

30 JULY 2008 - NEW PROOF OF VIDEO FAKERY ON 9/11

New Proof of Video Fakery on 9/11

Abstract. Five arguments have emerged as among the strongest proofs that video fakery took place on 9/11, namely: that United 175 is traveling at an impossible speed for its altitude; that the entry into the South Tower with no debris is physically impossible, that this occurs in uniform motion in violation of Newton's laws, that the Naudet brothers' video of AA 11 hitting the North Tower reveals "cut outs" being created by secondary explosions and that the Evan Fairbank's video of United 175 displays similar problems.

Madison, WI (OpEdNews) July 30, 2008 — A recent dispute between prominent 9/11 activist Kevin Barrett and founder of Scholars for 9/11 Truth James H. Fetzer has led to the presentation of what appear to be five of the strongest, if not the strongest, arguments for video fakery on 9/11. Indeed, they are strong enough that Fetzer, who spent 35 years teaching logic, critical thinking and scientific reasoning, has described them as "decisive" in establishing the complicity of the media in misleading the American people about the events of that day. "It is a sad commentary on the state of freedom of the press that we now have overwhelming evidence that the mass media — television, in particular — was crucial to the deception."

Barrett, who is running for Congress in Wisconsin's 3rd District as an Independent Libertarian, challenged Fetzer to offer stronger and more formal support for his views on video fakery, which have evolved during the past year and a half from skepticism to acceptance. "During that time, I conducted more than fifteen interviews with students of video fakery and became convinced by the evidence they produced that there is no reasonable alternative explanation." Ironically, he and Barrett jointly host a radio program, "The Dynamic Duo", on gcnlive.com, where Barrett hosts Mondays and Fridays and Fetzer the rest of the week. The arguments that Fetzer has found to be the most compelling were published in Barrett's Truth Jihad News (July 16, 2008) as follows:

(1) Multiple experts (including the FAA, the Royal Air Force, and so on) have calculated the speed of United 175 as reflected by the Michael Herzarkhani video at approximately 560 mph (averaging their estimates). While that corresponds to the cruise speed of a Boeing 767 at 35,000 feet altitude, it would be impossible at 700-1000 feet altitude, where the air is three times more dense, as Joe Keith, an aerospace engineer and designer of the Boeing "shaker system", has recently explained, in the video entitled, "Flight 175 - Impossible Speed", which is archived at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x2upl977dsY>. While Anthony Lawson has claimed such a plane could reach that speed in a dive, the plane is clearly not diving.

(2) The way in which the plane enters the building appears to be impossible as well. Go to killtown.blogspot.com and scroll to (what is now) the sixth image and you can view the plane interacting with the building. It is passing into the steel and concrete structure without displaying any signs of impact, where the wings, the engines, the fuselage and other component parts all remain intact. It should have been the case that massive debris was breaking off and the plane was being dismantled by the interaction between the moving plane and the stationary building, as early critics and late--from the Web Fairy to Morgan Reynolds--have been maintaining for years now. So this is yet another physical impossibility.

(3) As Joe Keith has observed, the interaction observed here also violates all three of Newton's laws of motion. According to the first law, objects in motion remain in uniform motion unless acted upon by a force. According to the second, an object accelerates in the direction of the force applied. According to the third, there is an equal and opposite reaction. But the plane moves at uniform motion through both air and building, which would violate Newton's laws unless the building provides no more resistance (force) than air, which is absurd. By most counts, the plane moves its length through air in 8 frames and also moves its length into the building in the same number of frames, which cannot be the case if these are real objects and real interactions. His paper is archived at http://nomoregames.net/index.php?page=911&subpage1=joes_law.

(4) Neither the impact of United 175 with the South Tower nor the impact of American 11 with the North show the damage done to the steel and concrete in the form of the "cut outs" that subsequently appear at the time they were allegedly being "caused" by the planes' impacts there. A study of the Naudet brothers footage reveals a secondary explosion after the initial impact and fireballs that actually causes the cut out in the North Tower. Indeed, an extension of the right wing's cut out was even "penciled in". Take a look at the study of this phenomenon under "9/11 Amateur, Part 2", <http://www.revver.com/video/605306/911-amateur-part-2/>. It is fair to infer that the same technique was employed to create the cut out images in the South Tower.

(5) The same student of the videos has examined the Evan Fairbank's footage and found ample grounds to dispute it. Certainly, it shows the same smooth entry as the Herzarkani footage and the same lack of debris from the encounter.

However, it goes further in considering the angle of the shot and how he came to take it, which suggests that he is lying through his teeth. He claims he saw a "white flash" and was able to determine it was a jet. But the time line is so brief that this explanation appears to be a complete fabrication. View this study at "9/11 Amateur, Part 3" at <http://www.revver.com/video/605306/911-amateur-part-3/>. Killtown has now extended the uniform motion argument to Evan Fairbank's video, <http://killtown.blogspot.com/2008/07/air-vs-skyscraper-video.html>.

"The evidence is so visual and easier to assess in video format that I find it more than a little puzzling why Kevin insists that the arguments should be presented in scholarly, written papers," Fetzer said. "But the fact of the matter is that Morgan Reynolds has already done that in his exceptional study, 'Plane Deceit at the World Trade Center', 54 pages with 71 footnotes, which is archived on his web site, <http://nomoregames.net>. Reynolds, the former Chief Economist for the Department of Labor in the Bush Administration, is an accomplished scholar with a half-dozen books to his credit and innumerable articles. Fetzer, who earned his Ph.D. in the history and the philosophy of science, is the author or editor of 28 books, with three on JFK and one on 9/11.

Scholars for 9/11 Truth has previously published a press release about this subject, "Mounting Evidence of 9/11 Video Fakery" (July 28, 2007), which is archived at 911scholars.org. What is most powerful about these new arguments, Fetzer said, is that they display the occurrence of events that would require violations of laws of physics, which is not possible. Laws of physics cannot be violated and cannot be changed. Which means that, if they are being shown in videos, they cannot be authentic. As Ace Baker, musician, composer and expert on digital processing, has recently observed, "9/11 seems to have been a media job as much as it was an inside job." His own study, "Chopper Five Composite", may be found at acebaker.com.

Video fakery and no planes are not the same thing, since, although the planes must have been present if the videos were authentic, they might or might not have been present if the videos are fake. They could have been faked for the purpose of concealing features of the planes or of their interaction with the buildings. "Although the absence of planes is even more controversial than video fakery," Fetzer observed, "there is considerable circumstantial evidence suggesting that, in this case, video fakery may have been required to conceal the absence of planes." The alleged eyewitness reports, for example, are far fewer than we tend to suppose. The occurrence of false memory syndrome appears to be a simpler explanation than violations of Newton's laws.

The debris often cited in support of the existence of real planes has been repeatedly challenged itself. The engine found on the sidewalk in New York appears to have come from a Boeing 737, not a 767. A piece of debris from an American Airlines crash found at the Pentagon has been traced back to a crash in Cali, Columbia, in 1995. Col. George Nelson, USAF (ret.) has observed that each of these planes had thousands of uniquely identifiable component parts, not a single one of which has been recovered from any of the four "crash sites". And John Lear, an aviation expert, has pointed out that, before any commercial carrier can pull away from the terminal, the captain must submit an "envelope" certifying that the plane was ready for flight. Yet not one of these envelopes has been produced, either.

Perhaps even more importantly, Elias Davidsson has a masterful study of the lack of evidence the alleged Arab terrorists were aboard any of the planes, among the most important papers in 9/11 research, <http://www.aldeilis.net/english/images/stories/911/noevidence.pdf>. "I know that Kevin is familiar with his work, because Kevin featured Davidsson as a guest on 'The Dynamic Duo' (July 11, 2008). I don't know what he makes of all of this," Fetzer said, "but the available evidence could be explained with a high likelihood if there were no planes and all of this had to be faked. I submit that any rational mind considering the evidence presented here should similarly conclude that video fakery took place in New York and that there is a very strong possibility that the planes were an illusion. How else is this evidence to be explained? What would be a more reasonable alternative?"

James H. Fetzer
Founder
Scholars for 9/11 Truth