

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK \_\_\_\_\_  
APRIL GALLOP, for herself and as Mother  
And Next Friend of ELISHA GALLOP, a Minor, No. 08 CV 10881  
Plaintiff AFFIDAVIT OF  
ROBIN D. HORDON

vs.

DICK CHENEY, Vice President of the U.S.A.,  
DONALD RUMSFELD, former U.S. Secretary of  
Defense, General RICHARD MYERS, U.S.A.F.  
(Ret.), and John Does Nos. 1-X, all in their  
individual capacities, Defendants

---

AFFIDAVIT OF ROBIN HORDON

I, Robin Dirk Hordon, declare, under the penalty of perjury:

That I am a former Air Traffic Controller [ATC] who worked at the Boston ARTCC [Air Route Traffic Control Center] located in Nashua, NH; and further, that I worked the specific airspace in which American Airlines flight Eleven [AA11] went off course and showed signs of an in-flight emergency before being considered a hijacked aircraft on September 11, 2001.

And further, as an employee of the FAA [Federal Aviation Administration], in addition to performing all the skills and requirements of an Air Traffic Controller, I also served for several years in a management capacity [in an Area Office], and charged with developing and coordinating airspace and procedural changes, improvements and modifications. This included working closely with the U.S. Military aviation operations.

2.

I also served in several temporary supervisory roles at the FAA. This specialty work required a basic understanding of communications, including the procedures associated with communication to higher supervisory levels, downward to sector operations, parallel to other areas of specialty, and outward to

various other air traffic control facilities, including military facilities, with whom we shared many common goals.

Furthermore, while serving as an Air Traffic Controller, Area Specialist and Facility Training Instructor, I was part of the team that helped bring the entire Air Traffic Control system into the computer era. We did this by creating a training program involving the FAA's new IBM9020 computer and its RDP [Radar Data Processing] computer programs. This experience familiarized me with both older analogue and modern digitized radar systems. I learned how radar data is collected, processed, and displayed at FAA air traffic control sectors in the ARTCC environment.

During the time I served as an Air Traffic Controller, I had direct experience with a successful scramble of military aviation assets in the assistance of an aircraft suffering an in-flight emergency. Additionally, I was peripherally involved in one case involving an aviation hijacking, and directly involved in handling a US Air Carrier which reportedly had an altitude-sensitive bomb on-board as it transited through my airspace.

I also performed the duties consistent with my job as a part of the National Air Defense System. During which time I worked closely with the Air Defense Command [presently NORAD] in the operation of various War Games, low altitude Oil Burner Bombing Runs, aerial refueling, scramble and flush operations, and interceptor operations.

I am also a pilot, and have accumulated 1600 hours of flight time in light aircraft, and qualified as a third level air carrier operating small twin-engined aircraft in the northeastern part of the U.S.A.

### 3.

I have the following piloting licenses:

Commercial Pilots License with an Instrument Rating and with the following ratings:

Airplane Single Engine Land  
Airplane Single Engine Sea  
Airplane Multi-engine Land  
Glider

Flight Instructor Airplanes and Instruments

I was also certified as a ground instructor, and passed the Flight Engineer Basic Exam for the Boeing 727 aircraft.

I also accumulated approximately 2000-hours of supervised aviation mechanic training working on airframes and engines, and the installation of electronics in light aircraft.

In addition to the above-mentioned training and experience, I also have a solid understanding of aviation operations, including aircraft upkeep, repair and fixed-base operations, flying aircraft and training new pilots. I am also familiar with the duties and training required of air traffic controllers who work in the Air Route Traffic Control Center [ARTCC] environment, which is integral to Military Aviation Operations and the National Air Defense System; and also from my experience with airspace planning and procedures. This includes experience working in conjunction with Military Aviation facilities such as NORAD and the National Air Defense System.

My views about 9/11 are based on all of the above experience.

When, late in the afternoon of 9/11/2001, I learned there had been no major communication or radar system failure that morning, before and/or during the attacks, between the FAA facilities and those of NORAD, I concluded that a major failure of the National Air Defense System must necessarily have occurred.

4.

This failure must have had its origins WITHIN the U.S. Governmental organizations responsible for defending the United States of America. More specifically, it must have originated

within the National Air Defense Systems, i.e., the FAA [Federal Aviation Administration], the Pentagon, and NORAD.

For such an attack to be successful, the standard intercept operating procedures in the defense of the U.S.A., which had been in place for more than 50 years, had to have been stood down or compromised.

#### SPECIFIC SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION, FACTS, and EVIDENCE

Over the years years since September 11, 2001, I have reviewed a voluminous amount of 9/11-related evidence. Based on this evidence, some of which I will now present, I am more convinced than ever that my original conclusions were correct.

#### SCRAMBLING PROTOCOLS, NORAD and WAR GAMES:

There were three modes of scrambling interceptors in active use on 9/11, just as in every hour of every day of every year, before and since. Fighters are scrambled

1. in the defense of this country,
2. to assist aircraft suffering in-flight emergencies, and
3. to assist in cases of hijacked aircraft.

The first two of the three scrambling protocols call for the immediate scrambling of interceptors without delay, and the third can also require the immediate scrambling of interceptors or appropriate military aviation assets, if deemed necessary.

The above three scramble protocols do not include any actions regarding the Drug Enforcement Agency's scramble and intercept operations, as they have their own distinct communications, operations and aviation assets.

5.

ONE of TWO: In Defense of the Unites States of America

Upon the notification of enemy aircraft [or sometimes missiles] inbound towards the continental United States, or in some instances North America, interceptors are immediately scrambled to conduct an interception. In such cases there is no need for prior approvals from the Pentagon to scramble aircraft.

NORAD and its facilities, including scramble or "hot bases" react to the situation immediately AND MAKE DECISIONS TO SCRAMBLE TOTALLY WITHIN FIELD FACILITY OPERATIONS. Speed is of utmost importance in scrambling military aviation assets, because the time factor is always critical in such situations. Detailed reports of these activities are filed in appropriate "after action" formats.

#### TWO of TWO: Aircraft Suffering In-Flight Emergencies

When the FAA contacts NORAD to request assistance for an in-flight emergency, it is standard practice for NORAD to IMMEDIATELY SCRAMBLE U.S. Military aviation assets, i.e., interceptors.

#### THREE of THREE: Possible Hijacked Aircraft

The third protocol for scrambling military aviation assets involves hijacked aircraft. In this situation the request to scramble military aviation assets comes from an FAA facility, or from another source which suspects that a hijacking may be in progress. The request can come from law enforcement, the State Department, or sometimes from an FAA air traffic control facility which overhears a suspicious radio transmission, or which receives a special hijacking transponder code from an aircraft, indicating that a hijack may be in progress.

#### 6.

In the case of hijackings the need to scramble Military aviation assets is less time-critical. The hijacking protocol involves both the State Department and the Pentagon because of the possible

need for coordination with foreign countries, and because long-range fighter escort is limited by the amount of fuel that interceptors can carry; and by other requirements.

However, the hijacking scramble protocol can also be of the "immediate scramble" type, and thusly be assigned the first priority of service. This happens whenever it is deemed appropriate by high level NORAD or Pentagon personnel. In which case, the Military response would have the same priority, or action status, as the first two scramble priorities noted above.

Each of the four airliners allegedly hijacked on 9/11/2001, i.e., AA11, UA175, UA93 and AA77, showed all of the signs of an aircraft experiencing an in-flight emergency, WELL BEFORE any of the planes were thought to be hijacked.

Please note that the following physical air traffic control-based signs are indicative of BOTH a potential hijacking and an in-flight emergency. These signs are:

1. Loss of radio contact
2. Diversion from an assigned routing or altitude without ATC approval
3. Loss of transponder

Additional signs of an airliner being hijacked are:

1. The observation by Air Traffic Controllers that a pilot has "squawked," i.e., used the airliner's transponder to transmit a special hijacking code
2. Suspect radio transmissions from the pilot of a SPECIFIC AIRLINER
3. As noted earlier: information from other sources about the FLIGHT in question

Each of the four allegedly hijacked airliners on 9/11 initially showed all of the signs of an aircraft experiencing only an "in-flight emergency."

Therefore, each flight should first have been treated as an in-flight emergency. At 08:21, ATC Pete Zalewski reported his suspicion that such was the case regarding AA11.

Indeed, there were no signs that any of the airliners were being hijacked during the early stage of each flight. Again, the signs indicating a possible hijack are: transmission of the special hijacking code via the airliner's transponder; or, radio transmissions from the pilot indicating that a hijacking may be in progress; or additional information from other sources about a possible hijacking of a specific flight.

## 7.

The ONLY evidence that AA11 was being hijacked were several radio transmissions in Arabic, at or around 08:24, indicating the possibility of a hijacking on board ONE of the aircraft transmitting on that frequency at that time.

However, it was never positively established that these suspicious radio transmissions came from AA11, nor any of the other airliners in question.

In fact, all of the suspicious radio transmissions alleged to have come from the airliners in question could have come from ANY OTHER aircraft aloft at high altitudes in the northeastern parts of the U.S.A. It was only a PRESUMPTION that the radio transmissions came from AA11.

Boston ARTCC air traffic controller Pete Zalewski sounded the first warning of serious trouble, after noting the loss of radio contact, the loss of transponder and, subsequently, AA11's radical and unapproved course change. This sequence of events started at 08:14.

The FAA's standard protocol in the case of an in-flight emergency is to request IMMEDIATE assistance from NORAD, which in these cases meant the Northeastern Air Defense Sector [NEADS]. The

FAA would have requested assistance in the case of AA11 no later than 08:21, but more prudently around 08:18, as the signs of an in-flight emergency became manifest.

However, the first radio transmission indicating that a hijacking might be in progress did not occur until 08:24. During the critical ten-minute period BEFORE this suspicious transmission, there were no signs of a possible hijacking. Rather, all signs pointed to an in-flight emergency, possibly caused by a serious loss of electrical power possibly due, in turn, to an electrical circuitry problem. In fact, ATC Pete Zalewski filed such a report to his supervisor regarding AA11 at 08:21.

His report of an impending in-flight emergency should have prompted an IMMEDIATE scramble of military aviation assets to assist AA11. A thorough analysis of ALL air traffic control audio tapes in use at ZBW [Boston ARTCC] and ALL adjacent and pertinent air traffic control sectors and facilities which had ANY relationship to the geographical flight path of AA11 should confirm this.

However, as stated by Colin Scoggins, the Boston ARTCC military liaison officer, most of the audio tapes were never analyzed and are still being withheld by the FBI.

## 8.

As we know, the Arabic radio transmissions raised suspicions that a hijacking was in progress, and set in motion a very different and slower scramble protocol that required Pentagon approval for the scrambling of interceptors.

Crucially, however, at 08:38 the Boston ARTCC placed a direct call to NEADS and requested support in the form of scrambled interceptors. This request should have SUPERSEDED ALL OTHER PROTOCOLS, since the FAA is the responsible agency in such cases.

It is telling that NEADS failed to respond to this DIRECT REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE made by Boston ARTCC. It is also telling that the interceptors were only granted clearance to take off when a Florida-based NORAD commander made an impromptu decision to do so, after NEADS had failed to respond appropriately. The commander's order actually fell outside the hijacking scramble protocol.

This NORAD commander surely understood that the U.S. Military's refusal to IMMEDIATELY ASSIST the FAA by honoring the Boston ARTCC's request for NEADS to IMMEDIATELY scramble interceptors was the INCORRECT SCRAMBLE AND COMMAND PROTOCOL, because at that point in time he responded by issuing an immediate scramble order to NEADS, with approval of superiors at the Pentagon to follow, later.

## 9.

The decision to scramble was issued at 08:46, and the interceptors were airborne at 08:52. This six-minute delay occurred because the interceptors were NOT given higher departure priority as called for in the standard scramble protocol for both in-flight emergencies and inbound enemy attack scenarios, i.e., in the defense of the country.

Instead, they were slotted for the usual first-come-first-serve departure sequences and ATC handling used in normal hijacking protocols [unless specifically requested otherwise as noted in the Special Military Operations section of FAA-Military orders].

It is now established that several overlapping War Games Exercises were in operation on or around 9/11/2001. In fact, the U.S. Military actually moved up the scheduling date of at least one of these exercises to the 9/11/2001 timeframe, even though this War Game Exercise had always previously been staged in October. One or more of these War Games is known to have included hijack simulations.

During the time I served as an ATC I had first-hand experience with Military War Game Exercises. On each and every one of those occasions the U.S. Military briefed all participants ahead of time about the upcoming exercises, including staff at both the FAA facilities and at all participating Military facilities. The FAA deemed its participation in these exercises useful from the standpoint of refresher training; and this continued to be the case at the time of 9/11, according to my sources within the agency.

Therefore, I believe that someone deliberately altered the long-standing hijack protocol in anticipation of, and even preparation for, the events of 9/11/2001.

It is known that in June 2001, the Joint Chiefs of Staffs issued a change in the operating orders for cases involving hijackings. Although the new order's authorization language remained the same as in the previous order, which had been in effect since 1997, in my opinion, the new order nonetheless had the effect of operationally altering the scramble protocol. I believe this was effected in the briefing process as the new order was passed down the chain of command. Such a conclusion is supported by the fact that the number of NORAD scrambles diminished to zero in the period between the issuance of the new order and September 2001.

The testimony and taped conversations of military personnel who were involved in the War Game Exercises on 9/11 also support this view. When confronted with the urgent need to scramble planes on the morning of 9/11/2001, military personnel often expressed surprise. Some even wondered out loud whether the hijack portions of the exercise had begun early. Many asked: "Is this part of the Exercise, or is it real world?"

It is important to note, however, that the FAA's initial response to trouble aboard AA11 involved no similar questions or conclusions. The presumptions and ultimately slowed scramble reactions and behaviors about a possible hijacking scenario came exclusively

from the chain of command within NEADS, NORAD and the Pentagon.

10.

All of the above suggests that both confusion and delay about the differences between scramble protocols in cases of in-flight emergencies versus hijackings were the intended result. The rescheduling of Military Exercises to concur with other War Game Exercises already planned for the 9/11/2001 time frame is further evidence of deliberate preparation.

In conclusion, there is no doubt in my mind that the Air Defense System for the United States of America, as historically provided by NORAD within the northeast geographical sector known as NEADS, under the auspices of the Pentagon, was deliberately compromised by elements within the U.S. Military.

This was done by scheduling War Game Exercises involving hijacking scenarios to sow confusion, and thus to delay by many minutes the appropriate and usual scrambling protocols associated with in-flight emergencies. Delay would be the predictable outcome, given confusion between real world and War Game Exercises.

I must emphasize, again, that no one has ever shown that the radio transmissions of Arabic-sounding people on 9/11 came from the radios on board the affected airliners. Those transmissions could just as easily have come from some other airborne platform in the northeast airspace.

The NEADS radar facility located at Rome, New York, was the sole NORAD facility responsible for all air defense activities in the northeast region of the U.S.A. on 9/11/2001. The NEADS facility was responsible for all of the radar coverage and all of the airspace in which all of the allegedly hijacked flights occurred, including the interceptors which NORAD finally did scramble after considerable delay. NEADS military commanders were surely in

the loop regarding the Military Exercises in progress, that morning, in the northeast sector of the United States.

11.

Civil first-responder authority in establishing and maintaining the safety of civilian aircraft falls squarely within the FAA's sphere of responsibilities; and, at 08:38 on the morning of 9/11/2001 the FAA requested immediate assistance from this same NEADS facility regarding civilian aircraft that were believed to be in trouble. But NEADS failed to follow the existing scramble protocol in each case.

The delay and confusion that prevailed in the case of AA11 was subsequently repeated with the three OTHER airliners, each of which was allowed to fly unhindered though U.S. airspace until each allegedly crashed. The three subsequent crash times were 09:03, 09:30/38, and 10:03/06 respectively. [The variations in the last two cases, i.e., AA 77 and UA93, reflect continuing uncertainty and/or controversy about the actual crash times.]

Notice, this amounts to:

1. a 25-minute delay in the scrambling/intercept response for UA175 before its crash into WTC2, and
2. a 52-60-minute delay in the scrambling/intercept response for AA77 before its alleged crash into the Pentagon, and
3. an 85-88-minute delay in scrambling/intercept response for UA93 before its alleged crash (or its shutdown) in Shanksville, PA.

As I have indicated, a senior commander at NORAD, upon learning about the delayed scramble situation, gave instructions to immediately scramble the interceptors. His actions indicate that he was aware that NEADS had not adhered to the proper scramble protocols.

Interceptors were scrambled from Langley AFB in sufficient time to intercept the unknown high speed air vehicle that displayed as an UNKNOWN HIGH SPEED PRIMARY TARGET [eventually thought to be AA77], which approached Washington DC [WDC] from the west over West Virginia.

However, the Langley interceptors were not redirected toward WDC from their initial departure routings. In fact, they were twice rerouted to points OTHER THAN DIRECTLY TOWARDS WDC.

12.

This failure to send the Langley interceptors directly towards WDC after departure INSURED that they WOULD NOT arrive over WDC in time to intercept the above noted UNIDENTIFIED HIGH SPEED PRIMARY TARGET [presumed to be AA77].

### **UNSEEN TARGETS, TRACKS and RADAR DATA ANALYSIS: THREE OF FOUR CRASHED**

After analyzing the 9/11 radar data made available by the 84<sup>th</sup> RADES Radar Squadron, a military unit tasked with monitoring and recording all radar data fed into it from its various military radar sites, FAA radar sites, and joint use radar sites, I concluded that three of the four airliners, AA11, UA175 and UA93, remained in full and positive radar contact from just after lift off at their departure airports until their respective crash points as follows:

AA11...Boston to WTC1...

UA175...Boston to WTC2...

UA93...Newark to Shanksville, PA

### **However, AA77 is a different story...**

On 9/11, air traffic controllers based at the FAA facility in Indianapolis, Ohio lost positive radar contact with AA77 as the plane flew over eastern Ohio. Furthermore, no one at any facility, nor at any time during the events of 9/11/2001, nor thereafter,

re-identified any target flying anywhere as being AA77. It is a fact that AA77 was never re-identified after it was lost to radar contact. Essentially, it remains lost, today.

The high-speed eastbound primary radar target observed by Danielle O'Brien at Dulles Tower-Potomac Approach was PRESUMED, but never proven, to be AA77.

13.

This presumption amounts to a dubious reverse time-engineered identification process, one BASED SOLELY upon unreliable and controversial evidence FOUND or possibly PLACED AT the Pentagon crash site. Consequently, it cannot be established that the target seen by Danielle O'Brien was AA77.

Indeed, it has never been proved that the aircraft that flew into, east of, or over the Pentagon on 9/11/2001 was AA77. To make such a claim at this point in time is sheer speculation. I will have more to say about AA77 later in this affidavit.

### **The phantom AA11...**

The phantom AA11 first announced by the 9/11 Commission in its 2004 final report was, in fact, the computer-generated TRACK for AA11 which continued on a southwesterly heading after AA11 [the actual airplane] struck WTC1. The phantom AA11 was a computer-generated TRACK on a screen, not a TARGET, i.e., an actual aircraft.

### **TRACKS are not TARGETS.**

TRACKS are created from specifically designed tracking computer programs, which associate an alphanumeric symbol with the RADAR TARGET with which the TRACK is associated. The computer continuously generates a TRACK for each TARGET to maintain the identity AND location of that specific aircraft.

Additionally, the FAA's Radar Data Processing [RDP] tracking program generates an informational display for each target, which identifies the flight and gives other relevant information. The program displays all of this information alongside each TARGET on a radar screen monitored by an air traffic controller, although the tracking portion of the program operates silently out of the controller's sight.

By design, the same computer program that generates each TRACK and its informational display automatically searches for the associated TARGET along the route of flight, or along the aircraft's last known heading/ground speed.

#### 14.

After AA11 crashed into WTC1, its computed-generated TRACK and informational display showing the same specific alphanumeric symbols identifying the aircraft, continued on AA11's last known heading and groundspeed towards WDC, even as the computer program continued searching for the former but recently lost TARGET.

A TRACK will remain in COAST MODE essentially forever, moving at the last known heading and speed, or routing and speed while the program searches for the original target, until and unless canceled by a specific manual computer input.

An individual unfamiliar with Radar Data Processing [RDP] and Air Traffic Control [ATC] symbols, procedures and programming specifications, might easily have confused the alphanumeric track or display for AA11 moving across a radar scope for the TARGET of AA11, i.e., the actual aircraft. Such a person might have easily concluded that the actual plane was still airborne.

However, a person experienced with these programs, associated nomenclature and symbols, would have noticed immediately that the TRACK was in COAST MODE, meaning that all the

alphanumeric symbols were the same EXCEPT the small COAST SYMBOL [#] which had replaced the now missing REAL TARGET symbol [/ or \ ].

An experienced individual would have noticed this immediately. Therefore, I suspect that someone at a location associated with one of the various inter or intra facility phone-banks established on 9/11/2001 who was watching an FAA Radar Display or a similar device showing the COAST TRACK of AA11, may have deliberately lied about AA11, claiming it was still airborne to increase the level of confusion.

Another possible reason for such a lie may have been to divert the interceptors from Langley AFB away from the high-speed eastbound primary target first noted by Danielle O'Brien at Dulles Tower-Potomac Approach. After the Langley fighters initially were sent out to sea, they were next sent to Baltimore, Maryland to intercept AA11, which then was presumed to be en route to WDC.

15.

I suspect that both of these actions may have been part of a sophisticated stand-down of NORAD's assets and responsibilities to protect the United States of America.

### **Why was AA11 Not Seen by NEADS?**

Years ago, I worked as an air traffic controller [ATC] in the very same airspace in which AA11 first showed signs of being an in-flight emergency beginning at 08:14.

In my former capacity as an ATC, I successfully handed-off military aircraft to the former ADC [Air Defense Command, presently NEADS] facilities in that same region. In that capacity I also had military aircraft handed off and identified to me.

I also identified/pointed out various civilian aircraft to ADC-NEADS when they had questions or concerns, as they operated

their War Games and daily military activities in the northeastern region.

I believe that the FAA's attempts to pass information about AA11 to NEADS on 9/11 failed because the radar data delivery systems to NEADS through NORAD's radar data and computer programming had been COMPROMISED as a result of the ACKNOWLEDGED BUT NEVER FULLY EXPLAINED 24-second delay in delivery of the radar data from NORAD's main computers to NEADS' radar displays. [For more details about this 24-second delay, see Chapter Four of Mark H. Gaffney's book, *The 9/11 Mystery Plane.*]

Because long range radar [LRR] sweeps or refreshes every twelve seconds, the now-verified 24-second delay represents two separate opportunities [each one 12-seconds apart] for a radar technician who may have been functioning as an "inside mole," and who was located in electronic space between the original radar data source [NORAD-FAA-or joint-use radar antennae sites], and the final destination of the radar data stream [NORAD-NEADS field facilities and eventually their sector radar scopes], to ELIMINATE SPECIFIC TARGET information, as desired, in the execution of the stand-down of NORAD and the ensuing COVER-UP of the stand-down which is still ongoing, today.

## 16.

NORAD also has the computer/radar capacity to simulate aircraft targets, that is, to create fake targets through digital means on radar displays seen by NORAD radar techs and interceptor pilots. NORAD routinely uses this simulation capacity to generate fake enemy targets during War Game Exercises.

The computer-generated false radar images are indiscernible from REAL WORLD targets and can easily fool both radar techs and pilots, alike.

Moreover, NORAD also has the computer/radar capacity to alter or erase radar data. This means that NORAD can REMOVE SPECIFIC RADAR TARGETS from the radar data base and radar data streams.

NORAD's computer/radar programs are designed so that simulated radar inputs or fake targets can be eliminated from the system by means of an electronic command, or a simple keystroke, AFTER the false images have served their intended purpose during a War Game Exercise.

I believe this electronically-actuated radar target out-take capability may have been used on 9/11 to clandestinely erase the real target of AA11 from the radar data base and data streams before the data reached NEADS.

Under normal conditions, the real primary radar target for AA11 would have been EASILY viewable on a large number of normally operating radar screens in use by NORAD-NEADS. I suspect that the real target was erased early in the radar data stream, BEFORE the radar data ever reached the various NEADS sectors.

This would explain why the primary target represented by AA11, i.e., a wide-body Boeing 767, was NOT VISIBLE to NEADS radar techs on 9/11/2001.

## 17.

I suspect this may have been the purpose of the most unusual, and now proven, 24-second delay in the NEADS radar data stream on 9/11. Although still-unexplained, the 24-second delay has been acknowledged by the Pentagon and NORAD. There is no mistake, it did happen.

I believe clandestine operators may have utilized the 24-second delay to eliminate the primary target for AA11 from NORAD radar screens. As a result, NEADS radar techs were unable to determine the geographical position of AA11; and because the

NEADS commander refused to launch his interceptors without a precise fix on the location of the target, AA11, the ultimate effect was to slow down NEADS' reaction time. I believe this delay may have been the intended outcome.

The lack of a primary radar target for AA11 also made it more difficult for both FAA and NEADS personnel to understand the nature of the unfolding events on 9/11, and to respond appropriately.

For example, FAA personnel made at least 40 phone calls to NEADS/NORAD while attempting to transmit the target location information regarding AA11, information that was vital to launch NEADS interceptors.

All of the above points to a pre-planned stand-down of NORAD's responsibilities and capabilities to defend the United States of America on 9/11/2001.

### **Why the primary radar target for AA77 was not seen by Indianapolis Air Route Traffic Control Center [ATRCC] in eastern Ohio:**

The FAA and NORAD's radar coverage of the United States is a mosaic of data collected by many different radar antennae sites covering the nation's airspace.

All of this radar data are normally processed by the FAA's RDP [Radar Data Processing] computer programs in each of the Air Route Traffic Control Center [ARTCC] computers, all of which are also electronically connected.

### 18.

Pertinent radar data, including primary radar returns which are radar signals reflected from the outer skins of aircraft, and secondary radar returns which are from transponders, eventually get processed, digitalized, and sent along to the various Air Route

Traffic Control Centers [ARTCCs], and ultimately to individual air traffic control sector radar scopes at those ARTCCs.

Primary radar returns and secondary radar returns are wholly different types of data, and are collected, processed, sent, received, and displayed differently. They also have different uses.

Primary radar data and secondary [transponder] radar data are collected by different radar antennae, with the smaller secondary radar antennae sitting atop the much larger primary radar antennae as they both continuously sweep 360-degrees around the horizon at the radar sites.

The FAA's Radar Data Processing [RDP] computers collect primary and secondary radar returns from across the country and assign this data to electronically defined geographical two-dimensional areas or zones. These geographic zones are square in shape and are known as "radar sort boxes." Taken together, all of these sort boxes collectively make up the larger contiguous grid-like-matrix-mosaic covering the entire United States of America, and somewhat beyond the U.S. border where needed for air traffic control purposes.

### **How the radar sorting process works:**

Although multiple radar antennae sweep the geographical area represented by each radar sort box, the data from only one primary radar source is selected for display in each individual sort box; and this is also the case with secondary radar data.

Although the sorting process is computerized and automatic, it is overseen and ultimately under the control of FAA personnel, who periodically review the radar inputs [both primary and secondary] for each sort box and set the priorities. FAA personnel determine which is the best radar data for each box, the second-best, third-best, and so on. The human commands are keyed into the RDP computers from the SE [Systems Engineer's] positions and consoles within the ARTCCs.

Once the priorities are set, the sorting is automatic. The RDP computers continue to select the single BEST primary radar data and the single BEST secondary radar data for each radar sort box. Thus, in practice, most of the available radar data is "sorted out." Only the best quality radar data is "sorted into" each individual sort box. From there, the best data is sent to the various individual radar scopes at each air traffic control sector within the ARTCCs.

As noted, the second-best and occasionally third-best secondary and primary radar returns for each zone are also identified; and if a failure or calibration issue occurs in the case of the best radar source, FAA staff are notified, and will then assign the next best radar data to the sort box. So, it is important to realize that the selection process is overseen by, and always remains under the control of, FAA personnel.

The human role in the sorting process is essential for a number of reasons. For example, although most radar antennae can "see" targets at both low and high altitudes, some radar antennae only "see" targets at high altitudes. Furthermore, most radar antennae cannot "see" lower flying targets on the opposite sides of mountains and ridges, which can necessitate specially tailored priorities for a given sort box. Also, some radar antennae cannot "see" primary returns.

Additionally, radar return capacities often vary, most notably along air traffic control sector boundaries, due to the fact that while radar data is collected by means of large circular sweeps, the radar sort boxes themselves are square in shape. Consequently, several complex boundary issues are always in play with regard to which radar data is sent to which radar sort box.

Understanding the human role is also important for reasons having to do with the September 11, 2001 "terrorist" attack. As we know, soon after Flight AA77's transponder ceased to transmit

secondary radar returns near the Ohio border, the Indianapolis ARTCC also lost primary radar coverage of the aircraft. At which point AA77 dropped completely off radar.

This happened despite the fact that adequate primary radar data was available for the entire region through which AA77 flew. According to the *9/11 Commission Report*, the loss of primary radar coverage was due to an unknown "technical glitch." Which is possible, but in my opinion highly unlikely. I believe the loss of primary radar coverage is more likely to have occurred through a human error, or even more likely, because the FAA system was intentionally hacked.

This is why it is vitally important that we understand how the FAA's radar sorting process works; and especially the human role; because the system is hackable.

By means of a few simple keystrokes, an FAA operator can enter commands into the FAA's RDP computer program, thus preventing any radar data stream from reaching a radar sort box, or group of radar sort boxes. Any such input entered through human error into the RDP computers on 9/11 would have severely compromised the radar data displayed to air traffic controllers at the Indianapolis ARTCC.

It is also possible that such commands were intentionally entered on 9/11, either at a remote location within the Indianapolis ARTCC itself, or from a remote location outside the Indianapolis ARTCC, by means of a "backdoor." Without question, as with any computer system, the FAA's RDP computers are vulnerable to hacking. It is possible that some unknown or unidentified agent clandestinely hacked into the FAA system for the purpose of resetting the priorities for the radar sort boxes through which AA77 flew, for example, by selecting as best source a radar antenna that did not have the capability to "see" primary radar.

Such an operator could have intentionally created a "black hole" in radar coverage; by means of which a plane swap could easily

have been carried out, unseen by ATCs. Minutes later, the same clandestine operator might have reset the original priorities for the sort boxes; with no one the wiser.

In the absence of a definitive explanation for the loss of primary coverage, this remains possible.

19.

### **Analysis of Radar Data Around WDC and The Pentagon:**

I have reviewed the 9/11 radar data provided by the Military's RADES 84th Radar Data Squadron (made available via FOIA requests); and I have cross-referenced it with eyewitness accounts developed by 9/11 researchers, including the Citizens Investigation Team [CIT] and Mark H. Gaffney in his book, *The 9/11 Mystery Plane*. On this basis, I suspect that the RADES radar data may have been tampered with, and possibly truncated so as to NOT show certain radar targets flying over and around WDC before, during, and after the Pentagon attack time period.

According to the above 9/11 researchers, eyewitnesses reported seeing multiple large aircraft flying at low altitudes around the WDC-Pentagon-Mall area. Without question, local and long-range radar systems would have detected any such aircraft flying at these low altitudes over WDC. However, for reasons still-to-be explained, the eyewitness accounts are not supported by the RADES Long Range Radar and local Short Range Radar data.

The radar data from 9/11 does show that a target approached the Pentagon from the west, made a sweeping 330-degree right-hand turn, then headed back to the Pentagon on a northeasterly heading. There is a gap, however, in the radar data for this target as it flew between the Naval Annex and the Pentagon.

Furthermore, immediately after this loss of radar, a radar "hit" or "target" suddenly shows up on radar, on this same projected radar track, i.e., at the side of the Pentagon.

The above-noted loss of the primary target just west of the Pentagon was most likely due to the target's low altitude. It may have dipped under radar coverage as it passed the Navy Annex and flew near the Pentagon, before reappearing on radar.

### **Was ground clutter erased?**

Some of the RADES radar returns from 9/11 can be characterized as "ground clutter," which often resembles a primary radar target, except that it is stationary. Examples of ground clutter in the RADES radar data show up north-northeast of the Pentagon [east of the Potomac and west of the White House, including parts of Georgetown].

Ground clutter can be caused by buildings and other objects on the ground. The Washington Monument is one well-known example. The issue with some of the ground clutter in the RADES radar data is that it suddenly and mysteriously vanishes. This is suspicious in my opinion because the location where this occurs is precisely where an air vehicle would have traveled if, as some believe, an aircraft flew over or past THE Pentagon.

21.

Moreover, at least one credible eyewitness reported seeing a commercial-size aircraft make a low-altitude left-banking turn over Georgetown. Notice, this flight path also corresponds with the "disappeared" ground clutter discussed above. This case too is suspicious.

The sudden disappearance of ground clutter suggests that RADES radar returns may have been intentionally scrubbed or erased to hide an over-flight from investigators.

### **Conclusion:**

The absence of radar returns for aircraft over WDC reportedly seen by eyewitnesses at altitudes high enough to have been detected by radar systems, and the Military's continuing denial that an E-4B command and control plane flew over WDC, even though multiple eyewitnesses saw and a CNN film crew videotaped such a plane, or planes, [as author Mark H. Gaffney reported in his book] suggests that the 9/11 RADES radar data may have been scrubbed or tampered with, and is therefore unreliable.

All of the above suggests that the U.S. Military covered up and/or fabricated the truthful radar data showing aviation operations around WDC on 9/11/2001.

22.

### **Other pertinent information about AA77:**

According to the U.S. Military and the FBI, the eastbound high-speed target eventually noticed by Danielle O'Brien as it entered her airspace at Dulles Tower-Potomac TRACON was AA77, based upon hard evidence allegedly found at the Pentagon crash site.

However, this claim remains open to challenge because the U.S. Military and FBI have never produced a scintilla of physical evidence from AA77, such as matching serial numbers from recovered plane parts, which would positively establish the identity of the plane.

Furthermore, legitimate questions persist about the chain of custody of other allegedly recovered evidence, such as the DNA of body parts found at the Pentagon crash site.

The flight of AA77 is exceptional, in comparison with the three other allegedly hijacked flights on 9/11, for the following reasons:

1. AA77 is the only one of the four allegedly hijacked flights on 9/11/2001 that was lost to radar contact. In the three other cases

FAA Air Traffic Controllers [ATCs] maintained radar contact from the time of departure until each plane crashed.

Testimony by ATCs, and the NTSB flight path study indicate that AA77 disappeared from radar and began a descent BEFORE it completed a 180-degree turn to an eastbound heading. AA77's transponder also ceased transmitting at about this time.

2. After AA77 disappeared from radar it was never positively re-identified by radar or by any person at any facility.

23.

Serious questions have been raised about the authenticity of the FDR [Flight Data Recorder] allegedly recovered at the Pentagon, and said to be from AA77. The U.S. Military, FBI and NTSB have never produced the appropriate serial numbers for the FDR in question, which would indicate that the FDR actually came from the original AA77 aircraft.

Furthermore, the last modification to the data inside the FDR reportedly happened approximately four hours BEFORE it was found at the Pentagon. This was many hours AFTER the alleged crash of AA77, which indicates that tampering of the FDR may have occurred at some point in time between the alleged crash at the Pentagon and the recovery time admitted by authorities.

All of which raises serious doubts about the veracity of all the routing, airspeed, altitude and other data allegedly recorded by AA77s' FDR after it was lost to radar.

It is known that Chic Burlingame, the pilot of AA77, participated in a military analysis of the Pentagon's defenses approximately one year before 9/11/2001, while on National Guard duty. That military analysis included a simulation involving a hijacked airliner used as an airborne bomb in an attack upon the Pentagon. This coincidence is suspicious, in my opinion.

Members of Burlingame's family have also stated categorically that Burlingame, a large and powerfully-built man, would NEVER have voluntarily surrendered control of his aircraft to ANYONE, let alone hijackers wielding small box-cutter knives who are known to have been considerably smaller in build and shorter in height.

24.

### **Operation Northwoods**

During the presidency of John Fitzgerald Kennedy the Joint Chiefs of Staff developed a secretive plan for a "plane-swap" type of military operation, known as Operation Northwoods. One part of the plan called for "swapping out" a U.S. airliner with a substitute aircraft which would be secretly "swapped in" to replace the original flight.

The substitute aircraft was to be deliberately crashed, or shot down, and the crash subsequently blamed on the Cuban leader Fidel Castro, thus creating a pretext for a U.S. Military invasion of Cuba. In order for such a scenario to succeed, a trusted and cooperative agent of the U.S. Military would have had to pilot the original "swapped out" airliner to an undisclosed and secure airport, where its passengers would safely debark.

Another part of Operation Northwoods called for the bombing of U.S. cities, causing the deaths of many U.S. citizens, all of which would also be blamed on Cuba.

As we know, President Kennedy not only refused to endorse Operation Northwoods, he fired or replaced all of the military men who had proposed it. Yet, the very existence of such a plan shows that the U.S. Military has the history, capability and heartlessness to stage a phony terrorist attack involving the cold-blooded murder of innocent U.S. citizens for the purpose of "justifying" a military attack on another country.

## **Was the Air vehicle that approached the Pentagon on 9/11 a military vehicle?**

As we know, the air vehicle that approached the Pentagon on 9/11 completed a 330-degree descending turn over Alexandria, Virginia, en route to the Pentagon.

According to a September 21, 2001 CBS report, the vehicle was flying at an altitude of 7,000 feet when it started its final descent. The same CBS report stated that this altitude was based on radar data. But how can this be, since, as noted, the air vehicle did NOT have a working civilian transponder [FAA transponder], at the time, which is necessary to transmit altitude information?

By this point, as noted, the aircraft was visible to the FAA solely via Primary Radar, which does NOT transmit altitude information. Therefore, the CBS report is suspicious. At issue is the actual source of the air vehicle's reported altitude of 7,000-feet?

25.

Military air vehicles are always equipped with a Military IFF [Identification-Friend or Foe] transponder, which enables them to be "seen" by Military long and short range radar systems. However, IFF transponders are NOT seen by FAA radar systems.

Therefore, it is possible that a military IFF transponder was the original source for the 7,000-foot altitude data reported for the air vehicle that approached the Pentagon.

Assuming the air vehicle was in fact a U.S. military plane, its Military IFF transponder would have established the target as a "friendly," resulting in an automatic stand-down or deactivation of the ground-to-air defense system protecting parts or all of WDC, including the Pentagon's missile defense system. Such a stand-down would have occurred with no change in military orders.

A civilian airliner, however, equipped only with an FAA transponder, whether active or inactive, would NOT have

automatically disarmed these same defenses. If such a plane's FAA transponder had been turned off, or was not working for some reason, only a SPECIFIC CHANGE in orders, i.e., a stand-down order, would have prevented the activation of Washington's air defenses against the unidentified intruder which, under the circumstances, would have been assumed to be hostile.

According to testimony to the 9/11 Commission by then-Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta, such a special order was in effect on the morning of 9/11/2001. In his testimony Mineta explained to the commission that he was present with Vice President Cheney in the PEOC [the Presidential Emergency Operational Center ] located under the White House during the 9/11 attack, and heard Cheney reassert the active status of what may have been just such a stand-down order. This suggests that the unidentified primary target may have been a civilian air vehicle, after all [later presumed to be AA77].

Here, however, a qualifier is needed: IF the unidentified primary target was in fact a U.S. Military plane, and IF it were deemed necessary to conceal or obscure this fact, it would have been necessary to issue a public a stand-down order for the devious purpose of steering the nation into thinking that the unidentified target was indeed a civilian air vehicle, i.e., AA77.

26.

**THE Geographic Location where the UNIDENTIFIED PRIMARY TARGET was first seen suggests the aircraft was NOT AA77...**

Analysis of the 9/11 RADES radar data shows that the high-speed eastbound UNKNOWN and UNIDENTIFIED PRIMARY radar target which later approached the Pentagon first appeared on radar over central West Virginia, at a point approximately 150-nautical miles [NM] west of the PLA [the Plains], Virginia radar site. The Plains radar site itself is located about 12 NM west of Dulles International Airport [IAD].

This is what one would expect if the aircraft had been flying at an altitude of 7000-9000 feet.

Similarly, an eastbound target flying between 7,000-9,000 feet anywhere west of this 150 NM point would NOT be "seen" by the PLA radar site because it would be BELOW the floor of the PLA radar site coverage for that region.

However, the FDR data [allegedly from AA77] indicates that AA77 flew at an altitude in excess of 20,000 feet during this portion of its flight over West Virginia [between 200 NM and 150 NM west of the PLA radar site]. This is well above the floor of primary radar coverage not only at 150 NM west of the PLA radar site, but even further west of this point, indeed, all the way to the maximum range of the PLA radar site at 200 NM.

For this reason, AA77 SHOULD have been "seen" by the PLA radar site as it flew over West Virginia, even when AA77 was far to the west of this point. How then, do we explain the fact that the PLA radar site did NOT "see" a primary radar target west of this point?

This suggests that one of the data sources may be incorrect. Another possible explanation is that the primary target was NOT AA77. As noted, if AA77 had flown at the altitude allegedly recorded by its FDR the PLA radar site would easily have "seen" the plane as a primary target during this portion of its flight.

This set of facts is precisely what one would expect if a plane swap had occurred over West Virginia, which would likely have involved a "swapped in" air vehicle flying at lower altitudes. This might explain why the unidentified eastbound target over central West Virginia was NOT seen on 9/11 until it reached a location 150 NM point west of the PLA radar site. Before that point the swapped aircraft would have been too low to be visible on radar.

## **The FDR location data and Long Range Radar location data are too similar for this to be mere coincidence**

Despite early reports that AA77 was lost to radar on 9/11/2001 after its FAA transponder ceased to transmit at 8:56 AM [or soon thereafter], it was later discovered that several Long Range Radar [LRR] towers, including one at Bedford, Virginia, actually did maintain primary radar coverage of AA77 during this portion of its flight; even though the ATC's at the Indianapolis ARTCC which was responsible for this region, never saw this same data on their radar screens.

There is a suspiciously close match between the positional data from the FDR allegedly from AA77 and the Bedford radar returns. Comparison of the data from both shows a positional match within 400 feet, which, in my opinion, is too close to be bona fide. In the real universe, near-duplicate geographical locations in matched time from two completely different sources are not possible due to width and distance inaccuracies of the sweeping radar beams, and also because of the fact that the sweeps of LRR towers are 12-seconds long.

The fact that the Bedford radar returns match the FDR data [allegedly from AA77] to within 400 feet at a distance of over 100 NM from the Bedford radar site exceeds the level of accuracy that is possible from a LRR site.

I suspect that one of these two sources establishing the "geographical locations in time", i.e., the FDR or the Bedford radar site data, was used to fabricate the other. However, it is also possible that BOTH were fabricated from some other third source.

All of which suggests that one or both of these sources, the FDR and/or the RADES radar data, was hacked, manipulated or in some way compromised to tell a false story: that the eastbound high-speed primary target which "popped up" over central West

Virginia and that eventually flew into [or over] the Pentagon was AA77.

If I am correct, this but is another example of the systemic cover-up of the truthful actions and activities by the U.S. Military and NORAD-NEADS on 9/11/2001; a deception that was possibly carried out by the U.S. Military's 84th RADES Squadron or group.

### **IN CONCLUSION:**

It is my opinion based upon my training, knowledge, real world experiences, and my understanding of how the ATC system, radar systems, RDP [Radar Data Processing] systems, and the National Air Defense System all work together, that:

The National Air Defense Systems, including the Air Defensive systems used to protect the United States of America, WDC and the Pentagon, were deliberately and knowingly compromised on or before 9/11/2001 by...

1. scheduling overlapping War Games Exercises on or around 9/11/2001, some of which included hijack simulations.
2. pre-installing and establishing hijack mind-sets and thought processes throughout the NORAD system. One possible example: the use of phony radio transmissions which sounded like Middle Eastern men talking and passing instructions in Arabic.
3. inserting a 24-second delay in the transfer of radar data from the main NORAD radar sites to the NEADS radar facility, and exploiting this delay to render the target AA11 invisible to NEADS radar techs while AA11 was in the vicinity of Albany, New York; all for the purpose of delay.
4. delaying the decision to launch interceptor aircraft from the "hot" or "ready" bases where the interceptor aircraft were deployed. Delay was essential because such scrambles were

routine. During the previous ten-years NORAD interceptors had been scrambled about 150 times per year.

5. failing to send the Langley fighters directly to WDC, which ensured that these fighters would not be on hand to intercept an unknown primary target approaching WDC from the west.

6. Vice President Richard Cheney's ordering of a continuation of the stand-down of the Pentagon's Air Defense Systems, as reported by Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta in his testimony before the 9/11 Commission; and

7. possibly swapping a Military air vehicle in place of AA77 over central West Virginia.

I also believe that the 84<sup>th</sup> RADES Squadron radar data for AA77, and possibly other radar data from 9/11, may have been altered, scrubbed or otherwise manipulated to hide what really happened, or to otherwise obscure or distort the truth.

For all of these reasons, I believe that the flight and operation of AA77 on 9/11/2001 did not happen as it has been presented to us by the Pentagon, the 9/11 Commission, and the various intelligence agencies. In my opinion, the data from AA77's alleged FDR is suspect.

It has never been shown that the primary target which appeared over central West Virginia some 150 NM west of the PLA radar site was actually AA77.

Nor has it ever been shown that the primary target seen by Danielle O'Brien at Dulles Tower-Potomac Approach was actually AA77.

Nor has it ever been shown that the air vehicle which approached, allegedly struck, or over-flew, the Pentagon was actually AA77.

From the moment that AA77 was lost to RADAR CONTACT on 9/11, its identity was never subsequently re-established. The target aircraft which subsequently appeared on radar over West Virginia was never shown to be AA77, neither by radio contact with its pilot [there was none], nor by transponder radar data [its civilian transponder remained "off"], nor by visual means, nor by anyone in the FAA Air Traffic Control (ATC) system. To this day, there is no proof that the primary target which approached the Pentagon was AA77.

It is possible that the real flight AA77, piloted by Chic Burlingame, was secretly diverted to an unknown airport or Military facility, and that the swap went undetected by RADES/FAA radar

Perpetrators could have concealed such a swap within the radar black hole that is known to have existed over the eastern portion of Ohio on 9/11/2001, and which may have been created for this purpose.

During the considerable chaos on 9/11/2001, while the FAA attempted to land thousands of aircraft across the entirety of United States air space, many commercial airliners were diverted from their scheduled flight paths. AA77 could similarly have been diverted to any number of undisclosed airports or Military airbases.

The eight-minute time period while AA77 was lost to positive radar contact, during which the PLA radar site recorded NO PRIMARY RADAR RETURNS for any air vehicle between 200 NM and 150 NM west of the PLA radar site, comprised sufficient time in which to stage a plane swap.

The U.S. Military is known to operate a fleet of Boeing 757s, which it uses for transport purposes. Therefore, a plane swap is entirely possible. The rugged mountain topography of West Virginia---it is a region of ridges and valleys---is also eminently suitable for such a swap.

Such a swap of AA77 could have been modeled after the aircraft swap-in/swap-out plan originally proposed by U.S. Military leaders in Operation Northwoods.

Finally, based on all of the above, it is my opinion that former VP Richard Cheney, former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and former Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Richard Myers, among others, were involved in the secret planning and execution of the attacks of September 11, 2001; and continue to be engaged in the subsequent and ongoing cover-up of the top-secret 9/11 attack scenario, including the cover-up of the cover-up.

I fully and knowingly state that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Robin Dirk Hordon