

The 9/11 Omission Report

Why were results of tweaked and unscientific tests used to help formulate the 9/11 Commission Report ?

An example of such dishonesty — **in an attempt to show that fireproofing was dislodged from the steel columns upon the plane impacts, NIST staff shot fifteen rounds from a shotgun at non-representative samples in a plywood box!**

Other examples of blatant disregard for scientific principles and truth came in the form of **inputting exaggerated data into modelling software in order to obtain the desired result — and a convenient graphic computer simulation that most will believe proves it must be true!**

Note—NIST just happens to be Government agency, belonging to the Dept of Commerce.

“Previous calculations by Engineers at MIT had shown that all the kinetic energy from the aircraft was consumed in breaking columns, crushing floors and destroying the aircraft itself.”

Former Underwriters Laboratories Executive, Kevin Ryan

Why was the 9/11 Commission so quick to accept the military's new position which lays the blame on the FAA for not giving them appropriate notice. For 3 years prior NORAD conceded they had been notified of the hijackings in time to intercept the last 3 planes to crash on 9/11.



In addition to the fact that the **FAA & NORAD are experienced in standard hijack and emergency protocols**, testimony strongly suggests the FAA carried out the appropriate procedures on the day and that the NORAD received enough warning to intercept at least 3 of the planes.

Intercepts occur regularly in response to pilots who, for example, are heading off course or who may have lost radio contact. Direct lines make it possible for the military to be contacted by the FAA almost immediately and have a jet airborne within minutes.

Around an hour and a half had elapsed since the first signs of the first hijacking, yet the most defended airspace in the world was penetrated at the Pentagon whilst Andrews Air Force Base sat silently only a few minutes away.

“We...had no way of evaluating the credibility of detainee information. How could we tell if someone such as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed...was telling us the truth?”

9/11 Commission Chair and Vice Chair, Thomas Kean and Lee Hamilton in *Without Precedent* (p119)

Why, was the Commission willing to accept information obtained through “interrogation” as evidence. **As we've seen in photos from Abu Ghraib and heard from released Guantanamo detainees “interrogation” can often mean torture, which is illegal under international law. How can evidence obtained in such a manner be acceptable—or reliable? The commission was refused access to the detainees or the interrogations.**

Government agency insiders tell us their numerous requests before 9/11 to investigate alleged hijackers (some of which were training at US flight schools and, in the case of 2 of them, even living with an FBI informant) were blocked.

Army reserve Lieutenant-Colonel A Shaffer, a top secret Pentagon project code-named Able Danger had identified Atta and three other 9/11 hijackers as members of an al-Qaeda cell more than a year before the attacks.