



# P.I.R.A.N.H.A. II

The PENTTBOMB Initiative for the Restoration and Advancement of Narrative History Archives

---

Strategic Doctrine for Digital Preservation, Archival Recovery, Evidence Handling, and Historical Memory

<b>Document Type</b>	Strategic memorandum / public white paper
<b>Prepared By</b>	PENTTBOMB Research Directorate
<b>Release Date</b>	06/06/2026
<b>Scope</b>	PENTTBOMB forums, LOLSUPERMAN.com, Lost911Media.com, 9/11 Library, FOIA tracking, and affiliated research communities

Prepared for internal orientation and public transparency. This document is not a call for harassment, deception, illegal access, or the manufacture of false evidence. Its purpose is to define a professional research posture for preservation, verification, and responsible publication.





## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

P.I.R.A.N.H.A. II is a professionalized doctrine for the next phase of PENTTBOMB and the wider Lost 9/11 Media ecosystem. It updates the earlier manifesto language into a practical framework: preserve fragile records, document provenance, verify claims before publication, and build a durable public memory infrastructure around disputed, obscure, or disappearing digital material.

The central problem is not simply that historical material is hidden. The larger problem is that the internet forgets by default. Links rot, uploaders vanish, forums die, search results drift, comment chains collapse, and digital evidence loses context. In that environment, preservation is not passive collecting. It is active stewardship.

PENTTBOMB, LOLSUPERMAN.com, Lost911Media.com, the 9/11 Library, FOIA efforts, Discord communities, and associated research spaces should function as a coordinated but accountable archival network. The network should be serious enough to earn trust, flexible enough to absorb new leads, and disciplined enough to survive hoaxes, false memories, drama cycles, and sudden attention surges.

The DVDRipper affair is addressed as a case study. The incident was not valuable because the claim was true. It was valuable because it revealed the intensity of public interest, the speed at which archival narratives spread, and the need for stronger evidentiary standards. The lesson is not to exploit uncertainty. The lesson is to build systems that can withstand it.

Core thesis: the future of lost media research belongs to communities that can combine curiosity with restraint, open participation with documentation, and cultural energy with archival discipline.



## I. STRATEGIC CONTEXT: THE CRISIS OF DIGITAL MEMORY

The early internet produced an enormous historical record, but it was not built for permanence. Message boards, personal websites, video hosts, file lockers, social media pages, and shock-site archives formed a scattered public memory system with no guarantee of continuity. Much of that material now exists only through partial mirrors, screenshots, upload fragments, cached pages, dead links, and memories from users who may no longer be reachable.

9/11 media research sits at the collision point of several unstable systems: public trauma, platform moderation, archival gaps, copyright barriers, sensationalism, folklore, and genuine historical inquiry. The result is a field where important leads can be buried under speculation, and where speculation can sometimes outpace evidence.

A professional approach must therefore treat the internet itself as a decaying archive. Every claim needs context. Every file needs provenance. Every recovered item needs preservation in more than one place. Every public release needs enough explanation that future researchers can understand not only what was found, but how it was found.

Strategic aim: shift the community from reactive searching toward durable archival infrastructure. The task is not merely to chase the next lead. The task is to build a system that makes future leads easier to evaluate, preserve, and explain.

Practical implications include:

- Treating deleted, obscure, or disputed material as evidence requiring context rather than trophies requiring hype.
- Maintaining clear distinctions between confirmed records, plausible leads, rumors, reconstructions, and satire.
- Recording source chains, dates, uploader histories, hashes, file names, archive captures, and discussion context wherever possible.
- Designing public pages so that newcomers can enter the topic without being dragged immediately into confusion, gore fixation, or hostile subculture behavior.

## II. MISSION AND SCOPE

PIRANHA II defines a mission that is broader than any single rumor, video, forum thread, or lost-media title. The mission is to preserve and organize the historical record surrounding 9/11-related digital media, with emphasis on obscure recordings, public records, user-generated documentation, contemporaneous internet discussion, and the cultural history of the search itself.

The scope includes both media recovery and meta-archival documentation. In other words, the project should preserve not only files and claims, but also the history of how those claims emerged, spread, changed, and were challenged. This matters because internet folklore can become part of the historical record even when the underlying claim is false.

Function	Operational Meaning
Preservation	Mirror and protect documents, videos, screenshots, public records, descriptions, and metadata before they disappear.
Verification	Separate confirmed material from unverified claims through provenance checks, source chains, and transparent confidence levels.
Documentation	Create clear public explanations of what is known, what is disputed, and what remains unresolved.
Community Memory	Maintain a stable institutional history so that each generation of researchers does not restart from zero.



### III. PLATFORM ECOSYSTEM

The project should be understood as an ecosystem rather than a single website. Each platform has a distinct role. Confusion arises when every space tries to do everything. A mature infrastructure assigns purpose: formal publication, discussion, wiki documentation, public outreach, video preservation, and internal coordination.

Platform	Primary Role	Professional Standard
PENTTBOMB Forums	Long-form discussion, evidence review, FOIA tracking, research threads, and institutional memory.	Thread titles, source summaries, clear moderation, archival tags, and visible correction history.
LOLSUPERMAN.com	Public-facing explanation hub for the LSM phenomenon, timeline, FAQ, users, leads, and search resources.	Neutral tone, careful wording, clear status labels, no unnecessary gore fixation.
Lost911Media.com	Wiki-style catalog of lost, obscure, disputed, or recovered 9/11 media and related research context.	Consistent page templates, citations, version notes, and claim status boxes.
9/11 Library	Video preservation and public archive channel for original-source uploads and historical material.	Accurate titles, source descriptions, no AI/upscale confusion unless clearly disclosed.
Discord / Community Servers	Rapid collaboration, triage, lead intake, and member coordination.	Avoid treating chat as the final archive. Important findings must be moved into durable pages.

This division of labor prevents the community from becoming dependent on one platform. If a Discord server disappears, the forum should preserve major findings. If a public page needs revision, the wiki should retain the deeper source trail. If a video is removed, hashes, descriptions, and mirror notes should remain accessible.

### IV. THE LOST MEDIA PROBLEM

Lost media research thrives on curiosity, but curiosity alone is not enough. The field is vulnerable to false leads because the emotional reward of a possible discovery can temporarily overpower the discipline required to verify it. That does not mean the search should become cynical. It means the search must become structured.

The LSM phenomenon demonstrates why structure matters. It combines trauma, rumor, shock-site history, early video platforms, deleted content, forum memories, and online myth-making. A professional project should neither sanitize the topic into meaninglessness nor sensationalize it into spectacle. The correct posture is sober documentation.

For public presentation, the project should consistently distinguish five categories:

Category	Definition	Public Label
Confirmed	Material exists, source chain is known, and authenticity is reasonably established.	Confirmed
Recovered but Context-Limited	Material exists, but exact origin, date, uploader, or chain of custody remains incomplete.	Recovered / partial context
Plausible Lead	Claim has some supporting context but no confirmed file or record.	Unverified lead
Rumor / Folklore	Claim is mainly based on memory, hearsay, or repeated community lore.	Unconfirmed rumor
Hoax / Fabrication	Claim has been shown to be false, staged, fabricated, or deliberately misleading.	Debunked / hoax



### V. CASE STUDY: THE DVDRIPPER AFFAIR

The DVDRipper affair should be treated as a defining case study in community dynamics. Its significance does not rest on the truth of the claim. Its significance lies in what the episode exposed about attention, verification, hope, and the speed of modern archival rumor.

At its peak, the incident concentrated attention around the possibility of a major recovery. That attention brought new people into the search, revived dormant discussion, and forced the community to clarify what it believed, what it could prove, and what standards it expected from a claimant. In that limited sense, the incident had operational value. It revealed demand. It stress-tested the network. It showed that the search was not dead.

However, a professional doctrine cannot treat hoaxes as a strategy. Deliberate fabrication damages trust, exhausts researchers, invites harassment, and makes genuine future leads harder to evaluate. The correct lesson is not that false claims are useful. The correct lesson is that sudden attention must be handled through documented process.

Lessons learned:

- A single dramatic claim can mobilize thousands of people faster than routine archival work.
- Attention is not the same as evidence. Public interest must be converted into documentation, not speculation alone.
- Communities need pre-existing verification protocols before a major claim appears.
- Public statements should avoid certainty until files, metadata, source history, or corroborating records are reviewed.
- After a debunking, the community should publish a clean summary so the same rumor does not endlessly regenerate.

The DVDRipper affair should therefore be archived as part of the movement history: a false lead that revealed genuine public appetite for lost-media discovery. The file did not emerge, but the search became visible.

### VI. EVIDENCE AND VERIFICATION STANDARD

A professional research culture depends on repeatable evidence standards. Claims should not be accepted because they are exciting, nor rejected merely because they are strange. Each claim should move through a predictable review path that records what is known and what remains uncertain.

Stage	Question	Minimum Documentation
Intake	What exactly is being claimed?	Original wording, claimant identity if public, date received, platform, screenshots or message export.
Source Chain	Where did the material or claim allegedly come from?	Uploader name, URL, archive link, file name, upload date, intermediary contacts.
Technical Review	Does the file or screenshot show signs of editing, re-encoding, staging, or inconsistency?	Hash values, metadata, dimensions, codecs, frame analysis where relevant.
Context Review	Does the claim fit known timelines, locations, public records, or platform history?	Timeline comparison, external references, known archive captures, witness/account history.
Publication	How should the community describe the claim publicly?	Confidence label, summary, caveats, preservation links, update history.

The goal is not bureaucratic theatre. The goal is to make the research legible to people who arrive later. A future reader should be able to understand why a claim was accepted, rejected, or left unresolved.



### VII. ARCHIVAL PRESERVATION FRAMEWORK

Preservation should be redundant, boring, and reliable. A dramatic discovery is only useful if it survives beyond the week it is found. The project should prioritize file integrity, source clarity, and long-term accessibility over aesthetic excitement.

Recommended preservation procedure:

- Save the original file exactly as received before editing, clipping, transcoding, or uploading elsewhere.
- Generate and store checksums for significant files so future copies can be compared against the original.
- Record the source path: original URL, platform, uploader, date retrieved, archive captures, and any intermediary accounts.
- Create at least one public-facing description and one internal preservation note for important material.
- Mirror important public-domain or permitted materials across more than one service, while respecting legal and ethical limits.
- Maintain a correction log for pages that were updated after new evidence emerged.

The project should also maintain a simple status taxonomy for files and leads: pending review, verified, context-limited, disputed, debunked, and archival note only. These labels prevent readers from confusing speculation with confirmed material.

### VIII. PUBLIC RECORDS AND FOIA INITIATIVE

The public-records program should be one of the most serious arms of the project. FOIA and related requests are slow, procedural, and often frustrating, but they create a paper trail that is more durable than rumor. Even a denial, referral, fee estimate, or no-records response can clarify where records may or may not exist.

The strongest requests usually avoid demanding sensational material directly. Instead, they seek indexes, logs, inventories, chain-of-custody records, administrative descriptions, processing notes, and media manifests. These records can reveal the existence, handling, or classification of material without requiring immediate release of the underlying media.

FOIA work should be tracked publicly where possible: request text, agency, submission date, response date, exemptions cited, appeal status, and next steps. This converts private correspondence into community knowledge and prevents duplicated effort.

Request Target	Why It Matters
Media inventories / evidence logs	Can show what recordings or evidence items were collected, catalogued, transferred, or reviewed.
Chain-of-custody records	Can clarify movement of evidence between agencies, offices, contractors, or archives.
Processing notes / indexes	Can reveal how records were categorized even when the actual media is withheld.
Referral and denial letters	Can identify which agency may hold responsive records or which exemption is being invoked.



### IX. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC TONE

A serious archive can be damaged by unserious behavior around it. The community does not need to become sterile, but it does need boundaries. The subject matter involves real deaths, real families, public trauma, and historical documentation. Professionalism is not the enemy of curiosity. It is what allows curiosity to be trusted.

Recommended governance principles:

- Do not harass alleged sources, witnesses, uploaders, families, agencies, journalists, or other communities.
- Do not manufacture evidence, fake screenshots, staged leaks, or false countdowns for attention.
- Do not present satire, reconstructions, or alternate-history material in a way that can be mistaken for evidence.
- Keep public pages readable for outsiders: avoid excessive in-jokes, hostile language, and unexplained lore.
- Moderate gore fixation and disrespectful behavior so the research does not collapse into spectacle.
- Publish corrections plainly when the community gets something wrong.

This does not mean stripping the project of personality. It means giving the public a reason to trust the work even when the community culture is strange, energetic, and internet-born. The archive can have atmosphere without sacrificing credibility.

### X. STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS

Public communication should be disciplined. Every major announcement should answer four questions: What happened? What is confirmed? What remains uncertain? What happens next? This format keeps excitement from outrunning evidence.

The project should avoid overstated language such as "proof," "smoking gun," or "confirmed" unless the standard has truly been met. Strong claims can be made, but they should be supported by source trails. The long-term brand should be reliability, not theatrics.

Situation	Recommended Public Tone
New lead received	Interested but cautious. Label as unverified and describe what is being checked.
Claim appears false	Clear but not vindictive. Explain why evidence does not support it.
Material recovered	Precise and source-focused. Describe provenance, limitations, and preservation status.
Major dispute	Process-focused. Move debate into evidence review rather than personality conflict.
Media attention	Sober and accessible. Emphasize preservation, public history, and responsible research.



### XI. RISK ASSESSMENT

The project faces predictable risks. Naming them in advance makes the community less reactive when they occur. The goal is not to eliminate every risk, but to reduce the chance that one event destroys years of work.

Risk	Impact	Mitigation
Hoaxes and fabricated leads	Loss of trust, wasted labor, repeated rumor cycles.	Verification protocol, status labels, published debunk summaries.
Platform loss	Discord, forum, or social accounts could disappear or become inaccessible.	Regular exports, mirrored pages, independent backups, domain redundancy.
Sensationalism	Research becomes perceived as exploitation rather than preservation.	Professional wording, moderation standards, clear public mission.
Internal drama	Fragmentation, splinter groups, loss of institutional memory.	Documented decisions, transparent roles, move findings from chat into durable archives.
Legal / copyright issues	Takedowns, disputes, or reluctance from legitimate sources.	Use descriptions and metadata when full files cannot be shared; respect removal requirements.
Research fatigue	Burnout after false leads or slow FOIA timelines.	Roadmaps, small wins, archival maintenance tasks, periodic public updates.

### XII. 2026-2030 ROADMAP

A mature archive should have a phased roadmap. The roadmap should be realistic, not theatrical. Each phase should produce visible improvements that remain useful even if no major lost item is recovered.

Phase	Priority	Deliverables
Phase 1: Stabilize	Make existing material easier to navigate and harder to lose.	Public FAQ refresh, sitemap, archive index, lead submission workflow, status labels.
Phase 2: Standardize	Create consistent templates and evidence handling.	Wiki templates, FOIA tracker, source-chain forms, verification checklist.
Phase 3: Preserve	Build durable storage and mirror practices.	Checksum library, backup schedule, mirror policy, public release notes.
Phase 4: Publish	Convert research into readable public outputs.	Annual report, case studies, recovered-media pages, debunk archive.
Phase 5: Institutionalize	Make the project survivable beyond one person or platform.	Role documentation, admin handover notes, moderation playbook, long-term archive plan.

### **XIII. DOCTRINE OF RESTORED MEMORY**

PIRANHA II is not a declaration that every rumor is true, nor that every archive is maliciously incomplete. It is a declaration that memory requires labor. The digital record does not preserve itself. Without deliberate action, the history of the early internet and its relationship to public trauma will continue to dissolve into broken links, partial uploads, and unverifiable recollection.

The project should therefore operate between two dangers: credulity and apathy. Credulity accepts too much and turns the archive into folklore. Apathy preserves too little and lets the record vanish. The professional path is neither blind belief nor sterile dismissal. It is documented uncertainty.

A community can be strange and still be serious. It can understand internet culture without becoming trapped by it. It can use design, atmosphere, and lore to attract attention while using verification, careful writing, and preservation standards to earn trust.

The public mission should be simple: recover what can be recovered, preserve what can be preserved, explain what can be explained, and mark uncertainty honestly when the record refuses to cooperate.

The challenges outlined throughout this report are unlikely to be resolved quickly. Digital preservation remains a gradual process, dependent upon sustained participation, institutional memory, and long-term commitment from those willing to document what others overlook.

Progress will likely emerge through incremental gains rather than singular breakthroughs. New archives will be uncovered. Forgotten material will resurface. Research communities will continue to evolve. Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catalytic and disruptive event, like another DVDRipper.

Until such a moment arrives, the work remains the same: preserve, document, verify, and remember.



### APPENDIX A: LEAD INTAKE CHECKLIST

A lead should not enter the public record as a claim without basic intake notes. The following checklist can be adapted for Google Forms, forum templates, Discord intake channels, or wiki talk pages.

- What is the claimed item, recording, document, page, or memory?
- Who is providing the lead, and do they want to remain anonymous?
- When and where did they allegedly see, obtain, hear about, or save the material?
- Are there URLs, filenames, screenshots, hashes, archive captures, or correspondence?
- Has the lead already been discussed elsewhere? Link prior discussions.
- What would confirm the lead? What would disprove it?
- What public status label should be used while review is pending?

### APPENDIX B: STYLE AND PUBLICATION RULES

PENTTBOMB and affiliated public pages should use language that is clear, confident, and careful. The tone should be professional without becoming lifeless. It should avoid both corporate blandness and exaggerated internet theatrics.

Use	Avoid
"Unverified lead"	"Confirmed leak" before review
"The claim attracted renewed attention"	"The hoax was good because it helped us"
"Recovered with incomplete provenance"	"100% authentic" without source chain
"This page will be updated as evidence develops"	Silent edits that erase previous mistakes
"Archival and historical research"	Needlessly graphic or disrespectful framing

End of document.