

Calling for Consistency: Analyzing the Approach of Pentagon No-Planers vs. WTC No-Planers

Adam Taylor, B.Sc.

13 July 2022 (version 1)

Please name the three theories promoted by [Truth Movement] members that you think have been most damaging in terms of public perception of the movement. Rank them from most to least damaging.

- 1) No plane at Pentagon, 39%
- 2) No planes at WTC, 32%
- 3) Pod theory, 14%

—Truth Movement poll, 2007¹

Sit down before fact as a little child, be prepared to give up every preconceived notion, follow humbly wherever and to whatever abysses nature leads, or you shall learn nothing.

—Thomas Huxley²

A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on both sides of each question.

—Charles Darwin³

Abstract

A subset of those in the 9/11 Truth Movement maintain that no plane crashed into the Pentagon on September 11th, 2001, and provide any number of arguments to justify that conclusion. Conversely, many of these same individuals reject what they consider the more outlandish claim that planes did not strike the WTC Twin Towers that day. Here, we compare the claims made by proponents of both ideas, concluding that the arguments and evidence they present are of virtually the same quality – that neither idea is more outlandish than the other. As such, the author concludes that if Pentagon no-planers reject WTC no-plane arguments based on evidence and methodology, they must therefore also reject their preferred theory, if they wish to be consistent.

Introduction

The anomalies and inconsistencies regarding the mainstream account of the 9/11 attacks are vast, encompassing a wide variety of topics.⁴ These include the geo-political aspects of the attacks,⁵ and physical anomalies surrounding the collapse of the Twin Towers and World Trade Center building.⁶ Discussion of physical anomalies, however, has not been limited only to the Tower collapses, but also to the hijacked flights themselves. Specifically, a subset of members in the so-called 9/11 Truth Movement allege that no aircraft crashed into either Twin Tower, the Pentagon, or in Shanksville, Pennsylvania. The impacts at the WTC and Pentagon have garnered the most discussion, and will be the main focus of this paper.

Theories which allege that no planes crashed into the Towers or the Pentagon have been extensively critiqued by others within the movement and elsewhere, and have been shown to be groundless in every relevant way.⁷ Despite this, both theories continue to be pushed by their

respective advocates. Of the two, Pentagon no-plane (hereafter referred to as PNP) theories appear to have gained more traction in the proceeding years, evidently stemming from their perceived superior plausibility. Most recently, AE911Truth founder and former CEO Richard Gage hosted the so-called “9/11 Con,” in which advocates of various PNP theories were given ample time to give arguments and evidence for their respective positions.⁸

While advocates of PNP theories often also allege no planes struck the Towers either, many of the most prominent PNP theorists reject such theories, insisting the evidence for planes hitting the Towers is well established. The problem, however, is that it has been observed that the evidence for *their* position, i.e., that no plane hit the Pentagon, is just as poor and unreliable as the evidence pushed by various Tower no-plane (TNP) theorists. John Wyndham, for example, summarizes the problem thusly:

Consider a comparison with the evidence for plane impacts at the World Trade Center (WTC). Apart from the clear capture on video tape of planes impacting the Twin Towers, there is no more key evidence for those plane impacts than there is for a plane impact at the Pentagon. There may, in fact, be much less.

For example, like the Pentagon, the WTC planes were never identified using time-change parts. Unlike the Pentagon, no black boxes with Flight Data Recorder (FDR) data have been produced for WTC planes. As for the Pentagon, no planes were reconstructed and plane debris at the WTC was not photographed extensively and identified. Seasoned pilots claim that even an experienced pilot would have difficulty hitting the Towers at the plane speeds, just as Hani Hanjour is not credible as the pilot of AA Flight 77. The WTC planes penetrated very substantial steel columns and largely disappeared into the building, as did the plane that evidence indicates hit the Pentagon. Bodies were not available for public identification, and so on. There are almost no witness accounts or photographs of the debris inside the Towers after impact, while there are a substantial number for the Pentagon. Given this comparison, it is surprising that so much contention has arisen about the Pentagon and not about the WTC planes. Additional strong physical and eyewitness evidence at the Pentagon arguably more than makes up for the lack of a clear photograph of a plane impact.⁹

Our purpose here is to expand on Dr. Wyndham’s point, evaluating in detail the arguments put forth by both PNP and TNP advocates. As noted previously, both of these theories have already been critiqued substantially. Thus, the author will not attempt to critique the evidence in any detail, but references will be provided at the end of each section which address the specific arguments being made.

Size of Impact Holes

TNP advocates insist that the damage inflicted on the Towers does not match with what would be expected from a plane impact. Specifically, it’s alleged that the size of the impact holes is smaller than what a plane the size of those used on 9/11 could produce.

The measurements make it more than clear: This was no Boeing 767 attack. There is no way how a Boeing 767 can be made to fit the holes.

—Stefan Grossmann¹⁰

[T]he North Tower’s hole wasn’t big enough for a Boeing 767 either, the alleged widebody airliner used on AA Flight 11 (officially tail number N334AA, FAA-listed as “destroyed”). A Boeing 767 has a wingspan of 155’ 1” (47.6 m) yet the maximum distance across the hole in the North Tower was about 115 feet (35 m), a hole undersized by some 40 feet or 26 percent.

—Morgan Reynolds¹¹

Similarly, PNP advocates insist the hole observed in the Pentagon is too small for a Boeing 757 to have caused.

How could the plane have entered through a hole much smaller than required without leaving large pieces of wreckage outside?

—Craig McKee¹²

The initial (pre-collapse) hole made by the alleged impact on the ground floor of Wedge One of the building is too small to admit an entire Boeing 757.

—A. K. Dewdney and G. W. Longspagh¹³

For more on why the damage to all three buildings matches a plane impact, see:

- Jim Hoffman, “A Critical Review of Morgan Reynolds' *Why Did the Trade Center Skyscrapers Collapse?*,” *911 Research*, 26 June 2005 (section titled “Reynolds' Analysis of the Plane Crashes”), at <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/reynolds/index.html#crashes>.
- Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “Missing Logic: A Review of The Missing Wings,” *911 Review* (2010), at http://911review.com/reviews/physics911/missing_wings/missingwings.html
- Jim Hoffman, “The Pentagon Attack: What the Physical Evidence Shows,” *911 Research*, 28 March 2006 (section titled “Pentagon Facade Damage Fits a 757”), at <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pentagon/index.html#facade>.

Lack of Debris

That the majority of debris from the planes was not recovered at the WTC site is hardly surprising, given that the aircrafts fully penetrated the buildings, were likely thoroughly broken up, exposed to the subsequent fires, and then destroyed by the collapse of the structures. Nevertheless, proponents of TNP theories insist more debris should have been recovered if real planes really did impact the buildings.

In the case of UAL 175 going into the south tower, a real Boeing 767 would have begun ‘telescoping’ when the nose hit the 14 inch steel columns which are 39 inches on center. **The vertical and horizontal tail would have instantaneously separated from the aircraft, hit the steel box columns and fallen to the ground.** (emphasis added)

—John Lear¹⁴

Every video that shows impact shows a plane flying through the tower wall the same way it flies through thin air: no cratering effect, no pushing parts of the building in, no crunching of the airframe as it hits resistance, no reaction from the heavy engines and hidden landing gear, **no parts breaking off, no outer 30 feet of the wing breaking off**, no bursting, shredding or bending of the wing. No nothing. (emphasis added)

—Joe Keith¹⁵

Likewise, assertions of lack of plane debris have been a mainstay of PNP theories as well.

Since we know the wings did not penetrate, why weren't they lying on the lawn? Same for the tail section and horizontal stabilizers.

—Craig McKee¹²

The main burden of this article has been to demonstrate that the debris found outside the Pentagon is inconsistent with the impact of a Boeing 757 or any aircraft of comparable dimensions. In particular, in the absence of some agency (possibly unknown to physical science) that removed the wings, there is no way to avoid the conclusion that the wings (and therefore the aircraft) were never present in the first place.

—A. K. Dewdney and G. W. Longspaugh¹³

Again, that most of the debris from the plane was not recovered is not even remotely surprising. In the words “Firefight” co-author Patrick Creed:

The pictures that you see, where people say “look there’s no plane debris,” it’s very selective photographs. There’s tons of pictures, and we have some of them in the book, where there’s debris everywhere. Pictures taken from very far away don’t pick up pieces of the plane about the size of the book and smaller. Because what the plane did, it was going 500 miles per hour. The majority of the wreckage was inside the building. And then in a fire that was burning at over a thousand degrees, it didn’t look much like plane debris. People compare it to regular plane crashes, but when you look at a plane crash, like a commercial airline crashing, usually the pilot’s trying to save the plane. That was not the case. Think more of a kamikaze attack on a ship in World War II. These people were intentionally trying to destroy the plane, the building, and everything else in the way. Completely different situation.¹⁶

Regardless, plane debris was recovered from both crash sites. Indeed, it appears *more* plane debris was recovered at the Pentagon¹⁷ than at the WTC.¹⁸ Again, given the facts discussed above, this is entirely what we would expect.

Eyewitness Accounts

In recent decades, eyewitness evidence has come to be understood as less reliable than previously thought.¹⁹ Human perception inevitably falls prey to some level of subjective inference, and so caution must be taken when using eyewitness testimony to reconstruct certain events. For example, while the majority of those who witnessed the Titanic sinking reported the ship split in two as it sank, some eyewitnesses claim it stayed intact.²⁰ Likewise, in 1917 a reported 70,000 people in Fatima, Portugal claim to have witnessed a “miracle of the sun” – that the sun danced, zig-zagged, careened towards Earth, and/or emitted multicolored light.²¹ No such events took place of course, given that (a) no one else in the world reported this event, and (b) such behavior from the sun would have subjected the Earth to catastrophic gravitational effects, which were not observed.

While examples such as these highlight the potential unreliability of eyewitness testimony, they can also serve to educate us in establishing the likely truth underneath such uncertainties. Both events are clear cases of testimonial inconsistencies, but said inconsistencies are not ultimately what matters. It is the *consistencies* in accounts which point to an underlying truth. In the case of the Titanic, the consistent detail is that the boat sank. That some witness descriptions of the boat as it sank differ would not be nearly enough reason to conclude the boat did not sink. And in the case of Fatima, while no such supernatural event took place, researchers do think some event in the sky probably was seen by the witnesses, albeit a localized and purely natural one.²²

Rather than accept these rather basic facts regarding eyewitness testimony, both TNP and PNP advocates have attempted to dispute the witness accounts of the three plane crashes. One method employed is to highlight perceived inconsistencies in the witnesses’ accounts, in an attempt to dismiss said testimony as unreliable. Morgan Reynolds, for example, has set forth a detailed examination of many eyewitness accounts at the WTC, citing perceived inconsistencies

between their statements in an attempt to demonstrate there are no reliable accounts of planes hitting the Twin Towers.²³ Similarly, PNP advocates such as Craig McKee and Adam Ruff make similar assertions about the many eyewitness accounts of a plane hitting the Pentagon. For example:

In our presentation, Adam [Ruff] and I pointed to the claims of alleged witness Steve Storti, who says he saw the plane hit the Pentagon from more than three-quarters of a mile away even though its flight would have been almost entirely blocked by apartment buildings until the last split second. He also makes the incredible claim that he could see movement in the windows.

—Craig McKee¹²

During the “9/11Con Pentagon” conference, McKee and Ruff attempted to further cast doubt on the eyewitness accounts using similar reasoning.²⁴ Likewise, the film “Loose Change Second Edition” also cites discrepancies between witness accounts at the Pentagon.²⁵ Again, this is not at all dissimilar to Reynolds’ attempt to cast doubt on WTC witness accounts. For example:

Next consider 9 witnesses who reported seeing a plane but who failed to mention an incredibly loud plane traveling at high speed, a puzzling oversight by many of these witnesses. [...]

It is odd that Mr. Leder “saw the plane coming into the building” and did not describe it as an airliner, instead subsequently puzzling over the situation, “How did this happen from a small plane hitting our building?” [...]

Kobren’s statement about seeing a plane on TV enter the South Tower while simultaneously seeing a plane’s shadow is impossible if the TV plane image was not “live,” real time, but on a multi-second delay of approximately 17 seconds, as is likely. [...]

—Morgan Reynolds²³

Perhaps the most outrageous (and frankly insulting) claim about the eyewitness testimony is that many of the witnesses lied about what they saw, or were even “in on it.” For example, Warren Cuccurullo (of Duran Duran fame) makes this rather blatant insinuation about eyewitnesses Stanley Praimnath and Devan Clark:

Now there’s a witness [...] doesn’t look American. He kinda looks Indian – what kind of a name is Praimnath? I don’t know, but it’s probably an anagram for something that’s not good. He’s sitting here and getting interviewed, and saying ‘the plane was coming closer, and closer, and closer. And I just froze, and dove under my desk.’ He dove under his desk, and the miracle desk saved his life. But the strangest part of the story, especially since we know – the CGI! – the strangest part of the story is he insists that the wing went through the fucking glass, through the steel, through the fucking walls, and wound up behind him, perfectly lodged into his door. [...]

Devan Clark, a videographer, who just happened film a shot that looks identical to the big giant CNN shot. Now, what kind of regular person just shoots a shot that is an exact clone of something you get from, like, who knows where they shot it from?²⁶

When asked who may have participated in faking videos of the South Tower strike, Ace Baker claimed “Devan Clark might be one of them.”²⁷

The PNP advocates have made similar accusations about eyewitnesses at the Pentagon. Craig Ranke provides us with several choice examples:

Father Stephen McGraw is a prime candidate for a deep cover agent. What could possibly be a more cush job that would leave you plenty of time for clandestine covert operations than a priest?

At this point the notion that Lloyd [England] was under some sort of mind-control or hypnosis on that day simply cannot be easily dismissed. ...He offered to take us to go look at the cab in the country but we simply didnt [sic] have the time and frankly I wouldnt [sic] have gone anyway!

He [Mike Walter] may very well be an intelligence operative that was deep cover for the official story and was literally wooing us to keep tabs and soften the official account by befriending us and inviting us into his home.

—Craig Ranke²⁸

Again, rather than accept rather well-known facts about eyewitness accounts and their potential (and often unavoidable) discrepancies, both TNP and PNP advocates have seized upon what they perceive as significant inconsistencies in the accounts, to make their case that no planes struck any of the structures on 9/11. What they fail to understand, it seems, is that the inconsistencies are not what matters. Again, the consistent details amongst inconsistencies are what signifies them as a trend, one that in all likelihood is true. And the consistent detail amongst the accounts is that planes did indeed strike the WTC, and a plane did strike the Pentagon.

For more on the eyewitness accounts, see:

- “No Planes Theory: R.I.P.,” *George Washington’s Blog*, 12 September 2006, at <http://georgewashington.blogspot.com/2006/09/no-planes-theory-rip.html>.
- John Wyndham, “The Pentagon Attack: Eyewitnesses, Debris Flow and Other Issues” (version 2), *Scientific Method 9/11*, March 2016, pp. 1-13, 41-50, at http://www.scientificmethod911.org/reviewpages/wyndham_reply_fe.html.

Videos of Impacts

Of all the evidence relevant to this discussion, this is the one area where the evidence is better for the WTC impacts than for the Pentagon impact. There are far more videos of the South Tower crash (but not the North Tower crash; see discussion below) than for the Pentagon, which to date there are only three videos of. Nonetheless, the number of videos has not stopped either TNP or PNP advocates from asserting their case, insisting the videos of the impacts are either unreliable, or were faked.

Ace Baker, for example, sets forth a comprehensive presentation which alleges evidence that all of the footage of Flight 175’s impact into the South Tower was faked – that the images seen were of a plane composited into the shots, rather than a real plane.²⁹ In one video, he shows how easy it would be to insert a composited plane into a shot.³⁰ This is not at all dissimilar to a demonstration from the late Rob Balsamo, showing how it easy it would be to *remove* a shot of Flight 77 at the Pentagon.³¹ Similarly Craig McKee, citing an analysis in Massimo Mazzucco’s film “September 11: The New Pearl Harbor,” claims the footage from a surveillance camera of Flight 77’s impact was doctored. In his own words:

All but one frame of two sets of surveillance videos purporting to show the impact of Flight 77 into the western face of the Pentagon on Sept. 11, 2001 appear to show the same thing. But it’s that one frame that tells the tale. It shows that evidence was falsified and that a deliberate plan was carried out to fool the public into thinking that a plane hit the building when it did not.³²

For detailed explanations of why there is no evidence that any of the footage from the WTC or the Pentagon was faked, see:

- Nick Irving, “Debunking ‘September Clues’: A Point-by-Point Analysis,” *TruthAction.org*, 10 October 2007, at <http://truthaction.org/debunkingseptemberclues.pdf>.
- Saul Trane, “Conspiracy Theory FAIL: The 9/11 Video Fakery No-Planes Theory (The Lies of Ace Baker),” *Debunking the 9/11 No-Planes Theory*, 18 May 2014, at <http://debunkingnoplanes.blogspot.com/2014/05/the-lies-of-ace-baker.html>.
- David Chandler, “Blink Comparator Views of the Plane at the Pentagon,” *911 Speak Out* (n.d.), at <https://911speakout.org/wp-content/uploads/BlinkedPentagonPlane.html>.
- Adam Taylor, “Contra Craig McKee: A Boeing 757 Did Strike the Pentagon,” *Adam Taylor’s Blog*, 14 June 2014, at <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2014/06/contra-craig-mckee-boeing-757-did.html>.

Alleged Missile Strike

One of the most commonly heard assertions from PNP theorists is that the damage seen at the Pentagon was caused not by a plane impact, but by a cruise missile. “Loose Change Second Edition,” for example, explicitly suggests this is in fact what caused the damage.³³ Similarly, some TNP advocates claim missiles struck the Towers as well. For example, according to David Shayler:

We know for certain that the official story of 9/11 isn’t true [...] I believe no planes were involved in 9/11. The only explanation is that they were missiles surrounded by holograms made to look like planes.³⁴

What I am still saying is go onto the internet and look at the footage... people have had a go at me saying there were no planes but there is little evidence to show that jets went into the buildings. I’m entitled to say they didn’t and something else did.³⁵

Granted, this theory carries the extra assumption that the missiles were cloaked by holograms of airplanes, an absurd and impossible feat (confirmed even by other TNP advocates³⁶). Yet virtually as absurd, in this author’s opinion, is the idea that every eyewitness at the Pentagon could mistake a cruise missile for a large Boeing 757 jet. Thus, both assertions are on comparable footing in regards to their plausibility.

On why there is no evidence missiles hit any of the buildings on 9/11, see:

- Eric Salter, “Analysis of Flight 175 ‘Pod’ and related claims,” *QuestionsQuestions.net*, 9 September 2004, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20050207005816/http://www.questionsquestions.net/WTC/pod.html>.
- Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “ERROR: ‘Only A Small Plane or Missile Could Have Caused Pentagon Damage,’” *911 Review*, last updated 18 December 2010, at <http://911review.com/errors/pentagon/smallplane.html>.

Internal Explosions

Rather than missiles causing the damage seen at all three buildings, TNP and PNP advocates have also suggested the holes were caused instead by powerful explosives planted inside the structures. For example, Ace Baker suggests the Towers “exploded from within,” and that that is what produced the holes and fires seen in them.³⁷ Likewise, Barbara Honegger claims explosives planted inside the Pentagon were responsible for the observed damage, writing:

[T]he central fact of the Pentagon attack on September 11, 2001, is the same as at the World Trade Center: inside-the-building explosives, which no foreign terrorists could have had the access to plant, making the official narrative of what happened on 9/11 impossible.³⁸

On why the impact damage to all three buildings does not support internal explosives being used, see:

- Jim Hoffman, “A Critical Review of Morgan Reynolds’ *Why Did the Trade Center Skyscrapers Collapse?*,” *911 Research*, 26 June 2005 (section titled “North Tower Hole Column Deflection”), at http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/reynolds/index.html#nt_columns.
- Victoria Ashley, David Chandler, Jonathan Cole, Jim Hoffman, Ken Jenkins, Frank Legge, and John Wyndham, “The Pentagon Event: The Honegger Hypothesis Refuted” (version 2), *Scientific Method 9/11*, February 2019, at http://www.scientificmethod911.org/reviewpages/ashley_honegger.html.

Alleged “Impossible” Maneuvers

A key component of the various no-plane theories on 9/11 is the supposed impossible man-euvers the planes were supposed to have carried out that day. Based on claims regarding aerodynamics and flight speed, TNP and PNP advocates assert that ordinary commercial jets could not have flown into the Towers or the Pentagon as observed, and then make the enormous leap of concluding that real planes did not strike the buildings. The planes that hit the North and South Towers were travelling at approximately 440 and 540 mph, respectively, when they struck the buildings,³⁹ whereas Flight 77 is said to have been travelling at a rate of approximately 530 mph.⁴⁰ These speeds, it’s contended, could not have been attained by the aircraft when they struck the buildings.

For example, according to the late John Lear:

The argument that the energy of the mass of the Boeing 767 at a speed of 540 mph fails because:

- a. No Boeing 767 could attain that speed at 1000 feet above sea level because of parasite drag which doubles with velocity and parasite power which cubes with velocity.
- b. The fan portion of the engine is not designed to accept the volume of dense air at that altitude and speed.¹⁴

Likewise, according to Jim Fetzer:

Multiple experts (including the FAA, the Royal Air Force, and so on) have calculated the speed of United 175 as reflected by the Michael Herzarkhani video at approximately 560 mph (averaging their estimates). While that corresponds to the cruise speed of a Boeing 767 at 35,000 feet altitude, it

would be impossible at 700-1000 feet altitude, where the air is three times more dense [sic], as Joe Keith, an aerospace engineer and designer of the Boeing "shaker system", has recently explained [...]⁴¹

PNP advocates insist that Flight 77 also could not have attained such speeds if it impacted the Pentagon. For example, according to Russ Wittenberg:

The story has Flight 77 was going 530 mph, or 460 knots. And it can't go that fast at level flight, down that low. If you're up high, the true airspeed can go up and it can go that fast. But not down low, the air's too dense.⁴²

Likewise, the late Rob Balsamo has argued the aerodynamics of Flight 77's path to Pentagon would have rendered its impact into the building "completely impossible."⁴³

As an aside, it's interesting to note that many PNP advocates, such as Balsamo and the now defunct "Pilots for 9/11 Truth" group, also maintain that the speeds and maneuvers of the planes that hit the Towers would also not have been possible using normal commercial airliners. Yet the majority in that group did not conclude that therefore real planes did not strike the Towers. Rather, it's suggested that the planes were possibly either modified to perform such maneuvers,⁴⁴ or were switched out with other aircraft.⁴⁵ Even John Lear, a confessed TNP advocate, when asked if the speeds attained were proven impossible, would that therefore prove the planes weren't real, he answered "No, it just means that the speed is impossible."⁴⁶

While this author does not believe the aircraft were modified or switched out, the reason for pointing this out is to draw attention to the baffling contradiction in logic being employed here. After all, if impossible speeds/maneuvers don't automatically mean no real planes, then why not apply this logic to the Pentagon crash as well? Why not conclude the plane at the Pentagon was modified or swapped with another aircraft, and allow that a plane still struck the building?

Regardless of this lapse in logic, the fact remains there is no good evidence that the actions of the planes on 9/11 were beyond the capabilities of normal Boeing aircraft. For more information on why, see:

- John Bursill, "Simulator Proves 'Impossible Speed' was 'probable' for Flt 11 and Flt 175," *911 Blogger*, 29 May 2009, at <http://911blogger.com/node/20232>.
- Anthony Lawson, "9/11: The Absurdity of the No-Planes-in-New York Theory," pp. 5-7, at <https://rense.com/general94/911%20-%20The%20Absurdity%20of%20the%20No-Planes-in-New%20York%20Theory.pdf>.
- Jeff Scott, "Pentagon & Boeing 757 Ground Effect," *Aerospaceweb*, 21 May 2006, at <http://www.aerospaceweb.org/question/conspiracy/q0274.shtml>.
- Ryan Mackey, "Physics Response to Flight 77 Trajectory Speculation," *International Skeptics Forum*, 16 March 2008, at <http://www.internationalskeptics.com/forums/showpost.php?p=3533616&postcount=1>.
- David Chandler, "g-Force and the Pentagon Plane," *Scientific Method 9/11* (2016), at http://www.scientificmethod911.org/reviewpages/chandler_gforce.html.

Case in Point: WTC1 vs. The Pentagon

As this comparison shows, the arguments and evidence presented by both TNP and PNP advocates are strikingly similar. The only area in which the PNP advocates' case is demonstrably stronger than TNP advocates' is the video evidence. There are abundantly more videos of the WTC impacts than there are for the Pentagon. However, it's important to emphasize that *this is only true of Flight 175*, of which dozens of videos and photographs exist of its impact into the South Tower. By contrast, there are comparatively few recordings of any kind of Flight 11's impact into the North Tower. Since the evidence for each impact should be able to stand on its own merits, it's worth examining a more narrowed case and compare the evidence for Flight 11's impact into WTC1, versus the evidence for Flight 77's impact into the Pentagon.

There are only three known recordings of Flight 11's impact into the North Tower: the video shot by Jules Naudet; the frames shot by Wolfgang Staehle; and a video shot by Pavel Hlava.⁴⁷ The Naudet shot is the clearest video which shows the plane in motion, but the image is still of fairly low quality, shot from a distance, and the plane registers at only around 100 pixels. The Staehle shot shows the plane clearly, but only as a series of one frame every four seconds. The Hlava shot is the poorest quality video, and the plane cannot clearly be seen.

Only three videos are known to have captured Flight 77's impact into the Pentagon: two security camera shots taken in front of the Pentagon, and a video shot from the Doubletree Hotel across the road, which captures the impact explosion but not the plane.⁴⁸ And while the security videos are comprised only of still-frames, the plane can be seen in them when examined closely.⁴⁹

As we can see, the video evidence for the North Tower impact is, as it turns out, of comparable quality to the video evidence for the Pentagon impact. And when we examine all of the other evidence relevant to this discussion, the results are even more illuminating:

- An abundance of plane debris was recovered at the Pentagon. By contrast, comparatively little plane debris was recovered at the WTC site.
- In addition to plane debris, both of Flight 77's flight data recorders were recovered (although one was damaged beyond its recordings being salvageable).⁵⁰ None of the data recorders from Flight 11 or Flight 175 were recovered at the WTC.⁵¹
- Flight 11 flew through open sky around 1000 feet in the air, and thus hit no incoming obstacles along its path. Flight 77, by contrast, struck several light poles before hitting the Pentagon, knocking them out of the ground. Such a damage path, if the plane impact was faked, would itself also have to be faked, an extra act of deception not needed for Flight 11.
- Of the published reports, around 100 people are said to have seen Flight 77 physically crash into the Pentagon.⁵² Comparatively fewer people saw Flight 11 strike the North Tower – around two dozen or so.⁵³
- Because WTC1 collapsed, the interior damage caused by the plane impact could not be analyzed. By contrast, the interior of the Pentagon could be examined, and the damage was found to be consistent with a plane impact.⁵⁴ This damage would need to be faked if no plane hit, another act of deception not needed for WTC1.
- Witnesses at both WTC1 and the Pentagon claim to have smelled and/or encountered jet fuel.⁵⁵
- Both Flight 11 and Flight 77 executed maneuvers that, while not impossible for commercial flights, would have been very difficult for amateur pilots to perform.⁵⁶

- Of the 92 occupants on Flight 11, the remains of 36 have to date been positively identified.⁵⁷ By contrast, remains from 179 of the 189 occupants from Flight 77 have been positively identified.⁵⁸

As we can see, the evidence for a real plane crashing into the Pentagon is, on balance, better than the evidence for a real plane hitting WTC1. Thus, were we to apply the logic employed by PNP advocates consistently, we would be forced to conclude that no plane crashed into the North Tower.

Conclusions

Based on this detailed overview of the arguments and methodology employed by PNP and TNP advocates, the author concludes that both hypotheses are on equal footing with regards to plausibility. The assertion that no plane crashed into the Pentagon on 9/11 carries the same (im)plausibility as the idea that no real planes crashed into the Twin Towers. If focus is placed specifically on Flight 11's impact into the North Tower, the evidence supporting a real plane strike appears even poorer than the evidence for a plane hitting the Pentagon.

Those PNP advocates who reject WTC no-plane claims are now faced with a unique challenge. In order to maintain their position that no plane struck the Pentagon on September 11th, they must be able to demonstrate, in exhaustive detail, that the quality of arguments and evidence they present is superior to the evidence presented by those who maintain real planes did not hit the Towers. If unable to do this, PNP advocates must then make a difficult decision:

- Either accept their arguments and evidence are just as poor as those for TNP theories, and thus reject both ideas.
- Or, if they maintain their position as correct, they must also accept that theories involving no planes at the WTC are just as viable, and should accept both.

PNP proponents must accept one of these options, if they wish to be consistent. To those in the Truth Movement who regard Pentagon no-plane theories as viable, this author asks that you take a hard look at the evidence, and focus on the right priorities, if a new investigation into 9/11 is truly what you want. If nothing else, we have a duty as truth seekers to follow the evidence wherever it may lead, and ensure we are communicating the correct facts about that terrible day, for our sake and the sake of generations to follow.

About the Author

Adam Taylor has been researching the events of 9/11 since August of 2007. He has contributed to sites such as Debunking the Debunkers (911debunkers.blogspot.com), AE911Truth.org, and ScientificMethod911.org. He is the author of the AE911Truth multipart essay "Debunking the Real 9/11 Myths: Why Popular Mechanics Can't Face up to Reality" (<https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/436-debunking-the-real-9-11-myths-series>), and the e-Book *20 Years On: Collected Essays on Why a New 9/11 Investigation is Still Needed* (<https://911docs.wordpress.com/20yearson>). His past writings can be found at his personal (yet discontinued) blog at <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com>.

Notes

- ¹ 2007 Truth Movement Poll, question 77. Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20200626123202/https://sites.google.com/site/wtc7lies/pollquestions38-80%3Ayouandthe911truthmove>.
- ² Thomas Huxley, "Letter to Charles Kingsley," 23 September 1860. Online at <https://mathcs.clarku.edu/huxley/letters/60.html>.
- ³ Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species* (New York: Signet Classics, 2003), p. 4.
- ⁴ John-Michael Talboo, "Top 40 Reasons the Official 9/11 Story is Bunk!," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 28 August 2008, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2008/08/top-40-reasons-official-911-story-is.html>.
- ⁵ For an extensive summary of these issues, see Kevin Fenton, *Disconnecting the Dots: How CIA and FBI officials helped enable 9/11 and evaded government investigations* (Walterville, OR: Trine Day, 2011). See also Paul Thompson, "The Complete 9/11 Timeline," at <https://911timeline.s3.amazonaws.com/index.html>.
- ⁶ The literature on this topic is itself vast, much of it arguing, either directly or indirectly, that the WTC towers were demolished through controlled demolition. See Niels Harrit *et al.*, "Active Thermite Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe," *The Open Chemical Physics Journal* 2, April 2009: 7-31. Online at <https://benthamopen.com/ABSTRACT/TOCPJ-2-7> (heading off attempts to refute this study is John-Michael Talboo and Ziggi Zugam, "9/11: Explosive Material in the WTC Dust," at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/911explosivematerialv1-3.pdf>); Gregory Szuladziński, "Temporal Considerations in Collapse of WTC Towers," *International Journal of Structural Engineering* 3(3), July 2012: 189-207. Online at https://aneta.org/911experiments_com/articles/IntJStructuralEng_TemporalConsiderationsInCollapseOfWTC Towers.pdf; Ivan Němec *et al.*, "Dynamics of Collapse of a High Building," *Journal of Mechanics Engineering and Automation* 2, June 2012: 349-354. Online at <http://www.davidpublisher.com/index.php/Home/Article/index?id=3888.html>; Gregory Szuladziński *et al.*, "Some Misunderstanding Related to WTC Collapse Analysis," *International Journal of Protective Structures* 4(2), March 2013: 117-126. Online at https://aneta.org/911experiments_com/articles/IntJJournalProtectiveStructuresWTC7SzuladzinskiSzambotiJohns.pdf; Steven Jones *et al.*, "15 Years Later: On the Physics of High-Rise Building Collapses," *Europhysics News* 47(4), August 2016: 21-26. Online at <https://www.europhysicsnews.org/articles/ePN/abs/2016/04/ePN2016474p21/ePN2016474p21.html>; Ivan Němec *et al.*, "A Contribution to Analysis of Collapse of High-Rise Building Inspired by the Collapses of WTC1 and WTC2: Derivation of Simple Formulas for Collapse Upper Speed and Acceleration," *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Physics* 6(12), December 2018: 2666-2680. Online at <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=89496>; Adam Taylor, "Review of Literature Regarding Progressive Collapse of WTC Twin Towers – A Call for Re-evaluation," *International Journal of Engineering and Techniques* 8(2), April 2022: 45-54. Online at <http://www.ijetjournal.org/archives/ijet-v8i2p8.html>. See also the various papers on this topic at The Journal of 9/11 Studies (www.journalof911studies.com).
- ⁷ For critiques of WTC no-plane theories, see Eric Salter, "A Critical Review of WTC 'No Plane' Theories," *Journal of 9/11 Studies* 4, October 2006, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200610/Salter.pdf>; Anthony Lawson, "9/11: The Absurdity of the No-Planes-in-New York Theory," *Salem News*, 1 August 2011, at http://salem-news.com/articles/august012011/no-planes_al.php; Saul Trane, "Conspiracy Theory FAIL: The 9/11 Video Fakery No-Planes Theory (The Lies of Ace Baker)," *Debunking the 9/11 No-Planes Theory*, 18 May 2014, at <http://debunkingnoplans.blogspot.com/2014/05/the-lies-of-ace-baker.html>. For critiques of Pentagon no-plane theories, see the various articles posted at Scientific Method 9/11, at <http://www.scientificmethod911.org/pentagon.html>.
- ⁸ "9/11CON: The Pentagon," 19 March 2022, at <https://richardgage911.org/9-11con-the-pentagon>.
- ⁹ John Wyndham, "The Pentagon Attack: Problems with Theories Alternative to Large Plane Impact," *Journal of 9/11 Studies* 32, December 2011, p. 5, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2010/Wyndham1.pdf>.
- ¹⁰ Stefan Grossmann, "9-11 Hole Science," *Gallerize*, 8 May 2005, archived at https://web.archive.org/web/20051217020609/http://www.gallerize.com/9-11_Hole_Science.htm.
- ¹¹ Morgan Reynolds, "Why Did the Trade Center Skyscrapers Collapse?," *Aisling Magazine* (n.d.), at <https://www.aislingmagazine.com/aislingmagazine/articles/TAM33/monotheism/9-11.html>.
- ¹² Craig McKee, "Pentagon Debates Expose Emptiness of Large-Plane-Impact Scenario," *Truth and Shadows*, 16 March 2016, at <https://truthandshadows.com/2016/03/16/pentagon-debates>.

- ¹³ A. K. Dewdney and G. W. Longspaugh, "The Missing Wings," *Physics 9/11*, 19 December 2004, at <http://physics911.net/missingwings>.
- ¹⁴ John Lear, "Affidavit: Case 07 CIV 4612 (GBD)," 28 January 2008, at https://www.thelivingmoon.com/47john_lear/08PDF_Files/John_Lear_Affadavit.pdf.
- ¹⁵ Quoted in Morgan Reynolds, "A No Planer Resigns From S.P.I.N.E.," *No More Games*, 1 August 2006, at <https://nomoregames.net/2006/08/01/a-no-planer-resigns-from-s-p-i-n-e>.
- ¹⁶ Quoted from "'Firefight' Authors & Contributors: A Plane Hit the Pentagon!," at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=osOauXe8QGA>.
- ¹⁷ Photos of plane debris from the Pentagon available at <https://www.ancreport.com/pentagon-debris>, and <http://911research.wtc7.net/pentagon/evidence/photos/index.html>.
- ¹⁸ Photos of plane debris at the WTC site archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20130610165451/http://wtcdebris.0catch.com>.
- ¹⁹ Gary Wells, Amina Memon, and Steven Penrod, "Eyewitness Evidence: Improving Its Probative Value," *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 7(2), November 2006: 45-75, at <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00027.x>.
- ²⁰ Bill Wormstedt, "The Facts - What Did the Survivors See of the Breakup of the Titanic?" (2011), at https://wormstedt.com/titanic/The_Facts.html.
- ²¹ Joe Nickell, *Looking for a Miracle: Weeping Icons, Relics, Stigmata, Visions & Healing Cures* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1993), pp. 176-81.
- ²² *Ibid.*, pp. 177-78.
- ²³ Morgan Reynolds, "The Original No Planers: Most Witnesses at the WTC Heard And Saw No Planes," *No More Games*, 28 February 2008, at <https://nomoregames.net/2008/02/28/the-original-no-planers-most-witnesses-at-the-wtc-heard-and-saw-no-planes>.
- ²⁴ See video and commentary of this at [https://odysee.com/@AdamFitzgerald:2/Richard-Gage---The-Three-Little-Liars-\(Part-1\);](https://odysee.com/@AdamFitzgerald:2/Richard-Gage---The-Three-Little-Liars-(Part-1);) and [https://odysee.com/@AdamFitzgerald:2/2,-Richard-Gage---The-Three-Little-Liars-\(Adam-Ruff's-Ignorance-On-Display\).](https://odysee.com/@AdamFitzgerald:2/2,-Richard-Gage---The-Three-Little-Liars-(Adam-Ruff's-Ignorance-On-Display))
- ²⁵ Transcript and commentary on this section of the film at http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/loose_change/pentagon.html#witnesses.
- ²⁶ "Warren Cuccurullo on 9/11 and Pornography," 2 July 2008, at <https://youtu.be/1Y2IbUiJMRw>.
- ²⁷ Hardfire TV, 20 May 2008. Relevant portion online at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AJ_PYWFAI2U.
- ²⁸ All quotes taken from and archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20200626122147/https://sites.google.com/site/wtc7lies/lettertorichardgreeneofairamerica>.
- ²⁹ Ace Baker, "9/11 - The Great American Psy-Opera," *Ace Baker 9/11 Research Blog*, 4 June 2012, at <http://acebaker.blogspot.com/2012/06/911-great-american-psy-opera.html>.
- ³⁰ Ace Baker, "9/11 Airplane Composite Theory," 29 May 2008, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9xQmM3LchU0>.
- ³¹ Rob Balsamo, "9/11 Pentagon DoubleTree Hotel Video Manipulated," 14 January 2014, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=olNre8z4bCg>.
- ³² Craig McKee, "Doctored Pentagon Video Proves 9/11 Cover-up and Inside Job," *Truth and Shadows*, 13 June 2014, at <https://truthandshadows.com/2014/06/13/doctored-pentagon-video-proves-911-cover-up-and-inside-job>.
- ³³ Transcript and commentary on this section of the film at http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/loose_change/pentagon.html#damage.
- ³⁴ Quoted in Ronald White, "Rebel MI5 agent says 9/11 planes were holograms," *The Sunday Times*, 10 September 2006, at <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/atticus-9gvk7036g2k> (subscription fee required).
- ³⁵ Quoted in Paddy Shennan, "9/11 was an inside job says Shayler," *Liverpool Echo*, 22 January 2007, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20071218063919/http://www.daveshayler.com/print/papers/220107LiverpoolEcho.html>.
- ³⁶ Joe Keith, a retired software engineer and no-planer, claims to have contacted twenty different companies that do hologram technology, and asked them if a hologram can be made to look convincing enough to look like a real plane crash. They all told him this was impossible. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=61TLD1o-0aM>.
- ³⁷ Ace Baker, "What Happened?," *Ace Baker 9/11 Research Blog*, 24 July 2008, at <http://acebaker.blogspot.com/2009/07/what-happened.html>.

- ³⁸ Barbara Honegger, "Evidence of Explosives at the Pentagon," in *The 9/11 Toronto Report: International Hearings on the Events of September 11, 2001*, ed. James Gourley (International Center for 9/11 Studies, 2012), p. 245.
- ³⁹ NIST NCSTAR 1-2, p. lxxiii, at https://www.nist.gov/publications/baseline-structural-performance-and-aircraft-impact-damage-analysis-world-trade-1?pub_id=101012.
- ⁴⁰ Paul Mlakar *et al.*, *The Pentagon Building Performance Report*, American Society of Civil Engineers, January 2003, p. 40. Online at <http://www.attivissimo.net/9-11/PentagonBuildingPerformanceReport.pdf>.
- ⁴¹ Jim Fetzer, "New Proof of Video Fakery on 9/11," *Scholars for 9/11 Truth*, 30 July 2008, at <http://911scholars.org/press-releases/124-.html>.
- ⁴² Quoted in "Zero: An Investigation into 9/11" (at approx. minute 41:55). Online at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6-CxA3iBHzA>.
- ⁴³ Rob Balsamo, "Arlington Topography, Obstacles Make American 77 Final Leg Impossible," *911 Blogger*, 13 March 2008, at <http://911blogger.com/node/14354>.
- ⁴⁴ "9/11 Aircraft - Why Fly So Fast?," 9 June 2014, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AfaWiEMuatU>.
- ⁴⁵ "AIRCRAFT SWAP - Scene From 9/11: INTERCEPTED," 9 June 2011, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7iwpBEB2pLs>.
- ⁴⁶ "9/11: John Lear Interview," 19 August 2009, at <https://vimeo.com/6185347>.
- ⁴⁷ All three videos shown and analyzed in "The last 1.2 seconds of Flight AA11," 20 August 2009, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3OtrdII1ijo>.
- ⁴⁸ "Pentagon Attack Footage," at <http://911research.wtc7.net/pentagon/evidence/footage.html>.
- ⁴⁹ David Chandler, "Blink Comparator Views of the Plane at the Pentagon," *911 Speak Out* (n.d.), at <https://911speakout.org/wp-content/uploads/BlinkedPentagonPlane.html>.
- ⁵⁰ "Specialist's Factual Report of Investigation: Digital Flight Data Recorder," *National Transportation Safety Board*, 31 January 2002. Archived at https://web.archive.org/web/20121010093205/https://www.nts.gov/doclib/foia/9_11/AAL77_fdr.pdf.
- ⁵¹ Although it's been occasionally claimed the recorders were recovered, the sources of these claims have been shown to uncorroborated and most likely false. See Mike Williams (webmaster), "Black Boxes," *9/11 Myths* (n.d.), at http://www.911myths.com/html/black_boxes.html.
- ⁵² "Eric Bart's Pentagon Attack Eyewitness Account Compilation," at <http://911research.wtc7.net/pentagon/evidence/witnesses/bart.html>; and "9/11 and the Pentagon Attack: What Witnesses Described," *Arabesque: 9/11 Truth*, 2 April 2007, at <http://arabesque911.blogspot.com/2007/04/911-and-pentagon-attack-what.html>.
- ⁵³ "What They Saw: Eyewitness Accounts of the NYC Aircraft Attacks," archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20140816141421/https://sites.google.com/site/wtc7lies/whattheyysaw:eyewitnessaccountsofthenyc>.
- ⁵⁴ Jim Hoffman, "The Pentagon Attack: What the Physical Evidence Shows," *911 Research*, 28 March 2006, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pentagon/index.html>.
- ⁵⁵ For WTC1, see NIST NCSTAR 1-7A, p. 17, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/analysis-published-accounts-world-trade-center-evacuation-federal-building-and-fire-0>. For the Pentagon, see <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2014/06/contra-craig-mckee-boeing-757-did.html?showComment=1402976900119#c552464175831049835>.
- ⁵⁶ Aidan Monaghan, "Plausibility of 9/11 Aircraft Attacks Generated by GPS-Guided Aircraft Autopilot Systems," *Journal of 9/11 Studies* 23, October 2008, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2008/AutopilotSystemsMonaghan.pdf>. See also John-Michael Talboo, "Knee Deep in Crap," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 18 December 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/12/knee-deep-in-crap.html>.
- ⁵⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Airlines_Flight_11#Aftermath.
- ⁵⁸ *Response to the Terrorist Attack on the Pentagon: Pentagon Family Assistance Center (PFAC) After Action Report*, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, March 2003, p. 33, at <https://download.militaryonesource.mil/12038/MOS/Reports/Crisis%20Report-new.indd.pdf>.

If any of the weblinks in this article no longer work or appear altered, please utilize the online Internet Archive to retrieve archived copies of them: <https://web.archive.org>