

LIBERTY TREE

Vol. 13, No. 9 — September 2011



Revisiting 9/11

By Dick Greb

With only ten percent of the 21st century under our belts, it's still too early to give the appellation of 'Crime of the Century' to the hijacking and kamikaze crashing of airliners into the twin towers of the World Trade Center complex and into the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, but it most certainly was a crime of gigantic proportions. And despite the ridicule heaped upon any explanation — ignominiously called *conspiracy theories* — other than the official one, there can be no doubt that there was indeed a conspiracy at work on that day. Unless you believe that the separate hijackings were unrelated, the very fact that four different planes were hijacked is proof that a criminal conspiracy existed. The extent of that conspiracy is the real question, and unfortunately for those who want to see truth prevail, that question is just one of many for which we will likely never be given satisfactory answers.

It has now been ten years since the catastrophic and catalyzing events¹ of that modern *day of infamy*, and the government has given no indications that it plans to reinvestigate the crime. In fact, the actions of government throughout the entire episode evinces an intent to conceal, rather than reveal, the facts surrounding what it has referred to as the worst terrorist attack on American soil. Indeed, its continuing obfuscation of the truth — whether through error or willfulness, or both — is one of the factors that may ultimately assure that the attack will remain in the running for crime

of the century. Just like any case where investigation of a crime is conducted by those who have a vested interest in the outcome, if not actual participation in the crime itself, truth is always a victim.²

As I said, the extent of the criminal conspiracy involved in the 9-11 attack is a central question that needs to be answered, as so many other questions come back to that one. Besides the actual hijackers (whether they were properly identified or not), every person who knowingly aided or abetted the commission of this series of crimes, no matter how small a part they played in the whole scheme of things, is a co-conspirator, and as such, they should rightly share in the criminal responsibility for the result, which was the *murder of thousands of people*. This is where foreknowledge comes into play, and of course, why such foreknowledge is always vehemently denied. If government agents knew of the plan, and allowed it to go forward, that's bad enough;³ if they not only knew, but orchestrated circumstances to make it more likely to succeed, that makes them complicit in those murders.

This type of orchestration can occur so far behind the scenes that it may be virtually impossible to discover; but sometimes hints of it come through. One such hint, to my mind, in the 9-11 attack is the training exercises that were going on at the same time as the hijackings. Although they didn't get a whole lot of

(Continued on page 2)

1. Could it be that this was the sort of event envisioned by The Project for the New America Century? See page 51 of *Rebuilding Americas Defenses*: www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf

2. Police officers routinely cleared by internal police investigations of any wrong-doing in brutality or illegal use-of-force cases is an excellent example.

3. In the 1993 WTC bombing, the FBI, after being informed of the plot by one of the participants — who requested that they supply him with fake explosives — instead let the bomb be built as planned, resulting in the death of six people. A CBS news video about this can be viewed at http://whatreallyhappened.com/IMAGES/wtc_bombing3.wmv

(Continued from page 1)

press, *Vanity Fair* did a great job in reporting on them.⁴ Officials in our air defense establishment admitted that these exercises — which included simulated hijacking of airliners — were being conducted at the same time as the actual hijackings. General Ralph E. Eberhart, USAF Commander of NORAD, was quoted as claiming that the exercises actually enhanced the response to the real threat, because everybody was already in a more alert status.⁵ Given the near-total failure of any military response to the hijacked planes, this seems like a pretty serious indictment of our air defense readiness.

Aside from that, however, this simultaneous existence of actual hijackings and training exercises on hijackings comes down to one of two options: either it was mere coincidence that both the real and simulated hijackings occurred at the same time; or one of them must have been based on foreknowledge of the other. Now, I'm no statistician, but I have to think that the odds of the first option are pretty long. But suppose for a minute that it *was* just a coincidence. Then, according to General Eberhart, the hijackers picked the *worst* of all possible times for their crimes, because our federally-controlled air security apparatus was more ready than usual to thwart their evil plans. And yet, despite this heightened readiness, 75 percent of the hijackers' plot was accomplished without any interference from the feds whatsoever.⁶ Given that it was managed by groups of four and five men armed with nothing but box-cutters,⁷ that would probably put the chances at about 50/50 for a pair of hijackers armed with pea-shooters to do the same on a normal day.

Then, there's the second option — foreknowledge. Perhaps the reason why such a precarious plan succeeded so far as it did was because people who knew of the plot maneuvered circumstances in such a way as to make the chances of success greater. This could work in either direction. That is, if the hijackers knew of the



General Ralph E. Eberhart, USAF Commander of NORAD on September 11, 2001.

those who have an interest in exploiting disasters (tyrants, for example), then perhaps the exercises were scheduled for the same day, and for the same reason. In the former case, though, it seems unlikely that the hijackers would have access to enough details of the planned exercise scenarios to determine that it would enhance their chances of success, since even the participants would be mostly kept in the dark, in order to maximize the usefulness of any evaluation of their performance. On the other hand, with the government's known predilection for infiltration of dissident groups (think COINTELPRO), it's not much of a stretch to believe that there could have been an informant (or even an agent provocateur) involved in the plot, feeding suggestions to the conspirators, while simultaneously leaking the plans to their government handlers.

I realize that to many people, this sounds crazy (or at least, *I* sound crazy), but pushing unstable people to engage in criminal behavior is a common ploy of the FBI in its War on Terrorism, as revealed by the *New York Times* in an article from November 29, 2010.⁸ In the same way, exploiting crises is a universal ploy of tyrants to gain greater power and control. This makes for

a powerful incentive to exacerbate such crises, because the greater the crisis, the greater the demand for (or at least the acquiescence in) more power to prevent another in the future. Thus, foreknowledge is a powerful tool for power-grabbers.

And one of the beauties of high-level behind-the-scenes manipulation is that it can be done under the cover of legitimate preparedness. Sending fighter planes off to another part of the country to engage in training is not, in and of itself, a

4. www.vanityfair.com/politics/features/2006/08/norad200608

5. Eberhart, when asked by the 9-11 Commission whether the training exercises helped or hurt the response, testified:

"Sir, my belief is that it helped because of the manning, because of the focus, because the crews -- they have to be airborne in 15 minutes. And that morning, because of the exercise, they were airborne in six or eight minutes. And so I believe that focus helped. The situation that you're referring to, I think, at most cost us 30 seconds -- 30 seconds." http://www.9-11commission.gov/archive/hearing12/9-11Commission_Hearing_2004-06-17.htm

6. According to the official story, the other 25 percent was thwarted by unarmed passengers who, by an unsuccessful 5-minute assault to breach the cockpit door, convinced the hijackers to crash the plane in Shanksville, Penn., rather than continue the 20-minute flight to Washington, D.C. The report also documents that the cockpit crew had received a warning from United Airlines about cockpit intrusions at least 4 minutes before the hijackers attacked, which should have given them ample time to secure the door, but apparently didn't do so. *The 9/11 Commission Report*, p. 11.

7. Personally, I find it rather incredible that dozens of adult passengers would let a few guys with box-cutters (or even regular size knives, for that matter) order them around and take over the cockpit of their plane in the first place. A bus full of children, maybe, but grown men and women? But then again, the FBI did report that they "collected 14 knives or portions of knives at the Flight 93 crash site," (*Report*, p. 457, FN 82.) so maybe they were carrying 3 or 4 each, and the people just felt overwhelmed by all that weaponry.

8. "In U.S. Sting Operations, Questions of Entrapment," <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/30/us/politics/30fbi.html>

(Continued on page 3)

BANK HOLIDAY IS ORDERED WAR TIME POWERS INVOKED

Special Session of Congress Called to Convene Tomorrow.

A modified bank holiday extending through Thursday was ordered Sunday night by President Roosevelt in a proclamation interpreted by some financial authorities as a temporary suspension

To Solve National Problems—President Roosevelt Suspends All Banking Operations Until Friday—Action Viewed as Definite Upward Start.

Revisiting 9/11



(Continued from page 2)

criminal thing. Quite the contrary, it's generally a good thing to have well-trained pilots defending our land. So, what blame could possibly be laid on the person who instigated the training, or scheduled it; unless, of course, it was done to further a criminal conspiracy. But alas, how would you ever prove such a criminal intent by anyone evil enough to execute a plan like that?

Making it even tougher to ferret out, the influence exerted might be so light of touch that those being manipulated never even know it's been done. This is a central premise of the movie *Inception*, starring Leonardo DiCaprio, where an idea to be implanted in a target's subconscious mind must seem to originate from the target himself in order to take hold. I've heard it said that Colonel Edward Mandell House, advisor to President Woodrow Wilson, among others, had such a gift — that he could suggest ideas to someone in a way that made the recipient believe he had thought of it himself. Is this what happened with the various training exercises scheduled for September 11, 2001, or was it truly just a coincidence? We will likely never know the answer to that question. But as for anybody who played a part in furthering that murderous conspiracy of ten years ago, we can rest assured that Christ sees what's in their hearts, and come judgment day, there will be hell to pay.



Will the HOLY DAYS of Big Banks' Past *haunt us again?*

In early 1933, as a result of the great panic, *a.k.a.* the depression, the fractional reserve banking system was experiencing yet another episode of 'bank runs.' A bank run occurs when ordinary folk sense their particular bank is weak and about to fail. They know that if it fails, their savings will be lost, and so they make haste to remove their deposits from said bank. At that time, this involved demands for redemption of frns in gold and silver — lawful money. To the Federal Reserve, such demands constituted a banking 'crisis.' As with all such 'crises,' it turned to the government to solve the problems it had created itself.

On March 2, 1933, two days before President Roosevelt's inauguration, President Hoover corresponded with the Federal Reserve, saying that he understood the Board was considering recommending the use of "emergency powers" under Section 5 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, "for the purpose of limiting the use of coin and currency to necessary purposes. I should be glad to have the advice of the Board."

On March 3, Governor Eugene Meyer of the Fed responded that the situation in Chicago:

has reached the point of extreme tension, with prospects that by the end of banking hours tomorrow the gold reserves of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago will be dangerously depleted. [The bankers] have requested that a national holiday be proclaimed as the only method they know of for dealing with the immediate exigency with which they are confronted. ... Similar conditions are developing rapidly in other Federal Reserve Districts. ... The [Board] has considered two methods of dealing with this emergency, one by executive order and the

"Holyday," also written "Holiday," see Webster's 1828 dictionary, is a "day set apart for commemorating some important event in history; a festival intended to celebrate some event deemed auspicious to the welfare of a nation; particularly ...devoted to religious solemnities." It is also "a day of exemption from labor; a day of amusement."

other by joint resolution of Congress. ... A form of executive order is enclosed for your consideration.

Meyer warned that immediate action was necessary in order to prevent a "banking collapse."

Hoover was awakened at 1:30 a.m. March 4th to read Meyer's letter, the same day Roosevelt was inaugurated with the ominous words: "This is a day of consecration."¹ Consecrated to the banking system, perhaps, because just two days later, he issued Presidential Proclamation No. 2039, an executive order declaring a bank holyday ("holiday") from March 6th to 9th. The order largely followed the Federal Reserve's proposal. Here is a portion of it:

Whereas there have been heavy and unwarranted withdrawals of gold and currency from our banking institutions for the purpose of hoarding; and

Whereas continuous and increasingly extensive speculative activity abroad in foreign exchange has resulted in severe drains on the Nation's stocks of gold; and

Whereas those conditions have created a national emergency; and

Whereas it is in the best interests of all bank depositors that a period of respite be provided with a view to preventing further

(Continued on page 4)

1. See *FDR and fear itself: the first inaugural address*, by Davis W. Houck, p. 140.

(Continued from page 3)

hoarding of coin, bullion or currency or speculation in foreign exchange and permitting the application of appropriate measures to protect the interests of our people; and

Whereas it is provided in Section 5 (b) of the Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. L. 411), as amended, "That the President may investigate, regulate, or prohibit, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of licenses or otherwise, any transactions in foreign exchange and the export, hoarding, melting, or earmarkings of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency . . ."; ...

Now, Therefore I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, in view of such national emergency and by virtue of the authority vested in me by said Act and in order to prevent the export, hoarding, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency, do hereby proclaim, order, direct and declare ... a bank holiday, and that during said period all banking transactions shall be suspended. ... (emphases added)

Note that people taking deposits from the banks supposedly resulted in "severe drains" on "the Nation's stocks of gold." How could this be, unless the people's gold *in the banks* were considered to be one and the same as the "Nation's"? If it belongs to the "Nation," that is, We The People, then the "Nation" has the right to it. Clearly, to Roosevelt and the bankers, the (collective) "Nation" was *not* We The People, it was nothing more than *the bankers themselves*, since they were the ones being drained. As later actions showed, Roosevelt was already planning a *nationalized gold stock*, with the Federal Reserve Board as the "Nation's" true representatives, something they had lusted after from the beginning.²

Banking collapses are inherent in the very nature of fractional reserve banking. If bank notes are empty promises, *i.e.*, they are not actually backed by the gold and silver they claim to represent, then they are fraudulent, and the bank should indeed fail, and its principals be hauled off to prison. However, the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 authorizes such fraud, and since the government benefits thereby, it does all it can to keep the fraud going, including, as Presidential Proclamation No. 2039 threatened, sending people who 'hoard' gold to jail for ten years. Even if — and most especially if, it would seem — the people stand to lose their property (the Fifth Amendment be damned).

As constitutional expert Edwin Vieira³ points out, the national 'emergency' for the bankers was that Americans wanted their *own* money, to which they were entitled, and demanded that the bankers honor their contracts. The 'hoarding' the bankers found menacing was nothing more than people's preference to hold their own

cash rather than leave it in the care of demonstrably irresponsible third parties (banks). 'Hoarding' is simply saving. Couldn't people as readily be accused of 'hoarding' money by saving it in banks? Perhaps their funds could be confiscated for the rash act(s) of keeping funds safe on deposit and thereby draining the nation of needed money flow for job creation?⁴ Given the propaganda of the banking system/government during the depression, such an absurd rationale for confiscating people's money in the name of the "Nation" does not seem impossible today. As long as bank 'bailouts' continue, stealth confiscation via inflation may be good enough for the banking system. But the entire system is now built on irredeemable paper. If depositors demand federal reserve notes to hold themselves, many banks might lose their "reserves" and fail; indeed, many are failing anyway. So there is no guarantee such holydays will not be called for in the future.

Many newspapers in 1933 lauded the bank 'holiday,' claiming that it was just the thing needed at the time to ensure the Nation's economic recovery. One might suspect that they were in the bank's pockets as well — or caught up in the totalitarian and fascist tone of the times.

It was widely acknowledged, even trumpeted on headlines, that Roosevelt had declared the bankster holiday by invoking war-time powers. But *America was not at war*. The Federal Reserve had designed the proclamation based on the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917, amended in 1918. In *Stoehr v. Wallace*, 255 U.S. 239 (1921), the Supreme Court said of this Act:

[It] is strictly a war measure and finds its sanction in the constitutional provision, Art. I, § 8, cl. 11, ... [One section of the Act did confer] authority summarily to seize property upon ... determination that it was enemy owned ... But ... Congress did not attempt the confiscation of the property of citizens or alien friends.

Congress resolved on March 3, 1921, that that date should be taken as the termination of WWI, and that "any Act of Congress, or any provision [thereof], that by its terms is in force only during the existence of a state of war," should be administered as if such war had terminated. Thus, the war-time powers invoked by Roosevelt were not legally available to him, even if they could be considered Constitutional.⁵

Never mind the blatant illegality of his action, however — during the banksters' holy days, Congress met and post-ratified his proclamation, and any actions he might take "thereafter," via the Emergency Banking Act. The hyped 'urgency' surrounding that Act, introduced and passed on March 9, 1933, was such that it passed with just a single copy available — so most legislators voted for it without reading it. Sound familiar?

If and when illegal and unconstitutional holy days are never again proposed by the Fed, nor implemented by its government lackeys ... well, then, your money in the bank should be safe.

2. See *Pieces of Eight*, by Edwin Vieira, Jr., 2002, p. 884.

3. Most of the details in this article are drawn from *Pieces of Eight*, by Edwin Vieira, Jr., 2002.

4. As in the popular mantra today: Get out and consume! Consuming will save the economy!

5. Which they cannot be, in many respects, but elaboration on that score, and on the gold confiscation which followed the bank holiday, must be reserved for another time.



Liberty Tree

Vol. 19, No. 10 — October 2017



... a conspiracy “theory”

by Dick Greb

It's now been 16 years since the Twin Towers (and their half-size cousin, Building 7) collapsed into a heap of rubble, and 24 years since the first attempt to bring them down. And despite plenty of interest on the part of the general public to have an *honest* investigation into the whole affair, the government continues its refusal to conduct any such investigation. Instead it considers the 9/11 Commission Report to be the final word on the subject, and characterizes anybody who believes otherwise as crazy conspiracy theorists. Of course, this is a classic case of the pot calling the kettle black, since the government's own explanation of the terror attack of September 11, 2001 involves quite a large conspiracy.

CONSPIRACY. ... Conspiracy is a consultation or agreement between *two or more persons*, either falsely to accuse another of a crime punishable by law; or *wrongfully to injure* or prejudice a third person, or *any body of men, in any manner*; or to *commit any offense punishable by law*; or to do any act with intent to *prevent the course of justice*; or to effect a legal purpose with a corrupt intent, or by improper means.¹

As you can see from this definition, any time at least two people cooperate in any criminal offense, there exists a conspiracy. Therefore, the government's proclamation that 19 men acted in concert to hijack airplanes and fly them into buildings is a grand conspiracy involving a mul-

titude of crimes. So the big question is not whether or not there existed a conspiracy in the 9/11 attacks — obviously one person can't hijack four planes at the same time — but what was the full extent of the conspiracy?

If every aspect of every crime that was committed that day was conceived, planned, prepared, executed and financed by the 19 men alleged by the government to have been a part of the operation, and by them only, then their conspiracy is complete, and the perpetrators will receive no earthly justice for their deeds, and the victims and their families will likewise receive no earthly justice for the grievous harm

done to them and their loved ones. This is basically the position of the government on the whole affair. The killers are dead, and so there's no need to look any further into the situation, except insofar as to determine what further oppressions must be visited on the American people 'to prevent another similar incident.'

However, if *any other person* was involved — by donating even the smallest amount of money to finance the operation, or by helping to plan any aspect of the operation — then justice could still be served, by prosecuting all such co-conspirators for the entirety of the crimes committed. This is why a proper and thorough investigation is still necessary, because the magnitude of this criminal conspiracy makes it extremely likely that many others were involved behind the scenes. And unless those criminal cohorts are brought to account for their involvement in the plot that resulted in the deaths of thousands of people, then true justice will never be done.

Wheel within a wheel

The definition above is from the first edition of *Black's Law Dictionary*, but in the eighth edition, a particular kind of conspiracy has been added.

WHEEL CONSPIRACY. A conspiracy in which a single member or group (the “hub”) separately agrees with two or more other members or groups (the “spokes”). *The person or group at the hub is the only party liable for all the conspiracies.* — Also termed circle conspiracy; hub-and-spoke conspiracy.²

1. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 1st Edition (1891). Emphases added and internal citations omitted throughout unless otherwise noted.

2. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 8th Edition (2004).

(Continued on page 2)

Notice that a *wheel conspiracy* is not just a single conspiracy, but multiple conspiracies, all wrapped up together into one. In this type of conspiracy, the hub orchestrates the actions of the spokes, and those spokes are not necessarily cognizant of the other spokes, and perhaps not even about the hub itself. The spokes of the wheel are manipulated like puppets on a string, by the grand puppeteers — the hub of the conspiracy. But it's possible that one or more of the spoke conspiracies could also be a wheel conspiracy! That is, it might itself be the hub of another orbit of conspiracies, like a dream within a dream. And also consider that the hub doesn't necessarily initiate the conspiracies of the spokes, it merely needs to orchestrate that which is already in the works.

This brings us back to the grand conspiracy of the September 11 attacks. To my mind, it's a perfect illustration of a wheel conspiracy, with the hijacking of the airliners being merely one of the spoke conspiracies. But, at the same time, another important spoke in this grand scheme was the manipulation of public perception, official investigations, etc., to eliminate any recognition that the hijacking was only a spoke, so as to insulate the hub from exposure. Thus, the official story reinforces the simplified conspiracy theory — that the 19 dead terrorists were the only ones involved — so no further examination is warranted or desired. This serves to sever the spoke from the hub, and so the hub remains undiscovered.

Long-range planning

With these preliminaries out of the way, I'm going to offer my own theory on what might have happened leading up to that fateful day in 2001. I'll tell you right up front that I have no proof for any of this, nor any practical way to obtain it. I offer it only as a spur to your own thinking about the attacks and their aftermath. Perhaps my perspective

(even if it turns out to be wrong) will be the spark that leads you to some new understanding. Or if nothing else, it could serve as a good example of red flags to help you avoid tin-foil-hat-wearing conspiracy nuts in the future.

Although technically, a wheel conspiracy consists of spoke and hub conspiracies, one feature of my theory is that some spokes were not

American Airlines Flight 11 suspects (World Trade Center)

Satam M. Al Suqami, Abdulaziz Alomari, Waleed M. Alshehri, Wail M. Alshehri, Mohamed Atta

United Airlines Flight 175 suspects (World Trade Center)

Marwan Al-Shehhi, Ahmed Alghamdi, Mohamed Alshehri, Hamza Alghamdi, Faysz Rashid Ahmed Hassan Al Qadi Banihammad

American Airlines Flight 77 suspects (Pentagon)

Khalid Almudhar, Majed Moqed, Waf Alhazmi, Salem Alhazmi, Hani Hanjour

United Airlines Flight 93 suspects (Pennsylvania)

Saeed Alghamdi, Ahmad Alhazmi A. Alhazmi, Ahmed Alnami, Ziad Samir Jarrah

BBC NEWS

You are in: Middle East

Page Sunday, 23 September, 2001, 12:30 GMT 13:30 UK

Hijack 'suspects' alive and well

A man called Waleed Al Shehri says he left the US a year ago

Another of the men named by the FBI as a hijacker in the suicide attacks on Washington and New York has turned up alive and well.

The identities of four of the 19 suspects accused of having carried out the attacks are now in doubt.

Rebuilding

- Uneasy pe
- Afghan arm
- Looking ah
- Aid shortfa
- Unfulfilled

Political uncertainty

- Karzai's sh
- Al-Qaeda t
- Qadir's assassinat
- Loya jirga assessed

Profiles

- Hamid Kar
- Ex-king's d
- Masood; SI
- Warlord Isi Khan

Even some of the official conspiracy's alleged suspects — the 19 hijackers — are likely false. By September 23, 2001, BBC News stated that the identities of four were already in doubt; Waleed Al Shehri, for example, was reported alive and had allegedly "left the US" a year before.

necessarily criminal conspiracies *per se*. Rather, they were just events that were manipulated by the hub in furtherance of its plans. One example which I will discuss later is the air traffic control response to the hijackings — individual ATC operators were not co-conspirators, but were simply manipulated into taking actions that helped the plot succeed. So, that being said, here goes.

It's a known fact that for decades the government, through its COINTEL program (and probably many more programs just like it), infiltrated groups that it considered subversive. The *agents provocateur* who infiltrate such groups operate on several levels. First, they provide inside information about the group back to their handlers; information such as the identity of members (including who the leaders are, and any exploitable rifts between members), what they are planning, where they meet, and how they communicate among themselves. Second, they exert influence into the operation of the group — perhaps even rising to leadership positions — which ultimately converts the group into an unwitting (shadow) government asset.³ These groups can then be used in any number of ways, without the group members ever realizing that they are actually carrying out the will of the government which they outwardly oppose! And this is not a one-shot deal. These subverted groups are like money in the bank; a rainy day fund of dupes for whenever they are needed.

We have some planes ...

At the center of the whole 9/11 plot was the hijacking of the four airliners by 19 men wielding box-cutters (by which I presume is meant retractable blade utility knives) and perhaps Mace. And yet, in my theory, this isn't the *hub* conspiracy, it is merely one of the spokes! But of course, there's no disputing that it was indeed a conspiracy. And it was also a very extensive one, which undoubtedly required an

(Continued on page 3)

3. With the all-pervasive surveillance now inflicted upon every one of us, tons of information can now be gathered without even having to go to the trouble of sending an actual person to infiltrate a target group. But the second aspect of the infiltration is the more important one in the long run.

(Continued from page 2)

enormous amount of planning and preparation. Now, the first thing to think about is whether or not all of this planning was done by way of face-to-face meetings. Because if not, then the presumption should be that any number of domestic and foreign spy agencies (who also engage in wholesale surveillance) were aware of the plot. In any case, the government has admitted that at least one of the hijackers was roommates with an FBI agent for a period of time. So, the first prong of my theory is that the shadow government knew there was a group planning to hijack one or more planes, and managed to introduce one or more agents provocateur into the situation.

Through the influence of such infiltrators (or one or more of the dupes described above), the original group is manipulated into expanding the plot into a literal grand slam of hijacking — four planes into four buildings. In the course of the planning, the same channels of influence inject details into the mix, ultimately helping guide (or at least always monitoring) the selection of dates, times, flights, destinations, etc. to those which serve the goals of the hub conspirators. In this way the hub controls the spoke without the spoke being aware of it. Once the major decisions are made, and preparations for the mission begin (such as flight lessons and other training), the hub can work on other spokes, some of which are meant to secure the success of the hijacking spoke.

Playing games

One such spoke is the war game exercises. It was admitted that a number of exercises were taking place on September 11, 2001, at least one of which involved the simulated hijacking of airliners. Talk about coincidences! And even though it was claimed by the military that their participation in these war games *improved* their performance on that day, the fact remains that three out of four hijacked planes made it to their destination, which can only mean that without the gaming, all four planes would have found their targets. The truth is that the simultaneous simulation and real-life hijackings introduced confusion into the situation, which negatively impacted the response to the real thing.

One aspect of that confusion concerns the nature of radar simulations. I once tested the radar systems used

by our commercial aviation system, and part of those tests was verifying that the radar receiver could pick up targets, and correctly identify their positions, and other relevant information. But because there was no way for the systems to receive actual target signals at that stage of the test, those targets were simulated — that is, they were generated by computer, and injected into the receiver. Once injected, the simulated targets were — to the radar system — exactly like a real target. They appeared on the air traffic control screen just like any plane would (as a blip with identifying information). It took a few minutes for the injected targets to first appear on the screen, and the same for them to disappear when you shut down the simulation.

Another aspect of the radar systems is called *Identification Friend or Foe* (IFF) which is the formal name for the *transponders* which the hijackers turned off when they took control of the planes. The radar system transmits a signal out, and when it hits a plane, that signal is reflected back to the system. This “primary return” pro-

duces a blip on the ATC screen. At the same time, the transponders send back a separate signal which gives flight number and altitude information. This is the “friend” portion of IFF; if no transponder signal is received, the plane is by default a “foe.” So, turning off the transponders doesn’t make the plane’s blip disappear from the screen, it just makes the flight and altitude info disappear.

Injections of confusion

Now for a simulated hijacking war game, you need to have a hijacked plane. So you can either use a real plane and pretend it’s been snagged, or you can inject a simulated plane. The advantage to the simulated plane is that you can make it do pretty much whatever you want, while the real plane would simply continue on its normal course. So, let us imagine for a moment a hijack simulation that is actively injecting *phantom* hijacked planes (complete with identifying info) onto ATC screens while *at the exact same time*, real planes are being hijacked and their identifying info is being removed from the screens. Is it possible that such a scenario could cause confusion in the minds of radar operators as to which plane is which? Might planes that have already crashed into buildings appear to still be flying at some other location? Is it possible that, unbeknownst to the official in charge of the war games, multiple simulations were running at the same time, such that even when the primary one was shut down by him



Listen to LWRN anywhere and any time!

**Download the APP
Smartphones
Iphones**

Visit **www.LWRN.net** and
Click on the links on the left side of the home
page!!

**Ask everyone you know to
download the app! And Listen!**

DOUBLE JEOPARDY *Editor's Note: Last month, we anticipated publishing an article on double jeopardy in this edition of the Liberty Tree. Lord willing, that article will run in just a couple months from now. So stay tuned!*

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

(thus making its fake targets disappear), other ones were left running, thereby ensuring continued confusion?

With all this in mind then, the next prong of my theory is that the hub conspirators manipulated events so that not only would the actual hijackings and the war game hijackings occur at the same time, but so that the simulations would purposely confuse and hamper any effective response to the real ones. As I mentioned above, this spoke, while not necessarily a criminal conspiracy itself,⁴ is indeed a part of the criminal hub conspiracy, by making the hijacking spoke more likely to succeed.

If you want something done right ...

As mentioned above, in early 1993 a group of criminal conspirators planned on setting off a bomb in the parking garage of one of the World Trade towers, hoping to make it fall onto the other tower, thereby bringing them both down — a terrorist two-for-one deal. One of the conspirators contacted the FBI, which passed on the opportunity to substitute non-explosives for the explosives to be used in the assembly of the bomb. The result of this missed opportunity was an *actual* bomb in a truck parked in the garage beneath the tower. However, the truck was parked too far from where it was meant to be, and while it killed six people and injured about 1,000 more, the bomb did not do enough damage to collapse the building.

Yet, even though this bombing was a failure for the terrorists, it seems to have served as an important learning opportunity. When the shadow government wanted to generate some home-grown terrorism to blame on anti-government types, the Alfred P. Murrah federal building in Oklahoma City was chosen for annihilation. Having apparently learned the unreliability of truck bombs in leveling whole buildings, explosive charges were planted *inside* the Murrah building to supplement Timothy McVeigh's fertilizer bomb in the rental truck parked at the curb.⁵ If not for the failure of some of those bombs to detonate, the building would have been completely demolished, and there would have remained no evidence of the explosives planted inside.

Of course, this raises an important question: If enough explosives to completely level a building could be hidden inside of it, even while it was occupied by federal government agencies (including the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms — and later, *Explosives!*), then why bother exploding a truck bomb outside? Surely, if the conspirators' ultimate goal was to simply demolish the building, the inside bombs would

eliminate any purpose for the outside bomb. And yet there were *both*. This fact is a clue to the existence of the same sort of wheel conspiracy we've been looking at with respect to the 9/11 attacks. The spoke conspiracy doesn't need the hub; the hub conspiracy needs the spoke, so the blame can be directed away from itself. After all, without the truck bomb outside, who would ever believe that it was anti-government crazies that brought the building down? And that's the bottom line. The truck bomb is nothing but a decoy, to hide the real cause of the destruction, so the blame can be laid at the feet of whatever terrorist-of-the-moment the hub chooses. And since it's just a decoy, the success of the operation is removed from the hands of the patsy, and rests instead in the hands of the hub conspirators.

If you're starting to notice a pattern developing here ... well, you just might be a wacky conspiracy theorist. If so, you'll want to keep your tin foil hats close by folks, because I'll be back to continue this tale in the next edition of Liberty Tree.



Liberty's Warriors



Invite YOU to listen and join
conversations about Freedom!

Every Wednesday on LWRN, at 4 PM EST, the popular Liberty's Warriors break down current events and politics in light of the principles established for this Constitutional republic by the founders and our founding documents. There are plenty of laughs along the way, and hosts **Bill Hale** and **JoAnn Nicholls** will engage you with their easy conversational style. Join in and be a part of the fight for Liberty!



**Live show time: 4 PM to 6 PM
Eastern, Wednesday
(Show repeats at 10-12 PM Wednesday
and 9-11 AM Thursday)**

Listen at www.lwrn.net

4. Of course, this would be true only if those in charge of the war games were unaware that the ultimate purpose of the games was to sow confusion.
5. Live coverage by Oklahoma City news crews documented the finding of additional *unexploded* bombs in the building, requiring multiple evacuations during rescue operations in order to remove them.

Liberty Tree

Vol. 19, No. 11 — November 2017



Last month I started laying out my own theory about the criminal

conspiracy that culminated in the collapse of three skyscrapers on September 11, 2001. As I said then, I have no proof that it's what really happened (which doesn't actually distinguish it much from the government's own theory). It's just my way of accounting for various aspects of what was reported. Of course, at the heart of the whole affair is the fact that it involves a major conspiracy, the full extent of which has never been reliably established. What's more, it's unlikely that it will ever be known, since a large component of the conspiracy is to prevent its discovery. Therefore, the control of evidence and information becomes a tool in the furtherance of the ultimate outcome — that being the accomplishment of the goals of the conspiracy without ever being identified as a conspirator.

As a refresher, the type of conspiracy involved in the 9/11 attacks is a wheel conspiracy, which is: "A conspiracy in which a single member or group (the 'hub') separately agrees with two or more other members or groups (the 'spokes')." ¹In part one, I identified the plan to hijack four planes simultaneously as one of the spoke conspiracies. As is likely often the case in wheel conspiracies, this spoke was manipulated into furthering the efforts of the

Continuing Criminal Conspiracies

hub conspiracy, without its knowledge. That is, the spoke not only

by Dick Greb

didn't realize it was being manipulated (through the use of *agents provocateur*), but wasn't even aware of the larger conspiracy of which it was merely a part. That made it a perfect dupe and fall guy for the hub.

Another spoke of the wheel was arranging war game exercises to coincide with the hijacking of the planes. The implementation of these exercises (including simulations of hijacked planes) introduced a level of confusion into the handling of the situation by air traffic controllers, and drew off military assets that could otherwise have been brought to bear on the hijackings. Thus, this spoke served to increase the probability of success for the hijacking spoke. And yet, the official story is that it was mere happenstance that these two spokes occurred on the same day.

... You have to do it yourself

We also looked at a couple of prior attacks against buildings, including the 1993 attempt to topple one World Trade Tower into the other, and the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City in 1995. Despite the opportunity to substitute non-explosive material for the explosives used to produce the bomb in 1993, the FBI declined

to do so, and the resulting blast killed six and injured about 1,000 more. But the truck bomb got parked in the wrong spot, minimizing damage to the building. In 1995, Timothy McVeigh's fertilizer bomb in a Ryder truck parked at the curb was supplemented by "sophisticated" explosives (according to local TV news interviews with experts) planted inside the building. If not for the fact that some of those explosives failed to detonate, the whole Murrah building would have been demolished, and no one would have been the wiser about the inside bombs.

And so a progressive pattern starts to emerge. Instead of simply taking advantage of "terrorist attacks" or other crises after the fact,² the shadow government actively participates (as the hub) to make the crisis worse, and to ensure that it is accomplished. After all, the larger the crisis, the more draconian the changes that can be implemented as a 'remedy.' And as was shown by the 'mistake' of the 1993 WTC bombers, it's hard to find good help these days. As the adage says, "If you want something done right, you have to do it yourself." So, even though the *appearance* of control is left in the less reliable spoke (in this case the hijacking spoke, which will be the fall guy), very little of that control actually exists. Instead, the hub con-

(Continued on page 2)

Don't
Call 911

Part II

1. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 8th Edition (2004).
2. As Rahm Emanuel said, "You never want a serious crisis to go to waste. And what I mean by that is an opportunity to do things that you think you could not do before."

trols all aspects of the plan through other, more reliable spokes.

What are the odds?

The reliability of the spoke to accomplish its goal is important when you consider the general hijack plan. Four groups of five men each (apparently there was one no-show) planned to take control of four commercial airliners, not only within a relatively short span of time, but within a short period of time after take-off. The conception of this plan is fraught with problems right from the start. In ordinary circumstances — that is, if everything worked as it usually did — this plot had virtually zero chance of success.

For example, United flight 175 had a capacity of 168 passengers, seven flight attendants and two pilots. If the plane had been full (and how could the plotters know that it wouldn't be?), the hijackers would have been outnumbered by over 30 to 1. As it was, with only 51 other passengers, they were still outnumbered 12 to 1! And they were armed with fairly small (even if very sharp) knives and maybe pepper spray. On American Airlines flight 11, the ratio was 17 to 1; on AA 77, 12 to 1; and the best odds for them, on United 93 (the one where the passengers purportedly tried to retake the plane, only to 'crash' anyway), was 10 to 1.

To make it even harder, FAA rules required that cockpit doors remain closed and locked during flights. According to the *9/11 Commission Report*, American Airlines flight attendants all had a key to the cockpit, but United attendants did not — their keys were stowed in the overhead compartments of seats 1A and 1B. This kind of inconsistency between airlines makes planning tough, unless you somehow know these details in advance. On the one hand, a hijacker could kill an AA attendant and get a key, but every other attendant would also have one, and so he could never be secure in the cockpit. In each of the four

planes, at least one attendant was reported to still be alive at the time of its crash. And even if you obtained a key to the cockpit, it would be foolish to believe that you could enter it without a struggle. So, in each scenario, hijackers would have to fight to get a key, fight to get in the cockpit, fight the pilots to wrest control of the plane from them, and then fly the plane, all the while fighting against steep odds to keep others out.³

Finally, although the hijackers were purportedly certified as commercial pilots, they had only simulator experience for large airliners. So, in the midst of all the hubbub going on around them, these inexperienced pilots had to fly actual jets into actual buildings under extremely stressful conditions, and get it all right the first time — there would be no reset button this time.

Where's that remote?

The point is that this hijacking operation, having the odds stacked so high against it, needed the outside help of the hub conspiracy for it to succeed. At the same time, since it was the cover for the hub's ultimate plan, the hub positively needed the hijackers' job to get done. But, this is where the next step of my theory comes in. Because the hub doesn't need the hijackers to fly the planes, it only needs them to implement the attack against the planes, so that the protocols for hijacking can be put into play, and so that any information coming from the planes in the mean time supports the hijacking scenario. Because (drum roll please) the planes were taken over remotely, and the pilots — both the original pilots and the hijackers — were reduced to observers, with literally front row seats for the action to come. Now, some of you may think such a thing is unthinkable⁴ or impossible, but I assure you it's neither. On December 1, 1984 — *17 years before* the WTC attacks — NASA's Dryden Flight Research Center and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) con-

**Boeing had been
designing systems for
flying pilotless
aircraft since at
least 1959 ...**

ducted a remote-controlled experiment called the **Controlled Impact Demonstration**. The purpose of the experiment was to test an additive designed to minimize the explosiveness of jet fuel in crash situations.

On the morning of December 1, 1984, a remotely controlled Boeing 720 transport took off from Edwards Air Force Base (Edwards, California), made a left-hand departure and climbed to an altitude of 2300 feet. It then began a descent-to-landing to a specially prepared runway on the east side of Rogers Dry Lake. ... The aircraft was remotely flown by NASA research pilot Fitzhugh (Fitz) Fulton from the NASA Dryden Remotely Controlled Vehicle Facility. Previously, the Boeing 720 had been flown on 14 practice flights with safety pilots onboard. During the 14 flights, there were 16 hours and 22 minutes of remotely piloted vehicle control, including 10 remotely piloted takeoffs, 69 remotely piloted vehicle controlled approaches, and 13 remotely piloted vehicle landings on abort [sic] runway.⁵

It has also been claimed that in early 1995, German air carrier "Lufthansa discovered that its new Boeing 747-400 aircraft had been fitted with flight directors [auto-pilots] that were *vulnerable to American remote-control*, ostensibly designed to 'recover' hijacked aircraft ... Lufthansa was not informed about this 'free extra' in advance, and was furious that its sovereign aircraft might be covertly 'rescued' by America, without the knowledge or permission of the Ger-

3. And don't forget that the people trying to get back in have ready access to cockpit keys.

4. Or as my late buddy Jim Kerr would say, "the most unheard-of thing you ever heard of."

5. <https://www.nasa.gov/centers/dryden/multimedia/imagegallery/CID/ECN-31803.html>

(Continued from page 2)

man Government.”⁶ Although I was unable to verify the existence of the cited article, or to find any other reference to Lufthansa swapping out Boeing autopilots, there is no question that Boeing had been designing systems for flying pilotless aircraft since at least 1959, when it received Patent #US2883125 A: “This invention relates to a method and means for controlling aircraft flight, and more particularly the flight of a pilotless airplane. ...*The guidance of aerodynes, such as pilotless airplanes by remote control* through radio means and the like *has reached an advanced stage* but is not well suited for long distance flights.”⁷ And a mere *nine* days after the 9-11 attacks, a patent application was filed for an “anti-terrorism aircraft flight control system,” which “incorporates an override system which will take control of an off-course aircraft which has entered or is about to enter a designated prohibited three-dimensional area.”⁸ The bottom line is that the ability to remotely fly jet airliners existed well before September 2001.

We don't need no stinkin' pilots

The implications of this are huge. First, and most important of course, is that this action more assuredly guaranteed that the planes would crash into the buildings. And while that may have been the end goal of the hijacking spoke conspiracy, it was merely a preliminary — albeit a necessary — step in the overall hub conspiracy. Since control of the plane can be taken from the real pilots as easily as from the hijackers, it didn't matter if the hijackers ever made it into the cockpit, or even if they intended to crash the planes at all. Their fate was sealed when they boarded the planes that morning.

Second, but also important is that these remote controllers *did not die*

You are invited



7:30 PM at 5 S. Center St. #1100, Westminster, Md.

Please bring a covered dish; the Fellowship will supply the turkey. Call receptionist at 410-857-4441 for details.

in the plane crashes! Instead of suicidal hijackers, you have homicidal psychopaths, who were willing to murder at least hundreds of passengers on the jets, as well as unsuspecting office workers in the towers.⁹ And unless they have fallen prey to one of the ‘cleanup’ spokes of the conspiracy and been killed themselves, they're still walking around free.

I'll be addressing the cleanup spoke later, but for now, I just want to point out one of the consequences of a remote takeover of the planes, and how that relates to another unbelievable aspect of the official conspiracy theory: the purported failure to recover the ‘black boxes’ from the crash sites. These flight data recorders — particularly the cockpit voice recorders — document the last hour or so of flight. So, in the scenario I've described, they may well have recorded pilots (or hijackers) voicing their surprise and concern that the plane's controls no longer responded to them. The real pilots may even have recognized, and perhaps mentioned, Boeing's Uninter-

ruptible Autopilot system as the likely reason for the loss of control. Certainly, such a recording would be a major contradiction to the official story, making non-recovery of the boxes (or the purported inability to extract the information from them) a necessary factor in the success of the hub conspiracy.

Bombs away

The next spoke in the hub conspiracy to consider is the destruction of the buildings. As learned from prior experience, explosives secreted inside buildings are more likely to bring them down than outside explosions. But just like in Oklahoma City, outside explosions provide the necessary cover for the ones inside. So, once the remote-controlled certainty of planes crashing into them has been secured, the real demolition preparations can begin. Much has been said about ‘controlled demolition’ and the technical expertise necessary to cause buildings to fall into their own footprints. However, a point I want to make is that the less averse you are to collateral damage to surrounding buildings, the more leeway you get in the demolition. Thus, some of the critical (and obvious to

6. This quote is cited as coming from a 2001 article by Joe Vialls, titled “France, Russia, Germany Responsible for 9-11.”

7. <https://www.google.com/patents/US2883125>.

8. #US20030055540 A1, <https://www.google.com/patents/US20030055540>

9. Of course, one shouldn't forget that subjects of MK-ULTRA mind-control experiments might be useful — though unwitting — candidates for such a nefarious job.

(Continued on page 4)

an observer) steps in a controlled demolition (as used in the technical sense), such as removing stairways and load-bearing supports, would become less necessary. The most important thing then is that the collapses need to appear related to the plane crashes.

So, the question is whether explosives could be hidden in strategic places within the two World Trade towers and set off in a manner that it would resemble a non-explosive collapse. And thanks to the work of other spokes that would actively cover-up the existence of the hub conspiracy, the resemblance would only need to be superficial. The official conspiracy theory is that the fires from the crashes weakened the steel support structure and caused the initial failure, and ultimately the whole building “pancaked,” as each floor dropped onto the one below. Opponents argue that the building collapsed at ‘free fall’ speed, and thus couldn’t have resulted from each floor hitting the one below.

My theory lies somewhere in the middle. Looking again at OKC, consider how those inside bombs got triggered. In order to look like McVeigh’s truck bomb was the cause of the destruction, the inside bombs had to be triggered almost simultaneously. But how could anyone know the exact second the truck would detonate? Was someone sitting around watching for it, so they could push a button? I suggest that the truck bomb created a pressure wave that was used as the trigger for the ones inside.¹⁰ Likewise, I suggest that the pancaking floors of the two towers created pressure waves that were used to trigger the explosives on the floor below. Boyle’s law says that if you halve the volume of an enclosure, the pressure will double. Not only should that much of a differential in pressure be high enough to use as a trigger, it would be unlikely to occur by accident before the appointed time (thus allowing more lead time for preparation).

Using this ‘double pressure’ would time the triggering such that subsequent floors would start to fall before the floors above reached them, and the effect would be the near free-fall speed collapse that was seen.

Let’s roll

When it comes to the Pentagon, a different dynamic existed, since total destruction of the entire building was apparently not part of the plan. However, a *particular* section of the building certainly seems to have been targeted, because the plane didn’t crash into the face directly in front of it as it approached, but did a 330-degree downward spiraling turn before it hit. Perhaps it’s just a coincidence that the Office of Naval Intelligence had only recently been moved into that area of the Pentagon. Or was that group investigating something that the hub conspirators wanted to remain concealed? Could it have something to do with the several trillion dollars Donald Rumsfeld admitted the Pentagon couldn’t account for? These considerations are another example of not wasting a good crisis, but instead, using it to accomplish things you would not otherwise be able to do.

And that brings us to World Trade Center Building 7, the 47-story building that collapsed without being hit by a plane. On the one hand, we have a building collapsing without a plane, and on the other hand, we have a plane (United flight 93) crashing without a building. Another coincidence perhaps? Or could it be that U93 was supposed to hit 7WTC and ‘cause’ it to fall down like its bigger brothers? Why then didn’t it reach its destination, given my theory that it was being controlled remotely and wouldn’t have been susceptible to interfer-



Listen to LWRN anywhere and any time!

**Download the APP
Smartphones
Iphones**

Visit www.LWRN.net and
Click on the links on the left side of the home
page!!

**Ask everyone you know to
download the app! And Listen!**

ence from anyone inside the plane?

For this, keep in mind that the spokes, while being manipulated by the hub, are not necessarily under full control by it. As I mentioned with respect to the hijack simulations, the air traffic controllers were not in on the conspiracy, but were manipulated by those who were involved through the introduction of false radar targets and such. Likewise, the military was also being manipulated, with scheduled war games in other parts of the country, unclear protocols for hijackings, and untimely and conflicting information being supplied from the FAA and civilian ATCs. They were being ham-strung from the outside so they couldn’t be effective, and that was enough to keep them out of the way for the most part. However, eventually they were able to arrive in time to take action, and they shot down U93 over Pennsylvania, leaving a miles-long trail of debris. But rather than admit that it was responsible for the deaths of 40 innocent people, a cover story was fabricated about the heroic passengers trying to regain control of the plane, but not being able to prevent the dastardly hijackers from killing them all.

I’ll pick this thread up again next month, and round out the rest of the hub conspiracy in the exciting conclusion to my version of Conspiracy Theory 9-11.



10. Perhaps improper positioning of the truck again foiled a total collapse, this time by failing to trigger the inside explosives that were farther away.



Liberty Tree

Vol. 19, No. 12 — December 2017



I left off last month with the scenario of United Flight 93 being shot out of the sky by Air Force fighter jets, despite the best efforts of the hub conspirators¹ to keep the military otherwise occupied and ineffective. The most immediate effect of this turn of events is that it left World Trade Center Building 7 without a plane to crash into it. Apparently not wanting to waste all the preparations already taken to demolish the building after the planned crash, Larry Silverstein — who in July 2001 entered into a 99-year lease of the World Trade Center complex with the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey — admitted in a news interview that it was decided to “pull it” anyway.² In the final tally, four planes were hijacked, and four buildings were destroyed — three of which were totally demolished, with the Pentagon being only partially destroyed. In this respect then, the most observable portion of the hub conspiracy was a huge success. But that isn’t the end of the whole conspiracy, not by a long shot.

In the big picture, there is more to be considered. Since an integral part of the hub conspiracy is to pin the blame for the whole tragedy on the hijacking spoke, other spokes must be activated to ensure that official investigations as well as public attention are directed along the pre-planned paths. And of course it’s a huge advantage in the planning process when you already know what’s going to happen. This simply can’t be overstated; because in the public mind, extreme emergencies such as the 9/11 attacks require quick reactions to deal with the disaster. And in such quick reactions, mistakes in judgment are often made, but are more

readily excused and forgiven. After all, who could have been prepared for such an unexpected event as hijacked planes being flown into skyscrapers? Why, the hub conspirators, of course!

In the same manner that foreknowledge allows them to interfere with air traffic controllers through mock hijack scenarios, and to minimize military response through war game exercises in other parts of the country, it also allows the hub to pre-position assets of their own choosing into positions of authority that will be called into action on the fateful day. And this can be done in the weeks and months leading up the event, so it goes completely unnoticed. You don’t need to push somebody in after the fact to run the show, you just promote or transfer them to the necessary post sometime prior. Conversely, people who the hub wants removed from the mix can likewise be transferred out of the way before they become involved,³ without raising suspicions of foul play.

Insuring and ensuring losses

When it comes to pre-positioning assets, let’s consider the presence of Larry Silverstein in this light. As mentioned above, Mr. Silverstein signed a 99-year lease just six weeks or so before the buildings were hit. Now, a month and a half isn’t much time to plan and prepare for the demolition of three huge skyscrapers, so it seems unlikely that he conceived this plan himself. And yet the buildings were under his control for those last critical weeks of preparation time. And to many people, this fact alone makes him the virtual poster boy of the conspiracy. One way to look

Tying
Up
Loose
Ends

Don't
Call **911**
Part III

(Continued on page 2)

1. My theory of the 9/11 attacks is that it was a wheel conspiracy, defined as: “A conspiracy in which a single member or group (the ‘hub’) separately agrees with two or more other members or groups (the ‘spokes’).” *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 8th Edition (2004).
2. It’s often noted that this terminology has connotations of controlled demolitions, and indeed seems to make little sense in the context of a building that purportedly fell down of its own accord.
3. On a more sinister note, they might also be purposely put directly in the path of the disaster, as will be discussed a little later.

By Dick Greb

at the whole affair is that it was just an unfortunate coincidence that almost before the ink had time to dry on a century-long lease, approximately 10 million square feet of premium office space covered by that lease was destroyed. Such a catastrophic loss may have been the death-knell for many an investor, but fortunately for Silverstein, he was able to collect more than \$4.5 billion from a passel of insurance companies (and the airlines involved) to compensate him for his losses. According to an article in the *New York Times*:

Mr. Silverstein and the Port Authority together had spent more than \$1.5 billion of the insurance money already, including more than \$500 million for Mr. Silverstein's rent to the Port Authority; about \$190 million for the Port Authority to buy out Westfield America's retail rights; and more than \$700 million to repay Mr. Silverstein's lender, GMAC, and to repay Mr. Silverstein and his partners most of their equity.⁴

So after spending one third of the insurance money paying off various expenses and recouping their investment, about \$3 billion was left to begin redeveloping the area destroyed in the attacks. Several of the buildings have now been completed and are open for business, including the Freedom Tower, now the tallest building in the United States. To sum up this scenario, Silverstein was able to slingshot a terrible catastrophe into a means to transform 16 acres in Lower Manhattan into a bigger and better World Trade Center complex.

A convergence of objectives

On the other hand, another way to look at the situation is that billionaire *real estate developer* Larry Silverstein was specifically chosen as the beneficiary of a lucrative lease arrangement just so that he would be at the helm at the time



Larry Silverstein, chairman of Silverstein Properties, which held the lease to the WTC buildings in 2001, speaking at the opening ceremony of Four World Trade Center on 11/13/13. The building has 2.5 million square feet of rentable space.

of the attacks, and thereby be in the necessary position to bring about the redevelopment of the site. And yet, even if this was so, that doesn't necessarily mean that Silverstein was a willing and witting participant in the conspiracy. He may have been chosen for the part because the hub conspiracists saw in him those traits that they considered necessary to wrangle the billions out of the insurance companies and get the rebuilding done.⁵ He would not necessarily inspect the internal structural framework of the buildings, so explosives could have already been placed before he took over control of the complex.

Another consideration is the possibility that the grand redevelopment plan for Lower Manhattan entered into the selection process for the target buildings. After all, if your plan is to knock some buildings down by flying planes into them, you need to pick the buildings, right? And if you get to choose anyway, why not knock down ones that will jump-start a huge remodeling project you had in mind? That makes it a win-win situation all around — except for the poor losers in the buildings and planes who were directly murdered in the conspiracy, and the untold number of other losers who were exposed to toxic conditions as a result of the destruction on that day. You see, this is just another way you can keep a crisis from being wasted.

It cost upward of \$10 billion to rebuild the complex as it now is, starting out from mostly piles of rubble. Imagine how much more time and money would have been required if not for the fast-tracking of the demolitions. In addition, the financial burden would have significantly shifted, since no billions would have been forthcoming from the insurance companies.

Of course, it's crazy to think that anyone would go to all the trouble involved in this grand conspiracy just to save a few bucks on safe and proper demolitions, and indeed, it would be crazy if that's all there was to it. But there are other objectives to consider as well. Front and center of these is setting up the pretext for a never-ending *War against Terrorism*. Coupled with that are all of the freedom-eradicating 'precautions' that now must be complied with to keep us 'safe.' And we must continually cement in our collective minds that radical Muslims were responsible for these attacks, and so we must hate them and kill them wherever in the world they may be. Never mind that the purported radical Muslims involved in the hijackings were already killed in the crashes, or that our Central Intelligence Agency has historically created, funded and trained the very same groups of radicals that we must later fight against elsewhere.

E pluribus unum

This possibility of widely divergent objectives can obviously make intricate hub conspiracies tough to figure out. Making it worse is that the separate spoke conspiracies may have objectives totally unrelated or even in opposition to those of other spokes, or of the hub itself. But whatever the situation, that diversity can be useful to the hub. Naturally, when goals are complementary, they enhance each other. However, a direct opposition of goals could also be used to isolate a spoke. After all, common sense would seem to dictate that if two groups have mutually exclusive goals, they wouldn't work together.

4. From "A Hole in the City's heart," *NY Times*, Sept. 11, 2006.

5. Of course, he may also have been selected for such reasons, and told of the plan too.

So, this kind of opposition could be an effective screen between the hub and the scapegoat spoke.

Since the spokes are just the means to the ends desired by the hub, their objectives are subordinate to it, if they are relevant to it at all. The overall job of the hub is to orchestrate this vast array of diverse interests and goals into one ultimate climax — the accomplishment of its goals without revealing its existence. *E pluribus unum* — out of many, one.

Before moving on from this subject of goals, I want to touch on one last aspect. Any of the people involved in any part of the overall conspiracy may decide to also branch out on their own, so to speak. They may become a small hub themselves, and set up a spoke or two to accomplish personal goals of their own, probably without the knowledge of the main hub conspirators. For example, a man who knows a specific flight will crash on a specific day, might decide that would be a good flight to book his wife onto, after having bought plenty of life insurance on her well in advance of course. Or knowing how disasters affect stock prices, someone might arrange very profitable trades for stock in companies he knows will be

thus affected. Of course, the main hub might also delve into such profiteering too.

Who would do such a thing?

In all this talk of hubs and spokes one could lose sight of the fact that where the rubber meets the road, *actual people* are the ones doing the dirty work. Whatever their reasons, it was human beings who imagined, plotted, prepared and executed this monstrous conspiracy to directly murder thousands of other human beings (as well as untold thousands more indirectly through the ongoing military actions that ensued). Normal people may ask themselves, “Who would do such a thing?” And the answer is, people who *aren't* normal. Psychopaths, in other words.

Psychopathy. Mental disorder, especially as apart from disease of the brain, and typified by emotional immaturity and instability, moral deficiency, and perversions.⁶



Listen to LWRN anywhere and any time!

**Download the APP
Smartphones
Iphones**

Visit **www.LWRN.net** and Click on the links on the left side of the home page!!

Ask everyone you know to download the app! And Listen!

But don't let the reference to brain disease fool you. These people are not crazy in the classical sense, like a lunatic. Rather they are morally and spiritually damaged, having seared consciences which enable them to trifle with the lives and deaths of others without remorse. The kind of people who send other people's children off to kill and be killed in foreign lands under false pretenses. The kind who buy and sell children for pedophilic purposes, send innocent people to prison by planting evidence, kill a stranger as a gang initiation, or sell pharmaceutical drugs to millions knowing them to be lethal.

The truth is, there's no real shortage of psychopaths in the world today. In fact, there's enough of them running around that it's rather amazing we're not all dead yet. But thankfully, your garden variety psychopath doesn't have access to the reins of power, and so isn't likely to be able to impact

(Continued on page 4)



A hearing of the 9/11 Commission on April 14, 2004, showing the swearing in of CIA Director Tenet and Deputy Director McLaughlin. Sitting directly behind the Commission's Chair, Tom Kean, is Philip Zelikow, a long-time “intelligence advisor” of some capacity in the Bush and Obama administrations. Zelikow served as executive director of the Commission, in a position to supervise and influence the entire direction of the public inquiry. Zelikow has also written about the formation of “public myths.” Was he an asset of the hub conspirators for the post-9/11 management of public perception?

6. Funk & Wagnalls *New Comprehensive International Dictionary of the English Language*, Encyclopedic edition (1978).

more than a handful of people at a time. He also lacks the ability to control (or even prevent) investigations of his crime, making him more likely to be caught. But the psychopaths who manage to get themselves into positions of real power are the ones who can most literally bring us hell on earth.

The general ridicule of conspiracy theories by government officials and their media minions helps perpetuate a bias against them in the minds of many. The odd thing is that while so many people have no trouble believing that a score of radical Islamic psychopaths executed the attacks of September 11, 2001, they still can't seem to wrap their heads around the idea that they had help, and that without that help, the attacks would not have succeeded. More to the point, they can't bring themselves to believe that there are psychopaths within the highest levels of our own government (and in the shadow government behind it), and that because of the power they wield, they are far more dangerous to all of us than a handful of hijackers could ever be.

Why would they do it?

When it comes to why, many possibilities come to mind. At the highest level, I think the overall answer is simply because they can. In the rarified air of global elitists, the lives of mere mortals just don't matter all that much. Any opportunity to eliminate lots of people — through war (an all-time favorite), tainted vaccines, genetically altering food supplies, etc. — is worth the trouble. These elitists are the type who ascribe to the ideology engraved into the Georgia Guidestones: "Maintain humanity under 500,000,000 in perpetual balance with nature." For those without a calculator handy, that's about a 92% reduction in the population of the world.

Just below that level, personal gain is a big draw. Some people make tons of money selling imple-

ments of war and destruction, and so its no surprise those people want to see more of both. For this type then, the possibility of never-ending war is a huge motivator. Others of this type might be enticed by the promise of lucrative contracts, or concessions, or other forms of bribery.

From that point down to the level of the foot soldiers, other factors start to come into play. The people at these levels won't have as great an opportunity to enrich themselves from the plot. Part of the reason for that is the compartmentalization that takes place in a serious conspiracy. The hub has an interest in nobody knowing any more than absolutely necessary for it do its part. So the spokes, knowing less, have less chance to profit. In the lower levels, threats of death (of both self and family), and exposure of previously unrevealed crimes (such as the types identified above that are earmarks of psychopaths) are undoubtedly used to get people involved and keep them quiet. Once again, total surveillance is a useful tool in discovering one's complicity in such criminal activity.

As each *intermediate* goal of the hub is accomplished, there is an obvious incentive to eliminate the participants of the spoke whose *final* goal it was. As Benjamin Franklin noted, "Three may keep a Secret, if two of them are dead."⁷ Thanks to the diversity of the spokes and the compartmentalization of the components, a lot of this might be accomplished with hardly a ripple of notice. Co-conspirators who didn't notice would be inclined to continue with the plan under the impression that they would be safe as promised. And those who did notice, seeing all the more clearly the gravity of their situation, would also be likewise inclined.

The bottom line is that there is no one-size-fits-all reason why



LIBERTY WORKS RADIO NETWORK

NEEDS YOU TO DONATE!!!

The simple truth is that if we do not receive financial help the Fellowship may not be able to continue the work we have begun with **Liberty Works Radio Network**. It does not take much, just \$5 or \$10 a month — SO PLEASE PRAY ABOUT IT, AND CONTACT THE FELLOWSHIP!!

someone would participate in a conspiracy of this sort. Different actors require different motivations. And it is a primary function of the hub to make sure that each gets what they require, or at least the illusion of getting it, until such time as they are no longer needed.

Just another Inside-Job conspiracy theory


The most important thing to take away from this series is the concept of the *wheel conspiracy*. With that idea in mind, you can start to see how various spokes might be worked into the overall plan. The nature of the wheel conspiracy is that the spokes radiate from the hub. So, the more of the spokes you can piece together, the closer you can get to identifying the hub. You just have to follow them back to it. And with spokes like military war game exercises, air traffic control hijack simulations and explosives planted in skyscrapers, it's impossible for me to believe that some part of the government (shadow or otherwise) wasn't at the hub. So I join my voice to those who say, "9/11 was an inside job!"

And with that, folks, we come to the end of my little tale. As I said from the beginning, I can't prove that any part of my theory is true,⁸ so you would be well advised to take it all with a grain of salt. If it does nothing more than provoke a little thinking on your part, then it was worth the effort to me.



7. *Poor Richard's Almanack* (1735).

8. Although I know what I said about radar simulations is true, I have no means to prove even that.



Liberty Tree

Vol. 23, No. 9 — September 2021



ANOTHER LOOK BACK

By Dick Greb

Primary radar is a system where the ground-based antenna transmits a radar pulse, then listens for the return energy *reflected* from an aircraft. **Secondary radar** requires an airborne transponder which responds to the pulse from a ground-based antenna by *transmitting* a return signal.

Note the dotted green line for AA flight 77: it is claimed that the transponder was turned off, so the plane *disappeared* from air traffic surveillance, and the dotted line represents the *speculative* path. Primary radar detects planes without transponder activation; yet the official story still claims the path is not known.

My, how time flies. It's been twenty years now since the grand slam of hijackings that were used as the excuse to entrap us in a never-ending War on Terror.¹ On this auspicious anniversary ('china,' wouldn't you know), I once again feel compelled to offer a few comments about that gigantic criminal enterprise which resulted in the deaths of thousands of New Yorkers. Not nearly as many as died as because of Governor Cuomo's insane order forcing nursing homes to accept COVID patients, of course,

but at the time, it seemed like a lot. As expected, the government was quick to pooh-poo any and all conspiracy theories, except for the one it conjured up itself — one in which all participants died, so no need to dig any deeper. Move along ... nothing to see here.

Over the decades, there have been many individuals and groups trying to do what the government refused to do — actually investigate what happened on that fateful day, so that we the people might finally come to know the truth of the matter. Not long ago, I came across a video produced by one such group — Pilots for 9-11 Truth — titled "9-11 Intercepted."² What interested me the most about this video is that it looked at the events of September 11, 2001 from the perspective of pilots and radar operators (air traffic controllers, or ATC). They were able to obtain quite a lot of data

concerning the radar tracks, flight information, and especially, telephone and radio communications among the various Air Traffic Controller (ATC) stations and with central command structures (including military air defense) as well as pilots of other planes in the vicinities of the hijacked planes.

In my previous articles about 9-11,³ I wrote about the war games and hijacking simulations that were happening at the very same day and time as the actual hijackings, and the conspiratorial implications of the confluence of those events. The "9-11 Intercepted" video also addresses those war games and simulations. That got me to thinking about my own personal experience with radar systems, and that's what I want to share with you here.

Back in the 90s, I was working as a radar technician at Westinghouse, and for a number of years, I tested

(Continued on page 2)

NOTICE

TEMPORARY PHONE CHANGE

To reach Save-A-Patriot, please call the Liberty Works Radio phone number at

410-848-9191

during the hours of 8-7 EST (most weekdays). Please note there is no voice mail at this number. The SAPF phone system is out of service temporarily; any donations toward its repair are most welcome!!

1. At least the second-longest war — the one in Afghanistan — is finally being allowed to wind down.
2. <https://tinyurl.com/nw88tmku>
3. See *Liberty Trees* from September 2011, and October through December 2017.

(Continued from page 1)

commercial radar systems. The two main systems I worked on formed the major part of the Air Traffic Control system in the US at that time (and probably still today). My main duty on those programs was to conduct what was considered the ‘system test,’ because it was the first time that all the separate components of the system were assembled together. However, due to the extreme high-power microwave output of the radar transmitters, we obviously could not be transmitting inside the factory. Thus, one vital component – the antenna – was missing, and so our transmitters were terminated into a dummy load (which dissipated the microwave energy into heat).

My normal assignment was the Airport Surveillance Radar (ASR) program, although I was occasionally loaned to another program, the Air Route Surveillance Radar (ARSR),⁴ when people were out. The system was fully redundant, being able to automatically switch between the two mirrored sections any time its internal self-tests detected errors. The ASR consisted of two receiver/processors, and two transmitters, each in a separate cabinet. Besides these major components, there were two secondary units: one was the ‘maintenance’ PPI (‘Planned Position Indicator’),⁵ and the other was called the ‘remote’ terminal.

Now, the ‘final test’ was actually a series of tests, beginning with an alignment run (most particularly to get the transmitter pulse properly tuned), and ending with an end-to-end sell-off test which had to go through with no errors throughout the entire test. These tests were performed through a test console which had an integrated computer, and the print-out of the sell-off test was signed off by an FAA representative. The main point here is that the testing of the system *was performed by computer*, by which all operations could be performed, and if memory serves, the main interface between the test set and the radar system was the ‘remote’ terminal.

All is not as it appears

With these preliminaries out of the way, I (finally) come to the main issue – the simulations. Right at the beginning of “9-11 Intercepted,” my ears perked up when I heard: “Turn the sim switches off. Get rid of that crap.” That comment was put in its full context around 24:30 of the video, with a NEADS⁶ radar operator saying: “You know, let’s get rid of this goddamn sim. Turn the sim switches off. Get rid of that crap.” The operator was referring to the war-game

simulations going on that day, but I admit that I don’t know what such a ‘sim switch’ might be. It sounds as if it’s a control on the ATC units, but I have my doubts whether it could be effective to remove ALL simulations that might appear on their screens, regardless of the claimed purpose of the switch. And here’s why.

As I mentioned above, the final testing of the ASR had to be done without access to its antenna. On the transmitting side, this made little difference, since we were looking at pulse shape, power output, etc. as it appeared in the transmitter cabinet. But, on the receiving end of things, it was a totally different story. Since, in normal operation, all the signal processing is done on the data received from the antenna, the absence of the antenna during testing creates a huge problem – there’s no actual data being received to be processed. Therefore, all data which would normally come from the antenna had to be simulated by the computer in the test console.

These simulations were called ‘scenarios’ in our test setting, and were ‘injected’ into the front-end of the receivers. Of course, for testing purposes, these scenarios represented known targets with known tracks, at known altitudes, etc. Thus, the test was designed to verify that the receiver/processor recognized and handled these simulated targets correctly, so the results could be passed along to the ultimate end users – the ATC screens. We had no ATC screens, only the maintenance PPI console (which looked like it belonged in a WWII submarine or something), which was also tested using those scenarios. And so, the computer verified the outputs of the receiver/processors against the programmed scenario inputs and passed/failed based on those results.

My understanding is that as far as the system was concerned, there was absolutely no difference between what would normally be received from the antenna and what was being injected into the system as scenarios. In other words, to the system, there were no ‘simulations,’ only received data. It did not, and indeed could not, distinguish the one from the other. If that is so, then a so-called ‘sim switch’ on an ATC unit could have no effect on whether such unit would see a scenario that was injected into the system as described above. The ‘scenario’ targets would be as real as the actual planes themselves. And they would remain in the system until the injections were terminated.

In our test situation, the initialization and the termination of the injection of scenarios took about one to two minutes to take effect. I mention this because the war-gaming simulations that were being used on that day could have been disabled – thus preventing the additional confusion among the ATCs – within a matter of minutes after the first confirmation of an actual hijacking. Allowing those false simulations

4. ASRs were positioned at airports and had a range of 60 miles, while the ARSRs provided the coverage between airports, with a range of 250 miles.

5. This PPI was a rudimentary version of the many-featured video screens used by the TRACON operators. It was the only visual representation available to us at this system level, and it consisted for the most part of a round screen with a sweeping radius line (think of a clock’s second hand), which showed the target ‘blips’ as it swept past.

6. Northeast Air Defense Sector.

(Continued on page 3)


(Continued from page 2)

to continue to languish in the system for so long afterwards was egregious, if not actually criminal.

Friend or foe?

Before going on, this seems like a good time to raise the issue of transponders. I doubt that many in the general public know any more about transponders than the little bit the mainstream media said about them – which was pretty much that they got turned off, making it harder to track the flights. Yet I know from my prior work experience that the transponders are actually part of the Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) system. Being a curious sort, I had occasion to question one of the friendlier engineers with whom I worked as to how the IFF could tell the difference between a friendly plane and an enemy plane. I was told that enemy planes would not transmit the IFF signal back. In other words, ‘no transponder’ equals ‘enemy aircraft.’ So when I heard on the news that transponders had been turned off, I had to wonder, “Why would a hijacker want to turn off the IFF and make himself a target?” Not being able to come up with any sensible reason for that, I deduced that since no transponder means an enemy aircraft, turning off the IFF was more likely a signal that a pilot could use to notify the ATC that there was trouble aboard the flight – a silent alarm, so to speak. Thus, when an ATC noticed that the flight information disappeared from his screen, he could immediately put hijack/intercept procedures into effect.

Now, as mentioned above, the media routinely said that the lack of transponders (from here on out, I’ll just refer to them as IFF) made the flights disappear from the ATC screens, and the only explanation I’ve heard was that ATC operators routinely only display the secondary data (IFF) and not the primary (the actual reflected target data). However, switching between primary and secondary data (or both at the same time) must surely be a simple matter for an ATC without even leaving their seat, so I’m sure they were able to see the targets. And in fact, ATC operators can be heard in the video



Top: An ASR-9 radar antenna.

Middle: ATC radar screen, 1950s, similar to the display used by the author in testing.

Bottom: ATC console in 2017 in Atlanta airport (training room). Many of the systems still in use today are decades old.

multiple times informing other operators that the target was available on “primary only.”

If I’m correct, then in an actual hijack situation, you would have a ‘naked’ target, which while unidentified, would still be fairly easy to track, since all other planes on the screen would still be identified. However, on 9/11, with four planes being hijacked at the same time, and flight paths which were not too distant one from the other, then keeping track of any one ‘naked’ target gets that much more complicated. It should still be possible, however, to know that the ‘naked’ targets are the four hijacked planes, even if you can’t be certain which of the four any particular target is.

Why all the confusion?

But of course, there was more to it than that. Because, on that fateful day, there were also *hijack simulations going on at the same time*. And this brings me back to injected scenarios. In a hijack simulation, there has to be a hijacked plane that shows up on the screens. For the sake of authenticity, a target must be created from scratch. In order for it to appear like a normal flight, it must have the secondary IFF information along with its primary data. So, it must have a *flight number* associated with it, as well as altitude, speed, location coordinates, etc. Well, what number do you choose? Is there some never-used number, like the 555 area code that all phone numbers in TV shows use, or just a number that isn’t being used at that particular time?

To my mind, this is an extremely important question to be answered. Since the simulations would have been planned in

advance (that is, before it should have been known which actual flights would ultimately be hijacked), then the choice of flight numbers could be quite telling. If the entire day’s worth of ATC data has been saved for investigative purposes, it would hopefully be

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

possible to isolate and specifically track each and every simulation flight from beginning to end – from the time they were first injected until the time they were terminated. This should be possible by eliminating the tracks of all known ‘true’ flights from that day. It should also be possible to compare the data from the ‘simulation’ tracks with the original programming of the scenario (if indeed they are still available) to see that they match. After all, a simulated flight can have no characteristic outside of what it has been programmed for. If it veers right, or takes a dive, or turns off IFF, it can only be because it was *programmed* to do exactly that. Unless ...

This brings me to another point, relating back to my years prior to my work on the ASR. Besides the radar systems I already mentioned, Westinghouse also manufactured quite a few military systems. The one of particular interest here had four operator stations. I was never assigned to this system, but a buddy of mine worked on them. Like the ASR, part of the test process was to load scenarios to check receiver/processor functioning. Unlike the ASR, however, the operator stations on these systems were more modern than the rudimentary ‘maintenance PPI,’ although still not as advanced as actual ATC consoles. The relevant issue here is that the scenarios on these systems could be *manipulated through the operator stations*. I don’t know if that was because of the way the scenarios were originally programmed, or whether my buddy modified one to make it possible, or if it was always possible, but nobody had tried to do it before. But anyway, we could ‘grab’ the simulated planes, and actually use the track ball and other controls of the operator station and ‘fly’ the things all around. It was like a super expensive video game. Three of us would get in on the fun at the same time. We set up obstacle courses on the screens and raced through them. It was a real blast! The point of this little side story then is that it is at least *theoretically* possible that an injected scenario could be *manipulated in real time*. It should also be recognized that many different scenarios can be run simultaneously – and manipulated independently of each other. So, there could be multiple *official* scenarios running at the same time that multiple *unofficial* scenarios were also being injected. And since communication with the system could be effected through a modem, those various scenario programs could likely be loaded from different physical locations as well.

Because it was planned!

With all this in mind, consider the ‘phantom’ tracks of the hijacked flights, even after they had crashed, flying in places the actual flights never flew. Let me say right up front that, as far as I’m concerned, an air traffic control radar system that displays false information is a FAILURE, and should be immediately taken off-line. After all, if it can



**Listen to LWRN
anywhere and any time!**

**Download the APP
Smartphones or iPhones**

Visit **www.LWRN.net** and
Click on the links to the left on home page!!

display planes that *aren’t* there, it might also *not* display planes that *are* there. What possible confidence could anyone have in such a system? I have to believe that such a situation is rare indeed. And in fact, the “9-11 Intercepted” video quotes Captain Jeff Latas, a former F15 fighter pilot, as saying that “false inputs on radar screens are unprecedented.” However, if more than one radar system saw planes that weren’t actually there, it seems less likely that it was due to system errors, and much more likely that the tracks were not ‘phantom’ – that is to say, *false*, but rather *simulated* tracks. In other words, every track seen on the ATC screens on that day were either actual real planes, or they were injected simulated planes. I see no other realistic options.

The bottom line of all this is that if there were radar tracks that showed already crashed planes still flying around, then it was because a scenario was running which was actively injecting that track. It reported whatever flight number, altitude, speed, and location was programmed into it, whether at the time the scenario was originally designed or ‘on the fly’ as described above with respect to the military radar system. If it’s the former situation, then the flight numbers of the planes which would actually be hijacked at a future time must have already been known to the scenario designers – that is, foreknowledge, not necessarily by the actual programmer, but by whoever chose the flight numbers to be used in the program. If it’s the latter situation, then the flight numbers could have been added/ altered after the initial hijackings by an active participant in real time. However, any such active participant would be an accessory to the hijackings in that they would be ‘running interference’ for them, and so making them more likely to succeed. Thus, in either case, there seems no way to avoid the conclusion that, within the structure of whatever agencies or groups planned and executed the war-game simulations on 9/11, there were co-conspirators to the murders of some 3,000 people. Even if they were unwitting accomplices before the tragedy, they would certainly recognize the part they played afterwards. And though they may have eluded justice so far, one day they will stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

