

The Wayback Machine - <https://web.archive.org/web/20020204081521/http://e...>

URL for this article: <http://emperors-clothes.com/indict/indict-2.htm>

Alternative address is <http://emperor.vwh.net/indict/indict-2.htm>

Join our email list at <http://emperors-clothes.com/f.htm>. Receive about one article/day.

Click [here](#) to email the link to this article to a friend. We encourage readers to reprint and re-post any Emperor's Clothes article. Please include the article's Web address.

[www.tenc.net](http://www.tenc.net)

[Emperor's Clothes]

=====

# MR. CHENEY'S COVER STORY

Section 2 of 'GUILTY FOR 9-11: BUSH,  
RUMSFELD, MYERS'

by Illarion Bykov and Jared Israel

[Posted 20 November 2001]

[Updated 21 November 2001]

Dedicated to the firefighters of New York.

=====

In [Section 1](#) we demonstrated that Andrews Air Force base, [10 miles](#) from the Pentagon, had combat-ready fighter squadrons on September 11th. Why didn't jets scramble from Andrews until after the Pentagon was hit?

(To read Part 1, Section 1, go to:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/indict/indict-1.htm> )

## LIE # 2: PRESIDENTIAL

# AUTHORIZATION WAS NEEDED TO SCRAMBLE JETS TO INTERCEPT FLIGHT 77

On Sunday, September 16th, Vice-President Richard Cheney was interviewed on NBC TV's 'MEET THE PRESS.' During that interview he created the impression that the military would have needed presidential authorization to scramble fighter jets to intercept American Airlines Flight 77 before it hit the Pentagon.

Mr. Cheney did not present this lie in a straightforward manner.

Instead he did two things. First, he avoided discussing the failure to intercept Flight 77. Instead he talked only about the choices Mr. Bush supposedly made after the Pentagon was hit.

Second, he took it for granted that presidential approval was required to intercept a commercial jet, as if this were an accepted fact. Then based on this false foundation, he emitted a fog of emotional misinformation to confuse the millions of Americans who wanted to know: why didn't jet fighters scramble to intercept Flight 77 before it crashed into the Pentagon? Doesn't the U.S. have radar and an Air Force anymore?

It is common for officials attempting to cover-up a capital crime to put the blame on a subordinate. However Mr. Cheney used a different approach on 'MEET THE PRESS.' Relying on his skills in public deception, Cheney tried to create the impression that nothing improper had occurred, that faced with horrendous choices a brave President had done the right thing.

But as soon as one sees through this verbiage, one realizes Mr. Cheney has actually placed the responsibility for the failure to intercept American Flight 77 on George W. Bush.

Here is the relevant excerpt from 'MEET THE PRESS':

"MR. RUSSERT: What's the most important decision you think he made during the course of the day?

"VICE PRES. CHENEY: Well, the--I suppose the

toughest decision was this question of whether or not we would intercept incoming commercial aircraft.

"MR. RUSSERT: And you decided?

"VICE PRES. CHENEY: We decided to do it. We'd, in effect, put a flying combat air patrol up over the city; F-16s with an AWACS, which is an airborne radar system, and tanker support so they could stay up a long time...

"It doesn't do any good to put up a combat air patrol if you don't give them instructions to act, if, in fact, they feel it's appropriate.

"MR. RUSSERT: So if the United States government became aware that a hijacked commercial airline[r] was destined for the White House or the Capitol, we would take the plane down?

"VICE PRES. CHENEY: Yes. The president made the decision...that if the plane would not divert...as a last resort, our pilots were authorized to take them out. Now, people say, you know, that's a horrendous decision to make. Well, it is. You've got an airplane full of American citizens, civilians, captured by...terrorists, headed and are you going to, in fact, shoot it down, obviously, and kill all those Americans on board?

"...It's a presidential-level decision, and the president made, I think, exactly the right call in this case, to say, "I wished we'd had combat air patrol up over New York."

--NBC, '[Meet the Press](#)' 16 September 2001 **(1)**

\* \* \*

Note that Mr. Cheney has performed a sleight of hand here.

First he says, "the toughest decision was...whether we would intercept incoming commercial aircraft."

Later he says, "The president made the decision... that if the plane would not divert as a last resort, our pilots were authorized to take them out..." that is, "shoot it down."

But "intercept": and "shoot it down" do not mean the same thing.

## "in·ter·cept

- "in·ter·cept (*in' ter-sèpt*) *verb, transitive*  
in·ter·cept·ed, in·ter·cept·ing, in·ter·cepts

"1. a. To stop, deflect, or interrupt the progress or intended course of"  
--'[American Heritage Dictionary](#)'

## "shoot·down

- "shoot·down (*sh;t'doun'*) *noun*

"Destruction of a flying aircraft by a missile attack or gunfire."  
--'[American Heritage Dictionary](#)'

Mr. Cheney deliberately confused these terms to stop people from asking: why weren't any of the hijacked planes intercepted?

Since "stopping, deflecting, or interrupting the progress or intended course of" a hijacked airplane does not necessarily involve violence, there could be no moral obstacle to scrambling fighter jets to intercept Flight 77. Therefore Mr. Cheney shifted quickly to the morally charged question of whether to shoot down "an airplane full of American citizens". By creating this emotional link between interception (not necessarily violent) and shooting down a commercial jet (very violent), Cheney hoped to create sympathy for a President forced to make this "horrendous" choice: to intercept or not to intercept.

Note that Cheney is speaking only of the period after Flight 77 hit the Pentagon. By confusing the issues of "intercepting" vs. "shooting down" AFTER the Pentagon was hit, Cheney was trying to get his listeners to forget the real issue: that nothing had been done BEFORE the Pentagon was hit.

Mr. Cheney attempted to hide the jump from "intercept" to "shoot down" by means of the following connecting sentence:

"It doesn't do any good to put up a combat air patrol if you don't give them instructions to act, if, in fact,

they feel it's appropriate."

This is disinformation. Mr. Cheney was treating his viewers like fools.

First, as anyone with a computer and basic knowledge of the Internet can find out, Air Traffic Controllers request military jets to intercept commercial aircraft on a routine basis. Sometimes the purpose is to tell a commercial pilot that his plane has gone off course; other times the interceptor goes up in order to observe the situation directly - for instance, to see who is flying the plane. None of this requires presidential approval.

Second, military interceptors (or 'escorts') already have clear "instructions to act." These instructions can be read online in detailed manuals from the FAA and the Department of Defense. The instructions cover everything from minor emergencies to hijackings. If a problem is serious, high-ranking military officers from the National Military Command Center (NMCC) in the Pentagon can take charge.

Let us consider the procedures used in intercepting commercial aircraft.

An Air Traffic Controller (ATC) may request military jets to intercept (or 'escort') a commercial aircraft in response to any serious problem which the Air Traffic Controller cannot solve through radio contact. Perhaps the most common problem is that a commercial jet has deviated from its authorized flight path.

Every commercial jet is required to follow IFR, or Instrument Flight Rules. IFR requires pilots to file a flight plan with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) before takeoff.

(FAA Order 7400.2E [14-1-2](#)) **(2)**

"Commercial flights fly according to predefined flight plans. These flight plans are intended to provide quick routes that take advantage of favorable winds while avoiding the routes traveled by other aircraft. The usual flight plan is a series of three connected routes: a standard instrument departure (SID) route, an en route path, and a standard instrument arrival (STAR). Each route consists of a sequence of geographic points, or fixes, which, when connected,

form a trajectory from the point of departure to the point of arrival."

--'[Direct-To Requirements](#)' by G. Dennis & E. Torlak

**(3)**

If a plane deviates from its flight plan, for example if it makes the wrong turn at one of its 'fixes,' an Air Traffic Controller (ATC) contacts the pilot. If the ATC cannot make contact, he or she will request an escort - that is, a military jet - to scramble and check out the situation. This is called 'interception.'

As you can see, interception is not necessarily an aggressive act. Usually it is requested because routine communication has become impossible.

For example, when the Lear jet chartered by Payne Stewart, the famous golf pro, went off course, and the pilot did not respond by radio, the FAA immediately contacted the military:

"Several Air Force and Air National Guard fighter jets, plus an AWACS radar control plane, helped the Federal Aviation Administration track the runaway Learjet and estimate when it would run out of fuel."

--'[CNN](#),' 26 October 1999 **(4)**

The FAA online manual describes how an escort (i.e., a fighter jet) might communicate with a commercial airliner which fails to respond to radio contact. The FAA has a chart entitled:

#### **"INTERCEPTING SIGNALS**

**"Signals initiated by intercepting aircraft and responses by intercepted aircraft."**

According to the chart, which is [available on-line](#), if a commercial jet is intercepted in daytime, the escort fighter jet may communicate by:

"...Rocking wings from a position slightly above and ahead of, and normally to the left of, the intercepted aircraft..."

This conveys the message, "You have been intercepted." The commercial jet should respond by rocking its wings, indicating it will comply.

The escort then makes a

"slow level turn, normally to the left, on to the desired heading [direction]."

The commercial jet is supposed to respond by following the escort.

(FAA 'AIM' [5-6-4](#)) **(5)**

When a commercial jet deviates from its approved flight path, it creates a potentially deadly hazard: it could collide with another jet. It is therefore reassuring that the FAA has an exacting standard for what constitutes an emergency:

"Consider that an aircraft emergency exists ... when:  
...There is unexpected loss of radar contact and radio communications with any ...aircraft."

--FAA Order 7110.65M [10-2-5](#) **(6)**

And:

"EMERGENCY DETERMINATIONS

"If ... you are in doubt that a situation constitutes an emergency or potential emergency, handle it as though it were an emergency."

--FAA Order 7110.65M [10-1-1-c](#) **(7)**

A high-ranking FAA official - called an Air Defense Liaison Officer ([ADLO](#)) - is stationed in the headquarters of NORAD, the North American Aerospace Defense Command. The purpose: to help the FAA and the military work together to handle emergencies as quickly as possible. **(8)** Escorts are usually scrambled from NORAD bases, such as the Otis Air Force Base on Cape Cod, Massachusetts, or the air base at Langley, Virginia. But not always:

"Normally, NORAD escort aircraft will take the required action. However, for the purpose of these procedures, the term "escort aircraft" applies to any military aircraft assigned to the escort mission. "

--FAA Order 7610.4J [7-1-2](#) **(9)**

Thus when Payne Stewart's Lear jet went off course:

"First, a fighter jet from Tyndall, Fla., was diverted from a routine training flight to check out the Learjet.

Two F-16s from another Florida base then picked up the chase, later handing it over to two Air National Guard F-16s from Oklahoma, which handed it over to two F-16s from Fargo, North Dakota."

--'[ABC News](#),' 25 October 1999 **(10)**

During a serious emergency, or if there is any possibility that a hijacking has occurred:

"The escort service will be requested by the FAA hijack coordinator by direct contact with the National Military Command Center (NMCC)."

--FAA Order 7610.4J [7-1-2](#) **(9)**

A Defense Department manual makes the same point:

"In the event of a hijacking, the NMCC will be notified by the most expeditious means by the FAA. The NMCC will, with the exception of immediate responses,...forward requests for DOD [Department of Defense] assistance to the Secretary of Defense for approval."

--CJCSI [3610.01A](#), 1 June 2001 **(11)**

Located in the Pentagon, the NMCC can tap into radar stations and thus monitor dangerous emergencies and hijackings. For example, during the Payne Stewart incident:

"...officers on the Joint Chiefs were monitoring the Learjet on radar screens inside the Pentagon's National Military Command Center."

--'[CNN](#),' 26 October 1999 **(4)**

When dealing with potentially hostile situations, escorts can adopt more aggressive behavior:

## "Small Private Plane Ordered to Land in Vicinity of Bush Ranch

"A small private plane flying unauthorized in the vicinity of President Bush's ranch near Crawford was ordered by the military to land Thursday, a sheriff's deputy said...."

"The Federal Aviation Administration declared that

the plane was unauthorized and ordered its occupants detained, Plemons said. At that point military officials, flying in two jets beside the plane, got on the pilot's radio frequency and ordered the Cessna to land...

"The plane landed on a private landing strip near State Highway 6, about eight miles from the Bush ranch near Crawford....

"In [a second incident, in] Wood County, Sheriff's senior Dispatcher Rodney Mize said a private plane was forced down by two military pilots in A-10 Warthog jets about 11:30 a.m. The jets flew one above and one below until the private plane's pilot landed at Wisener Field near Mineola."

--'[AP](#),' 13 September 2001 **(12)**

The 'Boston Globe' reported that:

"[Marine Corps Major Mike] Snyder, the NORAD spokesman, said its fighters routinely intercept aircraft.

"When planes are intercepted, they typically are handled with a graduated response. The approaching fighter may rock its wingtips to attract the pilot's attention, or make a pass in front of the aircraft. Eventually, it can fire tracer rounds in the airplane's path, or, under certain circumstances, down it with a missile."

--'[Boston Globe](#),' 15 September 2001 **(13)**

Now, let us return to Mr. Cheney and his interview on 'MEET THE PRESS.'

As you will recall, he said:

"It doesn't do any good to put up a combat air patrol if you don't give them instructions to act, if, in fact, they feel it's appropriate."

Mr. Cheney is attempting to misinform by pretending that intercept pilots need 'instructions' from the President, when he knows perfectly well that clear instructions and a whole organizational network exist to handle intercept emergencies.

Moreover, Mr. Cheney's implicit argument - that there is no point in sending up an escort unless the pilot has clearance to shoot down a commercial jet - is absurd. Why would such a decision have to be made in advance of scrambling the escort? Even if an airliner has been taken over by a terrorist with a suicide mission, how could Mr. Cheney, Mr. Bush or anyone else other than God Himself possibly predict how the hijacker would respond to an intercept by military jets? Even if a hijacker were ready to die for the glory of crashing into the Pentagon, does that mean he would also be ready to die for the glory of ignoring a military pilot's order to land?

So even if the military had no authority to shoot down Flight 77, why not send up escorts planes? Isn't that in fact how police and the military routinely handle hijack situations - by mobilizing a potentially overwhelming force in the hope of getting the hijacker to surrender?

Why, as Mr. Cheney claims, would there have been "no point" in trying this tactic in the case of Flight 77? Weren't many human lives at stake? Isn't that "a point"?

## A DEFENSE THAT BACKFIRES

What about the rest of Mr. Cheney's remarks, his contention that only President Bush could authorize the military to actually shoot down a hijacked plane? In all probability this is true. But as we shall see in a later section, this comment, as well as other things Mr. Cheney said on 'MEET THE PRESS,' will prove damning to George W. Bush when he goes on trial for treason.

Summary of evidence is CONTINUED IN  
PART 1, SECTION 3

[Emperor's Clothes Urgently Needs  
Your Help!](#)

[See Below]

## FOOTNOTES:

For a map of Washington showing the distance from Andrews

Air Force base to the Pentagon go to: <http://emperors-clothes.com/indict/andrewsmap.htm>

**(1)** 'NBC, Meet the Press' (10:00 AM ET) Sunday 16 September 2001.

Full transcript at:

<http://stacks.msnbc.com/news/629714.asp?cp1=1>

Backup transcript at:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/nbcmap.htm>

**(2)** Regarding rules governing IFR requirements, see FAA Order 7400.2E 'Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters,' Effective Date: December 7, 2000 (Includes Change 1, effective July 7, 2001), Chapter 14-1-2.

Full text posted at:

<http://www.faa.gov/ATpubs/AIR/air1401.html#14-1-2>

**(3)** For a clear and detailed description of flight plans, fixes, and Air Traffic Control, see: 'Direct-To Requirements' by Gregory Dennis and Emina Torlak at:

<http://sdg.lcs.mit.edu/atc/D2Requirements.htm>

**(4)** 'CNN,' 26 October 1999 "Pentagon never considered downing Stewart's Learjet," Web posted at: 8:27 p.m. EDT (0027 GMT)

Full text posted at:

<http://www.cnn.com/US/9910/26/shootdown/>

Backup at:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/cnnlearjet.htm>

**(5)** FAA 'Aeronautical Information Manual: Official Guide to Basic Flight Information and Air Traffic Control (ATC) Procedures,' (Includes Change 3 Effective: July 12, 2001) Chapter 5-6-4 "Interception Signals"

Full text posted at:

<http://www.faa.gov/ATpubs/AIM/Chap5/aim0506.html#5-6-4>

**(6)** FAA Order 7110.65M 'Air Traffic Control' (Includes Change 3 Effective: July 12, 2001), Chapter 10-2-5 "Emergency Situations"

Full text posted at:

<http://www.faa.gov/ATpubs/ATC/Chp10/atc1002.html#10-2-5>

**(7)** FAA Order 7110.65M 'Air Traffic Control' (Includes Change 3 Effective: July 12, 2001), Chapter 10-1-1 "Emergency Determinations"

Full text posted at:

<http://www.faa.gov/ATpubs/ATC/Chp10/atc1001.html#10-1-1>

**(8)** FAA Order 7610.4J 'Special Military Operations' (Effective Date: November 3, 1998; Includes: Change 1, effective July 3,

2000; Change 2, effective July 12, 2001), Chapter 4, Section 5, "Air Defense Liaison Officers (ADLO's)"

Full text posted at:

<http://www.faa.gov/ATpubs/MIL/Ch4/mil0405.html#Section%205>

**(9)** FAA Order 7610.4J 'Special Military Operations' (Effective Date: November 3, 1998; Includes: Change 1, effective July 3, 2000; Change 2, effective July 12, 2001), Chapter 7, Section 1-2, "Escort of Hijacked Aircraft: Requests for Service"

Full text posted at:

<http://faa.gov/ATpubs/MIL/Ch7/mil0701.html#7-1-2>

**(10)** 'ABCNews,' 25 October 1999 "Runaway Plane Crashes in S.D.; Golfer, at Least Four Others Killed," by Geraldine Sealey

Full text posted at:

<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/us/DailyNews/plane102599.html>

Backup at:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/abclearjet.htm>

**(11)** 'Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3610.01A,' 1 June 2001, "Aircraft Piracy (Hijacking) and Destruction of Derelict Airborne Objects," 4.Policy (page 1)

PDF available at:

[http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/cjcsd/cjcsi/3610\\_01a.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/cjcsd/cjcsi/3610_01a.pdf)

Backup at:

[http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/3610\\_01a.pdf](http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/3610_01a.pdf)

**(12)** 'The Associated Press State & Local Wire' 13 September 2001, Thursday, BC cycle, "Small private plane ordered to land in vicinity of Bush ranch"

Full text posted at:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/bushranch.htm>

**(13)** 'The Boston Globe,' Saturday 15 September 2001 Third Edition Page A1, "Facing Terror Attack's Aftermath: Otis Fighter Jets Scrambled Too Late to Halt The Attacks" by Glen Johnson.

Full text posted at:

<http://emperors-clothes.com/9-11backups/bg915.htm>

=====  
**Emperor's Clothes  
Urgently Needs  
Your Help!**

[This appeal was posted January 2002]

=====  
In order for Emperor's Clothes to continue publishing after January 15th, the deadline for catching up with our rent, we urgently need your help.

Since September 11 our readership has increased more than 600%. We now transfer over 1 gigabyte of data a day. But our income has not kept up with increasing expenses.

We do not charge for articles, and we do not accept advertising. But we do pay bills.

We are not exaggerating to say: in order to continue publishing, we urgently need the help of all our friends.

Please send whatever contributions you can! \$20, \$50, \$100, \$500, \$1000 or more. Every penny will be used to get articles to more people.

- You can make a donation using  at [https://www.paypal.com/xclick/business=emperors1000@aol.com&no\\_shipping=1](https://www.paypal.com/xclick/business=emperors1000@aol.com&no_shipping=1)
- You can make a credit card donation by going to our **secure server** at <http://emperors-clothes.com/howyour.html#donate>
- **Or Mail** a check to Emperor's Clothes, P.O. Box 610-321, Newton, MA 02461-0321. (USA)
- Or make a donation by **phone at the donation line**, (U.S.) 617 916-1705.

Note: If you mail a donation or make one by secure server, please let us know by email at [emperors1000@aol.com](mailto:emperors1000@aol.com) to make sure we receive it.  
Thanks!

Thank you for reading Emperor's Clothes.

[www.emperors-clothes.com](http://www.emperors-clothes.com) or  
[www.tenc.net](http://www.tenc.net)  
[Emperor's Clothes]

This Website is mirrored at <http://emperor.vwh.net/> and at  
<http://globalresistance.com>