

February 8, 2011

Author: Richard Gage

Source: [Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#)

In early 2009, I watched the “National Security Alert” video by the Citizen Investigation Team (CIT) where recollections of 10 eyewitness accounts of the attack on the Pentagon were presented (of many more that were interviewed). These accounts included the witnesses’ recollection of the path being taken by the plane prior to impact. The path that many of them recalled was to the north of the former CITGO gas station. Based on these few accounts CIT presented its case that the plane flew over the Pentagon since the damage trail was not consistent with the north path.

My main focus relative to 9/11 had been on the destruction of the three World Trade Center skyscrapers. I had not been able to spend much time on the Pentagon issue. I was initially impressed by CIT’s presentation and, more than a year and a half ago, provided a short statement of support for their efforts.

After making my statement I became aware of more details of the CIT witness accounts as well as the rest of the compelling eyewitness testimony that is available. The vast majority of eyewitness accounts refute the CIT flyover conclusion, as they entail that the plane hit the Pentagon or was flying so low it could not miss.

I was also surprised to learn that **12 of the witnesses that CIT interviewed (including six witnesses to whom CIT refers to as north path witnesses) were in a position to see the Pentagon and all 12 stated that they saw the plane hit the Pentagon.** It was clear from this that CIT used improper investigative methods. CIT used and presented only those portions of their witness reports which fit their conclusion. The preponderance of CIT’s own evidence in fact supports the conclusion that the plane impacted the Pentagon. (See Summary and Analysis of “National Security Alert” and other works listed below for these and many additional witness statements that describe the plane as clearly impacting the Pentagon).

Because of these concerns I provided new statements in December 2009 and January 2010 pointing out that my previous statement of support should not be interpreted as an endorsement of their conclusion that the airplane flew over the Pentagon. **Despite these statements, CIT has continued to publish my original statement and characterize it as an endorsement of their flyover conclusion. I am hereby now on the record clearly as NOT supporting the CIT investigation at all. In addition, I insist that CIT delete my name from its web site in any and every context in which it might give the impression of support or endorsement of their efforts from me.**

I base my present position also on a number of blogs, papers, and videos that have shed light on the Pentagon Flight 77 issues and on CIT’s work. These papers should be among those studied by anyone seeking the full truth about these matters. Most of these works analyze additional evidence and come to different conclusions than CIT does.

Relevant critiques of CIT and their National Security Alert include:

[Summary and Analysis of “National Security Alert”](#), Chris Sarns, Feb 5, 2011

[9/11 Pentagon Witnesses: They Saw the Plane Hit the Pentagon](#), Video by Jeff Hill, June 14, 2010

[Overwhelming Evidence of Insider Complicity](#), David Chandler and Jon Cole, Dec 2010

[“Debating” What Hit the Pentagon by Exaggeration, Name-calling, and Threats](#), Gregg Roberts, Jan 2011

And critiques that examine CIT’s earlier work “Pentacon” are helpful as well:

[Google Earth Exposes Pentagon Flyover Farce or Critiquing PentaCon](#), by Jim Hoffman, July 2009

[To Con a Movement: Exposing CIT’s PentaCon ‘Magic Show’](#), Victoria Ashley, July 2009

Relevant peer-reviewed papers (posted on [Journalof911Studies.com](#)):

[Flight AA77 on 9/11: New FDR Analysis Supports the Official Flight Path Leading to Impact with the Pentagon](#), Frank Legge, (B.Sc.(Hons.), Ph.D.) and Warren Stutt, (B.Sc.(Hons.) Comp. Sci.) January 2011

[What hit the Pentagon? Misinformation and its Effect on the Credibility of 9/11 Truth](#), Frank Legge, (B.Sc.(Hons.), Ph.D.), July 2009 (updated Feb 2010)

There was a time in the four years after 9/11 when I simply assumed that the official story of the destruction of the WTC Twin Towers on 9/11 was true. One could say that I “endorsed” the official story based on what I knew at the time, but as I learned more, my opinion of what happened to those buildings evolved radically. John Maynard Keynes, father of Keynesian Economics, once said: “When the facts change, I change my mind. What do you do, sir?” A similar evolution has occurred in relation to my view of CIT’s work.

I strongly recommend that people who care to research what happened at the Pentagon take personal responsibility for forming their own conclusions by acquainting themselves with a wide range of analysis done by people who have come before them rather than jumping to conclusions based on a skewed selection of evidence and argument, or being unduly influenced by any type of authority figure. Use your own discernment, based on your use of the scientific method to arrive at a coherent theory that you can confidently stand behind.

One of the authors cited above, Frank Legge, PhD., admonishes us to adopt a “prudent approach” to the Pentagon piece of the 9/11 puzzle. In the end he wisely advocates the “precautionary principle” which is to “assert only what we can truly know,” given the contradictory evidence, misinformation, disinformation, and lack of information from official sources, and the difficulty in verifying much of it, years after the fact and with inadequate resources.

Legge concludes that there is prima facie evidence that “the official explanation of the event at the Pentagon is false and that a cover-up exists. He concludes as well this negative hypothesis: that there is “no proof that a 757 did not hit the Pentagon.” And, since officials are holding the cards (videos) as to what did or didn’t hit the Pentagon, Dr. Legge’s recommendation is that investigators “take care to

avoid publicly asserting that the 757 did not hit the Pentagon”.

We can all agree that no hijacked plane should have been able to violate the airspace of our nation’s capital and hit the headquarters of the most sophisticated defense system in the world – an hour and a half after the assault began on the Twin Towers.

The 9/11 Truth movement will be more likely to succeed in its effort to educate the public about the Pentagon by focusing on those areas of greatest agreement.

Sincerely,

Richard Gage, AIA