

Letter Added to [A Critical Review of WTC 'No Plane' Theories](#)
Eric Salter

This is a rebuttal to the post on Ningen's blog "Does NIST's own data prove 'no planes,' and has Jones failed to disclose that in his "planes" thesis?" <http://ningens-blog.blogspot.com/2007/01/does-nist-prove-no-planes-and-has-jones.html>

Ningen's main complaint is that I, and Steven Jones, failed to disclose the findings of analyses of the Scott Meyers footage which showed no deceleration of the Boeing as it hit the building. He attempts to turn this omission of a discussion of the NIST deceleration into a demonstration of some type of malfeasance, which it is not. My analysis of the Fairbanks footage was done specifically as a response to claims by Webfairy and others that no deceleration was observed in that footage; it was not intended to be a thorough survey of all the studies existing at that point in time, and I made no such claim.

Ningen's intent to portray intellectual dishonesty on my or Steven Jones' part smacks of the general pattern by the no-planers of attempting to discredit opponents, as a means of distracting attention from the fact that they have failed to prove their claims.

I can't confirm or deny that the Meyers footage does not have deceleration, as I don't have access to full quality footage. Additionally, the method used by the NIST to plot the "pixel locations" of the nose and tail of the aircraft is not specified in detail. If they simply placed a marker at one location, such as the tail or nose, than I would be of the opinion that this method would be less accurate than my method, which used the entire outline of the plane to calculate positioning.

After the discovery of a positioning error, a revised version of my Fairbanks footage analysis showed a 10% reduction in speed, a finding that has been posted since November:
<http://www.questionsquestions.net/WTC/175speed.html>

Ningen does not cite this revision, which more or less makes him a hypocrite (does it not?) after complaining about "failures to disclose" in my and Steven Jones work. The smaller measurement also lessens the disparity between my measurement and NIST's. With these close values, even a modest margin of error in the measurement of deceleration in the video clips could account for the discrepancies between the analyses.

More reasons why the NIST analysis of the Meyers footage does not support no-planes claims can be found in my November 2006 response

to Rick Rajter's analysis of that same video:

<http://www.questionsquestions.net/WTC/175speed.html#update>

It must be pointed out that NIST does not analyze the Fairbanks footage, so my findings aren't contradicted by their study. My method is easily replicable by someone with the right skills. Let's see someone use this method and get different results. And if there is an unexplained discrepancy, that would mean simply that one or both of the videos is fake, which doesn't tell us anything more than that there is video fakery, a possibility I've discussed at length already. (See [A Critical Review of WTC 'No Plane' Theories](#) .) The claimed absence of a large plane would remain unsupported.