

## 9/11 – Evidence Suggests Complicity: Inferences from Actions

**Frank Legge (Ph D)**  
**Logical Systems Consulting**  
**Perth, Western Australia.**  
**flegge@iinet.net.au**

### **Abstract**

Examination of the official reports of the events of 9/11 reveals serious deficiencies. A particular deficiency is the failure to identify some of the participants. The reports produced distortions in the public perceptions of the events and resulted in deflection of the political process. Some comments are provided on trends which have developed which are detrimental to democracy and personal freedoms. Further investigation is urgently required.

The tragic events that have come to be known as 9/11 remain unresolved to this day. On September 11, 2001 the Twin Towers at the World Trade Centre (WTC), New York, were hit by hijacked planes and collapsed some time later at near free fall speed. The government of the United States of America does not withdraw in any way from the conclusions set out in the three reports it authorized.<sup>1</sup> All three reports attribute the collapses entirely to the damage caused by the plane impacts and subsequent fires. These reports assert or imply that al-Qaeda carried out the attacks alone. Numerous writers and organizations have pointed to the immense scale and complexity of the attack, and also to a series of extraordinary events after the attack, and assert that these show that al-Qaeda must have had help.

In my previous paper ten observations were presented, each of which indicated that explosives were used to bring down the Twin Towers, and also a third building that was not hit by a plane, building 7 of the WTC (WTC 7).<sup>2</sup> Four of these observations are based on videos taken at the time and are virtually irrefutable. The purpose of the present paper is to study this evidence in more detail to determine whether a connection between certain observations and the administration can be inferred.

There is circumstantial evidence that some part of the US administration was involved in the attack. It is certain that there was a strong desire on the part of some members for a “catalyzing event”, like Pearl Harbor,<sup>3</sup> in order to provide the impetus for the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq; however desire is not proof of complicity. The fact that the air attack on Afghanistan commenced on October 9, less than a month later, is not proof either but does suggest the possibility that plans for the invasion were already in place.

Writers like David Ray Griffin and Michael C. Ruppert<sup>4</sup> have assembled a great deal of material, strongly suggestive of complicity. I will draw on this and other observations to set out a concise case for the complicity of at least some part of the US administration in the events of 9/11.

### **1. Denial of explosives**

The government has gone to extraordinary lengths to suppress the fact that explosives were used for the demolitions of 9/11. The reason that the use of explosives was concealed must

be that it would have seemed improbable that al-Qaeda could have accomplished the enormous and highly skilled task of secretly installing the required explosives in three buildings. It was plausible to blame the hijacking of aircraft on al-Qaeda but if the public had suspected that explosives had been used it might have become impossible to convincingly claim that al-Qaeda had acted alone.

Once one has got over the surprise of discovering that a third building came down that day, and has had a chance to study the video, it is not hard to discern that the collapse has all the appearance of a controlled demolition.<sup>5</sup> How then was it possible that three substantial investigations could have been carried out without examining the possibility that explosives were used? The only reasonable explanation is that the investigators were in some way under the control of the perpetrators of the crime.

The investigators could not have been under the control of al-Qaeda.

## **2. The manner of collapse of WTC 2**

In the case of the north tower, WTC 1, sufficient time was allowed between the plane impact and the demolition for evacuation of the building, at least for the part below the impact zone. This did not happen however with WTC 2, the south tower, the top of which started to topple over.<sup>6</sup> This building started to collapse downwards within one second of it starting to tilt, which suggests the timing of the demolition was under the control of a close observer. The collapse started before evacuation was complete, causing much loss of life.

Avoiding unnecessary loss of life appears to have been a concern of the perpetrators, judging by what happened with WTC 1, but in the case of WTC 2 this concern apparently gave way to another. The change in procedure would have been due to the critical importance of maintaining the illusion that the buildings were destroyed by plane impact and fire. If the top of WTC 2 had tipped right over and had fallen to the ground the perpetrators would have found themselves in a dilemma. If they then demolished the lower unheated portion it would have been impossible to argue that fire in the top caused the collapse. If they left the lower portion standing it would have contained explosives which would lead to certain discovery of the plot. To avoid this dilemma the tower had to be dropped the moment it started to tip to conceal the use of explosives. History shows that this strategy was very successful in molding public opinion: very few people have become aware that explosives were involved.

There appears to be no reason to think that al-Qaeda would have been concerned about limiting the loss of life, and they would not have cared about revealing the use of explosives. It is reasonable to believe that if al-Qaeda had carried out the demolition it would have been done in such a way as to ensure that both towers toppled over, thus maximizing the destruction and loss of life. This would also have been much easier to achieve.

Given that explosives were used, and that an attempt was made as far as possible to prevent the toppling of WTC 2, it is reasonable to believe that it was not al-Qaeda that carried out the demolitions.

### **3. War games in the face of warnings**

The government was in possession of numerous warnings that an attack using hijacked aircraft was imminent.<sup>7</sup> Despite this danger war games were planned and carried out that simulated the hijacking of aircraft.<sup>8</sup> These games would obviously have had the potential to cause confusion and thus appear to have been an essential component of the plan. The games ensured that the failure to intercept the hijacked aircraft could later be attributed to staff receiving misleading information and to some incompetence in the handling of this information.

While it is possible that al-Qaeda may have conceived the idea that running war games during the attack would provide confusion it would not have been possible for them to have arranged it without inside help.

### **4. Failure to intercept hijacked aircraft**

Even after allowing for some incompetence and confusion it is difficult to accept that the first plane hijacked should have got through to its destination, WTC 1, given that it was a known regular passenger flight, but not responding to radio calls and had its transponder switched off. It is even harder to accept this excuse for the second plane, which hit WTC 2, as the first plane had by now turned off course, as shown by radar, thus confirming its already suspected status as hijacked. This should have created a heightened state of alert.

Finally it is impossible to allow the excuse of confusion for the plane which hit the Pentagon. It was the third plane hijacked that morning and, when radio contact with it was lost, the first plane had already hit WTC 2, proving that the attack was not a war game simulation, but real. The emergency system would have been on highest alert. After radio contact with this plane was lost 46 minutes elapsed till impact, a generous amount of time for interception.<sup>9</sup> After the second plane hit its target, thus confirming beyond any possible doubt that a real terrorist attack was in progress, 34 minutes remained till impact, still ample time for interception.

It is standard procedure to intercept all aircraft which lose radio contact, or go off course. Given that this did not happen for the third plane, even though all possible confusion had been eliminated, it is clear that a stand-down order had been issued to the Air Force. It is worthy of note that in June of that year a new order was issued that required calls for interception to pass through, and be approved by, the office of the Secretary for Defence, Donald Rumsfeld.<sup>10</sup>

The Air Force could not have been stood down by al-Qaeda.

### **5. Exclusion of independent observers**

After the attack on the WTC independent investigators were not permitted access to the site and the workers were not permitted cameras (nevertheless numerous photographs have emerged). Even the access of the official FEMA observers was hindered.<sup>11</sup> There can be no reason for these restrictions other than to control the flow of information.

It would not have been in the interests of al-Qaeda to block information that explosives had been used and even if it had been in their interests they could not have ordered it.

## **6. Rapid removal of debris**

As this was a crime scene it was a legal requirement that material be left as far as possible untouched until properly examined for forensic evidence. This did not occur. Some higher authority appeared to have blocked normal procedures. In particular the steel, which would have shown evidence of the use of explosives, was shipped away for scrapping, mostly overseas.<sup>12</sup> Although scrap steel does not have a very high value stringent procedures were put in place to track and prevent diversion of the loads.

The conclusion is that there was something to hide. al-Qaeda had nothing to hide and in any case could not have given these orders.

## **7. Withholding of security information**

In the case of the Pentagon attack there were numerous security cameras which must have recorded evidence of what occurred. These were all seized. The manner in which the camera was seized from a nearby service station is particularly interesting: the FBI arrived for it within minutes of the attack, suggesting that they had been aware, not only that the camera existed and that an attack was imminent, but also precisely where it would strike.<sup>13</sup> They could not remove the camera before the attack without giving the game away but did so before anyone could have made a copy of the recording.

Again we see an action for which al-Qaeda could have had no motive and could not have given the orders.

## **8. Withholding of black box records**

It was initially stated that no black boxes from the planes were found although workers reported otherwise.<sup>14</sup> Later it was stated that some had been found but were not readable. Eventually some black box information was released. Given the chain of lies it is highly likely that the released material has been edited to the advantage of the official story and will not be reliable.

al-Qaeda had nothing to gain from this series of events and could not have ordered any part of it.

## **9. Insider trading**

In the days before 9/11 there was an extraordinary increase in the level of put option trades and in the put-call ratio on the airlines involved. Profits of billions of dollars were made. This is a particularly significant observation because the action was contrary to advice being provided by financial advisers at the time who were suggesting that it was a good time to buy airlines. Trading houses know the identity of every person or organization that places a trade. Insider trading is an offence and is continually monitored and offenders prosecuted.

In considering who might have made these trades one would of course look at who knew the event was about to happen. It is what happened after the attacks that provides the clue to the identity of the inside traders: investigations did not reach conclusions and no prosecutions followed.

Al Qaeda, if acting independently, would not have made these trades as doing so would have given away the timing of the attacks and would also have identified the airlines to be watched, so the project would have been doomed. If al-Qaeda made these trades they must have had certain knowledge that the investigations would be blocked. They could not have blocked the investigation themselves.

There are numerous other similar pieces of evidence, such as the rapid removal of the debris from the Pentagon crash site, and the exclusion of observers from the crash site of Flight 93, quickly followed by extensive earthworks which obliterated the scene.

All nine of these suspicious actions, with the possible exception of the last, provide no discernable benefit to al-Qaeda, and in every case there is no way for them to have made the arrangements. If the concealed evidence showed that only al-Qaeda was involved it would be inevitable that the US administration would have released it, as promised, in order to prove their case, but this has not occurred.

If it was not al-Qaeda, who was it?

In consideration of all the evidence stated above there appears to be no alternative to the conclusion that some part of the US administration was involved in the events of 9/11. Regarding the demolitions it is not simply the use of explosives which leads to this conclusion; it is the use of explosives together with systematic and comprehensive denial of their use.

Regarding the war games, planned to take place while a hijack warning was current, the administration was either criminally involved in planning the attack or was criminally negligent in failing to recognize and act upon the obvious danger that the war games would cause confusion and place the population at risk. Let us compare these two possibilities.

If we assume it was just administrative negligence that was the factor which prevented the hijacked planes from being intercepted we must simultaneously assume that some other organization planned and initiated the war games. We have already dismissed the possibility that this could have been done by al-Qaeda so another group must be invoked. Could there be some renegade component of the CIA, for example, that participated in the attack and planned the war games diversion without the administration itself becoming aware or involved? Is there a group that would have a motive? This seems unlikely given that the motive appears to rest with the government itself, because it wished to invade Afghanistan and Iraq. It also seems unlikely that the government could have been persuaded to cooperate in the stand down of the Air Force while a hijack warning was current without becoming suspicious, due to the timing, that it could be laying the groundwork for a covert action.

It is however the testimony of the Secretary of Transportation, Norman Mineta, before the 9/11 Commission, that provides the most compelling means to distinguish between these two possibilities.<sup>15</sup> It is clear from Mineta's testimony that the vice president, Dick Cheney, safe in

the Presidential Emergency Operations Center, was in charge of the response to the threat to the Pentagon. He was aware that a hijacked plane was approaching the Pentagon. He had it in his hand to have the plane shot down, but apparently chose not to do so.

The group handling the complex details of the operation must either have been part of the administration or functioning as a contractor. In either case the Mineta testimony provides a prima facie case that, at least for part of the operation, Dick Cheney was in command. The 9/11 Commission failed in its duty to follow this obviously significant line of evidence and thus showed that its purpose was to provide cover rather than to investigate pertinent facts. It is also clear that the mass media has failed in its duty to bring this serious breach of trust by a government body to the attention of the public.

When thinking about the possibility of complicity it is natural to wonder how it might be possible for people who profess to have the best interests of the nation at heart to become involved in such a nefarious project. The only feasible explanation for such involvement would be that they thought they were sacrificing the few for the greater good of the many. The presumed greater good would have been to maintain power and obtain control over dwindling oil supplies. If such were the motive it would represent, at best, an arrogant failure to realize that the vast majority of Americans would have preferred to accept rising prices for oil, as it became scarcer, rather than to have blood on their hands.

The price of oil has in fact already risen substantially, sufficient to permit the utilization of numerous large, lower grade resources. The higher price has not crippled the economy but will have the benefit of slowing the inevitable onset of energy difficulties. With the information at its disposal the administration must have accurately predicted this state of affairs. The implication is that the desire to invade Iraq may not have been based so much on the need to control oil supplies as on the more sinister desire for power, a concept supported by the PNAC documents.<sup>3</sup>

It is clear that there is a danger that another attack, similar to 9/11, may be planned. If another attack were to happen there is reason to fear that it would be used to create additional restrictions on personal freedoms, possibly martial law, and to justify military action, regardless of whether it was logical to do so. Tension with Iran is the current danger area.<sup>16</sup>

To judge whether the administration has already brought the nation perilously close to a totalitarian state consider the manner in which the president now claims the right to break the law, an example of which is the practice of “extraordinary rendition” in which a suspect is sent overseas for torture.<sup>17</sup> Consider what happened when one of these men, totally innocent of any crime, attempted to sue for damages: his case was thrown out in defiance of the constitution.<sup>18</sup> Consider also what might be the purpose of the multi-million dollar contract recently awarded to a subsidiary of Halliburton to build detention facilities.<sup>19</sup>

An essay by Michael Green, and references within it, indicate that 9/11 is just one of a series of covert actions, including the rigging of the last two elections, which mar the history of the nation.<sup>20</sup> There is hope that this particular action, being so catastrophic and blatant, will mobilize public opinion sufficiently to bring about the reforms needed to restore proper democratic processes and reclaim power from vested interests.

**If it turns out that identification and prosecution of the perpetrators cannot be achieved there remains a substantial benefit if there is wide public distribution of the truth about 9/11. This knowledge will enhance the prospect for a successful prosecution if a similar event were to occur in the future and will render any repetition less effective in manipulating public opinion. There is therefore hope that spreading this information will reduce the risk that a repetition will be attempted.**

**A fully independent investigation is clearly urgently required. A group urging further investigation has recently emerged. This group, Scholars for 9/11 Truth, has come into prominence because of the scientific basis of its enquiries and the academic stature of its founding members.<sup>21</sup> The group is working to overcome the present secrecy so that the truth about 9/11 can be established in more detail and hence facilitate appropriate action.**

### **End notes and references**

Version 1.2. This version has point 9 added above, discussing insider trading, and some additional comment at reference 3 below.

1. Reports on the events of 9/11.

FEMA report.

<http://www.fema.gov/library/wtstudy.shtm>

How fires affect steel buildings.

<http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/fires/steel.html>

NIST Report.

<http://wtc.nist.gov/pubs/>

Kevin Ryan: Rebuttal to the NIST Report.

<http://portland.indymedia.org/en/2004/11/303154.shtml>

9/11 Commission Report.

<http://www.gpoaccess.gov/911/>

Criticism of the 9/11 Commission Report.

<http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20050523112738404>

2. Frank Legge, “9/11 – Evidence for Controlled Demolition: a Short List of Observations”, 9/11 On-line Journal, 2006.

3. The PNAC document “Rebuilding America’s Defenses” contains the following:

“The process of transformation is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor.”

One of the difficulties inherent in providing references to web sites is that the material there may change with time. It is useful to examine articles written close to the time of interest which quote the material and thus lock in both the surrounding information and the response which seemed appropriate at the time. For example:

<http://pilger.carlton.com/print/124759>

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article1665.htm>

Inside the site below is a link to the document “Rebuilding America’s Defenses”, a pdf file, quoted in the link above.

<http://www.oldamericancentury.org/pnac.htm>

PNAC’s bland site.

<http://www.newamericancentury.org/>

4. David Ray Griffin, “The New Pearl Harbor”, 2004; “The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions”, 2005.

Michael C. Ruppert, “Crossing the Rubicon”, 2004.

5. Three buildings collapse. While WTC 7 looks like a conventional demolition the collapses of WTC 1 and 2 look different. This is because they had to be demolished from the top down to give the impression that the collapses were caused by plane impact and fire. This is more fully explained in the previous paper.<sup>2</sup>

WTC 7

[http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/videos/docs/wtc7\\_collapse2.mpg](http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/videos/docs/wtc7_collapse2.mpg)

WTC 1

[http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/videos/docs/north\\_tower\\_collapse.mpeg](http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/videos/docs/north_tower_collapse.mpeg)



## WTC 2

[http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/videos/docs/south\\_tower\\_collapse.mpeg](http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/videos/docs/south_tower_collapse.mpeg)

6. The top of WTC 2 tilts, then drops and distorts.

[http://www.angelfire.com/ny5/tradecencrimes/eh\\_wtc4.jpg](http://www.angelfire.com/ny5/tradecencrimes/eh_wtc4.jpg)

7. Warnings.

“On July 10, an FBI field agent in Phoenix, AZ, named Kenneth Williams reported suspicions of a hijacking plot.”

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/EVA206B.html>

“Britain’s spy chiefs warned the Prime Minister less than two months before September 11 that Osama bin Laden’s al-Qaeda group was in “the final stages” of preparing a terrorist attack in the West.”

[http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/planes/analysis/nypress\\_missingpieces.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/planes/analysis/nypress_missingpieces.html)

“Britain gave President Bush a categorical warning to expect multiple airline hijackings by the al-Qaeda network a month before the September 11 attacks.”

<http://www.sundayherald.com/24822>

8. Was NORAD stood down?

<http://www.prisonplanet.com/911/norad.htm>

9. Timeline.

<http://www.911timeline.net/>

10. Rumsfeld’s office involved. “...forward the request to the Secretary of Defence...”

[http://911research.wtc7.net/planes/analysis/norad/docs/intercept\\_proc.pdf](http://911research.wtc7.net/planes/analysis/norad/docs/intercept_proc.pdf)

11. Obstruction. FEMA staff access restricted.

[http://911review.com/coverup/fema\\_wtc.html](http://911review.com/coverup/fema_wtc.html)

12. Removal of crime scene evidence.

<http://www.planetark.org/dailynewsstory.cfm/newsid/12721/story.htm>

13. "The FBI was here within minutes and took the film."

[http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2001/12/1211\\_wirepentagon.html](http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2001/12/1211_wirepentagon.html)

14. Black boxes.

[http://www.americanfreepress.net/html/black\\_box.html](http://www.americanfreepress.net/html/black_box.html)

15. Mineta's testimony – "Does the order still stand?". This video was originally on the 9/11 Commission website but has been deleted. Fortunately it was copied and is now stored on several sites.

<http://blogcritics.org/archives/2005/08/02/145747.php>

This testimony not only provides evidence about the role of the Vice President during the attack but also shows that the official statements regarding his whereabouts at the time appear to be false. As it is known that there was no fighter plane close enough to shoot down the plane approaching the Pentagon during the period referred to in this testimony the order referred to must have related to anti-aircraft defences.

16. Tension with Iran.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/03/07/international/middleeast/07cnd-iran.html?ex=1299387600&en=b7d8c3b4d8c6da08&ei=5088&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>

17. Extraordinary rendition. Former C.I.A. official: "an abomination."

[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/03/24/bush\\_shuns\\_patriot\\_act\\_requirement/?page=1](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/03/24/bush_shuns_patriot_act_requirement/?page=1)

[http://www.newyorker.com/fact/content/?050214fa\\_fact6](http://www.newyorker.com/fact/content/?050214fa_fact6)

18. Extraordinary rendition (Maher Arar case thrown out).

[http://szamko.gnn.tv/headlines/7664/New\\_York\\_Judge\\_Dismisses\\_case\\_of\\_Maher\\_Arar](http://szamko.gnn.tv/headlines/7664/New_York_Judge_Dismisses_case_of_Maher_Arar)

19. Hugh detention centre contract awarded to a Haliburton subsidiary.

[http://www.infowars.com/articles/ps/gulags\\_for\\_american\\_citizens\\_in\\_final\\_stages.htm](http://www.infowars.com/articles/ps/gulags_for_american_citizens_in_final_stages.htm)

20. Michael Greene. "How they get away with it".

<http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/green/HowTheyGetAwayWithIt.html>

21. Scholars for 9/11 Truth. The web site and a paper by Prof. Steven Jones, a founding member.

<http://www.st911.org/>  
<http://www.physics.byu.edu/research/energy/htm7.html>