Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...
Posted by NeoSaber on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 06:20:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The movie might have some credibility if it didn't discredit its own evidence.

It throws up a bunch of quotes from people who said it sounded like a missile. Then it puts up quotes from people who saw a plane.

It talks about how the lawn in front of the pentagon was undamaged, suggesting something small must have hit it from a higher angle. They discredit this idea almost immeditately, twice. First when they trace the flight path to the point of impact on the birds eye view of the pentagon, you can indeed see that the ground along the flight path is different than the grass around it. It looks like the grass was torn up by something large going across it. Then it shows security camera footage of a large fast moving object coming across the lawn and striking the pentagon at ground level. They try to divert your attention from this obvious flaw in their theory by asking if the blur looks like a 757. However, they won't show you a scale comparision of a 757 to the Pentagon. They just show distance shots of a 757. For all we know the image they show of a 'real 757' is a model and it might as well be because we can't get a size comparison from it.

The movie questions how a large plane could only make a small hole after plowing through several layers of reinforced steel and concrete, but doesn't really get into how the hole of the initial impact is large enough to be a fuselage impact and that the hole even fans out at the bottom matching where large wings and engines would hit.

At one point it shows a quote saying the wings and tail should have sheared off when the plane hit. The idea of this is to plant the idea in your head that experts think the tail would have broken off and been easily found. However if you look at where the quote is from, it was a reporter asking a question at a briefing. It's not an expert talking, just someone with no experience asking the question. Although I don't have the footage right in front of me to review, when the planes hit the world trade towers I don't recall the wings and tail bouncing off the buildings. They plowed right through the steel wall they struck.

It claims that the terrorist who crashed the plane into the pentagon didn't have enough skill to fly it. It backs this up with two quotes from people at a flying school. Not enough evidence to even be worth discrediting, so they try to change the subject quickly by saying there's more evidence that the government won't release.

Frankly, I don't care if there are more tapes since the creators of this movie haven't raised any credible doubt to the official story. As a matter of fact, their obviously flawed presentation of their 'evidence' only serves to strengthen the official story by discrediting all the conspiracy theories. Why would anyone believe anything in this movie? I just saw it for the first time 20 minutes ago and I've already realized enough major flaws in it to discredit the whole basis of their evidence.