



No, Saudi Arabia did NOT do 9/11

Description

The bombshell 911 news this past week, is that a freshly-published court filing from Jul 2021, has revealed at least two of the 19 alleged “hijackers” may have been recruited by the CIA.

Now this isn't exactly “news”, after all it has long since been established that the CIA, FBI and/or any other US alphabet agencies simply must have been involved. It couldn't have happened without their involvement.

Unfortunately, but not unexpectedly, the new release doesn't go that far. Instead, the testimony from Donald C Canestraro Declaration – former lead investigator for the Office of Military Commissions – discusses the *“intelligence failures that led to 9/11”*, while focusing mainly on the “hijackers” and their backgrounds.

According to a report in Grayzone, the court filing relies on anonymous testimony from *“high-ranking CIA and FBIA officials”*:

...the filing is a 21-page declaration by Don Canestraro, a lead investigator for the Office of Military Commissions, the legal body overseeing the cases of 9/11 defendants. It summarizes classified government discovery disclosures, and private interviews he conducted with anonymous high-ranking CIA and FBI officials.

That should be a red flag, right there. Rather like Sy Hersh's recent “revelations” on Nord Stream 2, any use of “anonymous insider sources” should always set off your internal bullshit alarm. It's more likely to be a limited hangout than anything else.

In fact, any discussion of the “hijackers” at all should engage your inner sceptic.

Reality check: The hijackers' names were supplied *by the FBI*. Virtually everything we know about those men came from US intelligence sources or the 9/11 Commission Report.



After the FBI managed to collate the names of the 19 men responsible for 9/11 within a couple of days, handily aided by their seemingly fire-proof passports, it was promptly revealed that at least four of those men were still – in fact – alive. They had never been on the planes and had no links to terrorist groups of any kind.

This was explained away as “confusion” and due to “arabic names all being very similar”, but whatever the cause it certainly calls the rest of the list into question.

Really, since the CIA and FBI are – or at least should have been – prime suspects with regard to *any* terror attack on American soil, nothing they release can be counted reliable information and nothing they say should be taken at face value. Concerning suspects, or anything else.

The filing has also led to renewed discussion of “Saudi links” to the terror attack (including in our comments section yesterday), since [again, from Grayzone]:

Many agents who spoke to Canestraro headed up Operation Encore, the Bureau's aborted, long-running probe into Saudi government connections to the 9/11 attack [...] Canestraro's investigation concluded, at least two 9/11 hijackers had been recruited either knowingly or unknowingly into a joint CIA-Saudi intelligence operation which may have gone awry.

Blaming the Saudis for 9/11 has been the acceptable face of 9/11 Truth for at least the last 15 years. Even mainstream papers have questioned “Saudi funding” for 9/11 or published reports on “suspicious links” between Riyadh and al Qaeda.

The New York times did a big, glossy long-form article about it just two years ago.

It was the thinking normie's opinion, the “lab leak” theory of 9/11.

Any Guardian comment section concerning 9/11 would be full of talk of Saudi Arabia. It was always permitted, while comments on explosive residue or building 7 would be removed.

A subset of journalism has always been those who construct complex narratives through navel-gazing over-analysis of “leaked documents” or court-ordered releases, without ever acknowledging the possibility that the source of this information makes it potentially entirely false. These same people lambast “conspiracy theorists” for making things “too simple”.

But sometimes the truth is very simple, and even in complex events there is usually a kernel of causation at its heart that can be summed up in one sentence.

Analysing Islamic terrorist in-fighting or how Saudi intelligence assets may have funded terrorist cells,

“blowback”...all of that is just picking gnat shit out of pepper.

In the grand scheme of things, it doesn't matter where the hijackers came from and it doesn't matter who the hijackers worked for, **because the planes didn't bring the buildings down.**

Talking about who was flying the planes and why is akin to debating what kind of saw the magician used to cut the lady in half.

Analyzing the illusion is not the same as seeing the reality.

The official narrative of 9/11 is literally physically impossible. Any and all analysis of 9/11 needs to start from there, or it will be fundamentally flawed.

What matters is that they found explosive residue in the dust. What matters is the collapse of Building 7. What matters is the obvious cover-up and suspicious behaviour.

Did the *Saudi Arabian* government publish 10,000 pages of transparent cover-up?

Did *Saudi Arabian* companies go on to make billions in profits from the *Saudi Arabian* “war on terror” or invasion of Iraq?

Did the *Saudi Arabian* military hold plane hijacking drills or stand down normal air defence procedures on the morning of 9/11?

No, they didn't.

At the end of the day, only one government profited from 9/11, only one government was capable of doing 9/11 and only one government *did* 9/11.

...and it wasn't Saudi Arabia.

by Kit Knightly

Category

1. Crime-Justice-Terrorism-Corruption
2. Main
3. NWO-Deep State-Dictatorship-Tyrrany
4. Politics-Geopolitics-Gov.-Events

Date Created

05/01/2023