

March 1, 2014

Dear Democratic Platform Committee Members,

The purpose of this letter is to demonstrate that we have not had the “Transparent and Open Government” that was pledged by President Obama regarding the September 11, 2001, attacks, and therefore, we should retain in 2014 the plank calling for a new 9/11 investigation that is currently on the CDP 2012 Platform.

The Department of Justice is currently requesting input from the public on how to implement this pledge for an open and transparent government: <http://www.justice.gov/open/>, so this call for transparency should be reflected in our Colorado Democratic Party 2014 Platform.

For your convenience, here is the 2012 plank, found on the last page under the section “Investigations,” found at [CDP 2012 Platform Final Proposal – 2012 04 14](#):

*Trust in our government and our democracy has been severely eroded in this new century as falsehoods have been spread to start unwarranted wars, torture has been condoned or ferreted away to foreign shores, the privacy of our own citizens has been invaded, and facts have been ignored or concealed regarding government involvement in and response to national crises. To restore transparency and confidence in our institutions and to honor the American ideal that “no one is above the law,” we call for:*

*37. A truly independent Grand Jury and public investigation, with subpoena power and the power to grant immunity, into anomalies ignored by the 9/11 Commission.*

*38. An independent investigation, with subpoena power and the power to grant immunity, into the source of orders that resulted in torture, torture sites, rendition, illegal detention of nationals and immigrants, and related issues.*

*39. Reviews of the investigations into the illegal invasion of Iraq, Abramoff and other lobbyists, the response to Hurricane Katrina, Wall Street contribution to our recent economic collapse and other major issues.*

We are writing this letter since it is possible that some of you may not be well informed on this issue, which is so important to all of us.

A book could be written with a more complete list of the evidence demonstrating lack of transparency regarding the 9/11 attacks—in fact, a number of books *have* been written showing the inconsistencies of official investigations and unofficial analyses with evidence to the contrary—but time and space will allow us to present only a few items for your consideration.

Much of this evidence may, on the face of it, seem contradictory and confusing. You may find yourself wondering, for example, how there could be both evidence for hijackers *and* explosives in the World Trade Center buildings. However, you and I cannot fit the pieces of that puzzle together without a genuinely independent investigation *with subpoena power and the power to grant immunity, into anomalies ignored by the 9/11 Commission*, just what our CDP has called for in past years.

We are grateful that the Platform Committee has had the wisdom to include this plank (or a similar one) since 2008, especially since we all recognize this as a very difficult subject to address. We hope you will see the wisdom of retaining it after reading the following evidence:

**Concerning the September 11, 2001, Attacks: What Are Some Ways That Obama’s Call for Transparency Has Remained Unfulfilled?**

**I. Lack of transparency, in general, by the 9/11 Commission Report**

1. Lee Hamilton and Thomas Kean concealed from the staff of the 9/11 Commission the fact that Philip Zelikow, the Commission's executive director, had written a detailed outline of the Commission's final report, complete with "chapter headings, subheadings, and sub-subheadings," before the staff had its first meeting. (David Ray Griffin, *9/11 Ten Years Later*, 71; original source is Philip Shenon, *The Commission: What We Didn't Know About 9/11*, 388 – 389.)

Philip Zelikow, essentially a part of the Bush administration, determined which material was to be published and which was to be ignored.

Obviously, a sincere investigation does not begin with a conclusion and omit and/or distort evidence that contradicts that conclusion.

2. Lee Hamilton acknowledged 935 lies by top officials to the 9/11 Commission to promote the Iraq war. See (at 1:30 minutes) [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5PY\\_qM28rnA&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5PY_qM28rnA&feature=youtu.be).

3. This is a list of 36 aspects regarding the 9/11 Commission that run counter to what we would have expected of a serious investigation: <http://wot-on-earth.blogspot.com/2013/10/911-commission-report-571-page-fraud.html>.

4. This is a list of 115 omissions and distortions of the 9/11 Commission: <http://www.911truth.org/the-911-commission-report-a-571-page-lie/>

## **II. Lack of transparency by the 9/11 Commission regarding the conclusion that Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda were responsible for 9/11**

1. Bin Laden denied responsibility for the 9/11 attacks:

See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kxmUFG9wOOQ>; and <http://salem-news.com/articles/january072013/bin-laden-interview.php>.

2. Some may argue against these denials, but they cannot argue that the FBI has never indicted bin Laden for the 9/11 attacks because the FBI has “no hard evidence connecting bin Laden to 9/11”:

See

<http://web.archive.org/web/20101011161759/http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/topten/usama-bin-laden>;

<http://web.archive.org/web/20090207113442/http://teamliberty.net/id267.html>; and

<http://www.consensus911.org/point-g-1/>.

3. *The 9/11 Commission Report* simply confirmed the Bush administration’s prior assertion that Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda were responsible for 9/11, despite the fact that this conclusion was based upon confessions obtained by torture.

See a report by msnbc:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20090212035205/http://deepbackground.msnbc.msn.com/archive/2008/01/30/624314.aspx>; and for a more

comprehensive report with other sources, see

<http://www.washingtonsblog.com/2013/03/911-commission-deceived-an-unintentional-work-of-fiction-based-on-cheneys-communist-torture-program.html>.

Some points that are noteworthy from the above two links include:

- More than one-fourth of the footnotes in the *9/11 Commission Report* cited “evidence” based on confessions obtained by torture.
- At least four of these tortured detainees later said that they gave false information as a way to stop the torture.
- One source was tortured until he agreed to sign a confession that he was not allowed to read.

- One of the primary sources of information for the 9/11 Commission, Abu Zubaydah, was tortured, was known to be clinically insane, and was found to have no association with al Qaeda.
- Ninety of the 92 torture tapes destroyed by the CIA were related to Abu Zubayda.
- The other primary source of evidence cited by the 9/11 Commission was Kalid Sheik Mohammed (KSM), who was waterboarded 183 times in one month and later stated “I make up stories,” to stop the torture.  
(<http://blogs.wsj.com/law/2009/06/16/report-ksm-lied-to-avoid-further-waterboarding-i-make-up-stories/>)
- While being tortured, KSM falsely confessed to the murder of journalist Daniel Pearl.
- The 9/11 Commissioners themselves doubted the accuracy of the torture confessions, yet kept their doubts to themselves.

### **III. Lack of transparency regarding the evidence of contact between intelligence agencies—of the U.S. and those of its allies—with the 9/11 hijackers**

1. There are 28 redacted pages of the 2002 Joint Intelligence Committee Inquiry (JICI) of 9/11 that purportedly show Saudi involvement with the alleged hijackers. According to one of the family members of the victims of 9/11, President Obama said to her in 2009 that he would be willing to make these pages public, but this promise has not been fulfilled. See <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/24/world/middleeast/24saudi.html?r=2&>.
2. For more on the redacted 28 pages as well as documented contacts between the FBI, wealthy Saudi individuals, and the alleged

hijackers before 9/11, see <http://www.ibtimes.com/911-link-saudi-arabia-topic-28-redacted-pages-government-report-congressmen-push-release-1501202>.

3. Some congress members are calling for these 28 pages to be declassified. For House Resolution 428: “Urging the president to release information regarding the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks upon the United States,” see <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/113/hres428/text>.

4. For many related sources of reports of intelligence service contact with the alleged hijackers, see <http://911blogger.com/news/2014-02-26/us-and-its-allies-had-contact-bin-laden-and-911-hijackers-many-times-911>

5. Lt. Col. Anthony Shaffer, who worked for the Defense Intelligence Agency, communicated to members of the 9/11 Commission that the intelligence program Able Danger had identified two of the three cells responsible for 9/11 prior to the attacks, but the 9/11 Commission did not include this information in their final report.

See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Able\\_Danger](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Able_Danger).

#### **IV. Lack of transparency regarding the air defense failures on 9/11**

1. Norman Mineta’s testimony to the 9/11 Commission strongly implies that Vice President Dick Cheney gave a stand-down order for the plane approaching the Pentagon. **Because of a “snafu,” according to the representatives of the National Archive, this video may have been “lost” and so is not part of the 9/11 Commission video archive.** However, it can be seen on YouTube.

See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bDfdOwt2v3Y>; and see [http://www.911truth.org/article\\_for\\_printing.php?story=20050724164122860](http://www.911truth.org/article_for_printing.php?story=20050724164122860); and this detailed article

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

2. NORAD changed its timeline for the air defense on 9/11 twice and the 9/11 Commission changed it yet again; the **9/11 Commission believed that the Pentagon may have been deliberately misleading the Commission and considered referring the matter to the Justice Department.**

See <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/08/01/AR2006080101300.html?sub=new>; and <http://stj911.org/evidence/military.html#3versions>

3. An E-4B plane (a state-of-the-art military flying command post) was seen by numerous witnesses and filmed by CNN, flying above the DC area before the Pentagon was hit. Did the Government have the foreknowledge to have an E-4B arrive over the D.C. restricted air space at the time of the attack? Why did the 9/11 Commission leave this out of their final report?

See [http://www.rawstory.com/news/2007/CNN\\_investigates\\_secret\\_911\\_doomsday\\_plane\\_0913.html](http://www.rawstory.com/news/2007/CNN_investigates_secret_911_doomsday_plane_0913.html)

## **V. Lack of transparency regarding the collapses of the three World Trade Center Buildings**

1. **NIST has provided an analysis of the collapse of WTC 7 that is not only flawed and improbable, but fraudulent.** See letter from attorney Dr. William Pepper to the Office of the Inspector General regarding this matter:

<http://www.journalof911studies.com/resources/2014JanLetterPepper.pdf>

Quote from this letter: *It was only some years after the issuance of the NIST Report that drawings were released in response to a FOIA*

*request, revealing that critical structural features in Building 7 were inexplicably missing from consideration in the Report....With the inclusion of these critical features, NIST's probable collapse sequence must be ruled out unambiguously.*

2. While NIST has conceded that WTC 7 collapsed at free fall acceleration for more than 100 feet, and while Shyam Sunder, NIST lead investigator for the collapse of WTC 7, correctly asserted that free fall cannot happen in a natural building collapse, NIST still refuses to investigate the possibility of controlled demolition, the only possible explanation for this free fall.

See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v3mudruFzNw>; and for an excellent video on WTC 7 narrated by Ed Asner, see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hZEvA8BCoBw>.

3. The scientific standard of sharing methodology and data so that other scientists can study it has still not been met by NIST for their analysis of the destruction of World Trade Center 7. Ironically, in response to FOIA requests for this data, the **Director of NIST has actually claimed that to release such data might “jeopardize public safety.”**

See <http://cryptome.org/wtc-nist-wtc7-no.pdf>; and <http://www.nist.gov/el/disasterstudies/upload/NIST-National-Construction-Safety-Team-Report-to-Congress-2010-FINAL.PDF>.

4. For further testimony from 29 structural engineers regarding the flawed analysis of WTC Buildings 1, 2, and 7, see [http://www2.ae911truth.org/downloads/29\\_Structural-Civil\\_Engineers\\_2009-06-17.pdf](http://www2.ae911truth.org/downloads/29_Structural-Civil_Engineers_2009-06-17.pdf)

**These concerns have not been answered by FEMA or NIST.**

5. The destruction of World Trade Center Buildings (WTC) 1, 2, and 7 exhibit *all* of the characteristics of controlled demolition by explosives and *none* of the characteristics of fire. **No fire, however severe, has ever caused a fire-protected steel-framed high-rise building to**



**collapse – with the alleged exception of these three skyscrapers on 9/11.** According to NIST, it was primarily the office fires, not the plane impacts, that caused the collapses of WTC 1, 2, and 7. Furthermore, WTC 7 was not hit by a plane.

NIST has ignored the evidence of controlled demolition by not addressing these characteristics. For a detailed analysis of the characteristics of controlled demolition and how they apply to WTC 1, 2, and 7 see a wealth of other materials at:

<http://www.ae911truth.org/en/evidence.html>.

6. Independent and renowned scientists have published in a peer-reviewed journal that **large amounts of tiny iron spheres and trace amounts of unignited nanothermite, a high-tech explosive, were found in the WTC dust.** The iron spheres have been shown to be the by-product of the ignited nanothermite. Nonetheless, NIST has refused to test for explosives or “exotic accelerants” (thermite in particular) as called for by the standard of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 921; especially see the standard for “high-order” building destruction (NFPA 921 18.3.2). **Significantly, to date the aforementioned journal article has been unchallenged by peer review.** The article can be accessed at:

<http://www.benthamscience.com/open/tocpj/articles/V002/7TOCPJ.htm>; and it is summarized here:

<http://www.ae911truth.org/en/news-section/41-articles/201-scientists-find-unignited-explosive-residues-in-wtc-dust.html>.

## **VI. Lack of transparency of the 9/11 Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regarding insider trading just before 9/11**

Evidence of insider trading in the stock market is a well known tool used by investigators for spotting foreknowledge of a future event, and therefore apprehending criminals. Shortly after 9/11, there was commentary in the press that persons had made enormous profits from foreknowledge of the 9/11 attacks by an unprecedented rise in

“put options” on American and United Airlines stock in the days immediately before 9/11, as well as stock of other companies adversely affected by the 9/11 attacks.

However, the SEC stated: “the trading was consistent with a legitimate trading strategy.” (<http://nsnbc.me/2013/09/11/911-insider-trading-revisited/>.)

The 9/11 Commission then asserted: “Exhaustive investigations by the Securities and Exchange Commission, FBI, and other agencies have uncovered no evidence that anyone with advance knowledge of the attacks profited through securities transactions.... A single U.S.-based institutional investor with no conceivable ties to al Qaeda purchased 95 percent of the UAL puts on September 6 as part of a trading strategy that also included buying 115,000 shares of American on September 10.” (*The 9/11 Commission Report*, p.172 and p. 499 n.130)

This circular argument by the 9/11 Commission starts without investigation with the conclusion that al Qaeda alone was responsible for the 9/11 attacks, instead of pursuing a real investigation that might lead to other responsible parties.

Nevertheless, scientific papers by independent econometricians have published studies concluding that the occurrence of very unusual trades shortly before 9/11 were not the result of “legitimate trading strategy,” but that they revealed high probabilities of insider trading—and therefore foreknowledge. **There has been no governmental or professional challenge to these investigations.**

(<http://nsnbc.me/2013/09/11/911-insider-trading-revisited/> and <http://www.consensus911.org/point-g-2/>)

When challenged to produce the records by an FOIA request, the SEC responded:

“This letter is in response to your request seeking access to and copies of the documentary evidence referred to in footnote 130 of Chapter 5 of the September 11 (9/11) Commission Report. (...) **We have been advised that the potentially responsive records have**

**been destroyed.”** (See [http://nsnbc.me/2013/09/11/911-insider-trading-revisited/.](http://nsnbc.me/2013/09/11/911-insider-trading-revisited/))

The above list is only the tip of the iceberg. There are many other issues regarding the 9/11 attacks for which we have not had transparency, such as the destruction at the Pentagon (evidence for explosives within the building), the demise of United 93 over Pennsylvania, the gagging of FBI agents and other Federal employees, such as Sibel Edmonds, who had crucial information prior to 9/11.

In spite of much information not included here, we hope you will see that **there is great need for transparency regarding the events surrounding September 11, 2001, which have been the justification for NSA spying, loss of civil liberties, ever-increasing tax dollars spent on a fraudulent “unending Global War on Terror,” resulting in the deaths, wounding, and displacement of millions of our fellow humans.**

As registered Democrats in Colorado, we thank you for your attention to this request to retain the plank calling for a

*A truly independent Grand Jury and public investigation, with subpoena power and the power to grant immunity, into anomalies ignored by the 9/11 Commission.*