

This e-mail, sent by Craig McKee, was forwarded me to by one of the 45 recipients.

- **Emphasis added as appropriate.**
- **Commentary by me is identified in bold blue text with the prefix “WHC Note:”**

From: Craig McKee <craigmckee911@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: New research makes strong case the a 757 struck the Pentagon

Date: June 13, 2018 at 3:14:59 PM PDT

To: Recipient

Cc: 44 Recipients

I thank Nelisse for including me in the email chain, which deals with a subject I am following very closely and care very deeply about.

I believe the Truth Movement has been the target of a disinformation campaign for more than a decade over the Pentagon issue. **There is a small clique** that is relentlessly pushing the idea that the government was telling us the truth about the crash of a 757 with the Pentagon on the official flight path (probably Flight 77, they say). For years this group has been writing papers and making presentations that push something that is almost indistinguishable from the official story.

They use spin and manipulation to gain support (**WHC Note: “use spin and manipulation” translates to the use of facts and logic**), suggesting that they alone are using “the scientific method” (**WHC Note: Craig, where is your implementation of the “scientific method? I haven’t seen any – only vacuous assertions unsupported by evidence.**) and that the same people who brought you controlled demolition of the towers have now turned their attention to the Pentagon and have concluded the government was telling the truth about an impact. They tell us that they have “brought closure” to the debate. (**WHC Note: no evidence for a missile, no evidence for internal explosions, no evidence for external explosions, no evidence for a flyover , no evidence for the “north-of-CITGO” flight path. Remember CIT's Robert Tercios – pointing in the opposite direction from Lagasse – proves that Lagasse was "pulling Ranke's leg," just as Chadwick Brooks' Library of Congress interviews in 2001 show that he was also "pulling Ranke's leg." CIT's interview with George Aman shows that when you cut an interview into pieces and re-arrange, you can make anybody's “recorded” interview say anything. As a final note, CIT has never released the unedited raw footage as requested – making the US Government more transparent than CIT. Craig, do you care enough about transparency to ask Ranke and Marquis to post all of their raw, unedited interviews?**) Dwain continues this by saying that Coste has “proven” that a 757 hit the Pentagon.

He has not.

Some may have been duped into joining this effort, but I’m convinced that others have consciously orchestrated it to divide the movement and dilute its truth-seeking efforts. Of course, group members are quick to say they don’t think Hani Hanjour flew the plane – so they can protest if anyone calls them official-story supporters. But all they talk about are the points in the official story that they think are RIGHT. They almost never challenge it (where the Pentagon is concerned).

This group, which features some familiar and otherwise-well-respected names in the movement (David Chandler, Jonathan Cole, Frank Legge, Jim Hoffman, Ken Jenkins, John Wyndham, and a few others) wants us all to disregard some of the very strongest evidence (**WHC Note: What Evidence! Craig McKee: I challenge you to a debate on the “evidence” you think you have – I know that you have NONE. In the past debates you have only criticized other people’s evidence without ever presenting an explanation of any evidence you feel support. Neither of Craig’s vacuous presentations present evidence for what he claims happened at**

the Pentagon – they only sling mud at his opponent’s positions: [Presentation 1](#) and [Craig’s Presentation 2](#)

we have that 9/11 was an inside job. They say they are doing this to protect the “credibility” of truth activists or just that they are following “the truth” where it leads. They don’t see a problem in putting literally years of effort into pushing this one aspect of the official story – and attempting to sow the seeds of doubt within the Truth Movement in the process.

Wayne Coste is the latest member of this **(WHC Reminder: “disinformation campaign” allegation)** group, whose members use the same positions and the same talking points over and over. He has been pumping out PowerPoint presentations since late 2015 on the 9/11 and Other Deep State Crimes Teleconference. I have endured every one. I and Adam Ruff debated Coste, and participants voted on which side made the strongest case. Adam and I won 17-1. Barbara Honegger debated him and won 23-3.

But that was just the beginning for Wayne. **He has produced copious amounts of speculation and some points that I have a hard time seeing as honest.** Basically he just bends and twists the facts until he thinks they support his “hypothesis.”

Coste repeats official **story points to us and demands that we explain how the crime scene could have been staged to look “exactly” like a plane crash (WHC Note: Seems like a reasonable request to me).** He points to damage on the Pentagon wall and demands that others prove how it was made. A failure to explain *exactly* **(WHC Note: I’d appreciate any explanation that makes physical sense – Craig has never explained the observed damage recorded by multiple independent photographers and videographers)** how it was done is confirmation in his mind that it must have been done by a 757 traveling at 530 mph. In his presentations, he shows what appears to be a small piece of metal fuselage photographed on the Pentagon lawn and tells us that this is a “large piece” of a 757.

Most troubling is that the best challenges made by the movement to the official story end up being the subject of Coste’s attacks. Same for Chandler, Jenkins, and company. The FDR data shows the government’s own case doesn’t hold up because the flight path was north of the Citgo gas station? The group claims the data was not decoded properly. When they are through with it, it supports the official story. No aviation professionals that I am aware of will endorse their “findings.” The Pentagon video shows clear signs of doctoring? **(WHC Note: Massimo Mazzucco made an unsubstantiated assertion that the two adjacent Pentagon parking-gate security cameras recorded at the same time. In fact they are “snapped” and recorded 4/30th of a second apart – as shown in the movement of Mickey Bell’s truck).** They tell us that we have misread that and that it actually supports an impact. No rational explanation for the nearly round C ring hole **(WHC Note: Craig, careful analysis shows there are three paths through the standing columns from the E-Ring entrance point to the C-Ring exit hole. The C-Ring exit hole is just an un-reinforced two-brick-thick 19x10 foot unsupported wall. It doesn’t take much to knock the flimsy wall down.)?** They rush to tell us that it’s not really round and that it fits just what we’d expect from a plane crash.

Dwain Deets was once a thoughtful supporter of the evidence put forward by Citizen Investigation Team, which revealed that the plane that approached the Pentagon did so following a flight path that was incompatible with the alleged damage. **(WHC Note: I was a supporter of the CIT analysis until I actually looked at the data carefully prior to making a Cable Access TV show on 9/11 that was to include the Pentagon).** But, inexplicably, Dwain did a reversal about five years ago based on almost nothing (initially he told me it was because he learned that remote control technology existed that could have been used). Since then, he has offered gushing praise for anything this clique has produced in support of a 757 impact. He characterizes Wayne’s collection of PowerPoint slides as being a “breakthrough,” which is baffling to anyone who has studied the Pentagon.

Wayne's output amounts to an avalanche of speculation and manipulation. He speculates that the odd shape of a tree must be the result of its branches being stripped by the blades of a 757 engine (that came from Chandler). Proof? None **(WHC Note: Photographs of the notched tree that was located just prior to impact with light pole #1 – and at a consistent altitude for the severed light pole #1 –came from photographic evidence!)**. He sees a dark shape on a surveillance video from the Citgo station and proclaims with *certainty* that it is the shadow of a 757 flying overhead right before hitting the Pentagon. Proof? None **(WHC Note: the shadow cast is at the correct location for the plane to be, just prior to the location where it would notch the tree described previously)**. Same with the quick “flash” reflected in the gas station canopy. Proof that this is thousands of gallons of jet fuel exploding? None **(WHC Note: Craig is out-of-date on this one, as I no longer talk about this flash being the reflected fireball. While the shadow is seen 15 seconds before Sgt. Lagasse hurriedly reverses his police car and leaves the Citgo station, the reflected flash has been determined to be reflected sunlight off of passing vehicles)**.

We know the official flight path is impossible because there was a VDOT tower in the plane's path. But, no problem for Wayne; he just bends the path around the tower. Problem solved! Proof that a plane actually followed this path? None. **(WHC Note: Final analysis shows that a south of VDOT antenna, which is consistent with Thomas Trapasso saying the plane went over his porch at 1400 South Barton Street, is the most likely path)**. He speculates that the plane, including its wings, was pulled into the building through a hole not large enough to accommodate it. **(WHC Note: The bent and bowed column 9AA defines the height of the left wing as it impacts the Pentagon facade while the bashed-in column 19 on the second floor and bashed-in column 18 – that is also pushed to the right – defines the location of the right wing as it impacted the Pentagon facade. Both column 9AA and Column 18AA are the pivot points for the light, low mass, ends of the wings as these wing-ends rotate and are pulled into the building by the heavier parts of the attached wings)**. Here, he seems to disagree with Chandler who thinks the wings were smashed into confetti (the bits of debris appear in photos to be small enough that you could collect them using a rake and some heavy duty trash bags). Proof that either of these things happened to the wings? None. **(WHC Note: Upon closer examination of the evidence, David Chandler no longer asserts the wings turn to confetti upon impact)**.

Dwain hopes we'll all come around to his and Wayne's way of thinking. And only once the entire movement has turned to that point of view, he seems to suggest, can we begin to question other aspects of the Pentagon event. So, apparently, we should spend many more years pushing the official impact scenario so that we can turn around and start talking about whether Hani Hanjour was a skilled pilot. Think about that.

If we do come around to the position being pushed by this clique, then this movement is truly screwed. I will keep fighting this, using evidence **(WHC Note: What Evidence! Craig McKee: I challenge you to a debate on the “evidence” you think you have – I know that you have NONE. In the past debates you have only criticized other people's evidence without ever presenting an explanation of any evidence you feel support.)** to aggressively challenge the official story. I hope others will make their voices heard.

Craig McKee

P.S. If you would like to add your name to our “No 757 hit the Pentagon list (some of you already have), you can drop me a note at craigmckee911@gmail.com. You can also go to the post that explains the list: <https://truthandshadows.wordpress.com/2017/12/11/the-no-757-hit-the-pentagon-list/> or to our Facebook group (<https://www.facebook.com/groups/388111014962530/>)

==-==-==-==-==-==-

Neither of Craig's vacuous presentations present evidence for what he claims happened – they only sling mud at his opponent's positions: [Presentation 1](#) and Craig's [Presentation 2](#).