

9/11: The Absurdity of the No-Planes-in-New York Theory

by
Anthony Lawson

"If one scratches the surface of the commission report, one finds huge holes in the official story. There's also a lot of disinformation out there and oddball conspiracy theories that need to be debunked."

Rick Veitch, writer and artist, co-author of
The Big Lie, Image Comics.

About This Article

Few things shock me rigid, these days, but seeing James Fetzer spouting his damaging no-planes-in-New York disinformation in an article hosted by *Veterans Today* has done just that. So this is, largely, a critical review of the work of Dr. James H. Fetzer, one the staunchest proponents of the no-planes-in-New York theory, and co-founder of Scholars for 9/11 Truth website, whose motto is:

[EXPOSING FALSEHOODS AND REVEALING TRUTHS](#)

Unfortunately, Dr. Fetzer is in the habit of not presenting any proof that what he presents as falsehoods have been accurately described. Over the years, he has written several articles about the TV coverage and amateur videos of the 9/11 New York events with definitive, but misleading titles such as: *Proof of Video Faking on 9/11*; *New Proof of Video Faking* and *More Proof of Video Faking*, but none of these articles carries any proof of video faking, whatsoever.

Dr. Fetzer's claims rest entirely on his personal belief—bolstered by others of a similar persuasion or with an interest in spreading disinformation—that the events depicted in these videos were impossible, because they defied Newton's Laws of Motion as well as those of more-modern theoretical aerodynamics. Therefore, it is his contention that the videos *must* have been faked. Which does not even come close to proving that the videos *were* faked.

Regrettably, the TV and cable stations that broadcast the New York events, live, and also obtained amateur videos for later transmission, have refused to make high-quality digital copies available for closer examination, but there are several reasons why I think that most of the videos that I have seen are genuine, because, for example, as a professional cameraman with many years of practical experience, I think that it would be most unlikely that even a TV professional, let alone an amateur could—at least on *Take One*, and there were no second chances—pan a camera across a predetermined area of New York scenery, including an empty stretch of sky, at an exact speed so as to end up framing the WTC at the precise moment when the South Tower exploded, so that a plane could then be superimposed onto that video to make it appear that a real plane had caused the explosion. And to suggest that it might have been *planned* to be done—one-chance-only—from a few helicopters, for a live TV broadcast is quite beyond my realm of comprehension.

Apparently Caught Unawares

In non-TV station videos, where the cameraperson seems to be concentrating on the burning North Tower, they appear to have been caught unawares by the appearance *and sound* of the plane. But, according to the no-plane-in-New York theorists, *the plane would not have appeared in the sky or in their viewfinders, because it was to be overlaid, later on*. So why has no one ever commented on, let alone explained why—if these people were expecting something to happen—their camera technique fell apart at the crucial moment? Nor has it ever been revealed, by those who insist that the videos are fakes, exactly *where* these videos *without a plane on them*, were taken to have the missing plane added. Just as significantly:

Not one (genuine) video has ever appeared in which the building explodes, without any evidence of a plane appearing to hit it, excluding, of course, those videos which were shot from the opposite side to the impact.

One other point about those 9/11 shots with violent camera movements is that it is far more difficult to convincingly superimpose *anything* onto videos taken with a camera that was moving, but in all of the clips with erratic camera movements, the allegedly-superimposed plane and the background still move with a remarkable degree of synchronism, and the smear and out-of-focus characteristics show a level of realism which strongly suggest the images are not composites but that they were exactly what the camera captured, in one hit, so to speak.

In any event, I repeat: No one, and that includes the most vehement no-planes-in-New York researchers and photo analysts—such as the oft-quoted (by James Fetzer) Jack White—has ever produced any proof that the significant 9/11 videos are the result of fakery. (I have seen a couple of poor attempts to produce such a video, and, in the interests of research, I've tried to make one myself, with no success, because it isn't as easy as some people claim it is.)

[10 MINUTE VIDEO ILLUSTRATION OF THE ABOVE](#) [VIMEO VERSION](#)

The Reference Links: *Some of the links in this article are for the reader to verify the source, so it is not essential that they are all accessed. In cases where they definitely illustrate a point, I have stressed them in bold type. In most instances, the videos will automatically open at the appropriate place.*

James Fetzer's Perceived Scholarly Status

There are many no-planes-in-New York theorists, but few are as damaging to the 9/11 Truth Movement as Dr. James Fetzer. Because of his academic status as a scholar and professor emeritus, his regular media and conference appearances makes him a perfect target for the mainstream-media lackeys who are hell bent on discrediting *any* alternative theory about 9/11, and the opportunity to discredit this extraordinary alternative view, about what happened in New York—which hundreds if not thousands of people saw with their own eyes—must be irresistible. By inference, those viewers, listeners and newspaper readers who are sitting on the fence are quite likely to either remain there, or fall off on the wrong side.

Even the editor-in-chief of *Veterans Today*, with whom I have had many exchanges, and whose heart I am sure is in the right place, seemed to have fallen under Dr. Fetzer's persuasive spell, when he wrote:

"A decade after the 9/11 attacks, to those who follow controversy and apply some brain power to things other than sports scores, the science and engineering "out there" says that, though planes may have hit the World Trade Center, I wasn't there, so I don't know – I only believe what I see with my own eyes and only part of that anymore – the "flying aluminum beer cans," aircraft made of thin and flexible aluminum can't cut steel, no matter how fast, and jet fuel, a form of cheap heating oil actually, can't melt it either."

[GORDON DUFF: 9/11, "HOW" OR "WHO"](#)

The "Flying Aluminum Beer Cans"

Certainly, jet fuel cannot *melt* steel, but the part about "*flying aluminum beer cans...*" could have been written by James Fetzer or Morgan Reynolds, both of whom are appallingly misinformed on this issue. No matter how surreal the plane's entry into the South Tower may look, particularly in the Michael Hezarkhani/CNN video, there is no indication, from the evidence that remains—the photographs of the holes that the planes made and photographs of some of the panels which show how the external walls of the Towers were constructed—that any steel was "*cut*" or "*sliced through*" by any section of the plane.

Aircraft Aluminium Alloy — Tensile Strength

However, the aluminium alloys used in the major structural components of modern aircraft have a tensile strength greater than construction steel, so the corollary is that the steel in the Towers would almost certainly not cut through the main spars or other substantial components of the aircraft, so something

Tensile Strength		
Material	Yield strength	Ultimate strength
Structural steel ASTM A36	250	400
Aluminium Alloy 2014-T6	400	455

else had to give, and this excellent video goes a long way to explaining what did: [WTC PLANES THRU STEEL WTC CONSTRUCTION](#) Or, if you are pressed for time, use this link [THE IMPACT AREA](#).

An Intention to Remain Ignorant?

I have an e-mail record of sending the link to the above video to some of the most notorious no-plane-in-New York theorists, on 23 March 2009. James Fetzer's e-mail address heads that section of the list, but there is no record of a reply from him, so I have no idea if he has ever watched the video.

A Unreasonable Response to a Reasoned Explanation

Around that time, Serguei Mechkov was a 28 year old Russian student, studying for his PhD in physics, in Paris. He first contacted me with regard to my video [WTC7 — THIS IS AN ORANGE](#), and was also a recipient of the e-mail about the [WTC PLANES THRU STEEL WTC CONSTRUCTION](#) video. On June 29, 2009, he sent a well-reasoned e-mail, in which he attempted to explain the physics of the South Tower impact. Here are his first two paragraphs.

Coming back to the accounts of "impossible speed" cited by Mr. Fetzer, his references consistently ignore the possibility of the planes being weaponized decoys rather than the supposed regular jetliners. Many of the arguments questioning the reality of the impacts break down completely if one considers modified cargo planes with powerful engines, reinforced nose and wings, and possibly an extra load of fuel to guarantee a good fire and lots of smoke.

When it comes to the crucial subject of physics, it is rather embarrassing to see how sketchily Newton's laws are invoked by Mr. Fetzer in this context, in the vein of "Joe's Law" as formulated by Joseph Keith....*


(Note: *Joseph Keith, whom Dr. Fetzer constantly refers to as an aeronautical engineer was nothing of the kind. He is a retired software engineer who worked for Boeing on a stress-testing system.)

Of course it had been confirmed, by then, that the NTSB had never forensically identified any of the 9/11 planes, so Serguei Mechkov's proposals were well within the realms or reasonable conjecture. I had long been aware that the 9/11 aircraft had, almost certainly, never been properly identified, and I had also proposed the possibility that a member of the Boeing 767 *family* of aircraft could have been adapted in this way. This video, uploaded in December, 2007 explored the possibility of a [SPECIAL PLANE](#)

Ever since this video was uploaded, Dr. Fetzer has never let a chance go by to comment on what I had proposed *only* as a possibility, but which he attempts to characterise as a definitive statement implying that Anthony Lawson says: *This is how it was done*.

But he reserved a special vitriolic side of his own character for the efforts of a student physicist who dared to make a proposal which could throw his own theory into disarray.

Fetzer's Response



The above e-mail concluded:

No wonder this is "your kind of guy", Anthony! Really! This takes the cake!
Jim

Whether or not Serguei Mechkov's proposals had merit is beside the point, this is an unconscionable and vile way for a professor emeritus; a scholar and academic to refer to the sincere efforts of any kind of student, and particularly one who was studying physics, which, according to his [Curriculum Vitae](#) Dr. Fetzer has not. In fact this, in his ignorance, is the kind of thing he continually falls back on in his attempts to justify his stance that there could not have been any real impact between a plane and either of the Twin Towers on 9/11.

Jim Fetzer July 16, 2011 - 8:14 pm excerpt

We all know what happens when a plane hits a tiny bird weighing a few ounces in flight. Imagine what would happen if it hit an acre of concrete on a steel truss suspended in space in flight. What do you think, Anthony? IT'S A MATTER OF COMMON KNOWLEDGE. I cannot be held responsible for your massive ignorance. We don't need a "peer reviewed study by a crash expert", Anthony. Your average 10th grade physics student can answer this one for you. But if you want to continue to make a fool of yourself here, be my guest. No one is more deserving of the recognition!

Website Publishers Beware

The above was in response to one of my many requests, dating back about four years, that he obtain a properly evaluated study by a crash-physics expert which would support his claims that the crash videos cannot possibly be genuine. With this kind of behaviour, it must be seriously considered that he does not genuinely represent the aims of the 9/11 truth movement, and that any material he offers to any website that claims to maintain any kind of editorial integrity should be carefully considered, and not simply dumped onto the [PRINT THIS](#) pile.

9/11 Truth Forums — Some Real Concerns

After the initial shock of what happened on September 11, 2001 had receded, and particularly when it was discovered that World Trade Center 7 had collapsed, virtually into its own footprint at approximately 5:20 PM that same day—having not been hit by a plane, and that this event was not even mentioned in the 9/11 Commission Report—the growth in 9/11 truth forums, all around the world, was exponential. However, anyone who still thinks that all of these forums and websites were begun by outraged U.S. citizens or foreigners determined to find out the truth, have not been thinking straight, and should ask themselves this question:

***If I were in charge of spreading disinformation about 9/11,
what medium would be my greatest asset?***

The answer, of course, is the Internet. And that is exactly what others thought, and exactly what happened. The real perpetrators of 9/11 either started what appeared to be genuine truth forums and websites, or they employed others to infiltrate legitimate ones, and to encourage the participation of those whose mindset was and still is:

***That's outrageous, no government would ever have
participated in doing that to its own citizens!***

The truth is quite the opposite. The killing of innocent people within the borders of what soon became emotively known as *The Homeland* is no different from sending innocent members of the military off to be killed in foreign conflicts that have nothing to do with protecting that *Homeland*, but which are profitable to owners and shareholders of *The Homeland's* oil, armaments and aviation industries, and can be sold to the public as necessary wars against those "*Who hate our freedoms*"; people who will, in any event, attack us as soon as they get the chance. And then there are those whose agenda is some kind of new world order; they are certainly not averse to a bit of sacrificing, just as long as it does not involve sacrificing themselves.

Less-Than-Truthful 9/11 Sites

One of the most suspect forums is *Pilots for 9/11 Truth*, a very clever name, for who among us would want to conclude that the very people who have our lives in their hands, whenever we board an aircraft, are not to be trusted. I have first-hand experience of the deviousness of certain people on this site, and I have been in touch with others who agree with my findings.

For example, John Lear (son of the Learjet founder), who is described as a *Core Member of Pilots for 9/11 Truth*, has a very confusing interview record to do with the 9/11 aircraft.

[John Lear \(Counter 0:36\)](#): "I'm thinking that the airplanes that crashed into the World Trade Center were... um, holographs..."

Yet Mr. Lear seems to be at odds with his own conclusions, during the following exchange on this [Vimeo with Rob Balsamo](#) at Counter 10:16.

Balsamo: If we were to determine that the... er, speeds were impossible, as an organization based on physics, math and aerodynamics, does that automatically validate no-plane theories?

John Lear: No, it just means that the speed is impossible.

There are, of course, many pilots, aeronautical engineers and others who disagree with John Lear, about the speed of the New York planes, for example a former F4-Phantom pilot, with 25 years experience on commercial jets had this to say about the South Tower plane:

[Field McConnell](#): It's my opinion, if I were in court right now, with my hand up in the air, under oath, I would adamantly suggest that it's quite possible that a Boeing Seven-Sixty-Seven could do the air speeds that's recorded. And if I'm wrong... then I'm simply wrong.

If you decide to access this short section of video, the rest of its content, about 45 seconds, demonstrates that Dr. Fetzer takes no notice of anyone whose views do not match his own.

The New York Planes

My video [9/11: THE UNIDENTIFIED MURDER WEAPONS](#) cites several documents, obtained in July, 2008 under the Freedom of Information act by a researcher named Aidan Monaghan, which reveal that none of the planes that were allegedly hijacked on 9/11 has ever been forensically identified, using debris found at the crash sites, yet many researchers still insist in referring to the plane as United Airlines Flight 175, which it almost certainly wasn't. But it suits those with a devious agenda to keep referring to the plane that the 9/11 Commission claim crashed into the South Tower as UA 175, so that it's possible aerodynamic limitations can be cited, rather than to refer to it as a member of the Boeing 767 Family of aircraft, for example.

Limitations as Opposed to Capabilities

Another favourite disinformationist tactic is to try and pass off the *speed limitations* and restrictions that are imposed by the FAA, at various altitudes, as being an aircraft's *performance capabilities*. An analogy is that a Ferrari driver will be breaking the law by travelling above a legal speed limit, but his car is unlikely to fall apart if he does so.

The Murray St. Engine

Here, it should be noted that it has been established that the jet-engine core which (apparently) fell out of the South Tower, a moment after the impact of what most people regard as having been United Airlines Flight 175, was, almost certainly, not from a Boeing 767 in the United Airlines fleet, for the simple reason that it was not the right engine type. That engine core, by the way, was later photographed about to be buried in a landfill on Staten Island. [MURRAY STREET ENGINE TEXT ARTICLE](#)

Some James Fetzer Logic

The following is a response of Dr. Fetzer's to a comment I made about this engine and the plane it came from, under one of the articles that he recently had hosted by *Veterans Today*.

[Quoting Jim Fetzer July 13, 2011 - 1:48 pm](#)

(2) He [Anthony Lawson] acknowledges that, "it will be seen that the engine almost certainly did not come from a United Airlines Boeing 767", which, of course, supports my claim. It did not come from a Boeing 767.

Because he does it with such aplomb, he almost gets away with it, but Dr. Fetzer has written this about himself:

" Indeed, having spent 35 years teaching logic, critical thinking and scientific reasoning, I would describe them as "decisive" in establishing the complicity of the media in misleading the American people about the events of that day."

[New Proof of Video Fakery on 9/11](#)

Yet he is often as misleading as the media he accuses. The following has to do with my request that he provide a link to a Fox video that he has claimed shows FBI personnel *unloading* an aircraft engine onto Murray St., from a van.

Here is his response to that request at the same link as above: [July 13, 2011 - 1:48 pm](#)

(1) "... but we have footage of agents in FBI vests unloading it from a van" is supposed to be a "bald faced lie". But Jack took those frames from FOX News footage, so the footage obviously exists. They are moving something heavy from the van and they are wearing FBI vests. Since the engine component remained at that location later in the day, it cannot be a "pick up" but has to be a "delivery". I can't imaging [sic] a reasonable person disputing this. But then, as should be clear by now, Anthony is not a reasonable man.

Let's analyse that paragraph, step by step.

"... But Jack took those frames from FOX News footage, so the footage obviously exists. They are moving something heavy from the van and they are wearing FBI vests.

Having not been able, or willing to reveal the requested link, this amounts to Dr. Fetzer saying: "*You'll have to take my word for it that the engine was being unloaded, rather than loaded.*"

Next we have:

Since the engine component remained at that location later in the day, it cannot be a "pick up" but has to be a "delivery".

There is absolutely no logic in the above sentence. None at all. We are being asked to take Dr. Fetzer's word for it that that the engine remained there for an extended period of time. But, so what? I can think of any number of reasons why this might have been necessary. Examples: the engine wouldn't fit into the van, or it was too heavy to lift into it, or the FBI personnel involved had more important things to do when the South Tower fell, less than an hour after the plane's impact.

But still he cannot resist the *ad hominem*:

I can't imaging [sic] a reasonable person disputing this. But then, as should be clear by now, Anthony is not a reasonable man.

More Fetzer Dishonesty

I will let the reader to judge who is being reasonable, in the above instances, and pass on to another much earlier piece of Fetzer dishonesty having to do with a dispute over the speed of the South Tower plane:

Quote from: [New Proof of Video Fakery on 9/11](#)

"While Anthony Lawson has claimed such a plane could reach that speed in a dive, the plane is clearly not diving."

I have challenged Dr. Fetzer about this, many times, but he has never changed it or apologised. He was implying that I had claimed the plane was diving *as it crashed into the building*, which I most certainly have never done. The radar record shows that the plane rapidly descended, within about six minutes from a high altitude, until it levelled off for its final run which lasted about 12 seconds. Just before it levels off, the angle of descent appears to be about 15 degrees, and its final descent slope towards the Tower about 3.5 degrees. As with a car that reaches the bottom of a steep hill, the plane's momentum could have caused it to exceed its maximum *approved operating speed*, for 12 seconds, but not its un-released actual performance *capabilities*; what is so often referred to as the *impossible speed*.

John Lear's Admission

In that regard, while trying hard to play it down as being a once-only test condition, even John Lear had to admit that the plane is allowed to reach a speed parameter known as Vd. In the Boeing 767's case: a velocity of [420 KNOTS](#) (483 mph), under flight-test conditions, at low altitudes. If that *permitted* speed—which is not a *definitive* airframe or engine *performance* speed—is increased by a mere 21%, the plane's calculated impact speed, when it met the South Tower, would be reached or slightly exceeded. And I have seen quotes along the lines of: *Mr. Boeing builds 'em strong*; and *the inbuilt safety factor may be as high as 50%* over a selected safety ceiling. Boeing will not release any wind-tunnel data, so what can be observed from what was recorded on video, as well as common sense, is all that anyone has to go on regarding the actual safety margins. [ADDITIONAL INFORMATION](#)

Anyone with an intelligence background, or even possessed of a modicum of common sense, must realise that not all 9/11-Truth-Movement forums and websites are the genuine article, but that the most apparently successful ones will have been infiltrated by people whose agenda is diametrically opposed to finding out the truth about what really happened that day, and where the responsibility lies. And some of them have found devious ways to confuse, even calling into question the honesty or the eyesight of hundreds, if not thousands of witnesses whose heads were already turned towards the smoking North Tower when the second plane hit the South Tower. Dr. Fetzer's website: *Scholars for 9/11 Truth* is one of them, and now he is being allowed to spread this nonsense on [Veterans Today](#).

The Eye-Witness and Video Evidence

Along with at least one ground-based weather camera, several TV helicopter cameras recorded the plane's approach, and one of these its actual impact, with another only losing direct line-of-sight moments before the crash. Later, during the following hours and days, around 45 private videos of the plane's approach surfaced, many of which were broadcast by TV and cable stations. Included in those videos were about six which captured the actual impact, and recorded the surreal manner in which the plane—weighing between 140 to 160 tons, and travelling at a velocity of about 580 miles per hour—pierced the south-facing wall of the South Tower (WTC 2), causing the building to [VISIBLY SHAKE](#), with the initial movement being a lurch toward the north. The linked video is only 55 seconds in duration, and is a must-watch in pointing out why Dr. Fetzer's understanding of Newton's Laws are so fatally flawed.

No internal explosion could have achieved that external directionality, because the force of an internal explosion on all of the four walls would have been virtually equal.

Neither computer graphics nor holograms could have made that building shake.

The Impossible Speed and Impact Mantra

Despite the fact that not one proponent of the No-Planes-In-New York theory has ever proved that even a single frame of any of the major videos that were shot that day had been faked or manipulated before being broadcast, uploaded to the Internet or otherwise distributed, most of

them continue to claim that the images of the New York attacks are all the results of video fakery. When called out on this very important issue, some have lamely claimed that broadcasting videos in slow motion or having a commentary overlaid, or their sound tracks changed constitutes video fakery, which of course is absolute nonsense, because it has been an accepted method of presenting news and sports programmes for decades.

This lack of any solid evidence of *true* video fakery means, of course, that, beyond a reasonable doubt, the videos which show a plane hitting the South Tower at about 580 mph and disappearing into the interior of the building are accurate representations of *what actually happened*. Therefore both the speed and the manner of the impact *were* possible.

A Video Frame and a Photograph

A significant nail in the coffin of no-planes and video fakery is the fact that two images, one a frame from a video, the other a still photograph, both having been shot within a few feet of each other, can be matched almost seamlessly. The video, shot by Michael Hezarkhani, was broadcast in the evening by CNN, while the still photograph, taken by Carmen Taylor was transmitted, via e-mail, to a TV station in Arkansas, where she lives. No one has been able to explain this as anything other than two strangers, private individuals, tourists in New York, both waiting on a ferry moored at Battery Park, using two different media who captured exactly the same event, at exactly the same time on the morning of September 11, 2011.

MATCHING PLANE IMAGES

The above video was uploaded in December, 2007, and I have since learned that Carmen Taylor's photograph was broadcast during the lunchtime news programme, that same day, only hours after it was taken, not, as I state in the video, during the evening.

What about Holograms?

This video [UA175 - THE LAST 12 SECONDS](#) is a brilliant graphic representation of the unidentified plane's track towards the South Tower, with positional data taken, as I understand it, from radar tracks and certainly the videos shot from various camera positions around New York. Apart from demonstrating that those who claim that the plane's track does not match, from camera-to-camera, are wrong, it also shows the area that an imaginary holographic projector, or projectors, would have to have covered so that the image would match the plane's perspective from an infinite number of camera positions, because who would have known where each amateur or professional camera was going to be?

An Absence of Light

Are you still with me? If not, never mind, just think about this: Before any kind of image could be projected, so as to be visible against the bright blue sky above New York that morning, some method of creating what I can only describe as A MID-AIR ABSENCE OF LIGHT would first have to have been employed to create what is known as a *travelling matte* into which the 3D plane image would fit, so that it didn't look transparent and blue where the skylight seeped through its lighter tones. Added to that, the light requirement to project such a science-fiction, all-over-New York animated hologram, or multiple holograms, would be measured in trillions of lumens. Considering that there is no evidence that such a system exists, or is ever likely to exist, it will not be considered. Which leaves us with...

The Video Fakery Theory

Proponents of this theory, such as James Fetzer, maintain that no planes of any kind were involved, but that both of the WTC Towers were rigged with explosives which were detonated in synch with graphic images of a plane impacting each tower. Because no TV-broadcast cameras were active in the case of the North Tower impact, and the only viable North Tower impact video is unclear, we are left to examine the requirements for the South Tower event.

Multiple Images

The images of the plane would have to have been computer generated, animated and then superimposed on all of the cameras which were broadcasting, or likely to broadcast the composite event. Of course each superimposed image would have to have a different

perspective so as to match each individual camera position, but would need to be generated by one computer, or a bank of linked computers which would also be linked to the detonators within the South Tower.

Required Precautions

Quite a daunting task, arranging all of that, and ensuring that no one involved—and there would have been many from each TV station: managers, producers, announcers, remote-video-feed technicians, vision mixers, sound engineers, a minimum of at least ten people from each channel—would become whistleblowers, when they realised that they had been complicit in a hoax involving the deaths of so many people.

The Risk of a Video Surfacing of the Tower Exploding With No Plane

It would also have been necessary to ensure that no *rogue* broadcast camera chain, which was not designated to be supplied (by the perpetrators) with an appropriate image of the plane, could somehow get into any of the TV stations' video switching systems, and, shooting from the south, inadvertently broadcast an image of the South Tower exploding, *including the explosives which produced the cut-out of the plane's shape*, without an image of a plane appearing in the shot, just prior to the Tower erupting.

Videos with the Plane Added

Not being a party to the planning, or a clairvoyant, I am at a complete loss for an explanation of the known fact that about 45 amateur videos of the event surfaced, within hours or days, with composite shots of a non-existent plane apparently hitting the South Tower as it exploded.

9/11 Add-a-plane Services?


It has been suggested that *all* of these videos were shot by specially *planted* operatives, who had the plane image immediately added to their videos by some *9/11-add-a-plane agency*, before they were sold or donated to the TV and cable stations. This would also have to include stills photographs of the plane's approach. An unlikely proposition, because it is inconceivable for the perpetrators not to have considered that at least one video, taken by someone who was not involved in the plot, might have surfaced and blown the whole hoax sky high, because it showed the South Tower exploding and the plane's entry hole magically appearing, without an apparent reason for this to have happened.

Analysing the Planning for the South Tower Event in Reverse

The following few paragraphs are written as though all of the videos were composites.

Because there are so many videos of the results of this Video Fakery, it is possible to work out exactly how it was planned. For a start, *real* atmospheric conditions do not affect computer generated images; you could add a graphic plane to a live image where a real 50-knot cross wind prevailed without the plane appearing to side slip by as much as an inch.

From a common-sense point-of-view, the pre-planned WTC 1, or North Tower graphic attack was almost perfect. The imaginary plane, having breached the outer wall would then, apparently, have hit the barrier presented by the 47 central columns and come to a halt, so no



one would be surprised that very little or no debris from what everyone would be thinking was a real plane had exited the opposite side of the building. (Some landing gear did.)

However, for some reason, known best to the real perpetrators and the no-NY-planers, this ideal track and impact point was not even considered for the South Tower impact. If it had been, then a virtual mirror image of the North Tower impact would have been the result. And it *is* the result which determines what *must* have been planned. So, if we are to even consider the no-planes-in-New York

theory, it must be concluded that the perpetrators of this murderous event, *deliberately* planned the exact position where the South Tower graphic plane was to hit, as well as its inward track, which was well off the *ideal* angle-of-attack and position.



South Tower (Apparent) Plane Entry Hole

This offset position—which would, somehow, have to have been pre-formed with high-tech explosives set inside the building, well before the event, to be detonated at the moment of *apparent* impact—meant that either:

- a) a lot of computer-generated debris had to be superimposed over *all of the videos and photographs*, as though it was being ejected from the building by the explosives, or
- b) fake debris had to be included in the explosive package, to make it appear as though plane bits and pieces were raining down on the streets of lower Manhattan.

Returning to a Critical Examination of the No-Real-Plane Parameters

Whichever of the above methods was chosen, or even a mixture of the two, the debris had to have included something that looked very much like the smoking, three-ton core of a jet engine, which appeared to fall into Murray St., where it must have been planned that the FBI was to unload part of a *real* jet engine from a van, because that is what Dr. Fetzer has told us actually happened, having consulted his photo-analysers, Jack White, about the Fox video of that event. As this photo montage indicates. [LINK TO ORIGIN](#)

Well, it doesn't really, because of the question. But in a comment relating to this issue, which has already been mentioned, Dr. Fetzer wrote:

Fetzer: *Since the engine component remained at that location later in the day, it cannot be a “pick up” but has to be a “delivery”.*

This is the kind of illogical mind-game that Dr. Fetzer plays; it is a constant thread that runs through many of his articles and comments about the New York events. Not only does he invent false "facts" and argue against provable facts, *he argues against himself.*

Exposing Falsehoods

It was relatively easy finding the following two photographs that were taken in Murray St., one shows the road conditions before dust covered everything, the other one includes the dust.





Dust-free engine disk



Dust-covered engine disk

The photographs that include the alleged FBI van, in Jack White's question-posing *Pickup or Delivery?* photo-montage, show that the Towers had already collapsed because there is a layer of dust over everything, including the engine rotor that can be seen in the photograph. Because the dust appears to have settled by this time, and the sunlight is coming from a low angle, this suggests late afternoon, I would also suggest that whatever the alleged FBI are



doing near the van, they could not be *unloading* the engine or any of its parts, because those items can be clearly seen, *totally dust-free*, in many photographs as well as a video taken by Gedeon Naudet *before* the Towers collapsed. In this video, the [ENGINE DISC](#) is still smoking, and people are milling about. So the engine parts must have been lying there before the dust began falling, and would the FBI have planted it in front of so many witnesses?


So Dr. Fetzer was clearly wrong when he wrote that the FBI were *unloading* the engine from the van. And it calls into question his reliance on people like Jack White who clearly got this one wrong, as he has, in my opinion, many others. But James Fetzer—since I have become acquainted with him through a couple of *guest spots* on his radio programme and countless e-mails—seems addicted to people who are not really the experts he would like to think they are. Joseph Keith is another example.

Joseph Keith was Never an Aerospace Engineer

Hardly a 9/11 article or comment of Dr. Fetzer's goes by, if it has to do with the New York planes or the lack of them, without a mention of "Joseph Keith, retired aerospace engineer; designer of the Boeing Shaker System." [CHECK THIS EXAMPLE](#). But Mr. Keith set me *and* Dr. Fetzer straight, along with a lot of others during the following e-mail exchange. If you can't be bothered reading the text, I am calling into question Dr. Fetzer's constant upgrading of Mr. Keith's status, from Software Engineer to Aerospace Engineer.




During the extended exchange Joseph Keith set the record straight, including the fact that he did not develop the "Shaker System". He worked on it. The quoted sentence in red, comes from a very long e-mail, in which he also explains his involvement with the "Shaker System".




Clinging to Misconceptions

But rather than accept that he was wrong, perhaps having been misled by someone else (a not unreasonable cop out), Dr. Fetzer immediately attacked me for daring to call his own misconceptions into question.




But Mr. Keith did not even design the "shaker system" as he admitted in his long e-mail, within that same series as Dr. Fetzer's reply, which Dr. Fetzer either didn't bother to read, or which he chose to ignore. This is the opening to Joseph Keith's e-mail.



Where Boeing enters the story is difficult to work out, from the rest of the e-mail, but the above seems to indicate that the "big shakers" already existed before Keith joined Ling...

Yes, I was recruited from Interstate Electronics by Ling Electronics, because of my expertise of the Fast Fourier Transform, to automate their [Ling's] big shakers...

So Joseph Keith did *not* develop a "Big Shaker" he worked on the *software* for them. Yet James Fetzer claims that he deserves honorary-Aerospace-Engineer status, nevertheless. Why? Because James Fetzer cannot stand being wrong. Note the subtle twist in this next e-mail of his, sent later on the same day:



Actually, it is not so subtle. I've never stated that Joe Keith was not an honest man, I had been questioning James Fetzer's honesty in calling someone an aeronautical engineer when that person was *not* an aeronautical engineer, by any stretch of the imagination. *Not even James Fetzer's*. But, by calling Keith and aeronautical engineer, Dr. Fetzer was attempting to add credibility to his own theories about the New York plane crashes.

Still Persisting With the Lie


Yet despite being otherwise informed, by Joseph Keith himself, James Fetzer repeats the lie in what I think he intended as a rhetorical question, in the same e-mail:

Do you think someone could design the shaker system and not know a lot about planes?

So he is still claiming as true, by rhetorical inference, two things which he had just been informed were *not* true:

1. That Joseph Keith developed the shaker system.
2. That Joseph Keith should still be accepted as an aeronautical engineer in the face of his own words: "Other than the big shaker system, I don't claim to know airplanes."

This is classic James Fetzer, and who is to know what else he tells lies or half truths about? Certainly, judging from what we've already seen, his website's motto is a lie.



[Exposing Falsehoods and Revealing Truths](#)

Repeatedly quoting someone who does not have the required specialised knowledge, on a particular issue, is tantamount to lying. It is no excuse claiming that you did not know that the person was not qualified to make a definitive statement. If you quote a source, you'd better be pretty sure that the source you are relying on has the required expertise, because you are, in a sense, guaranteeing, to the best of your ability, that the statement you are passing on is accurate. But, as we've already seen, Dr. Fetzer has not even deemed it necessary to consult a real crash-physics expert about the New York impacts, because, in his own words:

Your average 10th grade physics student can answer this one for you.



The above photograph appears to show the still-smoking engine section exiting the South Tower (yellow ringed), with an accurate shadow of it on the North Tower. Is it a graphic, i.e.

photo fakery? Or was a real engine shot out of the South Tower using some kind of giant mortar? If it is the giant-mortar how might it have been secreted inside the building without anyone noticing it.

Some Additional Questions for Dr. Fetzer

If that's a real engine core, which was shot out of the building, what were the FBI doing—as you have claimed they were—*unloading* another one from a van? If it's a graphic engine, overlaid onto the photograph when and how was it done? You must know that there are many videos that depict exactly this same apparent event, so they would, according to your theory, have to have been faked, as well.

If, in Dr. Fetzer's wildest dreams, he can still accept that all of the above was a mixture of live-action explosions and video fakery, then he must prove it. He might also like to explain why the graphics artists involved in the deception depicted the plane as travelling at an *impossible speed*.

An Imaginary Winding Up of the TV Hoax Pre-Production Meeting

Having been to many meetings to discuss the parameters of making TV commercials involving special effects—none, I hasten to add, involving murder—I can just imagine, after having listened to the TV & Video Fakery concept that had been outlined by the senior initiators of this project, some junior member of the team plaintively suggesting:

Excuse me, Sir, but don't you think it would be a lot simpler to do it with real planes?

There Must be a New, Untainted Inquiry

The events of 9/11 defined this century. Devastating wars were launched and millions of innocent people have been killed, mutilated and traumatised because of the criminal misconceptions forced on us by very evil men in the U.S. administration of the time; misconceptions which the current administration has done nothing to correct. That monumental task has been taken on by a world-wide movement of concerned individuals and groups who are certain that we were not told the truth about what happened on 9/11 or which national entities were involved with the perpetrators who shut down NORAD, for example.

The 10th anniversary of this horrendous event is almost upon us, and it is important that we all stay focussed on one thing: Getting a new inquiry launched, and the more the 9/11 Truth Movement is distracted from this aim, the less likely that we shall succeed.

The case for a new inquiry about the Pentagon is inherent in the fact that a plane was never forensically identified, and that the images from the estimated 80-or-so surveillance cameras surrounding what should have been one of the most secure areas on the planet have all been suppressed. What actually happened is, therefore, almost beside the point. The point being that what was said to have happened almost certainly did not.

Judges, after hearing a not-guilty verdict, do not turn to the jury and ask: "Well if he didn't do it, who did?" It is up to the relevant law enforcement agencies to recommence their inquiries.

What happened, initially, in New York was obvious, because real people saw it happen, and because so many videos captured what happened to the South Tower. But, once again, the planes were not forensically identified and were almost certainly not the planes that were allegedly hijacked that morning, so the official story was a total fabrication. Although the no-planes-in-New York theorists have been recognised as either fools or monumental liars—by those who can think for themselves—they have given many a mainstream-media lackey an excuse to bundle all of those who are genuinely seeking the truth into one single category:



Foil-hatted nutters who don't even think that real planes hit the Twin Towers.

This nonsense really has to stop, and not hosting disinformationists like James H. Fetzer on otherwise serious websites will go a long way to dispel this very damaging image.