

Reynolds & Rajter paper, comments.
October 3, 2006

Reviewer 4:

The truth is such a rare thing it is delightful to tell. Emily Dickinson

I will attempt to be constructive, to say how the paper could be stronger. As it stands, it does not meet standards allowing it to be published. It deals too heavily in unsubstantiated speculation [us] and is spotty in citing hard evidence. It totally avoids discussion, even speculatively, of one of the pillars of any NPT or NBB (no big Boeing) scenario: how EVERY video recording, those broadcast live and those which were first shown publicly in the hours, days, weeks, months and years afterward, could ALL have been detected, intercepted, analyzed as to camera location, altered in a way that would be 1) undetectable and 2) consistent with a cgi inserted Boeing image from every other angle/distance/pan/zoom and RETURNED TO ITS MAKER undetected. The absence of any apparent effort to locate and talk to a videographer who could say something like, "Something else [or nothing] was in my viewfinder, but then a plane appeared in my video, after I'd loaned it to these guys who said they were FBI and needed to borrow the tape..." Evan Fairbanks would be one obvious candidate, as it is KNOWN the FBI badly copied and confiscated his original tape. If your thesis is serious, you would seek him out along with many others. That you do not, do not even DEAL with how the faking you allege had to have happened was done, is a severe weakness. It seems that in NOT doing this basic research, you are conceding that you do not WANT to discover the truth. You could not use the Emily Dickinson epigraph I have suggested as better than the Thoreau!

So, without that line of research being evident, the paper is one-legged. It wobbles and hobbles.

My critique and suggestions will be in this 12 pt bold throughout. Suggested deletions will be underlined. *Suggestions for insertions/additions will be in italics.*

Exploding the Airliner Crash Myth

By

Morgan Reynolds and Rick Rajter

September 21, 2006

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

— Henry David Thoreau

{The Thoreau quote seems questionable in its appropriateness}

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. (**Vague -- "top" of what?**) 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, (This is shamelessly circular.) 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 [add:] *within the 9/11 truth movement?* 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 (**What "facts"? You have made charges, sort of-- try "realities"**) 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. (**On what charges, specifically? This seems unsupported as it stands.**)

But governments like Bush-Cheney come and go. After Bush-Cheney leave office, nothing really changes because the Invisible Government is still in power. {**Not sure how this is relevant to you thesis.**} The conspiracy runs deep and the No Big Boeings C crashed (NBB), {or, if capitalized, then NBBC} not the somewhat misnamed no-planes-theory (NPT), takes the analysis to a new level, right into the inner sanctum. The other side makes {This is somewhat vague – other side of what? Do you mean others in the 9/11 truth movement or the OGCT skills?} 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, {This is a bit disingenuous and not really true! They use the NPTers to smear the whole 9/11 truth movement, seldom pointing out that the great majority of 9/11 truthers disavow the NPT} 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 *government/media/paymaster* complex is not.

Here is the big picture: the blood libel {Is this a commonly understood term?} that *nineteen* 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 *is breached*, a complete rout will swiftly follow. The public will find out that Katie Couric, Peter Jennings Charles Gibson and the beloved {I don't find this term accurate and nothing this weak in resonance adds any credibility to an essay that already is so insubstantial.} 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 {this term is vague. In a way, the “war on terror” is a “reinvention of America” -- if the authors mean *a restoration of a democratic America*, then say so.} 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 {spell this out, this term may not be as well known as you believe.} data are meticulously kept because of liability issues. The two American Airlines Boeing 767s in question—tail numbers MailScanner has detected a possible fraud attempt from "162.58.35.241" claiming to be N334AA and

MailScanner has detected a possible fraud attempt from "162.58.35.241" claiming to be 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 MailScanner has detected a possible fraud attempt from "162.58.35.241" claiming to be N612UA for Flight 175 and MailScanner has detected a possible fraud attempt from "162.58.35.241" claiming to be 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 **{showing a comparison w/ all flights out of Logan and Dulles on that day or on a typical Tues in late summer could add strength to this assertion}** 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 **{Is this a typo? “full” insurance? In EITHER case, the meaning is murky}** 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, 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!” **{Not self-evident that this is “fake”}** “Hello, mom. This is your son, Mark Bingham”), not to mention the technical inability of the purported Arabs to pilot the planes as advertised. **{Here we have a problem that is bigger than just LISTING this: there is another quite compelling possibility: the planes were flown**

using remote **GUIDANCE**, so showing the alleged hijacker pilots had no skills **cannot prove NBB.**} 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. **{Asserting absence does not prove absence. }** 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. **{Excellent point.}**

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, **{Government says it has DNA match with all but one passenger at Pentagon site. IF you can dispute this, then you must tackle the government's claim specifically and directly. Merely asserting a counter claim doesn't cut it.}** luggage, or cargo. Disappearance may be routine in the Bermuda Triangle but it is unprecedented in the northeastern United States. **{Very weak effort at humor, goes flat; article is improved without this.}** 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 claim is bogus and since there are photos showing specific pieces of plane debris at both WTC and Pentagon sites, those MUST BE DEALT WITH EXPLICITELY AND SPECIFICALLY. If what you do later re the tire/landing gear in NYC is any indication, you get an "F" ...}** 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. **{Do you need to specify within the 9/11 truth movement, or is it maybe worth saying among those within And outside the 9/11tm?}**

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.* **{Better as separate sentence. Stringing too many disparate things in a series w/in the same sentence just numbs the reader, adds no credibility.}**

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). {This is TERRIBLE! It was a joke in its original O.J. S. trial context and LOSES strength here!}

Figure 1(b): The putting green in front of the Pentagon. {HAS to be a better pic for this caption!}

Figure 1(c): An airliner would have to hop over the unburned cable spools before hitting the ground floor. {The spools are NOT undisturbed, though, and they are a considerable distance out from the wall – conceivable that a two degree angle of descent could miss hitting them.}

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.

http://www.hybrideb.com/images/washington/hq_facade_1.jpg

http://www.hybrideb.com/images/washington/arrows_1.jpg

http://www.hybrideb.com/images/washington/arrows_2.jpg

http://www.hybrideb.com/images/washington/arrows_3.jpg

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. **{There is still a lot of eyewitness testimony that supports the BB hypothesis. If you cannot cite this AND REFUTE, the claim here is unwise and no amount of cute language changes the weakness of it. We also have the Mineta testimony (which, granted, does not say WHAT Cheney was tracking, but something WAS being tracked that appeared to be a plane.)}**

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. **{“This article” should be identified by author and title in the body of the paper.}**

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. **{Here is where the unsupported speculation starts to run wild. “Most likely” is not self-evident.}** 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. {us} According to media reports, witnesses reported a low-flying airliner heading east/southeast but no local resident claimed to see a plane crash.

<http://photos1.blogger.com/blogger/5459/522/1600/Flight93CraterReuters.0.jpg>

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 ☺. {Submit for publication to “Mad” comic book. This does not make it into Jo9/11S.}

<http://photos1.blogger.com/blogger/5459/522/1600/plane.into.crater.0.jpg>

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. **{This “compelling counterevidence must, alas, be produced.}** 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, {There are some photos that refute your claim. There is voluminous oral history testimony from FDNY supporting plane debris on the ground in the WTC 1 and 2 vicinity. The claim here simply is fantasy – WORSE than unsupported speculation.} 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. **{Redundancy adds nothing. Redundancy adds nothing.}** 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, *arguably one of* the strongest building in the world, without suffering loss of a single aluminum panel or flap. **{Again, this is not correct. Saying it again does not change the fact that it is contradicted by real evidence and reliable testimony of professional first responders.}** 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. **{Are you ignorant of a thesis sometimes called “garage door hypothesis” that suggests the walls and sections of the floors can be opened by explosives to let the planes in? The flash in the Fairbanks video is followed by smoke that can be seen in three waves in the next three frames outside the walls, suggesting this is more than hypothesis. Any NBB or NPT must address this alternate theory and its evidence, that can explain the same phenom you say supports ONLY your hypothesis. Will you ever say HOW the holes in the facades were created? IF NBB, then what? Explosives? If explosives can exist to make a hole without a plane, could explosives be used in COORDINATION with a guided aircraft?}** Apparently 9/11 changed everything. **{Irony here would work better were there a strong argument above it.}**

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? {Note approximately 17 projecting outward elements of the cladding, suggestive of explosives used to open

hole. This observation is credited to MR himself in the article before the “Some Holes” piece.}

Figure 4 (b) Silhouette of passage by RoadRunner. Hmmmmmm!? {If I were the editor, I would request these not appear. It mocks the seriousness of the subject and adds zilch to the power of the argument.}

Figure 4 (c): Beep! Beep!

http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/photos/docs/wtc_fires_dsnc1775A.jpg
[roadrunner.jpg](#)
[silhouettepic.jpg](#)

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. **{us}** Wing spars are built of strong but brittle forged aluminum and must break off. **{Unless, of course, the way was opened by explosives...}** 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 **{But not solid, about 3/8” - 1/2” at the 80th floor and 1/4” - 3/8” at the 92nd floor.}** and 52” high steel spandrel belts in sequence over milliseconds, each aluminum forward edge **{actually, the FORWARD EDGE of the wings of the**

Boeing 767 is FIBERGALS, so your argument is stronger than you realize.} 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. **{Is this a wise choice? It seems more to undercut your seriousness, shows a greter interest in comedy and farce.}** 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 slipping 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 3: 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.

<http://photos1.blogger.com/blogger/5459/522/1600/Iran%20Plane%20Debris--%20wing.jpg>

Figure 4: Three-pound bird goes mano a mano with aluminum plane and does heavy damage. {These photos are WONDERFUL and show these wings, whether Boeing on other, are also FIBERGLAS, not aluminum! Is this, though, the TAIL section of an aircraft? IF SO, then maybe better pix are available?}

<http://photos1.blogger.com/blogger/5459/522/1600/bird-wing.jpg>

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). **{It is not at ALL clear how you are measuring. If you measure the BANKED plane the damage seems to fit very well. You must here address the NIST diagrams.}**

2. No plane debris on the ground below the impact holes. **{Repetition has never turned wrong into right. This is wrong.}**
3. No fuel burned below gashes of either tower.

Figure 6: A lot of aluminum encounters a little bit of steel. {These pix are also wonderful. Of course the claim is absurd that planes penetrated the towers without aid of garage door being opened...}

3. No plane debris visible in the gashes, hanging out, nor outside any exit side of a tower. **{You MUST deal with the prominently published photos of obvious plane fuselage debris on the roof of WTC 5, to the northeast of the south tower. Ignoring that gets you no credibility. Acknowledge and knock it down if you can; do not pretend it's non-existent.}**
4. 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, **{I have never understood why you do not see the fireball and acknowledge that it can change the dynamic situation of the plane. It BLOWS UP probably NOT from jet fuel. When you cannot see the fireball, acknowledge that it changes the dynamics, you undercut totally any credibility you might possess re NBB. This is one reason in think the whole thesis is doomed, cannot be repaired by a few changes here and there. This is fundamentally flawed.}** hidden from view. Virtually all 3.1 million plane parts, passengers, luggage, and cargo vanish. This extraordinary disappearance happens twice, once in each tower. **{Yes! There is a fireball in EACH TOWER!}**
5. Almost no airplane debris at any of the four alleged crash sites (“the cleanest crash sites in aviation history” **{source?}** except for evidence planted by government agents like the landing gear below) **{Is there any support for this allegation? As I see it, this is another instance of us.}** 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, {Could it be that DUST and NO DUST has to do with whether th pic was taken before or AFTER collapse of one or both of the towers!? Honestly, if the dust from a tower's collapse does not register on your senses, on your mind as a legitimate cause for seen discrepancies, you have no business submitting to a journal. Other changes, as the position of the “Greco-Roman column fragment can be from any cause from blast from collapse to a person kicking it when running blind trying to escape the debris cloud. Nothing in your entire piece is more undoing of your abilities to make sensible judgments than the false analysis of differences in these few photos. You must drop this entire sequence; this is unsupportable and UNPUBLISHABLE.} further from the corner, further forward toward the top of a dust-free Greco-Roman pillar. We suspect tampering with evidence ☺. Actors {us} 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. {Any witnesses or photos? us}**

<http://www.hybrideb.com/images/newyork/tire2.jpg>

http://www.flywireradio.com/911/131043205_085ddb9997_o.jpg

http://www.flywireradio.com/911/131043184_332cfad5ae_o.jpg

3. “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. **{Have you realized that the videos you refer to all show the south tower plane moving from SUNLIGHT INTO SHADOW prior to contact/impact with the wall? Could THIS account for why no impact is visible in the videos? The impact is shrouded in shadow and it does not register in the electronics of the camcorders. As for the four words, “The videos are fake,” this needs pages of substantiation to show how the videos could have been intercepted, how the complex geometry of camera angles could be calculated, etc, and all done and**

returned to the videographers undetected, IN EVERY CASE, and MISSING NONE. Such a pillar of the NBB can not be dropped like that with no supporting evidence, not even us...}

4. 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].

{The above box is all pretty good stuff, BUT the RELEVANCE to the present paper is not evident, Can the link be made clearer? Or should it be used in another paper?}

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 Prainmath, reports a plane part in the building. Prainmath tells his tall tale on page 93. **{Check spelling: MAY be Prainmath. This is from memory and I'm not sure.}**

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, **(When the volume of videographic evidence is as great as in the case of the south tower strike – arguably the MOST PHOTOGRAPHED CRIME IN HISTORY – that evidence becomes less “soft”).** “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, **{Hardly comparable.}** as are billboards at NBA and MLB games, even customized by region. **{Relevance?}** 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. **{Once again, an alternate theory – walls/floors removed by virtually simultaneous explosions – that is, split-second before and coordinated with plane approaches – must be dealt with, as similar results are accounted for by both hypotheses. Also, the sun/shadow situation must be acknowledged, not ignored.}** 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. **{Must specify which videos in order to say “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 **{NOT SERIOUS.}** 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. **{I haven’t time to open the link, BUT I will say that the scenario of hiring “actors” to say something untrue about an event of this magnitude begs credulity. It is preposterous that even two such could be found who could be paid to lie about this.}** 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 **{“Hearsay” is something very different than direct witness testimony. This kind of slurring of two things is inadmissible in scholarly articles.}** inadmissible in court.

Scrutiny of alleged eyewitness testimony, however, may not be entirely worthless. As far as we can tell, **{Not a terribly precise or meaningful phrase.}** there is a dearth of testimony from disinterested witnesses **{Meaning exactly what?}** 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 **{Two points: two authors, equals "we have not seen" and even so, THAT is meaningless. If you are the same who have not seen the fireballs nor registered that those could change an entering plane's trajectory, then it is entirely without force or substance.}** 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 **{I am sorry, I unintentionally deleted the sentence or part of sentence that referred to a lawyer like Gerard Holmgren. What I was TRYING to do was indicate that it SHOULD be deleted, since we do not know what kind of lawyer he is and thus do not know what the statement means. He could be a sleazy lawyer or a sharp one. Unless you say specifically what you mean, the statement is better left out.}** 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. **{us}** 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." **{Source?}** 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?" **{Source?}**

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 our 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. **{Judgments of time are not reliable. Also, the man could have been diverted from looking for some seconds. A lot of this is more us, unsupported speculation.}** Murtagh's timing is off by an order of magnitude. **{"An order of magnitude" is not supported by data YOU have presented. Omit that false statement.}** 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. **{us}** 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. **{subjective and unsubstantiated.}**

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. **{CBS was also broadcasting and interviewed witnesses live who said they saw a plane hit. You cannot selectively take some witnesses and ignore others.}**

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 *of [?]*my view.”

A: “You could see the plane come in just from the righthand side of the screen...” **{Source?}**

Marcus lcke 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. **{One doesn't know what to say. Except this is absurd, for reasons earlier comments have tried to make clear.}** Some lied (I we have nominees) and some may have been duped. **{us}** 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 Statue of Liberty so maybe he put his mind to work on “disappearing a Big Boeing.” **{Cannot be taken seriously.}**

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. **{us}** 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) **{Such sky could not have been reliably predicted nor counted on.}**
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 electro-chromic 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.” **{Source?}**

The technology was publicly available in 2003, so it is possible the military had developed it earlier. **{us}** 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 **{unsupported speculation.}** 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. **{Here you might as well have a garage door scenario and have the plane go right in and blow up. Trajectory of the plane would not support a fly by.}** It would all happen within the space of two seconds, stunning everyone. The spectacular

fireball on the east side of the south tower **{Oh, so you do notice the fireball. Could THIS be a cause of the plane “disappearing”?}** 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. **{more us.}** 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. **{sus = SHAMELESS unsus specu}** 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. **{ Why OMIT 8:46!?}** 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. **{Why, here, do you go back to ignoring the effect of the fireball!?!}**

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. **{What is TRULY impossible is that two researchers could turn on and off a fireball – it's there when you want it, not when you don't. The entire thesis cannot fly.}**

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.^u 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.**