Why I Am Not Convinced 9/11 was an Inside Job

David Chandler, author of “Why I Am Convinced 9/11 was an Inside Job,” argues that many physical and scientific pieces of evidence can easily lead people to believe the truth about the 2001 terrorist attack: that it was planned by the United States Government. Despite many valid examples of physical ‘proof’ of the government’s involvement, Chandler fails to assess one key feature in accusing the government of conspiring a mass murder: Why would they do such thing? Though one might argue the government is made up of lying, evil politicians, there are many different reasons why terrorist group al Qaeda (Muslim Extremists) would have committed this major atrocity. Chandler also fails to evaluate the events leading up to 9/11, but instead focuses on the events after and the government action which leads him to his brave and questionable conclusion. Because of the dispute between al Qaeda and the United States as well as al Qaeda’s claim for responsibility of the attack, Chandler’s argument isn’t as powerful as readers make it out to be.

The first and possibly the most important question one might ask is: Why would the United States Government do this? Well, there’s not much evidence in Chandler’s essay to prove this. He states that Bush framed al Qaeda for the attack only to be able to declare war on them. Not only would this give the American citizens someone to blame for their deceased family and friends, it would also later boost the falling approval rating of President George W. Bush. While
this isn’t a far reach. There is far more evidence concerning al Qaeda’s actual involvement in the terrorist attack. Again, Chandler fails to even mention the events leading up to the 9/11 attacks. According to Prospect Magazine, Osama Bin Laden, leader of al Qaeda, recorded a video of himself claiming total responsibility for the attacks. Whether or not this video was orchestrated by the U.S. government, Chandler fails to recall this event of another party claiming to commit the violent crime. The website also writes that Bin Laden originally had an Anti-American sentiment because of “the support it gave to Israel’s invasion of southern Lebanon in 1982” (Prospect Magazine). Not only did Bin Laden despise America, he despised the entire Western World. Bin Laden is the leader of a terrorist/Islamic Extremist group. His tactics of leadership included waging war on powerful countries, especially the United States. Prospect Magazine states that “Bin Laden adopted a war against “the far enemy” in order to hasten the demise of the “near enemy” regimes in the middle east. And he used 9/11 to advance that cause.” With these claims of Bin Laden being Anti-American, it seems that he had more than enough reason within himself to carry out and attack on the western world. This counterargument could be lethal to Chandler’s essay because he does not once justify the ‘mass murder committed by George W. Bush.’

David Chandler also states in his essay that the leaseholder, Larry Silverstein, had ‘adequate motivation’ to demolish the buildings. According to Chandler, his contract contained an escape clause that would allow him to owe nothing if the buildings were destroyed by terrorists and there was a major asbestos problem in the buildings. Although this may be true, would the owner of the World Trade Center willingly murder 3,000 innocent Americans to escape paying for remodeling and treatment for the buildings? Also, Chandler does not cite any sources containing Silverstein’s reasons for the investment. Which leads to another lacking
quality of David Chandler’s essay: Sources. Although there are quite a few sources referenced throughout the 11 pages, he fails in some places and it is obvious. Many of Chandler’s claims are a ‘he said/she said’ kind of evidence. For example, he references Silverstein’s collaboration with the firefighter and their decision to “pull it” (bottom of page four). I discovered the video containing this information and found that the claim was altered. Silverstein is being interviewed post-9/11 and the firefighter called him and stated that they couldn’t contain the fire and they (the fire department) were going to have to “pull.” Although “pull” is a word of many definitions, Silverstein and the fire fighter were clearly implying that they needed to ‘escape the building and give up’ before the building collapsed on them. I rewatched the video multiple times and Silverstein never says, “pull it.” After discovering this, I became skeptical of other sources that were somewhat altered within Chandler’s essay.

Some might argue that the attack could have been prevented. According to a timeline on ABC News, George Bush was on vacation while he was informed by the CIA of threats from Osama Bin Laden. However, he was informed that the attack would be carried out with explosives. Also, the department of Homeland Security, who defend against domestic terrorist threats, was created by Bush after 9/11 in 2002. Who was doing Homeland Security’s job on 9/11? The CIA and FBI, rival agencies, were competing for a reputation with 9/11 information. During and before the attack, the two agencies refused to share information regarding the attack in order to gain a sense of ‘superiority’ over the other (New York Times). This was a prominent reason for the establishment of the Homeland Security agency. The 2003 New York Times report also states that the agencies failed to counter the attack having known al Qaeda planned to attack the United States for years. A report from the United States Department of Defense also explains the difficulty stopping the attack. They list points about the air defense on 9/11 which
include that there were “19 or 20 planes that she and the other ID techs had investigating as possible hijackings. Only the initial four – American 11, United Airlines Flight 175, American Airlines Flight 77 and United Airlines Flight 93 – were the real deal.” Although these reports could be American citizens that were genuinely concerned, they were likely calls from other members of al-Qaeda attempting to confuse the other air defense workers. Another point made in this report was that they simply did not have enough time to react to the calls. The first call was made at 8:37 AM and the first plane, American 11, ambushed the North Tower at 8:47 AM. Since the incident, the military has been monitoring the U.S. skies. Even though the U.S. knew about the attacks, they had no idea where they would be, when they would be, or what would be used. This further pulls apart Chandler’s essay because he contradicts the fact that the U.S. had very little knowledge of the attacks.

David Chandler’s argumentative essay is remarkably difficult to counter, but it is very easy to deconstruct and identify flaws. As mentioned earlier, there is an obvious lack of sources at some points. For example, in the middle of page six, he writes that there are “hundreds of eyewitnesses” and that there are videos showing explosions within the buildings. Yes, there may be hundreds of witnesses and there may be videos, but he does not reference anything at this point in the essay. He also steers away from the topic of the essay at the end which is unnecessary. Although the JFK assassination may prove that the United States Government is sneaky, it does not help his argument in that it is a completely different time period and event. Chandler also claims that “there is no public evidence that any of the supposed hijackers were on any of the planes.” According to ABC News, all 19 hijackers were in the United States before the attack and bought plane tickets to the same destinations. Also, CNN shows a timeline of 9/11 and they were able to identify what hijackers were on which planes because they were in the
American/United Airlines records for getting on the planes. There is simply too much evidence of the hijackers being on the planes for Chandler’s claim to be true. Another flaw in the essay is that the author retrieves the majority of his information from one site:

http://911review.com/attack/anthrax.html. I visited the essay and it seems that virtually anyone could have created the website. Apart from the videos, which are physical evidence of what happened, Chandler uses a very skeptical website for most of his sources.

There is no doubt that David Chandler’s argument is valid, and that any reader has reason to believe it. There are tons of physical evidence that would prove just how dubious the entire attack is. Whether the physical effects of 9/11 were sheer coincidence or planned by the government, they were very strange. The author also does very well by breaking his claims as well as the evidence provided down until the reader can understand. For example, a physicist may know what nanothermite is and its power, but the average reader would need an explanation down to a Level 1 Hayakawa Abstraction. However, Chandler’s lack of sources as well as his lack of explaining the “Why?” make his argument very easy to deconstruct and propose a counterargument consisting of different kinds of evidence. Some of the author’s claims were also altered to fit his argument. For example, Silverstein saying, “Pull it” and that there was no evidence of the hijackers on the planes. I was convinced by David Chandler’s essay, “Why I Am Convinced 9/11 was an Inside Job” at first. After my research, it is difficult to conclude whether the government or al Qaeda was responsible. Al Qaeda claimed responsibility and the government claimed they could have done nothing to stop the attack because of the time constraints. Chandler’s essay contains enormous amounts of physical evidence which cannot be refuted as well as sources that prove the government took away files from the public which is definitely suspicious. Regardless, Chandler’s argument contains a strong claim backed up by
countless details but it also contains a few flaws. The government may very well have been involved, but there is too much conflicting evidence to make a clear verdict.
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