

What hit the Pentagon?

Frank Legge

flegge@iinet.net.au

17 Sep 2007

The position I hold is simple. In answer to the question "What hit the Pentagon" I say I don't know and attempt to turn the discussion to the more fundamental question "Why was the Pentagon hit". It should not have been. It should have been well defended. Flight 77 was the third plane hijacked so there was ample time to confirm that real hijackings were taking place, not a war game, and ample time to send up fighters to investigate, as is the normal procedure. One presumes that there were also anti-aircraft defenses round the Pentagon as it is the hub of the military machine.

And of course there is the video testimony of the Minister for Transport, Norman Mineta to the 9/11 Commission. He came into the bunker under the Pentagon as the plane was approaching and saw Cheney there. A young man came into the room and said to Cheney "The plane is 50 miles out". Then he came in and said "The plane is thirty miles out", and when it got down to 10 miles out the young man also said "Does the order still stand?" and Cheney confirmed that it did. Shortly after this the plane hit the Pentagon. There is little doubt that Cheney had it in his hand to shoot down this plane but had a reason not to do so.

Getting back to the question of what hit the Pentagon, this has been a topic of heated debate. At first glance it appears that the 757 could not have hit the Pentagon because there appeared to be too little debris, and too little damage to the wall of the Pentagon. It is very attractive to find evidence to dispute the claim because, if true, it would prove once and for all that the official story is a pack of lies, and many people have tried very hard to do so. However if you look at the evidence carefully you will find that it cannot be proved that no 757 hit the Pentagon. This doesn't really matter because there is ample evidence that explosives were used at the WTC, and that is sufficient to prove the official story is a pack of lies.

The argument that something other than flight 77 hit the Pentagon is based on several assertions as follows:

- 1. No debris.** There is at least one photograph which shows ample small debris scattered over a wide area. The debris reaches to the helicopter landing pad, some distance away from the impact site. One has to conclude that the photos which show too little debris result from the foreshortening which occurs when the camera is close to the ground. There are photos which show debris identifiable as the rotor of a 757 engine, and the wheel of a 757. There are photos which show men in white shirts and black trousers, not ordinary workers, hastily collecting debris from the lawn. The authorities recently released a video purporting to show what hit the Pentagon. It did not do so of course - they want to keep us arguing. The video did however show some substantial pieces of debris flying high up in the frame followed by several small pieces which landed and bounced across the road a considerable distance from the impact site. See it at Judicial Watch, video 1. Judge for yourself how far these pieces traveled.

<http://www.judicialwatch.org/archive/2006/flight77-1.mpg>

There are five pieces of debris in an area about the size of a tennis court in front of the camera. If there are similar amounts from here all the way to the impact site, and perhaps on the other side as well, there will be a very great number not previously taken into

account. As far as I know no-one else has commented on this. In my view this is a missed piece of evidence for a powerful explosive charge being set off at, or just before, impact. The video also shows a large brilliant white flash just as the plane arrives. This is further evidence for explosives. The explosion of fuel would be expected to produce a red fire ball, not a white flash. A red fire ball does appear after the white flash. If explosives were used to destroy the plane you would not expect the plane to make a perfect impact mark on the building, as happened at the towers.

2. Hole too small. The photo most often shown appears to offer a hole too small to admit a 757, however the lower part of the photo is obscured by water spray from a fire truck. This question has been carefully studied. By combining information from several photos taken prior to the collapse of the front wall it is possible to find marks which are far too wide apart to have been made by a missile. This still leaves the question open about what size plane hit the Pentagon. Some say it was a 737 but this does not fit with the damage to light poles on approach and does not fit the mark on a power generator which was nearby. This has a mark in the right place to have been hit by the right hand engine of a 757. It is not surprising that the marks on the wall are hard to see as that section of the Pentagon had recently been reinforced. Why did the plane circle right round to hit that section which had few occupants due to the reconstruction taking place? Why did it not hit the other side in the hope of collecting Donald Rumsfeld? Why did it not hit the relatively weak roof? Did the perpetrators want to minimize casualties? Who were killed? There were auditors there who were investigating the loss of millions of military dollars.

3. Plane could not have withstood the spiral dive required. This is not true. Calculations show that the g-force on the plane was well within design capability. There is also the experience of a similar plane which was pulled out of a dive with g-force substantially above the design rating. It was not damaged.

4. The pilot was not competent to perform the navigation or the accurate approach. There is evidence that the hijackers were more interested in learning to fly than to take off or land. That was suspicious in itself and caused some FBI reports to be made which were apparently blocked. It is reasonable to believe that with a little use of gps they could have navigated to their targets and it is not hard to point a plane at a wall. Also the ability to fly planes without pilot assistance has long been established. It requires the fitting of equipment to take over control of the autopilot. As the normal investigation of the wreckage by the FAA was not carried out we have no way of knowing what equipment might have been found. Four planes crashed that day - none was examined by the FAA as the law requires. Similarly the CIA obtained an injunction to prevent the police from investigating the other notorious crime scene - building 7. Very suspicious.

5. Ground effect would have prevented the 757 from hitting at ground level. This is often repeated but is nonsense. Ground effect is small at high speeds and easily overcome by control input. The plane was descending at an angle of 1 in 10, which is quite steep so ground effect would have only been present in the last couple of seconds of the approach - not long enough to deflect the plane, given its huge momentum at high speed.

Here are some good references:

Jim Hoffman casts serious doubt on the missile theory:
<http://911research.wtc7.net/pentagon/attack/index.html>
<http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pentagon/index.html>

Aerospaceweb appears to destroy the missile theory:

<http://www.aerospaceweb.org/question/conspiracy/q0265.shtml>

On 11 Sept 2007 we happened to meet a person who claimed he had seen TV coverage of the 757 hitting the Pentagon. He was in Melbourne at the time. He said the plane came in low and skimmed the ground before hitting the building. There is therefore some reason to believe that this footage does exist but the authorities have banned further showing and the complicit media have gone along with the ban.

The plain fact is that the authorities could easily show what hit the Pentagon as they have many tapes of the hit. In my opinion they choose not to do so because they want the investigators to argue with one another. This is working well for them. I believe they keep the evidence in reserve so that if investigators ever achieve some degree of consensus that no 757 hit the Pentagon they will produce the evidence that it did in order to throw the truth movement into disarray.

Application of the precautionary principle would result in avoidance of the assertion that the 757 did not hit the Pentagon.