



Why they didn't use planes

Sometimes people ask me "why would they use missiles or whatever and run the risk of being caught out ? If they're going to sell a story about planes, why not make it as convincing as possible and use real planes" ?

It's a silly question, because in the face of direct visual and forensic proof that they didn't use planes (mostly supported by what little witness evidence we have), speculations about their thinking and planning are meaningless.

Nevertheless, since we live in extremely silly times, I'm going to address this question on its own terms.

Put yourself in the position of the perps. You have to think through what could go wrong in each possible scenario and then decide which scenario poses the smallest risk.

You want to sell a story about hijacked planes.

At the first level of decision making, you have two choices.

- 1) Actually use planes.
- 2) Use missiles or whatever the blobs 11 thing is, and convince people that they were planes.

Lets first look at the second scenario. You have the media on your side to tell the story. What could go wrong?

- 1) Witnesses might see that they were not planes and report it.

Well this has actually happened, but it seems that nobody takes any notice. The myth of "thousands of witnesses" to a big plane strike keeps getting trotted out on the basis of a circular assumption. "Because big jets were there, then people must have seen them - because people saw them, that proves they were there."

Clearly the perps thought about how to minimize the problem of contrary witness reports, and came up with a simple but effective plan.

This problem is easy to minimize. The first strike happens, and because the object is small and fast and unexpected, no-one is too sure what it is, or whether they saw it correctly. A few witness reports go to air reporting missiles or small planes or no craft at all, but there is only an 18 minute window for this to occur before the whole world sees a big jet live on TV - using commercially available real time animation technology. This distracts the media from interviewing many witnesses to the second strike, because everyone is fixated on the video replay. Those few witnesses who might get a moment with the media, then lack confidence in what they saw, because

once again, the object was small, fast and unexpected. Seeing the TV replay - which was instantly available - would make most people think that they just didn't see it properly. The few who remain unshakable in their belief that it was not a large plane are easily shouted down and drowned out by the endless replays. In addition the airlines release a statement saying that they've lost two big jets and any witness dissent is *instantly* - the moment the second strike happens - marginalized almost to the point of oblivion.

This is not speculation. Read through the transcripts of broadcasts as they unfolded between about 8.47 and 9.30 and you will see that this is *exactly* what happened. From the moment the second strike occurred, anyone who tried to say that it was not a large jet immediately had a TV replay shoved in their face.

What little witness evidence was gathered in the brief time available between the two strikes was not enough to do any real damage, and everything after that was corrupted by everybody having TV replays of the second jet shoved in their face as soon as they opened their mouths.

In that brief period between the two strikes, there was only one witness who said a large jet - and that just happened to be the vice prez of CNN, which of course is a major player in the scam - just as pivotal as the govt.

So we can see that the problem of contrary witnesses, while a minor inconvenience is easily overcome with some good planning.

Again, this is not speculation. The successful execution of this plan has been tested in the real world - and it works. The scenario I have outlined exactly fits with the documented record of the events.

Once the sheeple factor sets in, everyone is chanting "what about the people who saw it ? " without ever bothering to check what those people actually did report. And if they do check, the numbers of reports are not high enough to inflict major damage on the official story. What little there is overwhelmingly supports something other than a big jet, but there wasn't enough time to gather enough numbers for this to be a significant evidence factor. And as for the ordinary person on the street - most of them would be easily convinced that they just didn't see it properly. Some might have lingering doubts or suspicions, but would be quickly silenced by ridicule and denial from the overwhelming pressure of the TV footage, and the whole world trying to convince them that they just didn't see it properly. Most would eventually come to believe that themselves.

So - that problem is easily dealt with. No cover story solves everything, and doubtless there are still some mutterings of doubt and suspicion amongst some people who were there, but it isn't enough to cause a serious problem.

Now to the other problem.

Someone might look at the videos and see what's really there. Which is exactly what Rosalee has done. And people just go into mind controlled denial. The alternative media is flooded with endless debunkers. The perps knew our collective psychology well. They certainly wouldn't be happy with

the groundswell of awareness which Rosalee has kick-started, but it looks very manageable compared to the problems I'm about to outline with the strategy of using real jets.

Again, this is not speculation. The way that both of these problems have been handled has been tested in the real world, fits exactly with the documented record, and the fact that I am even needing to write this, 3 years after Rosalee first busted the video evidence, is testimony to how wisely the perps judged the choice of strategy.

Now lets look at the other choice - using real jets.

This immediately splits into two sub-choices 1) Pilot them with suicide pilots
2) Remote control them.

The problem with the first choice is obvious and I think most people on this list have already accepted the absurdity and the monstrous difficulties of such a scenario, so I won't go into them here.

Remote control.

Before addressing the problems with that, the scenario splits into more - sub-choices.

1) Hijack a real flight with real passengers aboard. 2) Launch a plane from somewhere else and pass it off as a real flight.

Basically, the choices here split into the option of crashing a plane with passengers aboard or with no passengers aboard. Both possibilities create potentially insurmountable problems in the cover up - and a reduced likelihood of the crash being successfully targeted to begin with.

Let's look at the latter problem. While it's certainly feasible to remote control a large jet into the towers, it's a high precision targeting job for an aircraft with very limited maneuverability. There's a significant risk that the plane won't hit its target properly. That it will hit some other building, just clip its wing on the tower and crash into the streets or cause a cascade of damage on other non targeted buildings, miss altogether and finish up in the Hudson, still reasonably intact - all kinds of risks.

Whatever the calculated likelihood of a successfully targeted crash, it would have to be significantly lower than that of a missile or blobs- thing, which is specifically engineered for such precision strikes.

Even the smallest increase in risk of the target not being hit properly would be completely unacceptable, given the easily manageable nature of any problems associated with the alternative scenario.

And missing the target is only the beginning of the problem. What about the aftermath ? Once it misses the target, there's a significant risk that the aircraft may crash in such a manner that it's reasonably intact. Rescue workers and emergency services who are completely innocent of the scam, and ordinary people wanting to help out are going to reach the wreckage before any perpsters, given that where it crashed couldn't be foreseen.

And what are they going to find ? Two choices. A plane with no -one in it. How are the perps going to explain that, huh ? Or a plane with passengers. This raises even more problems. Using a plane with passengers creates two more sub-choices.

1) Hope that all the passengers get killed in the crash, so there's no survivors to talk or hope that the perps can get to them first and knock them off before they do talk.

2) Kill them before the crash with a timed release of gas into the aircon system. Which of course leaves more forensic evidence to cover up, when the bodies are examined. Imagine the massive operation needed to get enough perps swarming over the wreckage quickly enough to control what the media, innocent rescue workers or survivors would start blabbing before the spin sets in. Far worse than anything a few witnesses could say in the 18 minutes between the two tower strikes.

These problems are not limited to the scenario of the aircraft not crashing as they were meant to. If the planes were successfully crashed into the towers, its still possible - although not very likely - that there could be survivors. Nevertheless, even assuming that everyone was killed, real crashes with real people leave real bodies, they don't just vapourize like in the S11 cartoon. So you have hundreds of retrievable bodies to worry about. If they were killed with gas prior to the crash, then you have the same forensic cover up nightmare as in the scenario where the plane misses its target.

And if you avoid this problem by hoping that everyone is killed in the crash, you face the horrible risk that there will be dozens of survivors to try to shut up - unlikely if the plane hits the target properly - but you don't know that for sure.

In addition, real planes leave real wreckage - unlike the S11 cartoon - which means real flight recorder boxes to be found and more stuff to hush up, involving more innocent officials to pressure. Of course, enormous pressure can be brought to bear, but the problem is how much would spill out before the spin gets into action. All of this is far worse than what a few witnesses could say in the 18 minutes between the strikes, and what a marginalized researcher can post on her website, hoping that people take notice.

As you can see, the scenario of using real planes creates a logistical nightmare compared to the piddling problem of a few witnesses to the craft, and easily marginalized conspiracy nuts analyzing video - easily suppressed by a compliant media.

In committing a crime, the idea is to leave as little mess as possible, because every bit of mess is a potential clue. Even in the event of a successfully targeted crash, real aircraft, scattering wreckage and bodies everywhere creates an enormous amount of mess to cover up compared to the relatively neat problem of a few witnesses and a few conspiracy nuts trying to tell people what the video shows.

The problems of the real plane scenario are enormously compounded by the possibility of a botched crash, which itself is a significantly increased risk

when using big lumbering jets not specifically designed for that task as opposed to precision weaponry which is far more reliable. In the unlikely event of a missile going off course, there would be far less mess to leave clues, and an easier co-opting into a plan B story - like terrorists stealing missiles and firing them at NY.

This explanation should hopefully put an end once and for all to the plane hugging fantasy - but then, these are very silly times in which we live.

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the articles posted on this website are distributed for their included information without profit for research and/or educational purposes only. This website has no affiliation whatsoever with the original sources of the articles nor are we sponsored or endorsed by any of the original sources.