

**The 1-Hour Guide to 9/11**  
(Version 1.0)

“Blue Text” in this essay denotes a hyperlink. If you are reading a printed version, you will need to visit [StopTheLie.com](http://StopTheLie.com) to access the additional information. (When you arrive at the site, choose “1-Hour Guide to 911” from the top navigation.)

**Part 1 - No Tinfoil Hat Required**

If one group accuses another of being delusional, they ought to prepare convincing evidence.

For many years now, the mainstream media has played a key role in maintaining the government's official account of 9/11. In all respects, it has done a brilliant job of filtering out everything that might undermine the government's claims, while simultaneously demonizing anyone who dares to challenge those claims.

So let's get right to it: Is it *really* baseless idiocy that drives people to question the official account of 9/11? Are the millions of Americans (including Senators, FBI agents, Doctors, Lawyers, Professors, Scientists, Engineers, etc.) all paranoid loons for suggesting we need a truly independent investigation of 9/11? The government and media would have you think so. They'd also (to help maintain that perception) need to keep you diverted from the information you're about to read.

The truth is, for decades our government has been doing very nasty things that most Americans would never believe to be true. The truth is, the media has fed you a steady diet of meaningless news stories instead of sharing information that is vitally important to the future of this country. The truth is, if it wasn't for the internet (which the media is now demonizing and the government is trying to get control of) most of us would have never known how badly our leaders have lied to us.

Let's start with the main assertion:

"It is crazy to think corrupt elements within our government intentionally LET the attacks on 9/11 happen so they could be used as a pretext for war. Furthermore, it is even crazier to suggest corrupt elements might have actually facilitated the attacks."

Now to be fair, I will admit it is utterly insane to intentionally provoke and allow an attack against one's own country. I agree it is even more insane (and criminal) to facilitate such an attack; sacrificing innocent human beings so the "outrage" could be used as a pretext for an already-established military agenda. ...Psychotic tyrants in other countries might resort to this type of "false flag" operation, but would *our own* government ever conspire to do the same? The answer might surprise you.

A hypothetical scenario:

Imagine if the President of the United States came on television and announced that Iraq had shot down a civilian airliner filled with American students on vacation. Imagine if there were no survivors, only grieving parents who had lost their children at the hands of a crazed and arrogant dictator. Imagine if all that remained of the plane and its crew was the frantic tape of its pilot's final transmission: "Mayday, Mayday, we are being tailed by an Iraqi Fighter...we need help up here and fast...mayday, do you copy..." and then the sound of an explosion, screaming, then silence.

Now, imagine in the midst of the "outrage" and calls for Saddam's head on a platter, some "idiot conspiracy theorist" stood up and said:

"It's all a lie! Iraq is innocent of the charges against it!!! Our government was behind the whole thing! They loaded a civilian airliner with FAKE passengers, flew the plane to a secret location, unloaded the fake passengers and replaced the original plane with a remote-controlled drone that was painted up to look like the original. They then had a FAKE Iraqi Fighter Jet (it was really an American Fighter painted to LOOK LIKE an Iraqi Fighter) chase after the remote controlled drone. Then, they transmitted a FAKE "Mayday" signal from the drone just before blowing it up! It was all a set up so we could frame and attack Iraq!"

In the above hypothetical scenario, who would you be more likely to believe? The president (with the media backing him up) or the "crazy conspiracy theorist?"

Well, substitute "Iraq and Saddam" for "Cuba and Castro" and you've got The Northwood's Document. The Northwood's Document is an official United States government plan to provoke and allow attacks to be used as a pretext for invading Cuba. The plan goes further to suggest, if provocation does not work, we could "attack ourselves" and blame Cuba. It even speaks of completely fabricating an attack to be used as a pretext. President Kennedy rejected the plan just prior to being assassinated. Had he not, this plan *would have* led to war and the death of many thousands based on total lies. Even worse, it might have led to a nuclear exchange with Russia: *millions* dead, based on lies.

Here are some of the highlights from this now declassified document:

**"Subject:** Justification for US Military Intervention in Cuba"

"As requested by Chief of Operations, Cuba Project, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are to indicate brief but precise description of pretexts which they consider would provide justification for US military intervention in Cuba."

"It is recognized that any action which becomes pretext for US military intervention in Cuba will lead to a political decision which then would lead to military action."

"It is possible to create an incident which will demonstrate convincingly that a Cuban aircraft has attacked and shot down a chartered civil airliner enroute from the United States to Jamaica, Guatemala, Panama, or Venezuela. The destination would be chosen only to cause the flight plan route to cross Cuba. The passengers could be a group of college students off on a holiday or any grouping of persons with a common interest to support chartering a non-scheduled flight.

a. An aircraft at Eglin Air Force Base would be painted and numbered as an exact duplicate for a civil registered aircraft belonging to a CIA proprietary organization in the Miami area. At a designated time, the duplicate would be substituted for the actual civil aircraft and would be loaded with selected passengers, all boarded under carefully prepared aliases. The actual registered aircraft would be converted to a drone.

b. Take off times of the drone aircraft and the actual aircraft will be scheduled to allow a rendezvous south of Florida. From the rendezvous point the passenger-carrying aircraft will descend to minimum altitude and go directly into an auxiliary field at Eglin Air Force Base where arrangements will have been made to evacuate the passengers and return the aircraft to its original status. The drone aircraft meanwhile will continue to fly the filed flight plan. When over Cuba the drone will be transmitting on the international distress frequency a "May Day" message stating he is under attack by Cuban MIG aircraft. The transmission will be interrupted by destruction of the aircraft which will be triggered by radio signal. This will allow ICAO radio stations in the Western Hemisphere to tell the US what has happened to the aircraft instead of the US trying to "sell" the incident."

Other ideas suggested:

"We could blow up a US ship in Guantanamo Bay and blame Cuba."

"Casualty lists in US newspapers would cause a helpful wave of national indignation."

"**We could develop** (emphasis added) a Communist Cuban Terror Campaign in the Miami area, in other Florida cities and even in Washington. The terror campaign could be pointed at Cuban Refugees seeking haven in the United States."

"We could sink a boatload of Cubans enroute to Florida (real or simulated). We could foster attempts on lives of Cuban refugees in the United States even to the extent of wounding in instances to be widely publicized. Exploding a few plastic bombs in carefully chosen spots, the arrest of Cuban agents and the release of prepared documents substantiating Cuban involvement also would be helpful in projecting the idea of an irresponsible government."

The Northwoods document (available at the [National Security Archive](#)) proves beyond any shadow of doubt that our government has openly conspired to completely MANUFACTURE a pretext for war. It also gives us an idea of how far the ruling elite are willing to go in order to deceive the American people--how far they are willing to go in order to get what they want.

Now, does this prove corrupt elements in our own government were in some way responsible for the attacks of 9/11? No, but it does irrefutably establish that it's NOT crazy to suggest it's possible. As a matter of fact, it proves a person must be ignorant, delusional (or simply lying) to suggest it isn't possible. It's just that simple.

## **Part 2 - The Reason They Lie**

Knowing full well that it isn't crazy to suggest complicity or cover up, why does the government try so hard to convince us otherwise?

Well, does it make sense that we should expect criminals running covert operations to "educate us" about the existence and history of such operations? Of course not. The whole point of a covert / "false flag" operation is to deceive. The whole point is to get away with something you would otherwise be unable to get away with. Deception (also known as lying) is the foundation on which these operations are built. Their first objective is to create and maintain cover.

Take a minute to look up "disinformation" or "psychological operation" or "false flag." These aren't just terms, they are *real weapons* used to achieve covert objectives. If there is anything you can be sure of, it's this: These weapons are well known to the ruling elite, they've been used for thousands of years, and they will continue to be used whenever it is believed the "targets" of the operation will respond appropriately. Simply stated, to the extent we blindly follow our "leaders," we encourage them to deceive and exploit us.

In case after case, if we dig even a little bit, we find that nearly everything our government denounces PUBLICLY, it engages in privately. And I do mean everything. [From overthrowing democratically elected governments](#) (and installing [ruthless dictatorships](#) in their place), to [training terrorist death squads](#) to kill innocent civilians. [From allowing American citizens to be infected with syphilis](#) (so the effects and spread of the disease could be studied in a "real world" laboratory), to KNOWINGLY contaminating civilian and military personnel with [depleted uranium](#).

Deception, theft, torture, murder, terrorism - These are the tools of tyrants, not the tools of a legitimate American Government. If we intend to reclaim our title as the home of freedom and justice in the world, we can no longer allow ourselves to be manipulated by the lowest among us. And the truth is,

if these crimes are sufficiently exposed, they won't be tolerated. Our false perception of the "benevolent state" has provided the cover for the wickedness it does. But when that cover is lifted and people see the truth with their own eyes, the illusion of legitimacy melts away. For all but the most cowardly and intellectually dishonest, continued self deception becomes impossible.

Assume for a moment that all of the allegations of wrong doing made to this point can be easily verified and are 100% true. (Unfortunately, they *can* be verified and they *are* true.) If you are like most Americans, you probably know very little (if anything) about these conspiracies. There are at least two reasons why. We've already covered the first, which is:

1. We can't expect those trying to hide what they're doing to tell us what they're doing. As important as it is for you to know what they're up to, it is equally as important to them for you to remain ignorant. They are willing to do whatever it takes to get what they want, lying is no exception, and there is little we can do about that.

However, we have complete control over the second cause of our ignorance:

2. We are ignorant of our government's greatest lies because we choose to be. We *choose* to believe the comforting words of our elected officials when they say: "There is nothing to see here, it's all a conspiracy theory, it is absurd to suggest we'd ever participate in such a thing, *trust us*."

Well I ask: Trust them based on what? Have they earned our trust? Or have they violated it over and over again? Is it really *absurd* to suspect them of heinous crimes when we've repeatedly caught them red-handed? -And how exactly can we expect to expose *any* of their crimes (great or small) if simply denying the charge and attacking their accuser is considered sufficient grounds for acquittal? We know the elite lie, we know they can be sadistic, we know they'll stop at nothing to secure and expand their power. If that isn't enough to warrant healthy skepticism, what is?

The history of unchecked power is clear; its tyrannical course, unavoidable. Over and over we have seen the maxim "absolute power corrupts absolutely" played out before us. Personally, I believe those who seek *absolute power* are already corrupt, but there's no need to split hairs; in the end the same holds true: **It is never absurd to question the statements, motives, or actions, of extremely powerful people. To the contrary, all evidence suggests it is absurd *not to*.**

Common criminals plague our society, but whatever threat they pose, it pales in comparison to the "threat" of those who rule over us.

Common criminals do not have access to the media, the trust of the masses, or the air of legitimacy given those who secure a high position in government. They cannot legally seize our money; destroy the purchasing power of our currency or command standing armies. They cannot "legislate away" our rights, or (by their reckless spending) reduce our children to debt slaves. They cannot obstruct investigations from inside the system. They cannot seal documents, confiscate video tapes or appoint their own investigators. They cannot subpoena witnesses, find out what the witnesses know, and then use the information they've obtained to more effectively whitewash their crime. They cannot have **BILLIONS of dollars in cash** sent into the desert, have it disappear without a trace, and have nobody bat an eye. They cannot orchestrate covert operations that drag us into war. They cannot commission our agencies to carry out atrocities around the world on "our behalf" - destroying America's reputation, undermining its future security, and setting the stage for other great powers to unite against us.

If we do not regain control of this country, we will lose what remains of it. In order to do that, we must know exactly what we're dealing with: there can be no illusions.

John Adams Wrote: "Liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge among the people, who have a right ...to that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge, I mean the characters and conduct of their rulers."

When speaking of our freedoms, Samuel Adams warned: Let us not be "cheated out of them by the artifices of false and designing men."

Frederic Douglas wrote: "Find out just what the people will submit to and you have found out the exact amount of injustice and wrong which will be imposed upon them; -the limits of tyrants are prescribed by the endurance of those whom they oppress."

The United States is like the Titanic - steaming headlong into an Iceberg. Sure, I know; you've got a lot invested in your ticket, the drinks are good and the shows are even better. The food is fantastic, the gambling exciting, and there are *tons* of fun things to do. Who wants to talk about that stupid iceberg anyway? Who wants to do what it takes to turn the ship around or at least plan an evasive maneuver? "*Nobody here, we're having too good a time!*" ...OK, but ignore the ice at your own peril. Know that those who intend to sink this ship will NOT go down with her. As a matter of fact they stand to profit handsomely. They will speed off in their lifeboats, unite with the *billions* of dollars *lost* in the desert, and YOU will be left treading water. But not to worry; an even *larger* "global government" will come to your aid. That is the ultimate plan, you know; bring America to its knees economically, erase the borders, and absorb it into a "New World Order." Oh, but that is a whole other topic.

For now, suffice to say, we've got some real tough choices ahead. Hopefully you've seen enough by now to realize (if you didn't already know) what we're dealing with. Hopefully you've seen enough to agree, if there is compelling evidence that counters the official account of 9/11, well it just *might be* something we should take a look at. After all, those darned government guys might be fibbing just a little bit...they do that sometimes.

### **Part 3 - The Cover Up**

We can now rest our case on whether or not it's "crazy" to question the government's official account of 9/11. Corrupt elements within our government have proven they are capable of carrying out, facilitating or covering up crimes of equal or greater depravity - this is indisputable.

However, to support a specific charge (a charge of cover up or complicity) we'll need to go further with the evidence. That is what the remainder of this essay will focus on. Specifically, it will focus on evidence that points to a "cover up" because a cover up, once proven, will establish complicity.

Consider what follows similar to a grand jury investigation. Our first job is to decide whether there's reasonable cause to believe a cover up has taken place. If the evidence reveals reasonable cause, it is then our job to indict.

Unlike the government's "investigation" into 9/11, ours will be truly independent. We will not allow the suspects to choose the detectives, limit the parameters of our inquiry, block access to damning information, lie by omission, etc.

Let it be known that we are not only demanding answers, we are demanding answers that can survive reasonable scrutiny. Because the government's claims regarding 9/11 (up until now) cannot survive reasonable scrutiny, they must be rejected in favor of answers that can.

There are perhaps 100 separate pieces of compelling evidence that clearly undermine the official government account of 9/11. But there is no reason for us to address them all here. For our purposes we need only ONE solid argument - one argument that shows, beyond a reasonable doubt, that what we've been told is a lie. In a nutshell, this is it:

The 3 buildings that collapsed in New York on September 11, 2001 (the north tower, the south tower, and world trade center building #7) were brought down by explosives. The evidence to support this claim is irrefutable. It can be physically observed and re-created. It can be mathematically proven, and independently verified via eyewitness accounts. The evidence to support the government's claim that fire destroyed all three buildings has no basis in reality - the "evidence" exists only in the form of words. There is no historical data to back their assertions, only historical data to refute them. No models have been able to physically reproduce the phenomena they describe because (as expected) the laws of physics cannot be violated. The government's refusal to first investigate and disprove the most logical cause for the collapse of the buildings (explosives) is, in itself, highly suspect.

### **Analogy:**

Suppose a man is found dead in his home. His house has been ransacked, two computers are missing, and there are signs he was tortured. His body is laying face down, his hands and feet are tied, and there are three gunshot wounds to the back of his head. Does it require a degree in forensic science to conclude foul play? If you are an outsider looking in on this investigation, would you be suspicious if this man's death was officially ruled a suicide? Would you say such a ruling was able to survive "reasonable scrutiny?" And what if after ruling the death a suicide, the man's home mysteriously caught fire (electrical problem) and his body was accidentally sent to the crematorium where it was promptly incinerated...Would you expect a cover up? Let's hope so.

Now back up a minute. What if the only information you had access to was the official account? What if the available information regarding this mans death consisted solely of the following: "Detective Johnson arrived on the scene where he found John Doe dead from a self inflicted gun shot wound. Investigators found a suicide note apologizing to his friends and family. Bouts with depression over the loss of his job and a recent divorce were cited as the most likely cause for his decision."

What if this is all the information you had access to? Isn't it reasonable to assume you'd never think twice about it? Of course; and that is how the perfect cover up is supposed to work. -Sure there might be quiet rumblings of a conspiracy - secret ties to the CIA and a covert drug running operation gone bad. But with the crime scene destroyed, and the body cremated, good luck proving it.

The official account of 9/11 is a cover up - plain and simple. For the sake of argument, we'll define a cover up as "a false story created to conceal the real story." For any cover up to succeed, the false story must be protected from information that undermines it. If the conspirators are unable to do this, the cover up falls apart.

Although all cover ups begin with a false story, there are other elements that play a supporting role: the destruction of physical evidence, creating distractions to control people's attention, vilifying those who level accusations, etc. These supporting elements (in conjunction with the false story) serve one goal: they keep you from seeing or considering anything that might reveal the truth.

1. Destroy evidence: If it doesn't exist, it can't be examined

2. Create distractions: (Here are a couple common tactics)

a) The "false debate" distraction: False debates are very useful because they lend credibility to the lie while distracting people away from questions that would expose it. Take our "suicide" story above. If people can be manipulated into a heated argument over "why" Bob killed himself, (because his boss fired him just a week before Christmas, because his heartless wife left him a week later, because he had a secret drug problem, etc.) the issue of whether or not Bob actually did kill himself gets lost.

In effect, the false debate turns the lie into an established truth - a foundation on which the subsequent debate is built. (Clearly, two people cannot argue about why Bob killed himself without first accepting the "fact" that he did kill himself.) As they become increasingly sure of their position,

they become increasingly dependent on the lie that supports it. Regardless of which side of the debate they're on, they will unite in protecting the false assumption on which their whole argument rests. In an odd way, defending the lie becomes an act of self-defense from that point forward.

-It goes without saying that once one "false debate" has been established; other "false debates" can grow up around it. In very little time, the masses can become hopelessly tangled in a web of falsities - endless arguments without merit. When this happens, only strong evidence can destroy the illusion - evidence that turns their attention back to the legitimate starting point; killing all descendents of the original lie.

b) The "major crisis" distraction: The power of a "major crisis" to manipulate the masses is well known among the ruling elite. Whether the crisis is intentionally created or naturally occurring, nothing enables them to more effectively expand power and direct the consciousness of their subjects. -To silence dissent, monopolize media talking points, rationalize the irrational, or completely bury an unwanted topic, nothing beats a crisis. (Especially when that "crisis" is war.)

3. Attack the messenger: If evidence cannot be destroyed, false debates aren't sufficient, or the crisis can't shake off growing dissent, the one remaining option to keep you from contemplating the evidence is to attack the messenger. When this is done, the conspirators' assertion is obvious: "What this person claims is absurd and any evidence he presents isn't credible."

Now ask yourself an obvious question: Why would it be necessary to vilify a person making "absurd claims" backed with "no credible evidence?" Isn't that something reasonably intelligent people could determine by looking at the evidence themselves? Do we really need (or want) others to decide for us what we should and shouldn't take into consideration? -In a "free" and "democratic society?" I don't think so.

The preceding three installments of this "1-Hour Guide" have been an attempt to expose the *mechanics* of how the government (with the help of the media) manipulates us into believing things that simply aren't true. For instance, the [Northwoods Document](#) proves our government would openly conspire to stand by and let our country be attacked, so long as the carnage helped them further their military agenda. Worse, it proves they'd go so far as to completely manufacture an attack if they couldn't bait the target country into attacking us first. This is not a "conspiracy theory" it is a "conspiracy fact." -And yet the average American still believes it's crazy to think such things are possible.

Is it an accident that everyone knows about Janet Jackson's "wardrobe malfunction" but nobody has heard of the Northwoods document? -how about the real story behind the USS Maine, the Lusitania, the Gulf of Tonkin, the USS Liberty or (what we're discussing now) the NeoCons' "New Pearl Harbor?"

Either we condone the exploitation of our country or we don't. Either we support the acts of liars, thieves, murderers and aspiring tyrants or we don't. This is our country, not theirs. LOOK at the evidence, decide what it means and determine once and for all where you stand.

Since it might take another few weeks for me to write the final installment, here are a couple clips that cover the evidence of "controlled demolition." Both are very well done - the evidence speaks for itself. The first clip (bombs.wmv) is about 5 minutes long and comes from the "[Loose Change](#)" documentary. The second clip is nearly an hour long and it comes from the Alex Jones documentary "[911 - Rise of the Police State.](#)"

#### **Part 4 - The Evidence**

##### **Exhibit A:** Pools of Molten Steel

There are limits to what fire can do. Those limits are determined by the amount of heat generated by a fire, the material the fire is acting on and the duration of contact.

For instance, the flame from a lighter can easily generate enough heat to ignite and destroy a piece of paper. Under ideal conditions, the whole process (from contact, to complete destruction) takes less than 60 seconds.

Conversely, you could hold the flame of a lighter against one of the core steel columns of the world trade towers for all eternity and it would NEVER ignite the steel. Nor would the heat generated from the flame of a lighter be sufficient to reduce the steel to a molten state. Without knowing the actual math of how steel conducts heat, most people can accept this as common sense.

If common sense dictates a lighter would never be sufficient to liquefy a massive steel support column, (measuring 16 inches by 36 inches by 4 inches thick) what would be sufficient? The easy answer is: A much larger, much hotter fire. That answer is correct, but for the purpose of our argument we need something more specific. For that "specific answer" we'll turn to the scientifically established "melting point" of steel. Our answer is: 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit.

If a fire manages to overcome the heat resistant properties of steel, raising that steel's temperature to 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit, the steel will melt. If the fire fails to raise the steel's temperature to 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit, the steel will not melt. (Keep in mind, we're not talking about the temperature at which steel weakens and loses its structural integrity, we're talking about the temperature at which it is reduced to a molten state.)

Again, we call on common sense to answer a simple question: Under what circumstances can a fire burning at less than 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit reduce steel to a molten state? The answer is: Under no circumstances.

To date, nobody has suggested the fires on 9/11 reached temperatures of 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit. Perhaps that is because, just as steel has a maximum temperature it can withstand before it melts, fuel sources have a maximum temperature at which they can burn. NONE of the known fuel sources burning on 9/11 could have reached the required temperature to melt steel.

As a matter of fact, the widely touted culprit of 9/11 (jet fuel) has a maximum burn temperature equal to only 60% of that required to melt steel. (Jet Fuel's maximum burn temperature is less than 1,700 degrees Fahrenheit.) The other fuel sources, (Desks, carpet, paper, etc.) could have reached temperatures of up to 2,000 degrees Fahrenheit under ideal conditions. -But that is still less than 75% of what would have been required to create the widely reported "pools of molten steel."

Because it is impossible for temperatures less than the melting point of steel to melt steel, we can only conclude the following:

- 1) Something else must have been acting on the enormous steel support columns for them to have been reduced to a molten state, and
- 2) The official account is provably and irrefutably a physical impossibility.

Please remember these facts the next time you hear a propaganda victim say: "Steel melts and that jet fuel melted the steel." The same ill-informed person might as well proclaim: "Steel melts and that guys lighter melted the steel." Both statements are equally absurd because both are equally impossible. ([References](#))

**This Essay (1-Hour Guide to 9/11) CAN be copied and distributed for NON profit purposes, provided authorship is noted (Joseph Plummer) and / or a link is provided back to [StopTheLie.com](#)**

