
Subject: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 19:58:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w5E8Ze-vGww>

Am not gonna comment on this, just want to know, what others think about it.

Topics you should debate about are..

Why did they confiscate the video at the Pentagon but not the ones that recorded the attacks on the WTC for example.

Why does it require a lawsuit to even force them to release a video that does not show much at all.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [ST3ALTH](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 20:05:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I doubt there ever was a plane that crashed into it.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 20:35:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not entering the "debate" as to whether it was a plane or not, but some things wrong with that video.

It does not show the entire building, simply the highest level.

The impact (you can see the dust push along the side of the building before the cloud rises) shows that the impact happened below the camera's field of view (the angle of the "impact dust")

You see this "impact dust" between 00:01 and 00:02 of that video, just before the cloud billows. You can also see the start of the cloud begin below the camera's view.

Aircraft or not, this video proves nothing other than the object approached at a near 0 degree angle to the building.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Jonty](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 20:44:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How tall is the Pentagon?
Because jet planes are pretty large you know.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [ST3ALTH](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 20:48:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The plane (if there was one) would simply skid on the ground and then just totally miss it, the pentagon aint tall at all, the odds of the pentagon. And there wasn't a single mark on the lawn next to it.

Also, 9/11 the WTC attacks, there were missiles on the bottom of the plane..

EDIT:

Everyone should look at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7E3olbO0AWE> "Loose Change" it is very well informed and it looks on every aspect of the attacks.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 21:06:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A bunch of people in a cave getting amateur pilots armed with box cutters to take over four commercial airliners and fly them into certain targets with a 75% success?

That sounds like a conspiracy theory to me.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 21:19:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This next video gets you thinking alot.

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-6225595810242416389>

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 21:44:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You forgot one thing: Blazer saw the plane

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [ST3ALTH](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 21:51:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

He really did?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 22:08:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 16:44You forgot one thing: Blazer saw the plane
Well there's always the possibility that Blazer is working for the government.

9/11 never happened. There is a secret cloaking device covering the twin towers right now. The towers are actually large missle silos with nukes pointed at the misunderstood peoples of Iran who are doing nothing wrong but trying to develop nuclear technology.

The pentagon was actually damaged because of a secret military weapons research facility that exists right underneath it. A bomb accidentally went off causing the damage that you see on the news, but was blamed on the terrorists so that we could go to war and take control of the world's supply of oil and llamas. It's all a conspiracy from those fat cats in washington who are in kahootz with the large multi-billion dollar corporations exploiting the free (or actually not so free) people of america.

There's the truth america. Did I change your lives?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 22:13:35 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ST3ALTH wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 16:48The plane (if there was one) would simply skid on the ground and then just totally miss it, the pentagon aint tall at all, the odds of the pentagon. And there wasn't a single mark on the lawn next to it.

Also, 9/11 the WTC attacks, there were missiles on the bottom of the plane..

EDIT:

Everyone should look at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7E3olbO0AWE> "Loose Change" it is

very well informed and it looks on every aspect of the attacks.

ROFL they had a news report about that and found falws in that internet video, pretty funny how it seems so real, but isn't. I think when a plane goes boom, it doesn't leave behind much of it's traces. Not starting a debate or anything.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [ron paul](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 22:25:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ST3ALTH wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 15:48 The plane (if there was one) would simply skid on the ground and then just totally miss it, the pentagon ain't tall at all, the odds of the pentagon. And there wasn't a single mark on the lawn next to it.

Also, 9/11 the WTC attacks, there were missiles on the bottom of the plane..

EDIT:

Everyone should look at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7E3olbO0AWE> "Loose Change" it is very well informed and it looks on every aspect of the attacks.

Hahahahaha, get your head out your ass. You're just saying that without even looking up any of the facts or even understanding what it is you're saying. Have you looked up any of the evidence or logs? Nope, didn't think so. So yeah let's just blindly agree with it because it tries to sound reputable etc.

Look at this. Someone who actually looked at every aspect of information possible to debunk it.

<http://internetdetectives.biz/case/loose-change>

I cannot believe you said that it's well informed. It was originally intended to be a fictional short movie. But dressing it up as a non-fiction documentary boosts popularity. Guess we know who IS uninformed though. Dear sweet jesus

Edit1: Also it doesn't matter if Blazer saw a plane either, how can we evaluate he is a credible witness. Just saying as this is a debate zone.

And the rest of you trying to explain it wasn't a plane or was a plane or whatever that crashed into the pentagon. None of you will have even the slightest idea in aeronautics or the advanced physics at work behind anything like this. So just don't theorize about.

Edit2: Also everyone with the satirical conspiracy theories. You aren't funny or smart.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 22:34:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, Blazer saw the plane. No, he doesn't work for the government, then or now.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 23:00:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 16:44 You forget one thing: Blazer saw the plane

None of us here, know or could understand what he saw, for all we know, he could had saw a small corporate jet or a unmanned aircraft, like a "global hawk" that they are using over in IRAQ and other war zones, maybe he saw one of these instead.

Being able to spot an object and comfirm its identify is a skill that is taught to people in the Armed forces and many factors can confuse your eyes and brain.

I do believe he saw something, but I douth he saw a 767 or a 757 then, many things could had affected his vision then or his memory now.

Eyes are pretty funny things, we do infact see more but the brain only takes a small part of what we see, as useful and turns it into images for us to see.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [ST3ALTH](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 23:31:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What was Blazer doing at the Pentagon on 9/11? Maybe he is a terrorist!

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 23:51:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 14:58 Why does it require a lawsuit to even force them to release a video that does not show much at all.

National Security, pish as usual

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [zunnie](#) on Tue, 26 Jun 2007 23:58:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Screw" 9/11 Mysteries
9/11 Mysteries

911research.com
debunking911.com

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 01:30:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 16:00

None of us here, know or could understand what he saw, for all we know, he could had saw a small corporate jet or a unmanned aircraft, like a "global hawk" that they are using over in IRAQ and other war zones, maybe he saw one of these instead.

Being able to spot an object and comfirm its identify is a skill that is taught to people in the Armed forces and many factors can confuse your eyes and brain.

I do believe he saw something, but I douth he saw a 767 or a 757 then, many things could had affected his vision then or his memory now.

Heh I guess I can't blame you for discounting my "story". Most conspiracy people are the same, you give them an eyewitness, and they say that they were mistaken. You give them 100 witnesses, and they say that the govt paid them. They will cling to their conspiracy no matter what evidence you give them, because its more exciting to think that there is a coverup.

As for seeing a "small corporate jet", that is just ridiculous. True I never served in the military and have no formal training on identifying aircraft, but you have to realize that most people, me included, know the difference between at least private jets, cargo planes, and commercial airliners. This thing roared right by my window, it was close enough that I could see figures through the windows.

ST3ALTH wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 16:31What was Blazer doing at the Pentagon on 9/11?
Maybe he is a terrorist!

My condo was very close to the Pentagon. Also my girlfriend at the time worked at the Pentagon, and it just so happens that she was at my place that morning, and running late to work. Had she been to work on time, she would have been in the exact area that was destroyed, and she would have been killed.

Here are some pictures THAT I TOOK from my apartment building:

The trees are barely obscuring a line of sight view, but you can get an idea of how close my place was.

You can check out the rest at <http://www.the-ownage.com/gallery/Pentagon>

Remember, these are MY pictures that I took. They are not from some random website. I was there. You can check the EXIF data on the pictures for exact timestamps of when they were taken. If you think the pictures are photoshopped I also included a video clip.

P.S. Yes I realize that none of the pictures actually show a plane hitting the Pentagon, so your conspiracy theory is safe for now

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 01:37:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 13:58

Why did they confiscate the video at the Pentagon but not the ones that recorded the attacks on the WTC for example.

Why does it require a lawsuit to even force them to release a video that does not show much at all.

Does anyone wish to comment on these two points?

No one has yet, understandable, you do have to think about it first to give a good reply, but funny no one has yet.

Blazer I like to keep a open mind about everything.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [zunnie](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 01:41:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You are missing one of the core elements:

- Why did they confiscate the video material if
- 1) it doesn't show anything or much,
- 2) shows the airliner impact, or
- 3) it clearly shows something else hitting ...

Why does it take a lawsuit to release a video that is showing not(hing) much, if it would prove all

conspiracies invalid then what is holding them back releasing that material if it exists? And if it exists, then once again why does it need to be protected or withheld from the public?

Why, on the contrary with the video's of the planes impacting the wtc, did they confiscate the video's and not release them to the TV stations to air it.

What is different in those video's that require it confiscated if it only shows the airplane impacting, or like the video that was released - merely due to a lawsuit being won in court- shows only the resulting impact.

Surely if the video only shows the explosion of whatever hit the pentagon and not the actual plane then you must conclude there is nothing to hide. So why keep it locked away for a year and only release it after a lawsuit?

Is this maybe the airplane you saw?:

http://youtube.com/watch?v=gGSwve_BU9I

and somehow confused it with the one that supposedly crashed into the Pentagon.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [AoBfrost](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 01:58:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OOne thing everyone, why do people base their lives on 911? it happened it's over, no one is still searching about it but nuts who think theres a conspiracy, i'm not saying there isnt, but look 911 is over, and even if you do find the truth it wont bring back 2000 people that died.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [zunnie](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 02:10:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You have obivously not questioned the things that have happened after and merely because of 9/11...

Furthermore the truth does not need protection

- Also, explain to me:

- Why did Bush and Cheney refuse to go under questioning seperately and under oath before the 9/11 Comission?

- Why was it not allowed to videotape the questioning or have a transcript of the hearing?

There are soooooO many things its not

even funny anymore lol

And meanwhile everywhere around the world this "War on Terror" is taking more lives and lives most notably in Iraq and Afghanistan.

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8539627650948217618>

"Let us never tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories concerning the attacks of September the 11th"

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [u6795](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 02:32:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I... used to be a staunch believer in the whole 9/11 was real thing, but I've seen so many videos and so much evidence (As well as Zeitgeist) that it's just impossible to believe anymore.

Zeitgeist changed my views on life, it's truly saddening.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 02:37:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You're asking why the government wouldn't release video that (you admit) didn't show anything. This is the same government that built a bridge no one would use in Alaska and created the Federal Interagency Committee for the Management of Noxious and Exotic Weeds. It would be much more worth our attention if they had immediately released the video.

Though I must admit, I certainly am open to a conspiracy theory on the Death Star.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [zunnie](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 02:42:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cant edit my post anymore.....

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qdd9hr8RUnY>

<http://newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>

Quote:

"Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor..."

"And advanced forms of biological warfare that can "target" specific genotypes may transform biological warfare from the realm of terror to a politically useful tool."

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 03:08:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The (pentagon) plane wasn't seen because it was travelling SO fast, that the video didn't catch it. In a documentary of the 911 incident, it shows the airplane crashing into the pentagon (through security cameras), the airplane was only shown in 1 frame, then the explosion.

The twin towers fell from the metal supporters weakening and letting loose of the weight of the full building. The planes were crashed near the top of the buildings, not the bottom. If the top part collapses on the bottom part of the buildings from the beams letting loose, then the rest of the buildings will fall to pieces from top to bottom as seen in the video.

I've seen videos of buildings similar to the world trade center being demolished.

It was not only the fire that made the buildings collapse, as people kept forgetting. One friggin airplane crashed into EACH tower! Plus, the weight of the top of the building collapsing on to the rest.

If you ask me, a LOT more evidence points against the theory of the 911 incident bombed with demolition than airplanes, and a LOT more evidence points towards the evidence of the airplanes used in the terrorism attacks.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 03:40:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think Blazer has flown in enough planes and been in enough airports to know what a commercial airliner looks like, especially when it passes close enough that had it not been flying at like 400+ mph at the time, he could have told you what the pilot looked like. Of course, you'll have to excuse him that he didn't actually have advance notice of the attack and therefore didn't have his video camera on.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 03:48:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 22:40I think Blazer has flown in enough planes and been in enough airports to know what a commercial airliner looks like, especially when it passes close enough that had it not been flying at like 400+ mph at the time, he could have told you what the pilot looked like. Of course, you'll have to excuse him that he didn't actually have advance notice of the attack and therefore didn't have his video camera on.

He didn't hear the sound of the plane coming? lol.

There is an airport only about 30 miles from me and I have planes flying over all the time for the fly

into landing, even when they are super high in the sky, I can hear them storm over and am talking when they really are that high, that you see them as a small shape in the sky.

So, am guessing, if this plane was so low in the sky, you would get up and have a look outside the window to see right?

As you say, it was so close that he could see people, with it be so low, I would had been up and looking well before the plane was passing me, lol.

AoBfrost wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 20:58OOne thing everyone, why do people base their lives on 911? it happened it's over, no one is still searching about it but nuts who think theres a conspiracy, i'm not saying there isnt, but look 911 is over, and even if you do find the truth it wont bring back 2000 people that died.

This is HISTORY, there is nothing wrong with researching into passed events, this is how we learn things.

And if the truth did come out, maybe that would put a stop to the next "911"

I dont fully believe one way or the other of the entire event, but I do think, there is more to 911, then we are being told and because of that, its worth finding out what they not telling us.

To believe one story over the other, without any douths, would be very ignorant.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [zunnie](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 04:07:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BlueThen wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:08

The (pentagon) plane wasn't seen because it was travelling SO fast, that the video didn't catch it. In a documentary of the 911 incident, it shows the airplane crashing into the pentagon (through security cameras), the airplane was only shown in 1 frame, then the explosion.

It doesnt show an airplane, it merily shows "something" crashing into the pentagon...

If it was clear by that video that a plane did crash at the pentagon we wouldnt be talking about this now.

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=L75Gga92WO8>

BlueThen wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:08

The planes were crashed near the top of the buildings, not the bottom.

Why did the lobby look like the plane hit the lobby?

BlueThen wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:08

If the top part collapses on the bottom part of the buildings from the beams letting loose, then the rest of the buildings will fall to pieces from top to bottom as seen in the video.

http://911research.com/talks/wtc/ndocs/tower2_exp1.jpg

<http://911research.com/talks/towers/docs/site1106.jpg>

Does that look like a pancaking effect to you?

Apart from that, both towers collapsed in under 15 seconds which is essentially at freefall speed.

The 47 core columns throughout the entire building had to have given way simultaneously for that to happen. But there was zero resistance all the way down.

And take a good look at the darker bands when they are collapsing you can fairly clearly see rows of explosives going off there.

Not to mention the reports of various tv stations, police, firemen, and other civilians about bombs going off everywhere...

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-6225595810242416389>

The reinforced "darker bands" that divided the building into three sections would have stopped a genuine collapse and cause the top section to topple.

http://911research.com/talks/towers/docs/eh_wtc4.jpg

The top section was actually toppling over before it "blew up in mid-air" (to quote a CNN reporter).

The centerpoint of the pressing weight of the block was not concentrated in the middle of the building. Yes it could -and probably would have- caused some floors below to partially collapse on the side the weight of the top-section was leaning on.

The top-section however was blown away and well, just look at the video's, that to me does not look like a pancaking effect.

Especially notice how these beams are thrown horizontal sideways.

Also where the hell did all the concrete go? 110 stories of concrete is a lot of concrete and nearly all of it was turned into gravel and dust all over NY...

BlueThen wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:08

I've seen videos of buildings similar to the World Trade Center being demolished.

Similar to the WTC?

BlueThen wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:08

It was not only the fire that made the buildings collapse, as people kept forgetting.

One friggin airplane crashed into EACH tower! Plus, the weight of the top of the building collapsing on to the rest.

Yes, the plane caused several columns to fail, however it was the resulting fires that broke out that sufficiently weakened the steel further (in just over an hour) to cause both buildings to collapse to the ground in a simular way.

BlueThen wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:08

If you ask me, a LOT more evidence points against the theory of the 911 incident bombed with demolition than airplanes, and a LOT more evidence points towards the evidence of the airplanes used in the terrorism attacks.

I havent.


Also, what is up with the explosions and smoke seen at the base of the towers even before they collapse?

Or the pools of steel/metal that were at the base of all three buildings that collapsed that day?

Jetfuel does not ever burn hot enough to create such pools of metal..
Explosives and thermite or thermate do.

File Attachments

1) [jetfuel.jpg](#), downloaded 796 times



Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [jnz](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 05:30:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

lol @ http://youtube.com/watch?v=zIAllcfrqYU&watch_response

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [zunnie](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 07:30:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://video.google.nl/videoplay?docid=7094545816220336237>

First 2 minutes is in Dutch, rest is in English (there are Dutch subs though you'll have to look through).

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 09:11:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The buildings did NOT fall at "freefall speed". Where do you get your data?

How do YOU know that the amount of dust and debris found all over NYC isn't enough for two large buildings, and why would there be less if there was explosives used rather than building collapsing through structural weakness?

Why do you completely ignore several pictures available that show obvious plane debris, including a piece of the fuselage with American Airlines coloring still visible?

Reference: Pic of the debris referenced from a more detailed report proving that it WAS a plane at this link though it is not the most detailed proof I have come across, it is sufficient.

Where are all the people on that flight? If you remember, there were a few moderately-famous people on many of the flights, including the wife of a senator on the one that hit the Pentagon who was scheduled to be on "Politically Incorrect with Bill Maher" that night and was flying to LA for her appearance. How did all the local firefighters and police officers not notice someone moving in the 60 dead passengers from that flight, and how did they manage to injure all those people with consistent injuries to a plane crashing into the building?

Also, there was a large exterior generator near the impact site. If it had been a missile that hit the building, it would have been blown AWAY from the building. But instead, it was pushed TOWARDS the building and part of the top sheared off by a plane heading TOWARDS the building. How do the conspiracy theorist whackjobs explain that?

Look, I am fully open minded to the fact that there's probably a fuckload of stuff that we aren't being told about the events up to, on, and after that day, but to tell me that a plane didn't hit the pentagon is just ludicrous, unintelligent, and practically insane.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [jnz](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 10:21:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Where is the plane?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 10:25:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Um, click my links. There are several pictures of plane debris held side-by-side with their non-destroyed counterparts.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 11:00:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ST3ALTH wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 15:48Everyone should look at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7E3olbO0AWE> "Loose Change" it is very well informed and it looks on every aspect of the attacks.

There are literally hundreds of things wrong with Loose Change. Factual errors, quotes taken catastrophically out of context, interviews with people who didn't have the authority they said they did, arguments supported by absolutely nothing whatsoever...

<http://www.loosechangeguide.com/LooseChangeGuide.html>

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [The 1337 Doitl0](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 11:49:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jonty wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 15:44How tall is the Pentagon?
Because jet planes are pretty large you know.

No, no they are not. The pentagon is a bit under twice as tall as the plane that hit it. The pentagon is 77ft tall and the plane that hit it is 44ft tall. The plane could have hit it 20-30ft in the air.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 12:26:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I fucking hate all of you who still thrive on blaming the US government for orchestrating an attack

on its own people on its own soil.

I can't really add to what tzarmind said, so I'll say this: Fuck you. You're all idiots.

Also, why would the government be so sloppy as to use real planes to hit the WTC buildings and then use a missile to hit the Pentagon? If you're claiming our government is smart/powerful enough to orchestrate this whole thing, why would they do that?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 12:38:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here's what I find hard to accept.

If the US government was capable of orchestrating this, why couldn't/didn't they fake some WMD evidence in Iraq?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 12:56:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 08:38Here's what I find hard to accept.

If the US government was capable of orchestrating this, why couldn't/didn't they fake some WMD evidence in Iraq?

Oh, I know! CUZ BUSH IZ IDOT LOL!!!!11!1!

Seriously, if our government is capable of such cover-up, why has this "War on Terror" been such a failure?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [Crusader](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 13:05:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Canadacdn wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 16:06A bunch of people in a cave getting amateur pilots armed with box cutters to take over four commercial airliners and fly them into certain targets with a 75% success?

That sounds like a conspiracy theory to me.

What really amazes me is that, first, the conspiracy theorists don't believe that scientists and engineers actually put a man on the moon...now they say cavemen can't do what they did in 9/11.

First off...the 9/11 terrorists were not cave dwellers...these fanatics were from the educated elite from their respective countries. All came from wealthy families and had a comfortable life ever since they were born. These terrorists DID NOT fit with the usual stereotypes people generally associate terrorists with.

Calling them "amateur pilots" would be HIGHLY inaccurate...4 of the hijackers (1 in each hijacked aircraft) had commercial pilot licences. Of course, since they had never piloted a real Boeing 757 except in simulators, they showed some unfamiliarity on that morning.

To say that the American government did this to it's own people is the most uneducated thing I ever heard in my life.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by: [Jecht](#) on **Wed, 27 Jun 2007 16:07:41 GMT**
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's the government. They used its army of pygmy mole people to set that plane debris there. I can't believe none of you came to that conclusion.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by: [ST3ALTH](#) on **Wed, 27 Jun 2007 17:11:47 GMT**
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It always was the government, and I completely agree with Loose Change, some people may not, some people may, but it gets you thinking allot.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by: [Crimson](#) on **Wed, 27 Jun 2007 17:21:26 GMT**
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Should have been called "Loose Screws". I love how they present the movie in such a way that they try to manipulate people to believe that if you agree with them, then you are intellectually superior to those who don't believe them, when in fact the opposite is true.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by: [Spoony](#) on **Wed, 27 Jun 2007 17:24:56 GMT**
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ST3ALTH wrote on **Wed, 27 June 2007 12:11** and I completely agree with Loose Change, some

people may not, some people may, but it gets you thinking allot.
Have you clicked the link I posted yet?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 17:29:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Of course not! It's a biased source!

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 17:38:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

zunnie wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:07
It doesnt show an airplane, it merily shows "something" crashing
into the pentagon...
If it was clear by that video that a plane did crash at the
pentagon we wouldnt be talking about this now.
<http://youtube.com/watch?v=L75Gga92WO8>

Try asking anybody that saw it.

zunnie wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:07
Why did the lobby look like the plane hit the lobby?

The fire spread through many stories of each building. The elevator shafts were also a good deal
of where the fire went through.

zunnie wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:07
http://911research.com/talks/wtc/ndocs/tower2_exp1.jpg
<http://911research.com/talks/towers/docs/site1106.jpg>
Does that look like a pancaking effect to you?

Although it did pancake, there still going to be dust. Explosion, fire, etc.

zunnie wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:07
Apart from that, both towers collapsed in under 15 seconds which
is essentially at freefall speed.
The 47 core columns throughout the entire building had to have
give way simultaniously for that to happen. But there was zero

resistance all the way down.

I wouldn't expect much resistance during the fall. Some of the core was left standing during the fall of the building.

zunnie wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:07

And take a good look at the darker bands when they are collapsing
you can fairly clearly see rows of explosives going off there.

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-6225595810242416389>

The air being pressurized under the fall of the building pushed the smoke out of the windows
making 'spurts' or as many of you people mistaken as bombs.

zunnie wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:07

Not to mention the reports of various tv stations, police,
firemen, and other civilians about bombs going off everywhere...

They didn't say that there WAS planted bombs, they said it was LIKE bombs.

zunnie wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:07

The reinforced "darker bands" that divided the building into
three sections would have stopped a genuine collapse and cause
the top section to topple.

Don't forget that the fire didn't only cause the building to collapse, there was a plane crashing into
it too.

zunnie wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:07

Simular to the WTC?

Small mistake there. No buildings similar to the WTC has been demolished that I know of. People
have compared the WTC with other buildings being caught on fire, and other buildings that have
been demolished. But those buildings have NO similarities of the much larger tower of the world
trade center.

zunnie wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:07

Also, what is up with the explosions and smoke seen at the
base of the towers even before they collapse?

bluethen

The air being pressurized under the fall of the building pushed the smoke out of the windows
making 'spurts' or as many of you people mistaken as bombs.

zunnie wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 23:07

Or the pools of steel/metal that were at the base of all three

buildings that collapsed that day?

No people mentioned that there were pools of metal or steel except you. I've seen dozens of videos and read dozens of articles, and again, no mentioning of "pools of metal and steel"

If you watch your 9/11 Mysteries, you'll notice MANY errors within it, as pointed out by your "Screw" 9/11 Mysteries.

Basically the "Screw' 9/11 Mysteries" repeats of what I said, but in more of sense. Watch it and it'll prove your whole statements wrong.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 17:39:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=L75Gga92WO8>

I dont see no plane hitting a building here, to be honest, I would expect a 757, whatever it was, to do more damage then that, lol.

To me, looking at it, that looks more like a missile hit.

But, am sure there is more video capture like this, would be nice to see more impact angles, to get a bigger picture before deciding for real, if it was a plane or a missile.

warranto wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 12:29Of course not! It's a biased source!

Is there such a thing as an un-biased source?

Me thinks not.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [ST3ALTH](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 17:53:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It is a missile, I am thinking there was a army jet that launched the missile right before the camera's point can capture it.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 17:58:01 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 10:39<http://youtube.com/watch?v=L75Gga92WO8>

I dont see no plane hitting a building here, to be honest, I would expect a 757, whatever it was, to do more damage then that, lol.

To me, looking at it, that looks more like a missile hit.

But, am sure there is more video capture like this, would be nice to see more impact angles, to get a bigger picture before deciding for real, if it was a plane or a missile.

warranto wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 12:29Of course not! It's a biased source!

Is there such a thing as an un-biased source?

Me thinks not.

The problem is, in that video, you are probably imagining that you're looking at a 2-story building. That is a 5 story building! (Or is it 6)... it's a problem on scale. The building is so huge that you can't tell how far away the camera is from the plane.

For reference:

<http://maps.google.com/maps?f=q&hl=en&geocode=&q=arlington,+va&ie=UTF8&ll=38.870654,-77.055724&spn=0.014367,0.02002&t=k&z=16&om=1>

This is the Pentagon from Google Maps. Notice the scale at the bottom of the screen.

<http://maps.google.com/maps?f=q&hl=en&geocode=&q=mall+of+america+minnesota&ie=UTF8&ll=44.854256,-93.242319&spn=0.013082,0.02002&t=k&z=16&om=1>

This is the Mall of America in Minnesota. I believe it's the biggest mall in the US with an indoor amusement park and over 500 stores. The Pentagon is almost as big as this mall!

It's a problem of scale. Since you haven't ever seen the Pentagon up close, in person, your brain has trouble fathoming just how huge this building is, so it's easy for you to think that something rather small and missile-sized struck it rather than a commercial aircraft.

But, I'll keep coming back to this. The plane passed right by Blazer's condo in Arlington, Virginia and he saw it with his own eyes, moments before it struck the building. He SAW the plane. He SAW the logo on it. He could see the people inside it.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [ST3ALTH](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 17:59:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I seriously doubt it was a AA plane.

Thats what I think.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 18:54:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 12:58IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 10:39<http://youtube.com/watch?v=L75Gga92WO8>

I dont see no plane hitting a building here, to be honest, I would expect a 757, whatever it was, to do more damage then that, lol.

To me, looking at it, that looks more like a missile hit.

But, am sure there is more video capture like this, would be nice to see more impact angles, to get a bigger picture before deciding for real, if it was a plane or a missile.

warranto wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 12:29Of course not! It's a biased source!

Is there such a thing as an un-biased source?

Me thinks not.

The problem is, in that video, you are probably imagining that you're looking at a 2-story building. That is a 5 story building! (Or is it 6)... it's a problem on scale. The building is so huge that you can't tell how far away the camera is from the plane.

For reference:

<http://maps.google.com/maps?f=q&hl=en&geocode=&q=arlington,+va&ie=UTF8&ll=38.870654,-77.055724&spn=0.014367,0.02002&t=k&z=16&om=1>

This is the Pentagon from Google Maps. Notice the scale at the bottom of the screen.

<http://maps.google.com/maps?f=q&hl=en&geocode=&q=mall+of+america+minnesota&ie=UTF8&ll=44.854256,-93.242319&spn=0.013082,0.02002&t=k&z=16&om=1>

This is the Mall of America in Minnesota. I believe it's the biggest mall in the US with an indoor amusement park and over 500 stores. The Pentagon is almost as big as this mall!

It's a problem of scale. Since you haven't ever seen the Pentagon up close, in person, your brain has trouble fathoming just how huge this building is, so it's easy for you to think that something rather small and missile-sized struck it rather than a commercial aircraft.

But, I'll keep coming back to this. The plane passed right by Blazer's condo in Arlington, Virginia and he saw it with his own eyes, moments before it struck the building. He SAW the plane. He SAW the logo on it. He could see the people inside it.

Whatever the size of the building is, I still see no plane, but it still does look like a missile hit.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 19:00:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 11:39 <http://youtube.com/watch?v=L75Gga92WO8>

I dont see no plane hitting a building here, to be honest, I would expect a 757, whatever it was, to do more damage then that, lol.

To me, looking at it, that looks more like a missile hit.

But, am sure there is more video capture like this, would be nice to see more impact angles, to get a bigger picture before deciding for real, if it was a plane or a missile.

warranto wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 12:29 Of course not! It's a biased source!

Is there such a thing as an un-biased source?

Me thinks not.

With the shutter speed that camera has, you couldn't even see the white vehicle that is passing by (1:26). You see the front of it in one frame, and it is gone the next where you see the flash of light signaling the explosion.

That biased source comment was intended as sarcasm.. as that is usually the response given by people who do not look at something.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 20:07:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ST3ALTH wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 10:59 Despite all the evidence and proof to the contrary, I will still stick with what I've been manipulated to believe because I don't want to admit that I was wrong and I have been owned.

I translated for you.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Jonty](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 20:12:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 21:07 ST3ALTH wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 10:59 Despite all the evidence and proof to the contrary, I will still stick with what I've been manipulated to believe because I don't want to admit that I was wrong and I have been owned.

I translated for you.

Yes, we already discovered you're good at translating things to agree with your point of view.

I don't doubt the US government is hiding a lot about this incident. Hell, some poll said that over 50% of Americans believed their government was hiding evidence about the existence of aliens (correct me if I'm wrong).

Also, the CIA shot JFK.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 20:21:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Again, why the fuck would the government be so stupid as to use a missile when they used planes at WTC if they were behind all of this. Oh, and someone take in account for Flight 93. What happened there?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [Memphis](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 20:40:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Scientologists did it.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 21:19:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

As always in this forum and by its users, everyone has ignored the first post and the topic.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [Rocko](#) on Wed, 27 Jun 2007 22:36:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 16:19As always in this forum and by its users, everyone has ignored the first post and the topic.

LOL

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Thu, 28 Jun 2007 05:34:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ST3ALTH wrote on Tue, 26 June 2007 16:48The plane (if there was one) would simply skid on the ground and then just totally miss it, the pentagon aint tall at all, the odds of the pentagon. And there wasn't a single mark on the lawn next to it.

Also, 9/11 the WTC attacks, there were missiles on the bottom of the plane..

EDIT:

Everyone should look at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7E3olbO0AWE> "Loose Change" it is very well informed and it looks on every aspect of the attacks.

Wow, your pretty fucking stupid if you beleive that.

You beleive anyone fuckin types in a youtube video.

Anyone who states only certain points, makes it look like their video is the truth.

The pentagon is fucking massive, like I mean, MASSIVE, It's not the tallest, but it covers a large surface area.

Not to mention, they've already mentioned-

THE PLANE WAS FLYING LOW FOR ABOUT 15 MILES BEFORE IT HIT THE PENTAGON

That video in the first post, is bullshit.

Someone else trying to prove it was a missle-

How about all the Wheels, Engines, Turbines, Cockpit, Blackbox that they found at the scene?

Your going to say thats all from a missle?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [ron paul](#) on Thu, 28 Jun 2007 11:12:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just to kind of clarify what jball said.

Why would the government use a missile IN PLACE of an air liner. At least if they use the air liner they can say terrorists done it. You see a missile can't be hijacked by terrorists so it's going to be harder to blame it on terrorists. The missile would just be doing what it was told. Something about computers or some such controlling it? Who knows what a computer is, never heard of of that word before.

So yeah, it would probably wouldn't cost much more to arrange an air liner to hit the towers than missile. If the US government is so deceptive (and it is quite deceptive) it would use an Airliner rather than a missile to orchestrate a terrorist attack. So therefore it wasn't a missile any of you seen. So by using logic we've concluded that it was an air liner and not a missile.

Also I'd like to take this time to point out that just about everyone that posts here is barely intelligible. So don't try and back your stupid missile theories or try and explain that it was an

airliner because only it would appear warranto and a few others have any understanding of basic physics.

(note: Zunnie has always been a retard anyway. That much is certain in everyones mind)

If the US government took any part in 9/11 it was to sit back and allow it to happen rather than directly orchestrating it. And it to be honest it sounds like it was orchestrated by a third party that isn't the US government. Probably the terrorist group Al Qaeda. They seem like the most likely candidates.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [The 1337 Doitle](#) on Thu, 28 Jun 2007 11:50:13 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If the "EVIL" government was trying to make the US scared of terrorists they WOULD have used a missile. Missiles can be hijacked too. Remember the intro to Red Alert 2:YR? Terrorists that are capable of hijacking US missiles are a heck of a lot scarier than terrorists who can jump on a plane.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel

Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 28 Jun 2007 12:26:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doesn't look like a plane to me The nose of the plane would be a lot bigger than that, even compaired against a 5 story building.

File Attachments

1) [whatsthis.png](#), downloaded 616 times



Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 28 Jun 2007 12:49:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's not necessarily what hit the building.

There is not enough to see, nor is the frame rate sufficient to catch it later, or even in better focus.

As I mentioned, it could just be a vehicle on the next road over.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 28 Jun 2007 13:25:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can see where it looks like a missile, but upon looking at it further, the "it's a car" is a lot more reasonable. If you're open-minded enough, you may actually see it.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 28 Jun 2007 16:12:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Once again, please refer to my reply where I remind you how fucking huge the Pentagon is...

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Thu, 28 Jun 2007 18:08:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Thu, 28 June 2007 12:12Once again, please refer to my reply where I remind you how fucking huge the Pentagon is...

Ok, I'm going to finish this "It was a missle" debate once and for all-
Google "Pentagon Plane Photos"

Youll see parts EVERYWHERE outside the pentagon.
You know why you dont see any after the fires?
Because, it melted down, into nothing.
That fire reaches thousands of degrees, and easily melts metal. It's because of their Jet Fuel.
You dumbasses really think they would tell us a plane over a missle?
If they wanted us to fear terrorists more, it woulda ben a missle.
The up-tight security at the plane terminals justify this, as they were tighter then a virgin's pussy for months.

now, someones going to tell me-
THOSE ARE PLANTED PARTS
THOSE ARE FAKE
PHOTOSHOP FTW

If this is you, dont even bother posting your ignorance.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [jnz](#) on Thu, 28 Jun 2007 18:52:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

fire does not reach 1000s of degrees in the open. even if you are burning jet fuel, petrol, petrolium, hydrogen, even if you use an oxidizer like nitrus oxide it doesn't go above 1000 degrees in the open. tbh, though i don't really care what hit the pentagon or who destroyed the twin towers.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 29 Jun 2007 03:49:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don't have a lot of time to post, seeing as how I've got laundry to do and it's late enough already... but I would like to throw my \$0.02 in here. You can take my word for it or not- I really don't care; I don't have the time or the will to go digging around the internet for links right now.

Off the top of my head, reasons why so-called conspiracy "evidence" is bullshit:

1. Why did the military/government confiscate footage of the Pentagon being struck?

Simple answer. The Pentagon, contrary to what some of you may believe, is a military installation. Given that the attack did quite a bit of damage to a large section of the building, don't you think that footage of the attack could provide future attackers intelligence about the building's weaknesses? Have you ever heard of a military willing to risk exposing a weakness that could allow a determined attacker to decapitate its command structure in one fell swoop? No shit they confiscated that footage- and they'd have been complete boneheads not to.

2. There wasn't any wreckage!

Look closer. If any of you nincompoops had ever bothered to research major air disasters, you would find that the intense heat generated by burning jet fuel can, and frequently does, consume the wreckage. Indeed, it doesn't take much more than a ruptured fuel line at the wrong time to create those conditions- on at least one occasion that I am aware of, an airliner's wing caught fire in flight after an engine explosion, and the fire consumed nearly half the wing before the crew cut off fuel flow to the damaged section. Also, airliners are designed to be durable from the inside out to withstand higher internal pressure against lower external pressure. They are not designed to survive head-on collisions with solid objects at several hundred miles per hour. Remember how many itty bitty pieces TWA Flight 800 was found in? Yeah- and that plane hit the water.

3. The World Trade Center collapsed rather than toppling!

It was designed to do exactly that from the moment of its conception in the 1960s. Why? Think of what would happen if that tall of a building fell over laterally in downtown Manhattan. In the event of a structural failure, the buildings were designed to collapse evenly, exactly as one would expect from a controlled demolition. The actual collapse was somewhat messier than an explosive demolition would have been (check out footage of such demolitions for a clue), mainly due to the uneven distribution of structural damage after the impact of a fucking airliner loaded with fuel. The plans factored in airplane impacts, but assumed that such impacts would be accidental, the result of navigational errors at the end of a long flight (with a light fuel load). They did not anticipate a deliberate attack. If it were not for the fire, the buildings would likely not have fallen at all.

That's all I've got time for. Take all that with a grain of salt if you will, but it's all the truth.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Fri, 29 Jun 2007 05:11:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I will reply to 1.

- 1) It was shown all over the world on TV.
- 2) There was pictures in every News Paper.
- 3) There was graphic pictures made to show where it was hit.
- 4) Graphic pictures was shown on TV shows about the attack on it.
- 5) Graphic video to recreate the attack run on the same spot, in a lot of TV shows about the day.

Pentagon is meant to be the World's more secure air zone but a 747 managed to strike it, really

makes me think, why they didn't go for the White house instead?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 29 Jun 2007 16:08:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not exactly the same, I know... but check out what happens to this aircraft during a controlled high-speed crash.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=--_RGM4Abv8

Edit: and the White House WAS a target.

The flight that was supposed to hit the White House was flight 93, the one where the passengers took back the aircraft, only to have it crash in a field.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 03 Jul 2007 02:01:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blazer saw the plane...case closed.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 03 Jul 2007 03:30:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Memphis wrote on Wed, 27 June 2007 15:40Scientologists did it.

Upon further review this seems like the most likely scenario.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [DutchNeon](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2007 00:14:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BuzzOfTheStar wrote on Mon, 02 July 2007 21:01Blazer saw the plane...case closed.

Maybe it was a plane which flew over the pentagon?

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2007 04:10:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dutch Neon wrote on Wed, 04 July 2007 19:14BuzzOfTheStar wrote on Mon, 02 July 2007 21:01Blazer saw the plane...case closed.

Maybe it was a plane which flew over the pentagon?

Sure.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2007 06:46:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sure, commercial airliners fly over the Pentagon ALLLLL the time.

Subject: Re: New Pentagon footage from hotel
Posted by [Tankkiller](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2007 17:04:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm sure the pentagon is restricted airspace, the f-16 squad from oklahoma, (my brother is in there) frequently travel at mach 1.5 to respond to false tips.

Truefully I'm thinking this video is simily the making of a pro using 3ds max (or some other rendering program) and a still bitmap of the side of the pentagon. Sure, This "attack" is all american. Just right in time before 4th of july too

The pentagon is more surcure then you think. Cars can't get in for high conrete barricades and retracting road barriers (they are always up, until the employes exgange (probley 4-5 in the morning, and down for a mere 10 minutes.)

Airplanes: They have a zone marked physically saying that this zone is restricted. By passing this zone the aircraft will be intercepted by the oklahoma f-16s.

missles: Highly unlikely for the fact they are not for sell. althought they most often appear on the iran, iraq, ireaslal, urkaian, russian, etc, and etc blackmarket. and having fireworks near the pentagon is suicidal.
