
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 peices 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 give way simultaniously 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 alot 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 seem videos of buildings similar to the world trade center being demolished. Simular 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 986 times

