evacuated.

United identified the plane as Flight 93. The airline did say how many people were aboard the flight.

United said it was also "deeply concerned" about another flight, Flight 175, a Boeing 767, which was bound from Boston to Los Angeles.

So now 93 requested an emergency landing at Cleveland! As it turns out, this was actually delta 1989. How does a plane request an emergency landing without identifying itself? And how did DL 1989 become UA 93 ?

What this clearly demonstrates is that the early reports are a total schmozzle - making it up as they go along. And not surprising since two of the alleged flights didn't even exist and the other two didn't crash. All the stuff we've been told about flight paths and radar are a pack of lies. The cover stories didn't fully settle down until Sept 12. But what's reasonably consistent in the early reports is that AA 77 hit the WTC and 175 was unaccounted for.

So, to summarize - two fictitious flights are blamed for the WTC strikes, and the FAA immediately starts diverting flights - including 175 and 93, which land somewhere. No hijackings.

The Cleveland Airport Mystery

<http://inn.globalfreepress.com/modules/news/article.php?storyid=323>

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the articles posted on this website are distributed for their included information without profit for research and/or educational purposes only. This website has no affiliation whatsoever with the original sources of the articles nor are we sponsored or endorsed by any of the original sources.