

The Pentagon Attack: Eyewitnesses, Debris Flow and Other Issues A Reply to Fletcher and Eastman

April, 2013

By John D. Wyndham (PhD, Physics)

Introduction

A recent letter¹ by Tod Fletcher and Timothy E. Eastman in the Journal of 9/11 Studies is a direct response to my paper², “*The Pentagon Attack: Problems with Theories Alternative to Large Plane Impact.*” In addition to presenting their own views, the authors give support to views on the Pentagon by other researchers such as Barbara Honegger and David Ray Griffin whom they quote many times. The authors avoid discussing the kernel of my paper as contained in Table 1 and its supporting tables, and instead present criticisms of some of the evidence together with many erroneous assertions as to what I wrote. These criticisms do not affect the conclusions in my original paper; rather the more detailed examination of the eyewitness and other evidence that has now occurred strengthens the case for the large plane impact theory.

Overview

The essence of my “*Theories Alternative*” paper was a study of the main eyewitness and physical evidence for and against several different individual theories, such as large plane impact or the use of explosives or bombs. My conclusion was that the large plane impact theory is by far the most plausible theory for explaining the main evidence.

In their letter, Fletcher and Eastman argue that my paper inadequately addresses or ignores the work of other researchers such as Barbara Honegger and David Ray Griffin, and that it fails to mention a number of key issues. In so arguing, Fletcher and Eastman make many incorrect statements about what I wrote. In addition these authors rely heavily on the two aforementioned writers for a number of key contentions, necessitating a reply that includes the work of these writers, even though the writers have not directly addressed my paper themselves.

Three main sections respond to the meaningful issues raised by Fletcher and Eastman:

- Eyewitness Testimony
- Plane Passage through the Pentagon Interior
- Previously Unaddressed Issues

¹ Tod Fletcher and Timothy E. Eastman, “The Pentagon Attack in Context: a Reply to John Wyndham,” November, 2012, <http://www.journalof911studies.com/resources/2012NovemberFletcherEastman.pdf>

² John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: Problems with Theories Alternative to Large Plane Impact,” December, 2011, <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2010/Wyndham1.pdf>

I discuss Fletcher and Eastman's inaccuracies and distortions in appendix A, *Distortions in the Fletcher and Eastman Letter*. Since David Griffin's treatment of the eyewitness testimony is a key issue in their letter, but is only a part of Griffin's overall treatment of the evidence, I have included a critique of Griffin's discussion of the physical evidence in appendix B. A discussion of the testimony of Loyde England, the unjustly-maligned taxi driver, is included in appendix C. Russell's and Griffin's analyses of the eyewitness testimony are discussed in detail in appendix D.

Eyewitness Testimony to Plane Impact³

In presenting eyewitness testimony in my original paper,² I relied mainly on Bart's list⁴ and gave many example testimonies in footnotes. I specified a range of 31, "considered a reliable figure by some researchers," to around 89 to 100 as the number of eyewitnesses to impact. The lower number of the range, 31, comes from the published results of Jerry Russell⁵ who lists 31 witnesses⁶ who "provide *explicit, realistic and detailed claims*" to impact. I cited David Ray Griffin as one researcher who considers this number reliable.⁷

Because I cited Griffin, Fletcher and Eastman criticize my mention of the 31 witnesses, stating⁸ that it "does not build upon Griffin's analysis of eyewitness testimony" and that I have "distorted" Griffin's arguments or conclusions. (See also appendix A).

In hindsight, my citation should have been directed to the original work of Russell. In addition, I did not build on Griffin's analysis for a number of reasons:

- It was not a goal of my paper to consider the many different criticisms of evidence that I deemed valid. The "31 witnesses" mostly appear solid.
- Both Russell's and Griffin's analyses of these witnesses are criticisms rather than scientific analyses, criticisms that on the whole appear to be deeply flawed.
- The main ideas in Griffin's analysis of the Pentagon "31 witnesses" were first put forward by Russell. One of Russell's more questionable ideas, that of "elite insiders," is not characteristic of Griffin's other work⁹. Griffin takes these ideas

³ On page 11 of their letter, Fletcher and Eastman declare that the eyewitness testimony is a "major element" of my argument. However, if we exclude the eyewitnesses to impact, the physical evidence alone is enough, in my opinion, to deduce that a large plane impacted the Pentagon on 9/11.

⁴ "Eric Bart's Pentagon Attack Eyewitness Account Compilation," 9-11 Research (<http://911research.wtc7.net/pentagon/evidence/witnesses/bart.html>).

⁵ Jerry Russell, "Eyewitnesses and the Plane-Bomb Theory," <http://www.911-strike.com/PlaneBomb.htm>

⁶ http://www.911-strike.com/eyewitness_explicit.htm

⁷ David Ray Griffin, "9/11 Ten Years Later," Chapter 7, p. 173, Olive Branch Press, 2011

⁸ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p. 11, 12.

⁹ In his book "9/11 Ten Years Later," pages 153-181, Griffin quotes, with two exceptions, the accounts of about 28 witnesses (from Norman Minetta to Gilah Goldsmith), nearly all of whom qualify as "elite insiders," without questioning their veracity. The exceptions are helicopter pilots Keith Bohn and Ronald Alan Galey. According to Griffin, they are lying about being in the air only after the attack, but telling the truth about the aftermath scene where they saw no plane parts.

and further develops them, but without benefit of Russell's caveats,⁵ some of which are:

- 'Advocates of "no 757" theories who would like to continue to contest the eyewitness issue, need to understand how high the barrier that has been raised.'
- "... if there is ever a trial or investigation... the weight of this eyewitness testimony in favor of a 757 impact will be extremely difficult to overcome"
- "It is possible that the high incidence of insiders among the highly explicit witnesses, is simply a result of the location of the incident."

Russell also has caveats in favor of the "no-plane" theory. But the above illustrate that Russell himself does not rule out the validity of the "31 witnesses" he analyzed.

Russell's Two Main Doubts

In his analysis⁵ Russell raises two main doubts about the reliability of his 31 "explicit" witnesses.⁶ According to Russell,

1. the reports claiming impact have "a high level of disagreement among the eyewitnesses, about the detailed physical description of the actual collision."
2. there is a "very high prevalence of elite insider connections among the witnesses who claimed to see the 757 hit the Pentagon."

Combining these two claims, Russell states "the combination of a very high incidence of severely contradictory reports and the high level of "insider" connections should be sufficient to cast a shadow of doubt over these eyewitnesses." However, as will be shown below, this combination is not sufficient to impugn or discredit the witnesses.

These two main criticisms of the 31 Pentagon witnesses to impact are echoed and expanded upon by Griffin.⁷ At the outset one must note that these two criticisms fight each other: they imply that the "elite insiders" were primed to tell an untruth, but their accounts differed too much for skeptics to believe them. Taken together, as a "house divided," these two criticisms have little likelihood of being valid.

My detailed examination of Russell's 31 "explicit" witnesses (see appendix D) resulted in different numbers. By my count there are no more than nine (9) individuals one might classify as "elite" insiders, not 13 as Russell finds. Of the 31, I can count only 19 individuals who "worked for either the federal Government or the mainstream media," rather than 24. Furthermore, I can identify among them only four (4)¹⁰ mainstream media journalists rather than seven (7)¹¹, as found by Griffin.

¹⁰ Steve Anderson, Vin Narayanan, Mary Ann Owens, James S. Robbins

¹¹ It is possible that Griffin in chapter 7 of "9/11 Ten Years Later," page 173, is not referring to the 7 journalists in the context of the 31 "explicit" witnesses.

Some examples of “contradictory” reports, together with Russell’s criticisms,⁶ are listed below. In each case, I have provided a “translation” of the witness account in the context of the overall testimony of other witnesses and based on my own understanding of common or vernacular speech.

- **Steve Anderson:** The aircraft "drug its wing along the ground."
Criticism: the lawn was undisturbed except for debris.
Translation: the plane was tilted so that one wing was very close to the ground. Just because Anderson’s observation of detail is close to the truth, but literally untrue and couched in poor English, does not warrant dismissing his observation that the plane was so low and close to the building that it could not avoid hitting it.
- **Battle:** the aircraft “was coming down head first.”
Criticism: the flight would have had to have been “level” to avoid “cratering into the basement;”
Translation: the plane was descending toward the Pentagon. There is nothing in this statement to indicate how level the flight was. The head is always in front (first).
- **Gary Bauer:** the aircraft “veered to the right into the Pentagon”
Criticism: the façade damage indicated the plane was “banking gently to the left;”
Translation: the observer, from his description, was on 395 facing so that the plane came from behind him and to his left; it passed from his left to his right as it approached and went into the Pentagon.
- **Bruce Elliott:** “the craft clipped a utility pole guide wire”
Criticism: “there were no guide wires.”
Translation: the plane hit something near or on a utility pole. (From his vantage point in the south parking lot, it is very doubtful whether Elliott could have seen a wire, had there been one).

In my paper I ascribed these so-called “contradictory reports” to “different styles of communication, different vantage points, poor use of language, and the fact that the plane traveled across the Pentagon lawn in less than one second, allowing only a fleeting glimpse by most witnesses.”¹² In amplifying this brief statement in this paper, the finding remains the same.

Some examples of “elite insiders”⁶ given by Russell are:

- **Sean Boger, Air Traffic Controller and Pentagon tower chief:** "I just looked up and I saw the big nose and the wings of the aircraft coming right at us and I just watched it hit the building." "It exploded. I fell to the ground and covered my head. **I could actually hear the metal going through the building.**"
- **Mark Bright, Mall Entrance guard:** "I saw the plane at the Navy Annex area," he said. "I knew it was going to strike the building because it was very, very low -- at the height of the street lights. It knocked a couple down." He said he **heard the plane "power-up" just before it struck the Pentagon.**

¹² John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, p.3

- **Walker Lee Evey, Pentagon's manager for the renovation project:** [Not an eyewitness, Evey is reporting what his people told him] “The plane approached the Pentagon about **six feet off the ground, clipping a light pole, a car antenna, a construction trailer and an emergency generator** before slicing into the building.”
- **Major Lincoln Liebner:** "I was about **100 yards away**," he said. "**You could see through the windows of the aircraft.** I saw it hit." "The plane completely entered the building,"
- **Terry Morin, Program Manager for SPARTA,** a high-tech military contracting organization: “The tail was barely visible when I saw **the flash and subsequent fireball rise approximately 200 feet above the Pentagon.**”

While differing in details, these testimonies all have the ring of authenticity rather than of prepared or coached statements. Not all of these witnesses appear to be “elite.”

With regard to “discrepancies” and “elite insiders,” the analyses of Russell and Griffin might be said to suffer from academic overkill. Scientists pay careful attention to accuracy in measured quantities, but no similar degree of accuracy is possible when dealing with the statements, perceptions, and reactions of human beings. Russell and Griffin are therefore overly judgmental when analyzing the witness testimonies.

Going a step further, Fletcher and Eastman claim¹³ that the “great majority” of Pentagon eyewitness testimony is “often imprecise,” so that “nothing useful can be learned from it.” This opinion is highly objectionable. How would the above authors themselves fare in a verbal interview? Would they always describe the scene with accuracy later in their writings? Apparently not, as shown in the following example.

In his Pentagon chapter, Griffin mentions critics who describe the lamp poles as having been “torn out of the ground.”¹⁴ Clearly the poles were NOT “torn out of the ground.”¹¹² The poles were snapped from their concrete bases when struck, as intended by their designers for the protection of motorists.¹⁵ Such an obvious discrepancy is of precisely the same nature as those attributed by critics to impact eyewitnesses and then used to discredit them. Since this description is not spontaneous and verbal but the written result of study, this statement by Griffin and the unnamed critics is a more significant error than the kinds of eyewitness testimony discrepancies that are being criticized.

It is fair to say that all the Pentagon witnesses could recognize a large commercial jetliner when they saw one. The Pentagon witnesses to impact report that a large jetliner came in very low and hit the Pentagon (hitting the lawn, as one or two reported, is close enough to be in agreement with impact). This is an observation that is beyond ambiguity and something on which they all agree.

¹³ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p.12-13.

¹⁴ See Griffin “9/11 Ten Years Later” p. 194

¹⁵ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Street_light

Additional, Specific Objections to Russell’s and Griffin’s Analyses

Journalists Stuck in Traffic: Of the four journalists that I can identify (Anderson, Narayanan, Owens and Robbins), two (Narayanan and Owens) were stuck in traffic on the nearby highways. It would be virtually impossible for these two reporters to have planned to be stuck there at the precise moment when the plane hit, because when traffic moves, one must move with it. The other two journalists observed the plane impact from their office windows in nearby buildings.⁶

Insider Testimonies are Validated by the Others: By my count, there were only nine (9) “elite” insiders, not 13. The fact that 22 witnesses were not insiders but also saw what the “insiders” saw, establishes a very strong argument that the insiders are telling the truth. For example, if 22 random, ordinary citizens count ballots with 9 town officials and they all agree, one can be confident that the officials counted correctly. In this sense, the ordinary witnesses have validated the testimonies of the so-called “insiders.”

Failure to Consider Consequences: Neither Russell nor Griffin consider the consequences of their speculation that the “elite insider” witnesses are lying. The witnesses’ main claim, that a large airliner hit the Pentagon, leaves no room for ambiguity. Therefore, these witnesses are either lying or telling the truth. If they are lying, there are significant consequences to deal with.

If the Pentagon event was the result of pre-planted explosives, why are there no witnesses who assert that the West wall simply blew up for no apparent reason? Where did the airplane “confetti” and parts come from, and how were these distributed without anyone observing the act? How did the first floor suddenly fill with debris, with wire wrapped about bent and abraded columns, an operation that would have taken considerable time to stage? Russell, Griffin, Fletcher and Eastman never discuss these issues. These researchers are not attacking the problem from a scientific perspective, but are content to offer criticisms without exploring their implications.

Based on Norman Mineta’s account of Dick Cheney’s conversation in the Presidential Emergency Operations Center (PEOC) where Cheney apparently allows a plane to approach Washington, Griffin pronounces¹⁶ Cheney “guilt[y]” of the “Pentagon attack.” Having thus argued that a plane was integrally involved in the attack, Griffin then disputes that the plane, presumably AA Flight 77, impacted the Pentagon. So does Griffin believe that the approaching plane flew over or away from the Pentagon? If so, how guilty can Cheney be if he cannot be tied to the Pentagon damage? Where are the witnesses to plane flyover? Once again, the logical consequences are not explored.

Griffin’s Presentation Indicates Bias: Faced with a large number of witnesses to impact and none to flyover or spontaneous explosion, Griffin’s handling of the evidence shows bias toward no plane impact. Griffin quotes many more witnesses (17)¹⁷ to the scene after

¹⁶ See Griffin “9/11 Ten Years Later” p. 156

¹⁷ Jamie McIntyre (CNN reporter – but not fully quoted), John McWethy (ABC reporter), Karen Kwiatkowski (Air Force Lieutenant Colonel), Sgt. Reginald Powell, Sheryl Alleger (Naval Officer, Eileen

impact, presenting them as believable, than he does witnesses to impact (7)¹⁸ whom he presents as contradictory and questionable. For aftermath-only witnesses, Griffin emphasizes they saw little or no evidence of a plane crash but offers no reasons why they may have missed the evidence of plane debris. There are many eyewitness accounts^{19 22} of plane debris both small and large that Griffin omits to cite, plus indisputable photographic evidence.

Practically all aftermath witnesses¹⁷ chosen by Griffin are “elite insiders.” Griffin does not question their truthfulness, which is at odds with his reason for doubting plane impact eyewitnesses. These two groups of “elite insiders” (impact and aftermath witnesses) on the surface appear to contradict each other. If they are reading from a script, it is not the same script.

Could persons unknown have influenced “elite insider” eyewitnesses to say a large plane hit the Pentagon, but failed to influence aftermath witnesses to corroborate the impact story? According to Russell and Griffin, “elite insiders” who saw impact are lying, but “elite insiders” who saw no plane debris in the aftermath are telling the truth! Surely the perpetrators would have also arranged for aftermath witnesses to lie and say they saw lots of recognizable plane debris? The “elite insider” hypothesis falls apart because it lacks internal consistency and believability.

A simple resolution is that the Pentagon plane impact and aftermath witnesses are basically ALL telling the truth as they saw it, along with misstatements common to all eyewitness testimony: the plane entered the building leaving outside few recognizable parts and little large debris. The plentiful small debris was difficult for some to recognize as such. Many aftermath witnesses do not support the plot supposed by Russell and Griffin, and thus do not support the notion of “elite insiders.” In any case for the perpetrators to have relied on such a plot with so many witnesses present to see what actually happened and to detect fraud would have been beyond foolhardy.

Griffin gives the evidence for plane impact without much detail in three (3) pages, but takes 24 detailed pages to present criticisms he feels weigh against plane impact. He omits important evidence for impact such as: the debris outside the C ring hole in line with the flight path indicated by other evidence; the geometry of the impacted low concrete wall, generator, and fence; the bent columns in the first floor, some wrapped with wire; and the gash in the second floor slab. Griffin’s criticisms are further addressed in appendices B and D in this paper.

Murphy (Registered Nurse), April Gallop (US Army executive administrative assistant), Tracy Webb (D Ring worker), Brian Ladd (Firefighter from Fort Myers - saw confetti), Captain Dennis Gilroy (Acting commander - Firefighter from Fort Myers), Captain John Durrer (firefighter), Ed Plaugher (county fire chief – saw no large pieces on day– later said there were large pieces), Major Dean Eckmann (pilot F-16), Keith Bonn (Huey helicopter pilot for Park police), Andrew Galey (Huey helicopter pilot for Park police), Judy Rothschild (documentary producer), Steve DeChiaro (engineer – president of technology firm)
From Griffin’s Chapter 7 of “9/11: Ten Years Later.”

¹⁸ Steve Anderson, Frank Probst, Mary Ann Owens, David Marra, Tim Timmerman, Lincoln Liebner, Vin Narayanan (Griffin chapter 7, pages 174, 176-177)

¹⁹ <http://arabesque911.blogspot.com/2007/04/911-and-pentagon-attack-what.html>

Unwarranted Prejudice Based on Witness Employment: By suggesting that persons linked to the government are liable to tell falsehoods, Russell has strayed into a mode of thinking that society largely rejects. In his paper, Russell is candid enough to quote a portion of Brian Salter's⁵ review of an earlier version of his [Russell's] paper:

"[Russell's paper] is, or will be perceived [sic] to be, an all-out attack on the victims themselves. Some of these Pentagon witnesses were hurt, and many more were psychologically traumatized. Rushing into ill-supported hatchet jobs for no other purpose than to keep the unnecessary no-plane speculation alive just helps to smear 9/11 Truth activists as hateful maniacs. Maybe that's the idea."

Salter's blunt reaction strikes a chord of concern that resonates with many. This is perhaps the most objectionable flaw in Russell's analysis. It is surprising that Griffin has accepted and expanded on this way of thinking, since in his other 9/11 writing Griffin quotes many "elite insiders" without the least implication that they may be lying.

As a rule, one should avoid accusing an individual or a group based on innocent characteristics. Accusing a whole class of person, without valid evidence, and then demanding that they prove themselves to be innocent, is indefensible. For this last reason alone, I reject the tone and content of Fletcher and Eastman's bulleted list²⁰ of suggested steps for analyzing eyewitness evidence. Nevertheless, it would be worthwhile to interview all witnesses again, if it were possible, using impartial and unbiased scientific methods.

Russell's Exclusion of Valid Eyewitnesses to Impact: Russell's reduction of the number of impact eyewitnesses to only 31 "explicit" witnesses is deeply flawed. In a document called *Vague or indeterminate eyewitness accounts*,²¹ Russell lists 29 witnesses that he excludes because they were "extremely brief, do not provide sufficient detail to determine whether the 757 struck the Pentagon on a low approach, or whether it might have flown over the Pentagon" Quite a few of these are, in fact, solid witnesses to plane impact!

Russell's arguments for excluding just three of these "vague" witnesses provides reason enough to reject his analysis entirely and to start afresh as Frank Legge²² has done. Consider Russell's treatment of Deb Anlauf, James Mosley and Jim Sutherland.

Deb Anlauf's Testimony and its Rejection by Russell:

Testimony: Deb Anlauf, resident of Colfax, Wisconsin, was on the '14th floor of the **Sheraton Hotel** [located 1.6 mile from the explosion], (immediately west of the Navy Annex) when she heard a "loud roar": Suddenly I saw this plane right outside my

²⁰ Fletcher and Eastman reply, p. 13

²¹ http://www.911-strike.com/eyewitness_vague.htm

²² Frank Legge, "Pentagon Witness Spreadsheet," (Excel file)

<https://dc1.safesync.com/LMGxbsCs/Conspiracy%20911/My%20contributions/Papers/Pentagon%20witnesses/PentWitnesses120416.xls?a=BSNFLFuZHZI>

window. You felt like you could touch it; It was just incredible. Then it shot straight across from where we are and flew right into the Pentagon. It was just this huge fireball that crashed into the wall (of the Pentagon). When it hit, the **whole hotel shook.**'

Reason for Rejection: Russell's reason for rejecting this testimony is that "From a distance of 1.6 miles, looking into the morning sun, we are not sure whether Deb Anlauf could have distinguished between an actual impact, and the magic show we propose. (If only we could see the Sheraton's security video....)."

Discussion: Russell's reason is spurious. It is easy to see distant objects when looking about 10° or more away from a sun fairly low on the horizon. The impact zone in the Pentagon West wall is ENE of the Sheraton Hotel. This is 22.5° North of East. On September 11 at 9:38 am in Washington, D.C. (latitude 38.9° N), the sun's position²³ had an azimuth of 128.9° and an altitude of 43.3°. A point on the horizon directly below the sun would be 43.3° away from the sun, and the impact zone would be more than 60° to the left of that point on the horizon. Anlauf had a clear view unhampered by the sun which she herself never mentions.

In short, Russell calls for the security video (confiscated or inapplicable) to replace a perfectly good witness, and for unsupported reasons.

James Mosley's Testimony and its Rejection by Russell:

Testimony: 'James Mosley, four stories up on a scaffold at the Navy Annex, "' ... I looked over and saw this big silver plane run into the side of the Pentagon".'

Reason for Rejection: "This could be another key witness. A little more detail would be nice. How high was the plane as it appeared to hit the Pentagon?"

Discussion: Here Russell wants more detail, which, if given, might then be used to claim that the details contradicted other witnesses. Russell has disputed other eyewitness accounts on the basis of conflicting details, but now rejects a clear testimony because of their absence. There is no ambiguity in Mosley's statement. The plane hit! Russell's reasons are again spurious.

Jim Sutherland's Testimony and its Rejection by Russell:

Testimony: "Jim Sutherland, a mortgage broker, was on his way to the Pentagon when he saw ... a **white 737 twin-engine plane** with multicolored trim fly 50 feet over I-395 in a straight line, striking the side of the Pentagon."

²³ Sun Simulator, Univ. of Nebraska, <http://astro.unl.edu/naap/motion3/animations/sunmotions.html>
This calculator is very simple to use, but does not address the issue of daylight savings time. Using 8:38 am as the time, the azimuth is 114.6° and the altitude is 33.4°. Again, Anlauf did not have the sun in her eyes. See <http://www.hotelplanner.com/Hotels/131549/Reservations-Sheraton-National-Hotel-Arlington-900-South-Orme-St-22204> and Visual Tours for a view from a guestroom on the 15th or lower floor of the Sheraton (the top floor is a pool, and the hotel has 16 floors total).

Reason for Rejection: ‘Sutherland is potentially an excellent witness, but we would like more detail as to the apparent height of the plane at impact. "50 feet over I-395" is a contradiction to the many witnesses who saw the 757 over the Annex, or over Arlington Cemetery.’

Discussion: Judgments of height, position and speed by eyewitnesses would be subject to considerable error and are fleeting as compared with seeing a large airliner at low altitude impacting the Pentagon. The reasons for rejection indicate bias aimed at discounting contrary testimony in favor of other testimony more favorable to Russell’s preferred theory. Once again the eyewitness sees the impact, but Russell quibbles over details that are subject to indeterminate error in an effort to cast doubt on the witnesses’ main and unambiguous observation, that of plane impact.

Summary: In addition to the above, Russell rejects other eyewitnesses to impact with terse but meaningless comments such as “No problem” (Aydan Kizildrgli) and “OK, it was a passenger plane” (Philip Scheuerman). Madelyn Zakhem (not a witness to impact) thought she heard a jet fighter – but it was a “huge,” “silver” airliner. Nevertheless Russell tries to pin her to what she thought she heard, not what she saw! In this instance Russell reveals himself as a manipulative researcher disrespectful of witnesses and evidence.

From these examples it is clear that Russell does not give proper weight to the various aspects of the testimony, thus indicating his bias. He makes major assertions without proper technical analysis. He uses discrepancies in details to cast doubt on the central observation of what must have been an unforgettable sight. His 31 “explicit” witnesses to impact are quite enough to establish plane impact, but it is probable that Russell has wrongly excluded many others. See appendix D for further discussion.

As stated earlier, Griffin expands on Russell’s ideas of “contradictory reports” and “elite insiders.” Griffin accepts Russell’s conclusion that the 31 witnesses are largely “elite insiders” and those who work for the news media or the government, and then proceeds to present and analyze eyewitness reports in a manner that selectively avoids plane impact witnesses and those who saw plane debris. Unlike Russell, Griffin suggests that the eyewitnesses to impact have little or no credibility at all. See appendix D.

Having studied Frank Legge’s analysis²² of the Pentagon witnesses, I recommend it as the preferred basis for discussion of the Pentagon eyewitnesses in the future.

Influences Exerted on Witnesses

Fletcher and Eastman return²⁴ to the question of witness manipulation by claiming that my paper discounts the reality of witness manipulation through interviewers, suggestion, and peer-pressure. As examples they cite April Gallop’s account of the Pentagon event and research by Graeme MacQueen on the World Trade Center (WTC) witnesses to explosions.

²⁴ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p.13 (at top)

As noted in my paper,²⁵ Gallop provides no credible evidence that her interviewer exerted undue influence on her. Her testimony, however, does seem to change over time. In an interview by Dennis Lopic (October 31, 2001),²⁶ Gallop's testimony indicates that the event occurred before she pressed her computer button and that she and others were led out of the building through a window in the E ring wall by her office mates, Corporal Eduardo Bruno and Sergeant Roxanne Cruz-Cortez. Later accounts by Barbara Honegger have Gallop pressing the button simultaneously with the event, and Gallop claiming she exited through the hole in the E ring wall where the plane entered.²⁷ This last account is patently false. Gallop's office (1E517) was near the point where the left wing tip would have hit. The region from her office towards the entry hole was an inferno.²⁸ As she herself admits, Gallop's work mates helped her to escape by handing down her child and helping her down. This exit was through the window as noted in the Lopic interview.

In MacQueen's video²⁹ on witnesses to WTC explosions, MacQueen begins by emphasizing the importance of eyewitness testimony (around 12:00 in the video). He describes one witness, Paul Lemos, who was approached by an architect and told that, contrary to what Lemos heard and saw as explosions, that these were not explosions (31:00). MacQueen then recounts the testimonies of three witnesses who, weeks after the event, still gave their original impressions of explosions, but then added that they may have been wrong based on what they learned later (37:00).

MacQueen's WTC witness analysis provides scant support for Fletcher and Eastman's claim that Pentagon witnesses were influenced in a similar fashion. The problem is that, for the Pentagon impact and unlike explosions at the WTC, there is realistically no room for ambiguity.

But supposing one does "seriously consider" the possibility of similar influences on the Pentagon eyewitnesses to impact, what might one expect as testimony? Perhaps something like this hypothetical account:

Three witnesses some weeks later stated in effect: "The West wall definitely blew up for no apparent reason as I looked at it, but I later learned that a Boeing 757 had impacted the wall. I guess I just missed seeing the Boeing."

Here Fletcher and Eastman have proposed a hypothesis, the "possibility that suggestion and peer pressure may have influenced witness accounts," but have neglected to consider that their hypothesis would give rise to unbelievable testimonies.

²⁵ John D. Wyndham, "The Pentagon Attack: . . .," December, 2011, appendix B, p.24

²⁶ Alfred Golberg et al., "Pentagon 9/11," 2007, Chapter II, page 30 (see also p.260, top).

²⁷ Barbara Honegger in "The Pentagon Attack Papers," Appendix to "The Terror Conspiracy" by Jim Marrs See April Gallop video, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5U5hOyZlrcY&feature=gv>

²⁸ <http://911review.com/articles/stjarna/eximpactdamage.html>. See photos #4 and #5.

²⁹ Graeme MacQueen, Toronto Hearings, 2011, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8UPwJGZfHbo> See also "The 9/11 Toronto Report," pages 178-181

Plane Passage through the Interior: “Quasi-Fluid Flow”

Fletcher and Eastman cite the “complete disintegration of a large aircraft inside the Pentagon” as a weakness in the large plane impact theory. They return to this criticism in a section titled ‘Proposed “Quasi-Fluid Flow”.’³⁰ The term “quasi-fluid” does not appear in my paper, but these authors nonetheless imply that these are my words and solution.³¹ The authors claim the interior exhibited “the disappearance of almost all normally-identifiable debris” connected with a “large airplane.” The first subsection below responds to this claim using statements from eyewitnesses.

Interior Witness Testimonies

Unlike the eyewitnesses to the event who were outside the Pentagon on the highway and elsewhere, those eyewitnesses who were inside the Pentagon when the event occurred were immediately plunged into a chaotic, debris-strewn, *often pitch black*, extremely hot, smoky and dangerous environment from which they had to escape for their lives. It is not surprising therefore that there are few survivors who identified plane parts among the broken columns and office furniture. Any such eyewitness testimonies tend to come from those who were admitted into the interior environment later, before or after the fires were extinguished. Here some examples of this testimony:

- **DC Matthew wrote:** "After about 15 minutes shoveling up chunks of carpet and brick, I found a piece of circuit board, and a **chunk** of the plane. When I say a chunk of it, I mean a piece that was about **3 oz of twisted aluminum**. The biggest piece I've seen so far is about the size of a refrigerator."
<http://pub6.ezboard.com/foldmenonlinewhatdoyouthink.showPrevMessage?topicID=957.topic>
- **Carlton Burkhammer and Brian Moravitz:** While searching through wreckage inside the building, firefighters Carlton Burkhammer and Brian Moravitz "spotted an **intact seat** from the plane's cockpit with a **chunk** of the floor still attached." Burkhammer also "spotted **lime-green pieces** from the interior of the plane" within the building.
<http://www.msnbc.com/news/635293.asp>
- **CMSgt. John Monaccio wrote:** "I was in room 1B461. The plane's inertia carried **aircraft remains** all the way through the building coming to rest on the outside walls of our offices. We discovered **cockpit wreckage** at our feet while attempting to rescue people from a Navy operations area." http://www.geoffmetcalf.com/pentagon/pentagon-email_20020316.html
- **ARFF Captain Michael Defina said:** "The only way you could tell that an aircraft was inside was that we saw pieces of the **nose gear**."
http://www.nfpa.org/NFPAJournal/OnlineExclusive/Exclusive_11_01_01/exclusive_11.01.01.asp

³⁰ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p. 2, 14

³¹ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p. 15

- **Navy Lt. Commander David Tarantino** (describing the A-E Drive punchout hole): "They found an area where fire surrounded a hole in a wall that was blown out. They heard cries from people who were trapped and saw a **plane tire**." <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~julianr/lexisnexis/tarantino.txt>
- **Paul K. Carlton, Jr.**, U.S. Air Force surgeon general, quoted by Dean Murphy, "September 11: An Oral History," p. 216: "I thought it was a terrorist bomb. . . .But then I saw the **landing gear**. It was on the ground in the alley between the B and C rings. When I saw it there, not only did I realize an airplane had struck the Pentagon but it was clear that the plane had come through the E, D, and C buildings to get there."
- **Rep. Ted Tiahrt** wrote: "In the C and B rings the plane had punched a hole you could a drive a truck around in, and I saw an **airplane tire**. It made it very real." <http://wichita.bizjournals.com/wichita/stories/2002/09/09/story1.html>
- **Capt. Jim Ingledue** (a First Responder, Virginia Beach Fire Dept): "I have no reason to believe it wasn't a commercial airliner." "I did see airplane seats and a corpse still strapped to one of the seats." <http://rense.com/general68/pass.htm>

As shown in my paper² (in a section headed *Airplane Debris*) there are at least nine pieces of debris identifiable as belonging to a Boeing 757, some of which were found in the interior of the building and in the A&E driveway outside the C ring hole.

Interior Damage and Debris

There was a tremendous amount of damage and debris in the first floor (see references quoted in *Photographic Evidence of Damage*, appendix A). While only a few of these photographs show plane parts, columns with wire wrapped around them and bent in the direction of plane passage provide convincing evidence that plane debris did travel through this floor. The gash in the second floor slab, where the top of the plane body hit, further corroborates the plane passage through the interior.³²

Regarding the quantity of debris, a frequent criticism is that a 100 ton plane could not disappear so easily into the rubble, even if it had been fragmented. However, an empty Boeing 757-200 (or Boeing 757-223 as some claim), such as that reportedly used in AA Flight 77, weighs only about 64 tons.³³ The fuel, which all burned up, would bring the weight up to around 100 tons, with passengers, crew and cargo adding 5 – 10 additional tons. The wings plus engines and landing gear, empty of fuel, together weigh 29 tons³⁴. If the wings and engines disintegrated partly outside (deduct 4 tons), as can be deduced from the failure of the wing tips to penetrate, and we ignore the passengers, crew, cargo and fuel, then only about 60 tons of plane debris should be in the building, assuming none was consumed by fire. The question of what happened to the passengers and crew is a

³² See the interior debris and second floor slab gash here: <http://scienceof911.com.au/pentagon/>

³³ <http://www.airliners.net/aircraft-data/stats.main?id=101>

³⁴ The Pentagon Building Performance Report, p.12, http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/pentagon/official/asce_pentagon.pdf

sensitive one. Lack of reliable independent evidence has impeded progress here though there are witnesses who report seeing corpses.

Referring to page 53 of *the Pentagon Building Performance Report*,³⁴ Fletcher and Eastman mention that many columns between the entry hole and the C ring hole were not destroyed. They claim³⁵ that my paper does not contest that ‘no path of [interior] destroyed columns was cleared by the “large plane”.’ This is not true. In my appendix D, I reproduce a portion of a figure from page 53 of the cited report, and show that ‘the initial debris flow cleared a path 12.33 ft wide [the width of a Boeing 757 fuselage] and about 158 ft in length along the damage path to the blue “impacted” column.’

Contrary to Fletcher and Eastman, I never claimed that the “plane disintegrated into small pieces upon collision with the columns without destroying them”³⁶ (my underlines). Clearly a great many columns were destroyed (“missing, broken, disconnected”) in a path of almost 160 feet. The fact that, beyond 160 feet into this path, one column in the path was not entirely destroyed, another was entirely destroyed, and that 4 or 5 columns situated at the edges of the path had little impairment is not significant. These columns were distributed along the path and separated by appreciable distances from each other, rather than being bunched together. Each column presented a barrier that was small in the horizontal direction compared with the width of the main debris flow.

Nor did I fail to “provide any physical arguments for the plausibility of this [quasi-fluid flow] hypothesis.”³⁶ See, for example, my mention of the witness testimonies about “millions” of small pieces of plane skin, the F4 Phantom experiment and the photos showing “shredded or wrecked pieces of metal wrapped around” interior columns, and the “bowed [in the direction of debris travel], abraded columns, with wire wrapped around some.”³⁷

Specific evidence³⁸ for high-speed fragment flow in the interior includes:

- Many columns were stripped of their concrete covering.
- Many columns were bowed or smoothly curved without “discrete deformation cusps.”
- “Orientations of the distorted columns and the columns that were severed all indicated a common direction for the loads that caused the damage.”
- The “direction of column distortion consistently formed an angle of approximately 42 degrees with the normal to the west exterior wall of the Pentagon.” The plane path, as indicated by other evidence, made a 38 degree angle with the normal, closely agreeing with column damage observations.

³⁵ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p. 15, footnote 39

³⁶ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p.15

³⁷ John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, pages 10, 14, and 30

³⁸ The Pentagon Building Performance Report, pages 29-34.

http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/pentagon/official/asce_pentagon.pdf

The fragment flow hypothesis was first proposed by others and is in fact well-supported by the evidence. According to the *Pentagon Building Performance Report* of January, 2003, “The impact effects may be represented as a violent flow through the structure of a “fluid” consisting of aviation fuel and solid fragments.”³⁹

Deflection versus Refocusing of Debris

Fletcher and Eastman appear to attribute to me a hypothesis that I never made, namely that the quasi-fluid flow of debris “refocused” itself to a “circular pattern beyond the columns.”⁴⁰ This is Barbara Honegger’s theory.⁴¹ The term “refocus” does not appear in my paper.

My suggestion was, and still is, that the plane body was shredded by the columns as it traversed the building destroying columns, but that there would be a sufficient amount of debris, traveling at high speed in the shape of the fuselage cross-section, to create the C ring hole. Scattering and deflecting of the shredded material is implied in my statement⁴² that “a sufficient quantity of debris ... could reach the C ring hole wall and break through it.” This implies that what did not reach the C ring wall would be deflected to the side. Rather than refocusing, the columns’ orientation indicates that an unknown quantity of material would most likely be deflected out of the main path delineated in my figure 2.

A Call for Quantitative Evaluation

With regard to “quasi-fluid” flow of debris, Fletcher and Eastman call⁴³ for my paper to have included a quantitative evaluation of the mass of airplane debris and its available kinetic energy in order to show that such a flow would have “sufficient mass, momentum and concentration to punch out the circular C-Ring hole.” However, such an evaluation could show, at most, that the debris flow hypothesis is reasonable. What these authors ask for in their first bulleted item (mass of airplane debris) is, at this point in time, completely unrealistic unless the debris has been stored somewhere and access to it is available.

That the flow was at first concentrated is beyond doubt, since all particles in the plane body were initially part of a cylinder moving in the direction of its long axis. Given the many variables involved, further evaluation would be complex and challenging, and would likely be a continuing source of contention. Professor Tomasz Wierzbicki, in his paper⁵⁰ on aircraft impact damage at the Towers, states his paper “will give a first order approximation of this enormously complex impact phenomenon” because of the “vast lack of exact facts.” If “punch out” was shown to be feasible, this result in itself would be unlikely to prove that a large plane did impact the Pentagon. Fletcher and Eastman

³⁹ The Pentagon Building Performance Report, p.46,

http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/pentagon/official/asce_pentagon.pdf

Frank Legge, <http://scienceof911.com.au/pentagon/> and Creed and Newman, “Firefight: ...,” 2008, p.27 quoted in footnote 85 of my original paper, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011

⁴⁰ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p. 16

⁴¹ Barbara Honegger, “The 9/11 Toronto Report,” Chapter 13, p. 256

⁴² John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, p. 37 (appendix D)

⁴³ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, pages 15-16

dispute the many eyewitnesses to impact and largely ignore the main physical evidence and damage. They also fail to offer any plausible theory that could account for the eyewitness testimony and the physical evidence in absence of large plane impact.

Others have already made some quantitative evaluations⁴⁴ with respect to the column damage. Given the preponderance of evidence in favor of large plane impact, as shown by my paper's Table 1, its supporting tables, as well as by other researchers,^{45 92} perhaps it is more appropriate to ask Fletcher and Eastman to perform a quantitative evaluation and prove, beyond a doubt, that the plane could NOT have behaved in the manner that my paper and others have suggested.

Kinetic Energy Considerations

Having stated the foregoing, here is a simple consideration of the energy available to break through the façade, destroy and damage columns and the C ring wall, fragment the plane, and create the kinds of other damage seen in the interior photographs. The aircraft data⁴⁶ are mostly from The Pentagon Building Performance Report by way of the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB). We will ignore the explosive energy in the fuel, and consider only the kinetic energy of the plane.

Total Kinetic Energy: On impact the plane weighed approximately 90.8 tons (82372 kg) and was traveling at a speed of 529 mph (236 m/s). Total kinetic energy⁴⁷ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Plane kinetic energy} &= \frac{1}{2} \times 90.8 \times 529^2 = 1270 \times 10^4 \text{ tons. (miles/h)}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \times 82372 \times 236^2 = 2.3 \times 10^9 \text{ joules} = 2.3 \text{ Gigajoules.}\end{aligned}$$

As a visualization aid, let us create a unit of energy called the *truck*. One truck of energy is defined as the kinetic energy possessed by one 10 ton (9072 kg) truck⁴⁸ moving at 60 mph (96.5 km/hour or 26.8 m/s).

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Kinetic energy of one truck} &= \frac{1}{2} \times 10 \times 60^2 = 1.8 \times 10^4 \text{ tons. (miles/h)}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \times 9072 \times 26.8^2 = 3.26 \times 10^6 \text{ joules} = 3.26 \text{ Megajoules}\end{aligned}$$

In terms of trucks, the plane kinetic energy available to do external/internal damage is:

$$\text{Plane kinetic energy} = 1270/1.8 \text{ (or } 2300/3.26) = 706 \text{ trucks of energy}$$

⁴⁴ The Pentagon Building Performance Report, section 7.1, p.45

http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/pentagon/official/asce_pentagon.pdf

⁴⁵ Jim Hoffman, <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pentagon/index.html>

⁴⁶ http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/pentagon/official/asce_pentagon.pdf, p.12

⁴⁷ The kinetic energy of a moving body is equal to $1/2mv^2$ where m is the mass and v the velocity. In the mks system of units, m is expressed in kilograms (kg) and v in meters/second (m/s). Energy is then given in joules. To simplify the calculation for the layman in the USA, we shall use the unconventional units of tons (m) and miles/hour (v) while noting the mks equivalents for readers in other parts of the world.

⁴⁸ Frank Legge has already used this analogy of a truck. See <http://scienceof911.com.au/pentagon/>.

Based on common experience, one or two trucks of energy could do considerable damage to a Pentagon first floor column when applied perpendicular to the column length. Of the 83 affected first-floor columns, 29 were completely removed or destroyed, 17 were severely impacted, 11 were moderately affected, and 26 showed some slight damage. The columns, 14 feet in height and 14 inches square in cross-section, had a concrete cover 1 ½ inches thick. Inside were cylinders of spirally-reinforced concrete with longitudinal steel rebar of thickness ½ inch (8 per column) or 1 inch in diameter (4 per column).⁴⁹

One truck of energy would seem sufficient to break through the relatively weak C ring wall and create a large opening. Completely removing a column might take 8 trucks.⁵⁰ Four trucks of energy per column might suffice for the severe column damage, while 1.0 and 0.2 trucks respectively might account for the moderately and slightly damaged columns. Using these numbers, one obtains 317 trucks for the above damage.

If about 317 trucks of energy were used to break through the façade, and destroy, break or deform the first floor columns and C ring wall, we still have 389 trucks of energy for other damage, including fragmenting the plane, generator and low wall damage, second floor column damage, stripping the columns, gashing the second floor slab and so on.

This admittedly rough calculation ignores the explosive energy of the fuel. The margins of error here may be large, but the result appears reasonable. There does not seem to be a borderline deficit of available energy.

The Fuselage as Projectile: The plane, empty of crew, passengers, cargo and fuel weighed 64 tons (58060 kg). The two wings, including the landing gear and engines, together weighed about 29 tons (26310 kg). The fuselage minus wings and tail can be considered as a cylindrical projectile of weight about 35 tons (31750 kg), width 12.5 feet (3.81 m), and length 155 feet (47.24 m) impacting the exterior wall and traveling through the first floor at an initial speed of 529 mph (236 m/s).

This projectile impacted, removed and damaged columns, shredding and scattering parts of itself outside the path defined by its geometry, but retaining enough energy in its original cross section to create the C ring hole. In its path, 11 columns (red/pink) were removed, 1 (blue) was severely damaged, and 5 (yellow) had cracking and spalling. The initial energy of this projectile is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Projectile energy} &= \frac{1}{2} \times 35 \times 529^2 = 489.7 \times 10^4 \text{ tons} \cdot (\text{miles/h})^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \times 31750 \times 236^2 = 0.884 \times 10^9 \text{ joules} = 0.884 \text{ Gigajoules} \\ &= 272 \text{ trucks.} \end{aligned}$$

⁴⁹ The Pentagon Building Performance Report, pages 5, 42, 48, 53

⁵⁰ By way of comparison with the WTC, Wierzbicki, Xue and Hendry-Brogan quote a value from another paper of 26 MJ (megajoules) as the energy needed to shear off an outer column in a WTC Tower. See <http://web.mit.edu/civenv/wtc/PDFfiles/Chapter%20IV%20Aircraft%20Impact.pdf>. 26 MJ is approximately 8 trucks. The WTC outer columns where the planes struck were made of ¼ inch or more steel with a square cross-section of 14 inches.

This is more than enough energy to remove 11 or 12 columns and break through the C ring wall. Much of this energy would be scattered out of the projectile path to cause adjacent damage. This result also seems reasonable, though error margins may be large.

Previously Unaddressed Issues

Is There No Visible Damage to the Façade from the Tail?

Fletcher and Eastman claim the “absence of any evidence” for damage to the Pentagon façade attributable to a 757-like airliner’s “approximately 40 feet high” tail.⁵¹ The tail tip is 44 feet above ground for a landed plane, but the vertical stabilizer itself extends only about 24 feet above the plane body.⁵² Fletcher and Eastman appear to be looking for a clear, vertical gash above the second floor. However, the absence of a gash does not imply absence of damage. There is evidence for façade damage caused by the tail as shown by Jim Hoffman.⁵³ This damage extends almost to the top of the fourth floor.

The Pentagon Performance and Building Report verifies significant damage up to the third floor slab, and minor damage up to the fourth floor.⁵⁴ See p. 20. A statement on p. 36 seems to contradict this, but may refer only to major damage (“obvious visible damage”).

Hoffman attributes the damage (cracked limestone facing and broken windows between columns 12 and 13) to “debris from the vertical stabilizer.” The fact that the “heaviest damage” is to the left of where one might expect is explained by the tilt of the wings and tail to the left, and by Hoffman as caused by a “slight roll” to the left as the fuselage penetrated the building. Hoffman suggests this “lateral displacement” of the damage might also have been caused by stresses, or by an “explosion” (a bomb in the luggage hold) or by a “missile.”⁵³ The tail, being relatively light as compared with the heavier parts of the wings, could have simply fragmented as in the F4 experiment, and the fragments caused the minor damage above the third floor slab.

There is general consensus that a large plane approached the Pentagon on 9/11 flying low. A large number of eyewitnesses also testify to its impacting the Pentagon’s West wall. There is not a single witness to the plane flying over or away from the Pentagon. It is safe to declare that this plane had a vertical stabilizer in order to fly correctly towards the Pentagon, and many witnesses observed the vertical stabilizer. These include witnesses such as Penny Elgas and Don Mason, who mentioned the tail as part of their

⁵¹ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p.17

⁵² <http://www.airliners.net/aircraft-data/stats.main?id=101>

⁵³ <http://911review.com/articles/stjarna/eximpactdamage.html> and

<http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pentagon/index.html#facade>

⁵⁴ See http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/pentagon/official/asce_pentagon.pdf, pages 20 and 36

testimonies to plane impact.^{55 22} As has been shown elsewhere,² the physical damage and debris at the Pentagon on 9/11 also support large plane approach and impact.

Those who would argue, because the observed damage on the Pentagon façade does not accord with their predictions as to what that damage should look like, especially where the vertical stabilizer is concerned, that there was in fact no plane impact, have a heavy burden of other evidence to overcome. While an interesting question, the issue of how the tail fragmented and caused the observed damage is one that is truly “unimportant.”

Could the Plane Have Flown So Low at High Speed?

Fletcher and Eastman’s claim⁵⁶ that a Boeing 757 cannot fly at high speeds of around 550 mph, as shown by the FDR data, at the low elevation indicated by the Pentagon eyewitnesses and physical damage, is not universally supported.

For example, the website, www.aerospaceweb.org/, founded 1997 and currently staffed by nine engineers and scientists working in the aerospace field, has an article⁵⁷ *Pentagon & Boeing 757 Ground Effect*. This article explains that, because of the high speed and low angle of attack, the ground effect is not a problem, especially with an aircraft that is under automatic control. The article relates the experience of two commercial airline pilots who tried this kind of approach in a flight training simulator and had no problems.

The Event Time (“stopped clocks”)

With respect to my paper’s coverage of Barbara Honegger’s clocks’ evidence for the event time, Fletcher and Eastman’s criticisms⁵⁸ have validity as to the way I handled the clocks’ evidence. However, they are wrong to assume that the clocks’ evidence is reliable or trustworthy. The event time was NOT a factor in my conclusion that the large plane impact theory is by far the most plausible one. The event time evidence, being “incomplete, unverified, or disputed” or simply inapplicable, was included in my paper’s appendix A which was added during the review cycle in response to one reviewer’s comments. As explained, appendix A evidence was not used in reaching a conclusion. What is not valid in Fletcher and Eastman’s criticism is that the so-called “stopped clocks” discrepancy indicates the FDR data is “unreliable.” It is not the FDR data but the “stopped clocks” evidence and the other timepiece evidence presented by Honegger that is unreliable.

The Pentagon event time has now been fully addressed by me in a separate paper⁵⁹ which shows, by experiment, that the “stopped clocks” evidence is untrustworthy, and that the evidence points very strongly to a single major event at 9:37:45, the official time that a

⁵⁵ <http://arabesque911.blogspot.com/2007/04/911-and-pentagon-attack-what.html>

⁵⁶ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, page 7, footnote 17

⁵⁷ <http://www.aerospaceweb.org/question/conspiracy/q0274.shtml>

⁵⁸ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p.18

⁵⁹ John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: The Event Time Revisited,” March, 2013, http://www.scientificmethod911.org/docs/Pentagon_Event_Time_Mar19_2013.pdf

large jetliner hit the Pentagon. See also “*Attack at 9:31*” in appendix B, *David Griffin’s Contradictions of the 757 Theory*.

The Question of Importance and Divisiveness

Fletcher and Eastman begin their letter by pointing to David Griffin’s “consensus approach” to the Pentagon events, and his thought that any disagreement over the “what hit” question should not undermine the consensus that does exist. Griffin’s contention is that the “what hit” question is of secondary importance and is also possibly destructive to the movement.⁶⁰ Fletcher and Eastman likewise state that the subject of my paper, namely what caused the damage and debris at the Pentagon, is a “secondary” question, or of “secondary importance.”⁶¹

Rather than debate what is essentially opinion, this author could simply point out that “importance” is very much in the eye of the beholder, and that many scientific discoveries and advances have come from research that was deemed unimportant at the time. If a topic is seen as divisive, that is all the more reason to try to resolve it. However, Griffin’s “consensus about the primary issue” is worth closer examination.

Griffin claims “that all members of the 9/11 Truth Movement agree” on this “most important point:”

“... the official story about the Pentagon, according to which *the Pentagon was attacked by American Airlines Flight 77 (AA 77) under the control of al-Qaeda*, is a lie.”

Griffin’s point contains two assertions and a judgment about them. The assertions are:

1. The Pentagon was attacked by a large airplane, AA Flight 77.
2. AA Flight 77 was under the control of al Qaeda.

Griffin claims that these two assertions, taken together, are a lie. While “all members” may agree, some will demur that assertion #1 is true, while only assertion #2 is a lie. Logically, these two assertions taken together will still be false even if only one of them is false. But the fact that the so-called “secondary” issue (#1) is embedded in this “most important point” indicates that it (#1) is not so unimportant after all. For example, the truth or falsity of assertion #2 is relevant only if assertion #1 is true! One way out of this logical confusion is to stipulate that one must not consider the two assertions separately, a stance that is difficult to justify and that further solidifies the importance of #1.

A similar problem exists in Kevin Ryan’s original article⁶² *A dozen questions about Flight 77 and the Pentagon that might lead to justice, and one that won’t*. According to Ryan, “what hit the Pentagon, for example, is a minor and nearly useless issue.” However, 75% of Ryan’s dozen questions assume that AA 77 hit the Pentagon. Ryan

⁶⁰ David Ray Griffin, “9/11 Ten Years Later,” Chapter 7, pages 153-155, 168, Olive Branch Press, 2011

⁶¹ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, pages 4, 12, and 19

⁶² <http://911blogger.com/news/2010-10-17/visibility-911-dozen-questons-about-flight-77-kevin-ryan>

simply assumes a result for an issue that is unresolved, while claiming it is too “minor” and “useless” to contemplate. This is no basis on which to call for further Pentagon research. Resolving the “what hit” question is the very basis for this future research.

Before leaving this issue of “importance,” and lest the reader imagine that this is just a case of questionable logic, here are a few reasons why this author feels it is important to resolve the question of what caused the damage and debris at the Pentagon:

- The lack of resolution on this issue has already hurt the movement, as seen in the April Gallop lawsuit which was thrown out as “frivolous” and “fantastical” with a hefty fine because of the Pentagon “no plane” contention.⁶³
- It is difficult to reply effectively to the widely-known Popular Mechanics (PM) article and book⁶⁴ when it is apparent to many that PM are correct in their criticisms of the truth movement on the Pentagon issue.
- Presenting to the public the solid WTC conclusions on controlled demolition, along with both evidence-based and speculative Pentagon theories, undermines our claim of scientific legitimacy. If we cannot resolve this issue among ourselves, what hope do we have to expect society to resolve the overall question of the official 9/11 story?

It cannot be substantiated that the Pentagon issue is unimportant. It is certainly important in the public’s mind. Whether or not it is divisive is up to us individually and collectively. But inconvenient complexities are not sufficient reason to sweep this question under the rug. Scientists will always research issues that interest them, whether or not they seem unimportant or divisive. Genuine scientific research should not be restrained by social or political considerations, in the government or in the truth movement.

The Question of Proof

In a section⁶⁵ headed *Appropriate Methodology for Pentagon Attack Analysis*, Fletcher and Eastman claim, in effect, that there is insufficient evidence to achieve an ‘unambiguous “scientific” conclusion.’ They criticize my use of the word “prove” with respect to the pre-eminence of the large plane impact theory versus the alternative theories as shown in my Table 1,² but they do not directly address that table, its supporting tables, or most of the evidence on which the tables are based.

However, their opinion on the insufficiency of the evidence itself requires proof, and Fletcher and Eastman offer none. These authors fail to substantiate many of their

⁶³ <http://www.centerfor911justice.org/> - The court’s decision focused only on the “no plane” theory. “No plane” adherents might do well to reflect on this fact. Is it possible the judges knew for a certainty they could defeat the arguments for “no plane,” but not the arguments for nano-thermite at the WTC?

⁶⁴ Meigs, Dunbar, and Reagan, “Debunking 9/11 Myths,” Hearst Books, 2011

⁶⁵ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p.4

opinions while offering esoteric arguments for how the problem should be addressed, but without so addressing the problem themselves.

For example,⁶⁶ after declaring the need to discuss aircraft issues in “full context,” they suggest that “lack of strong video evidence that an airliner struck the Pentagon,” along with the Dulles Flight 77 terrorist video that appears to have been altered, together indicate that “major elements of the external Pentagon events were staged.” Such a conclusion on the basis of such flimsy evidence undermines the credibility of these authors and anything they might say about the sufficiency or insufficiency of evidence or appropriate methodologies.

As noted earlier, Fletcher and Eastman demand proof, by quantitative analysis, that the flow of debris had sufficient energy, momentum and focus to destroy columns and punch a hole in the C ring wall. However, it is they and others, who are trying to prove through similar demands and criticisms that a large plane did not strike and could not have struck the Pentagon, upon whom the burden of proof actually rests. My initial goal was not to prove any existing theory. When starting this research in 2011 after reading Frank Legge’s first paper⁶⁷ on the subject,⁶⁸ I had no favored theory. Allow me to emphasize:

When, in my paper, I compared the main observations with various theories, my aim was not to prove a particular theory but to allow the observations to determine the most plausible theory. To really reply to my paper, Fletcher and Eastman and others would have to show that the witnesses to impact are lying, and that all the evidence of damage and debris attributable to large plane approach, impact, and passage through the building, was staged. Except for the eyewitnesses, they have not attempted to do this. And the attempt to impugn the eyewitnesses has no credibility, as this paper shows.

As Jerry Russell correctly noted,⁵ the “bar” is very high. The “no plane” adherents have not yet even attempted to reach it. This is because they continue to deal with the issue dismissively and not as scientists. To attempt to reach the bar with the “no plane” theory, they would have to address the missing pieces of this theory as laid out in my original paper’s tables.

There is, in this author’s opinion, more than enough evidence to reach a conclusion on the Pentagon question, but the evidence needs to be processed correctly. Prejudice, bias, and a refusal to examine consequences will always impede one’s progress toward resolution. In any scientific examination worthy of the name it does not matter what specific conclusion is reached, or who was right and who was wrong along the way. What matters is the integrity with which the examination is conducted.

⁶⁶ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p.10

⁶⁷ Frank Legge, “What Hit the Pentagon? Misinformation and its Effect on the Credibility of 9/11 Truth,” July, 2009 <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2009/WhatHitPentagonDrLeggeAug.pdf>

⁶⁸ Prior to this, Victoria Ashley listed some of the problems with the “no plane” theory in an email to me.

Correction to the Second Floor Gash Length

My original paper gave an estimate of the length of the knocked out portion of the second floor slab. The estimate was 20 – 30 feet.⁶⁹ However, this estimate was based on a faulty interpretation of the video frame⁷⁰ showing the gash. This video was clearly taken when clean up was in progress, at which time the floors above the entry hole had collapsed. The frame is showing the second floor gash in the still standing portion of the building. This portion is about 50 feet from the entry hole. So, assuming the gash extended from the entry hole to this point, the length of the gash must have been 70 – 80 feet in length.

Summary

In some cases Fletcher and Eastman bring up valid points of evidence that were not addressed previously, such as: what happened to the plane's tail, and could the plane have flown close to the ground at high speed. But these authors also present their criticisms without considering the logical consequences. There are distinct differences between pure criticism and a scientific investigation that explores the consequences of hypotheses.

In addition, a large portion of this paper (see also appendix A) is taken up responding to Fletcher and Eastman's mistaken assertions as to what I wrote. These errors, plus their inclusion of some irrelevant topics, serve to confuse the reader as to the nature of my paper.

Fletcher and Eastman's arguments do not change the conclusions expressed in Table 1 and its supporting tables in my original paper. On the contrary, the above more-detailed examination of evidence, such as the eyewitness testimony and the column damage and debris in the first floor, further strengthens this evidence and the conclusion that a large plane did indeed impact the Pentagon on 9/11.

Acknowledgments

The author is indebted to Frank Legge and David Chandler for reviewing several drafts of this paper, for suggestions on how to order the material and what material to include and what to exclude, for pointing out ways of improvement, for discussions of some of the issues, for many edits along the way, and for their sustained support over the several months during which this paper was written. My thanks are also due to Jonathan Cole for reading the paper and suggesting some finishing touches.

⁶⁹ John D. Wyndham, "The Pentagon Attack: ...," December, 2011, p. 30 (appendix B)

⁷⁰ <http://scienceof911.com.au/pentagon/> See video frame showing second floor damage.

Appendix A

Distortions in the Fletcher and Eastman Letter

The Question of Distortion

Fletcher and Eastman use variations of the word “distort” on three occasions:⁷¹ (1) to claim that I distorted Griffin’s arguments on the 31 “explicit” witnesses, when in fact I had not mentioned these arguments; (2) to claim I had distorted the façade damage evidence by omitting any mention of plane tail damage; and (3) to claim I had distorted the low wall/generator trailer evidence by omitting mention of previously unheard of evidence that they attempted to present by way of a faulty reference that was meant to point to an unpublished book. In each of these three cases, Fletcher and Eastman claim that I “distorted” something by omitting to mention it.

Based on their usage of the word, the treatment accorded Pentagon impact eyewitnesses over the past decade by the “truth movement” appears to constitute one the greatest distortions in this movement’s brief history. After simply ignoring these witnesses for several years, first Russell and then Griffin begins to undermine them with the claim of the “elite insider,” an argument that I show in this paper to be speculative and without foundation. There is not, to my knowledge, a single case of any eyewitness to plane impact (among those listed) who has been shown to have been lying.

According to Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary, the word “distort” means to “twist out of regular shape,” “to twist aside mentally or morally,” and “wrest from the true meaning.” On this basis, ignoring the eyewitnesses to impact would be an omission rather than a distortion. But to suggest, without evidence, that they are lying is a gross distortion.

My use of the word “distort” in this appendix is applied to cases where Fletcher and Eastman state something about my work that is not true, for example, that I relied on the FDR data for the plane speed, when I clearly present a speed of 420 mph⁷² based on witness estimates. These distortions are misrepresentations of fact. It will be incumbent upon Fletcher and Eastman to provide an explanation of how these mistakes occurred.

Photographic Evidence of Damage

While Fletcher and Eastman indicate that my paper’s “interpretation of photographic evidence at the site” is a “key weakness,”⁷³ it is not clear, because of the way their letter is organized, to what evidence they are referring. My paper gave many references and a discussion of the photographic physical evidence. See *Airplane Debris* on page 10.

⁷¹ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p. 12 (at top), page 17 (two occurrences)

⁷² As would be expected, witness speed estimates vary widely and are sometimes contradictory. Morin said the plane was slow, but at full throttle! The FDR and radar data give speeds much higher than 420 mph.

⁷³ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p.2

For general photographs of interior and exterior damage and debris, including a photo collage of plane debris and parts, see the replies after the announcement⁷⁴ of my original paper on 911Blogger. See also these websites.⁷⁵

There are a number of photographs of the interior debris, and these show a great deal of debris that could not have come, for example, from the intact ceilings above. See for example Goldberg et al.,⁷⁶ and these websites.⁷⁷

The FDR Data

Another distortion made by Fletcher and Eastwood is their repeated claim that I used the Flight Data Recorder (FDR) data to reach my conclusions. I will not attempt to defend the FDR data here, except to say that it appears solid, it agrees with other evidence, and, because of its complexity, would be extremely difficult to successfully alter.⁷⁸ Fletcher and Eastman's misrepresentation is that I *relied* on the FDR data in reaching my conclusions.⁷⁹ This is untrue.

I referred to the FDR data in my appendix A, along with other evidence that I clearly state was not a factor in my conclusions. My paper did not attempt to identify the type of large plane or its flight number. I did not infer the plane speed or bank angle from the FDR data, rather I used witness testimony. For example, I quoted a speed of 420 mph based on witness estimates, not a speed of over 500 mph as can be inferred from the FDR data. I stated that no witnesses saw a steep bank – their testimonies indicate a straight flight before impact, a fact that excludes the north of Citgo theory favored by CIT, which theory forces them to assume that the plane must have flown over the Pentagon to avoid causing damage in the north-south path. Despite my non-reliance on the FDR data and my placement of it in appendix A, Fletcher and Eastman specifically claim that I use it for plane speed and bank angle.⁸⁰ This claim is completely false.⁸¹

In the same category as the FDR data is the Dulles “terrorist” video that, it is claimed, appears to have been altered. This video can likely only shed light on the hijacker story, as I state in my paper.⁸² Nevertheless, Fletcher and Eastman present this evidence on three occasions in their letter as if it had bearing on my conclusions.

⁷⁴ <http://911blogger.com/news/2012-01-08/pentagon-attack-problems-theories-alternative-large-plane-impact-john-d-wyndham>

⁷⁵ <https://sites.google.com/site/wtc7lies/911pentagonflight77evidencesummary>
<https://sites.google.com/site/wtc7lies/pentagonattackpage2>

⁷⁶ Alfred Golberg et al., “Pentagon 9/11,” 2007

⁷⁷ <http://scienceof911.com.au/> and <http://rense.com/general32/phot.htm>

⁷⁸ Frank Legge, <http://scienceof911.com.au/pentagon/>, see “The FDR File,” and <http://www.journalof911studies.com/resources/Legge-Letter-June.pdf>

⁷⁹ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, see for example p.4, footnote 9 and p. 18 at top

⁸⁰ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p. 18 at top

⁸¹ John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, pages 2 and 6

⁸² John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, appendix A , table 2

The Treatment of Explosives

Fletcher and Eastman write: “On this basis he [Wyndham] argues that witness testimony to the sound of bombs going off and the distinctive smell of cordite within the Pentagon can be ignored as erroneous.” Again these authors state that I attempt to “rule out ... pre-placed internal explosives ... [as a] key part of the Pentagon attack.”⁸³

Contrary to these claims, I write in my paper:⁸⁴ “To summarize, there is some credible evidence for a bomb or bombs, exploding at the same time as a large plane impacting the building.” “Use of explosives to augment the large plane impact damage, or to create other damage and casualties at the same time, is not ruled out” and “... plane impact does not rule out the additional use of bombs.” Clearly, Fletcher and Eastman’s charge is erroneous, even to their denying my use of the words “not ruled out.”

It remains to be proven whether or not bombs, if used, were a “key” part of the Pentagon event. Barbara Honegger’s claim, that the *entire* event was possibly accomplished with bombs, is not in agreement with the evidence. In addition, she fails to address the consequences of her supposition. See my original paper, appendix B, for a discussion of these consequences.

In her Toronto Report chapter, in the section on “primary explosions,”⁸⁵ Honegger quotes a number of witnesses who inferred bombs. One of these is Terry Morin who is also cited as one of the 31 witnesses to impact by Jerry Russell. According to Morin, who was formerly in the military, “it sounded like a 2000-pound bomb going off...” Morin states that he watched the plane as it flew lower, “shearing off a portion of a highway light pole,” and the airframe disappeared behind a row of trees but that the tail was still visible when he saw the “flash and subsequent fireball” of impact. Given his words, it is clear that the phrase, “like a 2000-pound bomb” did not imply for him that a bomb was used instead of a plane impact. If someone like Morin can state the impact of the plane sounded like a bomb, is it surprising that others, with less experience with explosives, might infer a bomb?⁸⁶

Fletcher and Eastman raise the question of the severe damage to the Naval Command Center (NCC) and the Army administrative area in Wedge 2, and the reported deaths in the A and B rings. Regarding the deaths, my paper suggested that a severe shock wave, strong enough to knock Lisa Burgess against a wall in an innermost corridor, might explain these deaths. However, as previously emphasized, my paper does not rule out the use of pre-planted explosives for the foregoing deaths and damage.⁸⁶

Fletcher and Eastman incorrectly claim⁸⁷ that “important considerations of context,” such as a need on the perpetrators’ part to destroy areas such as the NCC area, are “never

⁸³ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, pages 14 and 16 (at bottom)

⁸⁴ John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, pages 27, 43, and 9, also p.2 (top)

⁸⁵ Barbara Honegger, The Toronto Report, p.249

⁸⁶ John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, pages 26 and 27

⁸⁷ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, page 17, first paragraph

mentioned” in my paper. In my paper⁸⁸ I discuss this very possibility, including mention of “missing funds,” “Able Danger,” and the NCC. However, such speculation goes beyond the actual physical evidence for explosives, evidence that already lacks corroborating data such as explosive residue, as present in the case of the WTC evidence. The main “visual” event, and certainly the event that convinced the public the country was under attack, was the impact of a large plane with the West wall of the Pentagon

The Pentagon Evidence as Compared with WTC Evidence

Fletcher and Eastman claim⁸⁹ that the physical, photographic, and video evidence from the Pentagon is markedly inferior to that for the World Trade Center (WTC). In my paper I disputed this opinion.⁹⁰ In some respects the Pentagon evidence is superior to the WTC, since, for example, there are photographs and descriptions of the interior damage.

In the case of WTC, just as for the Pentagon, there were many claims that no actual planes hit the Towers, but, unlike the Pentagon, these claims failed to gain the same traction in the 9/11 truth movement. In addition, unlike the WTC, and with a few exceptions,⁹¹ scientists have generally not addressed the Pentagon problems in formal papers until recently.⁹²

Staged Events

Fletcher and Eastman have modified and extended my usage of the term “staged” event to include almost any form of deceptive practices, including ones that are easily accomplished out of sight, and not in real time. Examples given by Fletcher and Eastman are the suggested altering of the Dulles video, and the surreptitious dropping of a headband or passport at a crash scene.⁹³

My original definition⁹⁴ was specifically applied to “*damage and debris*” at the Pentagon and directed at the supposed arranging, in real time, of the damage and debris so as to

⁸⁸ John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, p. 27 (2nd paragraph from top),

⁸⁹ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p. 3

⁹⁰ John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, p.4, *General Assessment ...*

⁹¹ Jim Hoffman, <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pentagon/index.html>

A.K.Dewdney, <http://physics911.net/missingwings/>

Mete Sozen, <http://www.purdue.edu/uns/html4ever/020910.Sozen.Pentagon.html>

⁹² Frank Legge, “What Hit the Pentagon? Misinformation and its Effect on the Credibility of 9/11 Truth,” July, 2009 <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2009/WhatHitPentagonDrLeggeAug.pdf>

Frank Legge, and Warren Stutt, “Flight AA77 on 9/11: New FDR Analysis Supports the Official Flight Path...” January, 2011

http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2010/Calibration%20of%20altimeter_92.pdf

Frank Legge and David Chandler, “The Pentagon Attack on 9/11: A Refutation of the Pentagon Flyover Hypothesis Based on Analysis of the Flight Path,” Sept., 2011 <http://stj911.org/contributions/index.html>

and its Addendum: <http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2011/12/27/addendum-to-the-paper-refuting-the-pentagon-flyover-hypothesis/>. See also David Chandler and Jonathan Cole at

<http://911blogger.com/news/2011-01-01/joint-statement-pentagon-david-chandler-and-jon-cole>

⁹³ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, pages 5, 6 and 11

⁹⁴ John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, p. 3

fool an onlooker into believing that a large plane hit the Pentagon if in fact this did not actually occur. In my paper, appendix B, the section *An Analysis of the Bomb Theory and its Comparison with Large Plane Impact* discusses some of the difficulties in staging the Pentagon damage and debris. In contrast, Fletcher and Eastman suggest this would be a “simple and minor operation”⁹⁵ but they never describe such an “operation” in detail or show that it would be “simple and minor.”

The effect of Fletcher and Eastman’s widening of my use of the term “staged” is to mislead the reader into thinking that the Pentagon scene could have been staged as easily as in their simple examples of a planted passport or headband, whereas in fact staging such a scene *in real time* is orders of magnitude more difficult. For example, stripping, abrading and bowing the first floor interior columns in a direction indicated by the entry and exit holes and adding a large amount of debris, all in real time and without damaging the ceiling above, would hardly be a “relatively simple and minor operation.” This damage and debris alone rules out all theories except for large plane impact.

My Use of the Word “Consensus”

In my paper² I use the word “consensus” only three times: in the Abstract, to point out the current lack of consensus on what caused the Pentagon damage; in the section *Airplane Debris* when noting a growing consensus that the plane debris came from a Boeing 757; and in the *Acknowledgements*, where I note that there exists a goal of achieving a higher level of consensus on the Pentagon. In the *Conclusion* section I did not use the word “consensus” but expressed the hope that “the 9/11 truth movement ... will acknowledge the preeminence of the large plane impact theory at this time.”

Despite my extremely limited use of the word “consensus,” usage I consider valid in all three cases, Fletcher and Eastman make the charge that I have called for “consensus” that the Pentagon was struck by a large plane. They then proceed to declare that I do not understand the meaning of the word “consensus.” In addition, these authors claim that my paper cites “Griffin’s argument for a consensus approach to the Pentagon....” whereas I do not mention or cite Griffin’s argument at all.⁹⁶

Lack of Evidence from Plane Parts and Serial numbers

Fletcher and Eastman pinpoint⁹⁷ the failure of federal agencies to identify airplane parts from their unique serial numbers, and cite this failure as “another important context for the analysis of the Pentagon staged attack by independent researchers.” But since the federal agencies failed to follow this standard forensic procedure for any of the 9/11 flights, yet nonetheless there is considerable agreement on what happened at the WTC, this failure should not be an impediment to reaching similar agreement on the Pentagon event. This failure of the federal agencies is not evidence against the large plane impact

⁹⁵ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, page 11 (first full paragraph at top)

⁹⁶ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, pages 11, 12 and 1

⁹⁷ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p.6 and footnote 15

theory as discussed later (*David Griffin's Contradictions of the 757 Theory*). It is a form of misrepresentation to continually present it as such.

Are All Senses Comparable for Pentagon Evidence?

In criticizing my suggestion⁹⁸ that the most compelling witnesses are those who saw what happened, Fletcher and Eastman claim⁹⁹ that the senses are of “roughly comparable reliability.” This claim seems designed to place witnesses, who heard sounds or detected odors, on the same footing as the eyewitnesses to plane impact. Some examples suffice to rebut this claim.

- A witness who could not see might have difficulty telling whether a plane had impacted the building, dropped a bomb on it, or had simply flown away while the building exploded.
- All seeing witnesses would be able to identify a large airliner by sight. The same cannot be claimed for their ability to identify the odor of jet fuel and cordite, or to distinguish between these two odors.

These examples support my statement, that the most compelling witnesses are those who actually saw the plane impact, rather than those who might have inferred something from sound or odor.

Testimonies that the Plane Crashed on the Lawn

There are a few eyewitness testimonies that have the plane crashing on the lawn. Fletcher and Eastman quote¹⁰⁰ one of these cited in my paper, noting that this portion of the testimony is false, but that my paper does not take this into account in its assessment of the testimony. Such testimonies are literally untrue and similar to those where the witness perceives a wing as touching the ground before impact, or a critic describes the light poles as having been “torn” out the ground. Allowing for witness vantage point, length of observation, and other factors, these discrepancies do not seriously change the main agreement among the witnesses that a large plane flew low and directly at the Pentagon West wall. Once again, discarding these testimonies as seriously flawed is academic overkill, unless one can show that the witness is lying altogether.

Donald Rumsfeld's and Lee Evey's Testimony

Fletcher and Eastman state¹⁰¹ that my paper avoids the “incoherence and incredibility of the explanations provided by Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and other Pentagon spokespersons.” They quote Rumsfeld and Lee Evey, program manager for the Pentagon Renovation Project.

⁹⁸ John D. Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: ...,” December, 2011, (*Category I*, p.7)

⁹⁹ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p. 14

¹⁰⁰ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, page 14, footnote 35

¹⁰¹ Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p,15, footnote 40

Since Rumsfeld and Evey were probably quoting the observations of others, they seem unsuitable witnesses to begin with, and best to avoid on the plane nose dispute. I agree with Fletcher and Eastman that the fragile nose of a Boeing 757 did not create the C ring hole. However, there is some truth in a portion of Rumsfeld's statement, that the plane came in "between about the first and second floor," since the second floor slab was knocked out for about 80 feet while most damage/debris occurred in the first floor through which the lower, heavier portion of the fuselage traveled. Evey's account also is accurate as to the penetration of the E and C rings. There were no D ring walls to penetrate in the first floor, a fact that still escapes many writers in the truth movement.

Rumsfeld's and Evey's statements are not so incoherent and incredible as Fletcher and Eastman make out. But my ignoring of them does not affect the conclusions in my paper. It is possible that witnesses who stated that they saw parts of the nose cone may have been mistaken as to the nature of these parts. For further discussion, see "The C Ring Hole" in appendix B, *David Griffin's Contradictions of the 757 Theory*.

Plane Geometry from Low Wall/Generator Collision

In their letter, Fletcher and Eastman suggest¹⁰² that the distances in my appendix C are in error, based on "analysis of the photographic evidence." This relates to the plane geometry as deduced from the low wall and generator collision evidence. However, there is nothing about this subject in the reference (footnote 42) that Fletcher and Eastman provide. Frank Legge has informed me that, according to one of the authors, the intended, correct reference is to a new book by Barbara Honegger.¹⁰³

Without any substantiation of the contrary "photographic evidence," this claim cannot be responded to at this time. In contrast there is ample photographic evidence that the generator would initially have been in a position to be struck by the right hand engine.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Fletcher and Eastman Reply, p,17

¹⁰³ Frank Legge, private communication, January 10, 2013. The book is titled, "Behind the Smoke Curtain: The Pentagon Attacked Itself on 9/11." A web search on this date reveals a talk of the same name by Honegger, but no mention of a book.

¹⁰⁴ John D. Wyndham, "The Pentagon Attack: ...," December, 2011, p. 13

Appendix B

David Griffin's Contradictions of the 757 Theory

Frank Legge, in a letter¹⁰⁵ to the Journal of 9/11 Studies, has already responded to David Griffin's Chapter 7.¹⁰⁶ He shows that the flight path and other evidence render the "no plane" theory highly improbable if not impossible. In this way, Legge has already dealt with some of the issues discussed here.

In his Chapter 7, David Griffin begins his discussion of the eyewitness and physical evidence that, to him, raise doubts about the official story (impact by AA 77) with this statement: "...I am more impressed by the places where the evidence for the official story falls down..." However, just as Griffin has failed to show that the eyewitness evidence "falls down," so also does he fail to show that the physical evidence falls down

In his chapter, Griffin sets out a series of 12 arguments¹⁰⁷ involving physical evidence against the "757 theory." Since only a few of these arguments involve the plane's probable identity as AA Flight 77, these arguments apply equally as well to the large plane impact theory discussed in my paper.

The following discussion takes each of these arguments or "contradictions" in order, and shows that none of them provide any serious obstacle for the large plane impact theory. The arguments are contained in Griffin's three sections: *False Claims Supporting the 757 Theory*, *Physical Evidence That Suggests the Falsity of the 757 Claim*, and *Additional Reason for Skepticism ... Attack at 9:31*.

"False Claims Supporting the 757 Theory"

Videos Purportedly Showing 757 Hitting Pentagon: Citing the work of Italian film-maker Massimo Mazzucco, Griffin concludes that the 5-frame video taken in the Pentagon parking lot has been intentionally altered. This contention was mentioned in my paper in appendix A, along with other disputed, unresolved, or inapplicable issues. Griffin's conclusion that these videos have "nothing to show that the Pentagon was struck by a Boeing 757" is not compelling evidence against large plane impact.

Status: Unresolved evidence not used for my conclusions on large plane impact. Unlikely to ever "prove" anything, even if the videos can be fully authenticated. One frame shows what looks like the tail of a large plane. The plane body appears to be hidden behind a metal box. The tail-like object is gone in the next frame.

Phone Calls from Barbara Olson: Griffin concludes that the Barbara Olson calls from AA Flight 77 were faked, and thus provide no evidence that AA 77 hit the Pentagon or

¹⁰⁵ Frank Legge, "The 9/11 Attack on the Pentagon: the Search for Consensus," June, 2012
<http://www.journalof911studies.com/resources/Legge-Letter-June.pdf>

¹⁰⁶ David Ray Griffin, "9/11 Ten Years Later," Chapter 7, Olive Branch Press, 2011

¹⁰⁷ David Ray Griffin, "9/11 Ten Years Later," Chapter 7, pages 182-196, Olive Branch Press, 2011

was even aloft after it disappeared from radar at 8:56 am. This conclusion is widely disputed by other researchers such as Erik Larson.¹⁰⁸ Either way, this is not evidence for or against large plane impact since the calls do not indicate the flight path.

Griffin admits the presence of an aircraft that made a “three-plus-minute downward spiral” but excludes it (“no reason to think”) as a Boeing 757 because of the air traffic controller comments. What the controller’s comments imply is an unresolved issue that is clearly contradicted by the many eyewitnesses to the approaching large plane, including the pilot of the C130 who had been instructed to follow and identify the plane.

Status: Disputed evidence relevant to plane identity and type and the hijacker story, and not used for my conclusions on large plane impact.

The C Ring Hole: Griffin’s treatment here of the C ring hole deals only with the Rumsfeld-Evey statements in the first few days after 9/11, that the plane nose had broken through the wall and was in the A-E driveway. No official document endorsed this claim, as Griffin points out, since the nose is too fragile and probably disintegrated on impact. However, Griffin takes the opportunity here to suggest Rumsfeld and Evey were lying. Since these individuals were probably not eyewitnesses to what they described, it seems more likely they were relating the unclear accounts of others. Confusion about the plane nose whereabouts is not evidence for or against large plane impact.

Status: Disputed testimony, and relevant to the large plane impact theory only if it can be established that parts of the plane nose did reach the A-E driveway. Other plane parts were clearly present in the A-E driveway. Not used when reaching conclusions in my paper.

“Physical Evidence That Suggests the Falsity of the 757 Claim”

Debris Deficit: This “contradiction” revolves around a significant error, namely, that about “100 tons”¹⁰⁹ of plane debris should have been collected from the site. The weight of an empty Boeing 757-200, such as was presumably used for AA Flight 77, is only 64 tons.³³ This weight does not include fuel, all of which is thought to have burned up, and the passengers, crew, and cargo.

Significant large or heavy parts, such as the engines, were seen by some witnesses outside the building. Ample fragmented plane parts were photographed and videoed in front of the Pentagon. Fires may have consumed some of the plane. The Pentagon interior impacted area is very large, large enough to obscure fragmented plane parts among the rubble from offices. Without a detailed and independent inspection of the rubble removed from the site, there is no way to evaluate the actual amount of recovered plane debris.

¹⁰⁸ <http://911reports.wordpress.com/2011/02/11/critique-of-david-ray-griffin-911-fake-calls-theory/>

¹⁰⁹ David Ray Griffin, “9/11 Ten Years Later,” Chapter 7, p.188, Olive Branch Press, 2011

Status: A conjecture based on an erroneous plane weight, impossible to further evaluate at this time and unlikely to affect the large plane impact theory, especially in view of the reduced weight of expected plane debris.

Videos: Regarding the 85 videos that might show what happened at the Pentagon but were confiscated by the government, Griffin asks basically two questions: (1) “Is it believable that ...none would give a clearer idea of what did and did not hit the Pentagon than the few frames that have been released?” (2) “Can we believe that the government would not release them if they supported its story?”

(1): Depending on the location and pointing direction of a camera and its frame rate (probably 1 second or greater), cameras may have been unable to capture an event that occurred in a fraction of a second. How many of the 85 cameras were pointing in the right direction? Were they all operating? This question is open and requires further data and study, but the answer to Griffin’s question is very possibly “Yes.”

(2): Given the fact that no 9/11 planes were reconstructed or identified from their parts with serial numbers, it is not surprising that the videos were not released. The government has not tried to prove its story. Release of evidence might inadvertently undermine the hijacker story. Suppose the videos were released and showed nothing. This might not be proof that a large plane did not impact, as explained in (1). If the videos did support plane impact, why would the government release evidence that settles an argument among its severest critics, an argument that undermines those critics’ credibility and ability to come together in unified, purposeful opposition? Again, the answer to Griffin’s question is likely “Yes.”

Status: Unresolved, but likely only to support the small or large plane impact theories. The small plane theory is highly unlikely for other reasons explained in my original paper. It is a mistake to assume that the government is lying about Boeing 757 impact because it refuses to release the videos.

Time-Change Parts: Since no time-change parts have been released for any of the 9/11 planes, this is not evidence against the 757 or large plane theory. If such were to be released, critics could still claim deception on the government’s part.

Status: Irrelevant to the discussion at this time.

Flight Data Recorder: As explained previously, this evidence was not used in reaching the conclusions in my paper about large plane impact. Resolving the issues of creation time, discovery location, and so on could help to vindicate the authenticity of the FDR data as analyzed by Legge and Stutt.⁹²

Status: Applicable to plane identity, but does not affect the large plane impact theory except that the FDR data, if vindicated, would demolish the no plane theory.

Fires: Griffin’s “contradiction” here is that there were too few fires. Just how many fires should have been ignited by the exploding jet fuel is a complex and difficult question. Only a portion of the fuel is thought to have entered the building. Several witnesses testified to fireballs coursing through the interior. Contrary to the words of Ralph Omholt quoted by Griffin, the plane was carrying less than half of its full fuel capacity. Griffin’s conclusion, that there is a “disconnect between the official theory and the empirical evidence” is highly speculative and unproven.¹¹⁰

Status: Speculative and unproven criticism.

Seismic Evidence: Griffin writes after quoting a previous book: “[The absence of a detectable seismic signal at the Pentagon] seemed to me strong evidence that the Pentagon had not been struck by a Boeing 757.” Considering the complexities involved, including considerations involving the nature of the building and the earth’s internal structure, this statement is not credible from a scientific point of view.

The absence of a seismic signal corresponding to a plane impact at the Pentagon was mentioned in my paper² in appendix A. Terry Wallace, a qualified seismologist quoted there and also by Griffin, calculated that the signal generated would be below the noise levels of the nearest recording stations.

Despite this input from a seismologist, Griffin continues to speculate by comparison with the WTC buildings, and concludes that an airliner hitting the Pentagon “should have produced seismic signals.” There is no basis, scientific or otherwise, for his speculation.

Status: The absence of a signal is not evidence against large plane impact, especially as a seismologist calculated that no seismic signal was expected.

Bodies from the Plane: In this section Griffin speculates, without proof, on the handling of the Pentagon bodies and their autopsies. He presents no evidence that suggests the “falsity of the 757 claim” or the large plane impact theory.

Status: This section fails to indicate anything about the 757 or large plane impact theories. In contrast, there are eyewitnesses (for example, Army Staff Sgt. Mark Williams) who saw bodies strapped into airplane seats.¹¹¹

The Five Lamp Poles: Griffin presents criticisms such as: poles “torn out of the ground”¹⁴ “would surely have skidded over the lawn, creating gouges in it”; hitting the poles might have caused the airliner to go “off course”; the “lamp poles appear to be cut at the base.”¹¹² These criticisms are all highly speculative and unsupported by experience or scientific analysis. See also the discussion of this issue by Frank Legge.¹⁰⁵

¹¹⁰ See http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/pentagon/official/asce_pentagon.pdf, pages 12 and 36

¹¹¹ <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/sept01/2001-09-14-pentagon-usat.htm#more>

¹¹² For a photo of a downed pole and a standing pole on a concrete base (top, right), see <http://img35.imageshack.us/img35/650/pole5.jpg>. See also *Russell’s Two Main Doubts* in the section “Eyewitness Testimony to Plane Impact.”

The poles were bent, broken, and pinched in a manner that is consistent with the high-speed impact of a blunt object such as a plane wing. The damage at the bases appears consistent with what might happen if the impact caused the poles to try to rotate about the metal base, given that poles are designed to break off as a road-safety feature.¹¹³ Such rotation would break the pole at the base but not necessarily send it skidding across the lawn. Because of the plane's considerable momentum and large mass compared with the mass of the light poles, any modification to the plane's trajectory would be unlikely to show up in the few hundred feet before impact.

There are a large number of witnesses who saw the poles impacted. Adding to this is the difficulty of staging the broken poles without being detected. Griffin's criticisms produce many more difficulties than they solve. Staging the broken poles, on and near the highway in broad daylight, also implies that the low wall/generator damage, the façade damage, the interior column damage and debris, and the C ring hole damage and debris were all staged in real time (the pole damaging the taxi could not have happened during the night – see appendix C) according to a selected hypothetical flight path from which little deviation (for example, in the case of the poles) was allowed.

The hypothesis that the poles' damage was caused by means other than large plane impact has consequences that raise serious difficulties. By failing to address these difficulties, the criticisms also fail.

Status: Highly speculative and unproven criticism with unaddressed consequences.

“Additional Reason for Skepticism ...”

Attack at 9:31: Griffin rehearses some of Barbara Honegger's evidence for an event time around 9:32 am as compared with the official *time* of 9:37:45 am. This was discussed earlier in *The Event Time* (“stopped clocks”), section *Previously Unaddressed Issues*.

This claim has now been fully dealt with in my paper *The Pentagon Attack: The Event Time Revisited*.⁵⁹ This paper compares the clocks' evidence for the Pentagon event time compiled by Barbara Honegger²⁷ with the evidence compiled by Adam Larson,¹¹⁴ and shows that Adam Larson's evidence, unlike Honegger's, is much more credible since

¹¹³ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Street_light, See section “Dangers.”

¹¹⁴ Adam Larson, “Part 1: The Elastic Timeline” Nov 2007
<http://frustratingfraud.blogspot.com/2007/11/pentagon-attack-timeline-questions-part.html>,
“Part2: Another Six Back?” Nov 2007
<http://frustratingfraud.blogspot.com/2007/11/another-six-back.html>
“Part 3: 9:32 Evidence Addressed” December 2007
<http://frustratingfraud.blogspot.com/2007/12/932-event-evidence-addressed.html>
“Part 3: Overwhelming Evidence for 9:38” August 2008
<http://frustratingfraud.blogspot.com/2008/08/overwhelming-evidence-for-938.html>

much of it does not depend on timepieces whose settings cannot be verified to have been correct.

The paper then shows, by experiments with clocks virtually identical to the clock which fell off the Heliport wall that the minute hand can easily move back because of the abrupt deceleration that occurs when the clock hits the ground. This renders the “stopped clocks” evidence untrustworthy. Also, there is a third stopped clock in addition to the two presented by Honegger, and this clock stopped at 09:36:27 am, a time much closer to the official time of plane impact.

Status: An event time around 9:32 am is contrary to the evidence. The “stopped clocks” evidence is untrustworthy as shown by experiment. In any case, this evidence was not used in reaching the conclusions in my paper. The best evidence points to an event time close to the official time of 9:37:45 am.

Summary of Griffin’s Contradictions

None of Griffin’s “contradictions” in his chapter 7 appreciably affect the large plane impact theory. All have reasonable explanations within the context of this theory. Those involving physical evidence are unresolved, inapplicable, untenable or disproved. Griffin’s attempt to discredit the eyewitnesses to impact and throw doubt on aspects of the physical evidence is not persuasive. By way of contrast, his treatment of other issues, such as those related to Wedge 1 as the target,¹¹⁵ have genuine merit.

In his last book, Griffin moved to some degree away from the “no plane” theory toward the work of Frank Legge, David Chandler, Jim Hoffman and others who infer plane impact. Since Griffin’s books have had an immense influence on creating public awareness of the problems with other parts of the official story of 9/11, it is to be hoped that Griffin will continue to reassess his position on the Pentagon in the light of recent work by scientists.

¹¹⁵ David Ray Griffin, “9/11 Ten Years Later,” Chapter 7, p. 157-167, Olive Branch Press, 2011

Appendix C

The Testimony of Taxi Driver Lloyd England

While the Citizen Investigation Team (CIT)¹¹⁶ members have endeavored to uncover the truth about 9/11 in order to bring the perpetrators to justice, their methods and arguments are inferior and inadequate for the task. Their attempts to lead a witness and even distort the witness testimony have been well documented, as in the case of Craig Ranke's interview of Albert Hemphill.¹¹⁷ This behavior not only lacks scientific integrity, it is unethical by any standards. However, CIT's treatment (see video - times quoted below relate to the video referenced here)¹¹⁸ of the taxi driver, Lloyd England, goes well beyond a lack of ethics to the libelous persecution of an inoffensive man.

According to England, he was driving his taxi by the Pentagon on 9/11 when a highway light pole was struck by the low-flying airliner, torn from its base, and sent crashing through his windshield. Photographs of England, his taxi, and the light pole (designated as pole #1 of the five that were struck) are well known to researchers. England stated that the pole, about 30 feet in length with the top portion and light fixture missing, pierced the windshield and lightly penetrated the back seat. CIT has taken photographs of the back seat puncture. Photographs¹¹⁹ taken on 9/11 show an irregular hole about a foot in diameter in the middle of the windshield close to the dashboard. England further stated that a stranger helped him remove the pole from the taxi and lay it on the highway. The top portion of the pole was apparently severed and can be seen in the background in the fast lane some distance away.

CIT and others have leveled a number of criticisms at England and his testimony:

- Why would England have removed the pole under the circumstances?
- How could he and another person have managed the removal of a heavy pole?
- Why are there no scratches on the taxi's hood?

Plausible answers to the above are: England's reaction was normal – the pole did not belong in his taxi; the pole remnant weighed little more than 200 pounds, since according to CIT the entire pole weighed only 247 pounds;¹²⁰ the pole traveled with some rotation so that the top, broken end speared the windshield and stuck itself in the back seat, securing that end enough so that the dashboard was able to support the pole sticking out of the windshield without scratching the hood. England's rough drawing (video at 3:31) illustrates this scenario.

¹¹⁶ <http://www.citizeninvestigationteam.com/>

¹¹⁷ See Legge and Chandler, http://stj911.org/legge/Legge_Chandler_NOC_Refutation.html

¹¹⁸ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=crvWTg-Lb6U>. This video contains large portions of the videos "Deconstructing the Pentagon Attack" by CIT. Times given are from this referenced video.

¹¹⁹ See <http://scienceof911.com.au/pentagon/> for a photo of the taxi and light pole parts.

¹²⁰ Information that CIT obtained from the Virginia Department of Transportation (see video at 2:50).

However, CIT claims that the plane flew north of the Citgo gas station and could not have caused the damage to the light poles. Their theory is that the poles were damaged before the Pentagon event occurred by persons unknown and then placed on 9/11 so as to mislead the world into thinking that a large airliner had struck the Pentagon when in fact the airliner flew over the building. Their theory has been dealt with elsewhere¹¹⁷ and is disputed by a large number of witnesses who saw the plane hit the light poles and impact the Pentagon, and by the FDR, radar and other data that rule out a north of Citgo path. Nevertheless, CIT claims that England is lying about the whole episode!

CIT's theory is that the light poles were dismantled and broken before the event at the Pentagon. Light pole #1 in particular was hidden or unnoticed until persons unknown brought the parts and fragments to the highway and distributed them in broad daylight. At the same time, England arrived in his taxi at the scene precisely on time to allow the co-conspirators to make a hole in the windshield of his taxi and a puncture hole in the back seat. All of this activity, according to CIT, happened in broad daylight with many other cars and witnesses nearby. CIT's theory is unbelievable and borders on the farcical.

CIT interviewed England in person in June 2008, at times deceptively recording him without his knowledge. England took the CIT personnel to his home and showed them the damaged taxi. England traveled the highway outside the Pentagon with CIT, but was clearly confused and mistaken about the location of his taxi and the downed light pole on 9/11. Based on England's confusion about the location almost seven years after the event, on the fact that England's wife, Shirley Hughes, worked for the FBI (apparently as a cleaner), and on some unclear statements made by England during the interview, CIT concluded that England had all but admitted that he was part of a plot to deceive the public and that England had taken part in an elaborate scheme involving the staged placement of light pole #1 on the highway in broad daylight. By publishing this ridiculous and hurtful conclusion on their website, CIT reveals more about itself than it does about the truth of the matter.

England's confusion about location seems genuinely connected with the passage of time and the fact that he had not seen any of the photographs so familiar to those in the truth movement. When unaware of his being recorded by CIT, England stated that a person he later learned was a neighbor was on the "bridge" and took photos of the pole and taxi. Later CIT claims he denied this by questioning the location. But England seems simply to fail to mention the bridge again while at the same time he took CIT to the neighbor's house to get the photographs. CIT's actual claim of conspiracy on England's part comes from some of his statements that occur in the following pieces of dialog¹²¹ (13:45 to 15:00 in the video):

"It's not the truth, it's his story!"

"...this is a world thing happening, I'm a small man."

"I'm not supposed to be involved in this."

"This is for other people. People who have money ..."

¹²¹ <http://scott3x.tripod.com/transcripts/eye/>

“When people do things and get away with it, you- eventually it's going to come to me. And when it comes to me it's going to be so big I can't do nothing about it. So it has to be stopped in the beginning when it's small.” “You see to keep it from spreading.”

It's never clear whether England believes the official story of 9/11 or not. But all of these statements by England, and the ones below, are perfectly understandable in the context of someone who reads books by David Icke¹²² (one such book was in the taxi) and even attends classes on these books. England stated this when conversing with Craig Ranke of CIT: “I was going to a class every week. We were dealing with stuff like this. I mean, it was a surprise to me that it happened to me.”¹²³

In a conversation string, CIT attempts on two occasions to put words in England's mouth, but England avoids each attempt (my comments are in italics):

Lloyde: This is for them. [*Speaking of people with money*]

CIT: Meaning they're doing it for their own reasons.

Lloyde: That's right. I'm not supposed to be in it. [*He was there purely by chance*]

CIT: But they used you, right? [*CIT tries to trap him*]

Lloyde: I'm in it. [*He avoids the trap. He's in it (involved) only by chance*]

CIT: You're in it.

Lloyde: Yeah, we came across, across the highway together.

CIT: You and their event.

Lloyde: That's right. [*The plane and his taxi came across the highway at the same time.*]

CIT: But they must have planned that.

Lloyde: It was planned. [*Clearly 9/11 was planned, even according to the official story*]

CIT: They meant for you to be there didn't they? [*Another trap.*]

Lloyde: No. They didn't mean for me to be there. [***Denies involvement in any plot.***]

Lloyde: You know what history is? Just what I said you gotta understand what you are saying. History is his story.

CIT: Absolutely.

Lloyde: It's not the truth, it's his story! It has nothing to do with the truth, it's his story!

If “they” did not mean for him to be there, how could he and his taxi be part of a plot? Nevertheless, based on the above statements and despite England's denial, CIT concludes that “***Lloyde in essence admitted his involvement in the 9/11 black operation ...***”.

CIT's analysis and conclusion have no basis whatsoever. These researchers do not know the difference between cobblestones and field stones or stones from a quarry.¹²⁴ They do

¹²² David Icke is an author and speaker with a large following. One of his books, “Children of the Matrix,” was published April 1, 2001, and is described on the Amazon website in this way: “The publisher claims that we are born into a world controlled by unseen forces that have plagued and manipulated humanity for thousands of years. David Icke exposes these forces and their methods of human control and he claims to reveal a fantastic web of global manipulation, orchestrated by forces beyond this physical realm.” See <http://www.amazon.com/Children-Matrix-Interdimensional-Controlled-Years/dp/0953881016>

¹²³ http://scott3x.tripod.com/transcripts/eye/david_icke.html

¹²⁴ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=crvWTg-Lb6U>. See 8:47, 10:08, 12:44, 12:58, 13:08, 13:18, 14:57

not know that a suit includes a jacket.¹²⁵ They readily jump to false conclusions that are defamatory to England, but are unaware that they are revealing more about their own lack of competence and suitability for the job at hand. If England had been involved in the plot they envision, would he realistically be speaking with them at all? CIT never seems to consider the obvious, let alone the possible consequences for England and themselves if its conjecture is true.

The taxi cab was England's source of income. There is no evidence that England profited in any way from the loss of his taxi or from his supposed involvement in an intricate staged event. All the evidence about England himself points to him as being a simple man of modest means rather than an "elite insider." The CIT researchers set out to discover the truth about 9/11, but their inferior methods and lack of good judgment amply fulfill Friedrich Nietzsche's words: "The most perfidious way of harming a cause consists of defending it deliberately with faulty arguments."¹²⁶ There is nothing wrong with England's testimony. The same cannot be said for its analysis by CIT. Nevertheless, in spite of its flawed analysis, CIT's investigations inadvertently uncovered some useful evidence that supports large plane impact, an example being the hole in the back seat of England's taxi and England's drawing of how the light pole was stuck there without damaging the hood.

Lloyde England's testimony and the accompanying physical evidence that a low-flying airliner hit a light pole and sent it through the windshield of his taxi cab are very strong evidence in support of the plane impact theory. Arguments aimed at discrediting this testimony and the witness seem to arise out of an attempt to sustain CIT's own theory of a flight path north of the Citgo gas station, a theory that is not supported by the physical evidence or the great majority of eye witnesses.

¹²⁵ http://www.citizeninvestigationteam.com/faq-staged_light_poles.html

¹²⁶ Friedrich Nietzsche "The Gay Science," section 191, German philosopher (1844 - 1900).

Appendix D

Pentagon Eyewitness Evidence Summaries

Russell's "31 Explicit" Eyewitnesses to Impact

Jerry Russell's analysis⁶ and summary⁵ of his "31 explicit" witnesses to plane impact reveal certain inconsistencies. Russell gives the following definition of "elite insiders":

Elite Insiders: "highly placed military officers, government officials, media officials, or employees of the Pentagon renovation team and security staff"

His summary states that 'Out of the 31 explicit witnesses, 13 had what I would consider "deep" insider connections, while 24 of 31 worked for either the Federal Government or the mainstream media.'

In his analysis, Russell explicitly identifies only 6 "elite insiders" so that we are left to conjecture as to the identity of the remaining 7 of the 13. In table 1, those explicitly identified by Russell as "elite insiders" have a plus sign ("+") following the word YES. In attempting to reach the number 13, this author omitted Lagasse and Sepulveda as not being "security staff" or "highly placed military officers" even though Lagasse might qualify as an insider under security staff. Reporters and journalists (4 in all) were included as part of Russell's "elite insiders," even though these do not qualify in the author's opinion as "media officials." In following Russell's definition in this way, the author identified 14 "elite insiders" rather than 13. See Table 1.

The author's own count of "elite insiders" excludes reporters and journalists as not being media officials because they seem to lack significantly high positions. His count excludes Bright and Morin as not being "elite" or not falling within Russell's definition, but it does include Bauer as a PNAC signer. The author's count of "elite insiders" is 9 rather than Russell's 13.

In identifying those working for the Federal Government or mainstream media, (M) was used to denote mainstream media, and (G) to denote government employment. The author's count of those with (M) and (G) affiliations is only 19, rather than Russell's 24.

In addition to these discrepancies in the numbers, a further problem with Russell's "31 explicit" witnesses is that three (3) are NOT eyewitnesses to impact at all, but are reporting the testimonies of others. This seems unacceptable when one realizes that the 3 non-eyewitnesses (Day, Evey, and Singleton) are all "elite insiders" by Russell's definition. As shown previously, Russell has excluded for spurious reasons at least three perfectly good eyewitnesses to impact who were not "elite insiders." But he *has* included three non-eyewitnesses who add to his count of "elite insiders!" Russell's choices undermine his credibility and his "elite insider" hypothesis because of perceived bias.

Table 1
Russells’ “31 Explicit” Witnesses to Impact

Witness (all eyewitnesses except for 3)	Employment or Affiliations	“Elite Insider”(Russell)	“Elite Insider” (author)
Steve Anderson	Reporter for USA Today (M)	YES	NO
Battle	Pentagon office worker (G)	NO	NO
Gary Bauer	Republican, former presidential candidate (2000), PNAC signatory	NO	YES
Sean Boger	Air Traffic Controller and Pentagon tower chief (G)	YES+	YES
Mark Bright	Pentagon Mall entrance guard (G)	YES+	NO
Dan Creed	Oracle software	NO	NO
Wayne T. Day	President Kirlin Inc., Wedge 1 mech. Subcontractor (not an eyewitness) (G)	YES	YES
Michael DiPaula	Project coordinator Pentagon Renovation Team (G)	YES+	YES
Col. Bruce Elliott	Former ammunition plant official reassigned to the Pentagon in July (G)	YES	YES
Walker Lee Evey	Pentagon's manager for the renovation project (not an eyewitness) (G)	YES+	YES
Ken Ford	State Department employee (G)	NO	NO
Kat Gaines	Heading south on Route 110	NO	NO
Afework Hagos	Computer programmer	NO	NO
Albert Hemphill	Present for meeting with the Director of the BMDO in the Secure Conference Room (G)	NO	NO
Terrance Kean	Lives in a 14-story building nearby	NO	NO
Sgt. William Lagasse	Pentagon police dog handler (G)	NO	NO
Major Lincoln Liebner	(G)	YES+	YES
David Marra	Information-technology specialist	NO	NO

Father Stephen McGraw	Opus Dei priest and former Justice Department attorney	NO	NO
K.M	Citizen, Pentagon City, USA	NO	NO
Terry Morin	Program Manager for SPARTA, Inc - "an elite high-tech military contracting organization" (G)	YES+	NO
Christopher Munsey	Citizen	NO	NO
Vin Narayanan	Reporter at USA TODAY (M)	YES	NO
Mary Ann Owens	Journalist with Gannett News Service (M)	YES	NO
Steve Patterson	Lives in Pentagon City, graphics design	NO	NO
Christine Peterson	Lives in Washington DC 28 years	NO	NO
Frank Probst	Pentagon renovation worker and retired Army lieutenant colonel (G)	YES	YES
James S Robbins	National-security analyst & 'nationalreviewonline' contributor (M)	YES	NO
Noel Sepulveda	Master Sgt. at Pentagon for a meeting (G)	NO	NO
Jack Singleton	President Singleton Electric Co. Inc., Gaithersburg MD, the Wedge One electrical subcontractor (not an eyewitness) (G)	YES	YES
Tim Timmerman	Pilot	NO	NO

- + “elite insider” explicitly identified as such by Russell
- G worked for Federal Government
- M worked for mainstream media

This author finds that less than a third of the 31 witnesses were “elite insiders” and only 61% were employed by mainstream media or the government. This contrasts with Griffin’s finding of “almost half” and “77 percent” respectively.

David Griffin's Discussion of the Eyewitnesses

In his book, *9/11 Ten Years Later*, pages 173-183, Griffin discusses specific eyewitnesses. This section examines his choice and treatment of those witnesses. Table 2 lists each eyewitness in the order in which Griffin presents them, together with Griffin's analysis and conclusion and the author's analysis and conclusion.

Table 2
Discussion of Griffin's Eyewitnesses

Eyewitness	Griffin's Analysis and Conclusion	Author's Analysis and Conclusion
Steve Anderson	Witness stated the plane's wing "drug" along the ground but lawn was unscathed. Untrustworthy.	Inaccurate detail and poor language, but the plane was too low to avoid impact. Trustworthy impact witness.
Frank Probst	Witness stated the plane's engine passed by him "six feet away" but, if true, the turbulence would have made him a victim. Untrustworthy.	The witness may have misjudged the distance but the fact he ducked meant the plane was too low to avoid impact. Turbulence effect unproven. Trustworthy impact witness.
Jamie McIntyre	Saw only very small plane pieces up to three feet long. Weights against a large plane.	The plane was mostly fragmented, but there were larger pieces in other locations. He reported the "huge gaping hole" in the Pentagon wall. Supports plane impact.
John McWethy	Saw no plane wreckage inside the Pentagon. [Implies no plane]	There was lots of building and furniture debris inside. Others did see plane wreckage inside. Contradicted by other witnesses..
Karen Kwiatkowski	Saw no airplane metal or cargo on lawn. [Implies no plane]	Plane "confetti" was difficult to recognize as such. Many other witnesses saw airplane metal. Contradicted by other witnesses.
Sgt. Reginald Powell	Saw no plane, nothing left from plane. Plane must have disintegrated. [Implies no plane]	Plane "confetti" was difficult to recognize as such. Many other witnesses saw airplane metal. Contradicted by other witnesses
Naval Officer Sheryl Alleger	Could not see any bits of airplane. [Implies no plane]	Plane "confetti" was difficult to recognize as such. Many other witnesses saw airplane metal. Contradicted by other witnesses

Registered Nurse Eileen Murphy	“The plane wasn’t there.” [Implies no plane]	Plane “confetti” was difficult to recognize as such. Many other witnesses saw airplane metal. Contradicted by other witnesses
Will Jarvis	“There was just nothing left.” [Implies no plane]	Plane “confetti” was difficult to recognize as such. Many other witnesses saw airplane metal. Contradicted by other witnesses
April Gallop U.S.Army	Gallop pushed computer button and there was a loud boom. Saw no evidence of a plane. [Implies no plane]	Gallop originally said the boom occurred <i>before</i> she pushed the button. Many others saw plane debris. Questionable testimony that is contradicted by other witnesses.
Mary Ann Owens	Stated that left wing scraped the helicopter area, but the lawn was not marred. Testimony disproved.	Inaccurate detail, but the plane was too low to avoid impact. Trustworthy impact witness.
David Marra	Stated the wing touched the helicopter pad and cartwheeled into the Pentagon, but the lawn was not marred. Testimony disproved.	Inaccurate detail and poor language, but the plane was too low to avoid impact. Trustworthy impact witness.
Tim Timmerman	Stated the plane hit the ground in front of the building, but the lawn was not marred. Testimony disproved.	Inaccurate detail, but the plane was too low to avoid impact. Trustworthy impact witness.
Major Lincoln Liebner	Plane completely entered the building, like a toy into a birthday cake. As a set with Narayana’s testimony, it is discredited by being mutually contradictory.	There is nothing contradictory about Liebner’s and Naryanan’s testimonies. The plane went into the building without appreciable resistance. Trustworthy impact witness
Vin Narayanan	The plane hit at ferocious speed, but the wall held up like a champ and barely budged. As a set with Liebner’s testimony, it is: discredited by being mutually contradictory.	There is nothing contradictory about Liebner’s and Naryanan’s testimonies. The plane, by implication, went into the building at high speed and the wall remained in place [but only for about another 30 minutes]. Trustworthy impact witness
Brian Ladd, Firefighter	Saw millions of tiny pieces of debris everywhere. [Implies no plane]	The plane was mostly fragmented, but there were larger pieces in other locations. Supports plane impact.

Captain Dennis Gilroy, Firefighter	Saw no aircraft parts. [Implies no plane]	Plane “confetti” was difficult to recognize as such. Many other witnesses saw airplane metal. Contradicted by other witnesses
Captain John Durer, Firefighter	Saw no aircraft parts. [Implies no plane]	Plane “confetti” was difficult to recognize as such. Many other witnesses saw airplane metal. Contradicted by other witnesses
Ed Plaughter, Fire Chief	One day after the event, said he saw only small pieces of the airplane, not large sections. Eight months later, said he saw identifiable plane parts. Suspected to have changed earlier testimony.	Could Plaughter have seen the identifiable parts on the second day after the event? In either case he: Supports plane impact.
Major Dean Eckmann, F-16 pilot	Saw no airplane wreckage during flyover in an F-16. [Implies no plane]	Plane “confetti” was difficult to recognize as such even for those on the ground. There were very few large parts to be seen, especially by someone speeding by at a distance. Contradicted by other witnesses
Keith Bohn, helicopter pilot	Saw a small slit in wall and small pieces of rubble but no aviation parts. [Implies no plane]	Plane “confetti” was difficult to recognize as such. Many other witnesses saw airplane metal. Contradicted by other witnesses
Ronald Alan Galey, helicopter pilot	Saw no aircraft part, but saw downed light poles. [Implies no plane]	Plane “confetti” was difficult to recognize as such. Many other witnesses saw airplane metal. Contradicted by other witnesses
Judy Rothschadl	Inside building saw no seats or luggage [Implies no plane]	There was lots of building and furniture debris inside. Others did see plane wreckage inside. Contradicted by other witnesses
Steve DeChiaro	Saw small hole in building, but no tail or wings. [Implies no plane]	Plane “confetti” was difficult to recognize as such. Many other witnesses saw airplane metal. Contradicted by other witnesses
Scott Cook and boss Ray	Had a view of the Pentagon from a conference room. Kept their eyes on the landscape and on the TV set. Suddenly saw the Pentagon had been struck. [Implies no plane]	The plane might have been in their view for only a second or two, during which time they might have been watching TV. Contradicted by other witnesses
Victor Correa, Army Lt. Colonel	Saw holes, inferred bombs. [Implies no plane]	Not a plane eyewitness. Contradicted by other witnesses

Lt. Nancy McKeown	Heard an explosion, inferred a bomb. [Implies no plane]	Not a plane eyewitness. Contradicted by other witnesses
Steve Vogel	Some thought a bomb had hit, not a plane. [Implies no plane]	Not a plane eyewitness. Contradicted by other witnesses
Michael J. Nielsen	Heard an explosion, reported others yelling “Bombs.” [Implies no plane]	Not a plane eyewitness. Contradicted by other witnesses
Don Perkal	Smelled cordite, heard people shouting “bomb.” [Implies no plane]	Not a plane eyewitness. Contradicted by other witnesses
Gilah Goldsmith	Heard whomp noise, saw black smoke, smelled cordite or gun smoke. [Implies no plane]	Not a plane eyewitness. Contradicted by other witnesses
Marine major	Saw heavy B ring damage, but plane did not travel past C ring. [Implies no plane]	Not a plane eyewitness. Contradicted by other witnesses
Robert Andrews	Saw bodies in the innermost A ring corridor, but plane did not travel past C ring. [Implies no plane]	Not a plane eyewitness. Contradicted by other witnesses

The information in Table 2 encompassing 33 witnesses can be briefly summarized by identifying several categories of witness, as follows:

- Seven (7) eyewitnesses saw plane impact. Griffin rejects these while the author accepts them.
- Two (2) eyewitnesses saw plane parts.
- Two (2) eyewitnesses saw small pieces of debris.
- Three (3) eyewitnesses saw no plane parts inside.
- Ten (10) eyewitnesses saw no plane parts outside.
- One (1) eyewitness did not see the plane.
- Eight (8) eyewitnesses heard explosions, smelled cordite or otherwise inferred a bomb.

Griffin rejects all 7 of the eyewitnesses to plane impact. Only 2 witnesses, according to Griffin, support plane impact, and these are the two who saw plane parts. The remaining 24 eyewitnesses saw nothing that would support plane impact, but many inferred bombs.

Based on his choice of eyewitnesses and their analysis, Griffin has arrived at an implicit conclusion: there was no plane impact, and that bombs/explosives were used to create the damage and debris. In his conclusion to the “Section on Witnesses,” Griffin states that the

“moral of this discussion is that ... witness testimony ... does not [provide overwhelming support for the 757 theory].” In arriving at this conclusion, Griffin has rejected valid testimonies to impact for spurious reasons and ignored dozens of other eyewitnesses to plane impact and plane debris, as well as photographic evidence of plane debris.

To better understand Griffin’s flawed result, let’s consider each of the witness categories in Table 2 in more detail.

Witnesses Who Saw Plane Impact

There are seven (7) eyewitnesses who reported that they saw a plane impact the Pentagon wall. These are: Anderson, Probst, Owens, Marra, Timmerman, Liebner and Narayanan. Griffin’s analysis is that these seven eyewitnesses are either “untrustworthy,” “disproved,” or “discredited.” Griffin’s reasoning is given in the table along with the author’s analysis and opposite conclusion, namely, that these are all “trustworthy” witnesses to plane impact. All are in agreement on the main and unambiguous observation that a plane impacted the pentagon.

Griffin’s dismissal of these eyewitnesses is in keeping with Jerry Russell’s doubts about discrepancies in witness details. Once again, it should be emphasized that completely discarding these testimonies because of questionable details on what witnesses perceived in a fraction of a second is not acceptable. One’s aim should be to discern the truth in the testimony, just as one discerns the truth in the statement that the “light poles were torn out of the ground.”

As Frank Legge²² and others^{4 19} have shown, there are at least 60 or more solid eyewitness testimonies to plane impact. Many of these testimonies are free of conflicting details or erroneous statements; they all agree that a large plane hit the Pentagon. Griffin has chosen a few testimonies that appear to have conflicts while ignoring a much greater body of eyewitness evidence for plane impact. However, in the author’s opinion, the seven testimonies chosen by Griffin provide solid evidence of plane impact.

Witnesses Who Saw Plane Parts

Griffin cites two (2) witnesses who saw plane parts, McIntyre and Plaughter. Both of these witnesses therefore support plane impact. However, McIntyre has been wrongly interpreted¹²⁷ as suggesting there was no plane, and Griffin suggests Plaughter’s later testimony is suspect.

There are dozens of other testimonies by those who saw plane parts, as well as photographs of small and large parts. None of these are mentioned by Griffin.

¹²⁷ <http://911blogger.com/news/2010-11-05/more-impossible-%E2%80%98eyewitness%E2%80%99-accounts-911-renaud-and-mcintyre>

Witnesses Who Saw Small pieces of Debris

These witnesses are Ladd and Bohn. Their observations are in accord with plane impact that fragmented the plane, especially in the case of Ladd who saw “millions of tiny pieces” spread “everywhere.” The plane “confetti” was not easy to recognize as belonging to a plane.

Witnesses Who Saw No Plane Wreckage Inside

Those witnesses cited by Griffin who saw no plane wreckage inside the building are McWethy, Gallop, and Rothschild. This is not surprising given the fragmentation of the plane that occurred and large amount of broken office furniture and building debris. The main part of this paper has already presented a number of witnesses who did see plane parts inside the building. The failure to observe something that has been seen by others is not strong evidence against its presence. Gallop’s failure to see plane parts is not surprising as there are witnesses who say she did not exit the building through the plane impact hole, as she later claimed.^{26 27}

Witnesses Who Saw No Plane Wreckage Outside

Griffin names ten (10) eyewitnesses who stated that they saw no plane wreckage outside the Pentagon. They are: Kwiatkowski, Powell, Alleger, Murphy, Jarvis, Gilroy, Durer, Eckmann, Galey, and DeChiaro. However, there are dozens of other testimonies by those who saw plane parts, as well as photographs of small and large parts. Once again, the failure to observe something that has been seen by others is not strong evidence against its presence

Witnesses Who Saw No Plane

Griffin quotes Scott Cook who was in a nearby building with a view of the Pentagon. Cook and his boss, Ray, were keeping an eye on the Pentagon as well as watching TV before the Pentagon was hit. It does not seem surprising that they missed seeing the plane since a distraction of only a second or two could have caused them to miss it. But the failure to see something is not strong evidence there was nothing to see.

Witnesses Who Inferred a Bomb

Griffin quotes eight (8) witnesses who heard an explosion or smelled cordite, or saw bodies and damage in areas beyond the C ring. None of these witnesses was in a position to see plane impact. Thus, their testimonies do not weigh against large plane impact.

As stated in my original paper and in this one, the large plane impact theory does not rule out the use of bombs in addition to plane impact. However, there is no evidence that bombs created the physical damage, such as downed light poles, low concrete wall and generator damage, façade damage, and the interior damage and debris that can be attributed to large plane impact.

Summary of Griffin's Eyewitness Evidence

In the many cases where Griffin's eyewitnesses failed to see plane parts, they are contradicted by other eyewitnesses who did see plane parts. The failure to observe or recognize plane debris when many others did is not strong evidence against the presence of plane debris. There are many reasons why a witness might not have seen or recognized plane parts, but those who did see provide strong evidence that such parts were present. In addition, there is indisputable photographic and video evidence of plane parts which clearly shows that the eyewitnesses who saw nothing are essentially not relevant to the discussion.

Griffin's choice of eyewitnesses appears to be highly selective in that it largely avoids plane impact witnesses and those who saw plane debris. Griffin finds unreasonable fault with the few plane impact witnesses that he does discuss. The net result is that his eyewitness analysis is far from satisfactory and clearly weighted in favor of the "no plane" theory.