Mid-Air Hijacking: The Planes and Passengers on 9/11

By James Philps

Abstract: *The world does not yet understand what happened to the crew and passengers aboard the four jetliners reportedly hijacked on September 11th, 2001. The narrative adopted by the government is full of contradictions and inconsistencys. This is true of all its aspects, including the total collapse of three World Trade Centers, the disappearance of $2.3 trillion from the Pentagon, and many other salient points. But even within the 9/11 truth movement, there has been a peculiar inability to agree on exactly what happened. As of this date, there are four main theories concerning the fates of the planes and passengers. None have managed to present a coherant, self-consistent narrative which fortifys its claims. Therefore, each will need to be discussed and compared against one another, utilising principles outlined in the philosophy of science. In this way, a consensus can be reached to determine which scenario is the most probable.*

Table of Contents

Introductions

According to the story put forth by the 9/11 Commission Report, on the morning of September 11th, 2001, 19 Islamic terrorists entered three airports in the eastern United States. The airports in question were Boston Logan, Washington Dulles, and Newark International. The terrorists were members of the Al Qaeda group who had undergone special training on the

order of Osama bin Laden. Their mission was to hijack commercial airliners and use them as guided missiles, destroying various targets. All four aircraft that were allegedly hijacked had been scheduled to travel on a transcontinental route, which ensured that large amounts of flammable jet fuel would be released upon impact with their targets. The attack pattern supposedly adopted by the terrorists was one which America's air defense system was poorly prepared to deal with. Astonishing though it may seem, up until that time, there was no formal system in place for military intercepts of civilian aircraft outside of the oceanic airspace known as ADIZ, or Air-Defense-Interdiction-Zone. [1] The use of multiple, simultaneous suicide hijackings would ensure that the agencies responsible for protecting America's skies would be overcome with confusion and indecision. Upon the operation's commencement, all four of the jet aircraft were successfully boarded, commandeered, and redirected by the hijackers.

Three of them managed to evade the US Air Force and slam into their targets with impunity, destroying the entire World Trade Center (WTC) complex, and wedge 1 of the Pentagon. The fourth, we are told, was the scene of a violent struggle between the terrorists and passengers, which resulted in its crashing into an empty field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, killing everyone on board. All in all, the tale espoused by the 9/11 commission report was a drama fit for a Hollywood blockbuster. The surprise attacks would immediately set the United States on a collission course with Islamic terror groups. Faithfully retold in countless books and documentaries, the official story of September 11th surmised that America was being targeted for her 'greatness' by jealous third worlders. The public was told that this was a different kind of war, which required great patience and compliance on the part of American citizens. In order to preserve the countrys existence, they were expected to sacrifice many liberties. Unfortunately, there is every indication that this entire tale is a fabrication. Doubts about the extent of Al Qaeda's involvement in the attacks were raised from the beginning. In the Arabic world especially, questions were raised about how this group had managed to pull off such a spectacularly successful operation without insider assistance. There was also mounting evidence disputing the claim that the government had no forewarning of the attacks.

The dispute went to such an extent, in fact, that members of the Bush administration were forced to step forward, reassuring the public that incontrovertible proof against Al Qaeda and its leaders would be presented

in due time. For example, on September 23, 2001, Colin Powell stated in an interview with NBC that, "...In the near future we will be able to put out a paper, a document that will describe quite clearly the evidence we have linking him (bin Laden) to the attack." [2] But in fact, no such white paper was ever compiled, let alone released for scrutiny. America's leaders made a half hearted attempts to convince the leaders of Afghanistan to turn Osama bin Laden into their custody, but they failed to satisfy the burden of proof for their accusations. Instead, they decided to launch a unilateral war against terrorism. A term that gave the administration leeway to go anywhere and do anything. The war saw the invasion of Afghanistan barely a month after the towers fell, and the invasion or Iraq just a year and a half later. At a time when entire nations were destroyed in the Wests crazed hunt for these individuals, the case against bin Laden was in a shambles. Indeed, the shocking failure to provide any evidence that the 19 Al Qaeda operatives had even entered the three targeted airports [3], much less boarded the planes and then hijacked them, hints that the central premise of the official story is deeply flawed. None of its proponents has bothered to explain why the Al Qaeda leadership had, during the selection process in 2000-2001, chosen men who were so poorly suited for this operation. [4]

This questionable lineup of characters included hijacker pilots who could not fly, and muscle hijackers who could not fight. Another inconvenient fact throwing doubt upon the tale of Arabic terrorists is that, according to the 9/11 Commission, there is no known way for the men to have broken into the cockpit [5], certainly not before the pilots could have transmitted the four digit hijack code (and instantly alerted NORAD and the FAA to the situation). A number of other important aspects of the planes behaviour are incapable of being reconciled with the official story, such as their unerringly accurate final maneuvers, their strange physical appearance, and the fact that key 'hijacking' events amongst unfolded in a synchronised fashion, which is difficult to explain without central command. [6] This evidential vacuum is disquieting in the extreme, considering the monumental policy decisions taken on behalf of the official narrative. If the theory of 19 Islamic hijackers is to be rejected, then an opposing theory must take its place. For all intents and purposes, there are three contending hypothesis' on the table. All of them are premised on the notion that there was a significant degree of government complicity in the attacks. There is Electronic Hijacking, No Planes, and Drone Swap. This paper will be broken up into five main sections: Three sections will introduce the three contending theorys and explain their claims and predictions. Two further sections will compare and

scrutinise them for consistency.

Section 2.1: Electronic Hijacking

The first of the three theorys to be examined is electronic hijacking, probably the most popular among 9/11 researchers. The reasoning is simple. All modern jetliners have sophisticated flight control computers, which allow the aircraft to be flown with all the precision of a human pilot. More insidiously, the autopilot feature can be made to over-ride human control and navigate the aircraft to a given destination, with co-ordinates fed to it from the flight management control system. [7] This can be arranged via a Trojan horse program installed into the FMCS, and disguised as something innocuous like a stall-recovery program. In this way, proponents believe that the four jetliners were steered to destruction by their own autopilots. Unfortunately, there are a number of technical difficultys that render this scenario implausible. Many of these are detailed in the skeptical paper, Remote Takeover On 9/11. [8] Although the article was authored by someone who tacitly accepts the official story, it provides a suitable background through which the feasibility of electronic hijacking can be assessed. The author does well to clarify just how thoroughly the flight crews of commercial airliners are trained, and on how the aircraft themselves are run by a complex and redundant web of structures that combine to reduce the possibility of mechanical failures -and hence sabotage- to a minimum. The aircraft involved in the September 11th attacks were Boeing 767s and 757s. They rely near exclusively on hydraulically assisted mechanical controls, which makes any takeover attempt of them exponentially more difficult.

Without a complete redesign of the whole aircraft (spanning many weeks or months at least), the pilots would still retain a significant range of options through which they can regain control of their aircraft This harsh technical reality has not been factored into the theorys promoted by researchers like Aidan Monaghan, whose work focuses primarily on the nature of the various navigational systems. They have not given consideration to the fact that these automated flight sequences are all routed in some way or another through the FMCS, and can thus be effortlessly overridden by the pilots. [9] Thus, any takeover scenario which leaves the pilots both conscious and functioning has a considerable risk of being disrupted. This begs the

question of why the perpetrators of the false flag attacks even bothered using Boeing 757s and 767s. A jetliner using a fly-by-wire system would not only be easier to modify, but would also leave the pilots with fewer options to retake control. In order to have any chance of success at all, the masterminds would need to develop some way to lock in the autopilot and freeze the control column, otherwise the terminal destination can be avoided with a simple jerk of the stabiliser trim (!). [10] But that alone would not take the pilots out of the equation. They could experimentally deactivate the FMCS, pull out breakers, and even switch off the AC buses, which would cause serious disruptions to the autopilot. In order to have complete control over the Boeing 767s and 757s, the conspirators would need to introduce provisions that would neutralise the crew and secure the cockpit. Provisions like posion gas. As it turns out, this subject was also covered by the author of Remote Takeover. Unfortunately, this is precisely where the article begins to wander of course.

He discredits himself by suggesting that the beleaguered crew could have taken turns going in and out of the cockpit while braving the gas. Then, the author naively asserts that only the cockpit would be sprayed, rather than the whole business class cabin. Worse yet, he only considered the limited effects of respiratory and lachrymatory compounds. This ensures that the rebuttal attempt falls flat. If we acknowledge the possibility that a fast acting vesicant was used, the pilots would probably be unable to re-enter the cockpit. While rarely lethal, these gasses absord through the skin and clothing, inflicting extraordinary pain on the subject in quick order. Sulfur mustard, phosgene oxime, and lewisite would be suitable for this purpose. [11] The true extent to which the pilots could have countered the Trojan horse systems is debatable. Given the effects of physical stress, a narrow time frame (from 46-43 minutes for Flight 77, to as little as 19-17 minutes for Flight 175), and hazardous gas permeating the cabin, the scope of their sabotage efforts would be somewhat limited. Its safe to say that their lung capacity as well as their mental facultys would be interrupted after exposure to the gas. The measures discussed so far are extensive in scope, and likely the minimum necessary for securing the cockpit. Moreover, if these foreign systems were to go undiscovered until their activation on 9/11, there would need to be heavy infiltration into all three of the host airports, utilising moles at various levels of the hierarchy. This increases the total number of conspirators required for the operation to succeed, which reduces its appeal somewhat. Any prospective false flag operation should be kept as small as

possible in order to preserve secrecy.

Section 2.2: No Planes

The second theory to be considered is no planes. This essentially revolves around the idea that there were no commercial plane crashes on 9/11. This inference can apparently be made by virtue of the sheer number of 'mistakes' observable in the live television coverage the attacks. For example, there is the fact that Flight 175 was travelling at a speed of 510 knots at sea level, while a Boeing 767 can only travel at a maximum speed of 360 knots. The no plane theory also disputes the possibility that a commercial jetliner could smash through the Twin Towers. Proponents claim that such an action would somehow violate the conservation of momentum law, and that Flight 175 did not suffer any deceleration during this event. They also argue that there is no way for an aluminum hulled aircraft to leave a 'cartoon outline' of itself in a steel framed skyscraper. [12] The no plane theory claims that the entire event was faked through CGI and crisis actors, and all buildings were empty at the time of their destruction. These assertions, while seemingly absurd, have a perverse rational. Proponents believe that TV fakery would be a safer course of action for the perpetrators, since they were not engaged in a conspiracy to commit mass murder. Since all victims were 'faked', they could not be charged with a crime even if they were caught. And regardless of whether the aircraft had passengers on board or not, using them to crash into buildings was just too risky. [13] The proponents show little interest in learning what actually *did* cause the extensive damage to the World Trade Center and Pentagon. Whether this was caused by drone aircraft, missiles, or bombs is strictly a side issue for them. Moreover, the 'no planers' cannot seem to agree on whether bystanders were fooled by holographic projections, or whether the entire drama was faked through CGI and actors.

There are pitfalls for both variations: The former is dependent on the use of nonexsitent 3D image projection technology, while the latter is burdened by the need to keep thousands of people silent on their complicity. Indeed, some proponents allege that every single person appearing on television during the 9/11 attacks were crisis actors reading off a script (!). This includes not only individuals who had visible injury's and post traumatic stress reactions, but also those who had just lost co-workers and family members. In short, the no planers beleive that not a single person died during the September 11th attacks. It is an outrageous assertion with no real

evidence put forth to prove it. Indeed, many adherents do not seem to understand that their theory has a burden of proof that must be satisfied by themselves. Extraordinary claims like these require extraordinary evidence. A handful of video 'mistakes' (even if proven beyond a reasonable doubt) *is not* sufficient grounds to argue that no terrorist attacks had taken place at all! Another disqualifying factor is that it does not provide any indications of who the perpetrators were. It essentially exculpates from blame all of the suspects that have been identified by 9/11 researchers. [14] These are people who had the means, motives, and opportunity to pull of the crime of the century. What is offered in replacement is nothing more an empty hall of smoke and mirrors. There is every reason to believe that the no plane theory is nothing more than a disinformation campaign meant to draw attention away from the strong arguments used by the 9/11 truth movement (such as forewarning of the attacks, war games that slowed response times), while directing barbs at critical thinkers and family members of victims.

The movement had an inauspicious and dubious beginning in 2007. Morgan Reynolds was the first to proclaim that there were no plane crashes on September 11th, making a fool of himself on national television. This was followed soon after by the release of September Clues. The entire documentary seems to be based on a faulty understanding of newtonian mechanics, as exemplified by the belief that aluminum planes could not have penetrated the steel frames of the Twin Towers, no matter how high their kinetic energy. Leaving all that aside, however, it would do well to take a look at aspects which the no plane theory has *not* drawn attention to. Away from the assertions of self-healing buildings and nose-out impacts is a hypothesis which would require all of the passengers and crew from the four flights (numbering approximately 250 people) to maintain a strict vow of silence for the rest of their natural lives. False identitys would need to be created. At one extreme, scenarios like those put forth by Dean Hartwell posit that air traffic controllers, gate agents, security members, and other airport personnel were witness to these deceptive goings on. [15] And of course, any partys who witnessed a plane load of people boarding an airliner at one side of the facility -and then inexplicably deplaning at the other side, escorted by men in black suits- would need to be debriefed and gagged, in order to prevent leaks. What if the dozen or so presidents that led both American Airlines and United Airlines were involved in the plot? Their participation would require an willingness to accept the huge financial losses following 9/11. That can only be reconciled if they were all moles inserted into leadership positions (and given hush money), something for

which there is no evidence for. This is a recurring and overwhelming problem with the no planes theory. Although we will refrain from making sweeping judgements for now, these flaws put the whole scenario into grave doubt.

Section 2.3: Drone Swap

The third and final theory to be considered is drone swap. This is predicated on the idea that at some point in their destination, all four of the planes were forced to make an unscheduled detour from their flight path, and engage in a clever shell game that would put a drone aircraft in its place. One way this could be done was if the jumo jet happened to fly over an airport, and provide a radar shadow for a drone that was taking off there, with air traffic controllers being none the wiser. Afterwards, the two planes would break away from each other, with the drone taking the commercial airliners identity and executing the attack, while the passenger plane was landed at an airport. This was the scenario posited in the article, Operation Pearl. [16] Presumably, all those onboard would then be liquidated by the conspirators. The technical procedure behind swapping needs to be explained. Radar screens are two-dimensional in their layout, with the vertical dimension of altitude suppressed. Hence, any aircraft which happens to fly directly underneath another would be *invisible* to a radar operator. Even if the latitude and longitude headings of the two craft didn't match up perfectly, most commercial search radars cannot differentiate them, because they have a low range resolution. [17] They are effectively unable to distinguish between two aircraft that get within a few hundred meters of each other. It is useful to speculate how this might have been done. Perhaps a pair of operatives would board each of the targeted planes on the morning of the September 11th attacks, masquerading as FBI counter-terror agents. They could deceive the pilots into thinking that Islamic terrorists were aboard their aircraft, and that there was an imminent risk that they would be hijacked.

This dialogue would not be disclosed to the other passengers, ostensibly to prevent them from panicking. With the pilots tricked into compliance, the agents would then direct them to turn off their transponders, and travel down a specific flight-corridor that led to an airport where 'SWAT teams' were on standby. [18] This corridor would enable a drone aircraft to conveniantly rendezvous with the commuter plane, stealing its identity, and

carrying out the faux-suicide attacks under remote control. After their role had been completed, the planes would be landed at a private airport, with a detachment of armed mercenarys waiting to detain and murder everyone aboard. Dressed up in SWAT uniforms, it would have been easy for them to continue the ruse started by the 'counter-terror' agents, and have the civilians offloaded into a prisoner transport vehicle. Officially, this would be done to arrest the 'terrorists' on board the plane, and to have the passengers 'debriefed' of information. The conspirators could then have the plane flown off to a disposal facility, and systematically dismantled and melted down. Critics of this hypothesis claim that there was never an opportunity to carry out a drone swap, but this is untrue. As far back as 2005, researchers such as Christopher Bollyn noted that both of the WTC bound planes happened to cross paths directly overhead over Stewart airport. [19] Not only did they make the passing within 2 minutes of each other, but their flight trajectories seem to match up exactly with the airports runways. This is hard to explain as the result of mere coincidence. Another example is how Flight 77 ventured into an area of poor radar coverage at 8:51 am, where it was not seen again until approximately 20 minutes later.

It seems distinctly possible that the jetliner descended into a valley and performed a swap with a waiting drone. Since its transponder was shut down by the time it reappeared, FAA radars were only able to see the craft through something called a primary return, which does not disclose information about altitude or identity. [20] Therefore, we have no real confirmation that the aircraft which slammed into the Pentagon actually was Flight 77. Some would raise doubts about the willingness of the crew to co-operate in a scheme that would involve their aircraft being so wildly off course. These concerns are easily addressed, however. If any FBI agents were on board the planes on the morning of 9/11, they would not hesitate to use their badges to intimidate anyone attempting to obstruct their mission. Peer pressure has a remarkable effectiveness on human beings, particularly in life or death situations such as this. The risk of their plane being hijacked by Islamic terrorists would have put the pilots in a position of great discomfort. If they required further convincing, the pilots could be put on the line with 'NORAD' officials, urging them (over private communication channels) to cooperate with the agents for the passengers safety. And even if, after all this overwhelming psychological manipulation, the crew had *still* steadfastly refused the demands to land, the operatives could have used violence to achieve their goals. They could have used weapons smuggled on board the plane, including tasers, batons, and firearms. The men would be

better armed than the non-existant hijackers were claimed to be. With a monopoly on the use of deadly force, it was a sure bet that the pilots complicity could be gained either by threatening them directly, or taking the passengers hostage. They would have no choice but to concede to their demands.

Evidence Filter

The implications of the no plane hypothesis diverge from both electronic hijacking and drone swap. Its premise (that there were no commercial plane crashes on the day of 9/11) puts a much larger emphasis on crisis actors and TV fakery. Rather than the military precision and logistical complexity required for the other two. What little evidence exists to supprt it also work to strengthen opposing theorys, such as the incredible 510 knot speed reached by Flight 175. If we use this factor as a pre-text to isolate NPT from its peers, it then becomes a simple matter of abstraction to rule it out of the equation entirely. For instance, one of the key attributes that must be possessed by a scientific theory is a methodology through which phenomena can be scrutinised, quantified, and assembled into a coherent framework. Startlingly, we see that the 'no plane theory' lacks this feature altogether. Because an observer cannot prove (to an arbitrary degree) the authenticity of the WTC or Pentagon attacks, this is considered sufficient grounds by proponents to dismiss any and all data collected during the events of 9/11. In other words, it is just another form of pyrrhonism: An anti-foundationalist approach which deny's the objective standards of rational enquiry. This puts it at odds with competing hypothesis' by its lack of predictive power. No plane theory has been unable to challenge the multitude of videos and photographs of planes hitting the towers, or the large number of eyewitnesses (numbering in the thousands) who confirm this. On this basis and others, the no plane theory can be discarded from further consideration.

Now that only two scenarios remain for consideration, a different metric must be used to compare them. One such metric is determining how many anomolys each theory can account for. This is crucial because the 9/11 attacks are the most anomolous acts of mass destruction in modern history. They are so shrouded in mystery and unexplained events that competing theorys face a difficult challenge. They must be able explain the anomolys that are present not only in the official story of 9/11, but any anomolys *they*

themselves might introduce. One of thse inexplicable events was the machine-like corrective maneuvers made by Flight 175 during the last 12 seconds of its approach to WTC 2. [21] In that short span of time, the aircraft descended over 400 meters into strong crosswinds that were blowing it off course. Rather than smoothly turning during the entire approach, the craft made three distinct turns that allowed it to strike the tower dead on. The final corrective maneuver had to be perfectly timed and executed, as an error of only 5 degrees left or right would generate a substantial error. [22] In this instance, both electronic hijacking and drone swap can provide an allibi. The craft would have been under the control of sophisticated flight computers, and was probably homing in on a GPS signal emanating from WTC 2. However, there are *three other types of anomolys* that cannot be explained equally well by both theorys. They can be categorised as A) odditys in Flight 175s visual appearance, B) odditys in Flight 175s kinematic performance, C) aerial mergers all four flights were seen to engage in.

With regards to the visual anomolys, one example is the gigantic fireball released by its impact with WTC 2. [23] There are calculations showing that at least 180 cubic meters of kerosene were required to make such a mushroom cloud, not including the extra fuel that spilled inside the building and ignited fires. This is inconsistent with the official story because Flight 175 would have only been carrying 40 cubic meters for its journey to LA, of which about 6 cubic meters would have already been consumed! Another anomoly is the nearly meter wide cylindrical object that was spotted under its fuselage, which left an imprint on the towers facade. An image analysis of this object determines that it was a distinct structure in its own right, and not an illusion caused by shadows or reflections. [24] It bears the appearance of an avionics pod of some sort. The device exploded the instant the jetliners nose contacted the tower. If the aircraft was in fact a military drone, then the self destruct mechanism could be rationalised as the conspirators attempt to prevent compromising evidence from being found. There are a host of other oddity's seen with Flight 175: The wing root is very thick, with extra bracing to the fuselage. The wing flaps are abnormally prominent, and there appears to be two blade antenna on the fuselage, as well as a boom mounting just underneath the tail. [25] Whatever the function of these anomalous structures, it is clear that they have no kin with a commercial Boeing 767. Their presence only makes sense within the larger context of drone swap, and the reality that any craft chosen for this

role would have to be specially adapted to their mission.

This would include not only evading the US Air Force, but also navigating hundreds of kilometers of air space, entering the target vicinity, and striking it with unerring precision. Some have speculated that the impactor craft were, in fact, prototype KC-767 tankers. [26] While it is true that such craft didn't come into official service until 2006, the *concept* of converting them into this role has been around for much longer. As far back as 1989, the Air Force authored a study of possible replacements for its KC-135 fleet, and concluded that the Boeing 767 fulfilled the requirements best. [27] More clues to the crafts identity can be found through examinations of its kinematic performance. As alluded to earlier, it was clocked in at an speed of 510 knots while flying roughly at sea level. The implications of this are explored in a feature documentary, 9/11: Intercepted: "We analysed the speeds of the South Tower aircraft thoroughly. We have found based on precedent, data, and aerodynamics that a standard 767 would be *impossible* to control at such excessive speeds over its max operating... Just like there has never been a steel skyscraper to collapse from fire prior to 9/11, there has never been an aircraft positively identified to exceed its max operating speed by more than 150 knots, its maneuvering speed by 220 knots, pulled gs, was controllable, and survived: Not before 9/11, or after." [28]

If these observations are valid, then they greatly reinforce the idea that military tankers were responsible for executing the attacks. One final point of interest is the strange behaviour taking place in the skys on that fateful day. As mentioned before, there was the incident where both Flight 11 and 175 flew directly over Stewart airport within minutes of each other. This would create a radar shadow that could be used by a drone aircraft waiting on the tarmc, and enable it to remain concealed from the FAA. Then there was the astonisihing fact that two different Flight 93s were registered in Newark airports database. [29] Both aircraft took off at roughly the same time on September 11th. One of them crossed paths and 'merged' with several other aircraft, before going into a holding pattern around Stewart airport (and landing there). The other went on to participate in a military exercise involving three other aircraft, including Delta 1989. The jetliners flew in formation with each other towards Cleveland, before scattering in all directions at 9:33 AM. As pointed out earlier, there are four types of anomoloys relating to the aircraft themselves. Electronic hijacking can only explain the precision maneuvers. Drone swap can explain these, along with the visual odditys, the kinematic performance, and the aerial mergers. This

must be counted as serious points in its favor. Only one final test remains to determine whether or not the theory is rigorous enough be adopted by 9/11 researchers.

Self Consistency

In order to fully assess the validity of the remaining theorys, we must know how consistent they are with themselves, and whether they introduce any anomolys that they themselves cannot explain. For instance, if we were to accept the argument that military drones took the place of the the jetliners, then how can that be reconciled with the fact that human remains belonging to the passengers were found at the crash sites? Or the fact that numerous phone calls made by the passengers prior to the crash spoke of Islamic hijackers? In this area, electronic hijacking appears to make a strong comeback. Because the terrorists, crew, and passengers would all be trapped on board their aircraft when the Trojan horse systems came online, the theory is compatible with both the forensic evidence and the phone calls. But in fact, deeper examination shows both these points are non sequitors. This is because the phone calls and DNA results are part of a larger framework which requires that A) the Al Qaeda operatives actually showed up at the airports, B) actually boarded the jetliners, and C) actually hijacked them. As discussed earlier, there is no real evidence backing any of these assertions. Most of the 'proof' that exists to support the official story is either manufactured, or entirely circumstantial. If the phone calls make repeated mentions of Islamic hijackers (which they do), then they were likely faked by the perpetrators themselves. Likewise, if the DNA tests shows the presence of the hijackers at the crash sites (which they also do), then the results were likely faked by the perpetrators. 9/11 researchers have long held doubts about the authenticity of the phone calls, and the logic behind this are best highlighted in a paper called Project Achilles. [30]

In it, the author conducts an experiment to find out whether cell phones can actually be used in an moving aircraft at altitude, and whether they can make a signal lock to ground based cell towers. The results are unequivocal: Even when flying in an area with good cellular coverage, reception will decrease roughly in proportion with the altitude increase. In a single engine light aircraft, the success rate fell to 0 percent at 7000 feet. In a twin engine light aircraft, the success rate fell to 0 percent at 6000 feet. This decrease in cell phone reception would be much more pronounced in a large airliner,

given the fact that their greater mass would provide more insulation against any signals. For this reason, the success rate at any altitude above 1000 feet was considered effectively nil. If the experiments results are valid, then it means that the phone calls *must have been made by impersonators*. How could the 9/11 conspirators have pulled this off? The most likely way was through the use of voice morphing technology. [31] This is a piece of computer software that analyses a persons voice, and allows it to be duplicated with a synthesiser. It requires only a 10 minute recording of the individual, in order to match their unique speech patterns. Spys could be used to infiltrate large telecommunications companys and covertly tap into the phones of the passengers. Audio recordings of their voice would be made, and the software would create digital copys of them. On the day of the September 11th attacks, operators would impersonate the victims and give false depositions by phone. This would help the masterminds shape public perception about the 'hijackings'. The cruel deception would pull on Americas heart strings and get them emotionally invested in the official story.

Just as the phone calls have been thrown into question, skepticism should also be shown towards the forensic investigations. After all, the conspirators were able to dispose of massive amounts of steel and concrete from the WTC complex, preventing investigators from determining whether or not explosives were involved. Who is to say that a similar deception wasn't used to conceal the absence of passengers and crew? The odditys associated with the crash of Flight 93 raise many red flags. For instance, the coroner who arrived on the scene was shocked to discover that no human remains could be found at the crash site. [32] It wasn't until many days later, after hundreds of searchers repeatedly scoured the area, that fragments of bodys were recovered. If military drones were indeed used to execute the September 11th attacks, then the conspirators would be forced to somehow cover up the absence of bodys at Shanksville and the Pentagon. We must acknowledge the disturbing possibility that the passengers and crew were murdered soon after landing, and secretly disposed of at the crash sites post mortem. This scheme would not be necessary at the WTC complex, given that there were thousands of bodys buried under a mountain of debris. Missing victims would not raise the same level of suspicion from the investigators. The Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME) was burdened with the task of identifying and sorting through all of the human remains. Because many of the bodys were dismembered by the impact, and were in varying states of decay, coroners were often unable to make visual

identifications.

This forced them to conduct a very large volume of DNA tests. [33] The OCME was assisted by the New York State Police Department (NYSPD), and several private laboratories. In order to pursue their work, they would need to create a database of the victims DNA profiles. They needed to gather the personal belongings of the deceased, something that would provide a skin sample, a hair sample, or saliva sample. If this was not available, then they could resort to 'kinship analysis' by gathering DNA from family members. Once the forensic database was created, the OCME and NYSPD would begin the monumental task of taking tissue samples from all the bodys and comparing them to their database, in order to identify who matched what profile. This is where the possibility of fraud can be introduced. As part of their PENTTBOM investigation, the FBI recovered human remains from Shanksville and the Pentagon, and subjected them to DNA analysis. [34] Samples that could not be linked to a victims DNA profile were assumed to belong to the terrorists. In other words, they were unable to provide a positive match for the alleged hijackers (with one possible exception). And unfortunately, there is no way to verify if these fragments of human bone and flesh were ever genuinely collected, with proper chain of custody tracking. There is no way to verify that the samples were moved to the OCME under strict security measures, or that they weren't tampered with before the laboratory took possession. Until the FBI allows 3rd partys to independently test the samples and try to replicate their results, the value of the DNA tests remain purely speculative.

Conclusion

To recap, the criteria used to judge the two competing theorys was on how many anomolys they can account for, and how self consistent they are with themselves. After examining all the points of contention, we must conclude that electronic hijacking is a substantially weaker hypothesis than drone swap. There are four types of anomolys relating to the aircraft themselves: The precision maneuvers, odditys in visual appearance, odditys in kinematic performance, and aerial mergers. Of these four anomolys, electronic hijacking can address only one, while drone swap can address all four. And for the other criteria -whether the theorys can adequately explain any anomolys they introduce- drone swap also appears to be superior. Because the cell phone calls could not have been made by the passengers as reported,

and because there were no bodys found immediately after the crash of Flight 93, electronic hijacking is not truly self consistent. The only way this contradiction could be neutralised is if proponents acknowledge that the phone calls were faked, and acknowledge that the aircraft were empty at the time of their crash. (Or alternatively, claim that the failure to find human remains at Shanksville was incidental) Until such time as further discoverys invalidate this conclusion, or force additional reconsiderations to be made, 9/11 researchers can firmly conclude that the false flag attacks were executed by military drones. This will greatly refine any attempts to understand what actually took place in the skies on that fateful day.

Bibliography

[1] www.9/11myths.com/images/a/a6/NORAD.pd Multiple Wargames on 9/11 Resulted in a 'Stand-Down' of NORAD, by Andrew Burfield

[2] www.nytimes.com/2001/09/23/international/23WIRE-DIPL.html U.S. to Release Evidence Linking bin Laden to Attacks

[3] www.newcrisispapers.com/noevidence.pdf No Evidence that Muslims Hijacked Planes on 9/11, by Elias Davidsson

[4] http://americanactionreport.blogspot.ca/2012/01/boundary-conditions-for-9/11-hijackers.html Boundary Conditions for the 9/11 Hijackers, Part 1: An Overview

[5] The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. (Page 5)

[6] http://www.serendipity.li/wot/spencer02.htm What Really Happened? A Critical Analysis of Carol Valentine's "Flight of the Bumble Planes" Hypothesis, by Leonard Spencer

[7] http://www.gnosticliberationfront.com/electronically_hijacking.htm Home Run: Electronically Hijacking the World Trade Center Attack Aircraft, by Joe Vialls

[8] www.9/11myths.com/Remote_Takeover.pdf Remote Takeover on 9/11: A Critical Analysis

[9] http://www.9/11-strike.com/remote_bb.htm Remote Control: Built-in or

Bolt-on, by Jerry Russell

[10] www.9/11myths.com/Remote_Takeover.pdf Remote Takeover on 9/11: A Critical Analysis (Page 14)

[11] http://emergency.cdc.gov/agent/vesicants/tsd.asp Vesicant/Blister Agent Poisoning - Toxic Syndrome Description

[12] http://www.9/11hoax.com/morgan_reynolds_9/11_hoax.html We Have Some Holes in the Plane Stories, by Morgan Reynolds

[13] http://9/11closeup.com/index.shtml?ID=71 Why They Didn't use Planes, by Gerard Holmgren

[14] http://www.9/11truth.org/article.php?story=20090713033854249 Demolition Access to the World Trade Center Towers: Part one - Tenants, by Kevin Ryan

[15] http://www.veteranstoday.com/2012/03/15/the-9/11-passenger-paradox-what-happened-to-flight-93/ The 9/11 Passenger Paradox: What happened to Flight 93, by Dean Hartwell

[16] http://www.serendipity.li/wot/operation_pearl.htm Operation Pearl, by A. K. Dewdney

[17] http://www.radartutorial.eu/01.basics/rb18.en.html Range Resolution

[18] http://www.serendipity.li/wot/operation_pearl.htm Operation Pearl, by A. K. Dewdney

[19] http://www.rumormillnews.com/cgi-bin/archive.cgi?read=76058 Did U.S. Air Force Planes Hit the Twin Towers, by Christopher Bollyn

[20] The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. (Page 16)

[21] https://youtu.be/ClDtwOR-3wQ UA175 - The Last 12 Seconds

[22] http://www.journalof9/11studies.com/volume/2010/Monaghan_Analysis.pdf Review of Analysis of Observed and Measured In-Flight Turns Suggests Superior Control of 9/11 WTC Aircraft, by Aidan Monaghan

[23] http://wtchoax.blogspot.ca/2006/01/demolition-of-world-trade-_

113867744748104189.html Demolition of the World Trade Center, by Karl Moor

[24] http://www.amics21.com/9/11/report.html Analysis of the Images of 11 September 2001

[25] http://kesler12-jamesrocket.blogspot.ca/2013/12/flight-175-visualanomolys.html Flight 175 Visual Anomolys

[26] www.scholarsfor9/11truth.org/ArticleWhatPlanes26Apr2006.html What Airplanes Actually Hit the WTC, by August Dunning

[27] http://www.boeing.com/commercial/767family/pdf/767tanker.pdf 767 The Latest From The Greatest

[28] https://youtu.be/f6WSDxErgBE 9/11 Intercepted

[29] http://9/11woodybox.blogspot.ca/2009/09/united-airlines-trackeddifferent.html United Airlines Tracked a Different Flight 93 than the FAA

[30] http://physics9/11.net/pdf/Achilles.pdf Project Achilles: Low Altitude Cellphone Experiments, by A. K. Dewdney

[31] http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/national/dotmil/arkin020199.htm When Seeing and Hearing Isn't Believing, by William M. Arkin

[32] http://9/11blogger.com/news/2007-02-25/many-misquotes-wallace-miller The Many Misquotes of Wallace Miller

[33] http://science.sciencemag.org/content/310/5751/1122 DNA Identifications After the 9/11 World Trade Center Attack

[34] http://911myths.com/images/e/ef/Team5_Box62_AliasesAndIDs-FBIIDsHijackers-2.pdf How FBI Determined The 19 Hijacker's Identities

Contact

For more information on this article, please forward all messages to jrphilps@live.com