

Exploding the Airliner Crash Myth

Posted on [October 27, 2006](#) by [Morgan Reynolds](#)

Exploding the Airliner Crash Myth

By Morgan Reynolds and Rick Rajter – October 27, 2006

There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil
to one who is striking at the root.

– Henry David Thoreau

Warning Label: In August we submitted this article to the Journal of 9/11 Studies because Editor Steven Jones had publicly promised to publish pro-plane and anti-plane articles, had solicited them and this was our effort to defend the position that on 9/11 No Big Boeings crashed at the four government/media-designated sites. Our paper was essentially dismissed out of hand by two anonymous reviewers (read here) who offered few specific objections. When we complained about the lamentable quality of the reviews, Jones sent the paper to new reviewers. They objected to virtually everything, and had plenty of specific objections (read here). However, we found little merit in their objections, especially for a paper that must cover a great deal of controversial ground without an encyclopedia of proof on behalf of every proposition and conclusion. Therefore, we present our analysis below for your critical review with the product warning that our analysis has failed to achieve the highly sought-after “Journal of 9/11 Studies” seal of approval. Our article might also profitably be compared with the pro-plane article by Eric Salter (pdf) recently found worthy enough in terms of “scientific” merit to appear in Jones’ Journal. Amid Salter’s unprofessional attacks on No-Big-Boeing researchers, we encourage you to pick through his paper in search of scientific merit in the Salter defense of the government/media Big-Boeing WTC crash stories. We also ask the reader to consider why Salter’s paper proved worthy of journal acceptance and ours was not. Could it be that the editors did not want side-by-side comparison of the pro/con arguments and evidence about alleged Big Boeing crashes at the four designated sites on 9/11? See this for a powerful critique of Salter’s article.

I. Introduction

Newtonian laws of motion combined with physical evidence prove no Boeing airliners crashed on September 11, 2001 at any of the four designated sites. The government’s story is a provable, gigantic lie although various possibilities remain open about what really happened.

From a narrow prosecutorial point of view, we already have enough evidence to prove guilt at the top. The 9/11 hoax was a stunning psychological operation (psy-op), the most audacious and murderous false-flag operation in history, well-planned, deceptive at every level, intended to manipulate public opinion, and wildly successful in the short run. Against this background, everything the government and its conspiring media say must be treated as a lie until independently proven otherwise.

No one can prove the plane crash stories because no one can prove a lie. By contrast, here we prove no Big Boeings crashed, we repeat, no Big Boeings crashed (NBB), at designated locations but that does not mean that large planes did not fly by, repeat, planes could have flown by. One thing is sure: laws of nature and physical evidence render the official story and any close variation of the plane story impossible.

II. Importance

Why is the battle over the plane fraud so ferocious? Well-intended people who “don’t want to go

there” argue that the WTC demolitions provide plenty of evidence to prove 9/11 was an inside job, especially combined with the government’s lies about the Pentagon incident. This is essentially true- these facts have no other reasonable explanation but that insiders did it-and they are sufficient to begin arresting and charging principals like Bush, Cheney and Rumsfeld.

But governments like Bush-Cheney come and go. After Bush-Cheney leave office, nothing really changes because the Invisible Government is still in power. The conspiracy runs deep and the No Big Boeings Crashed (NBB), not the somewhat misnamed no-planes-theory (NPT), takes the analysis to a new level, right into the inner sanctum. The other side makes the familiar charges that NBB advocates are kooks, divisive and spew nonsense to discredit the sensible 9/11 skeptics. The media, goes the argument, can have a field day any time they wish by setting NBB proponents and opponents against each other, so no-crash advocates had best remain silent to preserve a united front and not confuse the public. But this admonition is superficial: “best evidence” is the right thing to do on its own and the American people are ready for the truth. The government-media-paymaster complex is not. Here is the big picture: the blood libel that young Arabs hijacked specific flights and crashed them into U.S. landmarks fuels the war on terror, a.k.a. the world domination project. Preserving the plane fiction is the perpetrators’ Maginot line. Once we breach this fortification, a complete rout will swiftly follow. The public will find out that Katie Couric, Peter Jennings Charles Gibson and the beloved leadership of corporate media were accessories to mass murder. Media are the enforcement arm of the powers-that-be, the mind control engine, the propaganda matrix. Once their deception and treasonous collaboration come into bright sunlight for all to see, an unprecedented wave of anger will be unleashed against the killers, their media mouthpieces and their paymasters. The traitors will be drowned and America’s reinvention will begin. This explains the intensity of the Big Boeing debate.

III. Phantom Flights

Before examining physical evidence-our principal task-many facts about the alleged flights subvert the official account. The Colgan Air flight 5930 Portland-Logan is riddled with questions¹ and AA Flights 11 and 77 were not scheduled that day.² Official BTS data are meticulously kept because of liability issues. The two American Airlines Boeing 767s in question – tail numbers N334AA and N644AA – were deregistered January 14, 2002, months late but with no proof they were involved in the alleged flights.³ Mohammed Atta supposedly left a rental car at Portland International and absurdly left a second car full of incriminating evidence at Logan, in other words, government agents over-planted evidence. And was Gate 26 or 32 used for the unscheduled flight 11? The two United Airlines aircraft that allegedly crashed that day-tail number N612UA for Flight 175 and N591UA for Flight 93-were in the BTS data base but only deregistered four years later on September 28, 2005, despite a requirement that destroyed aircraft be deregistered within 24 hours.⁴

Further fueling suspicion, all four cross-country flights had improbably light loads with only 25% average occupancy while the airlines, government and media never produced credible passenger manifests, a routine matter, and all inexplicably lacked Arab names.⁵ The airlines have refused requests to issue final manifests. Within a week of the attacks major media reported ten alleged hijackers alive and an eleventh (Majed Moqed) a friend reported missing since 2000 (identity theft?) but the media dropped the issue. FBI Director Robert S. Mueller effectively gave them their marching orders, declaring November 3, 2001: “We at this point definitely know the 19 hijackers who were responsible,” and said the FBI was sticking with the names and photos released in late September. [Associated Press, 11/3/2002].

Ongoing searches of birth, death and marriage records suggest many passenger names were fake.⁶ Families of air crash victims remain oddly silent, suspicious behavior as government lies and evades while dissatisfied families of ground zero victims are outspoken.⁷ Searches fail to show hull insurance paid on the four jetliners despite the small number of insurers in the industry. Then we have missing airport surveillance video tapes, an incredible string of 19 airport security/screening failures, flights disappearing from conventional radar, missing flight data (fdr) and cockpit voice recorders (cvr), gag orders on FAA flight controllers-military-firefighters-police-airline-employees, physically impossible cell phone calls⁸ with fake dialogue⁹ (“I see water and buildings. Oh my God! Oh my God!” “Hello, mom. This is your son, Mark Bingham”), not to mention the technical inability of the purported Arabs to pilot the planes as advertised. Nothing checks out in the official account about the alleged flights. Controlled media naturally steer a wide berth from these problems in favor of canonizing the Official Government Conspiracy Theory (OGCT) and ridiculing the Alternative Conspiracy Theory (ACT).

IV. Missing Plane Wreckage: Show Me Debris

The most obvious defect in the official story is the absence or near-absence of conventional airplane wreckage at each crash site. The US Government could have ended plane controversy long ago by allowing independent aircraft accident investigators to examine the unique serial numbers on time-change parts at each crash site and compare them to each plane’s maintenance logbook. But there has been no known NTSB, FBI or independent investigation of the so-called jetliner crash sites.

Government and media tell us to believe without proof that four “hijacked” commercial jets vanished within 80 minutes that morning without a trace of bodies, blood, luggage, or cargo. Disappearance may be routine in the Bermuda Triangle but it is unprecedented in the northeastern United States. Big Boeing crash sites are extremely messy, with 3 million plane parts, bodies, limbs, blood, seat cushions, books, purses, spectacles, luggage, cargo and many other materials strewn about. We repeat, four Big Boeings vanished with nary a trace, leaving no reliable evidence of debris. This is so stunning that it rivals total destruction of three steel-framed skyscrapers on the same day at the WTC, the only total disintegrations (allegedly) caused by fires in history. Yet supposedly it is “crazy” to challenge the airliner crash data.

V. Fiction #1: Big Boeing Vanishes in Pentagon

Of the four alleged 9/11 crashes, extensive research and facts most clearly refute the government’s “a-757-went-into-the-Pentagon” whopper. Many if not most 9/11 skeptics believe no Boeing 757 crashed into the Pentagon because the gash was too small, no plane marks were left on the building (the Twin Towers had plane “silhouettes of passage” but not the Pentagon even though concrete is brittle and more likely to shatter and show a plane’s imprint), no verified debris, no bodies, no blood, it is physically impossible to land a 757 at a speed of 500+ mph because of the downwash sheet, etc.

Figure 1(a): A small hole in the wall, no plane silhouette and no wreckage. If the Boeing does not fit, you must quit (the Big Boeing theory).

Figure 1(b): The putting green in front of the Pentagon.

Figure 1(c): An airliner would have to hop over the unburned cable spools before hitting the ground floor.

Figure 1(d): Pieces around the car are not burning or burned while the steel hood is burning and burned through and the right front fender is noticeably distorted. This suggests explosives were used because jet fuel cannot burn through steel and therefore cannot burn through steel hoods and engines.

If the 9/11 research community cannot prove that the Big Boeing at the Pentagon story is an obvious fraud, then we have proved little or nothing about the entire 9/11 hoax. Those who believe there was an incoming Big Boeing might begin their 12-step recovery program with hunt the Boeing and then consult this article.

VI. Fiction #2: Big Boeing Vanishes in Pennsylvania

The killers-for-hire did such an embarrassing job in Pennsylvania and the story is so weak that few researchers defend it. It is easy to disprove that a smoking hole about 20'x20'x10' could not swallow half the parts of Flight 93's 757, much less the whole thing. While we are taught to believe Big Boeings flew into (through?) steel/concrete towers and were invincible enough to cut out "realistic" plane shapes, a 757 could not accomplish the same feat at the Pentagon or in soft ground at a covered quarry in Pennsylvania! Conveniently, the government-designated hole is at the deep end of the covered mine, one of many signals it was a set up. For more, see this article.

Was an airliner in the area? Probably because the witness reports make a good case for it, given their high credibility and relative uniformity in testimony. Most likely, it was an airliner fly-by. And it may even have involved stealth technology to "disappear" the plane over the crash site, as explained below.

Figure 2: Smoking hole near Shanksville, PA unmarred by plane debris, bodies, luggage, etc. A local resident observed, "It's the only place it could have gone down and be sure no one would be hurt." Translation: it was the only place where there could be no witnesses. According to media reports, witnesses reported a low-flying airliner heading east/southeast but no local resident claimed to see a plane crash.

Figure 3: Because of possible enforcement court proceedings, national security and privacy reasons, the government has not yet released this evidence of the Shanksville plane crash .

VII. Fictions #3 and #4: Big Boeings Vanish into Twin Towers

Many if not most 9/11 researchers reject the Big Boeing crash theory for the Pentagon and Pennsylvania incidents for lack of supporting evidence and compelling counterevidence. Similar suspicion about two Big Boeings disappearing into the twin towers is less common. It's almost a taboo topic to doubt the WTC Big Boeing stories but if we look at the gashes in the towers, a telling question arises:

How could two wide-body aluminum jetliners glide through massive steel walls, steel/concrete floors and steel/concrete cores without a single aluminum flap, panel or part knocked to the ground below the impact zone, no Boeing wreckage visible in gashes, no deceleration and then vanish inside? About the south tower, for example, NIST (pdf pg 38) states, "The aircraft completely disappeared into the building in a fifth of a second."¹⁰ Completely disappeared, the government says. That would be unprecedented for air accidents in populated areas. The scientists of NIST seemed to have little problem dispensing with Newtonian physics and supporting the preferred conclusion that a fragile aluminum plane disappeared completely through and into a heavy steel/concrete tower, the strongest building in the world, without suffering loss of a single aluminum panel or flap. The tail sections

never broke off despite the fuselage crashing into the dense core within 60' at the north tower and within 37' at the south tower. We live in remarkable times when scientists and engineers believe such nonsense. Apparently 9/11 changed everything.

To expose these lies in the clearest fashion possible, consider evidence like this silhouette of passage in WTC 1:

Figure 4 (a): Boeing 767 silhouette of passage?

Figure 4 (b) Silhouette of passage by RoadRunner. HmMMMMM!?

Figure 4 (c): Beep! Beep!

Figure 4(a)-(c): No airplane debris was visible in the gash and not one verified piece of Boeing wreckage was knocked to the ground below the impact zone. Look at the conspicuous right wing tip mark. If the RoadRunner can fly through an Acme steel plate, apparently a Boeing can too, right? The electronics-loaded, fragile airliner nose section crashed into the steel wall and instantly plowed into 5-6 steel/concrete floors, remaining intact. The fuselage disappeared far inside the gash without crumpling or torsion (twisting) and forward wing momentum was no greater than the fuselage, despite stout resistance against the fuselage from the tower. In truth, with no direct resistance from the building and powered by full throttle engines, wing momentum would tear the wings from the suddenly-decelerating fuselage. Wing spars are built of strong but brittle forged aluminum and must break off. But back to the government-media fairy tale: As each wing root and its fuel and heavy undercarriage crashed into walls and floors, no fuel spilled and nothing burned across the face of the building, all fuel being carried inside. Since 767 wings are swept back about 35 degrees, each intact wing must sever steel 14" square columns and 52" high steel spandrel belts in sequence over milliseconds, each aluminum forward edge effectively fragmenting, slicing or "sawing" through steel columns/belts and steel-reinforced concrete floors (e.g., each 20' x 60' steel floor pan was 7 tons) with nothing from the aluminum Boeing breaking off. Amazing! This theory led Australian 9/11 researcher Gerard Holmgren to suggest that carbide-tipped rotary saw blades to cut steel will be superseded by aluminum blades. Despite no structural connection to the main spar, the right wing tip in question survived this brutal collision intact, left its imprint or tattoo on the aluminum façade and demurely slipped inside each building. Credulous Americans, including physicists and engineers judging by their silence, join in embracing such a WTC Boeing crash fiction at each tower.

Figure 5: A C-130, about half the weight of a Boeing 767, hit this 10-story apartment building at approximately the 8th floor in Tehran last December and crumpled outside, bouncing debris around and spilling burning jet fuel over the impact wall and inside the building. There are bodies, blood and limbs strewn around as with all airplane crashes except the alleged four Big Boeing crashes on 9/11.

Figure 6: Three-pound bird goes mano a mano with aluminum plane and does heavy damage. The WTC data should excite scientific curiosity because they defy logic and laws of nature and are contrary to any plane crashes in history. Here is a summary of what is wrong:

1. Holes in the towers too small to swallow wide-body 767s (wingspan 156' and height 44' yet WTC 1 hole is about 126' wide and WTC 2 only 103' wide).

2. No plane debris on the ground below the impact holes.
3. No fuel burned below gashes of either tower.

Figure 6: A lot of aluminum encounters a little bit of steel.

4. No plane debris visible in the gashes, hanging out, nor outside any exit side of a tower.
5. Videos showing the same impossible physics, gliding smoothly at 500+ mph through the steel exterior and steel/concrete floors and stopping within a tenth of a second inside. Like Wile E. Coyote, apparently the plane suddenly “realized” inside it cannot fly through a steel/concrete building and suddenly destroyed itself completely inside, hidden from view. Virtually all 3.1 million plane parts, passengers, luggage, and cargo vanish. This extraordinary disappearance happens twice, once in each tower.
6. Almost no airplane debris at any of the four alleged crash sites (“the cleanest crash sites in aviation history” except for evidence planted by government agents like the landing gear below) and no time-change parts with serial numbers unique for each aircraft ever identified or proven.

Figure 7(a): Landing gear amid dust, adjacent to old scaffolding, not on a street corner, close to curb, just left of the mid-point of a dusty Greco-Roman pillar lying in the gutter.

Figure 7(b): Landing gear on a dust-free street corner near shiny new scaffolding, set back from the curb and no Greco-Roman pillar visible. The tire and brakes look different too.

Figure 7(c): Landing gear in new photo op: tire looks in better health, no extensive dust, new scaffolding, further from the corner, further forward toward the top of a dust-free Greco-Roman pillar. We suspect tampering with evidence . Actors gape at nice tire and shiny shaft, wondering why the tire, brake housing and shaft would be unburned despite their ejection through a “jet fuel conflagration” high atop a tower. ALL PLANTED AIRPLANE PARTS WERE UNDER SCAFFOLDING, THEY JUST PULLED OFF THE COVERS AT THE RIGHT TIME.

7. “Every video that shows impact shows a plane flying through the tower wall the same way it flies through thin air: no cratering effect, no pushing parts of the building in, no crunching of the airframe as it hits resistance, no reaction from the heavy engines and hidden landing gear, no parts breaking off, no outer 30 feet of the wing breaking off, no bursting, shredding or bending of the wing,” says Joseph Keith, retired software engineer in the aerospace industry. “No nothing.” The videos are fake.

8. Regulations require a complete National Transportation Safety Board crash report for every scheduled commercial air crash except in cases of suspected foul play responsibility shifts to the FBI. That transfer was done but in response to a FOIA request by Col. George Nelson (USAF ret.), the FBI refuses to release any information because 1) it “could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings,” and 2) “could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” There are no enforcement proceedings and the FBI has a lot of chutzpah to express concern for the privacy of the American people.

It is a foregone conclusion for most people that airliners went into the Twin Towers, no questions asked. After all, the whole world saw it on TV. Yet it is time to challenge the Big Boeing stories. The Government has never attempted to prove its OBL fiction because it could not. OGCT is the most audacious fraud of all in a history littered with frauds like Operation Northwoods, Gulf of Tonkin

incident, Watergate, Iran-Contra, Kuwait baby incubator hoax, Niger yellow cake and WMDs in Iraq. No one can prove a lie, hence government cannot prove OGCT.

- 9/11 was solved on TV within 60 seconds of the second tower event by a Fox News anchor: an instant conspiracy theory
- There is no proof of Arab hijackers, for example, no Arab names on passenger manifests
- No verified security video tapes (fake of Dulles boarding nearly three years later)
- AA flights 11 and 77 were not in BTS data base
- AA airliner tail numbers N334AA and N644AA not FAA-deregistered until January 14, 2002
- United airliner tail numbers N612UA and N591UA not deregistered until September 28, 2005
- “In our investigation, we have not uncovered a single piece of paper either here in the United States or in the treasure trove of information that has turned up in Afghanistan and elsewhere that mentioned any aspect of the September 11 plot,” stated FBI Director Mueller. He claimed that the attackers used “extraordinary secrecy” and “investigators have found no computers, laptops, hard drives or other storage media that may have been used by the hijackers, who hid their communications by using hundreds of pay phones and cell phones, coupled with hard-to-trace prepaid calling cards.” [Federal Bureau of Investigation, 4/19/2002; Los Angeles Times, 4/22/2002]
- On June 6, 2006 the FBI stated that OBL is not wanted for 9/11 because the FBI has “no hard evidence” that he was involved
- The U.S. government refuses to authenticate the December 13, 2001, bin Laden “confession video.”
- Mainstream media reported as many as ten of the accused hijackers alive after 9/11 (Hamza Alghamdi, Saeed Alghamdi, Salem Alhazmi, Ahmed Alnami, Abdulaziz Alomari, Mohand Alshehri, brothers Waleed M. Alshehri and Wail Alshehri, Mohammed Atta, Khalid Almidhdhar) and Majed Moqed was reported seen by a friend in 2000.
- Expressing uncertainty over the identity of the accused hijackers on September 20, 2001 FBI Director Mueller said, “We have several others that are still in question. The investigation is ongoing, and I am not certain as to several of the others” [Newsday, 9/21/2001]. On September 27, after revelations in the media about live hijackers, FBI Director Mueller responded, “We are fairly certain of a number of them.” [South Florida Sun-Sentinel, 9/28/2001]. On November 2, 2001 Mueller stated, “We at this point definitely know the 19 hijackers who were responsible,” and said that the FBI would stick with the names and photos released in late September [Associated Press, 11/3/2002].

VIII. Radar Evidence

The government and media report flight paths for four airliners so there is no proof of these flights independent of the perpetrators’ tales. Among other anomalies, the last 20 minutes of the alleged path of the unscheduled Flight 77 which allegedly flew into the Pentagon are missing. These data are worthless because they come from the government and outside investigators cannot verify them.

In addition we know:

- Technicians can insert blips onto FAA and military radar screens, and they do so routinely in wargame exercises and these were ongoing that morning
- Some wargame drills that morning reportedly were “live-fly” exercises where actual aircraft simulated the behavior of hijacked airliners
- FAA, military, AA and UAL personnel are under gag orders, so there is no independent corroboration of the radar data

- Team 8 through FOIA has obtained radar evidence that the (unscheduled, probable radar inject) Flight 11 was 9.6 miles west of WTC 1 at 8:47 a.m., 20 seconds after the alleged crash.

IX. Tower Oscillation

Each tower had a sudden hole in it, spread over five or more floors, at least 100 feet wide and some 15 feet tall or higher at its apex. No one disputes these holes, only the cause. Something caused the holes, one side asserting Big Boeing crashes, another internal explosives (we set aside earthquakes, EM pulses, train crashes, etc.). No one that we know challenges the oscillation readings from the events, although they were quickly damped. Most occupants of the towers seemed to believe that the building oscillated because of a bomb or bombs, especially those who had experienced the FBI-led 1993 bombing. They had no better theory at the time. In the NYT-establishment book, *102 Minutes: The Untold Story of the Fight to Survive inside the Twin Towers*, only one person, Stanley Praisnath, reports a plane part in the building. Praisnath tells his tall tale on page 93.

Both Boeing crash proponents and NBB crash believers predict oscillations upon application of a sudden force, be its source asymmetric gas expansion or a plane crash followed by jet fuel fires. There is no reason to favor Boeings or explosives based on oscillation data because oscillations are a common prediction of both theories.

X. Soft Evidence

When people defend the WTC airliner story, they cite soft evidence like videos, “many, many eyewitnesses,” unproven flight data recorders, and an alleged consensus among researchers who favor Big Boeings. Nearly everybody says videos “clearly show the commercial jet liner.” True, the perps did not fake videos and forget to insert a jetliner. The question is, do the digital images reflect reality or is the jetliner image inserted? In NFL broadcasts, the first-and-ten line is inserted in real time, as are billboards at NBA and MLB games, even customized by region. At the Winter Olympics, TV trickery inserted the flag of each speed skater’s nation under the ice and then switched it in real time as the skaters switched lanes. Truly remarkable.

Videos can be trumped by asking whether the Newtonian laws of motion still prevailed on 9/11. If so, then videos showing seamless WTC 2 penetration with no deceleration must be fake. Rick Rajter has calculated the deceleration of the “plane” on a couple of the videos and found no observed deceleration (see Appendix below). So that video is fake.

The next argument is that there were “many, many witnesses.” Even if we granted many, many for the sake of argument, so what? One day in the past, many, many witnesses saw the earth was flat and five years ago many, many saw the psy-op on TV, including those who allegedly saw an airliner hit a tower from the street below or a skyscraper.

To sketch in a refutation of eyewitness accounts, first, most people in the “canyons” of lower Manhattan could not see a plane if it smacked into a tower at 500+ mph, and many said so. A plane at 500 mph would cover a 60-foot-wide street and its sidewalks within a tenth of second. Virtually everyone’s view was blocked. Second, people on the Jersey shore might see a plane head for the south end of Manhattan but were too far away to verify that it crashed into the south tower. The only potentially good views would be selected spots on the water close to the south end of Manhattan and selected west-facing windows in skyscrapers south and southeast of WTC 2. Third, many witnesses heard no jet and some videos have no jet liner sound even though it is trivial to insert the sound of booming jetliner at (incredibly) high speed and low altitude. Fourth, witness testimony is notoriously unreliable and fungible. Fifth, people lie (the perps probably hired actors, readily available in

Manhattan, along with the script delivered to complicit media moguls). Sixth, physical evidence trumps eyewitness testimony, especially conflicting witness testimony not under oath and not subject to cross-examination. Researchers should pay more attention to physical evidence than hearsay inadmissible in court.

Scrutiny of alleged eyewitness testimony, however, may not be entirely worthless. As far as we can tell, there is a dearth of testimony from disinterested witnesses affirming a Big Boeing crashing into the north tower: many thousands of people in Central Park plus northbound drivers, passengers and pedestrians along First, Second and Third Avenues, Lexington Avenue, Park Avenue, Madison Avenue, Fifth Avenue, Avenue of the Americas, Broadway, etc., could have seen a low-flying AA Boeing 767 thundering south/southwest down the island of Manhattan. At high speed it would have been incredibly noisy, extraordinary and scary. It would have echoed down the canyons. The direction or source may not have been obvious at first. At 400+ mph the jetliner would have taken approximately one minute to fly less than seven miles from just north of Central Park into the North Tower, time enough for witnesses to see and track a plane even if they could not confirm that that same plane hit the north tower. Thousands of disinterested eyewitnesses could have confirmed a Big Boeing flying overhead if the official story were true but I've not seen any such interviews done that morning. The internet lacks credible "street interviews" and the controlled media did not go there. That is a telling fact.

The witnesses offered often are media, "anonymous" or those who do not confirm a jetliner flying into a tower at all. From a legal, adversarial point of view, most WTC "eyewitness" testimony in favor of large airliners is highly vulnerable. Get them in court and cross-examine them under oath. That is a new ball game and I strongly suspect that an attorney of the "Gerard Holmgren" variety would crush them. In a traumatic event, people switch into survival mode and their powers of observation become impaired, highly selective, and they are much more susceptible to media manipulation. One telephone caller to Bryant Gumbel of CBS said he just saw beams shoot out from the WTC building followed by, "Wait a minute, the radio just reported it was plane parts that flew out of the building, so, I just saw plane parts fly out of the building." Radio is powerful enough but people are most susceptible to visual [pdf] manipulation.

Marcus Icke looked at same-day WTC 1 witness reports and found 10 of 11 witnesses reported seeing a small plane or missile, not a large commercial airliner. The exception was CNN's Sean Murtagh who claimed he saw a commercial airliner crash into the north tower.

CNN was the lead sled dog that day and quickly set up the party line within minutes. The key to CNN coverage that day was at 8:54 a.m. when Sean Murtagh, CNN's vice president of finance and administration, "witnessed the crash from his nearby office" and told [CNN Anchor Carol]"Lin via an on-air phone call that the plane that hit the north tower was a 'large commercial passenger jet.'" Uh huh. "My office faces south toward...the...what,...where the trade center used to be and... probably caught the last 5-6 seconds of flight of the first plane flying straight into the north tower. Impact, fireball and when it hit, it was like, you got like a thud in your stomach, like did I just see what I just saw?"

That is a credible eyewitness statement, right? Wrong. Here's what is wrong: first, CNN offices then were at 5 Penn Plaza on W. 33d street, almost three miles north of the WTC, a 10-minute ride, not a walk. That's not "nearby" by my lights. Second, facing south from an office on the 21st floor sounds good but it's not a good vantage point because the plane would fly by in a flash, too fast to get a real

fix on what it was. Third, the plane would take over 20 seconds to arrive at the north tower, not “the last 5-6 seconds of flight” claimed. Murtagh’s timing is off by an order of magnitude. While hugely effective, Murtagh’s testimony is not credible. Fourth, CNN led its coverage with a report from one of its own executives about a large airliner flying into the North Tower. They did not have enough respect for the audience to interview an actor on the street, instead putting the lie “in plain view” by broadcasting it from a CNN employee. Fifth, Murtagh is a poor actor, with a flat, disinterested delivery that no appalled American watching an airliner fly into the North Tower could possibly muster.

Some truth leaks out in early media coverage of a disaster because the controlled media is not entirely controlled down to the reporter level. It’s almost amusing how Murtagh’s lie is immediately overturned by the first unidentified female witness who insisted the North Tower hit came from inside, and then the second, Jeanne Yurman, who reported a sonic boom. Neither witness confirms Murtagh’s report of a large airliner.

XI. What happened at WTC 2?

Because of the element of surprise, the WTC 1 hoax did not have to be very good but WTC 2 had to be better because many were watching WTC 1 and listening. This is where the criminals might have used considerable psy-op “magic.” One of the damning examples of central mind control was ABC News anchors overruling their reporter on scene at WTC who never heard or saw a plane coming into the south tower.

Reporter: “...Oh my God.”

Anchor: “That looks like a second plane has just hit...”

R: “I did not see a plane go in. That, that just exploded. I...”

A: “We just saw another plane coming in from the side.”

R: “You did? That was out my view.”

A: “You could see the plane come in just from the righthand side of the screen...”

Marcus Icke looked at 41 eyewitness reports from the south tower who claim to have seen an aircraft collide with WTC 2. Some were interviewed that day (more reliable) while others were interviewed later. No one reported seeing a Boeing 767-200 series with United Airlines livery crashing into the tower, an extremely strict standard, but all seemed to report some type of aircraft crashing into the tower. Many reported an aircraft vanished inside the tower. Since this is physically impossible for a real plane, these witnesses were lying or deluded. Some lied (I have nominees) and some may have been duped. A delusion would be the result of some kind of trickery that remains hidden from researchers. The range of possibilities runs from an airplane fly-by of some kind coordinated with timed explosions inside the tower to David Copperfield on scene. No kidding. He has “disappeared a train” and the Statute of Liberty so maybe he put his mind to work on “disappearing a Big Boeing.” More extensive analysis of witness testimony is necessary, but commentators at this stage cannot simply point to a tower of babel (conflicting testimony) and assert, “See, many witnesses saw Big Boeings crash into the towers.” Whatever the reliability of individual eyewitnesses may be, testimony contrary to Newtonian laws of motion is worth less than zero.

XII. Optical Camouflage?

The military may have cloaking or stealth technology that allows it to temporarily “disappear” a plane from optical view. Essentially, there would be two ways to turn the plane to “blue sky” at the touch of a button, making the plane invisible to those on the ground and perhaps those at higher levels:

1. flexible liquid crystal display screens on the aircraft itself that display the background image (cloudless blue sky)
2. external sources projecting a background image in so-called stereoscopic form to a camouflaged aircraft covered by a retro reflector.

It would be easier to turn a plane “invisible” on a beautiful, cloudless day. If the plane had no stealth anti-radar technology, however, the plane would be visible on radar and FAA and military radar records will be forever sealed.

The possible technology includes this:

Lockheed’s legendary ‘Skunk Works’ experimental arm is known to be developing new electrochromic materials. Their aim is to create camouflage panels which can change color or tint when subjected to an electrical charge. Other engineers like Boeing and Northrop, are also working on similar stealth technologies.

“One of these systems is the “electrochromic polymer” that is being developed at the University of Florida. These thin sheets cover the aircraft’s skin and sense the hue, color and brightness of the surrounding sky and ground. The image received is then projected onto the aircraft’s opposite side. When charged to a certain voltage, these panels undergo color change. Another similar ‘skin’ is being tested at the top-secret Groom Lake facility at Area 51 in Nevada. It is reputed to be composed of an “electro-magnetically conductive polyaniline-based radar-absorbent composite material.” The system also utilizes photo-sensitive receptors all over the plane that scan the surrounding area, subsequently the data is interpreted by an onboard computer which outputs it much like a computer screen making the aircraft virtually invisible to site.”

The technology was publicly available in 2003, so it is possible the military had developed it earlier. Such a plane might have taken off from Stewart Air base in Newburgh, NY, the alleged crossover point of the flight paths of Flights 11 and 175. The soon-to-turn-invisible plane would blend in with a radar inject and become the new radar blip. The aircraft could have been remote controlled to fly by the south tower on its east side or piloted by a human. The plane would time its “switch to invisibility” at the south tower with nearly simultaneous ignition of internal charges in the tower. It would all happen within the space of two seconds, stunning everyone. The spectacular fireball on the east side of the south tower went off too fast to be natural and it did not burn at the so-called impact hole where oxygen and fuel would be abundant, so it was a trick. It performed its role of being a spectacular distraction to further hide the fly by and was an Independence Day terror event on its own. The plane’s engines presumably would have been quieted to enhance the realism of the feigned crash, perhaps essentially gliding for moments. It then headed out to sea for destruction if remote controlled or more likely it landed at a secret base because it would have been expensive “one-off” technology. This entire hypothesis, of course, may prove barren but deserves further investigation, especially since it would reconcile impossible crash physics with eyewitness testimony to the contrary. Food for thought: the same chameleon plane could have appeared at all three incidents: 9:03a at WTC 2, 9:32-9:37a at the Pentagon, and 10:06a at Shanksville. The single plane theory actually might make sense! We shall see.

XIV. KINETIC ENERGY

A Boeing 767 traveling at 530+ mph would have approximately 4 billion joules. This number is impressive, but produces a contradiction in the official story: the video of the south tower, e.g., Scott Myers’, exhibited a four percent deceleration at most (see Appendix A below). Let’s say the numbers

are off by a factor of two and it is actually eight percent, yielding a bigger slowdown. Using the kinetic energy equation, an 8 percent slowdown would still have 85 percent of its kinetic energy available once the plane was completely in the building. Are we to assume that the remaining 85 percent is insufficient to exit out the other side? NO. If we move to a more reasonable two percent observed slowdown, there would be 96 percent of the original kinetic energy available. Amazingly, 4 billion joules of energy will get a plane into the building but 3.8 billion joules cannot get the plane out the other side.

If the plane cannot get through the second half of the building, how could it have gotten through the first half so easily? What KE advocates are saying is, “Four billion joules got the plane through the first three-quarters of the building easily, but 3.8 billion joules could not get it ‘no how’ through the last quarter of the building.” This is ridiculous. KE advocates believe the plane had invincible energy one moment, dropped off by a mere 8 percent and totally fell apart, to never be seen again. This is an impossible theory.

XV. Conclusion

On 9/11 we had four astonishing, unverified and uninvestigated crashes. The airlines refuse to look at evidence that their Big Boeings did not crash as advertised.¹¹ Wreckage at the four sites was virtually nonexistent and no parts were verified by serial number despite this routine ID method in aircraft accident investigations. Government/media claims two Big Boeing disappeared into the twin towers within a 16.5-minute interval, another disappeared into the Pentagon, and another crashed in rural Pennsylvania. All supposedly vanished through undersized holes. Gullible Americans believed Bush-Cheney and marched off to war. “What fools these mortals be,” Shakespeare wrote.

These are physically impossible crashes. Airplanes do not exhibit completely different physical behaviors within one-twentieth of a second at a given place. They cannot be insuperable and shatter without slowing down in the next instant.

If the government wanted to prove that specific hi-jacked airliners crashed as advertised, it could show the time-change parts that uniquely identify each aircraft. Government could show the NSA and/or commercial satellite photos of the airliners going about their deadly business that morning. It could show dozens of Pentagon videos it is hiding, flight data recorders, cockpit voice recorders, and so much more. There is no chance, of course, of the perpetrators voluntarily doing anything of the sort. Fabricating more evidence at this point is too risky for them. The release of the latest Pentagon “video” was a fiasco. There are too many sharp analysts on the internet waiting to pounce.

We are closer than ever to figuring out what happened with the four “strike” events. Perhaps one day the controlled media, Congress or a public prosecutor, seized by sense of duty, will tap this growing body of research, thereby igniting probes that lead to justice.

•Professor emeritus in economics at Texas A&M University and Ph.D. student in Engineering and Materials Science at MIT.

APPENDIX A:

Did The Digital Plane Image Decelerate at WTC 2?

By Rick Rajter

One of the major oddities of all WTC2 videos is the apparent lack of plane deceleration from many of the observed camera angles. The plane seems to fly in effortlessly, but then comes to a complete stop while inside (apparently violating conservation of momentum and energy). To the layman, these two conservation laws mean we should expect TWO major sources of slowdown when one object

penetrates another:

- Energy is lost via dissipation as the intruding object breaks and destroys the impacted area into smaller pieces
- Energy is transferred to the broken pieces in the form of kinetic energy or gained velocity.

A quick example: If I throw a baseball through a window, the dissipation of energy occurs in breaking the big piece into little pieces and velocity gained by little pieces as they fly away from the original window location. The kinetic energy of the ball is a finite supply used up as these two processes occur. At UA flight 175's alleged impact speeds (estimated anywhere between 500-600 mph depending upon the source), a 767 speeding at reasonably full weight would have some 4 billion joules of KE for consideration.

Considering that KE energy is a finite source to draw from, a key question arises: "Do the videos show deceleration, or are zero deceleration claims hogwash?" To the best of our knowledge, Stefan Grossman (presumably helped by Marcus Icke) did the first numbered, reproducible frame-by-frame analysis of the flight 175 image. Using the Fairbanks video, Grossman calculates a zero percent deceleration. In fact, as the plane enters the building, some frames appear to show a slight acceleration. This is most bizarre and must be either a 1) measurement error on Grossman's behalf or 2) a creation error on the TV-fakery side. Reality, of course, makes acceleration impossible. I personally think it is a measurement error from a single frame, as this acceleration frame comes right after a deceleration frame. Thus, if this one data point is an error, it implies an offsetting error in an adjacent frame, given the fixed aggregate time budget.

Eric Salter followed with his own analysis and claimed 13% deceleration based on frame-by-frame study using one of the 2-3 Fairbanks video variants. One of the suspicious facts about the Fairbanks video(s) is that the FBI had possession of them before they went public.

There is a major flaw in Salter's analysis. He used an overlay or "trace" to match the blurry 767 image to judge its speed. The problem is that it is hard to match a wide-line trace or outline of a plane against a blurry plane image with real consistency.

Salter is inconsistent in choosing an anchor point to locate his trace against the video plane image. When the image is outside the building, Salter anchors the trace at the main wings. After the plane is mostly inside the building, Salter switches and anchors the trace at the back of the tail wing. The trace never matches the image perfectly: outside the building "excess" tail wing shows to the left of the outline, but inside the building, this excess disappears. Therefore, Salter artificially slows down his plane trace yet the plane blur goes off ahead and Voila! Deceleration falsely established.

For my own analysis, I decided to use the widely known Scott Myers camera pictures, so I didn't have to worry about compression issues, frame rates, etc. I found the highest resolution version I could get my hands on in order to minimize loss or measurement precision. The 15-picture spread was (allegedly) taken using fixed 0.033 second intervals, features a nearly fixed camera angle, and has a fairly decent contrast on key plane features. Thus, it is perfectly suited for frame-by-frame analysis, one of the best videos in terms of high signal-to-noise ratio.

Using photoshop, I took all 15 sections and placed them in one layered PSD file. I then ran a series of difference filters on each neighboring pair of frames to ensure camera positioning on the pictures had not been altered and that they were in perfect registry (by contrast in the Salter analysis, the WTC wall moves from frame to frame). A few pictures had to be moved left one pixel in order to be in closer

registry to frame one. No frames were moved up, down, or right by any amount.

I used four different locations on the plane (two pre-impact positions and two post-impact positions). Of the pre-impact positions, the fuselage glare is the easiest to define, but the front of the nose also provides robust numbers and a good sanity check (reduces subjectivism). Using unaltered/un-enlarged pictures, a pixels per second average of two pre-impact locations yield a mean of 29 pixels per frame with a standard deviation of 0.6 with a sample size of 6.

The post-impact speeds were calculated in the same manner, but using two different locations on the back tail. Interestingly enough, the speeds calculated here on the best matching data points show a 29.0 pixels per frame outside the building with a standard deviation of 0.6 and sample size of 6 versus 29.6 inside the building with a standard deviation of 0.5 with a sample size of 5. In other words, I found 4% acceleration.

Can it be measurement error? It is possible, but I was analyzing under 8X magnification. But playing devil's advocate, let's look at a worst-case scenario. Suppose I made a 1-pixel error on EVERY measurement (perhaps I drank too much coffee and was too jittery with the mouse). That would give me an average pre-impact speed of 30 pixels/frame and a post-impact speed of 28.6 pixels/frame. That implies a 4.6% decrease in the average velocity. Average velocity is $(V_{\text{final}} - V_{\text{initial}})/2$, so that means the actual instantaneous velocity at the end of the interval would be an absolute maximum slowdown of 9%.

The endpoints of my calculations then are acceleration of 4% and deceleration of 4.6%. But the assumptions underlying the latter are severe. A more reasonable adjustment yields a middle ground estimate. The most I would be off in favor of acceleration is 0.5 pixel per interval. If so, then the maximum slowdown would be 2-2.5%.

A 2.5% loss of velocity means 95% of original KE is still available. If we assume 4 billion joules is a reasonable estimate of the energy pre-impact, then the plane would still have 3.8 billion joules after entering.

To double-check, I blew the frames up by 8X using adobe photoshops standard interpolation function, which gives me more precision measuring differences in pixels between the frames. This analysis, giving generous concessions to the deceleration crowd, gives a 3% instantaneous velocity slow down. In short, magnification produces no difference from the un-enlarged analysis.

In summary, if there was deceleration, it was trivial.

Footnotes

1

[http://www.democraticunderground.com/discuss/duboard.php?az=show_mesg&forum=125&topic_id=12490&mesg_id=13789&page,](http://www.democraticunderground.com/discuss/duboard.php?az=show_mesg&forum=125&topic_id=12490&mesg_id=13789&page)

[http://team8plus.org/e107_plugins/content/content.php?content.16,](http://team8plus.org/e107_plugins/content/content.php?content.16)

<http://www.911dossier.co.uk/attabag.html>, http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/atta_9-11.html.

2 [http://oldsydimc.cat.org.au/front.php3?article_id=36354.](http://oldsydimc.cat.org.au/front.php3?article_id=36354)

3 [http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/avs/offices/afs/afs700/.](http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/avs/offices/afs/afs700/)

4 Ibid.

5 [http://www.911closeup.com/index.shtml?ID=65.](http://www.911closeup.com/index.shtml?ID=65)

6 [http://www.wingtv.net/thornarticles/911passengerlist.html.](http://www.wingtv.net/thornarticles/911passengerlist.html)

7 [http://www.arcticbeacon.citymaker.com/articles/article.cfm/1518131/37580.](http://www.arcticbeacon.citymaker.com/articles/article.cfm/1518131/37580)

8 <http://www.physics911.net/projectachilles.htm>.

9 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/1556096.stm>.

10 <http://wtc.nist.gov/pubs/NISTNCSTAR1Draft.pdf>.

11 <http://www.prisonplanet.tv/articles/september2004/300904refusestoview.htm>.

Like this: