

Jules Naudet's film the "9/11"

Story: At 8.46 a.m. on September 11, 2001, at the intersection of Church and Lispenard Streets in Manhattan, one of two French film-making brothers, 28-year-old Jules Naudet was filming a group of firemen from Ladder 1/Engine 7 at 100 Duane Street, checking for an alleged suspected gas leak, when he captured what was thought to be unique film of American Airlines Flight 11 from Boston flying into the north tower of the World Trade Center, three quarters of a mile away.

On the "911" there where never any "Planes", no photo or video is Real, and the Entire Thing Is A Hoax. The "Towers" you see are also not the real Towers.

VIDEO:

The entire "911" film in itself is a complete hoax. There are many but subtle video errors throughout the film. Some crowd scenes has been digitally fabricated. There are many minor video errors.

The "911" film follows a rookie fire-fighter on his first days as a fire-fighter. Careful study of the story reveals many subtle errors.

The location of the video, where we see "The Plane" is about the only place in the entire N.Y. city where this kind of video could have been captured. It was difficult to get a clear shot at the Towers due to may high rise buildings. Locations further to the west would require recording against the sun.

The idea that there would be a "gas leak" is the excuse to put the camera in the middle of the street. The Towers look unreal. Why target the camera on the Towers?

You are not allowed to bring any electric camera into a suspicious gas leak! No amateur cameramen are allowed to enter the closed-off area!

There are numerous actors who look and walk around in the area.

The Actor-fire-fighter happens to hold his helmet when he looks upwards.

The exact camera position (rendering) has been used also in a completely different so-called amateur-video about the towers.

The plane is transparent, and looks unreal. The glass-plane.

The plane disappears right in front of the Tower.

Panning and zooming is too steady for a hand camera.

This is by professional equipment. Compare to other film; compare the resolution and quality of the video.

A building to the left has serious video rendering problems.

A building to the right has serious video rendering problems.

The facade can be seen undamaged after the plane has disappeared! The "Hole" appears only later!

The hole is not consistent with the Plane:

(A) Donald-Duck style -- completely absurd

(B) position and angle of wings is wrong.

The amount of "Fire" not consistent with the amount of fuel in the "Plane". Too much.

The "Fire" appears at several places.

The "Fire" shall appear immediately at the impact point, and no where else. The fire cannot

"follow" the plane and come out at the other side.

No plane can go through the façade without having fins, wings and tail breaking off and falling into the street.

The impulse-law have kind of disappeared. Alternatively was the mass of the "Plane" zero. No vibration or swing in the very high rooftop antenna.

The shape and appearance of the Towers reveal a picture in layers; not the real towers.

Several subliminal threatening images of animals and faces appear in the fire and smoke. This prove that the video was produced in advance.

The shape and length of the "Hole" not consistent with other "videos".

AUDIO:

The Plane sound not consistent with a Boeing 767-200ER

The sound is delayed before reaching the ground. This inconvenient delay seems to have gone, or it does not pose an obstacle.

The sound from the hit has a special echo, obviously fabricated, that is not consistent with a real event outdoors.

There seems to be different sound tracks.

Someone is recorded screaming; the audio is reversed/backwards.

When the "Plane" hits the Towers

File Attachments

1) [Naudet_image003.jpg](#), downloaded 1594 times

Subject: Re: Jules Naudet's First-Strike-Film

Posted by [Tufa](#) on Sun, 05 Jun 2011 10:13:33 GMT

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

Picture source: Simon Shack

Recources and references:

The entire "911" film:

911.torrent, the DVD version

9-11 - Naudet Brothers - 3 versions.torrent

My own (for Sweden) composition analyse the Naudet closely:

911_WTC_Longintro_Tufavideo_DVD_2010.torrent

The subject is the "No Plane" issue.

911_clips_collection_to_tufavideo_net.torrent:
From_internet\naudetnumbered.mov
From_internet\naudetdeshakenumbered.mov
From_internet\hires-firsthit.xvid.avi
From_internet\WTC First Impact HQ.flv

File Attachments

- 1) [9-11 - Naudet Brothers - 3 versions.torrent](#), downloaded 1053 times
- 2) [911.torrent](#), downloaded 1001 times
- 3) [911_WTC_Longintro_Tufavideo_DVD_2010.torrent](#), downloaded 1380 times
- 4) [RUBBLEanalysisTONY_PROBIE.jpg](#), downloaded 1897 times

Subject: Re: Jules Naudet's First-Strike-Film
Posted by [Tufa](#) on Sun, 05 Jun 2011 12:07:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And it "just happened to ..."

Leslie Raphael 18 March 2006

How probable is it that not only did Naudet (or whoever) capture Flight 11 -- as if that were not enough on its own -- but that he and his brother GÃ©dÃ©on then went on to record the rest of that day's events -- and survive them? Who else could be almost simultaneously inside the towers, out on the streets and back at Duane Street firehouse, seven blocks away, than a pair of miracle workers like these? Does the English - or the French - language have a word for people who can repeatedly, umpteen times in the space of a few hours, "just happen" to find themselves in the right place at the right time, doing the right thing? Apart, that is, from "liar" ("menteur").

Their friend Hanlon just happened to work at a firehouse seven blocks from the Trade Center; Hanlon just happened to be off duty that day; That firehouse just happened to take no casualties, Hanlon or anyone else, on 9/11; It just happened to be the night before September 11 when Jules cooked for the firehouse and they sat up all night laughing about it (20:54 into film); Jules just happened to capture the first plane (24:46); GÃ©dÃ©on just happened to capture the second one (33:55); Jules just happened to film - and identify - out of the hundreds of firemen passing through the lobby of WTC 1: Father Judge the Chaplain (walking about on his own - making himself enormously useful), who was later killed (47:41); the chance last encounter of Chief Pfeifer with his brother Kevin, a Lieutenant with Engine 33, who was later killed (31:33); lovable old (57) Chief Richard Prunty of Battalion 2, who was later killed (21:11); Chief Pfeifer just happened to be looking towards the camera, trying his radio, when the south tower came down, so that Jules conveniently gets a good reaction shot (50:53) - similar to the Flight 11 shot in that, when it happens, Pfeifer is (a) not talking to anybody and (b) fiddling with, but not actually using (because that would distract him), some gadget; but totally dissimilar in that he actually seems to hear the noise in the lobby, unlike the plane; Jules and his group just

happened to come across, in the pitch-blackness and confusion after the collapse, the late Father Judge (55:24); Jules just happened to be far enough away from the north tower to escape when it collapsed and film his escape as it happened (1:08:28); Seven hours later, one of the brothers - we are not told which - just happened to be filming the top of the No. 7 building as it suddenly and unexpectedly collapsed (1:28:27); etc etc.

Quote from Account and criticism by Leslie Raphael 18 March 2006. He write that "Al Qaeda could have done it", which is impossible, because the "911" cannot be implemented at all by anyone -- it is pure fiction.

The Naudet Flight 11 shot - conveniences

Back in 2006 one or two still thought that the "cuts" could be real: A real plane or a drone, and real towers, and real fire. It is a computer animation! See below what problems would arise, in case you just imagine, for a while, that it actually was real:

Leslie Raphael 18 March 2006

The photographer is outside, not -- like most people in Manhattan at any given time -- in a building (like the firehouse he was in 15 minutes before) or a vehicle (like the car he was in 5 minutes before), where filming a plane would be far more difficult.

He is in the middle of Lispenard Street, not on a pavement, where he would risk pedestrians walking in front of him, bumping into him, running past him, etc.

He is in a north-south street, giving a view of the Twin Towers -- not, for example, further west along Lispenard, with the 430-foot AT&T Building in front of him, blocking the south view -- which even the 40-foot building on the east side of the street would do, as demonstrated in the photograph at the start of this essay, which does not even show its full five-floor height.

He is at a crossroads, which puts the full width of an east-west street (Lispenard) between him, at the north-east corner, and the traffic, blocking the south end of the intersection. If he had been at the south-east corner, or if the roadblock had been in a north-south street, but not at an intersection, the stalled traffic might not have completely obscured his view of the tower, but he would have been standing too near it, and might have had to film the impact above the top of a 7-foot mail van or fire truck, which would look too convenient. Using an intersection provides an excuse for getting him right back from the traffic and filming from the other, north side of the street. And if the cameraman has to be at the north-east then so does the gas leak.

Why at this particular intersection, and not, for example, the next one down, Church and Walker? Because this one has the huge, and hugely convenient, AT&T Building -- see No. 38.

He is in one of the few streets in Manhattan, if not the only one, where he could photograph a building (a pair of buildings, in this case) in the street next door, three quarters of a mile away, in the middle of his picture and equidistant from buildings on the sides of the street he is in, with only fresh air between them - and above them - and no other buildings from next door visible. You don't get this view from West Broadway next door to the west, and Broadway on the east side had no view at all of the Trade Center. Anyone who worked around Church and Lispenard would know about this amazing view, but what are the chances of someone accidentally having it as a backdrop the day a plane flew into that building next door?

Any building visible from the street next door, from that distance, would have to be at least 800 feet tall, which excludes all but a dozen in the whole of New York. The only reason these buildings are visible at all is because they are the tallest in the whole city, and this picture is not the normal Manhattan street scene it is made out to be. In a million pictures of New York taken at random from street level, how many would accidentally show the tallest buildings in the city -

three quarters of a mile away - in the middle of the picture - with empty space to left, right and above - from a street next door to them - with skyscrapers of its own - equidistant from the buildings on either side? I would suggest - with emphasis on the words "random" and "accidentally" - not a single one. But if not random, and deliberately composed that way - as many as you like.

If he was in West Broadway, he would only be able to see the north face, and his film of the plane would look too convenient, but from even one street away, with the towers' corners visible - and only their top quarter - it is impossible to tell how close he is to them: he could be on the other side of the city. Even New York inhabitants might not be familiar with the view from Church Street, or realize that this is only one street away from the towers - and the film does not mention the fact.

The picture has also been composed vertically: 1. the street traffic, 2. the Tribeca Hotel and the building beyond it, further down Church Street, 3. the Twin Towers. There might have been no middle layer in this sandwich - he could have filmed the plane immediately above the top of Chief Pfeifer's SUV - but having other buildings in between increases the distance between the target and any possible distractions at ground level

He has a camcorder with him, unlike most people -- even professional photographers don't always have their equipment with them.

He is already filming with it when the plane appears, when he might still have had to switch it on, load a tape, change the battery, etc

The group members are all standing still, unlike most New York pedestrians -- or firemen -- who tend to be going somewhere.

The gas leak has just been dealt with seconds before the plane appears, and nothing of any great importance happens in the interim, which allows the photographer to immediately switch to filming the new subject.

The plane flies alongside the next street west, when it could have been 20 blocks away -- but would they have heard it?

The cameraman is already filming westwards -- almost towards the plane's closest approach to him, about 250 yards away -- just before it arrives. This makes it easier to capture on film when it does arrive, by simply waiting for it to pass its closest point and disappear behind the AT&T Building before panning left. The plane could have turned up behind him, or at an awkward angle, instead of passing straight in front, from right to left, north to south.

The plane's closest point is where it is most difficult to film: the cameraman does not attempt to film its flight until it passes that point, and is flying away from him -- much easier to film than flying towards him, at that speed, that close -- yet he must have been able to see the plane arriving, beyond the Post Office building to the north-west.

The plane is flying horizontally, in a straight line, making its direction easier to follow, when it could have been turning, or flying in circles, or climbing, or falling.

The gas leak call is at 8.30, putting the group on location at the right time, when it might have been ten minutes earlier, and by 8.45 they would have been back down in Duane Street, having dealt with it -- or ten minutes later, and they would still have been driving up Church Street when the plane passed, heading in the opposite direction. (In a Fire Department (WTC Task Force) interview, 23 October 2001, Pfeifer claimed the call was "sometime about 8.15 or so" and that "We were there for a while." A half hour for a gas leak?)

The call (which was not filmed, despite the cameraman being at the firehouse when it came in) is about a gas leak, when it might have been about a fire -- but would the cameraman have been able to film the plane if he was filming a fire, with noise, smoke and danger?

How many other cameramen could have been "in the right place, at the right time" if, like Naudet, they had been conveniently filming one of the emergency services, whose job involves being in any place, at any time, allowing an instant pretext to be contrived?

The cameraman is not troubled by traffic obstructing his view, any more than pedestrians: the junction has been blocked with fire vehicles -- although, since the gas leak is at the north-east

corner, they could have been parked up the east end of Lispenard -- but that would not be convenient, when it would leave northwards traffic, like the white mail van parked at the lights, or one that might be heading up to the Post Office for a collection.

At a junction of two one-way streets (Church northwards, Lispenard eastwards), where Church has been blocked, he only has to worry about traffic coming from one direction -- the one he is filming towards -- west.

There would not be much through traffic from that direction in any case, since from this junction eastwards, Lispenard Street is virtually a one-way cul de sac, stretching only one more block before ending where Broadway meets Canal Street. (Another reason the area is relatively quiet for Manhattan is that the subway and bus routes up Church Street turn off to the north-west up Avenue of the Americas, three blocks south of Lispenard). But he needs to be able to guarantee no traffic.

The photographer could quite easily have been filming the firemen towards the east, but the film's only, and very brief, view in that direction is just after the photographer gets out of the car (Edit 24 in the film sequence list). After that we get south (Edits 25 and 26), north (27) and west (30), but never again east. Why ? Because the less time he has until the plane's arrival, the more he wants to avoid having his back to it, and east is the worst direction to be facing, with the plane behind him.

It cannot be to avoid being dazzled by the sun, because, as the film clearly shows, he cannot even see it -- he and the entire width (and length) of Church Street are in the shade, while the Trade Center towers are in the sunshine -- perfect filming conditions.

The cameraman is with a group of firemen, of all people, just as one of the most disastrous fires in US history breaks out, when he could have been with, for example, a group of office workers -- in, for example, the World Trade Center.

He manages to record a plane actually crashing -- incredibly rare, if not unique -- when no-one captured either Flight 77 hitting the Pentagon or Flight 93 crashing in Pennsylvania later that morning, or -- for example -- the crash in Queens two months after 9/11, or the crash of a DC-8 in Brooklyn in 1960.

He isn't -- as shown earlier in the film (edit 26 in film sequence list) -- kneeling in the street filming firemen hiding the Twin Towers when the plane passes, or they would have blocked the view.

He isn't -- also as shown earlier in the film (edit 28) -- filming towards the ground when the plane passes, or capturing the plane would have been far more difficult.

He is standing, stationary, undistracted and facing the subject when the plane passes, when he could have been kneeling, walking, concentrating on filming something important or with his back to the subject.

The men in front of him when the plane arrives behind them are all standing in silence, and apparently only pretending to be busy, and it is never established whether there actually was a leak, or if so, how to deal with it. Chief Pfeifer fiddles with his gas meter and sticks his hand in his pocket, and his fireman colleague leans over the grating, as if, like the bystander beside them, looking for the world's first visible gas leak. If they had been genuinely occupied, it would have been a distraction from the plane -- which, unlike the photographer's ostensible subjects, could hardly be called aimless. (In a 2002 interview, Pfeifer claimed that "they" -- not "I," not "we" -- phoned Con Ed, the utility company, but there is no evidence in the film of him or anyone else making that call before the plane arrives, and after it the gas leak seems to be forgotten about -- having served its function as an invented excuse. In January 2002, firefighter Tom Spinard (Engine 7, Duane Street) told a WTC Task Force interviewer the call "turned out to be a false alarm." So when did that become apparent -- one second before the plane turned up?

No-one in the film distracts his attention by talking to him, and the cameraman's own voice is never heard; voices close to the camcorder microphone could even have drowned out the plane. The firemen might have noticed it, but would the cameraman?

He has no view of the south or west sides of the north tower and only a distorted view of the top third of the east side ; the only part of the building he has a clear, direct view of is the top third of the north face -- less than 10% of the whole tower. When the plane's impact could have been on any side of the building, down to at least the 50th floor -- more than 50% of the tower's exterior surface -- most of it hidden from the cameraman -- how convenient it should be in the middle of the only 10% has a clear view of, on the face closest to him.

He judges the point where the plane reappears so precisely -- left and up simultaneously -- rather than left and then up, wasting time -- that no adjustment is required, up or down, left or right, when he might have overshot, undershot, or had to raise or lower the camera, blurring his picture of the impact.

He judges the plane's speed (and the length of the building) so precisely he catches it just as it comes back into sight: neither too early -- which would look premature - nor too late to capture the impact.

He captures the point of impact almost exactly in the centre of the picture, when it could easily -- and far more credibly -- have been off centre, at the edge, or barely captured at all.

In a TV interview in 2002, he claimed to have been so close (but still managing to avoid mentioning he was in the next street, as if he could fail to be aware of it, having lived in New York since 1989) he could read the plane's markings, making the accuracy of his judgment even more astonishing, if he was looking up at the plane one second, and down at his camcorder's viewfinder the next, to pan left.

He films a plane flying at 450 m.p.h. with a stationary camera, when most photographers would have to move the camera -- and/or themselves -- to track a plane in motion ; in this film, the camera motion stops when the plane motion starts -- when it first appears, that is -- when most film of planes has both together.

He manages this feat by having a 430-foot building hiding the plane until it is far enough away to film from almost straight behind it, with plane and target so close together it disguises the fact that the focus of the film is the target, not the plane about to hit it.

He is at the north end of this building, which hides the plane for most of its remaining flight -- until the last couple of seconds -- when if he had been further south, it would have appeared earlier, which might involve trying to follow it with the camera; further north, and neither plane nor target might be visible at all.

He condenses a plane flying half a mile into an angle of 20 degrees, between its reappearance at the south-east corner of the AT&T Building and the impact point on the north tower - the last two seconds of a 46-minute flight, compacted to an eighteenth of a full circle, before the plane hits the only twelfth of the building clearly visible to the only cameraman in Manhattan to film it happening : truly, photographic minimalism at its most minimal - with total concentration on what is known, in a different branch of the film industry, as the Money Shot.

He could have been at the Duane Street firehouse, but filming the plane would have been far more difficult, with only three seconds' warning, and, being much closer to the tower, having to swing the camera right up to the top 20 floors -- even if the firehouse faced south, which it doesn't, meaning he would have had to run outside and across the street.

He could have been in West Broadway, but the plane would have been just about overhead, with no AT&T Building providing an excuse for not even attempting to track it in motion.

He could have attempted to zoom in on the plane before it hit its target, but might have lost it with the tiniest camera motion magnified, and missed the impact shot, or blurred it.

At the plane's speed, it would have been a mile away within eight seconds ; if he was so curious about the plane, having lost his chance to capture a close-up and seen it disappearing behind a huge building, how much was he hoping to be able to see by the time it reappeared? What made him carry on trying to film it when it was already tiny and getting tinier by the second?

He is standing on the same spot when the plane hits the building, three quarters of a mile away, as when it almost flew over his head six seconds before, when he might have had to

walk, or at least lean -- more than just pan 90 degrees -- to capture an object that had moved that distance at that speed.

Between the sound warning and the impact, he has a convenient six seconds to capture the event, when it might only have been two -- or gone on for sixty, if, for example, the plane had flown around the target and come back for the collision -- as the Pentagon plane did later.

The plane's flight is horizontal, and low enough to allow the engine noise to be heard on the ground, when it could have targeted the tower diagonally downwards, and not been audible until the last couple of seconds.

He has a completely unobstructed view of the small part of the tower he could see, when there might have been other buildings or street furniture in the way -- like the traffic lights at the south-east corner, or -- not shown in the film - the suspended lights at the north-east corner.

The plane hits the first building visible ahead of it after it first appears on film, when it could have hit the second one (the south tower), a third one not visible in the film, etc -- or none at all.

The north tower is hit first, when it could have been the south tower -- but filming a head-on view of that from the same distance, without using zoom, would put the photographer in the Hudson River. None of the actual views of the south tower impact were from that angle or distance -- and that's why.

He and the firemen -- and the alleged gas leak -- could have been on the west side of Church Street, but the towers would have been completely hidden behind the AT&T Building, making capturing the plane virtually impossible.

The gas leak could have been -- most are - inside a building, but was allegedly out on the street.

The pan is only 90 degrees, when it might have been 180 or more -- if, for example, he had been facing east and swung round anti-clockwise, towards the firemen, increasing the risk of blurring the picture.

All the firemen are standing in front of him or on his right when the plane passes, when they, or just one of them, could have been on his left, blocking his view of the impact. There were twelve from Duane Street alone, yet no more than five firemen, from any house, are ever on screen at any one time: where are the rest of them, where are the men from the two other houses who answered the call, and how could every single one of these 20-plus firemen manage to avoid accidentally getting into the impact picture? When the plane hits the tower, not one fireman is in shot, yet this junction is supposedly swarming with them.

The phone call was not, like many of those received by FDNY, a hoax call, or the firemen would have left the scene before the plane arrived.

The gas leak is dealt with before the plane turns up; if the plane had turned up just as they arrived at the junction, it would look premature, and suspiciously convenient -- even more so than having Subject A dealt with first, before Subject B. In real life, Subject B would be more likely to interrupt than wait for an earlier subject to end.

He could have recorded (on film or audio) ten seconds of the flight, but not the last ten seconds ; he could have recorded the ten seconds before the last ten but then lost view of the tower, and/or the plane ; that did not happen. He is only interested in capturing the flight's end - the rest of it is totally irrelevant to him - and he knows where its end is going to be, so he only has to make sure of having a view of the tower.

If you wanted to arrange film of the impact, followed by a close-up of the gash in the building, a photographer north of the tower would be needed; this photographer is to the north, only 12 degrees east of the plane's flight path, measured from the target.

He would have to be not too close, to get a proper view of the top of the tower -- and to avoid danger -- but not so far away he had no view at all; this photographer is at a reasonable distance -- roughly 1,300 yards - six seconds of flying time. He could have been one second away, or twenty seconds - both totally useless for filming the plane. He might have been so close he couldn't fit the tower into his picture, or focus on it properly: sudden unexpected

events often are either too close, too far away, too small or too big, to capture on film - but the dimensions and the focus of this one were just right, somehow. Not everybody could get a decent picture of a Boeing 767 with wings 150 feet wide and a tail 50 feet tall smashing into the top floors of a giant skyscraper 1,200 feet off the ground, at 450 miles an hour - not your average holiday snap - even if they knew, hours in advance, it was going to happen: how on earth could you possibly take a picture of that? And if you knew, how could you take the picture so as to disguise the incriminating evidence? How could you make it look accidental? Could it, in fact, credibly be accidental? But that's the central issue of this whole essay.

He would have to be close enough to the plane to hear the engine noise above sounds closer to him -- music, traffic, etc; this photographer was one street away, at a crossroads with no moving traffic -- but two parked fire trucks, more than capable of burying plane noise, if close enough to the cameraman, and if their engines weren't switched off.

He would need to avoid tracking the plane in motion, so as to record the impact clearly; his pan left means he blurs only the building, not the plane, and the entire filmed flight is contained in just one stationary frame. (Or perhaps the reason for not filming the plane from close to it might be to avoid clarity, rather than blurring -- to hide the fact, for example, that it was not a Boeing jet, or not a 767, or not American Airlines, or not Flight 11).

He would want to visually condense the flight to the minimum, so as to avoid camera motion -- the best way being to get right behind the plane; this film is shot from right behind the plane, with the visible flight condensed to 20 degrees.

He would want to leave out all of the flight but the last few seconds -- the rest of the flight would be an irrelevance or a distraction, and only the impact needs to be captured; he films only the last two seconds.

He would want to leave out most of the tower, and only capture the area of the impact -- the rest of the tower is irrelevant, nothing is happening there, and if anything did, it could be a distraction, or an obstacle to filming; only the top third of the north face is visible in the film, the rest of the building being hidden behind others. The plane hits that very part of that face. The partial view also misleads as to how close the photographer is to tower and plane.

He would need to have some photographic experience, when no amateur could capture a scene like this, with its sudden, fast, perfectly-judged 90-degree pan. Jules and G           Naudet are documentary film-makers, both listed as "Director, Producer, Cameraman and Editor" in their only previous film, "Hope, Gloves and Redemption: The Story of Mickey and Negra Rosario" (filmed in 1999, but only issued on DVD (Pathfinder PH 90969) in 2004), raising questions over Jules' claim to have almost no camera experience (Edits 19 and 22).

He would need a cover story as a pretext for being in the right place at the right time to capture the plane; the documentary film about the firemen and the gas leak at that junction provide a plausible pretext -- on first appearances.

His film was about firemen, when if he had been filming, as in his previous film, boxers, they would not have been out in the street first thing in the morning, they would not have had the right to block road traffic at a junction, they would not be able to provide instant transport down to the tower after the first impact or the authority to enter the building, etc.

He already has a perfectly clear view of the target from where he is standing, so he could have captured the impact without having to pan the camera left at all, but it would look suspect if he was filming the target just as the plane appeared in view; the camera motion suggests lack of preparation -- although the perfect motion and the perfect view at the end of it, having the tower in the middle of the frame, suggest otherwise.

If just one of these circumstances had not applied, this film might easily not exist; how likely is it that every one applied, not one went wrong, and that not one other person in Manhattan managed even one single piece of luck, to produce even an off-centre, blurred monochrome photograph of the event, let alone perfect color film of it? A unique film might be credible -- if it had faults -- or, conversely, a perfect film, if we had others less perfect to compare it with -- if not quite as imperfect as the Hlava film. How likely is it that this photographer achieved both

uniqueness and perfection?

The word "perfection," is, of course, relative: the film is "perfect" in the sense that it fulfils all the requirements. It is slightly blurred -- but not nearly as much as it might have been; and it captures the sound of the plane, its last two seconds of flight and its impact, right in the centre of the picture, followed by close-ups, with no editing -- the whole 44-second sequence is uninterrupted; and it does it in a way that looks plausibly accidental. The kind of perfection that involved showing us a clear, totally undistorted close-up of the plane in flight, with its "American Airlines" livery visible, would be the kind of perfection that destroyed any chance of luck as an explanation.

An exercise like this involves weighing different factors against each other. You can never have absolute perfection in every department -- sacrifices have to be made, and the main sacrifice here was that the plane had to be filmed from a considerable distance. It is still clearly identifiable as a plane, and that was the point of the exercise -- filming the damage and what caused it.

Subject: Re: Jules Naudet's First-Strike-Film
Posted by [Tufa](#) on Fri, 24 Jun 2011 01:01:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Simon Shack video analysis is here! He show that the "Plane"-picture disappears first, and then is the "Hole" made afterwards :roll:

911_clips_collection_to_tufavideo_net.torrent:
From_internet\911 AMATEUR part2_(360p).flv

:flower: :flower:

File Attachments

1) [911 AMATEURp2_fire.jpg](#), downloaded 1508 times

Subject: Re: Jules Naudet's First-Strike-Film
Posted by [Tufa](#) on Mon, 16 Jul 2012 11:20:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

911_clips_collection_to_tufavideo_net.torrent:
TV\Classical_Naudet_ani_DR1_C1.flv

The picture is when the Actor find that he have to hold the heavy uncomfortable helmet with his hand. You think a real fire-men, that where the equipment all day, should need to hold the hat while looking up :d :d

File Attachments

1) [Classical_Naudet_ani_DR1_C1.jpg](#), downloaded 1364 times

Subject: Re: Jules Naudet's First-Strike-Film

Posted by [Tufa](#) on Mon, 06 Aug 2012 17:33:24 GMT

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

911_clips_collection_to_tufavideo_net.torrent:

TV\Naudet_first_TV4_F1.flv

No plane parts break off and fly away. No dent in tower. No explosion from the fuel.
How much fake can a video be? Also known as the Glass-Plane, due to its apparent transparency.

File Attachments

1) [Naudet_first_TV4_F1.jpg](#), downloaded 919 times
