

PS 133 9/11 Unmasked Part 2: A Conversation with Dwain Deets about Able Danger

progressivespirit_2018-09-11T08_57_53-07_00.mp3

John: [00:00:05] 9/11. You can't get much more controversial than that. So let's do it. This is Progressive Spirit. My guest this week is Dwain Deets, former aerospace engineer for NASA, and he is member of the 9/11 Consensus Panel consensus911.org. He says the official story of what happened on 9/11 does not add up and he looks at the hijackers: particularly the role of Mohamed Atta and Able Danger.

Dwain: [00:00:32] According to the official story intelligence didn't know who was in the country before 9/11. Whereas a major research agency - and that's Able Danger - Produced evidence showing that the man called Mohamad Atta was probably in the United States from January 2000 onwards. This evidence was blocked from the FBI on three occasions.

John: [00:00:56] Time for Progressive Spirit progressivespirit.net. Stay with us.

[00:01:00] Progressive spirit is produced every week. It couldn't happen without the financial support of my congregation. Southminster Presbyterian Church in Beaverton, Oregon Southminster's website is www.southmin.org. Progressive Spirit is produced in the studios of KBOO in Portland, Oregon for the Pacifica Radio Network and PRX the Public Radio Exchange as well as podcast. Show KBOO some love, won't you? KBOO.fm and click donate.

[00:01:33] For the Pacifica Radio network and PRX, the Public Radio Exchange, and from the studios of KBOO in Portland, Oregon, this is Progressive Spirit, progressivespirit.net. I'm John Shuck. This is the second of a four-part series on 9/11, specifically the work of the 9/11 Consensus Panel, an international 23-person panel of 9/11 researchers.

[00:01:56] The panel was spearheaded by Dr. David Ray Griffin and Elizabeth Woodworth. They've published a book on their work entitled [*9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*](#). This book was released on September 11th, 2018. This is from the book's cover: "9/11 Unmasked is the result of a 6-year investigation by an international review panel which has provided 51 points illustrating the problematic status of all the major claims in the official account of the 9/11 attacks; some of which are obviously false.

[00:02:31] Most dramatically the official account of the destruction of the Twin Towers and World Trade Center 7 could not possibly be true unless the laws of physics were suspended that day. But other claims made by the official account including the claims that the 9/11 planes were taken over by al-Qaida hijackers, that one of those hijackers flew his plane into the Pentagon, and that passengers on the planes telephoned people on the ground, are also demonstrably false. The book reports only points about which the panel reached consensus by using the best evidence consensus model employed in medical research. The panel is composed of experts about 9/11 from many disciplines including physics, chemistry, structural engineering, aeronautical engineering, and jurisprudence."

That's from the book's cover. Last week Elizabeth Woodworth and Dr. Graham McQueen were my guests to discuss the purpose, goal and work of the panel, as well as address a few of the 51 points including foreknowledge of World Trade Center Seven's collapse, eyewitness testimony of explosions prior to the collapse of the World Trade Center towers, military drills that had been moved to September 11th, and evidence for steel recovered from World Trade Center 7. This week I speak with Consensus panel member Dwain Deets. Our conversation will focus on the alleged

hijackers, including an analysis of whether or not phone calls could have been made from any of the planes, the strange story of Mohamed Atta - or were there two Mohamed Attas? - and in particular, Able Danger, an 80-person intelligence network that identified an al-Qaida cell in the Bronx led by Mohamed Atta back in January 2000. Before I play that interview with Dwain Deets I want to play a portion of an interview with Dr. David Ray Griffin. Last Year on Progressive Spirit, [I interviewed Dr. Griffin about his book](#) that had just come out at that time entitled [Bush and Cheney: How They Ruined America and The World](#).

John: [00:04:40] You know there's one neocon who knows the truth more than any and he's still living. And that's Dick Cheney. In fact, a major part of your book really is about his role in all of this. Have you ever met Dick Cheney? Is there any chance that he might have a come to Jesus moment?

Dr. David Ray Griffin: [00:05:01] [Laughter] I have not met him and it would be... you know anything's possible but I'm not going to count on it. You know he and Bush are both card-carrying Methodists. I mention that because the school where I taught, Claremont School of Theology is primarily a Methodist school. They have been a particularly great embarrassment to us.

John: [00:05:35] You know you are a theologian and I have to say how proud I am as a religious person that you are the one who has really put your scholarly efforts toward this and I think it's obviously because of your theological training that has allowed you to sift through a lot of the lies of the state that keep coming at us. In fact, I want to read a quote from you, you wrote, "The big lie," you said, "The hope behind this book is that journalists, politicians and other people seeing that the neocon mania for Empire has been leading America and the world in general to hell will realize that concerns about reputation are trivial by comparison, and we may be emboldened to stop the madness by exposing the Big Lie for what it is." And I saw that as a call to not be scared off by the labels of conspiracy theorists or all of that kind of stuff - all of the threats to our reputation or job - but to really embrace the truth as it comes to us.

Dr. David Ray Griffin: [00:06:32] Yeah, I'm glad you quoted that statement. I think it's the most important statement in the book to say this is what it's about. But I should say now, you know, for a while there was no doubt that I was the leader of the 9/11 truth movement but now the leadership has become so widespread and in different fields. So you've got Richard Gage who is currently, you know, he is really taken over the leadership of the 9/11 movement and rightly so. But also the physicists, chemists like [Niels Harrit](#), there's a lot of expertise in this movement. Believe it or not there is another book that will be coming out pretty soon within a year probably that is based on a program that a colleague and I started called Consensus 9/11. And so we got about 20 experts from various fields to see what consensus we could have about which parts of the official story are false. I was motivated to do this because I would hear stories about journalists who just wish to put down the movement. They would quote somebody who is, you know, not a scientist, not a philosopher, but just a guy who calls himself a member of the 9/11 movement. And he makes some really stupid comments and then so the journalists will quote such people and say, "That's what 9/11 Truthers believe." So we [say], "No. Here is what 9/11 skeptics believe." We got to the point where we'd have to get a certain percentage of agreement among our group to say, "OK this is consensus." And so that will show further how widespread this movement is and how sound the scholarship is. And for those of us in the movement it's just, you know, it's so ludicrous - the official story - and we've proven it time and time again, and the evidence is so strong and the reputation of dozens actually hundreds of people, scholars of various fields, have agreement on this, but probably nobody listening to this broadcast has ever heard of [9/11 Consensus](#), or heard of any of these things to show that the official story is a lie. Now one thing one of the new things in the book is about Cheney. According to the official story he was in his office and then he was taken downstairs by the Secret Service. But he didn't really get into the room down there till I think it was 9:58am. [The fact was](#)

[that Cheney went down very early](#). The mainstream press pretty much ignored all the evidence including one member of the cabinet who said, "No, no Dick Cheney was down there certainly before 9:30am and certainly before the Pentagon was struck." But the reason for the lie about this was it that way they could claim that Cheney could not have been responsible for the attack on the Pentagon. Well, in the book I've summarized new evidence that showed that there were at least three major statements by members of the Secret Service who were there and involved in 9/11 who said that Cheney was into the room before 9:30am. I mean this is a blockbuster story, potentially, for the press to say this story about 9/11 that shows that Cheney lied and the 9/11 Commission lied about where Cheney was. And this has been available for over a year. And you do not have a single mainstream report about this.

John: [00:11:20] Why do you suppose that is?

Dr. David Ray Griffin: [00:11:23] Now there's another show in itself. Well it all goes back to empire. These are all things to support America's dominance of the world and therefore of its natural resources.

John: [00:11:44] That was an interview broadcast in August 2017 with Dr. David Ray Griffin who along with Elizabeth Woodworth formed the 9/11 Consensus panel. Now I speak with Dwain Deets a member of the 9/11 Consensus panel. Dwain Deets is former Director for Research Engineering and Aerospace Projects at NASA Dryden Flight Research Center where his work earned him the NASA Exceptional Service Award and inclusion into *Who's Who* in science and engineering. Dwain Deets served as Director on the [Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#) board from 2008 to 2009. He spoke on 9/11 Truth subjects on several occasions. The titles of those presentations include "The Puzzling World Trade Center 7 Destruction," "United 93: A Tale of Two Planes," "9/11 Consensus Panel and the Pentagon 757." Welcome Dwain Deets to Progressive Spirit.

Dwain: [00:12:38] Yes. Thanks for having me here.

John: [00:12:40] Well let's start with Mohamad Atta. Who was this guy? And what was the what's the story about him in regards to 9/11?

Dwain: [00:12:50] The 9/11 Commission identified him as a technical leader of the 9/11 hijackers. There is a separate consensus point on Mohamed Atta, Atta actually is what he prefers to have his name pronounced, as the Consensus panel has looked into it. There apparently were [two different individuals](#) going by the name of Mohamed Atta. And so it's a little bit unclear with these two kind of personalities on exactly who he was. Able Danger was the code name for a high-level intelligence operation that basically identified Mohamad Atta very early as being in the United States and that's what makes [this an interesting consensus point](#). We'll go over the more details as we talk on.

John: [00:13:47] Okay. Let's talk about that. What was Able Danger and what was its role in 9/11 according to the official story?

Dwain: [00:13:54] According the official story the 9/11 commission didn't even mention Able Danger. So if you want to talk about it as an official story item, there wasn't any. But there's a whole lot of information about the importance of Able Danger if you actually look at the evidence. So maybe I'll just start talking about Able Danger as a code name for a very high-level intelligence operation cofounded by Generals Hugh Shelton and Peter Schoomaker, Commanders in Chief of the Defense Department's Special Operations Command. Telling the story about Able Danger takes time but it is important because its works strongly indicated that the man identified as Mohamad Atta had been in the United States in January February of 2000, about 18 months before the 9/11

attacks. Whereas, the official story said he arrived in June 2000. Furthermore, the official story claimed that the U.S. intelligence didn't know he was in the country before 9/11. Whereas an important part of the U.S. intelligence, Able Danger that is, knew he had been there since January or February of 2000. However Able Danger evidence was consistently ignored by government officials. The 9/11 Commission failed to mention the evidence. And the Defense Department's inspector general covered it up. Louise Freeh the former director of FBI. Called 9/11 Commission's claim that it was not "historically significant" quote "astounding" unquote.

John: [00:15:51] So was Able Danger released at all to other intelligence agencies? Tell me about that itself. Who was involved in Able Danger and what did they discover?

Dwain: [00:16:00] Well, Able Danger very early on, I mean, they started operations late in 1999 within just a few months they identified an al-Qaeda cell operating in Brooklyn or the Bronx. And they also identified Mohamad Atta as the primary leader of that cell. But they thought very soon as after finding this information that it would be very wise to share this information with the FBI and so partially that the cell could be removed. If that's what the right thing was to do. And so at that point, when they sought permission to go ahead and start a channel of communication with the FBI, the Able Danger legal side resisted it very strongly. In fact, they resisted, yet resisting means they said no. They did that three times.

John: [00:17:15] So, this is three times between January 2000 and September 11 2001?

Dwain: [00:17:21] Yes. It all occurred let's say in a very short period of time about June of 2000. So it's still more than a year before 9/11. The thing that happened is there was immediate let's say repercussions of that. I'll explain. First that it was very memorable by the team the leadership team of Able Danger because they developed these charts showing communication passed between individuals and they would have a chart on a cell. And so they had one of these charts and they had a photograph of Mohamad Atta kind of in the center of that chart and it was memorable enough that one of the team members put that chart up above his desk kind of on the wall. So it wasn't just kind of hidden in the nitty gritty of the information but it was actually there for them to see that that individual's face every day.

John: [00:18:35] And he was like you say in the center of the chart, I mean as a central player in this cell.

Dwain: [00:18:40] Exactly. And that's why they, Able Danger leadership thought that was the right thing to do is to communicate to the FBI so something could be done about it.

John: [00:18:51] And this Able Danger group is no small group. There are what? 80 members of it?

Dwain: [00:18:56] Yeah 80 individuals. And they are drawn from different services like there were people from the Navy, from the Army, all the specialties in intelligence gathering, so it was very highly qualified to do this kind of work. They gathered the information using open source Web site information. So it's not like they're tapping phones or anything like that that we tend to think of now but they were just using open source information and gathering what information they could that would make sense.

John: [00:19:37] So they've gathered information on this cell in Brooklyn, New York and which Mohamad Atta is in the center of this and three times the leadership of Able Danger who has been doing research trying to figure out these cells, these al-Qaeda cells, in the United States tells the FBI and the FBI is resisting it, uh or, who's resisting it again?

Dwain: [00:20:05] Let's say the special ops command which was the one who basically formed Able Danger. So that's in their own line of authority. On the legal side is the one that was resisting it. But, of course we don't know where they were getting their instructions from. Could be anywhere up higher at the Pentagon or even above that. So I'll just identify one person, Army Lieutenant Colonel Anthony Schaffer was the first one to seek to open communications and he did that based on his superior, the head of the Able Danger, asking him to do it. So basically, "I was turned down." And another thing that happened at that time again this is let's say June of 2000--is that the Army ordered one of the individuals, Major Eric Kleinsmith to destroy all 2.5 terabytes of Able Danger data. Now this information is withheld from the public until five years later. But the repercussions were more than just saying, "No you can't contact the FBI." They actually were told to destroy all of their data.

John: [00:21:30] And when did you say this was? In 2000?

Dwain: [00:21:32] Yes it was in May of 2000.

John: [00:21:37] OK. So the implication here is that Mohamad Atta, I guess is, somehow there's a cover up here or he is being groomed for something else?

Dwain: [00:21:49] He's been protected for some reason. Doesn't necessarily mean that he actually has a significant role. It means that there's someone protecting him so he is not being taken out.

John: [00:22:05] Right. Then what happened? So what you mentioned is that after these photos then come out of the alleged hijackers Mohamad Atta's photo is there and members of the Able Danger team are saying "Hey wait, we know this guy."

Dwain: [00:22:23] Exactly. Yes. So this is immediately following 9/11. So just in the week after. As everyone is starting to find out pictures of the hijackers. They just reacted very quickly. Again, I'm talking about the leadership team, the people who are in the same room where that chart had been on the wall so that it was ingrained in their in their minds. And actually the chart got handed off to well one of the analytical lead, a dual PHD by the name of Eileen Preisser, she took a copy of it the Atta chart that is to Republican Congressman Curt Weldon and he was important in that he was the vice chair of the armed services and also the Homeland Security Committees. Weldon with two other Republican Representatives Chris Shays and Dan Burton. All three of them went to the White House. And showed it to Deputy National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley. And Hadley said that he was going to show it to President Bush. I'll also throw in that there have been, this is after 2000, independent corroboration of the fact that Atta was in the United States during that time period. So it's not just coming from Able Danger. Some of the examples are there was an individual by the name of Johnelle Bryant who worked for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and she said that sometime between the end of April and the middle of May 2000, Atta came into her office asking for a loan to buy a small airplane. Which she did refuse. And there are two other Atta sightings. One in by people in the Portland, Maine Public Library said that he was in there using their computers. And also he was issued a parking ticket in Brooklyn. And this was in the spring of 2000. So that's independent evidence that Able Danger actually had valid information.

John: [00:24:47] That's how you got the pronunciation of his name, right? Didn't the person he had asked for the loan he told her how to pronounce his name as in "atta boy" or something like that?

Dwain: [00:24:54] That's right. He says, "It's kinda like atta boy. Remember atta boy."

John: [00:25:00] I'm speaking with Dwain Deets he is the former Director for Research Engineering and Aerospace Projects at NASA Dryden Flight Research Center. He's also a member

of the 9/11 Consensus panel a book coming out in the early part of September. Should be out in fact by now *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation* by Elizabeth Woodworth and David Ray Griffin looking at the evidence in which this panel has consensus regarding official stories and of what happened on 9/11. And the point we're looking at today is the point of Mohamad Atta who was believed to be a tactical leader, one who allegedly hijacked Flight 11 that went into the World Trade Center. The story here is we're talking about Able Danger an intelligence group that had identified him in one of the cells and the story so far is that they tried to present that to the FBI but the lawyers for Able Danger itself said, "no" three different times. And so there is independent evidence as we've talked about of Mohamad Atta being around before 2001 in fact and in 2000. So when do we next hear about Mohamad Atta that the 9/11 Commission report, right?

Dwain: [00:26:13] Well it's in the efforts by the team leaders from Able Danger. They made a couple of efforts to brief the 9/11 commission staff. One was in October 2003 where Colonel Schaffer was in Afghanistan at the same time that the executive secretary Philip Zelikow of the 9/11 Commission was also in Afghanistan. So he arranged to brief them and briefed him for about an hour. That took place. Now five months later from that briefing Schaefer had his security clearance withdrawn. OK I don't know whether those two were connected to each other but possibly they were. Then there was a second briefing by the Able Danger head and his name is Captain Phillipott and he briefed the 9/11 commission staff in April 2004 which happened to be the same month that they put out their official report. Well the final report came out from the 9/11 Commission and it was totally silent on Able Danger. Nothing there.

John: [00:27:30] Nothing at all. He didn't even mention that it had existed?

Dwain: [00:27:32] They didn't mention Able Danger. They mention things about Mohamad Atta. They said that he was in the United States starting it was June of 2000 later on. I guess what I want to say is that the response of these of the two co-chairs of the 9/11 Commission now they did this maybe August 2005. So that was about a year later. A year plus later they're asked about why they did not cover Able Danger and their answer was and here's where they said quote "It's not historically significant" unquote. They also said quote "They never were told that Mr. Atta and the other threats were identified." So basically, they're saying they were never told. After the leaders of Able Danger had made these two efforts to tell the 9/11 commission. And when it's all said and done the commission said well we were never told.

John: [00:28:47] So they actually told them and then the commission said they never told them. And you mentioned the security clearance of one of the leaders was taken away. What else happened to some of these people on Able Danger who are reporting about this?

Dwain: [00:29:00] Well that gets into kind of the next part when it basically is getting more and more attention in Congress at first on the House side and then it gets into Senate Committee hearings. And at the time that started happening some things became public knowledge and the Pentagon came down hard on Able Danger. They interviewed all 80 individuals associated with that and then they turned it over to their inspector general to have an independent -- they call it -- an independent review of Able Danger. And the IG basically covered the whole thing up. Covered it up by saying that these individuals that were leading Able Danger they were saying that they were unreliable. Couldn't be trusted. These kinds of things. And the other thing is that the Pentagon never provided any written documentation of what Able Danger had come up with. So it ended up just being the Able Danger leaders their word against the Pentagon that basically acted as if Able Danger had nothing to do with 9/11. And that's where the crux of the issue became.

John: [00:30:37] This is Progressive Spirit. I'm John Shuck. My guest is Dwain Deets. He is a member of the 9/11 Consensus panel. The book we are discussing is *9/11 Unmasked: An*

International Review Panel Investigation. Much more to come. Stay with us.

John: [00:31:01] You're listening to the podcast version of Progressive Spirit. If you enjoy the show please go to iTunes, Stitcher, Google Play, Podomatic, Tune In or whatever podcast app you use to listen and give Progressive Spirit 5 stars. Won't you? Contact me through progressive spirit dot net with your thoughts and ideas about the show and be sure to share this podcast on your social media. Follow on Facebook and Twitter. The Web site again is progressive spirit dot net.

John: [00:31:34] This is Progressive Spirit. progressive spirit dot net. I'm John Shuck my guest is Dwain Deets former director for research engineering and aerospace projects at NASA Dryden Flight Research Center we're discussing the work of the 9/11 Consensus panel and their book *9/11 Unmasked An International Review Panel Investigation*.

John: [00:32:03] So have these folks from Able Danger talked recently or said more to other sources or were they silenced or what happened?

Dwain: [00:32:12] The Consensus panel really didn't look into that question. They kind of wrap it up at this point that that the Inspector General's report that came out in 2006 I believe it just kind of ruined their reputations of these individuals. And I might say that the final report in David Ray Griffin's book that he put out called, [*The New Pearl Harbor Revisited*](#). And it has the subtitle 9/11 comma The Cover Up comma and The Expose. The book goes into a detailed analysis of the Inspector General's inspection, we'll call it, its lack of transcripts, its circular reasoning and prejudicial treatment of witnesses basically indicated that the Pentagon through its so-called independent review actually wanted to put Able Danger to bed. So that it had no significant role and basically ruined the reputations of these individuals.

John: [00:33:29] Really threw them all under the bus so to speak.

Dwain: [00:33:31] Exactly.

John: [00:33:33] What about the chart itself. I mean does that exist somewhere?

Dwain: [00:33:37] Well the actual chart that was on the wall. It was there for a number of years and it had been taped it had been moved from one wall to another as the individuals were moved around and it ended up being so raggedy and with tape all over it that it finally just got tossed in the trash. So there wasn't a major effort to retain it. It's not clear to me whether individuals actually still had a copy in their computer records computer files. The argument of the Pentagon was that it never existed and that these individuals just made the whole thing or they misremembered whatever words that they wanted to use on it.

John: [00:34:31] In the consensus 9/11 website there is an image of the al-Qaida network snapshots of these cells and what is that image?

Dwain: [00:34:40] That was a representative image. It's not the one that actually had Mohamad Atta on it. So they weren't able to show the actual one from the information obtained.

John: [00:34:52] I'm speaking with Dwain Deets. He is a member of the 9/11 Consensus Panel. The topic that we're looking at is one of the points regarding Able Danger and Mohamad Atta and the events in regarding to 9/11. So give me a summary right now of what we've said so far. If you don't mind. And then we'll pick up from here.

Dwain: [00:35:15] Okay. Actually what I'd like to do is actually [read it from the consensus 9/11](#)

[website](#) because I think it's so succinct.

John: [00:35:26] All right.

[00:35:26] Basically it says the official 9/11 account is discredited by the evidence below: one-- the 9/11 Commission report described Mohamad Atta as the quote technical leader the 9/11 plot unquote. Number two-- according to the official story Mohamad Atta entered the U.S. in June 2000 but in fact he had come months earlier in January to February 2000 time period. Three --according to the official story U.S. intelligence didn't know he was in the country before 9/11. Whereas a major research agency and that's Able Danger cofounded by two commanders in chief of the Defense Department Special Operations Command with the acronym S O C O M produced evidence showing that the man called Mohamad Atta was probably in the United States from January 2000 onwards. Four-- this evidence was blocked from the FBI on three occasions. Five-- the commission was notified of the Atta evidence in October 2003 in July 2004 yet failed to include the evidence in its July 2004 report and later described it as having no historical significance. The five witnesses to the evidence were later claimed to have been unreliable or deficient in memory. Seven-- the official story may imply not just incompetence but deliberate cover up with serious implications. Given this evidence at best the 9/11 official account is discredited and the public has apparently faced with lies and coverup. At worst a man called Mohamed Atta was protected by elements within the Pentagon and allowed to act and travel freely until 9/11.

John: [00:37:32] Spell out if you wouldn't mind the implications of this.

Dwain: [00:37:35] Well the implication it's pretty clear that he was being protected for some reason. The different departments however you want to call it agencies were purposefully not communicating. For a military agency to purposely not communicate with the FBI which would be the logical thing if you wanted to remove that cell which seems to be what you would want to do. Apparently, the Pentagon or higher up had different plans for what they wanted done. The consensus panel didn't figure out what that might be but I guess I certainly have the idea that it's possible that Mohamed Atta was being protected in order to be maybe a patsy maybe something else actually was going to come down but the people in charge of that whole event wanted to have someone to point to as the person who was at fault and carry the whole thing out. That's just the way I would look at it.

John: [00:38:49] I'm speaking with Dwain Deets of *The 9/11 Consensus Panel* we're talking about one of the points of the 9/11 Consensus panel in their book that has just come out on September 11th called *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. The panel hears about Mohamed Atta and the Able Danger intelligence work. And congressman Weldon really pursued this. Can you tell me more about his role?

Dwain: [00:39:17] Well yes not only did he bring it to the attention of the White House immediately after 9/11 but he really pushed within the house and his committees that he was the Vice chair on to really get to the bottom of it. But one interesting conversation between his deputy basically his chief of staff had a conversation with a deputy executive secretary of the 9/11 commission whose name well first of all Weldon's chief of staff was talking to a person named Kojm K O J M and he was he was really pressing him on why the 9/11 Commission did not include Able Danger in their report. And the answer he got is quote "It did not fit with the story we wanted to tell."

John: [00:40:12] What a strange answer isn't it? I mean that just sounds like the story we wanted to tell as opposed to the facts we want to uncover. I don't know what that means.

Dwain: [00:40:23] Exactly. Yes. And I'll just add I'm not sure whether we have it as a 9/11 consensus panel point or not. But it pertains to the executive secretary of the 9/11 Commission, Philip Zelikow. The word came out -- it was determined later by an author from the *New York Times* I don't recall his name right now he wrote a book but he found that Zelikow had secretly written an entire detailed outline of the report. Before they even made their first investigation. So the story that they wanted to tell was determined in advance and Zelikow was the person that made that happen. It was even hidden from the staff of the 9/11 Commission. So it was it was basically held secret from the staff itself.

John: [00:41:27] The 9/11 Consensus panel has another point about Mohamed Atta and that is that there are two Mohamad Attas. How does that happen?

Dwain: [00:41:36] There is a [consensus point about there being two Mohamed Attas](#). In one case the behaviors of Mohamed Atta is not anything at all like a devout Muslim. He was paying for lap dances and all kinds of alcohol and stuff like that the night before 9/11. But there's also this other Mohamed Atta that is he's physically quite a bit different size. So it'd be hard to mistake the two and he was so devout that he wouldn't even shake a woman's hand. And so they're so different that it's just impossible to mistake one for the other. And so it's like they were doing maybe these two were doing carrying out different activities or they would be spotted by members of the press. That would end up being the story on them. And so if you think of them again I've mentioned it before. Think of them as patsies. Well it's possible that there was actually two different patsies that were designated as Mohamad Atta and it ends up just confusing the whole thing about who he was and his characteristics.

John: [00:43:09] Yeah. And then there was another [consensus point on whether or not Mohamad Atta drove to Portland, Maine](#) and then took the flight back to Boston and leaving a suitcase or something with his with his will in it.

Dwain: [00:43:28] For all of the hijackers including this case there are no airport security photos or videos that actually show many of the hijackers. That [includes that Portland thing](#). But there are there is a separate consensus point on the [attempt to find a security video of the hijackers at Dulles Airport](#). And that would be for the flight that was American 77. There was a contractor hired to look at footage of all I don't know what the number is of security cameras at that airport and they could not find a single time where there was an image of a hijacker. So basically, that whole thing didn't happen.

John: [00:44:34] Dwain Deets is my guest on Progressive Spirit. We're talking about the 9/11 consensus panel the book that has come out on September 11th *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. Consensus 9/11 dot ORG is the website so wrapping this up about Mohamad Atta. What would the consensus panel ultimately say about this person's involvement in 9/11?

Dwain: [00:45:02] They basically would say that the official story about Mohamed Atta cannot stand up to a very large amount of evidence. The evidence in terms of newspaper articles that have been published in some cases it would be books that have been published by people that should be in a position to know. The Mohamed Atta story basically cannot be what the official story says and that's about as much as I can say.

John: [00:45:41] One of the ways that the official sources promoted a narrative that there were hijackers in the first place had to do with alleged phone calls from the airplanes either by cell phone or onboard phone. What did the consensus panel determine regarding evidence for [alleged phone calls from the hijacked planes](#)?

Dwain: [00:46:00] The main point is that it was determined through several means that the cell phones at that time period of 2001 were not designed to be able to communicate from an airplane flying higher than 5000 feet and be able to connect between the different cell phone towers. So the whole idea of having cellphones being the means of communication between passengers on those flights with calling their loved ones back home basically cannot be substantiated because of technical reasons. And that means that that didn't happen. Either the airplanes were actually on their ground so was not an issue of cellphone connection. Or we don't know what happened. But the official story that they all these communications took place couldn't have happened. And we know that for sure because when there was one case that actually went to trial about 9/11 the Moussaoui trial was basically the supposedly the 20th hijacker. It was the FBI's time to talk about the phone call, the cell phone calls. And they presented the information basically in court in a very obscure way. They would have a chart that indicated who made the call. One particular one was Barbara Olson because that was such a critical call because that was the only way that we knew there were hijackers on board airplanes and that they used box cutters so if that call didn't really take place and that whole story falls apart. Well what the FBI did is they had a table that said the phone call that Barbara Olson made did not connect or basically they used other things like the connection the length of the call was zero seconds and you don't know that's what they came up with or what they presented unless you do a detailed study of the charts.

John: [00:48:29] Like you say the phone calls are important. The Barbara Olson one was about how the hijackers had the box cutters and then the 93 U.S. Flight 93 that allegedly crashed in Pennsylvania had the whole "let's roll" kind of thing. Talk about that phone call.

Dwain: [00:48:47] Yes well that that particular phone call the husband was on the airplane and he is I think he was a pilot or a military person that had that kind of experience. He called his wife back home and she verified that it was him calling because her phone identity had his phone number show up or his name actually in the phone. So she confirmed that it was him calling, and he, on the call said basically that they were going to the term they used was "let's roll" because the passengers were going to take over the hijackers. And so that's a story that was told but it we basically determined it couldn't have happened. And in fact the story didn't actually develop until a number of days after 9/11. It kind of slowly started to show up in the media. So. It's almost like someone created the story after a period of time in order to get something to let's say stir up the public.

John: [00:50:01] But the best evidence on any of these phone calls is that they couldn't have come from cell phones and they couldn't have come from onboard plane phones either.

Dwain: [00:50:09] In the case of the flight 77 that was the one in back in the Pentagon. We have letters from American Airlines stating that that model airplane at that time period did not have satellite phones is what they call them. So. So that's the evidence that says it couldn't have been by satellite phone and I already told you the reason why it couldn't be by cell phone.

John: [00:50:39] Dwain Deets has been my guest on progressive spirit. He is the former director for research and engineering aerospace projects at NASA. He was involved in the 9/11 consensus panel that has released a book called 9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation by Elizabeth Woodworth and David Ray Griffin Panel's website is consensus 9 1 1 dot o r g.

[00:51:03] Thank you for this information. Thank you for being with me today.

Dwain: [00:51:06] Thank you very much I enjoyed talking with you.

John: [00:51:16] Next week my series on the 9/11 Consensus panel continues. I speak with David Chandler about the physics behind the collapses of world trade centers 1, 2, and 7. Does the official narrative stand up to the scientific evidence?

ADDENDUM: Following the interview, Dwain Deets, offered this clarification regarding Mohammad Atta as a “patsy.”

Why Mohamed Atta was a Patsy

John Shuck asked me the question, “who is Mohamed Atta?”

I answered The 9/11 Commission Report said Mohamed Atta was the leader of the 9/11 hijackers.

Then Shuck asked a follow-up question, “Who do you say Mohamed Atta is?”

I responded too quickly, when I answered without elaboration, “He was a patsy.”

After rethinking my answer, I should have gone thru my rationale first.

A rule of thumb about The 9/11 Commission Report, is that everything it said was wrong. David Ray Griffin’s book, “The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions” roughly makes that case.

An excellent way to approach this is the story of the hijackers, themselves. There are many holes in that story. Here are a few:

1. The only way the public learns about the hijackers is from an alleged onboard phone call from AA Flight 77 passenger, Barbara Olson to her husband, Solicitor General Ted Olson. But, the case for phone calls from the airplanes as the means of transferring essential information about the operation falls apart, leading me to the conclusion, they did not happen.
2. No alleged hijackers were video recorded going thru security check at any of the departure airports.
3. Mohamed Atta didn’t act like a devout Muslim, as would be expected of a religious extremist planning to end his own life in a Jihadist suicide mission.

Mohamed Atta, as well as other alleged hijackers, several months before 9/11 engaged in activities related to piloting aircraft. These activities included taking flying lessons in general aviation airplanes.

The question to ask, why was Mohamed Atta doing this?

We know that someone in the military was protecting him, because attorneys in Joint Operations Command (JOCOM) prohibited Able Danger leaders from sharing information with the FBI on Mohamed Atta being in the United States, during Jan/Feb 2000.

It is fair to assume, the same entity that was protecting Atta was probably also providing a handler. Someone to see to it Atta behaved in a manner consistent with the way he would be expected to have done when he later is accused of being a pivotal actor in a great crime.

If the storyline was going to be, once the big event happened, Atta was to be falsely claimed to be the lead hijacker; then it was important he plays the role of a lead hijacker before when the event eventually takes place.

In this role of acting under the guidance of his handler, 'patsy' is an appropriate descriptor. One definition of the word: someone who is easily taken advantage of, especially when it leads to being blamed for something.