

The Untrustworthiness of the 9/11 Commission

What the Khaled A. Shoukry memorandum also said.

In its inquiry into the background of alleged 9/11 hijacker, Mohamed Atta, the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI] interviewed and polygraphed a man who had been identified as an associate of Mohamed al-Amir in Cairo, Egypt during the 1990s. The FBI recorded the details of the interview in a memorandum entitled, Khaled A. Shoukry.

The official story of the September 11, 2001 attacks maintains that Mohamed al-Amir, using the name Mohamed Atta, became the "ringleader" of the operation and piloted Flight AA11 as it crashed into the north tower of the World Trade Center. Although *The 9/11 Commission Report* uses al-Amir's biographical data for Atta's, it does not expressly claim that al-Amir was Atta. Curiously, the report uses the name Atta throughout its text and only in endnote 81 on page 495 does the name, Mohamed Amir, appear:

81. [. . .] On one occasion, German authorities intercepted a call in which such a gathering was mentioned. An individual phoning Zammar's house on February 17, 1999, was told that he was away on a trip to a distant, "bad" region, but that "people" at 54 Marienstrasse knew where he was. The same conversation revealed that these "people" included "Said, **Mohamed Amir**, [and] Omar," **likely a reference to** the apartment's original occupants, Said Bahaji, **Atta**, and Binalshibh. Federal Prosecutor General (Germany), response to Commission letter, June 25, 2004, p. 9. [. . .]

The phrase, "likely a reference to," hardly establishes the identity of al-Amir as Atta to be a fact. Nor is the reader informed of the evidentiary basis for that conclusion.

The sole, brief reference to information from the Khaled A. Shoukry memorandum in *The 9/11 Commission Report* appears on page 161 and reads:

On a visit home to Egypt in 1998, Atta met one of his college friends. According to this friend, **Atta** had changed a great deal, had grown a beard, and **had "obviously adopted fundamentalism"** by that time.

The source for this passage is given in endnote 66, on page 494:

66. [. . .] On Atta's fundamentalism, see FBI electronic communication, "Khaled A. Shoukry," June 17, 2002.

But that 12-page FBI memorandum would not be declassified, nor placed into the public domain until years after the publication of *The 9/11 Commission Report* in 2004. The image below is from the memorandum's first page, showing some of the document's over 200 redactions:

#44

DECLASSIFIED BY 60309AUCATAM/MLT/CLS
ON 04-26-2006

~~SECRET~~
---- Working Copy ----

b6
b7C

Page 1

Precedence: ROUTINE Date: 06/17/2002

To: Counterterrorism Attn: UBLU/RFU
Tampa SA [REDACTED]
ORA 1

From: Philadelphia
Squad 11, PhJTTF
Contact: IRS [REDACTED]

Approved By: [REDACTED]

Drafted By: [REDACTED] smh

Case ID #: ~~(S)~~ 199N-PH-93296 (Pending)

Title: ~~(S)~~ KHALED A. SHOUKRY
IT - UBL

Synopsis: ~~(S)~~ SAC authorizes opening preliminary inquiry (PI) based upon subject's contact with [REDACTED] a former associate of Mohammed Atta.

Now compare the entire paragraph of the FBI document from which the 9/11 Commission extracted the information to support its conclusion that Atta became fundamentally religious [at page 10]:

* By May 1998, AL-AMIR had obviously adopted a fundamentalist life; however, he did not express any militant views about the United States and he definitely did not say anything suggesting he would ever become involved in something like the 9/11/2001 attacks.

Mohamed Atta's alleged conversion to Islamic fundamentalism is an essential element in the official story of his allegedly having become an anti-U.S. terrorist. That the Shoukry memorandum, alone, was selected by the Commission to support this conclusion should evoke suspicion of its validity. What does not support the preconceived account is considered extraneous and omitted from the report.

Below is another omitted passage from the FBI's Shoukry memorandum [from page 3]:

[redacted] knows AL-AMIR by his true name and prior to approximately 9/14/2001, had never heard the name MUHAMMED ATTA.

The person chosen to confirm **Mohamed Atta's** conversion by 1998 **had never even heard the name Muhammed [sic] Atta** before September 11, 2001, that is, not during his lifetime.

The 9/11 Commission transgresses the public's trust with its omission of the information contained in the items below [from the bottom of page 6 and the top of page 7]:

* [redacted] claimed that when he saw AL-AMIR's photograph on the Internet and television, he did not believe the person was AL-AMIR for the following reasons:

1. The pilot was identified as MUHAMMMED ATTA, not MUHAMMED AMIR.
2. The pilot was described as being born in the United Arab Emirates. [redacted] knew AL-AMIR was born in Cairo.

~~SECRET~~

---- Working Copy ----

b6
b7c

Page 7

3. The pilot was described as having a degree in electrical engineering. AL-AMIR had a degree in architectural engineering.
4. The person whose picture was on the Internet and television was described as having attended flight schools in Florida. [redacted] knew that if AL-AMIR had come to Florida, he would have contacted EL-[redacted] and he did not.
5. [redacted] believed the photograph looked like AL-AMIR, but he was not positive it was him.

* On approximately 9/14/2001, [redacted] was called at home by [redacted] who also graduated from the engineering department of Cairo University in 1990. [redacted] asked [redacted] if he had seen the photograph of the suicide pilots and [redacted] replied affirmatively. They then briefly discussed whether one of the photographs looked like AL-AMIR. [redacted] told [redacted] none of the photographs was AL-AMIR and that AL-AMIR's name was not ATTA.

Whereas the 9/11 Commission cited the FBI's "Khaled A. Shoukry" document to confirm Mohamed Atta's conversion to fundamentalism, that document clearly states that **the source did not believe that Mohamed al-Amir was the same person as Mohamed Atta**, the person alleged to be the "ringleader" of the 9/11 attacks. The Commission's disreputable methodology is the issue. Its conclusions must be evaluated in light the methodology employed to justify them. One would be foolish to credit any part of *The 9/11 Commission Report* as being trustworthy without independent corroboration. Such distortion should not substitute for our history. **Please call for a new investigation.**