

Why We Expend Energy on Proving Large Plane Impact at the Pentagon

by David Chandler and Wayne Coste

A talking point that has been used rhetorically against us numerous times in denouncing our research on the Pentagon is,

“... Some who purport to be part of the 9/11 Truth Movement are determined to focus their efforts – and ours – on supporting element after element of the official story... So much is false in the Pentagon story – why would any truther spend years describing only what they think is true?”

(First off, the word “only” is a gratuitous falsehood. Simply browse <http://911speakout.org> and see for yourself the nature of our work.)

We call this a rhetorical talking point because it is typically not addressed to us with an opportunity to answer or open a dialogue. It has been used as the justification for publicly denouncing our work. Prime example: <https://jamesfetzner.org/2018/09/craig-mckeen-why-do-we-tolerate-a-truther-cabal-that-constantly-props-up-almost-all-of-the-9-11-pentagon-official-story/>.

On the other hand, this question sometimes comes from people who may sincerely wonder why we make the effort we do to establish that indeed, a large plane did hit the Pentagon on 9/11. So for those in the latter category we have an answer.

We study the evidence at the Pentagon because we are a Truth Movement. Our prime objective is not to catch the government in a lie. Our prime objective is to determine the truth. If, and to what extent, the government is lying will emerge in the process. It is dangerous to make unsupported assertions because statements that don't stand up to scrutiny can and will be used against us. We will be attacked at our weakest point. We have excellent evidence for preplanned demolitions of the buildings at the World Trade Center, implying insider involvement, but if we make weak or false assertions about the Pentagon attack, that will become the entire focus of the case against us.

Asserting large plane impact at the Pentagon is no more defending the official story than asserting large plane impacts at the World Trade Center. We are not defending the official story. We are not claiming we were attacked by Muslim hijackers. We think it is highly likely that all of the planes on 9/11 were guided to their targets by computers. The trajectories and high speeds at low altitudes would make the planes very difficult to control even for experienced pilots. A real question is how a hijacked airplane could be allowed to enter the Washington DC airspace, and attack the Pentagon without air defense of any kind. Even these questions will fail to make an impact, however, if we make careless assertions that can be used to discredit the whole of our research.

Some have said the Pentagon is the most important aspect of the 9/11 attack because whereas attacking the World Trade Center was a crime, attacking the heart of the U.S. military was an act of war, justifying war as a response. I don't know the legal merits of this argument, but it really doesn't matter. If we assume this is true, it does not follow that the best evidence for 9/11 being a self-inflicted wound is to be found at the Pentagon. The attack on the Pentagon was part of the overall event of 9/11. Establishing that there had to be insider involvement at the World Trade Center therefore implies the entire event, Pentagon included, was orchestrated by powerful insiders. Therefore we should not sully the evidence we have uncovered at the World Trade Center with weaker (or false) claims about the Pentagon event. Keeping our focus on the search for truth is the key to a successful case.