
Subject: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [zunnie](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 03:16:11 GMT

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

If you people still believe in the official story of 9/11 it is about time that you open your eyes as to what is unfolding as the greatest deception and treason in the history of human civilization probably!

Read the following carefully, study it and then ask yourself: What are we going to do about this?

<http://prisonplanet.com/video/911insidejobvideo.wmv>

[source and petition: <http://www.thepetitionsite.com/takeaction/929981172>]

Scholars Call for Release of 9/11 Information

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND
OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:*

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT,

On Behalf of the People of the United States of America, the Undersigned Scholars for 9/11 Truth Hereby Petitions for, and hereby demands, Release of the Following kinds of documents, video and films, and physical evidence to the public for study by experts and scholars investigating the events of 9/11:

1. Immediate release of the full Pentagon surveillance tapes, of which five frames (only) have been released via the official ASCE report, as Judicial Watch has also requested. We further demand release of the video tape seized by FBI agents minutes after the Pentagon hit, from the fuel service station near the Pentagon, as well as any other videotape which shows the 9/11 strike on the Pentagon.

See

<http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/20...repentagon.html>

http://www.defenselink.mil/releases/2000/b...0_bt218-00.html

<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/May2000/20005022a.jpg>

<http://perso.wanadoo.fr/jpdesm/pentagon/pa...fct-videos.html>

2. Immediate release of 6,899 photographs and 6,977 segments of video footage held by NIST, largely from private photographers, regarding the collapses of WTC buildings on 9/11/2001 (NIST, 2005, p. 81). In particular, all footage relating to the collapse of WTC 7 (including shots before, during and after the collapse) must be released immediately, without waiting for the NIST report on WTC 7, which is long overdue and may be prolonged indefinitely.

3. An explanation from Vice President Richard Cheney regarding the "orders" described by Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta in his testimony before The 9/11 Commission. Secretary Mineta stated that while in an underground bunker at the White House, he watched Vice President Cheney castigate a young officer for asking, as a plane drew closer and closer to the Pentagon, "Do the orders still stand?" The officer should be identified and allowed to testify at a deposition under oath.

See http://www.911truthmovement.org/video/hamilton_win.wmv

4. The documents generated by Vice President Cheney's energy task force have been kept from the public. A court case brought forth a few maps that display oil fields in the Middle East. We hereby put Congress on notice that there is probable cause with regard to criminal activities by the Cheney Energy Task Force involving a criminal conspiracy to launch illegal wars and/or terrorist activities. We therefore demand that Energy Task Force document that comprise, discuss, or refer to plans to invade the Middle East, including Iran, and Venezuela or other sovereign nations be released immediately.

See *Cheney v. District Court* 542 U.S. 367 (2004) and *United States v. Nixon* 418 U.S. 683 (1974).

See http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article....RTICLE_ID=33642

5. Audio tapes of interviews with air traffic controllers on-duty on 9/11 were intentionally destroyed by crushing the cassette by hand, cutting the tape into little pieces, and then dropping the pieces in different trash cans around the building. We demand an explanation for this destruction of evidence and ask that the possible existence of other copies of such tapes or perhaps of written transcripts of the interviews be pursued. All air traffic controllers on-duty on 9/11 should be allowed to testify during a public forum under oath.

See

<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html...=archive:search?>

<http://web.archive.org/web/20040509021515/...nws-tape07.html>

6. The Secret Service, which is highly trained to protect the President from danger and to move him to a secure location in the event of a threat, breached its own standard procedures by allowing President Bush to remain at a public location for 25 minutes after it was known that the nation was under attack. All Secret Service personnel who were at Booker Elementary School with President Bush on 9/11 should be required to testify in public and under oath about these events.

See

<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/story?id=121331&page=1>

http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/IMAGES/f..._press_9-10.gif

<http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/bushbook.mov>

7. On the morning of 9/11, some five "war games" or "terror drills" were being conducted by U.S. defense agencies, including one "live fly" exercise employing aircraft. These drills reportedly included the injection of false radar blips onto the screens of air traffic controllers. In addition, the government was running a simulation of a plane crashing into a building the morning of 9/11. Who was in charge of coordinating these war games and terror drills? Who had the ability to issues orders in relation to their conduct? On which screens were "false radar blips" inserted? When did such false injects commence? When were they purged from the controllers' screens? What was the effect of these activities on standard procedures for interdicting hijacked aircraft?

See

http://www.911readingroom.org/bib/whole_do...p?article_id=92

<http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/...ranscript.shtml>

<http://www.spiegeltech.com/media/McKinney2.rm> (6 minutes, 12 seconds into the video)

http://www.boston.com/news/packages/sept11...ne_exercise.htm

8. It has been reported that the FBI long ago found three of four "black boxes" from the two airplanes which hit the Twin Towers, yet has consistently denied that they were ever found. Their data would be of the greatest importance to understanding the events of 9/11. This matter must be investigated and the data they provide released to the public.

See

<http://www.pnionline.com/dnblog/extra/archives/001139.html>

<http://www.counterpunch.org/lindorff12202005.html>

For each of the four sites under investigation, the 9/11 Commission reported that two Boeing 757s, and two Boeing 767s (FAA, Part 121, airliners) owned by United Airlines and American Airlines were hijacked by novice pilots and were subsequently crashed, resulting in an unimaginable loss of life. Approximately 3,000 people died the morning of 9/11 as the direct result of these officially reported hijackings and subsequent crashes.

These four scheduled airliners were reported to have carried a total of 266 passengers and crew members, which, under FAA and NTSB regulations, demands a comprehensive investigation of the primary and contributing causes of each. In the case of suspected criminal foul play, the NTSB would normally assign the lead investigative role to the FBI, with assistance of investigators from the NTSB and FAA. A comprehensive investigation of each aircraft crash is not a regulatory option: they would have been mandatory. Therefore, we demand public release of each comprehensive crash investigation report, including access to all physical evidence that was required to have been collected and secured at a suitable facility. Such evidence should have included a large assortment of indestructible parts, including landing gears, surface actuators, engines, black boxes, and so on. The serialized parts would be invaluable in identifying each aircraft and, contrary to some reports, could not have "vaporized" upon impact.

Considering the enormous loss of life and financial collateral damage, if no crash investigations were conducted, who made the decision to disregard the FAA, Part 121, regulatory requirement? In the absence of the Part 121 investigation reports, the identity of the responsible authorities who made the decision not to investigate must be released, and they should be made immediately available for deposition under oath.

9. In the weeks before 9/11, the US Stock market showed rather high levels of activity on companies that would subsequently be affected by the attacks. The afternoon before the attack, alarm bells were sounding over trading patterns in stock options. A jump in United Air Lines some 90 times (not 90 percent) above normal between September 6 and September 10, for example, and 285 times higher than average the Thursday before the attack, have been reported. A jump in American Airlines put options 60 times (not 60 percent) above normal the day before the attacks has also been reported. No similar trading occurred on any other airlines appear to have occurred.

Between September 6-10, 2001, the Chicago Board Options Exchange saw suspicious trading on Merrill Lynch and Morgan Stanley, two of the largest WTC tenants. An average of 3,053 put options in Merrill Lynch were bought between Sept. 6-10, compared to an average of 252 in the previous week. Merrill Lynch, another WTC tenant, saw 12,215 put options bought between Sept. 7-10, whereas the previous days had seen averages of 212 contracts a day. According to Dylan Ratigan of Bloomberg News: "This would be the most extraordinary coincidence in the history of mankind, if it was a coincidence. This could very well be insider trading at the worst, most horrific, most evil use you've ever seen in your entire life. It's absolutely unprecedented."

On September 18, 2001, the BBC reported: "American authorities are investigating unusually large numbers of shares in airlines, insurance companies and arms manufacturers that were sold off in the days and weeks before the attacks. They believe that the sales were by people who knew about the impending disaster". According to the London Independent, October 10, 2001: "To the embarrassment of investigators, it has also emerged that the firm used to buy many of the 'put' options—where a trader, in effect, bets on a share price fall—on United Airlines stock was headed until 1998 by 'Buzzy' Krongard, now executive director of the CIA."

See

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1549909.stm>

<http://news.independent.co.uk/business/new...jsp?story=99402>

The 9/11 Commission, after looking into the pre-9/11 stock trades, never denied their unusual nature. Instead, the Commission declared that al-Qaeda did not conduct the trades, and asked no further questions.

<http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/156656584...=books&v=glance>

Who, if not al-Qaeda, performed the incriminating trades? This information exists, it can be easily obtained, and it needs to be made public. Moreover, illegal money transfers may have been processed through computers housed at the World Trade Center shortly before planes crashed into the Twin Towers on 9/11. We demand a disclosure of the source of the put options and that this whole sordid affair receive a complete and public investigation.

See

<http://www.rediff.com/money/2001/dec/17wtc.htm>

<http://archives.cnn.com/2001/TECH/industry...harddrives.idg/>

10. Eyewitness testimony and a substantiating photographic record suggest that a large sample of slag from the World Trade Center is being held at Hangar 17 of the John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York City. Access to the slag sample should be made available to appropriate physicists in order to conduct non-destructive X-ray Fluorescence tests and other forms of examination, which should reveal evidence of the cause of the collapse of the Twin Towers. Based on these tests, we further demand two small samples (about the size of a fist) be extracted from this large piece for further scientific analysis.

See <http://911proof.com/resources/Slag+Sample.gif>

11. Release of a complete inventory of the plane wreckage and debris from flights 11, 77, 93 or

175 or any other aircraft that crashed or was destroyed on September 11, 2001, including, but not limited to:

(a) the location (whether warehouses or otherwise) of all such items;

(B) a catalog of photographs and videotapes taken of any and all such items; and

© a list of all tests and examinations concerning any and all such items, including reports of such tests or examinations.

12. Release of a complete inventory of any steel, other metal or other material from the World Trade Centers, including, but not limited to:

(a) the location (whether warehouses or otherwise) of all such items;

(B) a catalog of photographs and videotapes taken of any and all such items; and

© a list of all tests and examinations concerning any and all such items, including reports of such tests or examinations.

On behalf of the People of the United States of America, we demand that the cover-up in this case end and that the kinds of documents, video and films, and physical evidence described above be provided to the public for experts and scholars to evaluate and assess in their efforts to expose falsehoods and reveal truths about events on 9/11.

FOR THE SOCIETY:

James H. Fetzer, Ph.D.
Founder and Co-Chair
Scholars for 9/11 Truth

Steven E. Jones, Ph.D.
Co-Chair
Scholars for 9/11 Truth

7 March 2006

*An online version of this petition -- with clickable links -- may be viewed here:
<http://st911.org/petition>

"Why did Tower #7 collapse?"

http://www.mp-gaming.net/wtc_7_cbs.mpg

http://www.mp-gaming.net/wtc7_collapse.mpg
http://www.mp-gaming.net/wtc7_collapse2.mpg

This is without doubt a controlled demolition.

And, i am not here to argue or fight with people, i have spent hours beyond hours investigating about this and read basically every report, document, the official documents, individual testimonies and so on. "Why?" you ask - Because things that have happened and you start thinking and placing logic and common sense in your examinations you will conclude that indeed something fishy is about it.

http://www.9-11commission.gov/staff_statements/staff_statement_15.pdf
Another minor(?) thing that is kind of odd is that they speak of "Bin Ladin" in the official 9/11 documents while everywhere on the world knows it is spelled as "Bin Laden". Did they make a "stupid" typo? Or is this the reason why he is not on the FBI website most wanted terrorists for the attacks of 9/11? Just odd to say the least...

Did you know that alot of the alledged hijackers turned out to be alive and well in Saudi Arabia and some other ME countries?
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1567815.stm>
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/1559151.stm

"Why indeed did the WTC collapse"
<http://www.physics.byu.edu/research/energy/htm7.html>

Hunt the boeing! If you find it, make sure you get in touch with Davic Copperfield...
Also notice on these pictures there are trucks dumping sand..
<http://www.asile.org/citoyens/numero13/pentagone/erreurs>

<http://www.ratical.org/ratville/CAH/RRIraqWar.html>
Lastly, why did the US invade Afghanistan, followed by Iraq and why is Iran the next target?
[*]Afghanistan: Taliban goverment does not want the US to pass through Afghan territory constructing a pipeline to Pakistan coastlines for natural gas transport. (In 1998 or so Clinton forbade the US to do business with Taliban).
[*]The US needs a REASON to invade Afghanistan overthrow the Taliban goverment and construct their natural gas pipeline to Pakistan coast.
---This is where 9/11 is born. An 'act of war', the US already 'knows' that Laden (or is it Ladin?) is hiding in the mountains of

Afghanistan so they invade and start building their pipelines.

So why Iraq you ask?

[*] Iraq started selling their oil in EUROS as of early 2000, it caused a -17% collapse of the US dollar, thus saddam, who is obviously proven by now not a threat to world peace was invaded and the US turned the wheel around and Iraq oil is once again priced in US dollars.

Why is Iran the next target?

[*] Iran just recently started selling their oil in EUROS as well as of March 2006. And being the 2nd largest oil producer in the world that will definately not do good for the US dollar.

I know and i have seen that Iran is provoking the US to attack, with their comments on achieving Uranium enrichment and nuclear technology.

This is EXACTLY what they want...

File Attachments

1) [wtc_7.gif](#), downloaded 337 times



Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 03:23:44 GMT

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

Oh my God, not this bullshit again. Get the fuck out!

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 03:45:36 GMT

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

"I'm sorry, but this information will remain confidential as it is part of an on-going investigaiton."

-Random person who is involved.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [zunnie](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 06:02:05 GMT

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

Bush President for the rest of his political life?

(source: <http://letsroll911.org/ipw-web/bulletin/bb...pic.php?p=71101>)

(search: <http://search.msn.com/results.aspx?FORM=TO...ent+For+Life%22>)

Quote:

A House bill has been introduced that would change the 22nd amendment and enable George Bush to remain President for the rest of his political life.

The bill would repeal limitations on a President holding office for a maximum of two terms.

The bill can be found at the Library of Congress website here.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [zunnie](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 09:36:29 GMT

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

Have a close read here and google some stuff if you dont believe it...

The collapse of WTC7 for example. The reluctance of the Bush administration to conduct an enquiry at all.

An enquiry which was conducted under the presumption that the official story was fact.

The fact that Osama Bin Laden is not wanted for the crimes committed on 9/11. Check out the FBI website.

<http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/terrorists/terbinladen.htm>

That Bush saw the first plane crash before entering the Brooker school, when that wasn't aired till the

following day, how was he watching the FIRST plane hit ???? And how could he have watched it unless they knew it was going to happen in the first place. Why would television be looking at the World Trade centre at all unless there was a reason??

Why does the Gov. not release the confiscated videotapes from the gasstation and the hotel across the street which definately recorded the plane impact on the Pentagon. Why did they DENY any video existed at first, and later release FIVE FRAMES showing only the explosion but without any trace to a Boeing... Examin the frames and you will notice a white smoke trail in the center-right, that is not a Boeing lol. Another fact what alot of people forget about the pentagon is this: When the "plane" impacted the building, the ROOF did NOT collapse, the collapse followed hours later and notice that the roof is not showing ANY damage. Futhermore the entire front of the point of impact is completely inconsistent with the damage a Boeing would have done. Watch photos from the pentagon or videos from CNN and you will see a large group of people collecting debris from a crashsite that needed to be examined thoroughly. This 'evidence' was immediately destroyed. Also they are seen carrying away a huge box(container) with a blue plastic cover minutes after impact, what was inside it? Why were there Trucks on the grass in front of the pentagon dumping layers of sand the minute after the crash while the firemen were still there fighting the fires?

The NORTH tower was hit by a plane first and collapsed LATER that the SOUTH tower. The South tower collapsed first which doesnt make alot sense. Furthermore if you look at the CNN videos while the towers collapse you can clearly see explosions going on far below the zone that is collapsing. Countless eyewitnesses have testified they heard multiple explosions INCLUDING firefighters, the recorded firemen radio mentions the existance of multiple explosions over and over. The buildings fell into their own FOOTPRINT, this is practically impossible -if we are to believe the various reports of educated people in engineering and controlled demolition fields- without the use of explosive charges strategically placed throughout the buildings. Also note that there were evacuation drills and powerouts a week before 9/11. <http://www.wnbc.com/news/1315651/detail.html> | <http://www.nbvfd3.org/audio/wtc03.mp3>

http://www.freedomfiles.org/war/discussion_in_firehouse.mpg !!

Ground Zero was immediately sealed off from the public, nobody but FEMA, FBI and CIA were allowed on the scene.

Debris, steel and all sorts of rubble was taken from the site as soon as possible to be destroyed. Cleaning the

evidence and leaving nothing for 'independent investigation teams' to discover and examine.

Surely you must be wondering about this: If indeed the construction of the WTC failed, numerous investigators

would want to see the rubble to determine the cause of the collapses to prevent such disasters from happening

in the future by making sure the same design error wouldn't be made.

Moreover SIX WEEKS after the WTC collapses at the base of the WTC when a lot of the rubble was removed they

dug up a pile of RED HOT LIQUID steel of intense heat. How on earth did the base get so hot if the impact zone

of the plane were hundreds of meters above it? Explosives called C4 generally create enough heat to cause this!

Jet Fuel is not hot enough to melt huge quality steel bars like that! Impossible, especially knowing the towers

were only about 40 mins on fire or something. There are countless other buildings all over the world that had fires

all over entire stories high and they did not collapse after burning for over 20 hours!

<< Now that is hot!

The whole buildings are literally pulverized to dust/powder during their collapse, this is impossible without

the use of explosives.

The Empire State Building had a military B-25 bomber crash into it on July 28, 1945.

<http://www.evesmag.com/empirestatebldgcrash.jpg> << image of impact zone

Quote: Too late the pilot of the U.S. Army B-25 bomber with three men aboard, saw the Empire State Building loom

up before his eyes. At 300 miles per hour, he plunged through the 34th Street side of the building wreaking

havoc.

The major portion of the wreckage penetrated the 78th floor. An engine hurtled down an elevator shaft igniting a

furious fire in the basement. Parts of the motor and landing gear tore through the entire building landing on top of a

13-story edifice across the street and igniting a second conflagration.

It did not collapse...

("An engine hurtled down an elevator shaft" -- Do some research on the WTC and you will learn this is not possible

in the case of the WTC towers. There are multiple elevator shafts in the WTC to prevent the shaft working as a big

chimney in case of fires.)

source: <http://www.evesmag.com/empirestatecrash.htm>

Wake up people for crying out loud..

(i will edit this post and add things later ..)

http://www.truthout.org/docs_03/042203A.shtml

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 13:44:05 GMT

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

convinced yourself yet, mate?

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 13:47:39 GMT

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

Are you really that stupid... really.

The building pulverized under its own weight and wtc 7 sustained massive structural damage to its lower levels destroying the structural integrity of the building. You sir are just another MP idiot trying to sound smart becuae you found a conspiracy theorists website. Also, if you look up the that bill EVERY president has attempted to pass something similar to that effect. So be quiet idiot.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 13:51:13 GMT

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

Quote: 6,899 photographs and 6,977 segments of video footage I'm sure you would have fun looking them all through?

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 14:09:50 GMT

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

Why the buildings collapsed:

[http://www.tms.org/pubs/journals/JOM/0112/Eagar/Eagar-0112.h tml](http://www.tms.org/pubs/journals/JOM/0112/Eagar/Eagar-0112.html)

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 16:11:00 GMT

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

I honestly didn't think you could sink any further, zunnie. I stand corrected. You just entered the point of no return. Not that we wanted you to return, anyways...

See, here's the thing. Two planes... they were hijacked. They then ran into the buildings. See, when a structure is weakened, it tends to collapse. That's what happened on 9/11. I put that in as easy of terms as I could put it.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 16:24:55 GMT

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

Did you think that maybe...MAYBE...the red-hot metal in the rubble came from the UPPER floor? Which collapsed along with the rest of the building? Because when a building falls, the top kinda gets mixed in with the bottom.

Or it was Photoshopped in. Because conspiracy theorists never have ulterior motives.

Also, if you will watch the actual footage of the collapse, you can see that the buildings started to collapse NOT from the bottom, as they would if they had been C4d, but rather from where they had been hit...where the steel had been sufficiently weakened by the jet fuel. If they were C4d, the "secret agents" would have had to climb up X many stories in both buildings, through the fire, without being seen by escaping civilians, cops, or firefighters.

And why would a B-24 bomber not cause the Empire State Building to fall? Big difference between a B-24 and a 7X7 #1: NO JET FUEL. B-24s are propeller-driven.

As to why Bush's statue has no end date on it yet? Just in case he resigns or is impeached or nutcases such as yourself decide to assassinate him.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 17:28:34 GMT

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

Or dies of natural causes.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 18:29:30 GMT

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

OPEN YOUR EYES..... LOL >>>>>>> OPEN THEM

PS LOOOOOOOOOOOOL SHOTGUNNERS HAV THE OPPOSITE COLOUR OF THE TEEM,
INTRESTING RITE ZUNNIE?

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 18:39:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Zunnie, zunnie, zunnie. Stop being so fucking gullible.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 18:45:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:The Empire State Building had a military B-25 bomber crash into it on July 28, 1945.
<http://www.evesmag.com/empirestatebldgcrash.jpg> << image of impact zone

Reality check here: the Empire State (steel girders and concrete) and WTC towers (load-bearing steel skin and steel core structure) were built using different methods of construction. The aircraft types are also massively different to the point that it isn't even funny...lemme run off a few of the differences here:

- The B-25 was a light, twin engined bomber. The closest size comparison I can offer is a prop-driven puddle-jumper (the lighter planes used by airlines for short hops)...not a very huge plane. It was also completely empty apart from its flight crew; it had neither bombs nor cargo or passenegers on board.
- The Boeing 757 and 767 are BIG planes. Their engines measure about the diameter of the BODY of the B-25. Both aircraft carry hundreds of people and multiple tons of cargo. We're talking a LOT of MASS here, and a lot of mass causes a LOT of damage when it impacts.
- The B-25, being a piston-engined aircraft, used aviation gasoline as fuel (similar to what your CAR runs on). It was also at the end of its flight on impact, meaning that its fuel tanks were very close to empty.
- The Boeing jets used on 9/11 were fueled by commercial jet fuel. It burns hotter than gasoline- and the planes were fully fueled or at least mostly full when they impacted those buildings. Let's not even discuss how much MORE of the stuff these planes carry.
- The B-25 was built, for the most part, from steel.
- Modern airliners are constructed from aluminum and lightweight composite materials. The only thing on an airliner that isn't likely to burn in a crash is its LANDING GEAR.
- The pilot of the B-25 was not intending to crash into the Empire State. He made a navigational error in poor weather. It was a freak accident and the only thing totaled was the plane.
- The hijackers DID intend to crash into the WTC towers and the Pentagon. They had studied the buildings and the planes to determine where to strike in order to bring the buildings down. They angled their planes to cause the most damage to the widest possible area, and accelerated on approach- making no attempt to evade a collision.

Oh, but they must be the same because a plane hit a skyscraper in both incidents, right? Fool,

you don't know what the hell you're talking about. Go away before you embarrass yourself any more.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 19:21:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Be carefully zunnie, the American government might see this and force you have the Harvesters on their appropriate teams as revenge for leaking their secret.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 12 Apr 2006 22:18:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think this business of flaming people who come to this forum with information they've found captivating when it's simply incongruous with your primordial beliefs needs to stop. Especially when you don't make an effort to debunk it. Zunny's raising points that weren't in the last 9/11 thread.

I'm not sure what to think on this, but I do have one question I don't think I've ever seen answered: Why did Tower #7 collapse?

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [zunnie](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 01:14:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Why did Tower #7 collapse?"

http://www.mp-gaming.net/wtc_7_cbs.mpg
http://www.mp-gaming.net/wtc7_collapse.mpg
http://www.mp-gaming.net/wtc7_collapse2.mpg

This is without doubt a controlled demolition.

And, i am not here to argue or fight with people, i have spent hours beyond hours investigating about this and read basically every report, document, the official documents, individual testimonies and so on. "Why?" you ask - Because things that have happened and you start thinking and placing logic and common sense in your examinations you will conclude that indeed something fishy is about it.

http://www.9-11commission.gov/staff_statements/staff_statement_15.pdf
Another minor(?) thing that is kind of odd is that they speak

of "Bin Ladin" in the official 9/11 documents while everywhere on the world knows it is spelled as "Bin Laden". Did they make a "stupid" typo? Or is this the reason why he is not on the FBI website most wanted terrorists for the attacks of 9/11? Just odd to say the least...

Did you know that alot of the alledged hijackers turned out to be alive and well in Saudi Arabia and some other ME countries?

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/1567815.stm>

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/1559151.stm

"Why indeed did the WTC collapse"

<http://www.physics.byu.edu/research/energy/htm7.html>

Hunt the boeing! If you find it, make sure you get in touch with Davic Copperfield...

Also notice on these pictures there are trucks dumping sand..

<http://www.asile.org/citoyens/numero13/pentagone/erreurs>

<http://www.ratical.org/ratville/CAH/RRIraqWar.html>

Lastly, why did the US invade Afghanistan, followed by Iraq and why is Iran the next target?

[*]Afghanistan: Taliban goverment does not want the US to pass through Afghan territory constructing a pipeline to Pakistan coastlines for natural gas transport. (In 1998 or so Clinton forbade the US to do business with Taliban).

[*]The US needs a REASON to invade Afghanistan overthrow the Taliban goverment and construct their natural gas pipeline to Pakistan coast.

---This is where 9/11 is born. An 'act of war', the US already 'knows' that Laden (or is it Ladin?) is hiding in the mountains of Afghanistan so they invade and start building their pipelines.

So why Iraq you ask?

[*] Iraq started selling their oil in EUROS as of early 2000, it caused a -17% collapse of the US dollar, thus saddam, who is obviously proven by now not a threat to world peace was invaded and the US turned the wheel around and Iraq oil is once again priced in US dollars.

Why is Iran the next target?

[*] Iran just recently started selling their oil in EUROS as well as of March 2006. And being the 2nd largest oil producer in the world that will definately not do good for the US dollar.

I know and i have seen that Iran is provoking the US to attack, with their comments on achieving Uranium enrichment and nuclear

technology.
This is EXACTLY what they want...

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 01:36:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Even if your evidence was convincing, I'd still have one fact that I could use to defend the fact that our nation was attacked by a foreign party:

We don't need to be attacked to go to war. We weren't attacked to join Vietnam. We weren't attacked to join Korea. We weren't attacked (by Iraq) to start the war in Iraq. If we want to start a war, we'll start a war. We don't need an attack on our soil (or a solid reason) to start a war. It's as simple as that.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 06:52:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The 911wasalie banner just took all your credit away...

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 11:32:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 12 April 2006 18:18I think this business of flaming people who come to this forum with information they've found captivating when it's simply incongruous with your primordial beliefs needs to stop. Especially when you don't make an effort to debunk it. Zunny's raising points that weren't in the last 9/11 thread.

I'm not sure what to think on this, but I do have one question I don't think I've ever seen answered: Why did Tower #7 collapse?

Because you touch yourself at night.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 13:47:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've read things that say that there were explosives planted at the ground floor of the WTC that

caused it to collapse. However, if anybody bothers to watch the videos, the WTC collapse was a sequential collapse; if weakness at the bottom had caused it to collapse, the top of the WTC would have been intact as it crashed further and further toward the ground. Instead, the top collapsed downward in a big plume of soot and debris, meaning that the structural integrity was compromised at the location of the plane explosion.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 14:21:41 GMT

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

That and ALL of the buildings in that plaza were designed specifically to collapse in on themselves or straight down if they ever experienced structural failure. The attackers wanted those towers to fall over and cause widespread devastation; the skill of the people who built the towers ultimately kept that from happening. The same goes for every other building that fell. In a sense, they were controlled demolitions- but by nature of design, not through the assistance of explosives as conspiracy nuts would have you believe. The only large-scale explosions in the WTC that day were caused by two airliners full of innocent civilians.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 15:47:23 GMT

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

I already pointed that out somewhat, but it was conveniently ignored...

1. Did you know that there are multiple ways of spelling "Osama bin Laden?" Including "Usama bin Laden" and "Osama bin Ladin?" Proving that they used a different spelling in the official report proves nothing. It only proves that the writers were familiar with a different form of his name

Quote:The IDENTITIES of four of the 19 suspects accused of having carried out the attacks are now in doubt.

2. This is what the BBC article said about them. Not that "the presence of Saudi hijackers on the planes is in doubt." Simply that their identities (obtained from studying grainy surveillance tape) were later found to be wrong. How do we know YOUR family members weren't in their place on the plane?

Quote:<http://www.physics.byu.edu/research/energy/htm7.html>

3. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/wtc/collapse2.html> (one of the sources he himself used, but ignored the explanation given by the professor of engineering. Read the entire article.

Quote:Also notice on these pictures there are trucks dumping sand..

4. I could see no trucks dumping sand. Unless you mean on the overhead picture, in which case you can see a lot of things there on the ground. Also, it is a common practice to dump sand on fire. And even if it wasn't, what are you trying to imply?

Quote:Because things that have happened and you

start thinking and placing logic and common sense in your examinations you will conclude that
I agree with you up to this point. You should start taking your own advice.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 17:28:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There ARE trucks dumping sand. However, the point of that was to make it easier for the wheeled vehicles doing the cleanup to move around on the Pentagon "lawn," as opposed to their wheels tearing up all the grass and soil, especially if it were to rain a bit.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 17:55:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whenever I hear about these idiotic conspiracy theories, I just remember that my own boyfriend (whom you all know as Blazer), LIVED in Arlington, Virginia on September 11th and he actually, with his own eyes, saw the low-flying plane right before it struck the Pentagon. He lived in a high-rise building of condominiums on one of the upper floors and had a nice view of the city. He said the plane was so close that he probably could have seen the pilot and passengers (if it weren't going so fast, I assume).

So, say what you like, but just remember that you're calling Blazer a liar.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 19:04:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm not going to vouch for the accuracy of this site, but it does explore what myths have arisen from 9/11

<http://www.911myths.com/>

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Renx](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 20:23:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Has anyone else watched Loose Change?

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 22:53:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Somehow, retarded just does not adequately describe this thread. Besides, George Bush can barely eat a pretzel without a trip to the ER. I doubt his ability to organize the demolition of multiple skyscrapers. This thread makes evolution seem logical.

...having your sig flip people off doesn't help your case either.

By the way, we're talking about terrorists. Whose to say they didn't have a little 'boost' from their luggage?

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 13 Apr 2006 23:22:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I want the engineering and critical analysis doctorate from the guy who did Loose Change.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 00:00:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Phase 9 wrote on Thu, 13 April 2006 18:53 This thread makes evolution seem logical.

Let's be friends.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 00:06:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Thu, 13 April 2006 19:00
Let's be friends.

Uh, okay. (?)

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 01:15:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Phase 9 wrote on Thu, 13 April 2006 18:53 Somehow, retarded just does not adequately describe this thread. Besides, George Bush can barely eat a pretzel without a trip to the ER. I doubt his ability to organize the demolition of multiple skyscrapers. This thread makes evolution seem logical.

...having your sig flip people off doesn't help your case either.

By the way, we're talking about terrorists. Whose to say they didn't have a little 'boost' from their luggage?

I can drink a can of soda and nearly choke on it, you can't help how your body reacts to what you're putting into it. I've had times where I drank a Sprite and nearly passed out from being unable to breathe after the first sip, since it went into the wrong hole in my throat instead of simply falling into my stomach.

Using that against someone is idiocy, please remember that he's as human as anyone else is.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 01:35:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not only that, but he's put under a microscope. Every normal day mistake we have, he's just as likely to have. The only difference is that the media will publish it and give millions of mindless liberals fuel to keep the anti-Bush fire going.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 02:10:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don't take it that way, I was making a joke that these liberals would actually look at before scrolling down and missing the point. Heck, I've done worse. There was the Great Wasabi Incident of aught-2... embarasses me to this day.

And the Sprite thing is totally understandable. ...Lost: Five 0 is my biggest vice, though. Stuff burns worse than that 8-year-old whiskey I found under the sink.

(Technically, I am conservative, and technically I support Bush. It was but a joke, sorry.)

I saw a book that reminded me of this thread, though. Michael Moore is a Big, Fat, Stupid White Man. Might be worth a look.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 11:58:29 GMT

Just because you're a conservative does not obligate you to support Bush.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 12:05:33 GMT

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

Yeah, you aren't supposed to blindly support leaders because they claim to support your ideals. The fact is, I am not fond of Bush at all. However, I am a Republican, and I did vote for him over Kerry. Honestly, I'd vote him over Kerry again simply because it was Kerry... Other than that, I didn't really want to vote him in again.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 12:45:40 GMT

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

Oh, and for everyone who absolutely hates Michael Moore, he pales in comparison to the crap that Alex Jones puts out. A few examples:

9-11: The Road to Tyranny (2002)

American Dictators: Documenting The Staged 2004 Election (2004)

Martial Law: 9/11 Rise of the Police State (2005)

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [Berkut](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 17:37:54 GMT

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

I didn't support Kerry...

Because I'm not old enough to vote :P

But I liked Bush more because Kerry could never seem to make up his mind. Bush is also said to be a Christian, and a supporter of Israel. Kerry was said to be for, then against, then for abortion (then again, I heard this from adults, and we all know how much adults tell the truth :P)

Politics aren't really interesting to me. Humans were never good at governing each other, anyway.

And when I said conservative, I mostly meant against stuff like abortion (I almost experienced that, and wasn't too happy about it when I found out.), gun-control (ok, the crooks have guns. What do we fight them with, harsh language?), and the "modern interpretation" (aka: editing), of the constitution.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 20:21:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, statistics show that countries with strict gun-control have substantially lower levels of violent crime. However, the right to bear arms shall not be infringed...

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 20:31:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NOw all you need is the hunting licence to GET thoes bear arm. Well, assuming bear hunting is in season.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 20:36:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Statistics also show that alchohol and tobacco kill more people than firearms. At least rifles come with a safety-switch

Another thing, I tried finding leading causes of death in the US. It almost never listed abortion. If it gets much worse, the leading cause of death in the US will be parents.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 20:43:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

omf

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Fri, 14 Apr 2006 21:04:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mrpirate wrote on Fri, 14 April 2006 15:43omf

Oh my 'what'? 'Fog'?

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 00:51:11 GMT

Ryan3k wrote on Fri, 14 April 2006 16:21 Well, statistics show that countries with strict gun-control have substantially lower levels of violent crime. However, the right to bear arms shall not be infringed...

WRONG!

<http://www.gunowners.org/sk0703.htm>

Quote: 1. Fact: The murder rates in many nations (such as England) were ALREADY LOW BEFORE enacting gun control. Thus, their restrictive laws cannot be credited with lowering their crime rates.¹

2. Fact: Gun control has done nothing to keep crime rates from rising in many of the nations that have imposed severe firearms restrictions.

* Australia: Readers of the USA Today newspaper discovered in 2002 that, "Since Australia's 1996 laws banning most guns and making it a crime to use a gun defensively, armed robberies rose by 51%, unarmed robberies by 37%, assaults by 24% and kidnappings by 43%. While murders fell by 3%, manslaughter rose by 16%."²

* Canada: After enacting stringent gun control laws in 1991 and 1995, Canada has not made its citizens any safer. "The contrast between the criminal violence rates in the United States and in Canada is dramatic," says Canadian criminologist Gary Mauser in 2003. "Over the past decade, the rate of violent crime in Canada has increased while in the United States the violent crime rate has plummeted."³

* England: According to the BBC News, handgun crime in the United Kingdom rose by 40% in the two years after it passed its draconian gun ban in 1997.⁴

* Japan: One newspaper headline says it all: Police say "Crime rising in Japan, while arrests at record low."⁵

3. Fact: British citizens are now more likely to become a victim of crime than are people in the United States:

* In 1998, a study conducted jointly by statisticians from the U.S. Department of Justice and the University of Cambridge in England found that most crime is now worse in England than in the United States.

* "You are more likely to be mugged in England than in the United States," stated the Reuters news agency in summarizing the study. "The rate of robbery is now 1.4 times higher in England and Wales than in the United States, and the British burglary rate is nearly double America's."⁶ The murder rate in the United States is reportedly higher than in England, but according to the DOJ study, "the difference between the [murder rates in the] two countries has narrowed over the past 16 years."⁷

* The United Nations confirmed these results in 2000 when it reported that the crime rate in England is higher than the crime rates of 16 other industrialized nations, including the United States.⁸

4. Fact: British authorities routinely underreport crime statistics. Comparing statistics between different nations can be quite difficult since foreign officials frequently use different standards in compiling crime statistics.

* The British media has remained quite critical of authorities there for "fiddling" with crime data. Consider some of the headlines in their papers: "Crime figures a sham, say police,"⁹ "Police are accused of fiddling crime data,"¹⁰ and "Police figures under-record offences by 20 percent."¹¹

* British police have also criticized the system because of the "widespread manipulation" of crime data:

a. "Officers said that pressure to convince the public that police were winning the fight against crime had resulted in a long list of ruses to 'massage' statistics."¹²

b. Sgt. Mike Bennett says officers have become increasingly frustrated with the practice of manipulating statistics. "The crime figures are meaningless," he said. "Police everywhere know exactly what is going on."¹³

c. According to The Electronic Telegraph, "Officers said the recorded level of crime bore no resemblance to the actual amount of crime being committed."¹⁴

* Underreporting crime data: "One former Scotland Yard officer told The Telegraph of a series of tricks that rendered crime figures 'a complete sham.' A classic example, he said, was where a series of homes in a block flats were burgled and were regularly recorded as one crime. Another involved pickpocketing, which was not recorded as a crime unless the victim had actually seen the item being stolen."¹⁵

* Underreporting murder data: British crime reporting tactics keep murder rates artificially low. "Suppose that three men kill a woman during an argument outside a bar. They are arrested for murder, but because of problems with identification (the main witness is dead), charges are eventually dropped. In American crime statistics, the event counts as a three-person homicide, but in British statistics it counts as nothing at all. 'With such differences in reporting criteria, comparisons of U.S. homicide rates with British homicide rates is a sham,' [a 2000 report from the Inspectorate of Constabulary] concludes."¹⁶

<http://www.nraila.org/Issues/FactSheets/Read.aspx?ID=78>

<http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig4/lott3.html>

<http://www.fff.org/freedom/fd0210e.asp>

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:04:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDemin wrote on Fri, 14 April 2006 19:51Ryan3k wrote on Fri, 14 April 2006 16:21Well, statistics show that countries with strict gun-control have substantially lower levels of violent crime. However, the right to bear arms shall not be infringed...

WRONG!

I was 90% sure of that, but I was too lazy to do the research. Thanks .

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:16:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Fri, 14 April 2006 21:31NOW all you need is the hunting licence to GET thoes bear arm. Well, assuming bear hunting is in season.

Well the right to bear arms and to bear arms is all fine and dandy but what about the right to arm bears?

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:17:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Bear arms" is the correct phrase.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:28:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Who gives a bear's?

Oh, s***, we're off-topic.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:33:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think this topic is better than the original one, personally.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:38:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SpyGuy246 wrote on Fri, 14 April 2006 20:33I think this topic is better than the original one, personally.

Amen. I vote change topic to "Homophones." (jk)

PS: For the idiots:

homophone >noun: each of two or more words having the same pronunciation but different meanings, origins, or spelling (e.g. new and knew).

-Wordperfect definition. Copy-pasted.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 02:48:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hope that pasting was worth ruining your eyes over.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 02:58:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SpyGuy246 wrote on Fri, 14 April 2006 21:48I hope that pasting was worth ruining your eyes over.

I was wearing sunglasses.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 02:58:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

File Attachments

1) [Beararms.jpg](#), downloaded 705 times



Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 05:01:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDemin wrote on Fri, 14 April 2006 19:51 Ryan3k wrote on Fri, 14 April 2006 16:21 Well, statistics show that countries with strict gun-control have substantially lower levels of violent crime. However, the right to bear arms shall not be infringed...

WRONG!

<http://www.gunowners.org/sk0703.htm>

Quote: 1. Fact: The murder rates in many nations (such as England) were ALREADY LOW BEFORE enacting gun control. Thus, their restrictive laws cannot be credited with lowering their crime rates.¹

2. Fact: Gun control has done nothing to keep crime rates from rising in many of the nations that have imposed severe firearms restrictions.

* Australia: Readers of the USA Today newspaper discovered in 2002 that, "Since Australia's 1996 laws banning most guns and making it a crime to use a gun defensively, armed robberies rose by 51%, unarmed robberies by 37%, assaults by 24% and kidnappings by 43%. While murders fell by 3%, manslaughter rose by 16%."²

* Canada: After enacting stringent gun control laws in 1991 and 1995, Canada has not made its citizens any safer. "The contrast between the criminal violence rates in the United States and in Canada is dramatic," says Canadian criminologist Gary Mauser in 2003. "Over the past decade, the rate of violent crime in Canada has increased while in the United States the violent crime rate has plummeted."³

* England: According to the BBC News, handgun crime in the United Kingdom rose by 40% in the two years after it passed its draconian gun ban in 1997.⁴

* Japan: One newspaper headline says it all: Police say "Crime rising in Japan, while arrests

at record low."⁵

3. Fact: British citizens are now more likely to become a victim of crime than are people in the United States:

* In 1998, a study conducted jointly by statisticians from the U.S. Department of Justice and the University of Cambridge in England found that most crime is now worse in England than in the United States.

* "You are more likely to be mugged in England than in the United States," stated the Reuters news agency in summarizing the study. "The rate of robbery is now 1.4 times higher in England and Wales than in the United States, and the British burglary rate is nearly double America's."⁶ The murder rate in the United States is reportedly higher than in England, but according to the DOJ study, "the difference between the [murder rates in the] two countries has narrowed over the past 16 years."⁷

* The United Nations confirmed these results in 2000 when it reported that the crime rate in England is higher than the crime rates of 16 other industrialized nations, including the United States.⁸

4. Fact: British authorities routinely underreport crime statistics. Comparing statistics between different nations can be quite difficult since foreign officials frequently use different standards in compiling crime statistics.

* The British media has remained quite critical of authorities there for "fiddling" with crime data. Consider some of the headlines in their papers: "Crime figures a sham, say police,"⁹ "Police are accused of fiddling crime data,"¹⁰ and "Police figures under-record offences by 20 percent."¹¹

* British police have also criticized the system because of the "widespread manipulation" of crime data:

a. "Officers said that pressure to convince the public that police were winning the fight against crime had resulted in a long list of ruses to 'massage' statistics."¹²

b. Sgt. Mike Bennett says officers have become increasingly frustrated with the practice of manipulating statistics. "The crime figures are meaningless," he said. "Police everywhere know exactly what is going on."¹³

c. According to The Electronic Telegraph, "Officers said the recorded level of crime bore no resemblance to the actual amount of crime being committed."¹⁴

* Underreporting crime data: "One former Scotland Yard officer told The Telegraph of a series of tricks that rendered crime figures 'a complete sham.' A classic example, he said, was where a series of homes in a block flats were burgled and were regularly recorded as one crime. Another involved pickpocketing, which was not recorded as a crime unless the victim had actually seen the item being stolen."¹⁵

* Underreporting murder data: British crime reporting tactics keep murder rates artificially low. "Suppose that three men kill a woman during an argument outside a bar. They are arrested for murder, but because of problems with identification (the main witness is dead), charges are eventually dropped. In American crime statistics, the event counts as a three-person homicide, but in British statistics it counts as nothing at all. 'With such differences in reporting criteria, comparisons of U.S. homicide rates with British homicide rates is a sham,' [a 2000 report from the Inspectorate of Constabulary] concludes."16

<http://www.nraila.org/Issues/FactSheets/Read.aspx?ID=78>
<http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig4/lott3.html>
<http://www.fff.org/freedom/fd0210e.asp>

If you could show me some results from an academic journal as opposed to "GUNOWNERS.ORG" to prove your point, it would have much more validity.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1440764.stm>

Here's an article from that biased mess that you linked me that is nested within the footnotes (a clever guise designed to make the site look credible). Anywho, this study says that "A new study suggests the use of handguns in crime rose by 40% in the two years after the weapons were banned." Guess who commissioned this research? "The Countryside Alliance's Campaign for Shooting." How convenient.

If you can show me an example where the study above has been replicated in the same area by a different and independent group of researchers, I will take your word for it. However, many of these little "studies" often have pitfalls and the results are plain WRONG. Anyone who takes a beginner's course in deviance/criminology knows that. In the meantime, interest groups pick and choose the findings that support their beliefs, discarding/ignoring others.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 05:24:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aww, we're on-topic again.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 15 Apr 2006 08:14:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:If you could show me some results from an academic journal as opposed to "GUNOWNERS.ORG" to prove your point, it would have much more validity.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1440764.stm>

Here's an article from that biased mess that you linked me that is nested within the footnotes (a clever guise designed to make the site look credible). Anywho, this study says that "A new study suggests the use of handguns in crime rose by 40% in the two years after the weapons were banned." Guess who commissioned this research? "The Countryside Alliance's Campaign for Shooting." How convenient.

If you can show me an example where the study above has been replicated in the same area by a different and independent group of researchers, I will take your word for it. However, many of these little "studies" often have pitfalls and the results are plain WRONG. Anyone who takes a beginner's course in deviance/criminology knows that. In the meantime, interest groups pick and choose the findings that support their beliefs, discarding/ignoring others.

<http://www.sfu.ca/~mauser/papers/asc/ASC2002/ASC02-Talk.pdf>
http://www.justfacts.com/gun_control.htm

Quote:* Right-to-carry laws require law enforcement agencies to issue handgun permits to all qualified applicants. Qualifications include criteria such as age, a clean criminal record, and completing a firearm safety course. (13)

* In 1986, nine states had right-to-carry laws. (14)

* As of 1998, 31 states have right-to-carry laws, and about half the U.S. population lives in these states. (3)

* Florida adopted a right-to-carry law in 1987. At the time the law was passed, critics predicted increases in violence. The founder of the National Organization of Women, Betty Friedan stated:

"lethal violence, even in self defense, only engenders more violence." (13)

* When the law went into effect, the Dade County Police began a program to record all arrest and non arrest incidents involving concealed carry licensees. Between September of 1987 and August of 1992, Dade County recorded 4 crimes committed by licensees with firearms. None of these crimes resulted in an injury. The record keeping program was abandoned in 1992 because there were not enough incidents to justify tracking them. (13)(15)

* Florida adopted a right-to-carry law in 1987. Between 1987 and 1996, these changes occurred:

Florida United States
homicide rate -36% -0.4%
firearm homicide rate -37% +15%
handgun homicide rate -41% +24%
(3)

* 221,443 concealed carry licenses were issued in Florida between October of 1987 and April of 1994. During that time, Florida recorded 18 crimes committed by licensees with firearms. (15)

* As of 1998, nationwide, there has been 1 recorded incident in which a permit holder shot someone following a traffic accident. The permit holder was not charged, as the grand jury ruled the shooting was in self defense. (7)

* As of 1998, no permit holder has ever shot a police officer. There have been several cases in which a permit holder has protected an officer's life. (7)

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Feetseek](#) on Thu, 20 Apr 2006 00:42:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can't see why some people just believe their story without giving the opposing story a chance??

PS: Not saying that anyone here do this, just a lot of people on Earth

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [renwarrior](#) on Sat, 22 Apr 2006 14:27:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i jsut watched 1 video (loose change) and it was pretty convincing. the pentagon attack looks pretty fake if it was an aircraft that hit it. but as for the twin towers attack...i really dont know what side to believe. there is a lot of evidence on both. but the way i see it is this:

if it was a terrorist attack,why planes?? i mean it would have been much more effective just to simply drive a few armoured van/trucks in to the building. a few dozen or so armed men. basically all they had to do was get in.kill the secuirty. go to where they needed to detonate the bombs and blow up the towers. why go to all the bother of hijacking planes and doing little damage to the buildings at the start and giving more people the chance of escape. if they had bombed teh building with suicide bombers on foot, they would have killed more people and could even have attacked hte buildings around them.more effective.

if it was a setup though,why go to all the bother again with the planes?? they could have simply blown up the towers with explosives and blamed it on terrorists.it would have been more convincing.or they could even have paid terrorists to do it.

but this is just what i think. since it is to do with america i really dont care very much since i live in the uk.but if the government wont release all the evidence of the attacks then they obviously have something to hide.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 22 Apr 2006 19:26:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You do realize all they had to do to hijack the planes were buy tickets and flash box cutters at

flight attendants. Don't be an idiot and side with zunnie.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 22 Apr 2006 20:48:37 GMT

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

It may have been "more efficient" (debatable, but for argument's sake...), but having aircraft fly into the building definitely hits harder on the "scare factor".

There is no point in killing someone if you can't "terrorize" them as well.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Sat, 22 Apr 2006 21:45:52 GMT

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

Why in the world would terrorists get armored vehicles for car bombs? First of all, an armored car would contain a good part of the blast. That's why Iraqi terrorists use sedans and trucks instead of captured or old tanks or the like for their bombs. Secondly, which would arouse more suspicion: several men buying a plane ticket or having several armored trucks make an unscheduled delivery to a downtown building? The 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center involved a car bomb (not an armored car) in the parking garage underneath the building, where you would think it would be most vulnerable. It only killed 6 people and didn't cause irreparable damage to the building.

And all they'd have to do is kill the security? Please; this isn't the Matrix. That would set off all kinds of alarms all over New York and cause all sorts of screwups in their plan.

Suicide bombers would certainly not have killed more than 2000 people unless they were armed with nukes. There is no way you could organize and move into the buildings in secret that many suicide bombers. And they certainly would not have taken down a skyscraper.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [renwarrior](#) on Sat, 22 Apr 2006 22:43:15 GMT

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

what i meant was,hijack the building with suicide bombers. they dont just ahv to sneak in. a full on attack would scare teh shit outta u if u saw it and didnt expect it. u wuld 'terrorize' them by slaughtering hundreds of innocents and when swat teams and police show up detonate them selves severly damaging the building and causing its destruction. besides it was just a rough idea.

people have their own opinions and their rightt o free speech u know. with the amount of evidence against the terrorist attack on its own would make you question the story.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 23 Apr 2006 00:54:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Maybe you should NOT try to plan a terrorist attack before the Secret Service and the CIA want to investigate you?

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [renwarrior](#) on Sun, 23 Apr 2006 15:10:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

good point. i think i'll keep em to myself,lol.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Mon, 24 Apr 2006 01:36:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

renwarrior wrote on Sat, 22 April 2006 17:43people have their own opinions and their rightt o free speech u know.

Only the right to free speech from the government. Fortunately, I'm a private citizen with the right to bear arms. Lock and load!

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 25 Apr 2006 22:06:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here's a question that hasn't been asked for the duration of this topic:

"Who cares?"

England's gun-related crime is irrelevant to the fact that the second amendment guarentees:

Mad TV version of Karl MaloneThe right to bear arms, and "arms" means guns and "bear" means have, so that means you should bear guns.

And it's most likely not going to change for a while.

As for the 9/11 stuff? Drop it. It's over. The time for that was about 4 years ago, when people still gave a shit.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 06:29:56 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Tue, 25 April 2006 18:06

As for the 9/11 stuff? Drop it. It's over. The time for that was about 4 years ago, when people still gave a shit.

WRONG!

9/11 is still very relevant and the subject is still very touchy for most Americans. You do realize we are still engaged in a war that stemmed from 9/11. Stop being an ignorant child.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [Feetseek](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 07:03:05 GMT

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

"Those who forget the past are condemned to repeat it." or at least something like that

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 15:20:18 GMT

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

DarkDemin wrote on Tue, 25 April 2006 23:29Dover wrote on Tue, 25 April 2006 18:06

As for the 9/11 stuff? Drop it. It's over. The time for that was about 4 years ago, when people still gave a shit.

WRONG!

9/11 is still very relevant and the subject is still very touchy for most Americans. You do realize we are still engaged in a war that stemmed from 9/11. Stop being an ignorant child.

You like to judge, don't you DarkDemin?

Perhaps I should've made myself clear:

Dover wrote on Tue, 25 April 2006 15:06The time for stupid conspiracy theories was 4 years ago, when people actually might've believed them.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 16:17:01 GMT

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

I think he was appropriate to assume that you're ignorant to say that we should stop worrying about 9/11, and that it was 4 years ago. If you would have made yourself more clear, I'm sure he

wouldn't have disagreed.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 17:46:55 GMT

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

My bad, then.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 03:37:38 GMT

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

Sorry, I am used to the idiots that post on this area of the forum.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 02:59:51 GMT

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

With Goztow gone, thread-bumpage shall recommence.

So do people here still believe that 9/11 was an inside job or did they all pass grade 10?

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 03:31:58 GMT

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

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 05:04:06 GMT

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

nikki6ixx wrote on Sat, 10 December 2011 20:59 With Goztow gone, thread-bumpage shall recommence.

So do people here still believe that 9/11 was an inside job or did they all pass grade 10?

I guess I usually don't have a problem with necro bumps.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 05:18:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Necrobumps really shouldn't be a problem... so long that the bump is relevant to the topic.

"LOL BUMP" is not relevant.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 05:43:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well there is only one way to solve this; let's send it into Mythbusters and have them run a plane into a replica building and see if they can get it to collapse in the same way. Of course, they'd just roll their eyes at the suggestion as everyone with half a brain knows that the only people who had artier motives for slamming planes into the twin towers on 9/11 were the terrorists.

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Homey](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 10:25:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just for shits I browsed youtube because of this topic.

These videos were posted this past summer, seem pretty interesting for anyone who wants to see a solid counter to the "truth" videos.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jC3JgWkNNIQ&list=PL3DB8819ED82ABA1F&index=1&feature=plpp_video

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Hitman](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 15:35:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

fuck america

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Gen_Blacky](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 19:53:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hitman wrote on Sun, 11 December 2011 08:35fuck america

fuck you

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [ehhh](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 20:04:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

fuck blacky

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [TankClash](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 20:34:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Read up on "Mechanics of Twin Towers collapse"

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Hitman](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 22:09:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ehhh wrote on Sun, 11 December 2011 13:04fuck blacky

Subject: Re: 9/11 Treason
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2011 23:58:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

necrolock plx
