

**ANALYSIS OF BARBARA HONEGGER'S PENTAGON PRESENTATION
"BEHIND THE SMOKE SCREEN"**

**Based on *The Pentagon Event: The Honegger Hypothesis Refuted* by
Ashley et al.**

Data Handling in Scientific Research

All data is susceptible to mishandling, and can be corrupted through ignorance, bias, or design. Most false theories or cases of scientific deception arise from mishandling or misinterpretation of the data. At the heart of scientific research is the scientific method which requires that ALL data be considered, and that different hypotheses and their consequences be examined until the hypothesis that best fits the data is uncovered and chosen as the best theory.

A common practice in the mishandling of scientific data is known as "cherry-picking." The following definitions of cherry-picking are from <https://english.stackexchange.com/questions/70550/cherry-picking-what-is-the-correct-usage>

Cherry-picking: "Cherry picking is the act of pointing at individual cases or data that seem to confirm a particular position, while ignoring a significant portion of related cases or data that may contradict that position."

"...while "cherry-picking" denotes picking only the best from some set, it also therefore connotes not picking things that are not the best."

From these definitions, cherry-picking is a usually negative act that includes not only selecting data items that best fit a chosen purpose, but also ignoring or omitting to mention data items that do not fit the chosen purpose. It follows that, from a study of the way mishandled data is chosen and interpreted, it is possible to determine the goal or chosen purpose of the researcher involved. Since, in scientific research, cherry-picking occurs either as a result of bias (conscious or unconscious) or an intent to deceive, the bias or deception can often be easily determined.

Analysis of Barbara Honegger's "Behind the Smoke Curtain" Presentation

The following table summarizes Barbara Honegger's claims about the Pentagon 9/11 evidence made in her "*Behind the Smoke Curtain*" presentations. The table is based on mostly verbatim quotes from the paper "*The Pentagon Event: The Honegger Hypothesis Refuted*" by Victoria Ashley, David Chandler, Jonathan H. Cole, Jim Hoffman, Ken Jenkins, Frank Legge, and John D. Wyndham. See http://www.scientistsfor911truth.org/docs/Honegger_Hypothesis_042916.pdf

The table has six columns as follows:

Column 1 - Barbara Honegger's (BH) Claim or Interpretation

The claim made by Barbara Honegger about an individual item of evidence or the evidence in general. The page number or numbers in the above paper on which the claim is made are given in square brackets, [].

Column 2 – T

If the authors of the above paper deem the claim by Honegger to be true based on all the relevant evidence, a T appears in this column.

Column 3 – F

If the authors of the above paper deem the claim by Honegger to be false based on all the relevant evidence, an F appears in this column.

Column 4 - ?

If there is sufficient competing evidence, lack of evidence, lack of resolution, or lack of confirmation upon which the claim made by Honegger could reasonably be debated, a ? appears in this column. However, if in the opinion of the authors of Ashley et al. there is stronger evidence that the claim is either true or false, a T or an F will appear in column 2 or 3. Thus, if

a claim is assigned the rating of F + ?, the authors consider that the evidence against the claim is the stronger evidence.

Column 5 – C

If there is evidence that the claim made by Honegger is based on cherry-picked data, a C appears in this column. The criteria used to determine if data has been cherry-picked are given below. These criteria are conservative and set a low bar to the number of evidence items that were cherry-picked. Items not marked C may also have been cherry-picked.

Criterion: Major evidence item omitted or ignored. This will be marked C.

For example, Honegger never mentions, explains or refutes the over 60 eyewitnesses who saw a large plane hit the Pentagon.

Criterion: Existence of competing evidence associated with the evidence item presented by Honegger but ignored by her. This will be marked C.

For example, Honegger uses Donley's photograph of an explosion or conflagration, taken several minutes after the main event, as evidence of pre-planted explosives, but never mentions that Donley saw a large plane impact the Pentagon wall and gave a detailed description of the impact and its consequences.

Column 6 - Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence

The authors' interpretation of the evidence on which Honegger bases her claim, as given in the paper. Competing evidence is also included. Additional evidence from later research may also be included. Based on the foregoing, the authors assigned a rating of T, F, or ? to the claim made by Honegger.

In her presentation, Honegger frequently revisits evidence already covered. The table entries will contain repetitions of evidence items already addressed. This repetition will be addressed and accounted for in the Analysis section.

Summarized from The Pentagon Event: The Honegger Hypothesis Refuted by Ashley et al.
http://www.scientistsfor911truth.org/docs/Honegger_Hypothesis_042916.pdf [n]=page number
T = True, F = False, ? = Unresolved, C = Cherry-picked. F+ ? = evidence that claim is false is stronger.

Table 1

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	C	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
B. Pentagon Theories					
No plane impacted the Pentagon on 9/11 [8]		F		C	Over 62 eyewitnesses saw a large plane impact the Pentagon. The physical damage accords with the eyewitness observations.
A white plane was destroyed outside the Pentagon west wall on 9/11 [8]		F		C	There was no damage to the wall where the white plane was supposedly destroyed, there was no corresponding debris and no eyewitness accounts. Honegger's claim violates physical laws.
All damage and fatalities were caused by pre-planted explosives [8]		F		C	There is no direct evidence of pre-planted explosives, only some witness testimony as to sound and odor.
Fallen and stopped Pentagon clocks show an event time earlier than the official time of plane impact of 09:37:46 am. [9]		F			Experiments with identical clocks show that the hands can move back appreciably when the clocks impact the ground after falling off the wall.
C. Flight AA 77 on 9/11					
Flight 77 did not leave Dulles on 9/11 since the BTS of civilian flights on 9/11 does not show a flight 77. [10]		F	?		The departure of flight AA 77 is confirmed by both radar and FDR data, as well as by airport personnel such as Brenda Brown.
C-130 pilot Steve O'Brien did not see the actual crash of FL 77 at the Pentagon. [But Obrien had identified the plane as a Boeing 757 when he encountered it close to the Pentagon.] [11]		F	?		The inference from the fireball and approximate location given by O'Brien, together with his observation shortly afterwards of the fire and smoke at the Pentagon, is compelling evidence the plane crashed at the Pentagon. No other fireball, plane or event locations were reported at that time.
Flight AA 77 did not get anywhere near the Pentagon and did not hit it. [11]		F			The radar track of AA 77 is continuous from Dulles to the vicinity of the Sheraton and is supported by the FDR data. From there, the FDR data and many eyewitnesses tracked the plane all the way to impact at the Pentagon.
Air traffic controller Danielle O'Brien conjectured from the "speed, the maneuverability" that the blip was a military plane. [11]		F	?		Using the FDR data, Frank Legge has shown that this conjecture is unwarranted – the plane underwent no maneuver beyond or even approaching the capabilities of a Boeing 757
"Without ... [Barbara Olson's calls] ... there is zero evidence Flight 77 returned East and the official story about the Pentagon falls apart." [12]		F		C	The continuous radar data and FDR data both show that Flight 77 turned back east and was seen by C-130 pilot Steve O'Brien shortly before it crashed into the Pentagon.

T= 0, F= 9, ?=3, C=4, F+?=3

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	C	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
There are anomalies in the FDR data file content, and its place and timing of discovery. [12] [13]		F			Legge and Stutt find no evidence that the FDR file is not legitimate or the data anomalous. The fully and properly decoded FDR file tracks the plane all the way from Dulles to the correct level to hit the light poles and the Pentagon.
D. A Large Plane Approaches the Pentagon					
A “white” plane was destroyed at or near the Heliport tower about 120 feet north of the “alleged” impact hole, at a time of 9:32:30, and without damaging the Pentagon wall. [15] [17] [18]		F		C	There were no eyewitnesses, debris or wall damage associated with such an event which violates physical laws. Most witnesses described a silver plane, and the debris was silver. One white piece likely came from the plane nose. Debris traveled north from the plane impact at column 14 because of prior momentum. The time of 9:32:30 comes from a fallen clock whose hands most likely moved back when the clock dropped.
Because of ground effect, the plane could not have flown closer to the ground than 56 feet, and would have hit the Pentagon wall at the fourth and fifth floor. [18] [19]		F			Because of the high speed and low angle of attack, ground effect is not a relevant factor. Eyewitnesses saw the plane hit the light poles, generator-trailer and low concrete wall, and the Pentagon wall at the first and second floors.
A military helicopter that arrived at the Heliport at 9:27:51 and departed at 9:32:33 was responsible for shooting down the “white” plane and destroying it just outside the Pentagon wall without any debris hitting the wall. [19] [20]		F			There is no credible evidence whatsoever for this physically impossible speculation. There are no eyewitnesses to this event, no associated plane wreckage, and no proof of an earlier event at 09:32:30. This is Honegger’s incorrect explanation for the debris at the heliport area that traveled north after the actual plane impact at column 14.
E. The Main Pentagon Event					
Honegger uses evidence of secondary explosions to assert there was no plane impact but rather a number of primary explosions all caused by pre-planted explosives (cordite) or even “thermite.” [21]		F		C	There was only one large, primary explosion, and this occurred at the time of plane impact at 09:37:46. A few witnesses claimed they detected cordite by its odor, but many more witnesses detected jet fuel. Secondary explosions are attributed to compressed natural gas, welding equipment and exploding propane tanks.
Honegger uses fallen stopped clocks to assert that the main explosive event occurred at an earlier time of 9:32:30 am or even 9:30 am. [22]		F			There is no evidence for an earlier time, since it can be shown by experiment that when identical clocks fall and hit the ground the hands can move back. Other fallen clocks give different times.
The lack of a seismic signal rules out impact near ground level by a Boeing 757. [24]		F			According to expert Terry C. Wallace, a detectable seismic signal was not expected to occur. Scores of eyewitnesses saw plane impact.

T= 0, F= 7, ?=0, C=2, F+?=0

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	C	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
In the “5-frames” surveillance camera evidence, Honegger states that the fireball is evidence only for an explosion OR the “white” plane being blown up. [26]		F			Frames from the two surveillance cameras have been studied extensively by Jenkins and Chandler using blink comparison and reveal the image if an American Airlines plane with trailing smoke probably caused by tree branches ingested in the right engine.
Honegger never acknowledges or explains the large number of eyewitnesses to plane impact. [27]		F		C	Ove 60 eyewitnesses saw a large plane impact the Pentagon west wall. A few distant witnesses judged it to be a small plane. Omitting mention of these impact witnesses is a major violation of the scientific method. See Appendix A.
Honegger claims that “A Plane Couldn’t Have Penetrated The Newly-Hardened Outer Wall” since “the entire wall [was] like a huge bomb and plane-proof vest.” [27]		F			The concrete in the wall was not steel-reinforced, contrary to Honegger’s altered graphic. Witnesses saw the plane penetrate the wall. If the wall were bomb proof, this would invalidate Honegger’s bombs-only theory.
The internal debris flow would have to “re-focus” itself in order to create the C-ring hole. [28]		F			As the plane fragmented, many particles would remain in a generally cylindrical shape, while other particles would spread out throughout the ground floor. Sufficient focused debris could reach the C- ring wall and create the hole there
Honegger never mentions the large amount of internal debris and the curved and abraded internal columns, with ceiling above intact, that indicate plane debris flow. [28]		F		C	This evidence points strongly to plane impact, since bombs could not reasonably have created these effects. The columns were abraded in a direction matching the observed plane path. Honegger’s omission is a major violation of the scientific method.
Honegger interprets a diagram by Dwain Deets to argue that a “quasi-liquid slurry” could not have reached the wall to create the C-ring hole. [28] [29]		F			Initial debris cleared a path, and internal columns did not block a flow of particles from reaching and creating the C- ring hole.
F. Observations Outside the Pentagon					
The light poles were pre-staged or broken in situ by some, possibly explosive, mechanism so as to appear as if a large plane had knocked them down. [30] [31] [32]		F		C	14 eyewitnesses saw the low-flying large plane hit one or more light poles with damage, such as the curved poles, consistent with such impact. Honegger has no theory for how the damage was created otherwise or why no one witnessed the act. By ignoring the stronger evidence and failing to provide an alternative, credible theory for the damage, Honegger’s claim constitutes another major violation of the scientific method.

T= 0, F= 7, ? =0, C=3, F+?=0

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	C	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
By denying the light poles were struck by a large plane, Honegger dismisses the evidence for the plane wingspan (between 100 and 130 feet). [32]		F			The struck light poles are major evidence of a large plane and its wingspan. By dismissing this evidence in favor of a totally unsubstantiated theory, Honegger's claim becomes a major violation of the scientific method.
Honegger omits to mention the damage to the generator trailer and low concrete wall. This is extremely significant evidence supported by photographs and eyewitness testimony. [32 – 35]		F		C	Honegger's omission is a major violation of the scientific method. This damage not only gives the engine separation of the large plane, which at 43 feet (est) matches that of a Boing 757 (42.5 ft) but shows why the lawn was not gouged, since the left engine in particular was inches above the highest point, the low concrete wall.
Honegger states that "spools 6 feet high were not bowled over," implying that a large , low-flying plane would have knocked them over. [36 -238]		F			A careful examination of the plane's geometry, orientation and path, and the spools' locations show this claim to be unsupported. The evidence from available data suggests that the plane missed the spools by a few feet or more.
Honegger stresses the pristine nature of the lawn outside the Pentagon wall in a direction perpendicular to the impact hole. She argues that a large plane did not impact at the official impact hole because: (1) the engines of a Boeing 757-200 extend nine feet "beneath the bottom of the plane" and "would have gouged the lawn," and (2) the lack of airplane debris on the lawn opposite the impact hole is further proof that no plane hit at the impact hole. [38 – 39]		F			Both of Honegger's arguments are incorrect. In (1), the engines of a Boeing 757-200 do NOT extend nine feet below the bottom of the plane, but only about 4.5 feet. Because of foreshortening in the photograph, the pristine lawn is deceptive. There was plenty of debris in the 95 feet from the wall not shown in the photograph, as well as to the north in the Heliport area, carried there by the momentum of the debris fragments after impact because of the large northward velocity component of the plane.
Honegger argues that a Boeing 757-200 could not possibly have impacted the Pentagon at the observed impact hole because her information and calculation shows that the top of the fuselage above ground was less than the distance between the top of the fuselage and the bottom of the engines, and the lawn was not gouged. [39 – 41]		F			By using a dubious "approximate" estimate (20 ft) of the plane height above the lawn from one of the 5 frames when the plane was hundreds of feet from the Pentagon wall, and a false figure of 9 feet for the plane engines hanging below the fuselage (actual about 4.5 ft), Honegger arrives at an incorrect height of the fuselage upon impact. The actual height was about 26 feet. Honegger omits the word "approximate" for the plane height as found in the Pentagon Building and Performance report, resulting in a major violation of the scientific method..

T= 0, F= 5, ?=0, C=1, F+?=0

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	C	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
Honegger claim's that columns 15, 16 and 17 are "bowed out," not in, as would be expected from the impact of the large plane and its right engine. [41 – 43]		F			It is not certain that the "columns" are remnants of the actual columns, or that they are in fact sloping out. A plane impact followed by an internal fuel explosion would arguably leave remnants in an indeterminate state. This is very dubious "evidence" and ignores all the actual eyewitness and other physical damage evidence.
Because of the "huge amount" of plane wreckage found near the Heliport at a point 120 to 150 feet north of the official impact hole, Honegger claims that this is where the "white" plane destruction happened, and not at the official impact hole at column 14. [43]		F			This contention is scientifically unsound because it does not take into account the plane's speed and direction of flight, both of which affect the debris distribution pattern. After impact at column 14, debris traveled north because of the pre-existing velocity component of 502 ft/sec in a northerly direction. This entirely expected behavior is NOT an indication of a destructive event north of the official impact hole, but a confirmation that the plane did impact where the façade damage indicates
G. Observations Inside the Pentagon					
Honegger avoids all mention of the overall internal damage pattern highly suggestive of plane impact and penetration, or the physical appearance of many columns which is also highly indicative of plane debris flow in the direction of the plane path. [45]		F		C	Many columns were bent/curved and abraded in the direction of the plane path to within a few degrees. The ceiling above (non-collapsed portion) was intact. This is highly indicative of the flow of many small pieces of plane debris, and is not consistent with the use of bombs or explosives. Honegger's omission is a major violation of the scientific method
Honegger never mentions the sudden appearance of a large amount of debris in the first floor, with the ceilings above intact. [46 – 48]		F		C	If bombs were used and the ceiling did not collapse, the debris would have to be trucked in. The flow of debris from a large plane readily explains the debris. Honegger's omission is a major violation of the scientific method.
Honegger claims there were three "exit" holes in the C-ring wall. [48 – 49]		F			There was only one "exit" hole for plane debris, the well-known C-ring hole. The other "holes" referred to by Honegger were doorways.
Honegger claims that an "alleged" 9/11 truth researcher, whom she does not name, has put out on "his" website a "doctored" diagram where he has "changed" the original Washington Post graphic to show a single plane exit hole. [49 – 50].		F			Honegger's charge is completely unfounded. The diagram is both technically and scientifically correct with a single exit hole and was freely available to all on the Internet.

T= 0, F= 6, ?=0, C=2, F+?=0

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	C	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
Honegger claims that the C-ring hole was not caused by aircraft debris, but rather caused by shaped charges in order to provide access to the area by Pentagon and rescue personnel. [50 – 51]		F			There is not a shred of eyewitness or physical evidence to support this assertion. There were at least four (4) doors for access between the A & E driveway and the interior of the C ring in the damaged area, so no additional access was needed for rescue personnel.
Honegger quotes Defense Department official Terry Mitchell who stated that the pile outside the C-ring hole was “all Pentagon metal.” [51]		F		C	Mitchell’s statement is false. Other eyewitnesses and photographs prove the presence of plane parts, such as a tire and wheel hub, in the rubble outside the C-ring hole.
Honegger points to the words “Punch Out” written on the wall at right of the C-ring hole as confirming her hypothesis that the hole was created by workers to access the interior and remove bodies. [52 – 53]		F			In construction, “punch out” indicates a to-do list. The words “PUNCH OUT” appear in an official diagram next to the numbers indicating bodies removed. The implication is that the words were a directive to create such a list, and in fact were added after the C-ring hole was created.
Honegger supports the theory of mechanical engineer Michael Meyer that the C ring hole was created using shaped charges, and that a round hole could not have been created by a flow of plane debris. [53]		F			Shaped charges could not have blown the wall and debris in the exact direction in continuation of the plane’s path. The debris and plane parts would have to be planted unobserved. . It would take an enormous amount of planning and activity, susceptible to discovery, to line up the light poles and generator/trailer/low concrete wall damage with the C ring hole. The hole approximately matches a debris flow with the shape of the plane fuselage.
H. Were Pre-Planted Explosives Used?					
Honegger’s central thesis is that <u>all</u> physical damage at the Pentagon resulted from the use of pre-planted explosives such as bombs (cordite) or thermite. [55]		F		C	Honegger omits to mention, ignores or discounts by misinterpretation the overwhelming, physical and eyewitness evidence for large plane impact
Honegger emphasizes physical and witness testimony that points to, or could point to, pre-planted explosives. There were at least four witnesses who said they detected cordite by its odor.[55]		F	?	C	There is NO actual physical evidence that would indicate pre-planted explosives such as cordite and thermite. Honegger uses witness interpretations of odor and sound, and her own interpretations of physical events and photographs to infer the use of explosives. At least 20 witnesses said they detected jet fuel by its odor, and a doctor found jet fuel in the lungs of one survivor.

T= 0, F= 6, ? =1, C=3, F+?=1

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	C	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
Honegger claims the upward deflection or breaching of a small section of the second floor slab was caused by a “Major Primary ... Explosion” that was heard and felt by witnesses McKeown and Thurman who had offices in the D ring. [55 – 58]		F		C	Honegger’s claim is altogether speculative for several reasons: (1) She claims the Pentagon Building and Performance Report (PBPR) said the breach was caused by an “independent explosion” but this not true – her quote is from William Pickering, not the PBPR. (2) She ignores the overall damage pattern consistent with plane debris flow. (3) Thurman described a “two-part explosion” consistent with plane impact followed by a jet fuel explosion. (4) The relatively minor upward breach is more likely a local anomaly caused by high-speed plane debris that completely stripped some floor beams from the underside of the slab above.
Honegger gives a confused and speculative account of the Donley explosion or conflagration photograph, implying it was caused by bombs or thermite. [58 -60]		F		C	The photo was taken several minutes after the main event of plane impact and jet fuel fireball. This much smaller fireball has been attributed to the explosion of welding equipment and even to the conflagration of a small tree. She never mentions that Donley saw the large plane impact the Pentagon wall, which omission is a major violation of the scientific method.
Honegger cites Steve Wolter’s findings that some concrete turned to mush, with reddish or bright orange hues, and speculates that the concrete was subject to a thermite reaction that led to the formation of iron. [60]		F			There is no evidence of temperatures greater than those produced by jet fuel fires. The thermite reaction does not produce iron oxide whose color is reddish, but can start with a fine mixture of iron oxide and aluminum to produce molten iron and aluminum oxide. There is no evidence of molten iron at the Pentagon. Honegger’s suggestion is speculative and not evidence for pre-planted explosives.
Honegger states that the PBPR “falsely claims” that eight (8) exterior columns were destroyed, and points to columns 10 through 17 inclusive that are marked as red in PBPR figure 7.9. She shows a photograph in which only four (4) of the eight columns appear to be totally missing. [60 – 61]		F			In its legend for figure 7.9, the PBPR defines a red column is as “Impacted. Missing, broken, disconnected, or otherwise without remaining function.” This definition includes what is seen in Honegger’s photograph for the 8 columns, even if the “remnants” were parts of the original columns. The remnants actually appear to be parts of the first floor ceiling that has fallen down. Thus her charge of falsehood on the part of the PBPR is untrue.

T= 0, F= 4, ? =0, C=2, F+?=0

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
Honegger reiterates her claim that the remnants of columns 15, 16 and 17, are “bowed out,” and therefore provide proof of an internal explosion rather than a plane impact. [60]		F		It is possible that columns knocked in by the plane, but which remained hinged at the top end, swung out under gravity or because of the jet fuel explosion. However, as shown previously, the column “remnants” are more likely parts of the first floor ceiling that collapsed and they are not bowed out.
Honegger implies that the computer fires seen by April Gallop indicate an internal explosion caused by bombs.		F	?	It is likely these fires were caused by current surge due to the impacting event, and were not indicative of explosives. Any such surge would tend to manifest itself preferentially in devices such as computers. This would explain why only the computers were on fire.
A half dozen witnesses gave accounts of events, such as bodies, shock waves, intense heat in the A and B rings and elsewhere. Some of these accounts were given verbally or in affidavits to Honegger herself, according to Honegger. [62]			?	These testimonies need confirmation. The PBPR makes no mention of bodies or damage in rings B and A. This evidence requires further research for verification and analysis.
Honegger denies that a large plane struck the Pentagon west wall at 09:37:46, followed by a massive jet fuel explosion. Instead, she claims there were five (5) “multiple primary inside explosions” and two (2) outside explosions that caused all the death and damage. The times of these explosions range from 9:30 am until 10:00 am. [63 – 65]		F		Honegger’s evidence comes from various timepieces and misinformation that have been shown to be inaccurate and unreliable. Her explosion times’ sequence lacks logical coherence and cannot explain the eyewitness testimony or the behavior of those inside and outside the Pentagon in the time period during which the main event of plane impact and secondary explosions took place.

T= 0, F= 3, ? =2, C=3, F+?=1

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	C	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
I. Other Issues					
In the third hour of her presentation, Honegger covers a variety of topics that do not have significant bearing on the question of what physically happened at the Pentagon on 9/11. [65]	T		?		These topics in themselves are of interest to those wanting background information on the people and politics surrounding 9/11 and its aftermath.
J. Summary and Conclusion					
Honegger's analysis omits to mention a host of eyewitness and physical evidence that contradicts her hypothesis. It ignores and violates basic physical laws of force and motion, and consistently misinterprets or distorts the evidence presented. It makes no effort to follow the scientific method, and, in one or two instances, violates ethical research methods by rewording quoted statements and/or attributing them to the wrong source. Honegger's false assertions about the integrity of other, highly qualified researchers in her Seattle and Washington, D.C. talks are particularly regrettable.[66]		F		C	Barbara Honegger's analysis presents an altogether erroneous picture of what happened at the Pentagon, to the detriment of those searching for the truth in this area, to the general public, and to the cause of legitimate scientific inquiry. On the positive side, Barbara Honegger's presentations have drawn many to consider the details of the events of 9/11. Nevertheless, these events, affecting as they do the lives of so many, are must be approached with a commitment to follow the principles of the scientific method by examining all the available evidence, eschewing all personal bias and other personal considerations, and by testing each hypothesis for its consequences.
Appendix A: Pentagon Eyewitness Testimony					
Honegger completely ignores, without mention, all the eyewitnesses who saw a large plane impact the Pentagon wall. [67 – 71]		F		C	64 eyewitnesses to plane impact are listed. Omitting to consider this evidence is a major violation of the scientific method.
Honegger completely ignores, without mention, all the eyewitnesses who saw a large plane impacting light poles. [72]		F		C	14 eyewitnesses to the plane impacting light poles are listed. Omitting to consider this evidence is a major violation of the scientific method.
Honegger claims a "white plane" flew toward the Pentagon wall and was destroyed outside the wall. [72]		F		C	There are many more eyewitnesses who said the plane was silver than those who said it was white. Listed here are 16 witnesses to a silver plane and 4 witnesses to a white plane. In her presentation, Honegger shows photos of silver plane debris without comment. This is a major violation of the scientific method.

T= 1, F= 4, ? =1, C=4, T+?=1, F+?=0

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	C	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
Honegger claims that no plane entered the Pentagon building. [73]		F		C	11 eyewitnesses to plane wreckage inside the Pentagon are listed. Omitting to consider this evidence is a major violation of the scientific method.
Honegger claims that all damage and deaths were caused by pre-planted explosives such as cordite and thermite, and not by a plane impact. [74]		F	?	C	There are many more witnesses who detected the odor of jet fuel than those who detected the odor of cordite. Listed here are 20 witnesses to jet fuel and 4 witnesses to cordite. Failing to mention this evidence is a major violation of the scientific method.
In addition to the four (4) witnesses who detected cordite, Honegger lists 13 witnesses whose testimonies might infer pre-planted bombs. [74 – 75]		F	?		About a half dozen of the 13 testimonies listed warrant further examination. However, there is no physical evidence of explosives, or other confirmation of the additional testimonies presented by Honegger.
Appendix B: Boeing 757-200 Front Views and Calculations					
Honegger claims that the engines of a Boeing 757-200 hang 9 feet below the bottom of the fuselage, in which case they should have gouged the lawn. [76]		F			As seen in the front view photographs, the engines of a Boeing 757-200 extend only about 4.5 feet below the bottom of the fuselage.
Honegger's theory of pre-planted explosives tries to explain highly-selective pieces of the physical and eyewitness evidence. [77]		F		C	Only the large plane impact theory, whose main elements are summarized here, can explain all the evidence.
Appendix C: Boeing 757-200 Specifications					
Appendix D: Geometry of the Plane Approach					
Honegger never mentions the damage to the generator-trailer and low concrete wall. [82]		F		C	This damage, observed by eyewitnesses as it happened, gives the separation of the plane's engines as about 43 feet, matching the actual separation of the engines of a Boeing 757-200 at 42.5 feet. Omitting to consider this evidence is a major violation of the scientific method.

T= 0, F= 6, ? =2, C=4, F+?=2

Barbara Honegger (BH) Claim or Interpretation	T	F	?	C	Scientific Interpretation of the Evidence or Competing Evidence
Appendix E: Plane Parts Found Near the C Ring Hole					
Honegger claimed there were no plane parts found near the C-ring exit hole. [83 -86]		F		C	Several plane parts were found inside and outside the C-ring hole, including a landing strut, a tire that matches the small tire at the nose of the plane, and a wheel hub.
Honegger claimed there were three "exit holes." [86]		F			Two of the "holes" are doorways as shown in the photographs.
Appendix F: Toronto Selected Excerpts					
When asked pointed questions about the plane debris and other issues, Honegger gave misleading answers . [87 – 89]		F			Honegger suggested there was no plane impact, and no need to talk about the eyewitnesses to plane impact. She claimed an earlier time of event. Honegger failed to disclose to the international panel that, of the three "exit holes," two were doorways through which smoke escaped. Omitting to consider and misrepresenting the actual evidence is a major violation of the scientific method.
Appendix : Seattle Selected Excerpts					
Appendix H: Websites, Papers, Articles and Videos					

T= 0, F= 3, ? =0, C=1, F+?=0

Analysis of Results

The above table contains claims made by Barbara Honegger in her “*Behind the Smoke Curtain*” presentation, based mainly on her Seattle presentation. The claims in column 1 and the rebuttal evidence in column 6 are taken directly and almost verbatim from the paper “*The Pentagon Event: The Honegger Hypothesis Refuted by Ashley*” et al. Because Honegger, in her presentations, frequently repeated certain claims, the 62 claims documented in the table contain duplicate claims. Before attempting to reduce the claims to a set of individually-unique claims, let’s consider what the table as a whole reveals.

Adding the values of T, F, ?, and C together for the entire table, we get this result:

Table 2

T	F	?	C	F+?	T+?	? alone
1	60	9	29	7	1	1

Preliminary Analysis

The figures in Table 2 show that the authors of Ashley et al. flagged one segment of Honegger’s presentation as being true (T). This segment was the last hour of the 3 hour presentation in which Honegger discussed general issues unrelated to the Pentagon evidence. In the first two hours where Honegger presented 61 claims about Pentagon evidence and its interpretation, 60 claims were deemed to be false (F) and one claim was rated as unresolved (?). The conclusion based on these figures is that Barbara Honegger’s Pentagon claims are almost totally wrong. In percentages, that is 98% false.

Out of the 61 Pentagon evidence claims rated as false (F), 7 were rated as F+?, indicating the existence of some evidence that could be the basis for debate. However, the rating for these 7 claims was still F, because the competing and contrary evidence was deemed to be stronger than the evidence cited by Honegger. If instead of rating these 7 claims as F, they were rated as T, there would then be 54 false (F) claims and 7 T (true) claims. In that case, Honegger’s Pentagon claims would still be extremely wrong, or 89% false.

Of the 61 Pentagon evidence claims, 29 showed signs of being cherry-picked.

Removing duplicate claims

TBS

Evidence of cherry-picking

Honegger's Pentagon evidence claims fall into at least two categories: (1) general claims, such "no plane impacted the Pentagon on 9/11," and specific claims such as "the light poles were staged or broken in situ by some ... explosive mechanism." It is easy to assign the rating of cherry-picked (C) to a general statement, since, as in example (1) just given, the fact that Honegger never mentions or explains the large number of eyewitnesses to plane impact automatically earns such a claim a C rating. An examination of specific claims, such as in example 2, will therefore give a clearer picture of the presence of cherry picking.

Examining specific claims for cherry-picking

TBS