

28 JULY 2007 - MOUNTING EVIDENCE OF 9/11 VIDEO FAKERY: NEW PROOF OF MEDIA DUPLICITY, SCHOLARS CLAIM

Mounting Evidence of 9/11 Video Fakery
New proof of media duplicity, Scholars claim

ABSTRACT. New studies provide substantial evidence that TV channels were broadcasting manipulated images in real time on 9/11. The on-line series "September Clues" and a detailed analysis of the live WNYW (Fox 5) helicopter video of UA 175 hitting the South Tower demonstrate the problems. The evidence of media duplicity on 9/11, which depends upon a time lag between the occurrence of an event and the time it is broadcast, is mounting.

Madison, WI (OpEdNews) 28 July 2007 — New studies of media coverage of the attacks on the Twin Towers have raised serious questions about the integrity of television broadcasts over CNN, CBS and FOX NEWS, according to Scholars for 9/11 Truth, a non-partisan society of students, experts, and scholars. "I used to think that the very idea of faking 'live' broadcasts was at least faintly absurd," observed James Fetzer, the society's founder. "But it turns out that there is a delay between an event's actual occurrence and the broadcasting of footage of that same event, which creates the opportunity for image manipulation."

New proof has appeared in "September Clues," a series of studies of these broadcasts currently available on YouTube and on google video. "These six studies, each of which is less than ten minutes in length, make it very difficult to deny that something was amuck on 9/11," Fetzer added, "and they have now been corroborated by an in-depth analysis of the digital properties of a 'live' WNYW (Fox 5) helicopter video of United Airlines Flight 175 hitting the South Tower, which Ace Baker has provided. It, too, can now be found on-line as 'Chopper 5 Composite' at <http://www.acebaker.com>. We have also linked to them from our web site, 911scholars.org."

Fetzer said he was affected in his thinking when relatives traveled to Madison from Milwaukee to visit with his daughter and son-in-law. "They wanted to watch a Brewer's game, so we put it on TV," he explained. "They had a favorite announcer who was on radio. So we put the radio by the television. To our astonishment, the radio broadcast was so far ahead of the television coverage that we knew whether it would be a ball, a strike, or a hit before the ball had left the pitcher's hand. I realized deception was possible."

The first segment of "September Clues", which is subtitled, "The 911 News Media Coverage," provides an instructive example. It starts with CNN footage in which, as the plane hits the building and begins to emerge from the opposite side, there is a "FADE TO BLACK!" On CBS, the wife of the producer reports observing the plane hit the building from her location in Chelsea. On FOX NEWS, a helicopter broadcast goes "FADE TO BLACK!" at the same point at which this occurred on CNN. As the voiceover explains, such events are important for multiple reasons, including:

- (a) the "FADE TO BLACK!"s on CNN and FOX occur just as the nose of the plane is emerging from the opposite side of the building, as though an editor were seeking to cover the image;
- (b) the announcer on CBS does not appear to notice any plane as it approaches the building, which would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible, to observe from Chelsea;
- (c) microphones located on-site near the base of the South Tower failed to pick up sounds of any impact, which presumably would have caused significant auditory reverberations.

Point (a) is especially striking, Fetzer said. "The study points out that the nose of the plane exactly conforms to the nose of a Boeing 767, but this one had just passed through 200 feet of steel and concrete and should have been severely damaged if not completely destroyed. Pixel pattern comparison confirms the correspondence, which, under the circumstances, would be physically impossible." The "FADE" takes place 0.28 seconds late, moreover, which appears consistent with human hand/eye response coordination.

They made a mistake they were unable to correct in time, Fetzer said. Six minutes later, CNN repeated the footage, but with the oddity that the network banner masked the appearance of the nose as it exited the building, as though that were not the most stunning feature of the video record. "That this was done provides powerful confirmation that the 'FADE' was a deliberate effort to conceal the occurrence of an event with the potential to reveal the

deception. What's the probability of two networks 'fading' at exactly the same moment of their 'live' coverage, if this was all on the level?

Ace Baker's 'Chopper 5 Composite' substantiates these concerns with proof that the image of the plane was recorded separately from the image of the Twin Towers, Fetzer said. He discovered that, when variations induced by the helicopter's motion are removed from the raw footage, apparent variations in aircraft speed that should be reduced are instead increased. Moreover, as the plane emerges from the building, the nose cone itself appears to accelerate and decelerate, repeatedly. That would not occur if this were an actual event being recorded on an authentic video.

The five other segments of 'September Clues' address other anomalies. 'Part 2: The Flying Telephants,' for example, shows that various videos of the airplane's approach are inconsistent with one another, where some show a smooth, perfectly horizontal trajectory into the building and others display a steep vertical descent before impact. A few show no plane at all. 'This means they can't all be authentic,' Fetzer observed, 'but they could all be faked, which I would never have taken seriously before these studies.'

'September Clues, Part 5: 17 Seconds' shows that audio beeps that were 17 seconds apart were included in broadcasts from the major networks, apparently in order to synchronize the footage being used. In some cases, the networks kept the audio track of the impact on the South Tower, but changed the video track so the nose cone exit would not be seen. The difference between the official 'time of impact' at 9:03:11 and the seismic effects recorded at 9:02:54 also turns out to be 17 seconds, which appears to have been the interval that created the opportunity for image manipulation.

Kevin Barrett, the founder of MUJCA and a member of Scholars, reports he is troubled by these new studies. 'I guess I'll have to take this possibility more seriously now,' Barrett said. 'In the past, I have assumed video fakery was far-fetched and that anyone who endorsed it was probably a crackpot! Now I'm not so sure.' Morgan Reynolds, former Chief Economist in the Department of Labor of the Bush administration, has gone further, contributing a chapter to a new book from Scholars, *The 9/11 Conspiracy*, which argues video fakery may have been used to conceal the absence of planes actually impacting the building, a more controversial claim.

The most important question about these studies is that they might be fake videos of video fakery, but Fetzer thinks they are authentic. 'I have the FAA Registry results for these four planes,' Fetzer said. 'Not only were AA11 and AA77 not deregistered until January 20, 2002, but UA93 and UA175 were not deregistered until September 28, 2005, which is quite peculiar for planes that were destroyed on September 11, 2001. It raises the prospect none of them were involved in 9/11.'

The technology for extremely efficient video manipulation has been around for some time. The on-line journal, *techreview.com*, published a piece entitled 'Lying with Pixels' (July/August 2000), explaining, 'Seeing is no longer believing. The image you see on the evening news could well be a fake—a fabrication of fast new video manipulation technology.' An example is moving Katarina Witt in and out of an ice skating exhibition. It could already be done on TV in real time prior to 2000. That was a year before 9/11.

Similar delays occur on radio. 'I called a friend recently after a show to ask what she thought, and she told me "Hang on!" because she was still listening.' The question of motivation for such a complex deception may also have an answer. 'I have been asked, "What are the chances that those planning the demolition of these buildings would be able to predict the exact location the planes would impact the towers to prepare the towers to begin falling precisely there?"' Fetzer said. 'The answer may be 100%.'

Ace Baker mentions a group long convinced of video fakery, including Gerard Holmgren, Rosalee Grable, StillDiggin, Killtown, and others, who have been frustrated their arguments have not been taken seriously. 'For that reason, I'm including this subject in a conference on "The Science and the Politics of 9/11: What's Controversial, What's Not," which will be held in Madison on August 3-5, 2007 (911scholars.org),' Fetzer said. 'We are going to do our best to get to the bottom of this. Truth about 9/11 is stranger than fiction.' (See <http://www.prweb.com/releases/2007/07/prweb541060.htm>)

James H. Fetzer
 Founder
 Scholars for 9/11 Truth