

There are no posts below your current threshold: [Change](#)[Print Thread](#)

[SlackerSlayer](#)  
(freedom fighter)  
09/12/06 02:16 AM

! **Smoking gun in a good quality second WTC tower impact** [ Post [294931616](#) ]

**Category:** News & Opinion (Specific) **Topic:** Conspiracy: 9/11 - Alleged Coverups

**Synopsis:** The plane that struck second, is a 737-400

**Source:** [compiled from photos and video](#)

**Published:** September 11, 2006 **Author:** SlackerSlayer

**For Education and Discussion Only. Not for Commercial Use.**

### [2nd Tower impact Quicktime file](#)

Compare the plane in the video with these two photos of one, a 737-400 tail (a 737-500 for a better angle of view, no dif in the two) and a 767-200ER tail, and tell me which one was flying into the building. The 767 tail has a little cone assembly that protrudes out from the tails elevator/horizontal stabilizers, which is blunt and nearly flush on the 737 models.

737-400



A better picture of the 500 model for a better view of the section in question



767-200ER



**SlackerSlayer** writes: "I have asked a certain member to show me the difference, so over time I finally dug into the pictures and after digging through very bad reproduction after bad reproductions, I've found a few that do show that a 767 did not strike the WTC1 Tower, the second impact. The engine found on the street is the real clue that seems to be over looked intentionally, like all the other evidences are being looked at,, right.


*But give this a look, and you be the judge.*

*URL source for the video and commentary can be found [here](#), the video above can be found at the last screen page at the bottom, top of the fourth to last paragraph, " (here, here, here and here) ".*

*My version of quicktime allows me to grab the video advanced cursor and slide it to see a freeze frame anywhere in the file.*

*The video shows me a blunt tail end, the 767 has that little cone tail end that is missing on that plane."*

*Edited by SlackerSlayer on 09/12/06 02:29 AM.*

Post Extras: 

**SlackerSlayer**  
(freedom fighter)  
09/12/06 02:36 AM

**👎 Re: Smoking gun in a good quality second WTC tower impact** **NEW** [ To: [SlackerSlayer](#) | Post [294931629](#), reply to [294931616](#) ] (Score: 2)

**Flag to:** SlackerSlayer, sushi\_girl, ratcat, randfreedom, Liberty\_Burning, CATO, Ground\_Control, m\_astera, mailman, BlackJade, Glyndwr, askel5, molson, petewagner33, rusalka, ResearchGuy

Here is another angle, [video\\_QT](#)




ps for mailman, I found it for you. Tell me a 767 flew into the tower, I dare ya.

When does a Prosecutor get to convict the accused based solely on a cops' word? See 911 and the official conspiracy story.

Slayer

*Edited by SlackerSlayer on 09/12/06 02:43 AM.*

Post Extras: 

[SlackerSlayer](#)  
(freedom fighter)  
09/12/06 02:46 AM

**!** **Re: Smoking gun in a good quality second WTC tower impact** **NEW** [ To: [SlackerSlayer](#) | Post [294931633](#), reply to [294931629](#) ] (Score: 2)

**Flag to:** SlackerSlayer, bobbysophistry, chump, HOUNDDAWG

Is that a blunt tail end or a conal tail end?

I need to make a flag list, bring em in here.

When does a Prosecutor get to convict the accused based solely on a cops' word? See 911 and the official conspiracy story.

Slayer

Post Extras: 


[petewagner33](#)  
(agent provocateur)  
09/12/06 03:21 AM

**!** **Re: Smoking gun in a good quality second WTC tower impact** **NEW** [ To: [SlackerSlayer](#) | Post [294931641](#), reply to [294931633](#) ] (Score: 2)



Yep indeed. Opens up a lot of questions, to include where the plane came from and where the other went.

There are always two parties; the establishment and the movement. -Emerson

Post Extras: 

 [Print Thread](#)

◀ Previous ▲ [Index](#) ▶ [Next](#) Flat  [Threaded](#)

Jump to

[libertyforum.org](#) | [Contact Us](#)

[Ain't Nobody's Business If You Do](#)

[Main Index](#) | [Search](#) | [New user](#) | [Login](#) | [Who's Online](#) | [FAQ](#)

### Fair Use Notice

?????This site contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We make such material available in an effort to advance awareness and understanding of issues relating to civil rights, economics, individual rights, international affairs, liberty, science & technology, etc. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes.

?????For more information please visit: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>

?????If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain

permission directly from the copyright owner.