

To: Massimo Mazzucco
From: David Chandler, Frank Legge, John D. Wyndham
Subject: The Pentagon Segment in Your New Film

October 24, 2013

Dear Mr. Mazzucco:

Thank you for your considerable efforts in dealing with 9/11 issues by way of your just-announced 5 hour film "*September 11 - The New Pearl Harbor*." We, the undersigned, have not yet had time to fully digest the entire film, but note that your treatment of the WTC appears very worthwhile.

However, as scientists who have expended much effort during the past several years on Pentagon research, we are perplexed that the film ignores our recently published papers aimed at resolving the Pentagon debate. This long standing debate in the truth movement centers on what caused the damage and debris at the Pentagon. Some of our papers have been published in the Journal of 9/11 Studies, www.journalof911studies.org. Because our aim has been to try to resolve this issue, one of us has collected these papers in one place and invited moderated discussion on them. See www.scientificmethod911.org.

Our published papers conclude that, based on all the evidence, impact by a large plane (consistent with a Boeing 757) did in fact cause all or most of the damage and debris at the Pentagon. The additional use of bombs cannot be ruled out at this time. The film's Pentagon segment argues against large plane impact and appears to favor small plane impact. Our papers show that this conclusion violates many evidence items and key rules in the scientific method.

An additional factor affecting the Pentagon segment is the way the film handles the "debunkers." At many key points throughout the film, a photo montage of six main debunkers of the 9/11 truth movement is shown, along with the narrator's commentary as to how and why they are wrong. In this way, the viewer is conditioned to expect a wrong statement by debunkers every time this montage is shown. This montage flashes on the screen in the Pentagon segment at 01:19 immediately preceding Jim Meigs' statement that "Hundreds of people saw an American Airlines jet fly into that building." Uninformed viewers, having been thus conditioned, will be led to think that Meigs statement is false without realizing that not "all" in the 9/11 truth movement believe that Meigs is wrong on this point. This is a fact about the movement that Meigs himself acknowledges in his Popular Mechanics' book (2011 edition, p. 90 at top).

The truth movement has spawned many incorrect theories, such as "no planes" at the WTC. But none of these theories has taken hold as strongly as "no Boeing 757" at the Pentagon. By accepting that planes hit the Twin Towers, one also accepts the fact that the official story is not entirely wrong. The entirety of the evidence then shows that a large plane did hit the Pentagon. Your Pentagon segment will thus further exacerbate and help to prolong the current confusion and debate on this issue. This is a serious matter as activists who assert that there was no large plane impact at the Pentagon undermine the credibility of those who are trying to educate the public about the demolitions at the WTC.

By way of introducing a specific example of the film's distortion of the Pentagon evidence, here is a most important step in the scientific method:

“Collect as many facts and as much data on the phenomenon as you can, being careful not to exclude at first any items because they appear dubious or unimportant. Discard nothing based on personal prejudice.”

The film violates this rule in a particularly egregious manner when presenting eye witness testimony as to the size or type of plane that struck the Pentagon:

- At 1:19 in the Pentagon segment, the debunkers' photo montage preceding Meigs' statement suggests to the viewers that Meigs' is about to tell a falsehood, and that large plane impact did not occur.
- At 1:37 in the segment, the narrator states that the majority of eyewitnesses described a large plane. Only the narrator speaks, while the film shows an unidentified individual talking and gesturing. This episode lasts for three seconds.
- At 1:40, the film presents the testimonies of four individuals who each describe in their own words seeing a small plane. These witnesses are Steven Gerard, Don Chauncey, a person called Omar, and an unidentified witness. A small plane in flight is also shown. This episode lasts for 48 seconds.

There are in fact 62 or more witnesses who described a large plane in clear terms. Eight of these identified it as a 757, while several others said it was a 737, 767, or 707. See Frank Legge's Excel spreadsheet, Bart's list and the compilation by Arabesque referenced below. With 62 witnesses to a large plane and only about 6 who describe a small plane, it is clearly biased, misleading and suggestive to give 16 times as much coverage to the latter witnesses while at the same time showing the viewer a small plane. The bias is increased by quoting the words of only the minority witnesses. At least four of these (Don Chauncey, Steven Gerard, D.S. Khavkin and Don Wright) were so far away that they might easily have misjudged the plane's size.

The film's biased treatment of the two witness groups is a clear example of scientific distortion, in the same manner as NIST's refusal to acknowledge the existence of witnesses to explosions and molten steel at the WTC. The net result is that the film's Pentagon segment becomes tainted like the NIST reports.

In conclusion, rather than point out here the many other problems with the film's Pentagon segment, we offer to work with you to bring the Pentagon segment into a state where it can receive the respect of other scientists. We invite your thoughtful response.

Sincerely yours,

David Chandler, B.S. (Physics), MS (Mathematics) Email: davidchaler@gmail.com

Frank Legge, PhD (Chemistry)

Email: flegge@inet.net.au

John D. Wyndham, PhD (Physics)

Email: jcwyndham@myfairpoint.net

References:

Frank Legge's Spreadsheet:

<https://dc1.safesync.com/LMGxbsCs/Conspiracy%20911/My%20contributions/Papers/Pentagon%20witnesses/PentWitnesses120416.xls?a=BSNFLFuZHl>

Bart's List: <http://911research.wtc7.net/pentagon/evidence/witnesses/bart.html>

Arabesque's Compilation: <http://arabesque911.blogspot.com/2007/04/911-and-pentagon-attack-what.html>

Recent papers on the Pentagon by scientists:

Frank Legge, February 2010

<http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2009/WhatHitPentagonDrLeggeAug.pdf>

David Chandler and Jonathan Cole, January 2011

http://911speakout.org/?page_id=219

Frank Legge and Warren Stutt, January 2011

http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2010/Calibration%20of%20altimeter_92.pdf

Frank Legge and David Chandler, September 2011

http://stj911.org/legge/Legge_Chandler_NOC_Refutation.html

Frank Legge and David Chandler, December 2011

<http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2011/12/27/addendum-to-the-paper-refuting-the-pentagon-flyover-hypothesis/>

John D. Wyndham, December 2011, Revised March 2013

http://www.scientificmethod911.org/docs/Theories_Alternative_March_2013.pdf

Frank Legge, June 2012

<http://www.journalof911studies.com/resources/Legge-Letter-June.pdf>

John D. Wyndham, March 2013

http://www.scientificmethod911.org/docs/Pentagon_Event_Time_Mar19_2013.pdf

John D. Wyndham, April 2013

http://www.scientificmethod911.org/docs/Eyewitnesses_DebrisFlow_FandE_Apr12_2013.pdf