

A CONTROVERSIAL STUDY

We have some holes in the plane stories
 We have some holes in the plane stories
 by Morgan Reynolds, Ph.D.

In my opinion, this is a fascinating piece that raises serious questions, not only about Shanksville and the Pentagon but about what hit the Twin Towers. Morgan's analysis of the Pentagon is devastating, where he makes a powerful case that whatever hit the building cannot have been a Boeing 757. He and I are in complete agreement here, as many of you no doubt will already know. I also agree that the Shanksville crash scene appears to have been contrived as a Hollywood-style prop. I have had numerous reports from residents of the area telling me that there had been an explosion in the air, but the FBI wouldn't even write it down! Morgan has informed me, however, that he believe he has proven that no plane hit the South Tower by a process of elimination. This has been a difficult concept for me to appreciate, but once I realized that video fakery and planes/no planes were separable issues, I began to get a grip on it. If the videos are authentic, then there had to have been planes. But if the videos have been faked, then there may or may not have been planes, since the fakery could have been to conceal features of the planes used or of their interaction with the buildings. At this point in time (22 November 2007), I am convinced by the work of Morgan Reynolds, Ace Baker, and others that there was video fakery on 9/11. I recommend their work be studied carefully.

"Flight 175" WAS a Cargo/FUEL TANKER by Omega Point
<http://letsroll911.org/ipw-web/bulletin/bb/viewtopic.php?p=105783#105783>

"Conclusion: The plane which hit the south tower was not and could not possibly have been the original flight 175 (even setting aside for a moment, the "pod" as well as the "flame-flash-missile")."

"Body length to wing proportion analysis proves it."

"Therefore, since it was not flight 175, yet fits the profile of a 767, in this case a 300, as opposed to a 200 series, and since we can hardly conclude that a US Air Force pilot was at the helm for a kamakazi mission, the logical and deductive conclusion which must be drawn was this this aircraft was in fact, a remotely piloted Boeing 767 drone aircraft, and if that's the case, what better candidate than the Tanker Transport fuel carrying cargo plane? And in this case, a military Boeing 767-300 reconfigured with a shrouded missile firing canopy (3D pipe-like structure, the end of which is seen to emit the flame-flash/missile) - in order to produce the resulting "shock and awe" fireball for psy-op purposes, and to create a suspension of disbelief, as to the cause (fire) of the near free fall total top to bottom destruction of the twin towers."

WTC-2 Plane-as-missile firing missile

26 Mar 2006 by Robert RiceHere are some additional studies that defend the authenticity of the film and the reality of the planes. But I am no longer persuaded by these arguments.

What airplanes actually hit the WTC?
 26 Apr 2006, August Dunning

Military Drone, not Flight 175,
 Hit the South Tower on 9/11

A Critical Review of WTC 'No Plane' Theories
 28 September 2005, Eric Salter (with updates)