

Were Stand-Down Intercept Orders Given On Morning Of 911?

<http://www.rense.com/general17/werestanddown.htm>

This writer, who is identified only by

top_view@planetmail.com

knows what he is talking about. He knows what Mike Ruppert and I knew immediately and some in this discussion are having a very hard time grasping.

The Air Force spokesman confirmed that AFTER the alerts and requests for INTERCEPTS of the aircraft were received from FAA/ATC, orders from the HIGHEST LEVEL of the executive branch of the federal government were received, demanding that the Air Force stand down and NOT follow through with ESTABLISHED scramble/intercept procedures that morning until further notice!

The writer is going from something he knows --- somewhere in the executive branch a STAND DOWN ORDER was issued --- to a pretty good guess of a probable culprit. The writer is 100% on the mark when he describes Cheney's deliberate confusion about the INTERCEPT PROCEDURES.

Cheney needs to explain why he lied about Bush having to make the decision to shoot down flight 77 on 9-11-01.

I feel that this writer is moving the discussion in the right direction.

Brian Quig
CTRL@LISTSERV.AOL.COM
<http://disc.server.com/Indices/149495.html>

AF Spokesman Says FAA DID Issue Alert IMMEDIATELY On 911 - Air Force Was Prevented From Scrambling

**** TOP_VIEW ****

The Big Picture

12-9-1

TOP_VIEW conducted a phone interview on 12.09.01 with a spokesperson for the U.S. Air Force, located in New York.

This person was ordered to the Ground Zero, Pennsylvania and Pentagon 9-11 crash sites within several days of the events, as part of an Air Force investigative probe.

Crucial information was conveyed to us, related specifically to the entire matter of IF or WHEN FAA/ATC personnel alerted appropriate Air National Guard/Air Force units, that four large passenger jets were significantly off course and that all standard communications with these craft had been broken.

We were informed that standard procedures fully in effect on the morning of September 11 were absolutely followed to a "T" by U.S. Air Traffic Control personnel; that via established channels and according to established guidelines, U.S. Air National Guard and Air Force units -- which are ALWAYS on alert to be scrambled for intercepts of either distressed OR suspicious and possibly hostile aircraft 365/24/7 in these United States -- WERE DEFINITELY contacted by FAA/ATC on 9-11 IMMEDIATELY after Air Traffic Control had become aware of the developing situation with the jets.

The Air Force spokesman confirmed that after the alerts and requests for intercepts of the aircraft were received from FAA/ATC, orders from the HIGHEST LEVEL of the executive branch of the federal government were received, demanding that the Air Force stand down and NOT follow through with established scramble/intercept procedures that morning until further notice!

The U.S. Air Force's hands (wings) were DELIBERATELY TIED on the morning of September 11, until such time that the horrifying treacherous, murderous deeds had been carried out by the BushMob.

Our informant has told us in no uncertain terms that as much as seventy percent of Armed Forces officers -- with the NOTABLE exception of most of the U.S. Navy -- are VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED to the treacherous, murderous actions carried out by profoundly corrupt and demonic elements somewhere within the federal government on 9-11, and to the wholesale treachery and demolition of the U.S. Constitution which said elements have now undertaken.

It was conveyed to us that the "story" is by no means over yet; that the fat lady has by NO means yet "sung", and that this large percentage of the military who DO support, uphold and defend the U.S. Constitution are NOT going let all this just "slide". They are simply waiting for the right time, to do all within their power to set things straight in the United States.

Furthermore, our source fully-concurred with the assessment of ourselves and others: that a CRUCIAL element in the government being able to "SELL" to the public their utterly false fables about WHY 9-11 death planes were NOT intercepted by Air Guard/Air Force units has to do with a deliberate, major and blatant distortion and twisting of the truth by none other than Dick Cheney himself; accomplished in the following manner...

Cheney, while being interviewed by Tim Russert on NBC TV's 'MEET THE PRESS' on September 16th, claimed that the military needed authorization from the president before scrambling fighter jets to intercept American Airlines Flight 77.

THIS IS A BIG, BIG, LIE, plain and simple.

For example: remember two years ago, when golf pro Payne Stewart's small PRIVATE Lear jet went off-course and out of communication just after takeoff in Florida?

Within MINUTES, on an immediate alert from the FAA, U.S. Air Force and Air Guard jets were scrambled to intercept Stewart's jet and see what the heck was up (not that it helped much in that case...): "Several Air Force and Air National Guard fighter jets, plus an AWACS radar control plane, helped the Federal Aviation Administration track the runaway Learjet and estimate when it would run out of fuel." -- CNN, 10.26.99

Interceptors were in direct proximity to Stewart's seriously messed-up aircraft within about TEN MINUTES of him having taken off. NOBODY had to go pull Clinton away from Vice-president Monica Lewinsky and get him to AUTHORIZE the INTERCEPT of Payne Stewart's jet that day.

Moreover, according to the same CNN article: "...officers on the Joint Chiefs were monitoring the Learjet on radar screens inside the Pentagon's National Military Command Center. -- CNN, 10.26.99

Air Traffic Controllers request military intercepts of private and commercial planes REGULARLY. Sometimes it's because communications have broken off; sometimes it's to inform a pilot that his plane has gone off course; other times it's to observe the situation directly - for instance, to see who's actually flying the plane and things like that. None of this requires presidential approval.

But there's more to how Cheney twisted the truth here regarding what is PROVABLY one of the biggest holes in the Federal Government's 9-11 tapestry of lies; since someone of even the most minimal intelligence would realize that such intercepts are VERY

common, do NOT require any "presidential authorization" and SHOULD HAVE TAKEN PLACE on September 11.

So what arch-spin-meister Cheney did was to very subtly and cleverly fudge the distinction between a common, often-executed intercept and a SHOOTDOWN of an aircraft already determined to be hostile.

Cheney put the entire situation in the context that there was a terribly troubling, agonizing ethical decision to be made whether or not to shoot down a number of passenger aircraft which "seemed" to be hostile, and that only the president (who was after all VERY busy reading rabbit stories to Florida schoolkids at the time) could have authorized this shutdown.

Well, first of all, there was no NEED for any order to SHOOT DOWN; there was only a need for Air Force/Air Guard units -- which are always standing by to respond to FAA alerts about troubled and/or suspicious aircraft -- to carry out standard intercept procedures.

And keep in mind that military interceptors (or "escorts") already have clear "instructions to act." These instructions can be read online in detailed manuals from the FAA and the Department of Defense. The instructions cover everything from minor emergencies to hijackings. If a problem is definitely serious, high-ranking military officers from the NMCC (National Military Command Center) in the Pentagon can take charge.

So: even if such intercepts had yielded information showing that the aircraft were indeed hijacked, were under hostile control and about to be used as guided missiles/fuel-air bombs, there is still -- according to our Air Force contact -- no requirement that any order to shoot down hostile aircraft must come from the president himself. There are procedures fully in place for NMCC commanding officers and the DOD to order such shutdowns, when it's obvious an attack of some kind is underway. After all, the "commander-in-chief" might be too busy reading about rabbits to schoolkids to be bothered making such decisions about shooting down hostile aircraft!

Cheney knows this probably better than anyone -- except for those military officers and personnel who were DIRECTLY SAT ON by the Executive Branch on the morning of 9-11, until it was far too late to take any preventive actions whatsoever. Moreover, when jets were finally scrambled, they were deliberately scrambled from more distant bases, making it a foregone certainty the interceptors would NEVER be able to reach the hijacked planes in time.

As an example of the blatantly false/disinformative statements made by Cheney (ONCE AGAIN!) to give some credibility to this highly-manipulated, non-timely "response" scenario, he claimed that there were no intercept aircraft ready for action at Andrew Air Force Base -- only TEN MILES from the Pentagon -- on the morning of 9-11. This has been proven to be a TOTAL LIE.

(For a map of Washington showing the distance from Andrews Air Force base to the Pentagon go to: <http://emperors-clothes.com/indict/andrewsmap.htm>)

Beyond any doubt: the Executive branch of the federal government -- whether G. W. Bush or more likely Dick Cheney himself -- EXPRESSLY AND UNILATERALLY FORBADE Air Guard/Air Force units from responding in a TIMELY manner to FAA alerts on the morning of September 11, as they were fully ready to do.

This is the TRUTH, and large numbers of Air Force and other military officers and personnel know it, beyond the shadow of a doubt.

And no doubt THAT explains exactly WHY Cheney has been in HIDING for so much of the past three months!!!!

- - - Here's a transcript of the MEET THE PRESS segment where Cheney gets going muddying the waters about intercepts, shootdowns, time frames, (non-existent) moral considerations that supposedly delayed a response even more, and other chaff to deflect truth-seeking radar. Following that is a very worthwhile analysis of Cheney's verbal/conceptual gymnastics from: www.emporers-clothes.com/

"MR. RUSSERT: What's the most important decision you think he made during the course of the day?

"VICE PRES. CHENEY: Well, the--I suppose the toughest decision was this question of whether or not we would intercept incoming commercial aircraft.

"MR. RUSSERT: And you decided?

"VICE PRES. CHENEY: We decided to do it. We'd, in effect, put a flying combat air patrol up over the city; F-16s with an AWACS, which is an airborne radar system and tanker support so they could stay up a long time...

"It doesn't do any good to put up a combat air patrol if you don't give them instructions to act, if, in fact, they feel it's appropriate.

"MR. RUSSERT: So if the United States government became aware that a hijacked commercial airline was destined for the White House or the Capitol, we would take the plane down?

"VICE PRES. CHENEY: Yes. The president made the decision...that if the plane would not divert...as a last resort, our pilots were authorized to take them out. Now, people say, you know, that's a horrendous decision to make. Well, it is. You've got an airplane full of American citizens, civilians, captured by...terrorists, headed and are you going to, in fact, shoot it down, obviously, and kill all those Americans on board?

"...It's a presidential-level decision, and the president made, I think, exactly the right call in this case, to say, "I wished we'd had combat air patrol up over New York." -NBC, 'Meet the Press' 16 September 2001 (1)

* * * FROM: <http://emperors-clothes.com/indict/indict-1.htm>

Note that Mr. Cheney has performed a sleight of hand here.

First he said, "the toughest decision was...whether we would intercept incoming commercial aircraft."

Later he said, "The president made the decision... that if the plane would not divert as a last resort, our pilots were authorized to take them out..." that is, "shoot it down."

But "intercept": and "shoot it down" DO NOT mean the same thing.

"intercept (nter-spt1) verb, transitive intercepted, intercepting, intercepts 1. a. To stop, deflect, or interrupt the progress or intended course of" (From 'American Heritage Dictionary')

"shootdown (sht1down) noun "Destruction of a flying aircraft by a missile attack or gunfire." (From 'American Heritage Dictionary')

Mr. Cheney deliberately confused these terms to stop people from asking: why weren't the hijacked jets intercepted?

Since "stopping, deflecting, or interrupting the progress or intended course of" a hijacked airplane does not necessarily involve violence, there could be no moral obstacle to scrambling fighter jets to intercept Flight 77. Therefore Mr. Cheney shifted quickly to the morally charged question of whether to shoot down "an airplane full of American citizens". By creating this emotional link between interception (not necessarily violent) and shooting down a commercial jet (very violent), Cheney hoped to create sympathy for a President forced to make this "horrendous" choice: to intercept or not to intercept.

<SNIP>

When dealing with potentially hostile situations, escorts can adopt aggressive behavior:

"Small Private Plane Ordered to Land in Vicinity of Bush Ranch"

"A small private plane flying unauthorized in the vicinity of President Bush's ranch near Crawford was ordered by the military to land Thursday, a sheriff's deputy said...."

"The Federal Aviation Administration declared that the plane was unauthorized and ordered its occupants detained, Plemons said. At that point military officials, flying in

two jets beside the plane, got on the pilot's radio frequency and ordered the Cessna to land...

"The plane landed on a private landing strip near State Highway 6, about eight miles from the Bush ranch near Crawford....

"In [a second incident, in] Wood County, Sheriff's senior Dispatcher Rodney Mize said a private plane was forced down by two military pilots in A-10 Warthog jets about 11:30 a.m. The jets flew one above and one below until the private plane's pilot landed at Wisener Field near Mineola." -- 'AP,' 13 September 2001 (12)

The 'Boston Globe' reported that: "[Marine Corps Major Mike] Snyder, the NORAD spokesman, said its fighters routinely intercept aircraft.

"When planes are intercepted, they typically are handled with a graduated response. The approaching fighter may rock its wingtips to attract the pilot's attention, or make a pass in front of the aircraft. Eventually, it can fire tracer rounds in the airplane's path, or, under certain circumstances, down it with a missile." -- 'Boston Globe,' 15 September 2001 (13)

Now, let us return to Mr. Cheney and his interview on 'MEET THE PRESS.'

As you will recall, he said:

"It doesn't do any good to put up a combat air patrol if you don't give them instructions to act, if, in fact, they feel it's appropriate."

Mr. Cheney is attempting to misinform by pretending that intercept pilots need 'instructions' from the President, when he knows perfectly well that clear instructions and a whole organizational network exist to handle intercept emergencies.

Moreover, Mr. Cheney's implicit argument - that there is no point in sending up an escort unless the pilot has clearance to shoot down a commercial jet - is absurd. Why would such a decision have to be made in advance of scrambling the escort? Even if an airliner has been taken over by a terrorist with a suicide mission, how could Mr. Cheney, Mr. Bush or anyone else other than God Himself possibly predict how the hijacker would respond to an intercept by military jets? Even if a hijacker were ready to die for the glory of crashing into the Pentagon, does that mean he would also be ready to die for the glory of ignoring a military pilot's order to land?

So even if the military had no authority to shoot down Flight 77, why not send up escorts planes? Isn't that in fact how police and the military routinely handle hijack situations - by mobilizing a potentially overwhelming force in the hope of getting the hijacker to surrender?

Why, as Mr. Cheney claims, would there have been "no point" in trying this tactic in the case of Flight 77? Weren't many human lives at stake? Isn't that "a point"?

A DEFENSE THAT BACKFIRES

What about the rest of Mr. Cheney's remarks, his contention that only President Bush could authorize the military to actually shoot down a hijacked plane? In all probability this is true. But as we shall see in a later section, this comment, as well as other things Mr. Cheney said on 'MEET THE PRESS,' will prove damning to George W. Bush when he goes on trial for treason.

Summary of evidence is CONTINUED IN PART 1, SECTION 3

FOOTNOTES:

For a map of Washington showing the distance from Andrews Air Force base to the Pentagon go to:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/indict/andrewsmap.htm>

(1) 'NBC, Meet the Press' (10:00 AM ET) Sunday 16 September 2001. Full transcript at:

<http://stacks.msnbc.com/news/629714.asp?cp1=1>

<http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/nbcmp.htm>

(2) Regarding rules governing IFR requirements, see FAA Order 7400.2E 'Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters,' Effective Date: December 7, 2000 (Includes Change 1, effective July 7, 2001), Chapter 14-1-2. Full text posted at:

<http://www.faa.gov/ATpubs/AIR/air1401.html#14-1-2>

(3) For a clear and detailed description of flight plans, fixes, and Air Traffic Control, see: 'Direct-To Requirements' by Gregory Dennis and Emina Torlak at:

<http://sdg.lcs.mit.edu/atc/D2Requirements.htm>

(4) 'CNN,' 26 October 1999 "Pentagon never considered downing Stewart's Learjet," Web posted at: 8:27 p.m. EDT (0027 GMT). Full text posted at:

<http://www.cnn.com/US/9910/26/shootdown/>

Backup at:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/cnnlearjet.htm>

(5) FAA 'Aeronautical Information Manual: Official Guide to Basic Flight Information and Air Traffic Control (ATC) Procedures,' (Includes Change 3 Effective: July 12, 2001) Chapter 5-6-4 "Interception Signals". Full text posted at:

<http://www.faa.gov/ATpubs/AIM/Chap5/aim0506.html#5-6-4>

(6) FAA Order 7110.65M 'Air Traffic Control' (Includes Change 3 Effective: July 12, 2001), Chapter 10-2-5 "Emergency Situations". Full text posted at:

<http://www.faa.gov/ATpubs/ATC/Chp10/atc1002.html#10-2-5>

(7) FAA Order 7110.65M 'Air Traffic Control' (Includes Change 3 Effective: July 12, 2001), Chapter 10-1-1 "Emergency Determinations". Full text posted at:

<http://www.faa.gov/ATpubs/ATC/Chp10/atc1001.html#10-1-1>

(8) FAA Order 7610.4J 'Special Military Operations' (Effective Date: November 3, 1998; Includes: Change 1, effective July 3, 2000; Change 2, effective July 12, 2001), Chapter 4, Section 5, "Air Defense Liaison Officers (ADLO's)". Full text posted at:

<http://www.faa.gov/ATpubs/MIL/Ch4/mil0405.html#Section%205>

(9) FAA Order 7610.4J 'Special Military Operations' (Effective Date: November 3, 1998; Includes: Change 1, effective July 3, 2000; Change 2, effective July 12, 2001), Chapter 7, Section 1-2, "Escort of Hijacked Aircraft: Requests for Service". Full text posted at:

<http://faa.gov/ATpubs/MIL/Ch7/mil0701.html#7-1-2>

(10) 'ABCNews,' 25 October 1999 "Runaway Plane Crashes in S.D.; Golfer, at Least Four Others Killed," by Geraldine Sealey. Full text posted at:

<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/plane102599.html>

Backup at:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/abcclarjet.htm>

(11) 'Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3610.01A,' 1 June 2001, "Aircraft Piracy (Hijacking) and Destruction of Derelict Airborne Objects," 4.Policy (page 1) PDF available at:

http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/cjcsd/cjcsi/3610_01a.pdf

Backup at:

http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/3610_01a.pdf

(12) 'The Associated Press State & Local Wire' 13 September 2001, Thursday, BC cycle, "Small private plane ordered to land in vicinity of Bush ranch". Full text posted at:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/bushranch.htm>

(13) 'The Boston Globe,' Saturday 15 September 2001 Third Edition Page A1, "Facing Terror Attack's Aftermath: Otis Fighter Jets Scrambled Too Late to Halt The Attacks" by Glen Johnson. Full text posted at:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/bg915.htm>