

# 9/11 Truth and the Joint Congressional Inquiry: 28 Pages of Misdirection on the Role of Saudi Arabia

By [Dick Atlee](#) and [Ken Freeland](#)

Global Research, September 11, 2015

Region: [USA](#)  
Theme: [Terrorism](#)

An irresistible temptation!

*For years the 9/11 Truth movement (9TM) has been vainly pleading with mainstream media – and the “alternative” 9/11-Truth-rejecting media (which we’ll include for our purposes as mainstream) to cover any of the endless, obvious problems with any of the Official 9/11 Conspiracy Theory (OCT) tales we’ve been told. Now, all of a sudden, these same mainstream media, echoing prestigious players like former US Senator Bob Graham, are on the rampage about a “9/11 cover-up,” and are pushing for the release of 28 redacted pages from the 2002 Joint Congressional Intelligence Committee 9/11 Inquiry’s report! So...let’s all of us 9/11 Truthers jump aboard this fast moving train with both feet, right?*

The 9TM has gradually been gaining a foothold with the public; a growing number of people countenance some kind of government role in 9/11 and/or its cover-up. Suspicion has likewise grown about the role played by Bush-administration neocons and their Zionist bedfellows. After 15 years of staunch media refusal to report the flagrantly obvious holes in the various OCT stories we’ve been fed, why is *this particular* issue suddenly headline news? Why at *this particular* juncture? And how does it just happen to be spearheaded by [one of the major contributors](#) to the initial coverup?

Let’s examine the question of why the Deep State might want this story heated up to a fever pitch:

## Misdirection

It is now commonly assumed among the public that those 28 pages in some way implicate the Saudi government in the events of 9/11, probably by financing the OCT-alleged hijackers. But consider the not unlikely possibility that the real players in 9/11 were not the Saudis, but rather the Bush neocons and their Israeli partners in crime. If they were looking for a way to deflect increasing public doubt about the OCT, blaming the Saudis would be an excellent choice.

Professional magicians employ *misdirection* – irrelevant bodily motions and various props – to distract the audience’s attention from what they’re really up to. Some of us in the 9TM consider the 28 Pages campaign to be just such a classical misdirection, so that the Saudis can be pulled out of the hat as the new scapegoats for 9/11. The benefits of such minor modification of the OCT outweigh its risks:

## Risks and benefits

Sure, there’s some risk involved. Releasing the 28 pages (if they say what it is widely

believed they will say) would, after all, make it obvious to the public that the government has been involved in some kind of cover-up. Hardly a surprise to the 9TM, or to that majority of Americans who have lost confidence in the official narrative. But let's remember that the government survived the Snowden/NSA disclosures virtually unscathed – Big Brother can now *legally* get all the info he wants, and polls have indicated that many Americans are absorbing this “new normal” by [censoring themselves](#) online. So another such embarrassment might be just as easily spun and exploited to the real perpetrators' advantage.

On the other hand, the benefits of such misdirection would be huge:

1. Everyone's focus would now be on the Saudis, and off the Neocons and their Zionist bedfellows.
2. The core OCT mythology would not only remain intact, but become solidified in the public mind (i.e., the catastrophic events of 9/11 were entirely the result of 19 hijackers' actions, whose commandeered airliner crashes were the efficient cause of numerous fire-induced building collapses).

Why does this matter?

On the broadest level of geopolitics, the OCT myth is the basis for Western Islamophobia and the perpetual “Global War on Terror.” Blaming the Saudis only amplifies the assumption of “international Islamic terrorism,” still omitting all reference to Western players.

It is patently clear that the hijacker aspect of 9/11 is logically unsustainable (see below). Whether or not these men ever really existed, whether or not they behaved as devout Muslims, whether or not they were on the planes and whether or not they were financed by the Saudis, Pakistan's ISI or anyone else – these may be useful questions for some purposes, but not for determining who was ultimately behind 9/11. Moving the public perception in the direction of blaming the Saudis for 9/11 because they supported the “hijackers” – the effect of 28 Pages campaign-support websites like [hr14.org](#), — means abandoning the ever-widening trail of truth so relentlessly blazed by the 9TM, a trail leading close enough to their doors that the real culprits are beginning to feel some heat.

Yet 9TM veterans who should know better are falling all over each other to jump on the campaign bandwagon, and indeed, to be seen as leading the parade for “HR14,” the Congressional resolution demanding that the administration declassify those 28 pages! As 9TM activists, they are well aware that the whole OCT story is a fabrication, and that the Saudis could not possibly have masterminded 9/11. Here's their rationalization in a nutshell: Because the mainstream media are suddenly embracing the topic, any wide public revelation of a “cover-up” will eventually lead to an unraveling of the real cover-up, and therefore represents 9TM's first – and perhaps last – real opportunity to break into the wider realm of acceptable public opinion. But meanwhile, to “protect” the politicians (and the uninformed public?) whose support is needed for the passage of this bill, these websites, whilst making a pretense of advancing the cause of 9/11 Truth, implicitly embrace the long-debunked OCT (now twisted ever so slightly to incriminate the Saudis).

But consider the past fourteen years of consistent derogatory treatment by the corporate (and even many “alternative”) media of those who seriously question the basic OCT myth, and the media consolidation this represents – the control of these sources by corporate

directors and the Deep State agents who write their playbook. These people are not fools – they don’t launch a propaganda ploy without Plans B, C, etc. in place for potential damage control. Based on the mainstream media’s track record of the past fourteen years, the chances of their running away with this story in a way that genuinely promotes 9/11 Truth seem vanishingly small. And the Achilles’ heel of such an overly optimistic hope is that the solid research and evidence gathered by the 9TM fall outside (and contradict) the Saudi-financed hijackers-dunnit scenario, so the media is unlikely to seriously reference any of it in its treatment of any forthcoming 28-pages “revelation.”

Looking ahead, where will this leave the 9TM? How is it going to respond if the 28 pages say exactly what people are expecting them to say, and 9TM leaders are credited for their release? Will these same 9TM activists now tooting the horn for hr14 be able to credibly turn around and say “Wait, this information is misleading because ‘the real 9/11’ was something far beyond the abilities of the Saudis to manage!”? And will the media do an about-face with them, and obligingly lavish coverage on what it has complicitly covered *up* since 9/11?

About those “Hijackers”

Our position on the irrelevance of Saudi “financing” admittedly hinges on the question of the alleged “hijackers.” If these alleged 19 hijacked and flew the jetliners in question, Saudi involvement might be argued to have significance (albeit still not the key to 9/11 perpetration). But there are a host of reasons for rejecting the entire OCT hijack scenario:

- \* The “hijackers”’ publicly documented behavior was not that of devout Muslims [1]
- \* There is no credible time-stamped video record of them boarding planes, much less arriving at the departing airports. [2]
- \* The stories told about Muhammed Atta and whomever it was who allegedly accompanied him to Portland, Maine changed constantly. [3]
- \* There is no original flight manifest showing Middle Eastern names. [4]
- \* The FBI came up with a list of hijackers within just a few hours of the first 9/11 event, a number of whom they replaced with substitutes shortly afterwards. [5]
- \* The transmission of cockpit comments of “hijackers” heard by the control towers could have been generated anywhere.
- \* The simple button-press sequence (“squawk”) signaling a hijacking was not executed on any of the four planes. [6]
- \* The initially-alleged cellphone calls that reported hijackings in progress were proven in most cases to have been technically impossible; most were later changed to on-board phone calls, some from planes that didn’t have on-board phones, and some calls (per the FBI) were never completed or didn’t exist – particularly the only one referencing “box cutters.” [7]
- \* The conditions in the planes’ passenger cabins that would have existed under the alleged flight behavior of the planes at the time of the calls were completely inconsistent with the background sounds on the calls and the behavior of the alleged

callers [8].

- \* With one exception, the alleged “pilots” had never flown a jet-liner; one had flown a simulator of a different plane with a completely different cockpit layout; the one who allegedly made the almost-impossible maneuver over the Pentagon had been declared by his instructors to be unable to even fly a single-engine plane. [9]

- \* The claims of finding a “hijacker” passport unscathed on the ground in NYC, and undamaged red bandanas (indicative of the wrong Muslim sect, in any case) in Pennsylvania, given the alleged physical reality of those crashes, are absurd on their face. [10]

- \* With respect to the question of how 9/11 could have happened without human hijackers, it is vital to note that as of 2001, the technology for complete remote takeover, isolation and control (takeoff, flying, landing) of commercial jetliners was well advanced and had been fully tested in the types of aircraft involved in 9/11, and the air traffic auto-pilot navigation lanes in the sky were precise to within a few feet. [11]

The list goes on. . . As one considers each piece of evidence, the chance that “hijackings” took place approaches zero. The real role of the alleged hijackers is not yet known – those with documented flying lessons may very well have been unwitting patsies. In any case, the question of who might have been financing their stay in this country, Saudi or otherwise, is at best tangential to the larger picture of what really happened on 9/11. No matter what the motive, then, any attempt to persuade people that the final answer to the question of 9/11 perpetration lies in this direction can only be construed as dangerous *misdirection*. The real price already being paid by the 9TM is the subversion of unwitting 9TM activists who help promote such meretricious campaign propaganda, thereby betraying the 9TM’s hard-won, fact-based alternative perspective.

The 28 Pages campaign: 9/11 Truth bonanza or limited hangout?

Our own concern about the 28 Pages campaign was triggered by the emergence of several websites supporting it, which hold out the promise that the 28 pages will answer the question of who was really behind 9/11 (and that this will turn out to be Saudi Arabia). Examples are [28pages.org](http://28pages.org) and most especially [hr14.org](http://hr14.org). As the latter is controlled by a veteran 9/11 truther, we appealed to him as fellow activists – an [ad hoc group](#) of 9TM activists sent him a letter critiquing the website from the standpoint of 9/11 Truth, requesting specific revisions of its message. Because his reply failed to substantially address the issues we raised, we have now published it as an [open letter](#).

We are hardly the first to find serious problems with the direction of the 28 Pages campaign. Perhaps the [first notable critique](#) came from the blog of Kevin Ryan; whilst this early criticism was on the milder side, its excoriation of the leadership of the 28 Pages campaign – Bob Graham and his “CIA protege” Porter Goss – is not to be missed! Years earlier, in fact, [Ryan had opined](#) in [Washington’s Blog](#): “Those redacted pages, and much of the 9/11 Commission report that followed, have always seemed to be a kind of ‘Get into Saudi Arabia free’ card for the powers that be.” Given the recent sea change in Saudi foreign policy – its nearer alignment with Russia and the BRICS bloc – such a prospect cannot be overlooked. What better way to incite public animosity towards the Saudis than by playing the tried and true 9/11 blame game?

Expanding on Ryan's disquieting report, Professor [Michel Chossudovsky](#), of Globalresearch.ca, [wrote](#):

Calling for the official release and publication of the 28 page classified section of the joint inquiry report pertaining to Saudi Arabia is an obvious red-herring. The objective is to confuse matters, create divisions within the 9/11 Truth movement and ultimately dispel the fact that the 9/11 attacks were a carefully organized False Flag event which was used to declare war on Afghanistan as well as usher in sweeping anti-terrorist legislation.

Both the Congressional inquiry as well the 9/11 Commission report are flawed, their objective was to sustain the official narrative that America was under attack on September 11, 2001. And Graham's role in liaison with the CIA, is "damage control" with a view to protecting those who were behind the demolition of the WTC towers as well [as] sustaining the Al Qaeda legend, which constitutes the cornerstone of US military doctrine under the so-called "Global War on Terrorism".

As the 28 Pages campaign unfolds, such scathing criticism has proven remarkably prescient. We urge our fellow 9/11 Truth activists to take it to heart, and to approach the 28 Pages campaign juggernaut, if at all, with extreme caution, so long as it faithfully clings to the OTC. *Caveat emptor!!*

*Dick Atlee is a member of the Maine 9/11 Truth group.*

*Ken Freeland is a member of Houston 9/11 Truth (<http://houston911truth.net/>) and is facilitator of the monthly 9/11 Truth and Other Deep State Crimes Teleconference (<http://houston911truth.net/9-11TruthTeleconferenceArchives.html>).*

*Cheryl Curtiss is a member of the Connecticut 9/11 Truth group and host of the radio show "9/11 Wake-Up Call" produced at the [University of Hartford](#) and archived at <http://www.radio4all.net/index.php/contributor/4212>.*

## Notes

1. \* Agents of terror leave their mark on Sin City / Las Vegas workers recall the men they can't forget; Kevin Fagan, *SFGate*, 4 Oct 2001

<http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2001/10/04/MN102970.DTL>

\* Terrorists partied with hooker at Hub-area hotel; Dave Wedge, *Boston Herald*, 10 Oct 2001 (retrieved from Wayback Machine 11 Sep 2015)

<http://web.archive.org/web/20011010224657/http://www.bostonherald.com/attack/investigation/ausprob10102001.htm>

\* Suspects' actions don't add up; Jody Benjamin, *South Florida Sun-Sentinel*, 16 Sep 2001 (retrieved from Wayback Machine 11 Sep 2015)

<http://web.archive.org/web/20010916150533/http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/local/southflorida/sfl-warriors916.story>

\* *Welcome To Terrorland*; Daniel Hopsicker (Trine Day, 2004)

<http://www.amazon.com/dp/0970659164/>

2. \* Point Video-2: Was the Airport Video of the Alleged AA 77 Hijackers Authentic?: Official 9/11 Videotaped Evidence; Consensus 911: The Best Evidence Panel

<http://www.consensus911.org/point-video-2/>

\* Point Video-1: The Alleged Security Videos of Mohamed Atta during a Mysterious Trip to Portland, Maine, September 10-11, 2001; Consensus 911: The Best Evidence Panel  
<http://www.consensus911.org/point-video-1/>

3. 9/11 Contradictions: Mohamed Atta's Mitsubishi and His Luggage; David Ray Griffin, Global Research, 9 May 2008  
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/9-11-contradictions-mohamed-atta-s-mitsubishi-and-his-luggage/8937>

4. The FBI took control of the original flight manifests and still refuses to release them, while the airlines defer to the FBI. It has been said that the following versions had the hijackers removed to spare the feelings of the victims' relatives. The reader must draw his/her own conclusions. The following from CNN on 17 Sep 2001 were retrieved from Wayback Machine 11 Sep 2015 )

\* Flight 11:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20010917033844/http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center/victims/AA11.victims.html>

\* Flight 175:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20010917034224/http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center/victims/ua175.victims.html>

\* Flight 77:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20010917033858/http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center/victims/AA77.victims.html>

\* Flight 93:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20010917033913/http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center/victims/UA93.victims.html>

5. Not a shred of evidence that any 9/11 'hijackers' boarded any planes; Craig McKee, Truth and Shadows  
<http://truthandshadows.wordpress.com/2015/03/19/hijackers-did-not-board-planes/>

6. Point Flt-1: A Claim Regarding Hijacked Passenger Jets; Consensus 911: The Best Evidence Panel  
<http://www.consensus911.org/point-flt-1/>

7. \* Project Achilles Report Parts One, Two and Three; A.K. Dewdney, 23 Jan - 19 Apr 2003  
<http://physics911.net/projectachilles/>

\* Point PC-3: Cell Phone Calls From the Planes: The First Official Account; Consensus 911: The Best Evidence Panel  
<http://www.consensus911.org/point-pc-3/>

\* *September 11 - The New Pearl Harbor*, Part 1; Massimo Mazzucco, YouTube [at 1:38:35]  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O1GCeuSr3Mk&t=5915>

\* Point PC-4: Cell Phone Calls from the Planes: The Second Official Account; Consensus 911: The Best Evidence Panel  
<http://www.consensus911.org/point-pc-4/>

\* Methodical Illusion Series with Rebekah Roth, Part 2 [1:57:50]; Wake Up To the Truth (BlogTalk Radio); 19 Nov 2014  
<http://www.blogtalkradio.com/911falseflags/2014/11/19/methodical-illusion-series-w-rebekah-roth-part-2>

\* Ted Olson's Report of Phone Calls from Barbara Olson on 9/11: Three Official Denials; David Ray Griffin, Global Research, 1 Apr 2008  
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/ted-olson-s-report-of-phone-calls-from-barbara-olson-on-9-11-three-official-denials/8514>



8. Methodical Illusion Series with Rebekah Roth; Wake Up To the Truth (BlogTalk Radio); 17 Nov 2014

\* Part 4 [17:50-1:09:50]

<http://www.blogtalkradio.com/911falseflags/2014/11/21/methodical-illusion-series-w-rebekah-roth-part-4>

\* Part 3 [1:05:23-1:17:30, 1:28:00-1:31:15, 1:42:00-1:45:20]

<http://www.blogtalkradio.com/911falseflags/2014/11/20/methodical-illusion-series-w-rebekah-roth-part-3>

\* Part 1 [35:35-55:35]

<http://www.blogtalkradio.com/911falseflags/2014/11/18/methodical-illusion-series-w-rebekah-roth-part-1>

9. \* Hani Hanjour: 9/11 Pilot Extraordinaire; What Really Happened

<http://whatreallyhappened.com/WRHARTICLES/hanjour.html>

\* *September 11 – The New Pearl Harbor*, Part 1; Massimo Mazzucco, YouTube [at 1:07:06]

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O1GCeuSr3Mk&t=4026>

10. \* FBI agent Dan Coleman explains how the passport of 9/11 hijacker Satam Al Suqami was “found”; 9/11 Blogger, 14 Nov 2011

<http://911blogger.com/news/2011-11-14/fbi-agent-dan-coleman-explains-how-passport-911-hijacker-satam-al-suqami-was-found>

\* Jihadist bandana – the “in” fashion for fall; Pilots for 9/11 Truth, 8 Nov 2006

<http://pilotsfor911truth.org/forum/lofiversion/index.php?t1383.html>

11. Plausibility of 9/11 Aircraft Attacks Generated by GPS-Guided Aircraft Autopilot Systems; Aidan Monaghan (with extensive references), Oct 2008

<http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2008/AutopilotSystemsMonaghan.pdf>

The original source of this article is Global Research

Copyright © [Dick Atlee](#) and [Ken Freeland](#), Global Research, 2015

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Dick Atlee](#) and  
[Ken Freeland](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the

copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)