Why I have an issue with Ted's phone call research
by David Chandler

This is a response to two "documents" produced by Ted:

1. Primarily Ted's talk at the *Aviation Impossibilities* conference:
   "The 9/11 Hijacking Myth Exposed" https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QRJnAu0tq8w
2. To a lesser extent, Ted's paper (or draft?):
   "UA 93 Phone Call Narrative Analysis_v2.docx" (Working from a pdf file. I don't know if it is posted anywhere.)

Ted sets out his goal in the title frame of his ppt talk to "Refute" the hijacker story. It is not clear initially whether he merely rejects foreign hijackers as the mechanism for navigating and crashing the planes into their targets, or whether he rejects the plane crashes entirely. He mostly appears to believe the planes were involved but electronically controlled, but at one point in the talk he seems to raise a question of whether Flight 93 crashed at all and he has in other contexts said he was on the fence about whether Flight 77 crashed into the Pentagon. If Flight 77 did not crash into the Pentagon, the question of electronic control is moot.

Ted's paper "UA 93 Phone Call Narrative Analysis_v2.docx" seems to rely heavily on the work of Elias Davidson in *Hijacking America's Mind on 9/11: Counterfeiting Evidence*. Note that the subtitle of Davidson's book (*Counterfeiting Evidence*) explicitly promotes the premise of faked evidence. Davidson in turn praises the work of the anonymous blogger *KillTown* who was well known in the early days for promoting theories of no planes at the World Trade Center and the supposed use of real time TV fakery.

As I pointed out in my talk at Turning the Tide 2025, discounting evidence presents a logical problem. Once you start discounting inconvenient evidence, how do you verify your own alternate hypotheses. Claims of fake evidence require more than plausibility arguments (i.e. such and such could have been faked). It requires actual evidence of the fakery.

Getting to the phone call evidence and Ted's "The 9/11 Hijacking Myth Exposed" talk...

I believe it is important to start with the audio recordings because the messages of the phone calls involve the emotional state as well as verbally transmitted information. I looked up a YouTube with three of the recorded phone calls from Flight 93. These appear to be from the Flight 93 National Memorial. Listen to them here:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OdDYMIKIElI

The recordings seem authentic to me, they seemed authentic to the family members and other call recipients, and judging by comments under the YouTube recordings, they overwhelmingly seem authentic to the public at large. Of particular note is they seem authentic to Sen. Ron Johnson who found them to be one of the most moving experiences at the Flight 93 National Memorial. The emotional state, and the ability of the callers to control their emotional state, varies. This is to be expected given the different personalities and different family situations. If the tone or content "sound fake" to you, that is not "evidence." It is completely subjective. I don't believe there is any way you or anyone else can put yourself into the state of mind of the passengers and judge what they would or would not prioritize to say to their loved ones in what they likely feared would be a final

communication in the face of imminent death. Expressions of love and, for some, religious faith, dominated their thoughts, in most cases, above rational descriptions of events on the plane. Subjective suspicions might be adequate to motivate you to search elsewhere for real evidence, but the tone or content of the recordings, compared with what you "think" they "should have said" or how they would have said it, is not evidence. How can any of us project ourselves into the existential crisis these people were facing?

Plus, you have to ask what a "propaganda" version phone call would be like. Such phone calls would most likely agree with each other in their details and convey the information the "official story" would be trying to convey. The real calls are personal and relate to each caller and their family situation in different, and sometimes non-obvious ways. Who knows, for example, how many men named Mark are in the Bingham circle of family and friends? That phone call was certainly not written by a script writer. The call may sound strange to our ears, but it did not cause the mother to questioning its authenticity.

More:

Betty Ong on Flight 11:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=COF0ErhsRDo

Brian David Sweeney on Flight 175:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gulhkfAjTko (ignore the annoying music)

Betty Ong functioned well in her professional capacity and actually did provide a fair amount of factual, reportorial information. She didn't have the precedent of hearing about prior hijackings going into buildings, such as the Flight 93 callers did. She identified her flight as flight 11, reported on conditions near the front of the plane, including the fact that the air near the front of the plane was filled with mace so no one could get to the cockpit, reported on several people who were stabbed and interacted with other crew members during the call.

Brian Sweeney's comment was focused on love and comforting his wife. I take Brian's comment, "I'll see you when you get there," to be a profound statement of religious faith, referring to the afterlife, which may also account for his calmness and apparent acceptance of his imminent death. This interpretation is validated by Julie Sweeney's comments on her husband's character as well.

Lisa Jefferson, recipient of call from Todd Beamer:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5EzyRNGQe08

Lisa's account of Todd's call doesn't sound like acting to me. Todd gave factual details, such as knives, stabbings, and what was presumed to be a bomb, and relayed plans to storm the cockpit, but also turned to messages about love to his family, and religious faith asking Lisa, who was a stranger to him, to pray with him. Bonding with a complete stranger in that kind of situation is strong testimony to his authentic emotional state.

People talk about how calm the callers were, but listening to the calls, I see variety. I see people struggling to master their emotions, each in their own way, trying to stay in control of their composure

in their situation. Put a bunch of people in a stressful, life threatening situation with no hope of help coming from the outside world and how could you presume to predict their priorities on phone calls?

For instance, Ted quotes a section of Tom Burnett's call as remembered by his wife:

…
Deena: "Where are you?" Are you in the air?
Tom: *Yes, yes, just listen*. Our airplane has been hijacked. It's United Flight 93, from Newark to San Francisco. We are in the air. The hijackers have already knifed a guy, one of them has a gun, they are telling us there is a bomb on board, please call the authorities.

Tom may have been speaking softly, but his comment, "Yes, yes, just listen…." communicates a definite impression of urgency and stress. Quiet and calm are not the same thing and we shouldn't project our assumptions into this kind of unusually threatening situation.

Ted focuses on the presumption that the passengers in the front part of the plane understood what was happening in the cockpit. According to the diagram of the plane, there is a hallway leading to the cockpit door. How the narrowness of the passage, the possible presence of a curtain, and possible closure of the door would shield them from the events of the takeover we cannot tell for sure. We cannot assume the passengers knew the pilots were killed. They might have imagined they were simply being threatened at knifepoint or gunpoint. The plane was still flying, after all. How could they know one of the hijackers had training as a pilot? I can easily see how a person being stabbed in your immediate presence might make a larger impression than something unknown happening in a separate compartment.

Family members who listened to the CVR recording from Flight 93 do not show any sign of suspicion of its authenticity. The sounds they report in the background are consistent with the content of the phone calls.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wv1HPrKtdYI

Transcript:
https://www.nps.gov/flni/learn/historyculture/upload/Cockpit_Voice_Recorder_Transcript_from_Flight_93_508-3.pdf

Yes, it would be better to have access to the entire CVR recording, (FOIA??) but given that the family members who heard the CVR recording directly did not question the validity or accuracy of the transcript, we have no rational basis to assert tampering.

My early response to Ted about theories of faked phone calls was that this has always been part of larger theories of no planes or plane swaps. For anyone who asserts that Flight 77 did not hit the Pentagon or Flight 93 did not crash in Shanksville, the phone calls are inconvenient counter-evidence that need to be discredited. Ted assured me this was not where he was going with it, but from what I see here, I'm not so sure. From "The 9/11 Hijacking Myth Exposed," starting at about 1:31:23 we have:

"Todd Beamer's call to GTE at 9:43, so a few mi... this is also a call that lasted until around 9:58 or 10:00 o'clock. It was also a call that actually went for another hour and 5 minutes because they didn't hang up on on the GTE side … at, or they didn't hang up on … well, yeah, it went longer than you

would expect it to if the plane had crashed, but we're not getting into that right now. We're just focusing on what was reported."

As I parse this, Ted starts to explain the extended connect time of the call very plausibly, as one side of the connection not hanging up, but catches himself and reinterprets the incident by raising the question of whether the plane actually crashed, but then again backs away from "getting into that," and claiming to just focus on what was reported. Yes, he was stumbling around verbally at this point, but in so doing, Freudian slip or not, he planted a suggestion implying the plane may not have crashed, which harkens back to the no plane or plane swap theories.

If the phone calls were faked, what does that imply? It goes far beyond the question of whether there were hijackers on board, or whether they actually took over the planes. It would require highly orchestrated and risky acting that would pass undetected by the family members, or alternatively require the family members to be in on the plot. Also, what would be the motive to go to this effort? It feels like asserting false phone calls is a back door way of suggesting that the flights did not occur. Either there was a plane swap or the planes were diverted and something else hit the targets. Fake phone calls don't fit with any other theories. This line of reasoning flies in the face of all of the physical evidence at the crash sites, the eyewitness evidence, the DNA evidence, the FDR and radar evidence, and in the case of Flight 93 the CVR evidence. *There were people who made those calls.* They were either on the planes and died at the crash sites or they were elsewhere and were murdered in some other horrendous way. We have no evidence to support any of the alternative scenarios.

How does the 9/11 Truth Movement gain anything from concocting inherently speculative scenarios layered on top of the solid evidence-based research we have compiled over the years? This is not a question of physical evidence vs. other kinds of evidence. It is a question of solid evidence vs. subjectivity and speculation. Ted's talk comes across to me as a sales pitch to ask the public to hear the phone calls the same way he does and thereby share his skepticism. What is the response if the public doesn't buy it? I don't buy it! Where is the rational argument that would show I am wrong or logically compel me to change my mind?

Ted makes the assertion that the phone calls are the only evidence for there being hijackers. But this is not true. The "May Day" calls sound visceral and completely authentic to me! I can't see any reason to question their authenticity. Ted seems to think yelling "Mayday!," and repeating it without providing other information, is odd. Would it be "odd" for a swimmer to yell "Help!" repeatedly? Critiquing the yell, even when there is clear panic in the voice, is what I find to be very odd. But oddness is not an argument. It is a completely subjective judgment that is not persuasive to anyone who does not already share that perception.

Other evidence of hijackers are the ATC calls, the hot mic moments with announcements to the passengers going mistakenly to the control tower, the CVR recording from Flight 93 that was played to the families, with a transcript for the rest of us, the video evidence of the Flight 77 hijackers going through security at Dulles, the DNA evidence of hijackers in the Pentagon, and the erratic maneuvers of the plane captured in the FDR that correlate with the reports of a passenger revolt. On this last point, the FDR data from Flight 93 shows the extreme roll and pitch maneuvers at the end of the flight that coordinate with other sources of data that together validate the reality of the hijacker response to the passenger revolt and corroborates the CVR data recording of the passenger revolt. The front-to-back changes in weight distribution on the airplane is captured in the FDR data through the automatic compensation of the horizontal stabilizers. The horizontal stabilizer field in the FDR shows a shift of weight to the back of the plane shortly after cockpit takeover, when passengers are moved to the back,

and a shift of weight to the front during the passenger revolt. (See Wayne's talk for Colorado 9/11 Truth at https://colorado911truth.org/2025/08/video-wayne-coste-on-the-manual-control-of-the-9-11-planes/40:52). BTW, how would the extreme roll and pitch maneuvers followed by inverting the plane and plunging into the ground be accounted for in the case of computer navigation without the human element of hijackers? The only way I see forward with these claims is to dismiss the FDR entirely as fake. That's a common unsupported assertion, but the internal evidence in the FDR is consistent with all the other evidence. The faked phone call/no hijacker hypothesis is swimming upstream against multiple lines of evidence.

There were literally tons of crash debris evidence for Flight 93, including both engines, one in the hole, one in the immediate vicinity, the CVR, the FDR, (both readable), other debris in the nearby trees, with only tiny fragments that could be carried by the wind scattered widely. Ken Jenkins points out that the widely scattered debris found a mile or more away was light weight material found down wind, not along the path of the flight prior to impact. The evidence that the plane was not hit by a missile includes the fact that the FDR recorded data all the way down to the moment of crash. Warren Stutt has pointed out that if the plane had been physically disrupted by a missile, the FDR would have failed to record data during the descent.

For me the fact that the FDR recorded the point of crash, with no missile disruption, together with the voluminous crash debris recovered, together with the erratic movements of the plane aligned with the passenger revolt recorded on the CVR and phone calls, together with the unanimous highly credible independent and highly personalized testimony of the callers that there were hijackers on board, together with one passenger who announced the onset of the revolt on a call, together with radio transmissions recording voices and struggle on the plane, together with evidence of hijackers on the other flights, including DNA at the Pentagon, all paint a consistent picture of actual hijackers on the flights. Furthermore, the fact that the FDR units show continuity of flights 77 and 93, from airport to crash site, shows that there were no plane swaps. The bottom line is the suspicion that the phone calls were faked is a rabbit hole that is pointless to enter.

But here we are.

One last comment:

While I was researching this response I was in contact with Simon Faulkner. He called my attention to a post on X that I had not seen before, since I am not very active on X. Here is the post: https://x.com/ic911justice/ The first line of the post is, "3 simple facts prove the story of Flight 93 is a fraud:", and a concluding link is to the *Aviation Impossibilities* conference video. The posting comes from @ic911justice with no individual author specified.

IC911 operates by consensus. The assertion that Flight 93 is a fraud has not been approved by the board and it does not speak for me. This post violates that agreement, and that is unacceptable. This needs to be discussed by the board.