

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 03:03:08 GMT

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

---

<http://www.ebaumsworld.com/pentagon.html>

You have to watch this... Way too much sense concentrated into one little flash movie.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Aurora](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 03:07:34 GMT

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

---

(I like how you watched a whole flash movie about it, then spelled it wrong in the title of the thread. Must have been a real informative movie. :rolleyes: )

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 03:17:56 GMT

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

---

Watch it...

<http://news.uns.purdue.edu/UNS/images/sozen.pentagon.jpeg>

Thats a simulation image of what happend, see that. Then look at the actual images...

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 03:43:50 GMT

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

---

The man who made that movie obviously knows nothing about plane crashes. A plane flying 550 miles per hour will literally vaporize into nothing after slamming into a building.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 03:47:19 GMT

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

---

I still think the wholes are a bit too small

Our sigs are the same size

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 03:51:33 GMT

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

---

When going 530mph and you have 5300 lbs of jet fuel and your plane is made out of aluminum and plastic. When you hit solid concrete there is not going to be much left.

Besides, how would you explain the disappearance of flight 77?

Don't tell me you believe in aliens.

Besides, any camera that someone uses as a security camera will have a hard time capturing something going that fast.

And the holes could be from anything.

When something is going that fast is is moving a lot of air. Those holes could be from an engine that that broke off and went right straight through.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 04:04:39 GMT

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

---

The Pantagon... Sounds like a Porno to me.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 04:15:30 GMT

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

---

Quote: Yea, I believed the movie. Too many things mentioned that only require common sense to understand. And if " a plane would vaporize" why dont normal plane crashes vaproize?

Theres times when a plane crashes going around that speed.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 04:23:39 GMT

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

---

The tail of the aircraft would be still there...

Plus there's no way in hell that a plane that big would be flying that low in a urban area...

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

---

Posted by [z310](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 04:26:02 GMT

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

---

Also note the history of the pilot(s)

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 06:20:50 GMT

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

---

The movie might have some credibility if it didn't discredit its own evidence.

It throws up a bunch of quotes from people who said it sounded like a missile. Then it puts up quotes from people who saw a plane.

It talks about how the lawn in front of the pentagon was undamaged, suggesting something small must have hit it from a higher angle. They discredit this idea almost immediately, twice. First when they trace the flight path to the point of impact on the birds eye view of the pentagon, you can indeed see that the ground along the flight path is different than the grass around it. It looks like the grass was torn up by something large going across it. Then it shows security camera footage of a large fast moving object coming across the lawn and striking the pentagon at ground level. They try to divert your attention from this obvious flaw in their theory by asking if the blur looks like a 757. However, they won't show you a scale comparison of a 757 to the Pentagon. They just show distance shots of a 757. For all we know the image they show of a 'real 757' is a model and it might as well be because we can't get a size comparison from it.

The movie questions how a large plane could only make a small hole after plowing through several layers of reinforced steel and concrete, but doesn't really get into how the hole of the initial impact is large enough to be a fuselage impact and that the hole even fans out at the bottom matching where large wings and engines would hit.

At one point it shows a quote saying the wings and tail should have sheared off when the plane hit. The idea of this is to plant the idea in your head that experts think the tail would have broken off and been easily found. However if you look at where the quote is from, it was a reporter asking a question at a briefing. It's not an expert talking, just someone with no experience asking the question. Although I don't have the footage right in front of me to review, when the planes hit the world trade towers I don't recall the wings and tail bouncing off the buildings. They plowed right through the steel wall they struck.

It claims that the terrorist who crashed the plane into the pentagon didn't have enough skill to fly it. It backs this up with two quotes from people at a flying school. Not enough evidence to even be worth discrediting, so they try to change the subject quickly by saying there's more evidence that the government won't release.

Frankly, I don't care if there are more tapes since the creators of this movie haven't raised any credible doubt to the official story. As a matter of fact, their obviously flawed presentation of their 'evidence' only serves to strengthen the official story by discrediting all the conspiracy theories. Why would anyone believe anything in this movie? I just saw it for the first time 20 minutes ago

and I've already realized enough major flaws in it to discredit the whole basis of their evidence.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 11:20:12 GMT

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

---

I said it on the n00bstories post with this in it, i'll say it here too.

Any of you who even hint at this being real are complete fucktards who should probably not be walking the streets unless you are surrounded in a huge fucking bubble.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 12:15:03 GMT

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

---

bigejoe14The man who made that movie obviously knows nothing about plane crashes. A plane flying 550 miles per hour will literally vaporize into nothing after slamming into a building.

There would still be large pieces of plane garbage, like a tail fin or something. At least, that's how it seems to go down in every other plane crash. [Not just from what I saw in that video]

Well, that's a really neat video, but I want to see more. Nice find.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [exnyte](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 13:42:22 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiAt least, that's how it seems to go down in every other plane crash.

That can't really be used as a comparison since there isn't very many other plane crashes where a plane hits a building and such a rate of speed, at that angle.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 17:00:59 GMT

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

---

There's a massive difference between accidental crashes and intentional ones. The aircraft involved in the 9/11 attacks were all near fully fueled at the tyime they impacted their targets-accidental crashes involving aircraft and buildings typically happen either on landing, when the aircraft is low on fuel, or on takeoff, when the aircraft is traveling at a relatively low rate of speed(and often a high angle of attack). Neither of those conditions existed in this case.

And no, there would not necessarily be a whole lot of wreckage- jet fuel burns extremely hot, hot enough to melt or burn almost the entire aircraft. In an ordinary explosion, there would be a significant amount of wreckage as the airframe would be spread out before the fire could reach certain parts of the plane. However, we are talking about an aircraft crashing into a building that was designed specifically to CONTAIN explosions, fires, etc. The whole aircraft went into the same spot, so the whole thing burned- the only parts of the plane that are designed to withstand that kind of heat are the engine turbines(which would have been more or less completely destroyed anyway, from impacting a building as sturdy as the Pentagon) It's really not that difficult of a concept.

The aircraft that crashed into the Pentagon was a smaller Boeng jet, I believe it was a 757(a small to midsize jetliner usually used for domestic flights and flights to neighboring countries), which is larger than the 737 and 727, but smaller than the wide body 767. Considering that all of the eyewitnesses were far away from the building and aircraft, it might have looked very small, especially when compared with a building of the Pentagon's size. A missile would have been too small to see clearly at such distances, and a smaller aircraft could not have caused such extensive damage.

Then, of course, the largest single flaw in this bullshit conspiracy theory- if the plane that hit the Pentagon was a small aircraft or missile, then where the fuck did the airliner go? The flight was tracked on radar right up until it went into the building, so unless 757's have suddenly become capable of trans-substantiation, there's no way this is even possible.

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [bigejoe14](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 17:45:25 GMT

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

---

In addition to the jet fuel thing, planes are made out of titanium. Titanium metal burns with an intense heat and an intense bright white color. It will burn until nothing is left and it is almost impossible to put out the fire by conventional means. So not only could the plane have vaporized upon impact, but the bruning wreckage can contribute to the fact that there was hardly anything left of the plane after the fires were put out.

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 18:24:08 GMT

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

Planes are made out of titanium? Wtf.

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [bigejoe14](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 19:28:24 GMT

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

Titanium alloys of Ti-6Al-4V flats and bars.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 20:00:17 GMT

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

---

Another two questions about this theory I need to ask are, what would the American government gain by lieing about it? And what happened to the people who were on the plane?

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 20:33:35 GMT

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

---

Quote:Another two questions about this theory

It isn't even a theory, really. Theories have factual evidence and observations to back them up and suggest that they have some credibility. This is simply something some idiot pulled out of their ass.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [bigejoe14](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 21:00:07 GMT

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

---

Quote:And what happened to the people who were on the plane?  
They were blown to bits along with the plane.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Apache](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 23:14:29 GMT

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

---

Take a look at this post on a Chevy / GMC forum I frequent -- I feel that Cobalt and some of the other truck guys do a good job explaining how rediculous this flash movie is after you get past its (excuse the pun) "flashy" presentation.

<http://67-72chevytrucks.com/vboard/showthread.php3?t=118150>

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 05 Sep 2004 23:21:40 GMT

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

---

The best quote under that link:

Quote:Go make a nice hot campfire and get drunk on beer in cans. Throw empty cans in hot fire. Next day try and find said empty cans. They are the same place as that plane.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Mon, 06 Sep 2004 00:06:36 GMT

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

---

Huh, that's bullshit.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 06 Sep 2004 03:53:07 GMT

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

---

Oh really? If you can provide evidence from another deliberate crash of a fully-fueled medium sized airliner into a heavily reinforced building that shows any large aircraft sections remaining after the crash, please, I'm all ears. Unless you actually have some kind of clue what you're talking about, don't.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Mon, 06 Sep 2004 03:59:07 GMT

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

---

I'm talking about your quote, that's nearly impossible.

Aluminium requires a lot more heat than the heat coming from a simple campfire to melt.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 06 Sep 2004 04:37:25 GMT

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

---

The melting point of Aluminum is 1220F, fire at its hottest point is 2552F.

So it will melt, but It will not boil.

<http://www.ueet.nasa.gov/materials/elements.php>

<http://webexhibits.org/causesofcolor/3B.html>

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Aurora](#) on Mon, 06 Sep 2004 06:56:23 GMT

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

---

ok, This is hilarious.

I'm going to jump in for a post.

I just have to point out something here... People are saying that it wasn't a Boeing 757 that crashed into the "Pantagon". Now, They can cite wrong evidence all they want, whatever. But they're missing something.

If it wasn't a Boeing 757, what the fuck happened to the missing plane?

And don't tell me that they somehow managed to get it out of the country undetected, with no other aircraft in the sky, military and civilian radars everywhere, and lots of military aircraft in the sky. That's more bullshit than is in that whole movie.

And that's saying something.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 06 Sep 2004 13:19:46 GMT

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

---

Well, I think the maker of video's point is that we don't know, and that if it was indeed a missile or smaller aircraft, it would be something that would have to be investigated.

It seems unlikely though...weren't parts of the engines found anyway?

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 06 Sep 2004 13:58:47 GMT

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

---

I'm guessing that the author is a Michael Moore wannabe liberal dumbfuck. If he had any common sense at all, he wouldn't have made that, but alas, he must not.

Just because the government doesn't release footage that doesn't mean that they're covering something up. Maybe they just wanted footage for evidence, but was irrelevant to the public because it was confirming something that every intelligent being already knew.

Edit: I thought this was quite funny:

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 07 Sep 2004 15:44:14 GMT

---



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

---

OK, this is real simple... Blazer lived in a 16th (ish)-story condo in Arlington, VA, when this happened. He saw the plane. It was definitely a 757 and not a "commuter jet", and it passed so close to his apartment that he said he could practically see the pilot. He was also close enough to hear the explosion seconds later.

Then there's the obvious question of what happened to the plane if it didn't hit the "pentagon"? One of the passengers on that plane was the wife of a Senator who was on her way to appear on "Politically Incorrect" with Bill Maher. If she didn't die, then where is she? Where are all these people?

Anyone who believes this crap is an idiot, plain and simple.

---

---

Subject: 9/11: The Pantagon...

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Tue, 07 Sep 2004 20:06:47 GMT

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

---

Everything makes sense until you look deeper into the subject...

---