

oilempire.us	Official Story	Limited Hang Out	Best Evidence	Distracting Disinformation
<p>what really happened?</p>	<p>al-Qaeda attacked us because they hate our freedoms</p>	<p>al-Qaeda attacked us because they hate US foreign policies</p>	<p>al-Qaeda, which was vastly exaggerated in size, attacked us - but the attack was allowed to happen and probably given critical technical assistance to ensure its success (without the knowledge of the patsies) www.oilempire.us/qaeda.html</p>	<p>“4,000 Jews” were warned to stay out the WTC, no Arabs were on the planes, Israel did it (distractions from the fact Israel had foreknowledge)</p> <p>The story of the Israeli agents arrested in New Jersey while filming (and celebrating!) the collapse of the WTC was spread widely by anti-Semitic websites, ensuring that 9/11 complicity evidence would be connected to anti-semitism - a great way to alienate New Yorkers and most other Bush opponents.</p>
<p>prior warnings</p>	<p>Bush and Rice say that they had no idea planes could be used as weapons</p>	<p>Michael Moore and other liberal critics suggest that the Bush regime was too blinded by its business ties to the Saudis to pay attention to the warnings</p>	<p>warnings came from at least 15 allied countries, multiple FBI investigations and other sources of intelligence that the attacks were imminent. It’s possible these warnings were partly recognition of the “legend” of 9/11 being sown in advance of the events. www.oilempire.us/warnings.html</p>	<p>the claim that focusing on foreknowledge is a distraction - when in reality, allowing 9/11 to happen through conscious pseudo-negligence would be the largest crime in US history - even if the wilder claims (demolition, remote control) are not true</p>
<p>inter-agency communication before 9/11</p>	<p>there was supposedly a “wall” between the FBI, the CIA and other agencies that allowed clues to the attacks to be overlooked merging these agencies into a supersized police and intelligence system will make sure it never happens again</p>	<p>some civil liberties groups think that the Patriot Act and other abuses can be undone without dealing with the fact that 9/11 was not a surprise attack</p>	<p>FBI whistleblowers have spoken about their experiences that show how valuable clues were deliberately ignored by management, it was not a case of simple incompetence.</p> <p>“Crossing the Rubicon” by Michael Ruppert documents a 2001 Rand Corporation report that noted these agencies had minor communication difficulties regarding counter-terrorism intelligence that did not disrupt their effectiveness and were easily solved.</p>	<p>this issue has been ignored by the hoaxers</p>
<p>air defenses on 9/11</p>	<p>the military tried their hardest, but were caught off guard by the terrorists, and was only able to show up slightly too late to stop the crashes</p>	<p>most of those advocating limited hang outs accept the incompetence theories, but few have looked in detail at the evidence.</p>	<p>The 9/11 Commission blamed the FAA for screwing up the response to the hijackings, yet FAA safely landed more than 4,000 planes at airports that were not expecting them immediately after the attacks began. FAA is not responsible for the Air Force’s inaction. www.oilempire.us/standdown.html</p>	<p>this issue has been ignored by the hoaxers</p>

oilempire.us	Official Story	Limited Hang Out	Best Evidence	Distracting Disinformation
<p>war games by the Air Force and NRO on 9/11</p>	<p>The official Commission claimed the NORAD war games helped the air defenses respond to the situation, which is unlikely, and ignored the NRO (National Reconnaissance Office) “plane into building” exercise near Dulles Airport.</p> <p>Neither the media nor the official Commission report dare make a list of all war games underway on 9/11, even though all are documented by mainstream media articles.</p>	<p>Department of the Navy employee Barbara Honneger, who is active in 9/11 complicity issues, promotes a “piggy back” theory. She claim the hijackers found out about the overlapping war games and timed their attack to take advantage of the confusion. Honneger also claims there was a large explosion at the Pentagon six minutes before Flight 77 hit it, and that “shoe bomber” Richard Reid was really Osama (both claims are absurd), so her war game claim is probably a fall-back cover story.</p>	<p>The war games facilitated the attacks by paralyzing the Air Force responses - copvicia.com/free/www3/011805_simplify_case.shtml <i>Crossing the Rubicon: Simplifying the case against Dick Cheney</i> by Michael Kane - a review of “Crossing the Rubicon” by Michael Ruppert</p> <p>Paul Thompson has a new, larger list of war games at www.cooperativeresearch.org</p> <p>Webster Tarpley, <i>9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA</i> (a book that is a mix of good analysis and misinformation): "the most palpably subversive actions could be made to appear in the harmless and even beneficial guise of a drill."</p> <p>part of a pattern of simulations masking real events. The “Internal Look” exercise simulated Iraq's invasion of Kuwait (1990) at the exact moment that Iraq invaded Kuwait (Cheney was Secretary of Defense). www.oilempire.us/wargames.html</p>	<p>Team 8 (a website from people who previously pushed the “pod” hoax, now focused on the war games issues)</p> <p>fake news from Alex Jones and “Prison Planet”</p> <p>www.prisonplanet.com/articles/january2005/040105defenseshield.htm 9/11 Whispers: Washington Defense Shield Deactivated Due To Wargames?</p> <p>Jones is promoting the idea that a terrorism exercise on July 7, 2005 - at the start of the G8 conference - was used as cover for the bombings of the London Underground and bus systems. Proving whether this is evidence of complicity or merely bait to mislead the skeptics would require a serious investigation that is unlikely. The impact on our civil liberties will be the same whether the 7/7 bombings were allowed to happen or a surprise attack.</p>
<p>Flight 77 flown into the nearly empty, recently reconstructed part of the Pentagon</p>	<p>Hani Hanjour, who flunked flight school, flew the plane with amazing precision - flying from 7,000 feet in a spiral dive, coming in so low that drivers on the nearby highway thought the plane would hit them. The official story claims that it is merely lucky that Flight 77 hit the least populated part of the Pentagon.</p>	<p>Coincidence theorists claim it was a one-in-five chance that the nearly empty part of the Pentagon was hit, even though the flight maneuvers were precision flying. It is hard to believe that a terrorist trying to cause as much damage as possible would have flown around the Pentagon to hit the one area with the fewest victims.</p>	<p>It is likely, but unprovable, that some form of remote control technology was used to steer Flight 77 into the nearly empty, recently reconstructed and strengthened part of the Pentagon. This “hijacking the hijackers” theory is detailed at www.oilempire.us/understanding.html An expert pilot hijacker substituted for Hanjour would not have made the amazing flight pattern to minimize casualties. Thousands could have been killed if the plane had hit any other part of the Pentagon. www.oilempire.us/pentagon.html www.oilempire.us/remote.html</p>	<p>The “no plane hit the Pentagon” science fiction stories ignore the facts that hundreds of people saw the plane and the physical evidence is consistent with a 757 crash. These stories also imply that those who saw the plane, the crash and the rubble afterwards are lying co-conspirators. The various “no Boeing” speculations distract from real evidence, and discredit 9/11 skepticism inside the Beltway, both by the majority of the citizens (most voted against Bush) and the political and military elites (who were not part of the cabal that facilitated 9/11).</p>

oilempire.us	Official Story	Limited Hang Out	Best Evidence	Distracting Disinformation
<p>Flight 93 crashed in Pennsylvania</p>	<p>the "heroes" took down the plane, saving Washington from further carnage</p>	<p>no limited hang outs</p>	<p>Flight 93 was probably shot down. The best collection of information documenting this is the website www.flight93crash.com - it has not been updated in years, but it did manage to save a number of early news articles and eyewitness accounts.</p> <p>Several theories WHY Flight 93 was shot down are at www.oilempire.us/dictionary.html#93</p>	<p>The <i>American Free Press</i> claims that the crash of Flight 93 never happened. Their companion publication <i>Barnes Review</i> promotes KKK leader David Duke and Holocaust Denial. Ignoring the fact that 4 planes crashed on 9/11 is similar to Holocaust Denial - both require suppression of eyewitness testimonies.</p> <p>Physics911, a hoax site that claims to focus on "physical evidence," claims that the passengers didn't really make phone calls to their loved ones and their voices were all simulated by military psychological warfare teams - a great way to alienate the victim's families from the skeptics.</p>
<p>Flights 11 and 175 flown into the World Trade Center</p>	<p>the official story is straight forward and well known</p>	<p>no limited hang outs</p>	<p>If 9/11 had happened an hour later, there would have been many more people in the towers and the casualty rate would have been much higher.</p> <p>It is also curious that the planes hit near the tops of the towers, which allowed most of the people in the Twin Towers to escape before the collapses. Nearly everyone below the crash zones survived the attacks.</p> <p>Flight 11, which hit the North Tower, flew over Indian Point nuclear power station (just north of New York City). If "al-Qaida" had hit this target instead, 9/11 could have been the biggest disaster in world history.</p> <p>Claims that Flight 11 and 175 did not hit the towers are disinformation to discredit and distract from real evidence.</p>	<p>Pods - the bizarre idea that Flight 175 had a "pod" underneath the wing that fired a missile at the South Tower just before impact (in reality, just a blurred photo of the normal "fairing" that connects the wing to the fuselage) A core part of the film "In Plane Site" www.oilempire.us/inplanesite.html</p> <p>flash - blurry video promulgated three years after 9/11 that purports to show a detonation on the plane's nose when it contacted the building - fun with photoshop! also from "In Plane Site"</p> <p>the "webfairy" theory (the bizarre claim that no plane hit the north tower, it was really a missile masked by a King Kong sized hologram)</p> <p>"holes too small for 767" (this is easily debunked by looking at photos of the size the WTC holes)</p> <p>no windows on the plane (and therefore a military tanker plane) plane wreckage in the rubble clearly showed the fuselage had windows and there's zero evidence for this claim www.oilempire.us/popular-mechanics.html</p>

oilempire.us	Official Story	Limited Hang Out	Best Evidence	Distracting Disinformation
<p>collapses of Building 7 and the Twin Towers</p>	<p>The towers fell from a combination of the impact destroying part of the supporting columns and fires reducing the strength of the steel. The extra weight of the plane (and collapsed floors) probably contributed to the collapse.</p> <p>Building 7 was ignored by the 9/11 Commission report, but the official story claims that part of a tower made a large gash on the building, and diesel fires from an emergency generator caused the building to collapse.</p> <p>The claim that lower Manhattan was safe to work and live in needlessly exposed countless thousands to dangerous levels of toxins from the WTC dust clouds -- that criminal negligence may kill more people than the plane crashes and building collapses.</p>	<p>The scandal of the collapse of the towers was the faulty construction standards that were used. The Progressive Review details this at www.prorev.com/wtc.htm</p> <p>If the towers were merely destroyed by conscious allowing of 9/11 to happen, then the construction standards scandal is not a limited hang out. It is an important story regardless of the claims for demolition of Building 7 or the towers.</p>	<p>It is difficult to say exactly what happened to cause the buildings to collapse as quickly as they did. Oil Empire does not have a position on whether there was demolition of the towers or not. The case for Building 7 seems much stronger. Evidence for the demolition of the towers is largely based on inference (the physical evidence has all been recycled). The demolition theories are not needed to prove complicity.</p> <p>Journalist Peter Lance, one of the few serious reporters willing to state that the Bush regime deliberately allowed 9/11 to happen, claims that Building 7 was demolished but the towers were not. He argues that Building 7, a military and intelligence facility, was destroyed in an operation similar to destroying classified materials in an embassy about to be overrun by foreign troops.</p> <p>Michael Ruppert suggests that Building 7 may have been detonated in order to destroy technical equipment used as part of the remote control flying of the planes -- equipment that could not have been discreetly removed after the attacks had succeeded.</p> <p>The best technical arguments in favor of the demolition theories are written by Jim Hoffman at http://911research.wtc7.net and www.911review.com</p>	<p>There is an enormous amount of erroneous material circulating on the internet making false claims for demolition. Many of these fake claims are marketed as “physical evidence” but they are merely hoaxes.</p> <p>North Tower fires had gone out before the collapse - numerous photos clearly refute this http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/reynolds/index.html</p> <p>kerosene fires can't melt steel (the best claims for demolition acknowledge this)</p> <p>Building 6 explosion www.911review.com/errors/wtc/b6_explosion.html</p> <p>a giant explosion at the base of the towers brought them down (In Plane Site, among others) www.questionsquestions.net/WTC/hoax.html</p> <p>“Pull It” quote (“bait” from Larry Silverstein) http://home.planet.nl/~reijd050/911_my_own_review.htm</p> <p>William Rodriguez, who has filed a “RICO” lawsuit against Bush claiming missiles were fired at the WTC and Pentagon, claims there was an explosion in the basement of the towers just before the plane hit. <i>Controlled demolitions of skyscrapers do NOT blow up the basement an hour before collapse. There was damage at ground level from falling debris from the crash, and perhaps from jet fuel going down the elevator shaft.</i></p> <p>the towers were destroyed with nuclear explosives (John Kaminski, Jimmy Walter) - probably the most ridiculous nonsense that anyone has offered</p> <p>we're waiting for the "No Buildings" theories ...</p>