




20 Years On

*Collected Essays on Why a New 9/11  
Investigation is Still Needed*



Adam Taylor

# 20 Years On

Collected Essays on Why a New 9/11 Investigation is  
Still Needed

Copyright © 2021 Adam Taylor

All rights reserved

Reproduction and distribution of this work is permitted, so long as:

- Proper attribution is given to the author
- It is not sold commercially
- Any changes made are clearly indicated

This eBook is intended for educational purposes only. It is distributed freely, and the author derives no monetary gain from it whatsoever.

Cover images from:

[http://architectuul.com/architecture/view\\_image/world-trade-center/8493](http://architectuul.com/architecture/view_image/world-trade-center/8493)  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/30/nyregion/is-one-world-trade-center-rises-in-lower-manhattan-a-design-success.html>

Dedicated to the lives lost on September 11th, 2001, and the countless number of lives that have followed as a result.

# CONTENTS

## Introduction

1

### Part 1: The Science of 9/11

#### 1. Other Collapses in Perspective

6

#### 2. Collapse or Explosion? The WTC “Sounds of Explosions” Issue

35

#### 3. Observations on NIST’s WTC Fireproofing Loss and Collapse Scenario

94

#### 4. Clarifying the Question of Collapse Times

102

### Part 2: Debunking the Debunkers

#### 5. 9/11 Undebunked: An Open Letter to Ryan Owens

117

#### 6. The World Trade Center WAS a Controlled Demolition: A Response to Mark Roberts

159

#### 7. Not so Noble: Debunking Joseph Nobles’ Criticisms of AE911Truth

180

8. Speaking Truth to Power: Myles Power's Case Against the Truth  
Movement  
225

9. Rebels without a Case: A Failed Debunking Attempt by Ron Craig  
and Rebel Media  
261

Part 3: Correcting Disinformation

10. How to Debunk Directed Energy Weapon Arguments  
273

11. Lying for 9/11 Truth: On the Pentagon and the Deceptions of Craig  
McKee  
283

Links to Original Writings  
294

Other Works by the Author  
297

About the Author  
298

## Introduction

*The truth is incontrovertible. Panic may resent it, ignorance may deride it, malice may distort it, but there it is.*

— Winston Churchill

September 11th, 2001. By now, the date itself could be its own sentence. What it means to any given person may vary, but it was (and to date still is) unquestionably the worst act of terrorism ever committed in the United States. It's been 20 years since it happened, but we are not 20 years *removed* from it. The effects of that day continue to reverberate down through history – whether it be the continuing wars fought in the Middle East, or the ever-growing restrictions on civil liberties, all in the name of fighting terrorism and protecting our homeland.

No matter what the average person thinks about that day, the official narrative, we are told, is that the attacks were carried out by 19 Islamic terrorists, following the orders of Khalid Sheik Mohammed and Osama bin Laden. However, many still question if that is all there is to that narrative, or if that narrative is wrong entirely. Those within the broad-ranged “9/11 Truth Movement” believe something else may have happened that day, something that the public has not been told the truth about. That the attacks may well have been an “inside job,” either partially or entirely orchestrated by entities within the U.S. government. It is that question this work explores, and one I've been exploring for over a decade of my life.

I was only ten when the attacks occurred, far too young to fully digest the tragedy of that day, or understand the full implications of what happened and the effects that would follow. But over the years I matured, I learned, and began to piece together everything little by little. What sent me down the path of taking a much closer and skeptical view of 9/11 was a chance viewing of a program that aired in 2007 on the History Channel. The program was aimed at debunking the so-called “conspiracy theories” of the 9/11 Truth Movement, wherein a theory was presented, only to be “refuted” by the on-screen experts.

Although this was an attempt at debunking the “inside job” narrative, it was the first time that narrative was presented to me in such extensive detail, and my curiosity grew. I did not know, up until that point, just how

many anomalies people had pointed out about the attacks, nor how large this collection of skeptics was. I was not convinced at that point we were lied to about 9/11, but I was convinced that possibility should be taken more seriously. And so, my decade-long research into 9/11 began.

During that period of time, I estimate I produced over 200 videos on the topic, and wrote dozens of articles critical of the official narrative of 9/11, all with the set purpose of working towards getting a new investigation of the attacks launched. The most productive period of my research, and where I posted most of my writings, was at the *Debunking the Debunkers* blog, created and hosted by my friend John-Michael Talboo. I also had the honor of contributing to Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth, the largest independent organization scientifically analyzing the WTC collapses from a skeptical viewpoint. My research largely focused on the collapse of the Twin Towers and World Trade Center Building 7, whose destruction many believe was the result of controlled demolition with explosives.

Over the years, many have wondered what qualifies me to analyze the WTC collapses from a scientific standpoint. With regards to expertise, the answer to that question is quite simple: not much. I freely admit I have no relevant credentials in physics or engineering, and have come at this topic as largely an amateur. To those who demand more than this, I can only offer my regrets. Despite my lack of credentials, I have endeavored to understand these topics to the best of my abilities, and I've read much scientific literature and learned a great deal with regards to physical sciences relevant to this topic. Furthermore, I've benefited from asking many scientists and engineers for help in understanding these topics, and I'm extremely grateful for this. For every article I've written, I've always hoped readers will judge the content based on its merit, not the lack of letters behind my name.

Despite my best efforts, however, and the efforts of the Truth Movement in general, a new investigation into the attacks has still yet to be achieved. Naturally this fact leaves me dismayed, but it's not a feeling I'm expressing for the first time here. In September of 2017, I officially announced my so-called "retirement" from the Truth Movement, explaining that after my trip to New York for the ten-year anniversary of the attacks, I truly felt the Movement was losing steam and began to feel a new investigation would never be realized. (See <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2017/09/why-10-years-at-least-for-me-is-enough.html>.) I

can't say that feeling has lifted since then, and I do still consider myself retired.

Why, then, am I releasing this work? This eBook, as the title states, is a collection of essays I've written during my years of research and are, in my opinion, some of my best. Now for the first time, they are all gathered together here in one place, formatted in a more organized fashion and done so for the convenience of others. As the title also makes clear, this work is released at the dawn of the twenty-year anniversary of the attacks. Although I still feel I've done as much as I can in regards to furthering a new investigation, I also believe it is important for people to have a correct understanding of what happened that day, especially two decades later.

The book is broken up into three sections. Part 1 contains my technical essays written on various aspects of the collapse of the WTC buildings, showing deficiencies in the explanations given by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and others, while also offering evidence that controlled demolition may actually be what really brought them down. Part 2 explores the claims of several so-called "debunkers," offering up rebuttals to their claims and explaining why their objections do not negate the need for a new investigation. Finally, Part 3 examines what I consider to be far-fetched and wildly unsupported claims made by those in the Truth Movement – claims that, in my opinion, can only be classified as disinformation. As I said, I believe people need to have accurate information about the attacks, and that goes for people both outside and *inside* the Movement.

We've been told over and over to never forget 9/11, and I quite agree. Over the past decade of researching the attacks, I've watched every video of the planes crashing into the towers, every video of the collapses, and countless images of the debris and wreckage. And no matter how much I've analyzed the event, no matter how closely I've examined the collapse of the Towers from a scientific standpoint, I have never once forgotten that there were people in those buildings, still alive, trapped, and whose lives were tragically taken when the buildings came down. What has motivated me over the years to examine 9/11 as intensively as I have is my passion to get justice for the victims and their still grieving families. Words cannot express the sympathy I have for all those most affected by that day, and it is their struggle that has been my guiding light all these years. We cannot forget that day, because we cannot forget the people who it matters to most. So long as their struggles remain, we should never stop fighting for or advocating for them.

This may well be the final work I produce on 9/11, but I will never forget that day, and nor should you. But if we never achieve a new investigation, then the best we can do is try to better our world, fix what problems it currently has, and work towards preventing the next 9/11s from happening. As of writing this, President Joe Biden has withdrawn all U.S. troops from Afghanistan, officially ending what is to date America's longest war. By ending the war that 9/11 led us in to, there is a glimmer of hope that creating a better world is perhaps indeed an accomplishable goal.

As for the information provided here, you may do with it as you wish. The work I did over the years was a labor of love, but a labor nonetheless, and I could not have done it without the help of some extraordinary people, whom I'd like to show my heartfelt gratitude. First and foremost, my sincerest thanks have to go towards my dear friend John-Michael Talboo. I would never have come as far as I have and done as much as I did without your help and guidance, and a platform to present my work on. You have been an invaluable research partner, and an even more invaluable friend.

Over the years I also benefitted from the help I received from other like-minded seekers of truth, either through technical assistance or just a platform which allowed me to reach a wider audience and help educate others. And for that, I'd like to give my sincerest thanks to Mark Basile, Stewart Bradley, Scott Burnan, David Chandler, Jonathan Cole, Ken Doc, Andrea Dreger, Richard Gage, Niels Harrit, Jeff Hill, Jim Hoffman, Faith R. Michaels, Eli Rika, Kevin Ryan, Jeremy Rys, Chris Sarns, Andy Steele, Bernie Suarez, Tom Sullivan, Tony Szamboti, Darcy Wearing, Steven Weathers, and John Wyndham. I would also like to thank Mick West. Although we disagree on this topic, he was kind enough to have me on his program "Tales from the Rabbit Hole," which allowed me a chance to communicate my position to an audience I other-wise would not have been able to.

9/11 will not be last great struggle or pain our country endures, but it is the one that continues to have a stranglehold on the very fabric of our democracy and way of life. Whether or not we get a new investigation, my hope is that we one day break that stranglehold, that 9/11 will be looked upon as a struggle we overcame – one of many obstacles done away with in our continuing quest to make a better world for this generation, and all the ones that will follow.

—Adam Taylor  
11 September 2021

# **Part 1: The Science of 9/11**

## Other Collapses in Perspective

Originally published 4 June 2011 at *Debunking the Debunkers*, and April 2013 at *Scientific Method 9/11*  
Revisions by Adam Taylor

One of the arguments that has been raised over the years by members of the 9/11 Truth Movement in regards to the collapse of the three WTC buildings is that, if the official story is correct, they were the first steel-framed high-rise skyscrapers in history to collapse because of fire. Indeed, in all of the history of structural engineering, not a single steel-framed skyscraper has ever totally collapsed due to fire.<sup>1</sup> However, in an attempt to invalidate this argument, numerous supporters of the official story of 9/11 have pointed out that there are several smaller steel structures that have collapsed due to fire. Journalist Chris Mohr, for example, cited numerous steel structures in his debate with architect Richard Gage.<sup>2</sup> The following are the most often cited steel structures that have collapsed due to fire (Chris Mohr referenced the first six in his debate with Richard Gage):

- Sight and Sound Theater (28 January 1987)
- McCormick Place (16 January 1967)
- Kader Toy Factory (10 May 1993)
- Mumbai High North Platform (27 July 2005)
- Interstate 580 (29 April 2007)

---

<sup>1</sup> Since first publishing this work, at least two steel-framed high-rises have collapsed due to fire – the Plasco Building in Tehran, Iran, and the Wilton Paes Almeida Building in São Paulo, Brazil. I will discuss these structures in the Afterword. See also discussion of these and other buildings in Chris Sarns, “A Record of Major High-Rise Fires Worldwide,” *AE911Truth*, 10 March 2020, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/648-a-record-of-major-high-rise-firesworldwide>.

<sup>2</sup> Full debate available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7-AaS5M0kBM>.

- World Trade Center 5 (11 September 2001)
- Dogwood Elementary School (27 November 2000)
- Windsor Tower (12 February 2005)
- Faculty of Architecture Building (13 May 2008)

It will be demonstrated why these structures cannot be justifiably used as comparisons to the WTC buildings, based on the estimated damage parameters and fire severity for these structures.

### **A note about steel failing due to fire**

A common misconception about this argument regarding other steel skyscrapers not collapsing is that it implies that steel cannot, under any circumstances, fail from being weakened by fire. But this idea is incorrect. Steel, while very strong, is not immune to the effects of fire, which is why fire-proofing is applied to many steel structures. The main argument that is really being presented is this: other steel-framed high-rise skyscrapers have never collapsed from fires that, upon careful examination, appear to have been more severe than the fires exhibited in the WTC buildings. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the WTC buildings should not have collapsed from the types of fires that were seen on 9/11. Of course, this argument must take other factors into consideration, including the construction of other buildings and the behavior of the fires themselves. However, these factors have already been examined and dealt with accordingly.<sup>3</sup>

This issue raises an interesting point. When one examines the list of collapsed steel structures cited by critics of the 9/11 Truth Movement, one thing immediately catches the eye: almost none of them are high-rise skyscrapers. The only building cited by these critics that is a high-rise is the Windsor Tower in Madrid, and this building did not suffer a complete collapse. Jim Hoffman has examined the partial collapse of the Windsor Tower, and notes that all this incident proves is that a huge building-consuming fire, after burning for many hours, can produce the collapse of parts of a building with weak steel supports lacking fire protection, and

---

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 197-208 of this present work.

that the collapse events that do occur are gradual and partial.<sup>4</sup> Hoffman has also examined the McCormick Place roof collapse, and has shown why this structure is also not comparable to the WTC buildings.<sup>5</sup> Aside from the Windsor Tower, none of the other structures cited by supporters of the official story are high-rises, and some of them are not even buildings.

It's interesting to note that critics are quick to point to these smaller and more poorly designed steel structures as valid comparisons to the WTC, while at the same arguing that other actual high-rises engulfed in fire are not comparable to the WTC due to "differences in design." If we are to draw comparisons between the WTC skyscrapers and other structures, then we would logically want to compare them to other skyscrapers. Several of these critics have demanded that those advocating the "no other high-rise collapses" argument provide an example of a skyscraper fire that matches almost exactly the conditions of the WTC on 9/11. The website debunking911.com, for example, has a detailed list of conditions which the anonymous author feels need to be met before drawing any comparisons.<sup>6</sup> But again, this same author has no problem offering drastically different constructed structures that have collapsed from fire as valid comparisons to the WTC.

To find a skyscraper matching the same conditions as the WTC is a difficult task. In terms of finding a building of similar design and structure, this is very difficult, as almost no two buildings are built exactly the same (except of course for the Twin Towers). There are, however, other skyscrapers that have been true infernos that can be considered comparable to the Towers and WTC7. For example, the One Meridian Plaza<sup>7</sup> and the First Interstate Bank,<sup>8</sup> two skyscrapers that had huge fires, were core and perimeter structures like the Towers and Building 7,

---

<sup>4</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), "The Windsor Building Fire," *911 Research*, last updated 20 March 2013, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/compare/windsor.html>.


<sup>5</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), "The McCormick Place Roof Collapse," *911 Research*, last updated 23 December 2006, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/compare/mccormick.html>.

<sup>6</sup> "First Time in History" (n.d.), archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20090201154712/http://www.debunking911.com/firsttime.htm>.

<sup>7</sup> "High-rise Office Building Fire One Meridian Plaza Philadelphia, Pennsylvania," *Iklim* (n.d.), at <http://www.iklimnet.com/hotelfires/meridienplaza.html>.

<sup>8</sup> "Interstate Bank Building Fire Los Angeles, California (May 4, 1988)," *Iklim* (n.d.), at [http://www.iklimnet.com/hotelfires/big\\_fires1.html](http://www.iklimnet.com/hotelfires/big_fires1.html).

although not quite the same. Here is a schematic of the design of the First Interstate Bank, a building that had a severe fire which lasted almost four hours:



Schematic floor plan of the 12th floor

Image from: [http://www.iklimnet.com/hotelfires/bigfires\\_2.html](http://www.iklimnet.com/hotelfires/bigfires_2.html)

Now compare this to the design of the Twin Towers and Building 7:




Image from: <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/plans/frames.html>




Image from: [https://tsapps.nist.gov/publication/get\\_pdf.cfm?pub\\_id=860567](https://tsapps.nist.gov/publication/get_pdf.cfm?pub_id=860567)

The construction these buildings was similar in terms of the core and perimeter. In terms of fire severity, even NIST has admitted that the fires in the First Interstate Bank and the One Meridian Plaza were likely more severe than the fires in at least WTC7.

There are more similarities than differences between the uncontrolled fires that burned in WTC 7 and those that occurred in the following buildings: First Interstate Bank Building (1988), One Meridian Plaza Building (1991), One New York Plaza (1970), and WTC 51 (2001).<sup>9</sup>

NIST therefore concluded that the fires in First Interstate Bank and One Meridian Plaza were at least as severe, and probably more severe, than the fires in WTC 7.<sup>10</sup>

The author of the previously mentioned debunking911.com article claims that “The statement that the WTC buildings were the first high-rise buildings to collapse from fire is deceptive because it purposely doesn’t take [other] factors into account.”

As we will see, it is in fact supporters of the official story who have ignored specific factors when comparing the WTC buildings to other steel structures. To simply brush off other high-rise fires by making claims about how the Twin Towers were hit by planes or that the buildings were

---

<sup>9</sup> “Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation,” 19 September 2011 (last updated 20 November 2019), question 9, at <https://www.nist.gov/topics/disaster-failure-studies/faqs-nist-wtc-7-investigation>.

<sup>10</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 341, at [https://www.nist.gov/publications/structural-fire-response-and-probable-collapse-sequence-world-trade-center-building-7?pub\\_id=861611](https://www.nist.gov/publications/structural-fire-response-and-probable-collapse-sequence-world-trade-center-building-7?pub_id=861611).

constructed differently is by itself deceptive. Claims like this fail to specifically address the actual factors involved in determining just how different and similar the WTC buildings really were compared to other incidents. We will therefore move on to address these specific points regarding the structures normally cited by critics and other defenders of the official story. Having already covered the Windsor Tower and McCormick Place, the structures we shall examine are: the Sight and Sound Theater, the Kadar Toy Factory, the Mumbai High North Platform, Interstate 580, World Trade Center 5, the Dogwood Elementary School and the Faculty of Architecture Building.

### **The Sight and Sound Theater**

On 28 January 1997, the Sight and Sound Theater in Pennsylvania suffered a collapse from a fire which lasted approximately 3½ hours. The building was a rectangular shaped structure that was approximately 100 feet wide and approximately 74 feet tall. The fire was started by welding operations occurring at the theater. Like the collapse of the McCormick Place exhibition hall, it was not a total building collapse – it was only a roof collapse. Much less was it the total collapse of a high-rise building. Photographs taken after the collapse show that the roof of one section of the structure failed due to the fire.



Aerial view



Front view

Images from: [https://www.interfire.org/res\\_file/pdf/Tr-097.pdf](https://www.interfire.org/res_file/pdf/Tr-097.pdf)

As we can see from these photos, this collapse could at best be described as a partial collapse of the structure. Only the roof collapsed, leaving the surrounding walls standing. Also, not only was the building not a high-rise, it was not even a multi-story structure. The building section that collapsed only had one floor that was open spaced, therefore the collapse

of this structure is not comparable to the “global collapse” of the WTC, which resulted in not only the failure of the floors, but also the failure of the buildings’ major support columns.

The FEMA report on the Sight and Sound Theater noted several issues that led to the building’s collapse,<sup>11</sup> including:

- The building did not have a sprinkler system.
- Construction on the stage floor damaged the sprayed-on fire-resistant coating of steel structural members.
- The building was under construction and fire doors were not yet installed, allowing the fires to pass through these openings freely.

While there is no denying that the fires were severe enough to cause the steel to fail, this should be no surprise regarding this particular structure.

### **The Kader Toy Factory**

On 10 May 1993, the Kader Toy Factory in Thailand collapsed after suffering one of the worst industrial factory fires in history. Although the factory was technically a series of four structures, the part of the factory which was on fire and collapsed was actually a single E-shaped structure which connected Buildings One, Two and Three. Building Four was a separate nearby structure.

This building is often cited by supporters of the official story due to the fact that the factory was a multi-story building which collapsed due to fire alone. However, according to official reports on the incident,<sup>12</sup> the factory was poorly designed and built. The steel frame-work was weak and none of the steel was insulated. The building also lacked any sprinklers. Also, the factory had apparently been damaged by a series of other smaller fires in the past. At the time of the May 10 fire, parts of the building were still being repaired from a fire which occurred in February of that same year. Ultimately, this structure had a completely different set of variables from

---

<sup>11</sup> Stanley L. Poole and Hollis Stambaugh, “\$15 Million Sight and Sound Theater Fire and Building Collapse Lancaster County, Pennsylvania,” *United States Fire Administration*, 28 January 1997, at [https://www.interfire.org/res\\_file/pdf/Tr-097.pdf](https://www.interfire.org/res_file/pdf/Tr-097.pdf).

<sup>12</sup> Casey Cavanagh Grant, “Case Study: The Kader Toy Factory Fire” (n.d.), archived at <http://web.archive.org/web/20070307071310/http://www.ilo.org/encyclopedia/?doc&nd=857100058&nh=0&sssect=0>.

that of the three WTC buildings, and therefore seems to be a very weak example to use as a comparison.

### **The Mumbai High North Platform**

On 27 July 2005, the Mumbai High North Platform in India's Arabian Sea completely collapsed due to a severe fire. A multi-purpose support vessel collided with the offshore platform, causing a major fire which caused the platform to collapse after two hours of burning.

This incident is another favorite of those critical of the 9/11 Truth Movement as evidence that steel structures can collapse from fires. However, when one examines the specifics of this incident, it becomes obvious that this structure is not even remotely comparable to the WTC. We note that, once again, this structure was not a high-rise skyscraper, but merely a seven-story structure.

The intensity of the fire was clearly due to the fact that the platform was a major oil rig, and produced 260,000 barrels of oil per day.<sup>13</sup> Compare that to the less than 10,000 gallons of jet fuel that entered each of the Twin Towers. Being that this structure was engulfed in a fire that had an unlimited source of fuel and air to sustain it, it is no surprise that this structure collapsed. It is hardly comparable to the WTC buildings, as it has almost nothing to do with the self-crushing steel building theory in which a tall structure crushes and shreds itself from top to bottom.

### **Interstate 580**

On 29 April 2007, the Interstate 580 in Oakland, California collapsed from a fire started by a gasoline tanker truck which crashed on the interstate. The interstate collapsed after about 19 minutes of burning. This incident is often cited by supporters of the official story due to the fact that it shows a steel structure collapsing after a relatively short period of burning. However, shortly after this incident occurred, the website [prisonplanet.com](http://prisonplanet.com) (now defunct) posted an article addressing critics'

---

<sup>13</sup> "Mumbai High North Platform Fire 2005 – 2 severed fingertips, 22 dead, 362 rescued," *IRC Risk and Safety* (2009), at <http://archive.constantcontact.com/fs037/1102467289629/archive/1102588063736.html>.

claims that the interstate collapse added validity to the “natural collapse” theory for the WTC.<sup>14</sup> As noted by the article:

Professor Steven Jones, a Ph.D. physicist and cold fusion expert, joined Alex Jones on the air yesterday to talk about the monumental differences between the two collapses. Jones said that the notion that steel supporting columns completely melted from fire is impossible and that what actually happened was that thin supporting bolts were warped, resulting in the collapse of the bridge section. [...]

The freeway section was made of highly flammable asphalt and took the brunt of a gigantic gasoline explosion with open air fires shooting 200 feet in the air. In comparison, the twin towers were impacted by aluminum planes filled with significantly less flammable kerosene and suffered limited fires that were oxygen-starved and almost out before the collapses occurred.

Building 7 was not hit by anything save a small amount of debris from the towers and suffered limited fires across just eight floors. In addition, explosions were being reported by occupants within WTC 7 before the towers had even collapsed. [...]

Halfway through the discussion with Steven Jones, a steel welding expert joined the conversation to express his incredulity at the fact that Fox News was comparing the collapse of the highway with the World Trade Center buildings.

“You can’t even begin to compare 5 inch thick steel plate core columns, approximately 2 foot by 5 foot rectangle 5 inch thick boxes to quarter inch and 3 quarter inch dowels that connect the steel to the support members,” said the steel expert.

“The logical deduction is that the rebar steel was exposed horizontally, that whole bridge surface and it was exposed intention, not like the fires that were lapping up fire-proofed 5 inch thick plate columns in the World Trade Center – these little bars had no heat sink and after two hours with all that weight on them they fell.”

---

<sup>14</sup> Paul Joseph Watson, “Debunkers Use Ludicrous Freeway Comparison To Attack 9/11 Truth,” *Prison Planet*, 1 May 2007, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20071106021941/http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/may2007/010507ludicrousfreeway.htm>.

Debunkers have also failed to acknowledge the fact that freeways in the San Francisco area have already been weakened by multiple earthquakes and regularly collapse entirely of their own accord by accident.

The Prison Planet article also cited an analysis done by Joseph Plummer,<sup>15</sup> who noted several differences between this incident and the WTC collapses, including:

1. This was an open-air fire, where the flames could reach higher temperatures.
2. The flames were focused on a single section of the bridge, unlike the randomly spread fires in the Towers and Building 7.
3. There were no reports of molten metal being found after the bridge collapsed.
4. The collapse of the upper freeway onto the lower freeway did not cause the lower freeway to collapse (i.e., no “global” or “pancake” collapse). The concrete was also not pulverized.
5. The columns of the bridge remained standing, unlike the Towers and Building 7.

It’s also worth noting that the investigation carried out by the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards documented that the steel from the interstate had been heated to temperatures ranging from 850°C (1,562 °F) to as high as 1,000°C (1,832°F).<sup>16</sup> In contrast, the NIST investigation into the collapse of the WTC showed that there was no evidence that the steel had exceeded temperatures of 600°C (1112°F). The highest temperatures estimated for the 11 samples examined by NIST was 250°C (482°F).<sup>17</sup> Ultimately, this incident is yet another example of a steel structure collapsing from fire that is not comparable to the destruction of the WTC. Not only was this structure not a high-rise, it was not even a building.

---

<sup>15</sup> Joseph Plummer, “Freeway Collapse,” *JoePlummer.com* (n.d.), at <https://www.joeplummer.com/freeway-collapse>.

<sup>16</sup> D.S. Dunn *et al*, “Analysis of Structural Materials Exposed to a Severe Fire Environment (NUREG/CR-6987),” *USNRC*, February 2009, p. iii, at <https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/contract/cr6987/index.html>.

<sup>17</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1, p. 90, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/federal-building-and-fire-safety-investigation-world-trade-center-disaster-final-report>.

## World Trade Center 5

On 11 September 2001, World Trade Center 5, a nine-story building that stood east of the North Tower, suffered a partial collapse after being damaged from falling debris from the collapse of the WTC. According to the FEMA report, the local collapse of four floors inside the building was caused by intense fires. Like many other incidents cited by supporters of the official story, this was not a total building collapse. Only four floors in one section of the building collapsed due to fires.

According to the FEMA report, the eighth floor of WTC5 collapsed down onto the seventh floor, and then both of those floors collapsed onto the sixth floor, and so on, down to the fourth floor.<sup>18</sup> One reason critics are fond of citing this structure is because they feel it lends credibility to the idea of a “pancake,” or “global” collapse as it is also referred to. However, upon closer examination of the building, it becomes apparent why the structure collapsed the way it did.

The pancake collapse only progressed to the fifth floor. The fourth floor of WTC5 did not collapse. Why didn't the floors pancake all the way down to the bottom floor? Why didn't the fourth-floor collapse? After all, the fourth floor had to sustain the loads of four floors which had collapsed on top of it. It's interesting to note that the ninth floor also did not collapse from the upper layer temperature of the fires on the lower floors. So why did only floors five through eight collapse? As we read in the FEMA report, there was no fire on the third floor, which meant that there was no heat to weaken the fourth floor from below.<sup>19</sup>


But the main reason that only floors five through eight collapsed seems to be due to the type of connections those floors used. The local collapse due to fire appeared to have occurred at the field connections, where the beams were connected to the shear stubs for floors four through eight. What this shows us is that any other type of connection in the building did not fail due to fires. The ninth floor of WTC5 was described by the FEMA report as “conventional for steel-frame construction and did not include a column-tree system.”<sup>20</sup> The ninth floor did sag due to the upper layer temperatures of the five burning floors below, but the connections did not fail and the floor did not collapse.

---


<sup>18</sup> FEMA WTC Report, Chapter 4, p. 6 (Fig. 4-7), at [https://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403\\_ch4.pdf](https://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_ch4.pdf).

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 14 (Fig. 4-15).

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 2.



Connection for floors four through eight (FEMA Report, Ch. 4, Fig. 4-2)



Failed connections (FEMA Report, Ch. 4, Fig. 4-18)



Ninth Floor of WTC5 (FEMA Report, Ch. 4, Fig. 4-14)

The main cause of the localized collapse was evidently due to the fact that floors five through eight were connected with shear tabs, as photos show that the beam stubs connected to the columns did not fail from the fires. And lastly, the reason that the fourth floor did not collapse appears to be because its connections had not been weakened by heat and fires from below.



Failed connection with beam stub still attached (FEMA Report, Ch. 4, Fig. 4-21)

The local collapse of WTC5 cannot be seen as comparable to any of the WTC buildings. With regard to the Twin Towers, the official explanation for the cause of collapse was not that the floors had pancaked, as was previously believed. Rather, the explanation given was that the connections did not fail, and that they pulled on the exterior columns, causing them to bow inward and break (although this scenario has been largely challenged by other researchers<sup>21</sup>).

---

<sup>21</sup> E.g., Jim Hoffman, “Building a Better Mirage: NIST’s 3-Year \$20,000,000 Cover-Up of the Crime of the Century,” *9/11 Research*, 8 December 2005, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/nist/index.html>; Eric Douglas, “The NIST WTC Investigation – How Real Was The Simulation?,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, December 2006, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200612/NIST-WTC-Investigation.pdf>; Anonymous and Franke Legge, “Falsifiability and the NIST WTC Report: A Study in Theoretical Adequacy,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*,

With regards to WTC7, NIST claims that the collapse was initiated by the failure of floor 13, which pancaked all the way down to the fifth floor. This left column 79 unsupported, which caused the column to buckle, which led to a progression of failures spreading from the east side of the building to the west side. Many have also challenged this scenario presented by NIST.<sup>22</sup> But the main point is that this description of the floors pancaking due to the heat is in stark contrast to the behavior of the floors in WTC5. The beams and girders in WTC7 were not connected with shear tabs, as was the case in WTC5. In fact, evidence suggests that, by NIST's own admission, the connections in WTC7 should have resisted the effects of the fires.<sup>23</sup> And in WTC7 there were never more than three floors on fire, one above the other.<sup>24</sup>

Based on the differences in the fire conditions and construction of the buildings, we can conclude that the circumstances surrounding WTC5's partial collapse are ultimately not comparable to the conditions of the other WTC buildings.

---

March 2010, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2010/Falsifiability.pdf>.

<sup>22</sup> E.g., Kevin Ryan, "The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science reaches its peak," *911 Review*, 10 September 2008, at [http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST\\_WTC7.html](http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST_WTC7.html); F. R. Greening, "Comments on the Draft Report NIST NCSTAR 1-9: 'Structural Fire Response and Probable Collapse Sequence of World Trade Center Building 7', issued by NIST August 21st, 2008," 11 September 2008, at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/greeningcommentstncstar1-9.pdf>; Ronald Brookman, "The NIST Analyses: A Close Look at WTC 7," *AE911Truth*, March 2010, at [https://www.ae911truth.org/images/The\\_NIST\\_Analyses\\_-\\_A\\_Close\\_Look\\_at\\_WTC\\_7.pdf](https://www.ae911truth.org/images/The_NIST_Analyses_-_A_Close_Look_at_WTC_7.pdf).

<sup>23</sup> Chris Sarns, "NIST fraud - WTC 7 Shear Studs," *OpEdNews*, 9 November 2008, at <https://www.opednews.com/Diary/NIST-fraud--WTC-7-Shear-S-by-Chris-Sarns-081109-134.html>.

<sup>24</sup> "The fires were ignited on at least ten floors; however, only the fires on Floors 7 through 9 and 11 through 13 grew and lasted until the time of the building collapse." Quoted from: NIST NCSTAR 1A, p. xxxvi, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/final-report-collapse-world-trade-center-building-7-federal-building-and-fire-safety-0>. See also Figures 10-4 and 10-24 in NIST NCSTAR 1-9, pp. 397, 417.

## The Dogwood Elementary School

On 27 November 2000, a fire broke out in the Dogwood Elementary School in Reston, Virginia. The fire, believed to have been caused by an electric short, caused many of the steel sections of the building to collapse after around a half hour of burning. This incident is another favorite of critics, as it shows a steel structure collapsing from fire in a relatively short amount of time. However, there are several issues regarding this building that need to be taken into account.

The investigation carried out by the U.S. Fire Administration noted numerous key issues that contributed to the severity of the fire and the collapse.<sup>25</sup> One of the main issues the report noted was that the building was not subjected to current fire code regulations. “Dogwood Elementary School, as well as other schools of similar construction in Fairfax County, was not subject to current code regulations since it was built in 1974.”<sup>26</sup>

Other issues noted by the report include<sup>27</sup>:

- *Sprinklers*: “When Dogwood Elementary School was constructed, the benefit of sprinklers in schools was not fully recognized. Moreover, the cost and expense were still too high to make mandating them practical. When codes requiring sprinklers were put into place, Dogwood was not required to retrofit with sprinklers in order to be code-compliant. While sprinklers would not have prevented the fire, they certainly could have minimized the destruction caused by it.”
- *Firewalls*: “Further contributing to the size of the fire at Dogwood Elementary was the lack of firewalls or fire stops in the building. As noted previously the school was essentially a large, open area with a high fire load of high surface area to mass ration combustibles, many of which were high BTU-generating fuels. There was over 1.1 million cubic feet of air available to fuel the fire – even more, if a window was open or after the roof collapsed. Firewalls could have limited the rapid growth and spread of the fire by containing it to smaller areas of the school.”

---

<sup>25</sup> William A. Tobin *et al*, “\$12 Million Dollar Fire at Dogwood Elementary School,” *U.S. Fire Administration*, November 2000, at <https://www.usfa.fema.gov/downloads/pdf/publications/tr-135.pdf>.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

As this was yet another example of a single-story building that was built far more poorly than any of the WTC buildings, we can conclude that comparing this structure to the Twin Towers and Building 7 is unjustifiable.

### **The Faculty of Architecture Building**

On 13 May 2008, a fire started in a coffee vending machine on the sixth floor of the 13-story Faculty of Architecture Building at the Delft University of Technology in the Netherlands. After burning for more than seven hours, a section of the building collapsed from the fires. Out of all the structures referenced by supporters of the official story, this appears to be the only one that can be seen as possibly comparable to the WTC buildings in terms of how the structure collapsed. The collapse started on the tenth floor of the building and progressed down to the bottom. Critics note that this collapse was similar to the top-down collapse exhibited by the WTC. However, upon close examination, this incident contrasts in many important aspects to the WTC.

For starters, the structure burned far longer than either of the Towers. (It did burn for roughly the same amount of time as Building 7, but the characteristics of the collapse are focused on more in relation to the Twin Towers.) The official study into the collapse documented a large amount of data on the building, but was unable to examine any parts of the building due to the fact that it was demolished right after the fire, as it was structurally unsafe. As a result, further research into the building is not possible. The study stated that a likely cause of collapse was the heat-induced spalling of the concrete support columns.<sup>28</sup>

Although this structure did collapse in a way that looked similar to the destruction of the Twin Towers, there are several important differences between the incidents, including:

- The building burned much longer than either of the Towers.
- The collapse was localized, leaving most of the main structure standing.

---

<sup>28</sup> Brian Meacham *et al.*, “Fire and Collapse, Faculty of Architecture Building, Delft University of Technology: Data Collection and Preliminary Analyses” (2010), at [https://www.dr.dk/NR/rdonlyres/FECDDBA8-7428-460D-846F-0C3D424D3A81/2748348/Delft\\_brandrapport.pdf](https://www.dr.dk/NR/rdonlyres/FECDDBA8-7428-460D-846F-0C3D424D3A81/2748348/Delft_brandrapport.pdf).

- The building was constructed very differently from the Towers.
- The collapse took approximately 10 seconds. Unlike many of the other structures referenced, we have several videos of this collapse, and they show that the collapse of the 13-story section took roughly 9 to 10 seconds from start to finish.<sup>29</sup> However, the Twin Towers, which were each 110-storys tall, each collapsed in approximately 15 seconds.<sup>30</sup> Building 7, a 47-story building, collapsed in less than seven seconds.<sup>31</sup> These contrast strongly with the collapse of the Faculty building. If the Towers and Building 7 were truly gravity driven collapses, as was the case for this incident, then we would expect them to have taken far longer to totally collapse than they actually did.<sup>32</sup>

Although there are undoubtedly similarities between the Faculty of Architecture Building collapse and the WTC collapses, it becomes apparent that under careful examination, the differences outweigh the similarities.

### **The Twin Towers and World Trade Center 7 in perspective**

We often hear arguments from critics about how the conditions of the WTC buildings were far different from other high-rise fires, such as “the planes did a lot of damage and dislodged fireproofing” or “those other buildings didn’t have jet fuel dumped into them.” However, although these were the circumstances for the WTC, this does not automatically mean that their conditions were more severe than other high-rise fires. Likewise, it also does not necessarily mean that the conditions of the WTC were far worse than the conditions of the other smaller steel structures we have discussed. Let us establish what the actual conditions were for the Towers and Building 7.

---

<sup>29</sup> Video and timing of the collapse available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c1SF3K5PaWI>.

<sup>30</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “Tower Destruction Timelines,” *911 Research*, last updated 18 December 2006, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/timeline/index.html>.

<sup>31</sup> “WTC 7 External Wall Descent Timing,” available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DcEm9wLR3N0>.

<sup>32</sup> For more on this point, see Chapter 4 of this present work.

## The Jet Fuel

Although the official reports do not claim the fires were fueled primarily by the jet fuel, it is useful to assess how much fuel actually entered each building, given that it was the main source that started the fires. (Note that this issue applies only to the Twin Towers, as Building 7 was not struck by an aircraft.)

According to one author, the amount of fuel that actually remained within each building was so small it would have fit into the back of a mid-sized U-Haul truck.<sup>33</sup> The author estimates that, after the initial impacts, approximately 929 cubic feet volume of jet fuel remained in WTC 1 and 793 cubic feet volume of jet fuel remained in WTC 2. The author also estimates that “If 900 cubic feet of fuel was spread evenly over just one 40,000 square feet floor of a Tower, it would result in a film 0.27 inches thick, about the thickness of a pencil.”<sup>34</sup> This assumes that all the fuel was confined to one floor. In reality, the fuel was spread out over numerous floors.

The author then goes on to point out that:

Even NIST admits in its Final Report, “The initial jet fuel fires themselves lasted at most a few minutes.” The only remaining source of fuel for the fires was common office furnishings. The idea that a few floors of common office furnishings burning for 56 minutes could result in the demolition of the South Tower is phenomenally ludicrous. If true, then every high-rise steel tower ever constructed should be immediately demolished as a hazard to public safety. Of course, that is unnecessary because no high-rise steel structure has ever collapsed as a result of fire.<sup>35</sup>

NIST estimated approximately 8,684 gallons of fuel entered WTC1 and 7,415 gallons entered WTC2. Of that, they determined around half of those amounts flowed away from impact zones and fire floors.<sup>36</sup> But how much of this fuel existed on the floors where the collapses started?

---

<sup>33</sup> Anon, “Non-animated Visualization Aids to Assist in Understanding the Demolitions of the World Trade Center Twin Towers,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 27 November 2007, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/e/VisualizationAidsWTCTowers.pdf>.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>36</sup> For jet fuel distribution amounts, see NIST NCSTAR 1-5F, Tables 5-3 and 5-4 (p. 56), at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/computer-simulation-fires-wo>

According to NIST, the collapse of the North Tower started at the 98th floor, and the collapse of the South Tower started at the 82nd floor.<sup>37</sup> As for the amount of fuel that remained on those floors, according to researcher Kevin Fenton:

Although the role of the jet fuel, which is said to have burned up within a few minutes of the initial impact, is not thought to have been large, the amount of fuel spilled on floor 98 and that on the central impact floors can also be compared. According to NIST's severe case scenario, only 454 gallons of jet fuel were spilled on floor 98 [of WTC1], which had an area of over 40,000 ft<sup>2</sup>, whereas over 1,905 gallons – over four times more – were spilled on each of floors 94, 95 and 96. This indicates that the jet fuel could not have been the major cause of the collapse. [...]

According to the severe case, more fuel – 1,495 gallons – was deposited on floor 82 than on either of the central impact floors, although the floor that received the largest amount of fuel was 79 (note: the numbers are similar for the base cases for both towers).<sup>38</sup>

When we recognize how much fuel actually remained in the buildings, we see how unreasonable it is to compare the Towers to structures such as the ones we've examined here. How can it possibly be justified to compare the Towers, which each had only about 3000 gallons of jet fuel remain on the fire floors, to structures like the Mumbai High Platform, which likely had over 1,000,000 gallons of oil to fuel the fires, or the Interstate 580, which had 8600 gallons of gasoline fueling the fires below it? Likewise, the heat from these fires has been greatly disputed. NIST has no evidence of high temperatures in either building. Their estimates of 482°F as the

---

.../rld-trade-center-towers-federal-building-and-fire-safety-0. Here NIST also acknowledges that: "The authors of the FEMA report suggested that half of the fuel not consumed in the fireballs could have flowed away, presumably down the elevator shafts and stairwells based on eyewitness accounts. [...] The jet fuel consumption estimate put forth by the FEMA team was used in the model because (1) no evidence or analysis emerged that significantly altered the FEMA estimate, and (2) the simulations were insensitive to both the amount and distribution of the jet fuel."

<sup>37</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1, Table 6-2 (p. 87). See also Figure 2-12 (p. 33).

<sup>38</sup> Kevin Fenton, "WTC Collapse Initiation Floors: What They Were and How Much Damage They Suffered," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, June 2008, pp. 2, 3, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2008/FentonWTCInitiationFloors.pdf>.

highest temperature the steel in the buildings reached is consistent with estimates of the maximum temperatures reached by the jet fuel fires.<sup>39</sup>

### The Structural Damage

The next aspect of the WTC Twin Towers incident that must be examined is the amount of structural damage the buildings suffered. These are the damage parameters as estimated by NIST<sup>40</sup>:

WTC 1:

35 exterior columns severed, 2 heavily damaged (out of 240)

6 core columns severed, 3 heavily damaged (out of 47)

43 of 47 core columns stripped of insulation on one or more floors.

WTC 2:

33 exterior columns severed, 1 heavily damaged

10 core columns severed, 1 heavily damaged

39 of 47 core columns stripped of insulation on one or more floors.

These damage parameters estimated by NIST have been disputed.<sup>41</sup> However, it is generally accepted that the structural damage was not a major factor in the collapse of the buildings. As Thomas Eagar of MIT writes:

While the aircraft impact undoubtedly destroyed several columns in the WTC perimeter wall, the number of columns lost on the initial impact was not large and the loads were shifted to remaining columns in this highly redundant structure.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> In “The Jet Fuel; How Hot Did it Heat the World Trade Center?,” the author estimates that the fuel on a single floor could not have raised the temperature to more than 257°C (495°F). See <http://911research.wtc7.net/mirrors/guardian2/wtc/how-hot.htm>. This is also consistent with tests conducted in uninsulated steel-framed parking garages, which found the highest temperature reached was 360°C (680°F). See “Fire Resistance of Steel Framed Car Parks,” *Corus Construction*, archived at [https://www.911research.wtc7.net/cache/wtc/analysis/fires/car\\_park\\_tests.htm](https://www.911research.wtc7.net/cache/wtc/analysis/fires/car_park_tests.htm).

<sup>40</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1, pp. 22-23, 41.

<sup>41</sup> Hoffman, “Building a Better Mirage” (section “Altering Flight 175’s Path”), and Douglas, “The NIST WTC Investigation,” pp. 9-11.

<sup>42</sup> Thomas W. Eagar and Christopher Musso, “Why Did the World Trade Center Collapse? Science, Engineering, and Speculation,” *JOM* (2001), at <https://www.tms.org/pubs/journals/JOM/0112/Eagar/Eagar-0112.html>.

What is generally seen as truly damaging to the structures was the fireproofing dislodged by the airplane impacts. The NIST report itself states that:

The WTC towers likely would not have collapsed under the combined effects of aircraft impact and damage and the extensive, multi-floor fires if the thermal insulation had not been widely dislodged or had been minimally dislodged by aircraft impact.<sup>43</sup>

This is also a major argument raised by supporters of the official story as to why the structures collapsed. But how much fireproofing was actually dislodged? Fenton also examines the structural damage and the loss of fireproofing in his article, writing that<sup>44</sup>:

Floor 98 [of WTC1] was not in the centre of the impact area, but was struck by a portion of the aircraft. The fuselage and the engines hit floors 95 and 96, whereas floor 98 was only hit by the outer section of the plane's starboard wing. Five of the perimeter columns on floor 98 were severed. If 50% of the building's gravity load is assumed to be carried by the columns in the building's core and 50% by the 236 perimeter columns, the five severed perimeter columns would have degraded floor 98's ability to bear the gravity load it supported by slightly more than 1%. The central impact floors, where 15-18 perimeter columns were severed, suffered more damage. The damage suffered by the central impact floors was therefore at least three times worse than that suffered by floor 98. [...]

According to NIST's severe case simulation, on floor 96, "The insulation was knocked off nearly all the core columns and over a 40 ft width of floor trusses from the south end of the core to the south face of the tower." On the contrary, the alleged damage to the fireproofing on floor 98 was much less, "The debris cut a shallow path through the west and center array of trusses, damaging the insulation up to the north wall of the building core." Even if NIST's simulations can be successfully challenged, it is logical to assume that the potential for damage to the fireproofing was greater on the central impact floors than on floor 98. [...]

NIST's severe case scenario predicts ten severed core columns on floor 80, but only 5 on floor 82 [for WTC2]. [...]

---

<sup>43</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1, p. xxxviii.

<sup>44</sup> Fenton, "WTC Collapse Initiation Floors," pp. 1, 2, 3.

[F]loor 82 only received a total of 1,400 lb of aircraft debris in this case, whereas floor 80 received over 40,000 lb, making it likely that any damage to fireproofing would have been significantly more severe on floor 80.

The amount of fire-proofing dislodged on the collapse initiation floors was evidently much less than on the other floors. There are other reasons for believing that the fire-proofing could not have been widely dislodged in the structures:

- In the case of the North Tower, the collapse initiated on the side of the building opposite to where the plane entered. With the amount of energy that would have been dissipated as the plane entered the building, it is unlikely that much of the fire-proofing would have been dislodged all the way on the other side of the structure.<sup>45</sup>
- NIST’s scenario requires that the planes be shredded into small pieces as they enter the buildings to widely dislodge the fire-proofing.<sup>46</sup> However, witnesses who escaped the South Tower described seeing intact portions of the aircraft, meaning that it is likely that the planes were not shredded into small pieces.

“The plane impacts. I try to get up and then I realize that I’m covered up to my shoulder in debris. And when I’m digging through under all this rubble, I

---


<sup>45</sup> NIST conducted tests where buckshot and shrapnel were fired at sections of steel coated in fireproofing. During one test, the projectile was fired at a velocity of only 102 ft/s (31 m/s), which resulted in no damage to the fireproofing. (See NIST NCSTAR 1-6A, Appendix C, p. 268, at [https://www.nist.gov/publications/passive-fire-protection-federal-building-and-fire-safety-investigation-world-trade-0?pub\\_id=101041](https://www.nist.gov/publications/passive-fire-protection-federal-building-and-fire-safety-investigation-world-trade-0?pub_id=101041).) Yet according to NIST, the plane debris was only travelling at a rate of approximately 51 ft/s (15 m/s) once it reached the south side of the North Tower, where the fire was supposed to have initiated the collapse. (See NIST NCSTAR 1-2, pp. 171-80 at [https://www.nist.gov/publications/baseline-structuralperformance-and-aircraft-impact-damage-analysis-world-trade-1?pub\\_id=101012](https://www.nist.gov/publications/baseline-structuralperformance-and-aircraft-impact-damage-analysis-world-trade-1?pub_id=101012).)

<sup>46</sup> Kevin Ryan, “What is 9/11 Truth? – The First Steps,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, August 2006, pp. 2-3, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Article\\_1\\_Ryan5.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Article_1_Ryan5.pdf). See also NIST NCSTAR 1-2, Figures 7-67 (p. 271) and 7-78 (p. 282).

can see the bottom wing starting to burn, and that wing is wedged 20 feet in my office doorway.” –Stanley Prainnath, WTC2 survivor<sup>47</sup>

Furthermore, Purdue University’s own simulation of Flight 11’s impact into the North Tower (which was described by the University as “[having] a realism never seen before”) showed the aircraft being shredded into large chunks, rather than the much smaller debris suggested by NIST.<sup>48</sup>

- NIST asserts that the inward bowing of the Towers’ perimeter columns initiated the collapse of the structures. However, we can see from NIST’s own estimates that the major inward bowing occurred in the area of the North Tower where evidently no fireproofing was dislodged.



Images from NIST NCSTAR 1-6, pages 161 (left) and 139 (right). Note: Blue areas indicate dislodged fireproofing. Red circles added by the author.

<sup>47</sup> “Accounts from the South Tower,” *The New York Times*, 26 May 2002, at <https://www.nytimes.com/2002/05/26/nyregion/accounts-from-the-south-tower.html>. There is also a recorded phone interview with Stanley Prainnath online in which he discusses seeing intact portions of the plane in the building: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GRwNJmQw1MY>.

<sup>48</sup> “Purdue creates scientifically based animation of 9/11 attack,” *Purdue News*, 12 June 2007, at <https://www.purdue.edu/uns/x/2007a/070612HoffmannWTC.html>.

This indicates that the inward bowing was caused by something other than the fires.<sup>49</sup>

To summarize: The amount of jet fuel that remained on the fire floors of the Towers was minimal in comparison to the total fuel from each plane. The heat from the fires appears to have been too weak to cause the buildings to collapse. The structural damage of the collapse initiation floors was less than that of the other more heavily damaged floors. The amount of fire-proofing dislodged from the collapse initiation floors appears to have been minimal compared to other impacted floors.

### **World Trade Center 7**

With regard to WTC7, there has been considerable dispute over the cause of the collapse of the building. It was claimed years ago that Building 7 was severely damaged by falling debris from the collapse of WTC1. However, NIST now admits that the structural damage to WTC7 played little to no role in the collapse of the building.<sup>50</sup> As for the fires, NIST claims that there were 10 floors on fire, with six of those fires being out of control.<sup>51</sup> NIST estimated that the temperature of the fires which initiated the collapse reached upwards of 600°C.<sup>52</sup> However, others have challenged this claim, including chemists Kevin Ryan and Dr. Frank Greening:

---

<sup>49</sup> For discussions of what else may have caused the inward bowing, see Tony Szamboti, “The Sustainability of the Controlled Demolition Hypothesis for the destruction of the Twin Towers,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 17 February 2008, pp. 5-6, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/SzambotiSustainabilityofControlledDemolitionHypothesisForDestructionofTwinTowers.pdf>; and Jim Hoffman, “A Hypothetical Blasting Scenario,” *911 Research*, 9 April 2009, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/blasting\\_scenario.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/blasting_scenario.html).

<sup>50</sup> “Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation,” questions 21 and 22.

<sup>51</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1A, p. xxxvi. See also Table 8-1 in NCSTAR 1-9 (p. 340), where the number of critical fire floors is listed as six.

<sup>52</sup> E.g., NIST NCSTAR 1A, pp. 21, 53. See also NIST NCSTAR 1-9, Table 8-2 (p. 353).

[R]aising those five floor beams to a temperature of 600 °C would require an enormous amount of energy, far more than was available from the burning of the office furnishings underneath the floor beams. –Kevin Ryan<sup>53</sup>

NIST's collapse initiation hypothesis requires that structural steel temperatures on floors 12/13 significantly exceeded 300 °C (570 °F) - a condition that could never have been realized with NIST's postulated 32 kg/m<sup>2</sup> fuel loading. –Frank Greening<sup>54</sup>

NIST has openly admitted that the fires were likely less severe than the fires in other steel-framed skyscrapers. Furthermore, scientists in the 9/11 Truth Movement have shown evidence that the fires claimed by NIST to have initiated the collapse would have burned themselves out before the time of collapse.<sup>55</sup>

## Conclusion

In light of everything we have seen, it appears that comparing the numerous steel structures cited by supporters of the official story to the WTC buildings is not justifiable. We must assume that the steel structures we have covered are the best examples these critics can find. But upon careful examination, these examples do not support their claims. The circumstances surrounding the collapse of the three WTC buildings were clearly far too different from these other structures. Even if these structures were in some way more comparable to the Towers and Building 7, the manner in which the buildings collapsed does not match the manner of the WTC collapses at all. Critics of the 9/11 Truth Movement have yet to cite a single steel-framed structure collapse that exhibited all of these characteristics:

- The collapses were very rapid.
- The collapses were mostly symmetrical.
- The collapses exhibited a smooth downward acceleration.

---

<sup>53</sup> Ryan, "The NIST WTC 7 Report."

<sup>54</sup> Greening, "Comments on the Draft Report NIST NCSTAR 1-9," p. 5.

<sup>55</sup> James Gourley *et al*, "Re: Public Comments on WTC 7 Draft Reports," 15 September 2008, in "Public Comments Received by NIST on DRAFT Reports," pp. 320-21, at <https://www.nist.gov/system/files/documents/2017/05/09/combined2008publicComments-2.pdf>.

- The collapses produced huge clouds of pulverized debris.
- The structures were almost totally dismembered, leaving no major structural supports standing.
- The collapses showed ejections of dust and debris.
- Witnesses described explosions as the buildings collapsed, and explosions were caught on video recordings.
- The collapses produced chemical residues of explosives and/or incendiaries.<sup>56</sup>

These were all features exhibited by the three WTC buildings. Supporters of the official story may be able to cite a steel-structure collapse exhibiting some of these features, but to date they have not been able to cite a steel-structured collapse exhibiting all of these features outside of controlled demolitions.

### Comparative Analysis of Steel Structure Fires

Structure	Skyscraper	Building	Total dismemberment (beams and columns)	Clouds of pulverized debris	Explosions reported by witnesses	Chemical residues of explosives/incendiaries	Smooth downward acceleration for multiple floors
Twin Towers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WTC 7	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Windsor Tower	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes*	No	No
McCormick Place	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Sight and Sound Theater	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	NA
Kader Toy Factory	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	NA
Mumbai High North Platform	No	No	No	No	No	No	NA
I-580 Bridge	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
WTC 5	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Dogwood Elementary School	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	NA
Faculty of Arch. Building	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No

\*According to one report, explosions were heard during the Windsor fire, although not at the onset of its partial collapse. See "Big fire destroys the well-known Madrid landmark," *Pravda*, 13 February 2005, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20080105000100/http://newsfromrussia.com/accidents/2005/02/13/58231.html>.

<sup>56</sup> The evidence for these features is catalogued at <http://www.ae911truth.org>.

Readers are encouraged to take into account the information we have discussed about these steel-framed structures, and decide for themselves how comparable they are to the Twin Towers and World Trade Center 7. We close with a quote from Joseph Plummer, for your consideration:

For the record, few in the scientific community doubt that it's theoretically possible for a building to experience failure if it is subjected to devastating heat for a sufficient period of time. And additional factors like no fire-proofing, no sprinkler systems, insufficient steel to "bleed off" heat or inferior construction greatly increase the possibility. However, what is "doubted" (or more accurately; considered downright impossible) is that such a failure would resemble anything like what was witnessed on 9/11. Gradual, isolated, asymmetrical failures spread out over time...perhaps. Simultaneous disintegration of all load bearing columns (leaving a pile of neatly folded rubble a few stories high)...no way.<sup>57</sup>

### **Afterword: The State of the Debate as of 2021**

When I originally published this essay in 2011 (and then again in 2013 at ScientificMethod911.org), the facts of the matter were that, aside from allegedly the Towers and Building 7, no steel-framed high-rise skyscrapers had ever collapsed from fire, before or since 9/11. Since then, however, at least two high-rises have collapsed from fire – the Plasco Building in Tehran, Iran, on 19 January 2017, and the Wilton Paes Almeida Building in São Paulo, Brazil, on 1 May 2018. Naturally, some have wondered how this affects my analysis and conclusions here. To that I have a few choice thoughts.

First, yes, I am well aware AE911Truth has made the case that the Plasco Building may have been taken down with explosives, like the Towers<sup>58</sup> (to date they have not drawn any conclusions about the Wilton Paes building). And I must make it perfectly clear that I do not agree with them. While they provide much in the way of justifying this conclusion, I

---

<sup>57</sup> Plummer, "Freeway Collapse."

<sup>58</sup> Roland Angle *et al*, "The Plasco Building Collapse in Tehran: A Preliminary Report," *AE911Truth*, 20 February 2017, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/plasco-building-collapse-in-tehran>.

have not seen anything, here or elsewhere, that proves to me that the building was felled by anything other than the fires.<sup>59</sup>

So, the building was brought down by fire, as was the Wilton Paes building. What does this mean for this present analysis? As far as any technical comparison goes, the collapse of these structures does not, in my view, add a great deal of weight to the idea that the Towers and Building 7 could have collapsed due to fire, for similar reasons laid out elsewhere in this essay. According to investigators, a “combination of significant fire load, lack of sprinkler system, malfunctioning of the firefighting water supply, and non-compartmentation of different parts of the building were the main causes of spreading of fire” in the Plasco building.<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, reports on the building state that the owner and the municipality were known to have neglected enforcing 22 of the national building regulations up to that point.<sup>61</sup> This is unlike the Towers and Building 7, which were built to code at the time of their collapses.

As for the Wilton Paes building, reports state that part of what contributed to its collapse was that it lacked virtually any thermal protection elements that are commonplace in buildings today.<sup>62</sup> In contrast, Building 7 had intact fireproofing at the time of its collapse, and as we explored above, NIST has not justified its conclusion that the fireproofing was widely dislodged from the Towers. Furthermore, investigators found what may have been a potential structural problem – namely, that the rebar may have lacked proper reinforcement.<sup>63</sup> And it bears pointing out that, as is explored later in this work, both of these

---

<sup>59</sup> One piece of data not explored by AE911Truth is the building’s rate of collapse which, as shown elsewhere in this work (pp. 106-108), supports a fire/gravity-driven collapse.

<sup>60</sup> Ali Akbar Aghakouchak *et al*, “Structural investigation of the collapse of the 16-story Plasco building due to fire,” *Struct Design Tall Spec Build*, 13 October 2020, p. 4, at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/tal.1815>.

<sup>61</sup> “Report on collapse of Plasco building released,” *Tehran Times*, 8 April 2017, at <https://www.tehrantimes.com/news/412459/Report-on-collapse-of-Plasco-building-released>.

<sup>62</sup> “Estrutura de concreto e aço contribuiu para queda de prédio, diz especialista,” *Gazetweb News*, 1 May 2018, archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20180502171100/http://gazetaweb.globo.com/portal/noticia/2018/05/\\_54031.php](https://web.archive.org/web/20180502171100/http://gazetaweb.globo.com/portal/noticia/2018/05/_54031.php).

<sup>63</sup> Paulo Helene *et al*, “Fire and Collapse of the Wilton Paes de Almeida Building in São Paulo, Brasil: lessons learned,” *Revista ALCONPAT*, 30 December 2019, at <https://www.redalyc.org/journal/4276/427661546009/html>.

structures collapsed at rates inconsistent with the rate of collapse of the Towers and Building 7.<sup>64</sup>

So, where does this leave us? While these structures don't pose a problem from a technical standpoint, I cannot deny they do from a historical one. While the collapse of these buildings does not refute the case for demolition, it would be silly to insist that they do not soften it a bit. The Plasco building and Wilton Peas building demonstrate that it is, in fact, possible for fire to cause a steel-framed high-rise skyscraper to collapse, and can do so symmetrically. Those in the Movement should now be humble enough to acknowledge this phenomenon is possible, if they weren't already. As made clear here, it was never my contention fire could not accomplish this. Rather, the cumulative evidence outlined here and elsewhere is what ultimately leads me to conclude the Towers were demolished. While these structures collapsed, they still lacked features consistent with demolition, whereas all those features occurred during the Tower collapses. As such, I will continue to regard demolition as the most likely explanation for WTC collapses, but one reason for thinking that should no longer be the outdated notion that fire cannot cause the collapse of a steel-framed skyscraper.

---

<sup>64</sup> See Chapter 4 (pp. 106-108 specifically) of this present work.

## **Collapse or Explosion? The WTC “Sounds of Explosions” Issue**

Originally published 31 January 2021 at  
<https://911docs.wordpress.com>  
Minor revisions by Adam Taylor

### **Contents**

Abstract

Introduction

1. How Important are the “Sounds?”
  2. Can Explosive Sounds be Decreased and/or Masked?
    - 2.1 Rapid Detonation Sequence
    - 2.2 Types of Explosives Used
    - 2.3 Placement of the Explosives
  3. Witness Accounts of Explosions
    - 3.1 Inconsistent Accounts?
    - 3.2 Loud Sounds are not always Explosions
    - 3.3 “Explosion” Doesn’t Mean “Explosives”
  4. World Trade Center 7
    - 4.1 Sound Levels
    - 4.2 Recordings and Witnesses
    - 4.3 Barry Jennings and Michael Hess
  5. NIST’s Distortions and Errors
  6. Conclusions
- Appendix A. Core Column Damage

## Abstract

When the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center complex collapsed on September 11, 2001, they exhibited numerous features that several researchers have identified as being consistent with controlled demolition with explosives. However, others have argued that the Towers could not have been destroyed via explosives, noting that the collapse events lacked a critical feature of explosive demolition: sounds of explosions. The absence of these sounds, it's argued, means explosives could not have played a role in the destruction of the buildings. In this paper, we examine this argument at length and find it to be groundless. We demonstrate that not only can explosive sounds be heard, but that even if this argument were correct, the entire premise of dismissing the demolition hypothesis based on this argument is fallacious to begin with. We also demonstrate that the official investigation into the destruction of these buildings failed to adequately consider this evidence, and therefore renders the conclusions of said investigation unfounded. The theory of controlled demolition with explosives has abundant evidence to support it, and this body of evidence does indeed include the sounds produced during the collapses.

## Introduction

The destruction of the WTC Towers has raised considerable debate regarding the mechanism which ultimately caused their destruction. The theory that currently is the most widely accepted is the one posited by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). According to NIST, the collapse of the Towers was caused by a combination of the airplane impacts and the resulting fires started by these impacts.<sup>1</sup> NIST's conclusions, however, have been largely challenged by many researchers.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1, at [http://www.nist.gov/manuscript-publication-search.cfm?pub\\_id=909017](http://www.nist.gov/manuscript-publication-search.cfm?pub_id=909017).

<sup>2</sup> The literature detailing the flaws in the NIST WTC report is vast. However, the very best critiques of the report are as follows: Jim Hoffman, "Building a Better Mirage: NIST's 3-Year \$20,000,000 Cover-Up of the Crime of the Century," *9/11 Research*, 8 December 2005, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/nist/index.html>; Eric Douglas, "The NIST WTC Investigation--How Real Was The Simulation?," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, December 2006, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200612/NIST-WTC-Investigation.pdf>; Jim Hoffman, "Review of 'A New Standard For Deception: The NIST WTC Report' A

Many of these same researchers posit an alternative explanation as to why the buildings collapsed the way they did; that they were destroyed through some form of controlled demolition with explosives. The evidence for this theory includes, but is not limited to:

1. Fast onset of collapse.
2. Collapse progression straight down through the path of greatest resistance.
3. Collapse accelerates as it progresses.
4. High velocity ejections of dust and debris.
5. Sounds of explosions (both recorded and reported by witnesses).
6. Pulverization of nonmetallic material.
7. Near-total dismemberment of the structure.
8. Chemical evidence of explosives/incendiaries in the post-collapse debris.<sup>3</sup>

Unsurprisingly, the demolition theory has come under heavy scrutiny by many detractors, and each of the above points has been disputed as being valid evidence for demolition to begin with. While these detractors have been responded to many times and have had their arguments shown to be false,<sup>4</sup> they have nonetheless continued arguing against the demolition theory in favor of NIST's explanations. However, out of all the points discussed above, the one that may indeed require further clarification is point 5 – the evidence for sounds of explosions. Those who believe the Towers were not destroyed by explosives have repeatedly disputed this

---

Presentation by Kevin Ryan,” 15 October 2006, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/kevin\\_ryan/newstandard.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/kevin_ryan/newstandard.html); Anonymous and F. Legge, “Falsifiability and the NIST WTC Report: A Study in Theoretical Adequacy,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, March 2010, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2010/Falsifiability.pdf>; Andrea Dreger, “How NIST Avoided a Real Analysis of the Physical Evidence of WTC Steel,” *AE911Truth*, 23 August 2011, at <http://www1.ae911truth.org/en/faqs/547-how-nist-avoided-a-real-analysis-of-the-physical-evidence-of-wtc-steel-.html> (full length version available at [http://www1.ae911truth.org/documents/How\\_NIST\\_Avoided\\_a\\_Real\\_Analysis\\_of\\_the\\_Physical\\_Evidence\\_of\\_WTC\\_Steel.pdf](http://www1.ae911truth.org/documents/How_NIST_Avoided_a_Real_Analysis_of_the_Physical_Evidence_of_WTC_Steel.pdf)).

<sup>3</sup> These and other evidence are catalogued at <http://www.ae911truth.org>.

<sup>4</sup> For refutations of arguments against the demolition theory, the website *Debunking the Debunkers* is highly recommended (<http://911debunkers.blogspot.com>).

point, arguing that the sounds produced as the Towers collapsed do not match with what is commonly heard in controlled demolition.

Mark Roberts, for example, presents multiple video clips showing buildings being destroyed with explosives, and argues that these events sound significantly different from the video recordings of the Towers' collapses.<sup>5</sup> Likewise, other detractors argue against the witness accounts of explosions from the Towers, insisting that "One can hear loud sounds and describe them as an [sic] 'explosions' [but] that does not mean that it was explosives creating them." Simply put, it's argued that "explosion" doesn't always mean "explosive."<sup>6</sup>

This author is in full agreement with an assessment made by the website 911myths.com, which states that:

[T]here's no doubt the collapse (and some events prior to it) involved what looked, and felt like explosions. That doesn't begin to prove that bombs were the cause, though – it'll take considerably more evidence to do that.<sup>7</sup>

As discussed above, we believe this further evidence does indeed exist. We also acknowledge that explosive sounds are not proof in and of themselves that explosives were used. However, the author also maintains that the sound evidence for explosions in the Towers is a significant aspect to take into account, given that such evidence is quite consistent with the demolition theory, and that several detractors seem to believe it is crucial in deciding whether or not this theory is correct. As far as we can tell, the two main arguments against this evidence can be summarized as follows:

- The sounds produced as the Towers collapsed are not consistent with sounds produced by explosive controlled demolitions.

---

<sup>5</sup> Roberts shows these clips in a video titled "WTC Not A Demolition," which can be viewed here: <https://www.dailymotion.com/video/xuj32d>. I have demonstrated that Roberts' video contains a significant number of false claims and fallacious arguments. See Chapter 6 of this present work.

<sup>6</sup> Author anonymous, "Firefighter's Interviews - Sounds of Explosives or Explosive Sounds in the Towers," *Journal of Debunking 9/11 Conspiracy Theories*, Volume 1, Issue 2, p. 3. Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20120208110648/http://www.jod911.com/sounds.pdf>.

<sup>7</sup> Mike Williams (webmaster), "Accounts of Explosions," *911 Myths* (n.d.), at [http://www.911myths.com/html/accounts\\_of\\_explosions.html](http://www.911myths.com/html/accounts_of_explosions.html).

- The sounds produced as the Towers collapsed, and the subsequent witness accounts of explosions, are not definitive proof that explosives were used.

In this paper, we shall demonstrate that both of these arguments – and their general variations – are not the be-all end-all of the demolition theory that many detractors would like us to believe. We shall argue the following points:

1. The “sound” of an explosion does not in fact define when an event involving an explosive has taken place.
2. The explosive sounds could have been decreased and/or masked in a variety of ways (by means of how the explosives were set off, what types of explosives were used, and where the explosives were placed).
3. The witness accounts of explosions are worthy of further consideration, and that the official investigations should have taken them more seriously.

### **1. How Important are the “Sounds”?**

In their investigation, NIST never seriously considered the possibility that explosives may have been used to bring down the WTC. The subject is hardly discussed within their report on the Twin Towers. Instead, NIST chose to address the subject primarily on their Frequently Asked Questions page.<sup>8</sup> In discussing their reasons for dismissing the idea that explosives may have been used to destroy the buildings, NIST explained that:

Video evidence also showed unambiguously that the collapse progressed from the top to the bottom, and there was no evidence (collected by NIST or by the New York City Police Department, the Port Authority Police Department, or the Fire Department of New York) of any blast or explosions in the region below the impact and fire floors as the top building sections (including and

---

<sup>8</sup> “Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC Towers Investigation” (Updated 15 November 2019) at, [http://www.nist.gov/el/disasterstudies/wtc/faqs\\_wtctowers.cfm](http://www.nist.gov/el/disasterstudies/wtc/faqs_wtctowers.cfm).

above the 98th floor in WTC 1 and the 82nd floor in WTC 2) began their downward movement upon collapse initiation.<sup>9</sup>

Most of the above explanation is significantly fallacy-rich, implying that demolitions do not proceed from “the top to the bottom” (when in fact some do proceed that way<sup>10</sup>), and that there was no evidence of “any blast or explosions” below where the planes impacted. The point regarding evidence of a “blast” or “explosions” is as about close as NIST gets to discussing the issue of the sounds from the Towers. They provide no quantitative data regarding exactly what types of sounds they believe should have been heard that would imply explosives were used. However, NIST does discuss the sound issue in far more detail in regards to their analysis of World Trade Center 7’s destruction. As well as discussing the idea that Building 7 could have been destroyed with explosives, NIST explains specifically what types of sounds should have been heard were that to be the case. They write:

[F]or a shaped charge with an explosive weight of equivalent to or higher than 9lb (detonated in a single delay), the noise level at a distance of ½ mile would have been on the order of 130 dB to 140 dB, roughly equivalent to that of a thunderclap directly overhead or an adjacent jet engine [...] People on the street would have heard 9lb of RDX go off a mile away in air (and even further away if the wind were blowing in their direction). There were no witness reports of such a loud noise, nor was such a noise heard on audio tracks of video tapes that recorded the WTC 7 collapse.<sup>11</sup>

As we can see, NIST specifically identifies the “sounds” of explosions as a key aspect in deciding whether or not explosives may have caused of Building 7’s collapse. But how justified is this argument? Exactly how significant is this issue in deciding whether or not an explosive event has taken place? A review of the detailed literature on this topic reveals the answer; not very. The NFPA 921 *Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations* is defined as the official document for “establish[ing] guidelines and recommendations for the safe and systematic investigation

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., question 8.

<sup>10</sup> See for example <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VZ1E2NP1-s8>.

<sup>11</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 357, at [http://www.nist.gov/manuscript-publication-search.cfm?pub\\_id=861611](http://www.nist.gov/manuscript-publication-search.cfm?pub_id=861611).

or analysis of fire and explosion incidents.”<sup>12</sup> In regards to defining what constitutes an event that can be described as an “explosion,” the *Guide* states this in discussing the issue of “sounds” of explosions:

Although an explosion is almost always accompanied by the production of a loud noise, the noise itself is **not an essential element in the definition of an explosion**. The generation and violent escape of gases are the primary criteria of an explosion.<sup>13</sup> (Emphasis added)

So, according to NFPA 921, the actual “sound” of an explosion actually *doesn't* define when an explosion has taken place. Instead, it is the generation and violent production of gases that define when such an event has taken place. But how does one conclude that such an event has taken place? The *Guide* further elaborates on what constitutes an explosive event based on the physical characteristics of said event. It states that explosives should be considered a possibility whenever there is “high-order damage,” which NFPA 921 defines as follows:

High-order damage is characterized by shattering of the structure, producing small, pulverized debris. Walls, roofs, and structural members are splintered or shattered, with the building completely demolished. Debris is thrown great distances, possibly hundreds of feet.<sup>14</sup>

The first two sentences of this description would apply to Building 7, and the entire paragraph would apply to the Twin Towers. In regards to the aspect of debris being thrown “hundreds of feet,” this undoubtedly happened in the case of the Towers. Analyses show that large steel sections were thrown over 300 feet away from the buildings,<sup>15</sup> while smaller debris was shot out as much as ¼ of a mile away.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> NFPA 921 *Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations*, 2004 Edition, Section 1.2.1 (PDF p. 6). Archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20140720031104/http://www.sierragal.com/252\\_stuff/NFPA\\_921.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20140720031104/http://www.sierragal.com/252_stuff/NFPA_921.pdf).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, Section 21.1.4 (PDF p. 149).

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, Section 21.3.2 (PDF p. 151).

<sup>15</sup> See David Chandler’s analysis in his video “High Speed Massive Projectiles from the WTC on 9/11,” available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eHnLlwqiu0A>.

<sup>16</sup> Crockett Grabbe, “Direct Evidence for Explosions: Flying Projectiles and Widespread Impact Damage,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, August 2007, pp. 4-5, at

Even NIST has acknowledged this event to some degree. While no mention is made of the steel being shot out from the buildings in their report on the Twin Towers, NIST does make mention of this event in their Building 7 report, noting that:

[F]ragments [from WTC1] were forcibly ejected and traveled distances up to hundreds of meters. Pieces of WTC 1 hit WTC 7, severing six columns on Floors 7 through 17 on the south face and one column on the west face near the southwest corner. The debris also caused structural damage between Floor 44 and the roof.<sup>17</sup>

NIST therefore acknowledges that sections of steel from the Towers travelled distances of at least 650 feet (since “hundreds of meters” would mean at least 200 meters, which would be about 650 feet). And this debris must have been extremely heavy, given that according to NIST it was able to sever seven steel columns in WTC7. So, in terms of their physical appearance, the Towers’ collapses seem to fit the definition of an explosive event quite well – which in turn should have been sufficient reason to properly investigate whether or not explosives may have been used to bring them down. The NFPA 921 *Guide* further explains how such an investigation should be conducted, noting that:

Chemical analysis of debris, soot, soil, or air samples can be helpful in identifying the fuel. With explosives or liquid fuels, gas chromatography, mass spectrography, or other chemical tests of properly collected samples may be able to identify their presence.<sup>18</sup>

In other words, chemical analyses for residues of explosives should be undertaken in such an investigation. But NIST itself has admitted that it in fact never carried out such tests in its investigation.<sup>19</sup> On what grounds did

---

<http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/GrabbeExplosionsEvidence.pdf>.

<sup>17</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1A, p. 16, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/final-report-collapse-world-trade-center-building-7-federal-building-and-fire-safety-0>.

<sup>18</sup> NFPA 921, Section 21.15.2 (PDF p. 164).

<sup>19</sup> “NIST did not test for the presence of explosive residue and such tests would not necessarily have been conclusive.” Quoted from “Sept. 2007 Response to April 2007 RFC, from NIST,” 27 September 2007, p. 4, available at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2007/NISTResponseToRequestForCorrectionGourleyEtal2.pdf>.

NIST refuse to do this? Although they maintain that such analyses “would not necessarily have been conclusive,”<sup>20</sup> they therefore leave open the possibility that such analyses would not necessarily have been *inconclusive* either.

While the procedures described in the NFPA 921 *Guide* are not mandatory for all investigations, it notes that deviations from its recommendations “need to be justified.”<sup>21</sup> The author is unable to find any rational justification for NIST’s failure to follow several important procedures described within the *Guide*. Even though NIST maintains that it did follow such standards in its investigation,<sup>22</sup> nothing within their reports suggest they followed crucial procedures in regards to identifying whether or not explosives were used. They have admitted that no chemical analyses for explosives were conducted on their part (contradicting Section 21.15.2 of the *Guide*), even though they acknowledged that several features of the buildings’ collapses match extremely well with what the *Guide* itself defines as an explosive event. Instead, NIST chose to identify the “sound” of an explosion as a necessary factor in deciding whether or not explosives were used, even though the *Guide* specifically denies that this feature defines an explosive event in the first place.

The most important fact we can take away from all of this is that the “sound” of an explosion is not actually needed in order to define when an event involving explosives has taken place. NFPA 921 explains several ways in which analyzing the possible use of explosives can be done, but

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid. NIST also claimed this with regards to testing for thermite/thermate residues (to be discussed later in this paper); see Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC Towers Investigation, question 22. Interestingly, this assertion is contradicted by Materials Engineering, Inc: “When thermite reaction compounds are used to ignite a fire, they produce a characteristic burn pattern, and leave behind evidence. These compounds are rather unique in their chemical composition [...] While some of these elements are consumed in the fire, many are also left behind in the residue. [...] The results [of testing residues], coupled with visual evidence at the scene, provide **absolute certainty** that thermite reaction compounds were present, indicating the fire was deliberately set, and not of natural causes” (emphasis added). Quoted from “MEi Provides Assistance in Arson Investigations,” *MEI Newsletter*, Spring 1996, at <https://www.materials-engr.com/ns96.html>.

<sup>21</sup> NFPA 921, Section 1.3 (PDF p. 6).

<sup>22</sup> “Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation” (Updated 20 November 2019), question 16, available at [http://www.nist.gov/el/disaster-studies/wtc/faqs\\_wtc7.cfm](http://www.nist.gov/el/disaster-studies/wtc/faqs_wtc7.cfm).

as we've seen NIST evidently ignored these suggested procedures and used their own fallacious reasoning in their investigation. While sounds can be helpful in determining if explosives were used, there are far more direct and obvious ways such analyses can be carried out. Just as detractors argue that an "explosion" doesn't always mean "explosives," the author feels justified in putting forth the reverse argument; that the "absence of explosion sounds" doesn't always mean "absence of explosives."

## 2. Can Explosive Sounds be Decreased and/or Masked?

Although we've demonstrated that explosive sounds are not required to define an event as involving explosives, we maintain that such sounds can in fact be heard in the audio of videos of the Towers' collapses. But several detractors disagree, asserting that the sounds produced as the Towers collapsed do not match with what is commonly heard in controlled demolitions. For example, the State Department links<sup>23</sup> to a video titled "9/11 Debunked: Controlled Demolition Not Possible,"<sup>24</sup> which asserts that:

If explosives were used on each floor of the World Trade Center, a succession of distinct explosions would be heard miles away. Yet, even at the base of the building, not a single explosion is heard.

In this section, we will show that such assertions are groundless, as they fail to take into account the numerous ways that the sounds of explosions could have been masked and/or decreased in the demolition of the Towers. There are three ways this could have been accomplished; how the explosives were set off, what types of explosives were used, and how the explosives were placed in the structures.

---

<sup>23</sup> "The Top September 11 Conspiracy Theories," *America.gov*, 5 May 2009, archived at <http://web.archive.org/web/20110323153132/http://www.america.gov/st/webchat-english/2009/May/20060828133846esnamfuaK0.2676355.html>. Comment on this article: John-Michael Talboo, "ALERT: US State Department Cannot Afford Professional Advice on WTC Destruction," *AE911Truth*, 3 December 2010, at <http://www1.ae911truth.org/en/news-section/41-articles/414-alert-us-state-department-cannot-afford-professional-advice-on-wtc-destruction.html>.

<sup>24</sup> "9/11 Debunked: Controlled Demolition Not Possible" at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tacYjsS-g6k>.

## 2.1 Rapid Detonation Sequence

There are two key problems with the above assertion. First, as we will see in section 3, there were in fact numerous witnesses to explosions from the Towers, and the sounds *could* be heard miles away.<sup>25</sup> The second problem is the assertion that the sounds of the explosions would necessarily be heard as “distinct” events. This, however, is not strictly true. This aspect of demolition is generally only observed in buildings brought down through what we could call a *traditional* controlled demolition. In their attempts to cast doubt on the validity of the demolition theory, several detractors argue that since the collapse of the Towers does not match exactly with what is seen in traditional demolitions, this weighs against the idea that explosives were used to bring the buildings down. However, as explained at 911review.com:

Defenders of the collapse story have suggested that differences between the Twin Towers’ destruction and conventional building demolitions weigh against controlled demolition being the cause of the former [...] The fact [that] the destruction of the WTC skyscrapers differed in certain ways from commercial demolitions has little to do with whether they were demolitions. A controlled demolition is the engineered destruction of a structure, and there are many ways to accomplish such, whatever the technical demands [...] A demolition that is planned as part of a covert operation to fit a narrative of events that attributes the total destruction of the building to a different cause (such as a jetliner crash and consequent fires) has a very different set of requirements than a demolition that is planned to legally remove a building in an urban setting.<sup>26</sup>

The fact of the matter is that explosives can be used to bring down a structure in a variety of ways, not being restricted to the conventional method by which buildings are usually taken down. All that is required for

---

<sup>25</sup> For example, one witness who heard the sounds produced as the Towers collapsed described them as “explosions,” and was located on the News Corp. Building in Manhattan, which is nearly four miles away from the WTC complex (via Google Maps: <http://goo.gl/maps/wSHTu>). See: “Fox News 9/11 Coverage: 11:08 a.m. - 11:23 a.m.” at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uw7vaGYZKfk>.

<sup>26</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “Covert Demolition,” *911 Review*, last updated 18 December 2010, at <http://www.911review.com/means/demolition/covert.html>.

the destruction of a building to be classified as a controlled demolition is for the structure to be destroyed by means of an external force consciously being used and controlled by individuals for a specific purpose. That's why it's called *controlled* demolition. And one aspect of the Tower demolitions evidently involved the sequence in which the explosives in the buildings were set off.

In a traditional demolition, explosives are generally set off in a particular sequence wherein their detonations are spaced out enough so that most of them can be heard distinctly from one another. When asked why explosives are usually set off in intervals, Stacey Loizeaux, the daughter of Controlled Demolition, Inc. president Mark Loizeaux, explained that:

[I]f I kick both your legs out from under you, you're going to fall right on your butt. If I kick one leg out from under you, you'll fall left or right. So the way we control the failure of the building is by using the delays. And, again, that varies structure to structure and depending on where we want the building to go.<sup>27</sup>

The following videos of demolitions highlight this point.

- J.L. Hudson Department Store Implosion: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-rctmcxGwM>
- Landmark Tower Implosion: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=79sJ1bMR6VQ>
- Seattle Kingdome Implosion: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kFz22x-WvrE>

However, this evidently wasn't the case for the demolition of the Towers. In order for the Towers to have been demolished while at the same time appearing to most people as purely gravity-driven collapses, the explosives would need to have been set off in rapid succession down the vertical axis of each building, gradually breaking apart each structure. Instead of breaking up the structural supports of the buildings more or less all at once (the usual sequence for a traditional demolition), the explosives would have been set off over an extended duration in order for the

---

<sup>27</sup> "Interview with Stacey Loizeaux," *NOVA* (n.d.), at <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/kaboom/loizeaux.html>.

buildings to appear that they were being destroyed by the falling building sections above where the planes impacted. Had sections of the Towers below the so-called “crush front” started breaking up before the crush front reached those levels, the illusion of a gravity-driven collapse would have been destroyed, thus further exposing the fact that the collapses were being caused by explosives.

Furthermore, setting off the explosives in such a way would have masked the sounds of explosions by preventing them from being heard as distinct events. As explained by Jim Hoffman:

[T]he reason I think people don't think of [the Towers' collapses] as explosions is because they occurred over a period of fifteen seconds in either case [...] Normally people think of an explosion as you hear a loud crack, a bang, and then it's just that one event. But if, in the case of a demolition where you might have thousands of explosions that are all blending in, then you get one, huge explosive event. But you don't hear any distinct explosions because there's so much above the roar of it.<sup>28</sup>

As a general rule, the faster a sequence of loud events is, the more difficult it can be to interpret the distinct sound of each said event. Take for example the video below, which shows thousands of firecrackers being set off in rapid succession.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=leR1EAdls4Y&t=00m39s>

Now compare this with what can be heard in the below video of the South Tower collapse.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DqiqVVpY62A>

While subjective interpretations may vary, the author feels that the sounds produced within both of these videos are very similar.<sup>29</sup> Both seem to

---

<sup>28</sup> Quoted from Jim Hoffman's presentation featured in the film “9/11 Guilt—The Proof is in Your Hands,” which can be viewed here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dvOQre3CTyo>.

<sup>29</sup> Indeed, several witness accounts even support this:

“I saw it as it was happening, and it sounded as if you had a hundred of those [...] firecrackers and you lit'em all off at once. That's what it sounded like, it sounded like the finale of the fourth of July over the east river.” (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1gYgg8Ig-Gc&t=6459s>)

feature what could be described as a continuous “roar” or “wave of sound,” rather than any distinct single noise or noises. By setting off explosives in such a rapid sequence, the difficulty of interpreting each explosion as a distinct event would increase dramatically. Thus, if the explosives in the Towers were set off in this fashion, this would have prevented the explosives themselves from being recognized as distinct events occurring within the buildings. As summarized at 911review.com:

The towers’ destruction cannot be accurately described without the word “explosion.” Huge clouds billowed out from the towers, starting around the crash zones, and grew rapidly as they consumed each tower, converting them to fine powder and fragments of steel, and depositing the bulk of the remains outside of each tower’s footprint in a radial pattern [...] One of the key underpinnings of that denial [that the buildings were demolished] is the fact that the explosions were continuous, extending for the entire 15-second duration of each tower’s collapse. Although witnesses describe loud pops at

---

“All of a sudden it was like bang bang bang bang bang, like bullet shots. And then all of a sudden, three tremendous explosions. And everything started coming down.” (<https://youtu.be/jpTpcCOWBwY>)

“Anyway, with that I was listening, and there was an incredibly loud rumbling. [...] The roar became tremendous. [...] I thought there had been an explosion or a bomb that they had blown up there.” ([http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812\\_WTC\\_GRAPHIC/9110205.PDF](http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812_WTC_GRAPHIC/9110205.PDF) [p. 13])

“We were in the process of getting some rigs moved when I turned, as I heard a tremendous roar, explosion, and saw that the first of the two towers was starting to come down. [...] When the dust started to settle, I headed back down towards the World Trade Center and I guess I came close to arriving at the corner of Vesey and West again where we started to hear the second roar. That was the north tower now coming down. I should say that people in the street and myself included thought that the roar was so loud that the explosive – bombs were going off inside the building. Obviously we were later proved wrong. [...] The sound it made. As I said I thought the terrorists planted explosives somewhere in the building. That’s how loud it was, crackling explosive, a wall.” ([http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812\\_WTC\\_GRAPHIC/9110098.PDF](http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812_WTC_GRAPHIC/9110098.PDF) [pp. 6, 7, 12])

“You know, and I just heard like an explosion and then cracking type of noise, and then it sounded like a freight train, rumbling and picking up speed, and I remember I looked up, and I saw it coming down.” ([http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812\\_WTC\\_GRAPHIC/9110386.PDF](http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812_WTC_GRAPHIC/9110386.PDF) [p. 10])

their onsets, the extended duration and loud roar of the explosions apparently prevented most people from thinking of them as explosions.<sup>30</sup>

## 2.2 Types of Explosives Used

Another way in which the sounds of the explosives could have been hidden is by having the sound levels themselves decreased. But is such a thing possible? Many detractors argue that any process that decreases the sound level of an explosive also decreases the effectiveness of said explosive. For example, one poster at the “International Skeptics Forum” (formerly the JREF forum) asserts that:

Explosives act by overpressure, which produces both their destructive power (higher explosive power is needed to cut steel than concrete), and the smoke/dust ejection. Reduced noise [means] no squibs. Squibs [mean] deafening loud noise at that very instant (plus the sound propagation delay).<sup>31</sup>

However, there are in fact ways in which explosive sounds can indeed be decreased by means of what types of explosives are used. The traditional explosives that are used in controlled demolitions are called C4<sup>32</sup> and RDX.<sup>33</sup> As we previously saw, NIST posited RDX as the most likely potential explosive that would have been used had WTC7 been destroyed by controlled demolition. And based on this, NIST concluded that such explosives could not have been used in the destruction of the building, given that sound levels of “130 dB to 140 dB” (the sound levels produced by RDX) were not heard or recorded.

However, this conclusion revolves around NIST’s own created scenario, in which RDX was the primary explosive used. This is merely a straw-man argument fabricated by NIST, as the leading proponents of the demolition theory have seldom posited RDX as the primary explosive used to bring down the Twin Towers and Building 7. Rather, the two materials largely believed to have been used in the demolition of all three buildings

---

<sup>30</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “Continuous Explosions Leveled the Towers,” *911 Review*, last updated 14 February 2015, at <http://www.911review.com/attack/wtc/explosions.html>.

<sup>31</sup> Quoted from <http://www.internationalskeptics.com/forums/showpost.php?p=8437753&postcount=5908>.

<sup>32</sup> C4 described at <http://www.eurenco.com/content/explosives/demolition-breaching/conventional/explosive-blocks/c4>.

<sup>33</sup> RDX described at <https://www.denix.osd.mil/cmrmpecmr/rdx/thebasics>.

are thermate and nanothermite, which are both variations of the incendiary thermite.<sup>34</sup>

The idea that thermite may have been used to demolish the WTC buildings was first proposed by D. P. Grimmer,<sup>35</sup> and later expanded upon by Dr. Steven Jones.<sup>36</sup> Using variations of thermite to destroy the Towers would provide a number of advantages in a covert controlled demolition. For starters, using such material would greatly reduce the risk of any accidental ignition potentially caused by the impacting airplanes and the ensuing fires.<sup>37</sup> Also, given that many of the components that constitute thermite are also generally found in office buildings,<sup>38</sup> detecting the presence of such material or the residue it would leave behind would be

---

<sup>34</sup> For a detailed explanation of what thermite is and its different variations, see Adam Taylor, “FAQ #7: What is nanothermite? Could it have been used to demolish the Twin Towers and WTC 7?,” *AE911Truth* (n.d.), at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/faqs/359-faq-6-what-is-nanothermite-could-it-have-been-used-to-demolish-the-twin-towers-and-wtc-7>. (Originally published 19 July 2012, at AE911Truth.org. Also posted at 911Blogger.com: <http://911blogger.com/news/2012-07-23/faq-8-what-nanothermite-could-it-have-been-used-demolish-wtc-skyscrapers>.)

<sup>35</sup> D. P. Grimmer, “Calculations on the Possible Use of Thermite to Melt Sections of the WTC Core Columns,” *Physics 911*, June 2004, at <http://physics911.net/thermite>.

<sup>36</sup> Steven E. Jones, “Why Indeed Did the World Trade Center Buildings Completely Collapse?,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, September 2006, p. 6ff, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why\\_Indeed\\_Did\\_the\\_WTC\\_Buildings\\_Completely\\_Collapse\\_Jones\\_Thermite\\_World\\_Trade\\_Center.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why_Indeed_Did_the_WTC_Buildings_Completely_Collapse_Jones_Thermite_World_Trade_Center.pdf)

<sup>37</sup> Adam Taylor, “FAQ #10: Wouldn’t the planes slamming into the Twin Towers have disturbed the demolition devices?,” *AE911Truth* (n.d.), at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/faqs/352-faq-9-wouldn-t-the-planes-slamming-into-the-twin-towers-have-disturbed-the-demolition-devices>. (Originally published 12 January 2012 at AE911Truth.org.)

<sup>38</sup> Although many of the components of thermite can also found in normal office buildings (such as aluminum, iron, oxygen, etc.), it is not possible that these materials in the Towers could have assembled themselves into a carefully formulated aluminothermic composite as a result of the fires or the buildings’ collapses. For a discussion of this, see: Jim Hoffman, “Thermitic Pyrotechnics in the WTC Made Simple: Three Points of Active Thermitic Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe that Anyone Can Understand,” *911 Research*, 26 April 2009, at [http://www.911review.com/energeticmaterials09/911research/thermitics\\_made\\_simple.html](http://www.911review.com/energeticmaterials09/911research/thermitics_made_simple.html).

much more difficult (which in turn would require a more detailed and thorough analysis of the WTC debris<sup>39</sup>).

A third advantage of using such material – the advantage relevant to the main topic of this paper – is that they can be formulated to demolish steel structures without producing the same types of loud explosive sounds generally heard in traditional demolitions. Thermite and its sulfur-based variant thermate are by definition not explosives, but rather incendiaries. When ignited, neither produce the loud booms and cracks generally heard from demolition explosives, but instead burn gradually without producing much sound. Some critics contend that this fact weighs against the suggestion that either of these materials could be valid candidates for demolishing the Towers, the idea being that they lack the necessary power to accomplish what supposedly only high-energy explosives can. However, such assertions are shown to be unfounded, given two facts.

One is that there are at least two examples of thermite being used to demolish steel structures; the Skyride Tower in 1935, and the steel-framed roof of the Reichstag Building in 1954.<sup>40</sup> Second, experiments conducted by civil engineer Jonathan Cole have shown that when placed properly on steel columns and beams, thermate can be used to attack steel in a variety of ways, from cutting straight through the steel to simply cutting through the bolt connections.<sup>41</sup> These facts demonstrate that thermate, in its general variations, can indeed be used for demolition when set up correctly.

Of course, it is not merely the capability of thermite to demolish steel structures that critics have challenged. Many have also asserted that thermite and thermate do not have the capability to produce the explosive

---

<sup>39</sup> It's worth noting that the NFPA 921 *Guide* specifically states that residues left by thermite should be tested for in an investigation (Section 18.4.5), which further highlights the absurdity of NIST's unjustified decision not to test for explosive and/or incendiary material in the WTC debris.

<sup>40</sup> Eli Rika, "Popular Mechanics Ignores Its Own Historical Records of Thermite Demolition: Destruction of Skyride Towers, Reichstag Dome Set Incendiary Precedent," *AE911Truth*, 4 November 2011, at <http://www.ae911truth.org/en/news-section/41-articles/575-popular-mechanics-ignores-its-own-historical-records-of-thermite-demolition-destruction-of-skyride-towers-reichstag-dome-set-incendiary-precedent.html>.

<sup>41</sup> Jon Cole, "9/11 Experiments: The Great Thermate Debate," *911 Blogger*, 10 November 2010 at, <http://911blogger.com/news/2010-11-10/911-experiments-great-thermate-debate>. Jon Cole's experiments did show that when thermate is contained in a particular way, it does produce an explosive sound, but the sound levels are clearly not the 130 to 140 decibels asserted by NIST.

features exhibited by each Tower as they collapsed. But such assertions are answered by the fact that the other material suggested to have been used to demolish the buildings is nanothermite, which *is* an explosive and not merely an incendiary. There is substantial documentation showing that nanothermite can be formulated as a high-explosive,<sup>42</sup> meaning that it does have the potential to produce the explosive features observed in the demolition of the Towers. As explained at 911research.wtc7.net:

One of the critiques of theories that thermite was used to destroy the World Trade Center skyscrapers asserts that thermite preparations don't have sufficient explosive power to account for the observed features of the buildings' destruction. This criticism seems to be uninformed by knowledge of some of the aluminothermic preparations known to exist – particularly those being researched for military applications [...] In contrast to the slow-burning behavior of low-tech thermite preparations, various engineered forms of aluminothermic materials apparently have explosive power resembling conventional high explosives while retaining higher energy densities.<sup>43</sup>

But given the above information, does this mean that, along with the high-explosive power of nanothermite, this also includes the feature of loud explosive sounds? A review of the technical literature shows that this is not necessarily the case. In the paper documenting the discovery of chips of nanothermite in WTC dust samples,<sup>44</sup> the authors point out that in April of 2001 the American Chemical Society held a symposium on the defense applications of nanomaterials, in which they stated:

At this point in time, all of the military services and some DOE and academic laboratories have active R&D programs aimed at exploiting the unique properties of nanomaterials that have potential to be used in energetic

---

<sup>42</sup> Kevin R. Ryan, "The Explosive Nature of Nanothermite," *Physics 911* (n.d.), at <http://physics911.net/the-explosive-nature-of-nanothermite>.

<sup>43</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), "Aluminothermic Technology: Existence of High-Tech Metal-Based Explosives," *911 Research*, last updated 12 August 2009 at, <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/theories/thermitetech.html>.

<sup>44</sup> Niels Harrit *et al*, "Active Thermitic Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe," *The Open Chemical Physics Journal*, 2009, at <https://benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOCPJ/TOCPJ-2-7.pdf>. Heading off attempts to discount this study is John-Michael Talboo and Ziggi Zugam, "9/11: Explosive Material in the WTC Dust," at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/911explosivematerialv1-3.pdf>.

formulations for advanced explosives [...] nanoenergetics hold promise as useful ingredients for the thermobaric (TBX) and TBX-like weapons, particularly due to their high degree of tailorability with regards to energy release and impulse management.<sup>45</sup>

From this, the authors of the nanothermite study point out that:

The feature of “impulse management” may be significant. It is possible that formulations may be chosen to have just sufficient percussive effect to achieve the desired fragmentation while minimizing the noise level.<sup>46</sup>

Likewise, published literature on this material shows its shockwave characteristics can be “tuned” for various purposes, which may include the reduction of the volume or sharpness of the blast sounds produced.<sup>47</sup> Therefore, if such explosives were used on 9/11 to demolish the Towers, we have a plausible explanation as to why the sounds produced as the buildings collapsed were not as loud as what is typically heard in controlled demolitions. The author grants that the sounds produced as the Towers collapsed may not have been the 130 to 140 decibels that NIST claims would have been heard had explosives been used. However, to imply that no explosive sounds of any kind can be heard in the audio recordings of the buildings’ collapses is clearly unfounded. Sounds consistent with explosive destruction are audible in the available recordings, and methods of decreasing the sound levels of such explosives do exist.

### 2.3 Placement of the Explosives

A third way in which the explosive sounds could have been hidden and/or masked has to do with how and where the explosives were placed within the structures. As we’ve established, many detractors dismiss controlled demolition as a viable theory of what caused the WTC buildings to collapse, sometimes by fallaciously refusing to even look at the evidence

---

<sup>45</sup> Andrzej W. Miziolek, “Nanoenergetics: An Emerging Technology Area of National Importance,” *The AMPTIAC Newsletter* 6.1, Spring 2002, pp. 43-44 (PDF pp. 4-5), at <https://www.darksideofgravity.com/nanosolgels.pdf>.

<sup>46</sup> Harrit *et al.*, “Active Thermitic Material,” p. 26 (PDF p. 20).

<sup>47</sup> Andrey Bezmelnitsyn *et al.*, “Modified Nanoenergetic Composites with Tunable Combustion Characteristics for Propellant Applications,” *Propellants, Explosives, Pyrotechnics* 35.4, August 2010.

for said theory. And it seems that much of this backlash has to do with the fact that many researchers within the 9/11 Truth Movement have failed to provide a coherent explanation of exactly how the Towers were demolished. That is, an explanation that includes specific details, rather than just a vague assertion of “the buildings were demolished with explosives.” This explanation would include details such as what types of explosives were used, where they were placed, and how they were detonated.

In section 2.2 we identified the potential types of explosives/incendiaries that could have been used in the demolitions; thermate and nanothermite. The next step is to understand the most probable way in which the explosives would have been placed in the buildings and exactly which structural components the explosives were placed on. By doing this we can establish a clearer understanding of how the buildings collapsed and, as is relevant to the main topic of this paper, how the explosive sounds could have been further masked in the demolitions.

In a traditional controlled demolition, explosives in the form of cutter charges are placed directly on steel components of a structure in order to cause it to collapse. When placed on vertical support columns, these charges are generally placed at a roughly 45° angle, which is done to ensure that as the building collapses it falls in a specific direction desired by the demolition crew.<sup>48</sup>



Figure 1: Examples of Demolition Explosives Placed at Angles

---

<sup>48</sup> A helpful video explaining this process can be viewed here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F5qipBVaM08>.

It has been suggested by some researchers that this method of demolition was applied to the Twin Towers, as several columns in the debris pile appeared to be cut in a similar fashion.<sup>49</sup>



Figure 2: Angled Cut Columns at Ground Zero

However, close analysis of these columns shows that in all probability they were in fact cut by oxy-acetylene torches used in the cleanup operations at Ground Zero.<sup>50</sup> Using explosives to cut through the Towers' steel columns this way would have been highly risky in a covert demolition, as such cuts could have been recognized by cleanup workers at the site. This would have been especially true considering that Controlled Demolition, Inc. was one of the groups contracted to participate in the cleanup at Ground Zero.<sup>51</sup>

By definition, the goal of a covert demolition entails fooling onlookers into thinking that the event is not a controlled demolition, but rather an

---

<sup>49</sup> For examples, see Jones, "Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Completely Collapse?," p. 31; and Mike Rivero (webmaster), "Shaped Charges and the World Trade Center Collapses," *What Really Happened* (n.d.), at [http://whatreallyhappened.com/WRHARTICLES/wtc\\_charges.html](http://whatreallyhappened.com/WRHARTICLES/wtc_charges.html).

<sup>50</sup> See a discussion of this issue at "Angled cut column explained," at <http://911blogger.com/news/2008-10-11/angled-cut-column-explained>.

<sup>51</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), "Ground Zero Players," *911 Research*, last updated 21 March 2013, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/groundzero/players.html>.

*uncontrolled* event. Such a procedure would not merely apply to the event itself, but would also need to apply to the aftermath of said event. If the Towers were destroyed through a covert demolition method, it follows that the appearance of the buildings' structural components after the collapses could not show the obvious signs of being attacked by explosives that are commonly seen in traditional demolitions. The explosives would therefore need to attack the columns in a non-traditional manner, which in turn would cause damage to the columns that cleanup workers would not associate with damage caused by explosives (at least not without further examination).

In a presentation given in 2007, mechanical engineer Gordon Ross suggested that the explosives were primarily placed on the weld connections of the Towers' core columns.<sup>52</sup> This method of demolition (as illustrated below) would entail that the explosives take out one side of these connections, which in turn would cause the column ends to be affected in two ways:

- The column end would have one of its flanges torn away as it falls away from the other column end (given that one side not attacked by the explosive would still be attached to the column).
- The other column end would have one or both of its sides pushed inwards (one side pushed in by the force of the explosion, and the other side pushed in by the flange as it tears away).

---

<sup>52</sup> Gordon Ross's presentation can be viewed here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RZjOMkieVaw>.




Figure 3: Effects of Explosives on Core Column Sections




Figure 4: Effects of Explosives on Column End, Top View

After the collapses, many of the core columns in the debris pile exhibited these exact characteristics (see Appendix A for examples). As noted by AE911Truth.org:

Many of the core box columns found in the WTC rubble had concave sides. Most were broken straight across at the weld points. Often, one side of the column's welds were deeply oxidized and even torn away. Explosions ripping across the weld points, as explained by Gordon Ross, offer an explosive hypothesis that demonstrates a mechanism with results resembling observations in the WTC rubble.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Jonathan Cole, Richard Gage, and Gregg Roberts, "FAQ #13: What is AE911Truth's assessment of the directed energy weapon (DEW) hypothesis?," *AE911Truth* (n.d.), at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/faqs/353-faq-12-what-is-ae911truth-s-assessment-of-the-directed-energy-weapon-dew-hypothesis>. (Originally published 18 May 2014 at AE911Truth.org.)

Though a thorough analysis of the columns would be needed in order to be sure this damage was caused by explosives, these effects are described in relevant literature as being consistent with the use of explosives. In describing “deformation” effects of explosives on steel surfaces, one military manual explains that:

The charge’s shock wave deforms the surface of the object directly under the charge. When the charge is placed on a concrete surface, it causes a compressive shock wave that crumbles the concrete in the immediate vicinity of the charge, forming a crater. When placed on a steel surface, the charge causes **an indentation or depression** about the size of the contact area of the charge.<sup>54</sup> (Emphasis added)

Attacking the weld connections of the Towers’ columns provides a number of advantages for a covert demolition. As we’ve established, doing so would inflict damage to the columns that, after the collapses, would be almost unrecognizable as damage caused by explosives. What would further simplify the process is that the explosives need not be placed on every core column in the buildings. Rather, as demonstrated by Gordon Ross, the explosives were evidently only placed on the outer 24 core columns, which would account for why portions of the Towers’ cores were seen standing after the collapses.<sup>55</sup>

Furthermore, using the explosives to break the welds provides a solution to two other problems associated with destroying the buildings in a deceptive fashion; the amount of explosives needed and the sounds produced by said explosives. In discussing the placement of the explosives on the core columns’ weld connections, mechanical engineer Tony Szamboti notes that:

The amount of explosive[s] needed to provide a concussion powerful enough to break the welds on the core columns is significantly less than that needed to cut through them. These charges could have been tamped to cause most of the energy to go into the column and reduce the noise level. [...] [I]t is feasible to minimize the percussive noise to a level consistent with that of the

---

<sup>54</sup> Field Manual 5-250, *Explosives and Demolitions*, 5 June 1992, Chapter 3: “Calculation and Placement of Charges,” p. 3-1 (PDF p. 79), at [http://www.bits.de/NRANEU/others/amd-us-archive/fm5-250\(92\).pdf](http://www.bits.de/NRANEU/others/amd-us-archive/fm5-250(92).pdf).

<sup>55</sup> Gordon Ross, “How the Towers were Demolished” at <http://gordonssite.tripod.com/id2.html>.

collapsing material, while still generating more than enough force to remove the column by breaking the weld.<sup>56</sup>

Thus, attacking the columns' welds directly would reduce the amount of explosives needed and would also reduce the noise levels. As a general rule, breaking an object at its seams requires far less effort than breaking directly through the main body of the object itself. The "tamping" of the explosives described by Tony Szamboti is also very feasible, as such methods can be done with a variety of simple materials, such as sand, clay, or mud.<sup>57</sup>

Based on the data cited above, we can reasonably conclude that detractors' arguments regarding the sound level of explosives are groundless. There are a variety of ways that the sound levels of explosives can be decreased, based on how they are set up, how they are set off, and what types of explosives are used. Any one (or possibly all) of the above cited methods could have been used in the demolition of the Towers, and likely were, given that the audio and visual evidence matches reasonably well.

### 3. Witness Accounts of Explosions

The final issue to discuss in regards to the debate over explosions at the WTC is the witness accounts of explosion sounds when the Towers collapsed. On 9/11, there were a vast number of witnesses who described the Towers' collapses and the sounds they produced as "explosions."<sup>58</sup> The most comprehensive examination of these witness accounts was produced by Dr. Graeme MacQueen, in which he documented that 118 first responders testified to hearing explosions as the buildings collapsed.<sup>59</sup> Such accounts have been regarded by many as powerful evidence of

---

<sup>56</sup> Quoted from: <http://911blogger.com/news/2008-10-11/angled-cut-column-explained#comment-199053>.

<sup>57</sup> Field Manuel 5-250, *Explosives and Demolitions*, p. 3-2 (PDF p. 80).

<sup>58</sup> Many of these accounts can be heard in the film "9/11 Revisited: Were Explosives Used?," available to watch here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PWgSaBT9hNU>.

<sup>59</sup> Graeme MacQueen, "118 Witnesses: The Firefighters' Testimony to Explosions in the Twin Towers," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, August 2006, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Article\\_5\\_118Witnesses\\_WorldTradeCenter.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Article_5_118Witnesses_WorldTradeCenter.pdf).

controlled demolition for the Towers. But as with the previous issues we've discussed in this paper, detractors feel there are prosaic explanations for these accounts that do not require explosives being used.

The author finds that there are generally three primary objections to the witness accounts of explosions from the Towers, summarized as follows:

1. The witness accounts are inconsistent with what can actually be heard in the audio recordings of the Towers' collapses.
2. Regardless of their testimonies, the witnesses were simply incorrect in what they perceived, and that the loud sounds they heard were not explosions at all.
3. Even if the loud sounds the witnesses heard truly were explosions, this does not mean that it was explosives that caused them, being that there are many natural forms of explosions that can occur in large fires.

As we shall see, none of these objections hold up in light of the available data.

### **3.1 Inconsistent Accounts?**

The first cited objection to the witness accounts has already largely been addressed in Section 2 of this paper. The sounds produced as the Towers collapsed were consistent with sounds of explosions, although perhaps masked and/or decreased to facilitate a covert demolition scenario. However, another concern raised by those who object to the demolition theory is that many of the accounts are inconsistent and do not corroborate each other. That is, some witnesses speak of hearing only one explosion, while others assert they heard two to three explosions, while others speak of as many as seven to ten explosions.<sup>60</sup>

As previously discussed in Section 2.2, the rapid rate in which the explosives would needed to have been set off evidently prevented many onlookers from interpreting the sounds they heard as explosions. Despite

---

<sup>60</sup> The multidimensionality of the witnesses' accounts is explored by David Ray Griffin in his essay "Explosive Testimony: Revelations about the Twin Towers in the 9/11 Oral Histories," *911 Truth*, 18 January 2006, at <http://www.911truth.org/explosive-testimony-revelations-twin-towers-in-911-oral-histories>.

this, many of the witnesses did describe several distinct explosions at the beginning of each collapse, perhaps at a time when the rapidity of the detonation sequence had not yet taken full effect.<sup>61</sup> Several researchers within the 9/11 Truth Movement have explained that explosives were likely not used to initiate the collapses,<sup>62</sup> but once the upper sections began their downward descent the explosives were evidently set off at the lower levels of the buildings in order to ensure the collapses continued to progress through the rest of the structures.

But given the fact that some discrepancies exist within the witnesses' testimonies, does this weigh significantly against the idea that such testimony can be used as evidence for explosions from the WTC? Given the inordinate number of explosives that would have been set off during the Towers' demolitions, it should not be surprising if the witnesses' accounts differ in regards to how many explosions were heard. Most people were in a complete state of shock when the buildings collapsed, and would have been far more concerned with the buildings' overall destruction rather than keeping count of exactly how many explosions occurred. After all, witnesses to a known controlled demolition would likely not be able to recollect exactly how many explosions were heard as the building was destroyed. Graeme MacQueen, in discussing these types of discrepancies, has written that:

---

<sup>61</sup> In fact, videos of both the North and South Tower collapse do indeed seem to contain several distinct loud booms at the very beginning of each collapse. Examples: North Tower – <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4e6KTRh92wM>, South Tower – <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9fNLz8zWwaM>.

<sup>62</sup> For example, Jim Hoffman has suggested that thermate was used to weaken the internal supports of the buildings, thereby allowing the upper sections to begin collapsing before the primary explosives were set off further down the structures. As he explains, "A key objective is get[ting] the top of the Tower to move before explosive action is clearly evident to onlookers outside the building." This analysis is described in more detail in his essay "A Hypothetical Blasting Scenario," *9/11 Research*, 9 April 2009, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/blasting\\_scenario.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/blasting_scenario.html).

Similarly, mechanical engineer Tony Szamboti has proposed that the internal supports of the buildings were weakened first, and that doing so would match with what is seen in the visual record of the beginning of each collapse. See his analysis in "The Sustainability of the Controlled Demolition Hypothesis for the destruction of the Twin Towers," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, February 2008, pp. 5-6, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/SzambotiSustainabilityofControlledDemolitionHypothesisForDestructionofTwinTowers.pdf>.

[T]here are apparent inconsistencies: one person will refer to a single big explosion, another will say there were three explosions, while yet another will claim to have heard seven. I have made no attempt to sort out all these claims and cannot pretend to know if they are ultimately compatible. But, on the other hand, I cannot read this material without being struck by the ways in which the witnesses' testimony is not merely cumulative but complementary and multidimensional.<sup>63</sup>

Although there appears to be some inconsistencies in the accounts of explosions, the fact that there exists this much testimony of explosions on 9/11 should have been reason enough to test for explosive residue at Ground Zero. If, in a murder investigation, an individual claims to have heard a single gunshot, but others claim to have heard three, and others claim to have heard seven, the police would still investigate if a gun was used. Regardless, many of the witness accounts do in fact corroborate each other very well, not only in terms of what they heard, but also what they saw as the buildings came down. In discussing accounts given by firefighters Dennis Tardio and Pat Zoda, Graeme MacQueen observes that:

Tardio and Zoda repeatedly affirm each other's accounts, both with words and with hand gestures. The hand gestures are like a series of karate chops starting high and going quickly downward. The witnesses evidently want to suggest that there were many discrete, energetic events that they observed, and that these started high up and then moved rapidly down the building at regular intervals. [...] These are firefighters and they are used to encountering the standard sorts of explosions that occur in building fires. But they do not talk about smoke explosions, or "boiling-liquid-expanding-vapor" (BLEVE) explosions, or any of the other expected forms of explosion. Instead, they are talking about something altogether different. They say that what they saw resembled a controlled demolition.<sup>64</sup>

Tardio and Zoda's accounts are as follows:

Tardio: We made it outside, we made it about a block.

---

<sup>63</sup> MacQueen, "118 Witnesses," p. 54 (PDF p. 8).

<sup>64</sup> Graeme MacQueen, "Eyewitness Evidence of Explosions in the Twin Towers," published in *The 9/11 Toronto Report*, ed. James Gourley (International Center for 9/11 Studies, 2012), p. 177.

Zoda: We made it at least 2 blocks.  
Tardio: 2 blocks.  
Zoda: and we started runnin'  
Tardio: (hand gestures) poch-poch-poch-poch-poch-poch-poch  
Zoda: (hand gestures) Floor by floor it started poppin' out...  
Tardio: It was as if as if they had detonated, det...  
Zoda: yea detonated yea  
Tardio: as if they had planned to take down a building, (hand gestures)  
boom-boom-boom-boom-boom-boom-boom-boom-boom...<sup>65</sup>

Some critics reject the above account given by these men, insisting that they are not literally speaking of the buildings being demolished with explosives, but simply speaking in similes to describe their experiences. As one author writes of their accounts:

In the context of reading it on a conspiracy site, this may sound like damning evidence. They are saying “detonated” and “they had planned to take down a building”. They even say “Boom” to describe the sound. But if you hear the other things they’re saying, view their body language and consider the context outside the conspiracy theory setting, something else emerges. Before or after every description is “**As if**”. “**As if** they had planned to take down a building”. “**It was as if as if** they had detonated”. They also use body language to show it was the sound of the floors crashing into one another.<sup>66</sup> (Emphasis in the original)

However, the account of another individual not only corroborates Zoda and Tardio’s accounts, but also shows that their descriptions lend far more credibility to the demolition theory rather than to any natural collapse theory. That individual is Paul Lemos, who on 9/11 described the building’s collapse very similarly to how Tardio and Zoda described it. As Graeme MacQueen notes:

Lemos was interviewed on videotape on 9/11 near the World Trade Center, with WTC-7 still standing in the distance. He was filmed by a different film maker at a different location than the firefighters just described. This footage appears to be *entirely independent of the Tardio/Zoda footage just discussed*. However, when Lemos begins describing the demise of the North Tower, he

---

<sup>65</sup> These accounts can be heard in the film “9/11 Revisited,” at about the 5:25 minute mark.

<sup>66</sup> Author anonymous, “Firefighter’s Interviews,” p. 12.

uses the same hand gestures as Tardio and Zoda: rapid chops that start high and move at regular intervals down the building.<sup>67</sup> (Emphasis in the original)

Lemos told a reporter that:

All of a sudden, I looked up and about twenty stories below [...] the fire I saw, from the corner, (hand gestures) boom, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom. Just like twenty straight hits, just went down and then I just saw the whole building just went “pshew.” And as the bombs were going people just started running and I sat there and watched a few of them explode and then I just turned around and I just started running for my life because at that point the World Trade Center was coming right down.<sup>68</sup>



Figure 5: Tardio, Zoda, and Lemos Describing WTC Collapse

While taking note of these similar accounts, Graeme MacQueen further observes that:

---

<sup>67</sup> MacQueen, “Eyewitness Evidence of Explosions,” p. 178.

<sup>68</sup> Paul Lemos’s account can be heard in this video: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vJ6cJ\\_jGqLo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vJ6cJ_jGqLo).

Lemos is even bolder than Tardio and Zoda, in that he does not qualify his statement by saying “*as if* they had detonated.” He refers openly to “bombs” and he says he watched them “explode.” In any case, the Tardio/Zoda footage and the Lemos footage are both rich in detail and mutually corroborating. The rich detail is apparent from the transcript, and the corroboration comes not just from the language used but also the hand gestures. These men clearly perceived the same event and came away with the same idea – that explosive devices in the buildings were used to bring them down.<sup>69</sup> (Emphasis in the original)

Ultimately, while some of the accounts may contain inconsistencies, the similarities we observe within many of the witnesses’ testimonies are the vital components of this issue that should be focused on. The similarities we find in the witnesses’ accounts is what identifies them as a trend that is worthy of further investigation. What the witnesses say they heard matches well with what can be heard in the audio recordings of the Towers’ collapses, and therefore should be seen as further corroborating evidence of explosions coming from the buildings.

### **3.2 Loud Sounds are not always Explosions**

Out of all the objections raised against the witness accounts of explosions, the next two are the only ones that the author feels are most credible and certainly worthy of consideration. The first of these objections is that the loud sounds the witnesses heard were simply not explosions at all, but rather any number of phenomena inside the Towers which could have produced loud booming sounds. Events such as falling elevators, steel breaking, floors collapsing onto one another, and even human bodies hitting the ground could have all sounded like “explosions,” and therefore could have caused witnesses to report the events as such. While these events certainly could produce sounds similar to explosions, we can safely rule out such possibilities by examining not only the sounds themselves, but also *the effects that followed the sounds*.

On 9/11, Port Authority police officer Sue Keane was in the North Tower of the WTC helping occupants evacuate the building. While helping one individual down the stairs to the mezzanine level, she described enormous explosions that she not only heard, but also felt the effects of. Part of her account is as follows:

---

<sup>69</sup> MacQueen, “Eyewitness Evidence of Explosions,” pp. 178-79.

A couple of minutes later, it sounded like bombs going off. That's when the explosions happened. I could hear it coming, and I knew something was going to happen. I braced myself. It started to get dark, then all of a sudden there was this massive explosion. We were on the mezzanine, which is all encased in glass. The windows blew in, everything went black, and we all got thrown.<sup>70</sup>

Her description of the effects of this event is rich in detail, and demonstrates that what she experienced was in all probability the result of explosions caused by explosives.

In his book *Practical Bomb Scene Investigation*, former FBI explosives expert James Thurman describes the primary effects of “chemical explosions as they relate to the initiation of explosives.” In addition to sounds, Thurman lists several other effects,<sup>71</sup> including:

- Positive blast pressure
- Partial vacuum during positive blast pressure
- Negative blast pressure
- Thermal effects
- Fragmentation

When we examine the details of Sue Keane's account, we find that her experience matches extremely well with these effects:

- *Positive blast pressure*: “The windows blew in [...] and we all got thrown.”<sup>72</sup>
- *Partial vacuum during positive blast pressure*: “There was this incredible rush of air, and it literally sucked the breath out of my lungs.”<sup>73</sup>
- *Negative blast pressure*: “Everything went out of me with this massive wind [...] Stuff was just flying past. Then it stopped and got really

---

<sup>70</sup> Susan Hagen and Mary Carouba, *Women at Ground Zero: Stories of Courage and Compassion* (Indianapolis, IN: Alpha, 2002), p. 65.

<sup>71</sup> James T. Thurman, *Practical Bomb Scene Investigation*, 2nd ed. (New York: CRC Press, 2011), pp. 29, 33.

<sup>72</sup> Hagen and Carouba, *Women at Ground Zero*, p. 65.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*

quiet, and then everything came back at us. I could breathe at this point, but now I was sucking all that stuff in, too. It was almost like a back draft. It sounded like a tornado.”<sup>74</sup>

- *Thermal effects*: “A firefighter [...] threw me under this hose, which in a way felt great, because I didn’t realize until then that my skin was actually burning. I had burn marks, not like you’d have from a fire, but my face was all red, my chest was red [...]”<sup>75</sup>
- *Fragmentation*: “[F]or three or four days there was still stuff coming out of my body like you wouldn’t believe. It was like shrapnel. It’s still coming out. I’ll look over and have this pinpoint under my skin and it will be bleeding.”<sup>76</sup>

Many other individuals at the WTC site experienced these effects as well,<sup>77</sup> further demonstrating that what the witnesses described was most likely caused by explosives rather than non-explosive phenomena. Given the witnesses’ reports of explosions from the Towers *and* the above cited effects, there is no basis for denying the possibility that explosives may have contributed to the collapse of the buildings. However, we find that in NIST’s investigation, that is exactly what was done.

### 3.3 “Explosion” Doesn’t Mean “Explosives”

The last objection to the witnesses’ accounts of explosions that the author feels is worthy of serious consideration is that the explosions the witnesses reported were not necessarily the result of explosives. That is, the Twin Towers were on fire before they collapsed, and there are many natural forms of explosions that can take place in a building fire. Such natural explosions could be caused by electrical generators, jet fuel vapor, pressurized containers, or any other material or objects that may explode

---

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.

<sup>77</sup> For accounts of other individuals who experienced these effects, see “The Destruction of Each World Trade Center Tower Generated A Hot Density Current,” archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20151129153818/http://911encyclopedia.com/wiki/index.php/The\\_Destruction\\_Of\\_Each\\_World\\_Trade\\_Center\\_Tower\\_Generated\\_A\\_Hot\\_Density\\_Current](https://web.archive.org/web/20151129153818/http://911encyclopedia.com/wiki/index.php/The_Destruction_Of_Each_World_Trade_Center_Tower_Generated_A_Hot_Density_Current).

when exposed to extreme heat. However, there are two primary problems with concluding that the explosions the witnesses described could have been caused by such prosaic explanations.

First, while such phenomena could certainly occur on the Towers' floors that were set on fire, this would not account for the explosive events that occurred well below where the planes impacted. Several witnesses (such as Paul Lemos) described explosions racing down the vertical axis of the buildings, not merely occurring where the damage and fires were located. Others described explosions that distinctly occurred well below where the planes impacted. For example, firefighter Edward Cachia testified that:

As my officer and I were looking at the south tower, it just gave. It actually gave **at a lower floor, not the floor where the plane hit**, because we originally had thought there was like an **internal detonation explosives because it went in succession, boom, boom, boom, boom**, and then the tower came down.<sup>78</sup> (Emphasis added)

Firefighter Timothy Hoppey gave a similar account, stating that:

[T]hat's when we heard the rumble. I looked up, and it was just a black cloud directly overhead. At that point I was thinking it was a **secondary explosion**. It looked to me like **it was much lower than where the planes had gone in**.<sup>79</sup> (Emphasis added)

And firefighter William Reynolds testified that:

After a while, and I don't know how long it was, I was distracted by a **large explosion** from the south tower and it seemed like fire was shooting out a couple of hundred feet in each direction, then all of a sudden the top of the tower started coming down in a pancake...

Q. Bill, just one question. The fire that you saw, where was the fire? Like up at the upper levels where it started collapsing?

---

<sup>78</sup> "World Trade Center Task Force Interview: Firefighter Edward Cachia," File No. 9110251, p. 5, at [http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812\\_WTC\\_GRAPHIC/9110251.PDF](http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812_WTC_GRAPHIC/9110251.PDF).

<sup>79</sup> "World Trade Center Task Force Interview: Firefighter Timothy Hoppey," File No. 9110229, p. 5, at [http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812\\_WTC\\_GRAPHIC/9110229.PDF](http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812_WTC_GRAPHIC/9110229.PDF).

A. It appeared **somewhere below that. Maybe twenty floors below the impact area of the plane.**<sup>80</sup> (Emphasis added)

Second, none of the above-mentioned natural explanations would possess the required power needed to contribute to the collapse of the buildings in the first place. Events like electrical or combustion explosions could potentially destroy structures such as wood frame houses, but the energy needed to destroy steel structures as strong and robust as the Towers would have been far in excess of what was available from these prosaic explanations. The only explosions known to have completely destroyed steel-framed high-rise skyscrapers are those caused by explosives. However, at least one theory has emerged in recent years that actually does attempt to explain how natural explosions in the Towers *could* have contributed to the collapses.

In 2011, Norwegian scientist Dr. Christian Simensen proposed the idea that molten aluminum from the airplanes reacted with water inside the Towers, which in turn caused violent chemical reactions that produced the explosions heard by the witnesses and that destroyed the Towers. As noted by a press release of this theory:

The impacts triggered massive explosions and fires, but the subsequent collapse of each tower came as a shock to those watching the disaster unfold.

Blasts heard just before the buildings fell have led to conspiracy theories that explosives were set off inside the towers.

But Dr Simensen believes after crashing into the skyscrapers the two jets would have been trapped within an insulating layer of debris.

As a result, the aircraft hulls rather than the buildings absorbed most of the heat from the burning aviation fuel.

---

<sup>80</sup> “World Trade Center Task Force Interview: Firefighter William Reynolds,” File No. 9110288, pp. 3-4, at [http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812\\_WTC\\_GRAPHIC/9110288.PDF](http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/nyregion/20050812_WTC_GRAPHIC/9110288.PDF).

It is then claimed molten aluminium from the jets, flowing down through staircases and gaps in the floors, reacted with water from emergency sprinklers on the lower levels.<sup>81</sup>

Unlike the previous prosaic explanations discussed above, this theory does have some evidence to support it, as the technical literature explains that explosions caused by aluminum-water reactions can be extremely powerful. As one article notes:

Whenever two liquids, with widely different temperatures, come into contact, an explosion can result. This is purely a physical phenomenon, but with aluminium there is an additional concern because it is a very reactive element that has a strong chemical attraction for oxygen, as evidenced in its naturally occurring compounds. Just as a large amount of energy is required in reduction cell electrolysis to break down the aluminium-oxygen bonds of its oxide form to produce metallic aluminium. This energy is released dramatically if the metal is able to recombine with the oxygen from either water or air. The energy released when 0.5 kg of aluminium fully reacts with oxygen [...] is equivalent to detonating 1.4 kg of trinitrotoluene (TNT).<sup>82</sup>

While this idea does seem offer an explanation for both the Towers' destruction and the sounds the witnesses reported, there are a number of problems with Dr. Simensen's theory that renders it as unlikely as all of the previously discussed explanations:

- Dr. Simensen's theory does not account for the inward bowing of the Towers' perimeter columns seen in the videos and photos. According to NIST, this effect was caused by the heating of the floor trusses which were weakened and sagged downward, which in turn pulled on the perimeter columns of each Tower until the columns finally broke. While the author disagrees with NIST's explanation of what produced this effect (as other scenarios can account for it; see note 62), there is no doubt this event happened and is entirely inconsistent with the

---

<sup>81</sup> Staff Reporter, "A NEW theory has emerged claiming to give the REAL reason the Twin Towers fell after the 9/11 attacks," *The Sun*, September 2011, reproduced at <http://911blogger.com/news/2011-09-21/new-theory-has-emerged-claiming-give-real-reason-twin-towers-collapsed>.

<sup>82</sup> Alex W. Lowery, "Safety coatings reduce risk of molten aluminium explosions," *Aluminium Times* 11.3, July/August 2009, p. 61.

effects of ANY type of explosion, let alone aluminum-water explosions.

- Dr. Simensen's theory requires that water react with molten aluminum from the aircrafts in order to produce the explosions he claims took place. However, according to NIST the sprinkler systems were not operational on the principal fire floors, given that the airplane impacts had severed the water pipes that carried water to the sprinkler systems.<sup>83</sup> The water evidently flowed down the stairwells from the severed pipes, which theoretically could have produced explosions at the lower levels, since the molten aluminum could have also flowed down the buildings as well. But the fact of the matter is that the collapses did initiate at the floors where the planes hit, so it can at least be said that no such explosions could have contributed to the initiation of collapse. What further complicates this scenario is that according to NIST, the collapse of WTC1 initiated at the 98th floor.<sup>84</sup> However, this floor had far less debris (i.e. aluminum) on it compared to other floors below which were struck by much larger portions of the plane.<sup>85</sup>

Despite these problems for Dr. Simensen's theory, he maintains that these were the explosions that "caused the uppermost floors of the buildings to fall and crush the lower parts" and that "these were the explosions that were heard by people in the vicinity and that have since given life to the conspiracy theories that explosives had been placed in the skyscrapers."<sup>86</sup> While we conclude that Dr. Simensen's theory is effectively groundless, we also note with interest that, in attempting to defend the idea that the Towers collapsed due to natural phenomena, Dr. Simensen has nonetheless acknowledged one aspect of the Towers' collapses that NIST and other detractors have consistently denied; that explosions equal in power to that of those produced by controlled demolition explosives contributed to the buildings' destruction. And if such explosions took place at the WTC, it follows that chemical analyses should have been carried out in order to determine their origin.

---

<sup>83</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1, p. 187.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 87.

<sup>85</sup> See Table 7-5 in NIST NCSTAR 1-2, p. 212, at [http://www.nist.gov/manuscript-publication-search.cfm?pub\\_id=101012](http://www.nist.gov/manuscript-publication-search.cfm?pub_id=101012).

<sup>86</sup> Reporter, "A NEW theory has emerged."

While further objections to the witness accounts may be expected, we maintain that the primary criticisms discussed so far have been effectively addressed. The witnesses' accounts of explosions from the Towers match well with the audiovisual recordings. They are corroborated by the reported aftereffects of the event, and there appears to be no prosaic explanation that can account for every aspect of what the witnesses heard and experienced that day. We thus conclude that 911myths.com's charge that "considerably more evidence" is needed to show that explosives were used has been answered.

#### 4. World Trade Center 7

Thus far we have primarily looked at the question of explosions in regards to the collapse of the Twin Towers. We now turn our attention to the destruction of World Trade Center 7, where sound evidence of explosions also exists. Like their report on the Towers, the NIST investigation into the collapse of Building 7 has come under heavy scrutiny by several independent researchers.<sup>87</sup> However, as we have previously established, NIST does provide a far more technical analysis of the explosion issue within their WTC7 report than they had done for their report on the Towers. Yet we find that their reasoning against explosion sounds from WTC7 is just as fallacious as their reasoning in regards to the Towers.

---

<sup>87</sup> For discussions of the flaws in the NIST WTC7 Report, the following articles are recommended: Kevin Ryan, "The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science reaches its peak," *911 Review*, 10 September 2008, at [http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST\\_WTC7.html](http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST_WTC7.html); F. R. Greening, "Comments on the Draft Report NIST NCSTAR 1-9: '*Structural Fire Response and Probable Collapse Sequence of World Trade Center Building 7*', issued by NIST August 21st, 2008," 11 September 2008, at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/greeningcommentsscstar1-9.pdf>; Ronald Brookman, "The NIST Analyses: A Close Look at WTC 7," *AE911Truth*, March 2010, at [https://www.ae911truth.org/images/The\\_NIST\\_Analyses\\_-\\_A\\_Close\\_Look\\_at\\_WTC\\_7.pdf](https://www.ae911truth.org/images/The_NIST_Analyses_-_A_Close_Look_at_WTC_7.pdf); Chris Sarns, "Fraud Exposed in NIST WTC 7 Reports," *AE911Truth*, 14 December 2016, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/317-fraud-exposed-in-nist-wtc-7-reports-series>.

## 4.1 Sound Levels

As discussed in Section 1, NIST identified 130 to 140 decibels as being the sound levels that would have been heard had explosives been used to bring down WTC7. Yet according to NIST, “There were no witness reports of such a loud noise, nor was such a noise heard on audio tracks of video tapes that recorded the WTC 7 collapse.”<sup>88</sup> However, we have also explained that such a scenario is based solely on NIST’s predetermined conclusion that RDX would have been the primary explosive used. Rather, as we have already seen, the main materials demolition proponents believe were used are thermate and nanothermite, which can both be formulated to react without producing such explosive sounds.

In addition to not testing for this material in the WTC debris, NIST also never simulated such a scenario either, as they deemed that it was “unlikely” that this material could have been placed inside Building 7 without detection.<sup>89</sup> Thus we see that NIST’s dismissal of a thermate/nanothermite demolition scenario is based not on scientific arguments, but rather an argument from incredulity; because *they* don’t believe such an event could have been done secretly, it therefore could not have happened.

## 4.2 Recordings and Witnesses

Another problem with NIST’s argument is that, by claiming that explosive sounds of “130 to 140 decibels” were not heard or recorded, it implies that no explosive sounds at all were heard from Building 7. However, this suggestion is demonstrably false. There were in fact several witnesses who reported hearing explosions from Building 7 as it collapsed. One of these individuals was first responder Craig Bartmer, who testified that:

I was real close to Building 7 when it fell down [...] That didn’t sound like just a building falling down to me [...] There’s a lot of eyewitness testimony down there of hearing explosions [...] I think I know an explosion when I hear it.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 357.

<sup>89</sup> “Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation” (Updated 20 November 2019), question 14.

<sup>90</sup> “WTC Building 7 Explosions First Responder Craig Bartmer Interview” at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-IfgYhjQ9fE>.

A New York University medical student working near Building 7 on 9/11 claimed that he and others “heard this sound that sounded like a clap of thunder” right before the building collapsed.<sup>91</sup> NY1 reporter Gigi Woods described a “loud, incredibly loud explosion” as Building 7 collapsed.<sup>92</sup> And first responder and former Air Force medic Kevin McPadden testified that right before Building 7 collapsed:

[I heard] explosions [...] we’re talking about bombs, because [it sounded like] “ba-bam!,” cause you know you get that like “ba-bam!” You know, there’s like a little explosion and then the force. And you could feel it coming through the ground. It was vibrating [...] You could feel the vibration move through things, cause it’s like a different wave that’s coming off of it. And then boom-boom-boom-boom-boom-boom-boom, that was the building coming down, not the explosions. So it was two distinct sounds that were happening.<sup>93</sup>

Furthermore, there are recordings from 9/11 in which loud explosions can be heard (which were recorded after the Towers collapsed, but before Building 7 collapsed).<sup>94</sup> There is also at least one video of Building 7’s collapse in which a sharp explosive noise can be heard as it collapses.<sup>95</sup> And according to an analysis by physicist David Chandler, several booms can be heard in one video right before the building collapses.<sup>96</sup> Again, these sounds may not have been the 130 to 140 decibels claimed by NIST, but the idea that explosive sounds of any kind were neither heard nor recorded is clearly unfounded. But perhaps the most obvious indication of this is found in regards to the testimony of two men who were nearly killed by an explosion in Building 7.

---

<sup>91</sup> “WTC7 eyewitness 2 PFC” at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zkuQtPzNEA>.

<sup>92</sup> “NY1’s Gigi Stone Woods on WTC 7: ‘Incredibly Loud Explosion’” at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NQEH7ApzKHM>.

<sup>93</sup> “Alex Jones interviews Kevin McPadden,” available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nKY0blFyNms>.

<sup>94</sup> “World Trade Center on 9/11 - Sounds of Explosions” at [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_A9X\\_8flGeM](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_A9X_8flGeM).

<sup>95</sup> “WTC7 collapse (rare video)” at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SIbqaybkbWI>.

<sup>96</sup> David Chandler, “WTC 7: Sound Evidence for Explosions,” 5 July 2010, at [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ERhoNYj9\\_fg](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ERhoNYj9_fg).

### 4.3 Barry Jennings and Michael Hess

On the morning of 9/11, Barry Jennings, the deputy director of the Emergency Services Department of the New York City Housing Authority, and Michael Hess, New York City's corporation counsel, went to the 23rd floor of WTC7, which acted as New York City's Office of Emergency Management. Upon arriving at the OEM, both men found that it was empty due to being evacuated. When they exited the 23rd floor and started down the stairwell, they were trapped inside the building by an event that both men described as an explosion. Here are the accounts given by both men on 9/11 after they were rescued from the building.

[Barry Jennings] Well me and Mr. Hess the Corporation Counsel were on the 23rd floor. I told him we gotta get out of here. We started walking down the stairs. We made it to the 8th floor.\* Big explosion! Blew us back into the 8th floor. And I turned to Hess and I said, "this is it! We're dead! We're not gonna make it outta here!" I took a fire extinguisher and I bust[ed] a window out. That's when this gentleman here heard my cries for help. This gentleman right here and he kept saying "stand by, somebody's coming to get you."<sup>97</sup>

[Michael Hess] I was up in the Emergency Management Center on the 23rd floor. And when all the power went out in the building, another gentleman and I walked down to 8th floor\* where there was an explosion. And we were trapped on the 8th floor with smoke, thick smoke all around us for about an hour and a half. But the New York fire department as terrific as they are just came and got us out.<sup>98</sup>

\*Note: The explosion actually took place on the 6th floor, and both men then made it back to the 8th floor. This was later clarified and confirmed by Barry Jennings and Michael Hess in subsequent interviews.

These accounts pose a serious problem for NIST's conclusion that no explosions took place within WTC7. Granted, this event clearly took place long before the building collapsed, and therefore has little bearing on the issue of the initiation of the building's collapse. However, in this case the focus should be directed towards the event itself, not the potential purpose

---

<sup>97</sup> "Raw Footage of Barry Jennings Interview" at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-XOK-r80nr8>.

<sup>98</sup> "Michael Hess, WTC7 explosion witness" at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BUfiLbXMa64>.

of said event. It is possible that this explosion played some role in the destruction of Building 7, but an investigation into the cause of the explosion is what would ultimately tell us if that were the case.

Despite the implications of Hess and Jennings' testimonies, NIST has subsequently attempted to explain away this event by arguing that what they experienced was not an explosion at all. NIST's claim, which has since been endorsed and repeated by defenders of the official story, is that the explosion the two men experienced was actually the result of falling debris from the collapse of the North Tower that struck WTC7. As NIST writes in their report:

Two New York City employees had gone to the OEM Center on the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor and found no one there. As they went to get into an elevator to go downstairs, the lights inside WTC 7 flickered as WTC 2 collapsed. At that point, the elevator they were attempting to catch no longer worked, so they started down the staircase. When they got to the 6<sup>th</sup> floor, WTC 1 [the North Tower] collapsed, the lights went out in the staircase, the sprinklers (at an unspecified location) came on briefly, and the staircase filled with smoke and debris. The two men went back to the 8<sup>th</sup> floor, broke out two windows, and called for help. Fire fighters on the ground saw them and went up the stairs.<sup>99</sup>

Before critically examining NIST's claims about this event, we first note that Michael Hess has since retracted his testimony from 9/11, now more or less agreeing with NIST's version of events. In an interview given to the BBC, Hess now claims that the event he and Jennings experienced was in fact just the collapse of the North Tower and that there were no explosions.<sup>100</sup> However, since his interview on 9/11, Barry Jennings has also been interviewed by both the BBC and the *Loose Change* crew, and in both interviews he repeated his assertion that the event he experienced was indeed an explosion.<sup>101</sup> Though Hess and Jennings' testimonies now

---

<sup>99</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 298.

<sup>100</sup> Mike Rudin, "Caught up in a conspiracy theory," *BBC News*, October 2008, at [http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/theeditors/2008/10/caught\\_up\\_in\\_a\\_conspiracy\\_theo.html](http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/theeditors/2008/10/caught_up_in_a_conspiracy_theo.html).

<sup>101</sup> For Jennings' interview with the BBC, see "WTC 7 - BBC The Third Tower - Conspiracy Files," available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vZbMfTtHkYM>. Jennings' interview is unfortunately not uncut, and is split up into multiple segments throughout the video. However, every segment featuring Jennings can be seen at the following timestamps in the video: 0:42, 9:22, 12:01, 13:43, 18:27, 47:00, and 47:30. For Jennings' interview with the *Loose Change*

contradict each other, by examining their testimonies and the events of that day further, we can reasonably establish that Jennings' testimony is in all likelihood correct. There are at least two primary reasons why the event described by these men could not possibly have been the result of debris from the North Tower's collapse striking WTC7.

First, Hess and Jennings were almost certainly trapped in the building before the North Tower collapsed. According to Hess's first testimony, he and Jennings were trapped in the building "for about an hour and a half." The interview Hess gave on 9/11 was given at 11:57am,<sup>102</sup> and the North Tower collapsed at 10:28am. According to the reporter who interviewed Hess, the interview was given "off Broadway by City Hall," which is several blocks from WTC7. Therefore, it is likely that Hess and Jennings were trapped at around 10:00am.

That is, if they were trapped at 10:00am, and were rescued "an hour and a half" later, they would have gotten out of the building at around 11:30am. An 11:30 rescue time is, furthermore, corroborated by the fact that, according to firefighter John Spiech, he and others entered Building 7 at around 11:00am, and rescued Hess and Jennings shortly thereafter.<sup>103</sup> Exiting the building at around 11:30am would have given Hess just enough time to make his way across the city to give his interview at 11:57. Had they been trapped later than 10:00am, or just after the collapse of the North Tower at 10:28am, Hess would not have had time to give his interview over an hour and a half later. This point is very important, as NIST had claimed in one of its previous reports that these men were rescued from Building 7 somewhere between 12:10 and 12:15pm.<sup>104</sup> But

---

crew, see "Barry Jennings Uncut," available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9e6rYzcAjog>. Also, the transcript of Jennings' full interview to the *Loose Change* crew can be read here: <http://s1.zetaboards.com/LooseChangeForums/single/?p=108750&t=451652>.

<sup>102</sup> David Ray Griffin, "Michael Hess, Barry Jennings: The 9/11 Interview with Evidence that NIST Lied about When Michael Hess and Barry Jennings Were Rescued," *WanttoKnow.info* (n.d.), at <http://www.wanttoknow.info/008/hessjenningswtc7explosiontvbroadcast>.

<sup>103</sup> Case 11-4403, Document 68-1, 14 February 2012 – "In The Matter Of: In re: September 11 Property Damage and Business Loss Litigation – John S. Spiech, May 27, 2009," p. JA-945 (PDF p. 112). Available at <https://911docs.files.wordpress.com/2021/01/volume-4-868-1161.pdf>.

<sup>104</sup> "Interim Report on WTC 7," which is Appendix L of NIST-SP 1000-5: June 2004: Progress Report on the Federal Building and Fire Safety Investigation

if Hess had been interviewed at 11:57am, this renders NIST's timeline impossible. Also, Hess's estimate of being trapped for an hour and a half may have been somewhat conservative, as Jennings stated in his *Loose Change* interview that he and Hess were trapped "for several hours."

Second, the effects of the event described by Jennings could not possibly have been caused by debris from the North Tower striking the south side of WTC7. According to Jennings, he and Hess were on the north side of the building when the explosion occurred and trapped them on the stairwell. Jennings testified that "the explosion was beneath me," "the landing gave way," and that the explosion "blew us back." This raises the question of how *falling* debris from the North Tower, even considering it had collapsed at this time, could possibly have caused an *upward* explosive force strong enough to blow Hess and Jennings backwards and knock the landing out from under them. This also somehow had to be accomplished by debris striking the *south* face of WTC7 while both men were on the *north* side. NIST itself admits that "it is likely that the structural damage (steel and floor slabs) did not penetrate beyond the perimeter of the building core" and that "there was relatively little damage to the interior of WTC 7."<sup>105</sup>

A video from 9/11 shows Michael Hess calling for help from a broken window on the northeastern face of WTC7,<sup>106</sup> which means he and Jennings would have been trapped on the stairwell located in the building's northeastern region. Yet according to NIST's own estimates,<sup>107</sup> the structural damage to WTC7 was nowhere near this location in the building.

---

of the World Trade Center, p. L-18 at [http://www.nist.gov/customcf/get\\_pdf.cfm?pub\\_id=860567](http://www.nist.gov/customcf/get_pdf.cfm?pub_id=860567).

<sup>105</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1A, p. 16.

<sup>106</sup> "WTC 7 Burning" at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZduP7HTM3cg>.

<sup>107</sup> For a summary of NIST's damage estimates for WTC7, see Section 5.5.3: Summary of Debris Damage to WTC 7 Based on Visual Data, in NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 182ff.





Figure L-12. Floor 6 plan.

Figure 6: Floor Plan of WTC7 Interior Frame (Appendix L of NIST-SP 1000-5, Fig. L-12. Note that the red circle has been added to highlight the northeastern stairwell.)



Floor plan based on structural drawings (Cantor 1985) and damage was estimated by NIST  
**Figure 5-94 Estimated debris impact damage to Floors 5 and 6 of WTC 7.**  
 Marked area indicates removed columns and floor segments.

Figure 7: Floor Plan of WTC7 Interior Frame (NIST NCSTAR 1-9, Fig. 5-94)

To summarize, if the explosion that Hess and Jennings experienced in Building 7 was caused by debris from the collapse of WTC1, then it must be adequately explained how a) Hess was able to be interviewed across town at 11:57am after being likely trapped before 10:28am, and b) how falling debris from WTC1 striking the south side of WTC7 caused an upward explosive force all the way on the north side of the building. Unless both of these issues are resolved, the testimony of Barry Jennings stands.<sup>108</sup> We have little reason to believe Michael Hess's new story, as it

---

<sup>108</sup> For a more in-depth study of Hess and Jennings' testimonies, see David Ray Griffin, *The Mysterious Collapse of World Trade Center 7: Why the Final*

greatly contradicts Jennings' and his own original testimony. Not only does Hess now deny that the event that trapped them was an explosion, but when asked by the BBC if he heard other explosions in the building he flatly stated "no."<sup>109</sup> However, Jennings stated in his *Loose Change* interview that he heard "all types of explosions" while trapped in the building.

Based on this data, we conclude that NIST's explanation for the explosion Hess and Jennings experienced is totally unfounded. In fact, NIST's only other argument against the event being an explosion is, again, that the sound levels evidently weren't high enough. In response to the question of whether or not the event experienced by Hess and Jennings could have been an explosion, NIST replied:

The sound levels reported by all witnesses do not match the sound level of an explosion that would have been required to cause the collapse of the building.<sup>110</sup>

This of course completely misses the point of the question, which was to determine if explosions of any kind took place within WTC7, not the intended purpose of the explosions. Interestingly, in an earlier version of their FAQ page, NIST's answer was longer than this. In the 2010 version of this page, their answer to this question read as follows:

The sound levels reported by all witnesses do not match the sound level of an explosion that would have been required to cause the collapse of the building. If the two loud booms were due to explosions that were responsible for the collapse of WTC 7, the emergency responder-located somewhere between the 6th and 8th floors in WTC 7-would not have been able to survive the near immediate collapse and provide this witness account.<sup>111</sup>

---

*Official Report about 9/11 is Unscientific and False* (Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press, 2010), pp. 84-110.

<sup>109</sup> Hess states this at about the 1:50 minute mark of this video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hy5lpp6yADw>.

<sup>110</sup> "Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation" (Updated 20 November 2019), question 17.

<sup>111</sup> "Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation" (09/17/2010, ARCHIVE, incorporated into 9/19/2011 update), at [http://www.nist.gov/public\\_affairs/factsheet/wtc\\_qa\\_082108.cfm](http://www.nist.gov/public_affairs/factsheet/wtc_qa_082108.cfm).

As we can see, NIST omitted the second part of this answer from the current version of their FAQ page, perhaps realizing that because the building obviously did not collapse at the time of the event, it is therefore absurd to argue their point based on the fact that Hess and Jennings weren't killed by the collapse. Yet we argue it is equally absurd to dismiss the event as an explosion simply because the sound levels weren't high enough to cause the building to collapse, because again, *the building did not collapse at the time of the event*. To argue in this way merely presupposes what the intent of the explosion would have been, which we argue NIST cannot possibly know if they don't investigate the event first. If NIST cannot identify a plausible prosaic explanation for what Hess and Jennings experienced, then it follows that the event would have been worthy of further investigation to identify the source and possible purpose of the event.

The author concludes that NIST's arguments against explosions from WTC7 are untenable. The arguments they have presented are based solely on their predetermined conclusions on what types of explosives would have been used and how they would have been set up. By creating their own straw-man version of events, NIST was able to dismiss every indication that explosives could have been used, including the audio recordings and witness testimonies that indicate explosions did indeed take place.

## **5. NIST's Distortions and Errors**

Based on every point so far discussed, the author finds that NIST has ignored a multitude of evidence that shows that explosions took place at the WTC complex on 9/11, and because of this they have failed to adequately determine if explosives may have contributed to the destruction of the Twin Towers and Building 7. This is despite the fact that there were several *a priori* reasons to consider that explosives may have been used in the destruction of the WTC buildings, including:

- The fact that explosives had been previously planted in the WTC by terrorists in 1993.

- The fact that terrorists have been known to use “diversionary attack[s] and secondary device[s]” when committing acts of terrorism.<sup>112</sup>
- The fact that never before 9/11 had fire caused the total collapse of a steel-framed high-rise skyscraper.<sup>113</sup>
- The fact that before 9/11 the only process that had ever produced the complete destruction of a steel-framed high-rise skyscraper is controlled demolition with explosives.
- The fact that the collapse of all three buildings exhibited characteristics consistent with the use of explosives.
- The fact that no building that has collapsed from fire has ever produced every feature exhibited by the WTC buildings.<sup>114</sup>

NIST acknowledges that they never forensically tested the debris at Ground Zero for evidence of explosives. They never investigated the possible use of incendiaries such as thermate and nanothermite. They have denied that the audio recordings and witness accounts indicate that explosions did indeed take place at the WTC. They have ignored the fact that every feature of the buildings’ collapses is readily explained by the controlled demolition theory. And yet despite all of this, NIST still

---

<sup>112</sup> This possibility was raised on 9/11 by New Mexico Tech explosive expert Van Romero, who suggested that the terrorists may have used the planes as a “diversionary attack” and then used explosives as “secondary device[s].” See Olivier Uyttebrouck, “Explosives Planted In Towers, N.M. Tech Expert Says,” *Albuquerque Journal*, 11 September 2001, archived at [http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/disinfo/retractions/ABQjournal\\_Romero911.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/disinfo/retractions/ABQjournal_Romero911.html). Romero has since retracted these claims regarding explosives (see John Fleck, “Fire, Not Extra Explosives, Doomed Buildings, Expert Says,” *Albuquerque Journal*, 21 September 2001, at <http://www.maebrussell.com/Articles%20and%20Notes/WTC%20Explosives.html>). Yet his original point remains a good one. Explosives *could* have been used in conjunction with the planes, especially considering that explosives had previously been planted in the WTC by terrorists in 1993.

<sup>113</sup> Chris Sarns, “A Record of Major High-Rise Fires Worldwide,” *AE911Truth*, 10 March 2020, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/648-a-record-of-major-high-rise-fires-worldwide>.

<sup>114</sup> See Chapter 1 of this present work.

maintains that they “found no corroborating evidence for alternative hypotheses suggesting that the WTC towers were brought down by controlled demolition using explosives.”<sup>115</sup> Yet the author argues NIST has no basis for claiming this, as they cannot know whether or not explosives may have been used *if they never even check*.

Below is a list of the major errors and fallacies the author believes NIST has committed in their investigation in regards to whether explosives may have contributed to the destruction of the WTC buildings.

Table 1: Errors in NIST’s Twin Towers/World Trade Center 7 Investigations

NIST Investigation	Error/Fallacy	Reason
<p>1. “[T]here was no evidence (collected by NIST or by the New York City Police Department, the Port Authority Police Department, or the Fire Department of New York) of any blast or explosions in the region below the impact and fire floors...”</p> <p>-NIST WTC FAQ</p>	<p>Failure to consider use of explosives based on witness testimonies.</p>	<p>Over 100 first responders testified to hearing explosions from the WTC on 9/11.</p>
<p>2. “People on the street would have heard 9lb of RDX go off a mile away in air...”</p> <p>-NIST NCSTAR 1-9</p>	<p>Identifies RDX as the primary explosive used.</p>	<p>Proponents of the demolition theory have seldom posited RDX as the primary explosive that would have been used.</p>
<p>3. “[T]he noise level at a distance of ½ mile would have been on the order of 130 dB to 140 dB...”</p>	<p>Identifies noise as key criteria for identifying use of explosives.</p>	<p>The sound of an explosion is deemed “not an essential element in the definition of an</p>

---

<sup>115</sup> Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC Towers Investigation (Updated 15 November 2019), question 8.

-NIST NCSTAR 1-9		explosion” by the NFPA 921 Guide.
4. “130 dB to 140 dB” sound levels -NIST NCSTAR 1-9	Asserts only these sound levels would be produced by explosives used to destroy WTC7.	A demolition involving incendiaries would not produce such sounds.
5. “[F]ragments [from WTC1] were forcibly ejected and traveled distances up to hundreds of meters.” -NIST NCSTAR 1-9	Failure to consider this event as consistent with the use of explosives.	The NFPA 921 Guide identifies this type of “high-order damage” as consistent with explosions.
6. “NIST did not test for the presence of explosive residue...” -NIST Response to Request for Correction	Failure to forensically examine WTC debris for residues of explosives and/or incendiaries.	The NFPA 921 Guide states that “chemical analyses” should be carried out to detect the presence of explosives and/or incendiaries.
7. “NIST’s WTC 7 investigation did follow the core tenet of NFPA 921” -NIST WTC7 FAQ	Failure to follow numerous recommendations made by the NFPA 921 Guide.	Reasons given in points 3, 5, and 6.
8. “There were no witness reports of such a loud noise...” -NIST NCSTAR 1-9	Failure to consider witness reports of explosion sounds.	Several witnesses testified to hearing loud explosions right before and during WTC7’s collapse.
9. “[N]or was such a noise heard on audio tracks of	Failure to consider	Several audio recordings of

video tapes that recorded the WTC 7 collapse.”  -NIST NCSTAR 1-9	explosion sounds heard in audio recordings.	WTC7’s collapse contain sounds of explosions.
<b>10.</b> “Two New York City employees had gone to the OEM Center on the 23 <sup>rd</sup> floor... When they got to the 6 <sup>th</sup> floor, WTC 1 collapsed, the lights went out in the staircase, the sprinklers... came on briefly, and the staircase filled with smoke and debris.”  -NIST NCSTAR 1-9	Inadequate explanation for the event described by these men as an explosion.	Neither the timeline of events nor the effects of the event match NIST’s explanation.

## 6. Conclusions

For years NIST and other detractors have argued that there exists no credible evidence for controlled demolition of the three WTC buildings on 9/11, including the evidence for sounds of explosions. We conclude in this paper that such a charge has been effectively answered and shown to be groundless. We have shown that such evidence has been found amongst the vast body of data regarding the WTC buildings’ destruction, and that the official investigators have failed to adequately consider it. It is for these reasons that the author calls for a new investigation into the destruction of the Twin Towers and World Trade Center 7 in order to fully understand what truly caused their destruction that tragic day.

### Appendix A. Core Column Damage

The following table provides examples of core column damage that the author deems indicative of explosives being used. Most of the images are cropped from larger photos in order to highlight the specific damage discussed in section 2.3. Images 1 through 10a, and 13 through 16 were taken from FEMA’s Ground Zero photo archive.

[http://www.fema.gov/photolibrary/bookmark\\_search.do?sDisasterNumber=1391](http://www.fema.gov/photolibrary/bookmark_search.do?sDisasterNumber=1391)

However, as of 11 February 2014, the webpage appears to have been deleted. Regardless, the author has archived the following cited photos, and a link to each unedited photo is provided to accompany each cropped image. Images 10b and 10c were taken from 911datasets.org (now defunct), which archives data released through FOIA requests to the International Center for 9/11 Studies.

<http://911datasets.org/index.php/SFolder:TFZWUA5UFIPUW3PQFOLXP5NS6Z6D76V3>

Image 11 is taken from a photo featured in Joel Meyerowitz's *Aftermath* (New York: Phaidon Press, 2006), p. 30.

Image 12 is from an archive of photos taken by Lane Johnson, but like the FEMA webpage, this site also appears to have been deleted.


<http://www.amny.com/entertainment/news/am-wtcrelics-pg2006,0,6613706.photogallery>

However, several of the photos, including the one cited below, have been archived at 911research.wtc7.net. A link to the complete unedited version of the photo is included in the table.

<http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/photos/hanger17.html>

Images 17 and 18 are from a photo taken by Graham Morrison, featured in "In the Land of the Free: September 11, 2001 – 10 Years Later," *LIFE Books*, Vol. 11, No. 12, 2 September 2011, p. 80.


Table 2: Evidence of Core Columns Damaged by Explosives

Photo(s)	Source	Core Columns
1.	<p>FEMA.gov</p> <p>Original:  <a href="http://tinyurl.com/mutjobt">http://tinyurl.com/mutjobt</a></p>	
<p>2a.</p> <p>2b.</p> <p>2c.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov</p> <p>Original:  <a href="http://tinyurl.com/17txroo">http://tinyurl.com/17txroo</a></p> <p><a href="http://tinyurl.com/nhr7x4m">http://tinyurl.com/nhr7x4m</a></p> <p><a href="http://tinyurl.com/mutjobt">http://tinyurl.com/mutjobt</a></p>	
3.	<p>FEMA.gov</p> <p>Original:  <a href="http://tinyurl.com/lrlpkms">http://tinyurl.com/lrlpkms</a></p>	

<p>4.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov Original: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/mcv42o5">http://tinyurl.com/mcv42o5</a></p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov Original: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/m7fwxwo">http://tinyurl.com/m7fwxwo</a></p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov Original: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/orsggc9">http://tinyurl.com/orsggc9</a></p>	

<p>7.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov Original: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/orsggc9">http://tinyurl.com/orsggc9</a></p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov Original: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/lwkambg">http://tinyurl.com/lwkambg</a></p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov Original: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/12fku84">http://tinyurl.com/12fku84</a></p>	

<p><b>10a.</b></p>	<p>FEMA.gov</p> <p>Original: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/14h3qhc">http://tinyurl.com/14h3qhc</a></p>	
<p><b>10b.</b></p> <p><b>10c.</b></p>	<p>911datasets.org</p> <p>Original: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/lbxbqq5">http://tinyurl.com/lbxbqq5</a></p> <p><a href="http://tinyurl.com/18bzyqf">http://tinyurl.com/18bzyqf</a></p>	 

<p>11.</p>	<p>Joel Meyerowitz, <i>Aftermath</i> (New York: Phaidon Press, 2006)</p>	
<p>12.</p>	<p>AMNY.com  Original: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/mt36zd9">http://tinyurl.com/mt36zd9</a></p>	
<p>13.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov  Original: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/15h7rtq">http://tinyurl.com/15h7rtq</a></p>	

<p>14.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov</p> <p>Original:  <a href="http://tinyurl.com/orsggc9">http://tinyurl.com/orsggc9</a></p>	
<p>15.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov</p> <p>Original:  <a href="http://tinyurl.com/pfqa4bp">http://tinyurl.com/pfqa4bp</a></p>	
<p>16.</p>	<p>FEMA.gov</p> <p>Original:  <a href="http://tinyurl.com/l4h3qhc">http://tinyurl.com/l4h3qhc</a></p>	

<p><b>17.</b></p>	<p><i>LIFE Books</i>, Vol. 11, No. 12, 2 September 2011</p>	
<p><b>18.</b></p>	<p><i>LIFE Books</i>, Vol. 11, No. 12, 2 September 2011</p>	

## Observations on NIST's WTC Fireproofing Loss and Collapse Scenario

Originally published 2021 at  
<https://911docs.wordpress.com>

In this paper, we outline and comment upon one of the most critical problems with the NIST WTC report. It involves serious contradictions within the report itself, invalidating the investigators' conclusions that the collapse of the Twin Towers was caused purely of the impact of the aircrafts and the resulting fires started by them. According to NIST, the collapses were initiated by office fires heating the floor trusses to the point where they began to sag downward. This in turn pulled on the perimeter columns and caused them to bow inward and eventually break, initiating the fall of the upper section of each building.<sup>1</sup> Though many researchers have pointed out severe flaws in the WTC NIST report,<sup>2</sup> we shall focus on

---

<sup>1</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1, at [https://www.nist.gov/publications/federal-building-and-fire-safetyinvestigation-world-trade-center-disaster-final-report?pub\\_id=909017](https://www.nist.gov/publications/federal-building-and-fire-safetyinvestigation-world-trade-center-disaster-final-report?pub_id=909017).

<sup>2</sup> The literature detailing the flaws in the NIST WTC report is vast. However, the very best critiques of the report are as follows: Jim Hoffman, "Building a Better Mirage: NIST's 3- Year \$20,000,000 Cover-Up of the Crime of the Century," *911 Research*, 8 December 2005, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/nist/index.html>; Eric Douglas, "The NIST WTC Investigation – How Real Was The Simulation?," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, December 2006, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200612/NIST-WTC-Investigation.pdf>; Jim Hoffman, "Review of 'A New Standard For Deception: The NIST WTC Report' A Presentation by Kevin Ryan," *911 Research*, 15 October 2006, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/kevin\\_ryan/newstandard.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/kevin_ryan/newstandard.html); Anonymous and F. Legge, "Falsifiability and the NIST WTC Report: A Study in Theoretical Adequacy," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, March 2010, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2010/Falsifiability.pdf>; Andrea Dreger, "How NIST Avoided a Real Analysis of the Physical Evidence of WTC Steel," *AE911Truth*, 23 August 2011, at [http://www1.ae911truth.org/en/f\\_aqs/547-how-nist-avoided-a-real-analysis-of-the-physical-evidence-of-wtc-steel-.html](http://www1.ae911truth.org/en/f_aqs/547-how-nist-avoided-a-real-analysis-of-the-physical-evidence-of-wtc-steel-.html) (full length version

one aspect of NIST's collapse scenario that, by their own admission, is crucial to their conclusions; the loss of fireproofing within the buildings.

According to NIST:

The WTC towers likely would not have collapsed under the combined effects of aircraft impact and damage and the extensive, multi-floor fires if the thermal insulation had not been widely dislodged or had been minimally dislodged by aircraft impact.<sup>3</sup>

Furthermore, researchers in the 9/11 Truth Movement submitted a Request for Correction to NIST, pointing out several flaws in their report.<sup>4</sup> One flaw noted by these researchers was that NIST's physical tests of floor models being heated by fires did not produce the level of sagging as NIST suggested in their report. In response, NIST stated:

[I]t is not possible to compare the floor sagging observed during the ASTM E119 tests with the floor sagging calculated by the analysis models. The ASTM E119 furnace profile is not representative of real fire condition. In addition the specimens had been fireproofed which prevented the steel from heating as quickly as it would in an unprotected condition as was modeled based on the estimated damage to the fireproofing due to debris impact.<sup>5</sup>

As we can see, NIST places a significant amount of importance on the fireproofing's dislodgement. The question is, could the plane impacts have dislodged the fireproofing to the extent NIST claims? Here we present three reasons why this cannot be the case.

## **1. The energy needed to dislodge the fireproofing was insufficient.**

---

available at [http://www1.ae911truth.org/documents/How\\_NIST\\_Avoided\\_a\\_Real\\_Analysis\\_of\\_the\\_Physical\\_Evidence\\_of\\_WTC\\_Steel.pdf](http://www1.ae911truth.org/documents/How_NIST_Avoided_a_Real_Analysis_of_the_Physical_Evidence_of_WTC_Steel.pdf)).

<sup>3</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1, p. xxxviii.

<sup>4</sup> Bob McIlvaine, Bill Doyle, Steven Jones, Kevin Ryan, Richard Gage, Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice, "9/11 Family Members and Scholars: Request for Correction Submitted to NIST," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, June 2007, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/RFCtoNISTbyMcIlvaineDoyleJonesRyanGageSTJ.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> "Sept. 2007 Response to April 2007 RFC, from NIST," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, September 2007, p. 3, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2007/NISTresponseToRequestForCorrectionGourleyEtal2.pdf>.

In their attempt to defend NIST's collapse scenario, supporters of the official story often show pictures of the impact hole that show damaged steel missing fireproofing.<sup>6</sup> However, it's important to note that these photos show damaged steel at the very front of the impact. Obviously, as the plane first enters the building it retains much of its kinetic energy, but as it travels through the building it will gradually lose energy. And in the case of the North Tower, the collapse initiated on the south side of the building, opposite to where the plane entered.

NIST attempted to show that the fireproofing would be widely dislodged by firing buckshot and shrapnel at steel plates and bars coated with SFRM (Sprayed on Fire Resistant Material).<sup>7</sup> During the testing, the gun was fired at velocities of approximately 500 ft/s and produced damage to the SFRM. However, at one point the gun misfired and produced a projectile velocity of just 102 ft/s (31 m/s), which resulted in no damage to the SFRM.<sup>8</sup> And yet according to NIST, the plane debris was only travelling at a rate of approximately 51 ft/s (15 m/s) once it reached the south side of the North Tower where the fire was supposed to have initiated the collapse.<sup>9</sup> This strongly suggests that the plane debris would have been unable to dislodge any fireproofing in the area of the building where the fires are said to have started the collapse.

## **2. The plane debris could not have behaved in the manner as described by NIST.**

NIST's scenario requires that the planes be shredded into small pieces as they enter the buildings to widely dislodge the fireproofing. As explained by Kevin Ryan:

[NIST's] test for fireproofing loss, never inserted in the draft reports, involved shooting a total of fifteen rounds from a shotgun at non-representative samples

---

<sup>6</sup> E.g., <https://web.archive.org/web/20101224220749/http://www.debunking911.com/impact.htm>.

<sup>7</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-6A, Appendix C, pp. 263-74, at [https://www.nist.gov/publications/passive-fire-protection-federal-building-and-fire-safety-investigation-world-trade-0?pub\\_id=101041](https://www.nist.gov/publications/passive-fire-protection-federal-building-and-fire-safety-investigation-world-trade-0?pub_id=101041).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 268.

<sup>9</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-2, pp. 171-80, at [https://www.nist.gov/publications/baseline-structural-performance-and-aircraft-impact-damage-analysis-world-trade-1?pub\\_id=101012](https://www.nist.gov/publications/baseline-structural-performance-and-aircraft-impact-damage-analysis-world-trade-1?pub_id=101012).

in a plywood box [...] Unfortunately, it's not hard to see that these tests actually disproved their findings. One reason is that there is no evidence that a Boeing 767 could transform into any number of shotgun blasts. Nearly 100,000 blasts would be needed based on NIST's own damage estimates, and these would have to be directed in a very symmetrical fashion to strip the columns and floors from all sides. However, it is much more likely that the aircraft debris was a distribution of sizes from very large chunks to a few smaller ones, and that it was directed asymmetrically.<sup>10</sup>

The planes being shredded into such small fragments is shown in simulations provided in NIST's report (see images below). Kevin Ryan's assertion that "it is much more likely that the aircraft debris was a distribution of sizes from very large chunks to a few smaller ones" is corroborated by three facts:

- Large portions of the planes were recovered from Ground Zero after they had exited the buildings.<sup>11</sup>
- At least one survivor from the South Tower, Stanley Praitnath, testified that he saw large portions of the aircraft inside the building:

The plane impacts. I try to get up and then I realize that I'm covered up to my shoulder in debris. And when I'm digging through under all this rubble, I can see the bottom wing starting to burn, and that wing is wedged 20 feet in my office doorway.<sup>12</sup>

- Purdue University's own simulation of Flight 11's impact into the North Tower (which was described by the University as "[having] a realism never seen before") showed the aircraft being shredded into


---

<sup>10</sup> Kevin Ryan, "What is 9/11 Truth? – The First Steps," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, August 2006, pp. 2-3, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Article\\_1\\_Ryan5.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Article_1_Ryan5.pdf).


<sup>11</sup> Photos of aircraft debris available at <http://web.archive.org/web/20130610165451/http://wtcdebris.0catch.com>.

<sup>12</sup> "Accounts from the South Tower," *The New York Times*, 26 May 2002, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/05/26/nyregion/26STOWER.html?pagewanted=all>. There is also a recorded phone interview with Stanley Praitnath online in which he discusses seeing intact portions of the plane in the building, available at <https://youtu.be/GRwNJmQw1MY>.

large chunks, rather than the much smaller debris suggested by NIST.<sup>13</sup>



Purdue WTC 1 Impact Simulation (<https://youtu.be/NOKJ4ZXgK4Q>)



Images from NIST NCSTAR 1-2, pages 271 (left; WTC1) and 283 (right; WTC2)

---

<sup>13</sup> “Purdue creates scientifically based animation of 9/11 attack,” *Purdue News*, 12 June 2007, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20191001094646/https://news.uns.purdue.edu/x/2007a/070612HoffmannWTC.html>. (Video of simulation available online at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NOKJ4ZXgK4Q>.) The simulation even shows debris exiting the structure in sizable portions, consistent with the large debris recovered from Ground Zero after the impacts: <http://www.cs.purdue.edu/homes/cmh/simulation/phase4/img276-0.jpg>.

Each of these points strongly suggests that the debris did not behave in the manner implied by NIST.


### **3. There was no fireproofing loss in the area of collapse initiation in the first place.**

According to NIST, the inward bowing of the Towers' perimeter columns initiated the collapse of the structures. This bowing was supposed to have been caused by the heat from the fires weakening the steel trusses, causing them to sag downwards and pull on the columns. However, we can see from NIST's own estimates that the major inward bowing occurred in the area of the North Tower where evidently no fireproofing was dislodged. According to NIST, the maximum inward bowing occurred at floor 97 on the building's southeast face.<sup>14</sup> But according to their simulated estimates for fireproofing loss, there evidently was no fireproofing loss in this part of the building.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1, Table 6-2 (p. 87). See also Figure 2-12 (p. 33).

<sup>15</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-6, Figure 5-17 (p. 139) at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/structuralfire-response-and-probable-collapse-sequence-world-trade-center-towers-0>. NIST also gives these estimates in NCSTAR 1-5G, pp. 185-89, but for some reason appears to show more dislodged fireproofing than in NCSTAR 1-6. However, it still shows no loss in the area of maximum inward bowing. See <https://www.nist.gov/publications/fire-structure-interfaceand-thermal-response-world-trade-center-towers-federal-0>.



**Figure 6-6. WTC 1 exterior columns bowing inward across most of the south face between Floors 95 to 97 (or 98) at 10:22:59 a.m. Note buckled panel at SW corner.**

Images from NIST NCSTAR 1-6, pages 161 (left) and 139 (right). Note: Blue areas indicate dislodged fireproofing. Red circles added by the author.

This point becomes all the more problematic for NIST when we consider the fact that the physical tests they conducted on a 35ft span floor area (incidentally, coated in less fireproofing than the actual steel assemblies in the Towers) produced only 3 inches of sagging after only an hour of heating.<sup>16</sup> When adjusted for scale, this would have been less than half the amount of sagging NIST claims the floor trusses in the Towers underwent.<sup>17</sup> (Keep in mind that according to NIST, it took 50 to 60 minutes for the fires in the North Tower to even reach the side of the building where the collapse is supposed to have started.<sup>18</sup>) That the inward

<sup>16</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-6B, Figure 6-9 (p. 105) at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/fire-resistance-tests-floor-truss-systems-federal-building-and-fire-safety-0>.

<sup>17</sup> NIST claims the Tower's floor trusses sagged over 40 inches before collapse occurred. According to mechanical engineer Tony Szamboti, a 3-inch sag for a 35ft floor span would translate to roughly a 15 to 20-inch sag for a 60ft span, the floor length of those in the Tower. See <http://www.internationalkeptics.com/forum/showpost.php?p=3294459&postcount=133>.

<sup>18</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-6, pp. 322, 338.

bowing of the Towers' columns occurred is not disputed, since this is visible in numerous videos taken before the collapse happened. But if, as we have established, the fires could not have produced this effect, it strongly implies something else other than the fires was the cause.<sup>19</sup>

It is for these reasons that NIST's fireproofing loss scenario for the WTC buildings cannot possibly be correct. The fireproofing in the Towers could not have been widely dislodged given the lack of necessary energy, lack of a necessary mechanism, and estimates made by NIST that contradict their own conclusions. And if NIST's report is wrong on this point, it calls into question the validity of their entire report. Thus, a new investigation into the collapse of the Towers is surely needed.

---

<sup>19</sup> For alternate explanations as to what could have caused this effect, see Jim Hoffman, "A Hypothetical Blasting Scenario," *9/11 Research*, 9 April 2009, at [https://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/blasting\\_scenario.html](https://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/blasting_scenario.html); and Tony Szamboti, "The Sustainability of the Controlled Demolition Hypothesis for the Destruction of the Twin Towers," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 17 February 2008, pp. 5-6, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/SzambotiSustainabilityofControlledDemolitionHypothesisForDestructionofTwinTowers.pdf>.

## Clarifying the Question of Collapse Times

Originally published 23 February 2021 at  
<https://911docs.wordpress.com>

### Abstract

Over the years, several discussions have been raised regarding the fall times of the WTC Twin Towers. Unfortunately, even after years of research, misinformation/misunderstanding continues to persist about how the Towers fell, how long they took to fall, and what all of that means. In this paper, we attempt to clarify these matters by examining both the fall times and fall rates of the Twin Towers and World Trade Center 7. This analysis does not claim to be a definitive description of the collapse mechanics of any building. Rather, the purpose of this analysis is to give a factual account of the Towers' collapse times and fall rates, and to compare them with other building collapses – specifically those that have fallen due to fire, or through controlled demolition. The author bases these findings on publicly available information regarding each structure discussed herein, including videos of the buildings' collapses, which can be studied and analyzed at any interested parties' leisure. We also apply the principal of inductive inference to the question of building fall times and fall rates, comparing the WTC to the various other structures in order to determine whether the Towers more likely collapsed due to the effects of fire/gravity, or controlled demolition with explosives.

### “Official” Estimates

Looking to official reports for a definitive estimate of the Towers' collapse times, unfortunately, turns up little of use. The 9/11 Commission Report (2004, 305) states the South Tower collapsed in 10 seconds. NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology), on an FAQ page and not in their report, states the time it took the first exterior panels to hit the ground was 9 and 11 seconds for the South and North Tower, respectively

(NIST, 2006). However, neither of these estimates gives us anything of value, given that (a) the Commission Report is not an engineering report, and thus not an authority on the collapse mechanics, and (b) as the NIST FAQ page makes clear, their statement is in reference to the first debris to hit the ground, not either structure as a whole. Various sources on the web also claim the Towers collapsed in around 10 seconds (or even less), but this appears to be a result of misreading seismographs which recorded the collapses on 9/11 (Hoffman, 2006a). In order to determine more probable collapse time estimates, we must look elsewhere.

Bažant *et al* (2008, 903) also looked at seismic records to determine a plausible collapse time estimate, arriving at mean durations of 12.82 and 10.49 seconds for the North and South Tower, respectively. Although others have challenged the methodology and conclusions drawn in this study and elsewhere (e.g., Szuladziński *et al*, 2013; Schneider, 2019), we will accept these figures as reasonably accurate. Important to note, however, is that these estimates only consider the fall time of the sections below the plane impact points, without the upper sections included. According to NIST (2005, 87), the collapses of WTC1 and WTC2 started at the 98th and 82nd floor, respectively, meaning the upper sections were 12 and 28 floors. We could then perhaps add one second to the fall time of WTC1, and two seconds to WTC2 (due to the difference in the upper section heights), and this gives us overall collapse times of 13.82 and 12.49 seconds, respectively, resulting in a mean average of approximately 13.1 seconds. Hoffman (2006b) takes a more straightforward approach, and bases estimates primarily on the video records, determining that the Tower collapses took around 15 seconds in either case. For the remainder of our discussion, we will accept this figure of 15 seconds as our time for the Towers, but we consider this an upper bound figure, as the fall times could have been as low as 13 seconds.

Determining the fall time of WTC7 is also subject to some debate, but appears somewhat more straightforward. Jones (2006, 4) estimates the building collapsed in approximately 6.5 seconds. Conversely, NIST estimated the fall of the first 18 stories took approximately 5.4 seconds, 1.5 seconds (40%) longer than free fall (NIST, 2008, 601). However, this estimate was based on the initial movement of the building's roofline, not its downward descent (Gourley *et al*, 2008). Because there is some dispute over the exact moment the start of the fall should be clocked at, we will consider both estimates in this study. Adding in NIST's additional 1.5 seconds to Jones' estimate brings us to a total collapse time of 8 seconds.

## Free Fall Collapses?

In order to continue our discussion, we will need to be familiar with a few figures. To calculate an expected free fall time, the calculation is

$$D = 16.08 \times s^2$$

where  $D$  is the distance in feet, and  $s$  is seconds. Next, the calculation to determine average acceleration is

$$a = \frac{2s}{t^2} - \frac{2u}{t}$$

where  $a$  is the acceleration in  $\text{ft/s}^2$ ,  $u$  is the initial velocity,  $s$  is the height in feet, and  $t$  is the time in seconds. Given that  $u$  is assumed to be zero in all cases here (since every structure starts at rest), we can disregard the second part of the equation and shorten it to simply  $a = 2s/t^2$ .

The Twin Towers were 1362 (WTC2) and 1368 (WTC1) feet tall. A fall from either height would take approximately 9.2 seconds in complete free fall. In other words, the free fall time of the Towers is calculated as  $1362 = 16.08 \times 9.2^2$ . Likewise, the average acceleration is calculated as  $2(1362)/15^2 = 12.10 \text{ ft/s}^2$ . This also results in a fall time exceeding free fall by approximately 63%. Building 7 was 610 feet in height, resulting in a free fall time of approximately 6.1 seconds. Assuming NIST's estimate of a roughly 8 second collapse, we find the average acceleration to be approximately  $19.06 \text{ ft/s}^2$ . This results in a fall time exceeding free fall by around 31%. Assuming Jones' estimate, we find an average acceleration of  $28.87 \text{ ft/s}^2$ , and an excess of free fall by only 6%.

Although claims have often been made that the Towers collapsed at free fall, or "near" free fall, these figures put things in better context. The rate of free fall in a vacuum is  $32.2 \text{ ft/s}^2$ , so in no sense can either of the Twin Towers be said to have collapsed at free fall. And while studies have found portions of their accelerations to be anomalous (e.g., MacQueen & Szamboti, 2009; Chandler, 2010), whether the overall fall times of the Towers can be said to have been at near free fall is still debatable. On the other hand, a much better case can be made for Building 7 to have fallen at near free fall, and indeed it has been found that for at least a portion of its collapse, its acceleration was indeed that of free fall (NIST, 2008, 602; Chandler, 2018).

It is this author's opinion that the focus on whether or not the Towers are said to have fallen at free fall was perhaps misguided all along. If the question at hand is to determine if the Towers were felled by explosives, or purely by the combination of fire and gravity, then the focus should squarely be set on analyzing their actual rate of fall, and how they compare to other structures felled by these competing scenarios. This, of course, involves examining real-world examples of each, which we will now proceed to do.

### **Inductive Inference and Other High-rise Collapses**

Inductive inference is the method of inquiry that “involves reasoning from a limited number of observations to wider, probable generalizations” (Baggini & Fosl, 2010, 8). While not definitive in the way deductive inference is, induction is recognized as integral to the scientific method (Rothchild, 2006), a “hallmark of scientific reasoning,” and the conclusions drawn from it are considered “warranted,” “more likely,” or “more probable” (DiCarlo, 2011, 40).

Inductive inference has played a major role in assessing the destruction of the WTC buildings, with researchers noting that before 9/11, fire had never caused the total collapse of a steel-framed high-rise skyscraper (e.g., Jones *et al*, 2016, 22). However, this should not be taken to mean that it is *impossible* for fire to cause such a structure to collapse – indeed, as this paper shows, at least two of the structures we will discuss were high-rises and did collapse from fire. The main point is to assess the ratio of fire collapses versus collapses caused by controlled demolition with explosives. And considering the extreme rarity of fire ever causing a high-rise skyscraper to collapse (Sarns, 2020), initial skepticism that fire caused such a thing three times in one day is warranted.

Adding to this inductive reasoning is the fact that the collapse of the Towers exhibited characteristics that, until 9/11, had only ever been seen in controlled demolitions (Griffin, 2005, 26-27). In addition, before and even after 9/11, no steel structure that collapsed from fire had exhibited every one of these features (Taylor, 2013, 24-25). One such feature is the rate of collapse, and that is the feature we will closely analyze here. To do so, we will compare the rate of fall between structures known to have collapsed from fire, and those that were knowingly felled by explosives.

We will first consider three structures known to have been brought down through controlled demolition with explosives: the Landmark

Tower, the Martin Tower, and the Farmers Bank Building. The reasons for choosing these structures are (a) they are all steel-framed high-rises like the Towers (as opposed to masonry structures), (b) they are fairly tall structures, all over 300 feet in height, and (c) they all collapsed more or less as single units, as opposed to collapsing in sections. The specific details of these buildings, in terms of their size and construction, are taken from [www.emporis.com](http://www.emporis.com).

- The Landmark Tower was 380 ft, and when demolished appeared to collapse in approximately 7 seconds (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=79sJ1bMR6VQ>). A free fall time from its height would have been approximately 4.8 seconds. This means its fall time exceeded free fall by approximately 45%, and its average acceleration was 15.51 ft/s<sup>2</sup>.
- The Martin Tower was 332 ft, and also collapsed in approximately 7 seconds (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6QI3VhFXYyw>). A free fall time from that height would be 4.5 seconds. It therefore exceeded free fall by approximately 55%, and its average acceleration was 13.55 ft/s<sup>2</sup>.
- The Farmers Bank Building was approximately 344 ft, and collapsed in around 8 seconds (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=60ekZeAtBbU>). A free fall time from that height would be 4.6 seconds. It therefore exceeded free fall by about 73%, and its average acceleration was approximately 10.75 ft/s<sup>2</sup>.

Now we will compare this with known fire-induced gravity-driven collapses. To the best of this author's knowledge, only three viable candidates exist: the Wilton Paes Almeida Building, the Plasco Building, and the TU Delft building. Each of these were steel-framed buildings which are said to have collapsed solely due to fire. To be sure, other steel structures have collapsed from fire as well, but we are disregarding these, not only because there are no video recordings of most of them to analyze, but also because they are not reasonable comparisons in terms of their size and construction (Taylor, 2013).

- The Wilton Paes Building was 277 ft. It collapsed in approximately 8 seconds. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JxCEpOw2hek>). A free

fall collapse would have taken 4.15 seconds. Therefore, it exceeded free fall by approximately 92%, and its average acceleration was 8.65 ft/s<sup>2</sup>.

- The Plasco Building was 138 ft. It collapsed in approximately 15 seconds. ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_MgJTa7SDaY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_MgJTa7SDaY)). A free fall collapse would have taken approximately 2.9 seconds. It therefore exceeded free fall by 417%, and the average acceleration was approximately 1.22 ft/s<sup>2</sup>.
- The highest point of the TU Delft building was 183 ft. Although this wasn't a total collapse, as only one section fell, this section did so in a progressive top-down fashion, which is also said to have been the case for the Towers. The section collapsed in approximately 9 seconds (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bizr86N-4nc>). A free fall collapse from that height would have been approximately 3.3 seconds. Therefore, the collapsed section exceeded free fall by 172%, and its average acceleration was 4.51 ft/s<sup>2</sup>.

Altogether, here are the results we arrive at:




Figure 1: WTC Towers and Controlled Demolition Acceleration/Free Fall Excess Comparisons




Figure 2: WTC Towers and Fire/Gravity Acceleration/Free Fall Excess Comparisons

These results show that the fall rates of the Towers and Building 7 appear much more in line with structures destroyed with explosives, rather than those felled by fire. The three known controlled demolitions examined showed a mean average excess of free fall of approximately 57%, close to the Towers' 63% and Building 7's 31% (for NIST's estimate). Likewise, their mean average acceleration was found to be approximately 13.27 ft/s<sup>2</sup>, again very close to the Towers' estimated 12.10 ft/s<sup>2</sup>. Taking either NIST or Jones' estimate as correct, the acceleration of Building 7 was found to be even greater.

Conversely, the mean average acceleration of the structures felled by fire/gravity alone is found to be approximately 4.8 ft/s<sup>2</sup>, and an average excess of free fall by 227%. Neither of these figures appear in line with the figures arrived at for the Towers or Building 7. But if the fall rates of the Towers are inconsistent with what is seen from fire/gravity induced collapses, the question still remains: how long should it have taken for them to collapse, if unassisted by explosives?

### Estimations of Expected Tower Fall Times

Several published studies, acting as critiques of the conclusions drawn by Bažant *et al* (2008), conclude that the upper section should have been arrested early on in the collapse (e.g., Szuladziński *et al*, 2013; Szamboti & Johns, 2014; Schneider, 2019). However, suppose we grant the

collapses were allowed to progress – how long should they have taken to fall? To the best of the author’s knowledge, only one detailed study has been put forth to determine the expected fall time of WTC7 (Kuttler, 2006). However, this study examined a hypothetical model of the collapse wherein the fall progressed from the top to the bottom. Since the collapse of Building 7 clearly started from the bottom, this model is of little value in assessing a realistic collapse time. Studies of the Towers’ collapses, however, prove far more valuable.

According to a study by Kuttler (2007), the expected fall times of the Towers, assuming they were purely gravity-driven collapses, should have been in excess of 25 seconds. This is consistent with an analysis by Szuladziński (2012), who found the Towers realistically should have collapsed somewhere between 23.53 and 30.19 seconds. According to him, “the pancaking mode is not a realistic proposition, as the calculated fall time becomes much too long.” In the same paper, he estimates the lowest possible fall time to be approximately 15.33 seconds, assuming perfectly frangible columns. This is also consistent with studies published by Němec *et al* (2018), Chandler (n.d.), and Mitteldorf (n.d.), who found the lowest possible collapse time to be approximately 15 seconds. Again, these studies assume variables that would favor shorter collapse times, such as perfectly frangible columns and purely inelastic collisions between floors. Interestingly, as we’ve established, this is the approximate collapse time of the Towers, suggesting their supports were significantly weakened throughout the structures during collapse. The study by Němec *et al* arrived at a calculated expected fall time of approximately 20.42 seconds, somewhat shorter than Kuttler and Szuladziński, but still in the same general ballpark, and it is noted by the authors that this is a conservative estimate.

If we assume the figures provided by Němec, Kuttler, and Szuladziński – fall times of 20.42, 25, 23.53, and 30.19 seconds – this results in average accelerations of 6.53, 4.36, 4.91, and 2.98 ft/s<sup>2</sup>, respectively. These times would have also exceeded free fall by 121, 171, 155, and 228%, respectively. We arrive at the following results:




Figure 3: Twin Towers and Estimated Expected Collapse Rates/Free Fall Excess

Just like the comparisons with known fire/gravity-driven collapses, the calculated expected fall times of the Towers appear totally at odds with what was actually observed during the WTC collapses. Most of them exceed free fall by over 100% (and even 200% in one case), and the expected average accelerations are far more consistent with what would be expected from a fall unassisted by explosives. And this conclusion is further supported by a study done by Korol *et al* (2011), which looked at the collapse mechanics of hypothetical ten-story structures. The results were that in 90 percent of the examined cases, the collapse was arrested. For the remaining 10 percent, the fall times exceeded free fall by 57 to 228%.

Table 1: Comparison of WTC Buildings with Controlled Demolitions and Fire/Gravity Collapses

Building Collapse	Free Fall Time (in seconds)	Actual Fall Time (in seconds)	Exceeds Free Fall	Average Acceleration (ft/s <sup>2</sup> )
<b>World Trade Center</b>				
Twin Towers	9.2	15	63%	12.10
Building 7 (Jones)	6.1	6.5	6%	28.87
Building 7 (NIST)	6.1	8	31%	19.06

<b>Demolitions</b>				
Landmark Tower	4.8	7	45%	15.51
Martin Tower	4.5	7	55%	13.55
Farmers Bank	4.6	8	73%	10.75
<b>Fire/Gravity Collapses</b>				
Wilton Paes	4.15	8	92%	8.65
Plasco	2.9	15	417%	1.22
TU Delft	3.3	9	172%	4.51

Table 2: Calculations of Expected Fall Times/Rates/Accelerations of Twin Towers

<b>Study (Twin Towers)</b>	<b>Calculated Fall Time (seconds)</b>	<b>Exceeds Free Fall</b>	<b>Average Acceleration (ft/s<sup>2</sup>)</b>
Němec	20.42	121%	6.53
Kuttler	25	171%	4.36
Szuladziński (a)	23.53	155%	4.91
Szuladziński (b)	30.19	228%	2.98

## Conclusion

The author concludes that the collapse of the Towers, based on their average accelerations and fall times, appears far more in line with what is seen from demolitions. Collapses induced by fire and driven by gravity, as expected, produce collapse times far higher, and result in much lower average accelerations compared to what was seen on 9/11, and from known controlled demolitions. Furthermore, calculations for the expected fall times for the Towers, assuming a purely natural, gravity-driven mechanism, produce fall times that appear more consistent with other structure collapses known to have been caused by fire. This analysis hopefully also brings clarification to the discussion of the Towers' fall times, showing that while free fall is not a necessary element to focus on,

comparisons with other known collapses caused by a variety of mechanisms can contribute to the discussion of what may have caused them to collapse.

Admittedly, this analysis is limited by the fact that it considers so few examples – only three in each case. But on their own, these results should cause us to seriously reconsider the mechanism which was ultimately responsible for the destruction of the WTC buildings on 9/11. For all the reasons cited herein, the author calls for further investigation into the collapse of the Twin Towers and World Trade Center 7, one that will seriously consider the kind of evidence and analysis presented here.

### References

- 9/11 Commission (2004), *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States*, W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Baggini, J. and P. S. Fosl (2010), *The Philosopher's Toolkit: A Compendium of Philosophical Concepts and Methods*, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bazant, Z. *et al* (2008), "What Did and Did Not Cause Collapse of World Trade Center Twin Towers in New York?," *Journal of Engineering Mechanics* 134, online at <http://cee.northwestern.edu/people/bazant/PDFs/Papers/476.pdf>.
- Chandler, D. (n.d.), "Idealized Pancake Theory Collapse Time," online at <http://www.scientistsfor911truth.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/IdealizedPancakeCollapseCalcs.pdf>.
- (2010), "Destruction of the World Trade Center North Tower and Fundamental Physics," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, online at <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.
- (2018), "Free Fall" (6 Parts), *Medium*, online at [https://medium.com/@davidchandler\\_61838/free-fall-131a94a1be7e](https://medium.com/@davidchandler_61838/free-fall-131a94a1be7e).

- DiCarlo, C. (2011), *How to Become a Really Good Pain in the Ass: A Critical Thinker's Guide to Asking the Right Questions*, Prometheus Books.
- Gourley, J. R. *et al* (2008), "Re: Public Comments on WTC 7 Draft Reports," online at <http://911research.wtc7.net/letters/nist/WTC7Comments.html>.
- Griffin, D. R. (2005), *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*, Olive Branch Press.
- Hoffman, J. (2006a), "Seismic Records of the Twin Towers' Destruction," *911 Research*, online at <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/demolition/seismic.html>.
- (2006b), "Tower Destruction Timelines," *911 Research*, online at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/timeline/index.html>.
- Jones, S. (2006), "Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Completely Collapse?," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, online at <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.
- Jones, S. *et al* (2016), "15 Years Later: On the Physics of High-Rise Building Collapses," *Europhysics News* 47.4, online at <https://www.europhysicsnews.org/articles/e pn/pdf/2016/04/e pn2016474p21.pdf>.
- Korol, R. M. *et al* (2011), "Collapse Time Analysis of Multi-Story Structural Steel Buildings," *The Open Civil Engineering Journal* 5, online at <https://benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOCIEJ/TOCIEJ-5-25.pdf>.
- Kuttler, K. (2006), "WTC 7: A short computation," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, online at <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.
- (2007), "Collapse Time Calculations for WTC 1," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, online at <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.

- MacQueen, G. and T. Szamboti (2009), “The Missing Jolt: A Simple Refutation of the NIST-Bazant Collapse Hypothesis,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, online at <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.
- Mitteldorf, J. (n.d.), “How did the Three WTC Towers Fall? A Minimum Time for ‘Pancaking’ Collapse,” *Scientists for 9/11 Truth*, online at [https://scientistsfor911truth.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Min\\_Time\\_for\\_Pancaking.pdf](https://scientistsfor911truth.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Min_Time_for_Pancaking.pdf).
- Němec, I. *et al* (2018), “A Contribution to Analysis of Collapse of High-Rise Building Inspired by the Collapses of WTC1 and WTC2: Derivation of Simple Formulas for Collapse Upper Speed and Acceleration,” *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Physics* 6, online at <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=89496>.
- NIST (2005), NCSTAR 1, online at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/federal-building-and-fire-safety-investigation-world-trade-center-disaster-final-report>.
- (2006), Answers to Frequently Asked Questions, online at <https://www.nist.gov/pao/national-institute-standards-and-technology-nist-federal-building-and-fire-safety-investigation>.
- (2008), NCSTAR 1-9, online at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/structural-fire-response-and-probable-collapse-sequence-world-trade-center-building-7>.
- Rothchild, I. (2006), “Induction, Deduction, and the Scientific Method: An Eclectic Overview of the Practice of Science,” *Society for the Study of Reproduction*.
- Sarns, C. (2020), “A Record of Major High-Rise Fires Worldwide,” *AE911Truth*, online at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/648-a-record-of-major-high-rise-firesworldwide>.

- Schneider, A. (2019), "The Structural Dynamics of the World Trade Center Catastrophe," *IABSE Congress 114*, online at <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1910/1910.10801.pdf>.
- Szamboti, T. and R. Johns (2014), "ASCE Journals refuse to correct fraudulent paper they published on WTC collapses," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, online at <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.
- Szuladziński, G. (2012), "Temporal considerations in collapse of WTC Towers," *Int. J. Structural Engineering* 3.3, online at [http://aneta.org/911experiments\\_com/articles/IntIJStructuralEng\\_TemporalConsiderationsInCollapseOfWTCTowers.pdf](http://aneta.org/911experiments_com/articles/IntIJStructuralEng_TemporalConsiderationsInCollapseOfWTCTowers.pdf).
- Szuladziński, G. *et al* (2013), "Some Misunderstandings Related to WTC Collapse Analysis," *Int. J. of Protective Structures* 4.2, online at <https://911speakout.org/wp-content/uploads/Some-Misunderstandings-Related-to-WTC-Collapse-Analysis.pdf>.
- Taylor, A. (2013), "Other Collapses in Perspective: An Examination of Steel Structures Collapsing due to Fire and their Relation to the WTC," *Scientific Method 9/11*, online at [http://www.scientificmethod911.org/reviewpages/taylor\\_other\\_collapses.html](http://www.scientificmethod911.org/reviewpages/taylor_other_collapses.html).

## **Part 2: Debunking the Debunkers**


## 9/11 Undebunked: An Open Letter to Ryan Owens

Originally published 7 September 2010 – 31 October 2010 at  
*Debunking the Debunkers*  
 Revisions by Adam Taylor

Mr. Owens,

Let me start off by saying that the purpose of this message is not meant in any way to insult you as a researcher or as a person in general. The purpose of this message is meant to simply inform you of errors that you have made in your 9/11 research, and my sincere hope that you will correct such errors. This is not meant to be an argument of any kind, but merely one researcher offering advice to another researcher.

That being said, the reason for this message is largely due to a post you made on your YouTube channel,<sup>1</sup> in which you claimed that if any 9/11 truther could point out anything you got wrong in any of your videos, you would either remove the video or fix the mistake.



*I've made this offer to truthers over and over again, and to date not a single one of them has been able to: Prove that anything in any one of my videos is wrong, and I promise I'll remove that video (or, at the very least I'll remove the incorrect part if it's something minor). You truthers have never, ever been able to do this.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Ryan Owens' (RKOWens4) YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/user/RKOWens4>.

*Instead you just resort to name calling and insisting that I'm a government agent. You can start with the video about the phone calls from the planes that I have as the video on my channel page above... if ALL of my video have been debunked, then name a single fact I got wrong in this video.*

I was initially shocked by this statement, as I had done essentially this with my updated “9/11 Un-debunked” series.<sup>2</sup> To date, you have not responded to my videos at all. I am well aware of how popular your videos are, as many of them are featured on prominent debunker sites. In fact, your work is apparently so good that the government itself is using your videos to discredit the Truth Movement. However, as popular as your videos are, I have found many errors in them.

Now, I happen to agree with many of your videos and their conclusions. For example, you have done a very correct debunking of Pentagon-no-plane theories. However, videos in which you discuss WTC collapse theories are greatly at issue. There are several dozen points I could raise here, but this would just undoubtedly lead to nothing but continuous debating back and forth. So, for this post I have simply listed the problems that I truly think are incorrect, and I feel that you should keep your word that you will fix these mistakes. But of course, if there are any points you believe that I have gotten wrong, feel free to point out where. For each point I will list one of your videos, a claim in that video, followed by my reasons why the claim is wrong on some level. I shall list a problematic claim as either “False,” “Most likely false,” “Misleading,” or possibly a combination of these three.

### **9/11 Debunked: Controlled Demolition Not Possible**

Claim 1: *The puffs of ejected dust were caused by pancaking floors.*

**Most likely false:** Debunkers such as yourself have argued for years that these ejections were caused by pancaking floors falling onto one another. But this claim is contradicted by the fact that many of these ejections were isolated below the demolition wave. The video you show from the NOVA program shows a scenario in which the floors remain intact as flat plates, thereby allowing the pressure to be built up without allowing air to escape

---

<sup>2</sup> Adam Taylor, “9/11 Un-debunked Version 2.0,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 29 March 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/03/911-un-debunked-version-20.html>.

anywhere except the windows. But this obviously would not have been the case for the floors collapsing in the Twin Towers, as they were clearly pulverized before they had reached the areas of the ejections below the collapse front. To create the ejections below and at the collapse front, the floors would need to continuously fall as flat plates, as demonstrated by the NOVA simulation. If the floors broke apart as they fell, the falling mass would allow the pressure to be released upward. NIST's "piston theory" is clearly contradicted by this.

What's more, Dr. Crockett Grabbe has calculated that the horizontal ejection rate of the puffs is disproportional to their vertical fall rates,<sup>3</sup> indicating they were driven by something other than compressed air. Physicist David Chandler has also demonstrated that some of the ejections are in fact not coming out of windows at all, but out of the steel corner columns of the Towers.<sup>4</sup> I would therefore ask you to reevaluate this claim, as evidence strongly goes against it.

*Claim 2: The squibs shooting out of the southwest corner of WTC 7 were actually window blinds.*

**Misleading:** While I do agree that the ejections at the southwest corner of WTC 7 are not squibs, your video fails to address the squibs that evidently are shooting out of Building 7 on the north face near the west side.<sup>5</sup> NIST's piston theory involved a scenario where the floors compressing air created the squibs shooting out of the Towers (see claim 1). But this explanation does not work for the squibs shooting out of the north face of Building 7, as these squibs formed at a time when the floors essentially did not move relative to one another.

What's more, these squibs are not addressed at all in NIST's final report on Building 7. A search of their 729-page report turns up not a single mention of the word "squib" or "puff." And the issue is also not addressed

---

<sup>3</sup> Crockett Grabbe, "Direct Evidence for Explosions: Flying Projectiles and Widespread Impact Damage," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, August 2007, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/GrabbeExplosionsEvidence.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> David Chandler, "Cutter Charges in the North Tower of the World Trade Center," 12 February 2010, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z0AD8HlrLZg>.

<sup>5</sup> Video of these ejections available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HiuFpuOsksc>.

at the FAQ section for Building 7 on NIST's website. I would therefore ask you to at least acknowledge the apparent squibs shooting out of the north face of WTC 7, as these ejections are far more visible than the false ejections you point to in your video. The official investigators have offered no explanation for the ejections, so the ejections are therefore still an unexplained phenomenon in the collapse of the building.

*Claim 3: Explosions were not heard at the base of the buildings or from far away.*

**False:** Videos show that the Towers did produce noises consistent with the roar of explosions continuously progressing down the buildings. They also show that the noises, described as explosions by witnesses, were heard from far across the city.<sup>6</sup> And sounds indicative of explosions have also been found in videos of WTC 7's collapse.<sup>7</sup> Your claim that explosions cannot be heard in any of the videos of the WTC's collapse is therefore wrong, and I would ask you to either rephrase this statement or remove it entirely.

*Claim 4: The controlled demolition of the WTC buildings would have left behind remnants of the explosives used in the debris pile.*

**Misleading:** In your video, you feature a statement made by Brent Blanchard of Protec. He has often claimed that objects such as det cord would have been found everywhere in the debris. However, he has also stated that controlled demolitions can be engineered to be radio controlled, which would eliminate the necessity of det cord.<sup>8</sup> Wireless detonators have been commercially available for decades.<sup>9</sup> And other parts of the explosives would also not necessarily be found, as pointed out by

---

<sup>6</sup> See p. 45, cf. n25, of this present work.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

<sup>8</sup> As confirmed to Dr. Steven Jones; see "INN Takes on the History Channel Pt. 1," 7 September 2007 (min. 5:27), at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7mlAcu6TRH0>. This fact has also been confirmed by former Controlled Demolition, Inc. employee Tom Sullivan. See "Tom Sullivan - Explosives Technician - Loader - AE911Truth.org," 19 March 2011 (min. 4:20), at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u5IqqJXyLbg>.

<sup>9</sup> See Jim Hoffman (webmaster), "Demolition Technology," *911 Review*, last updated 18 April 2009, at <http://911review.com/means/demolition/index.html>.

explosives technician Tom Sullivan, formerly of Controlled Demolition, Inc. He points out that explosives can be engineered to be self-consuming, and therefore would not be found in the debris.<sup>10</sup> Because of this, I would ask you to either add a disclaimer to your video, or remove this claim entirely.

### **9/11 Debunked: World Trade Center - No Free-Fall Speed**

Claim 1: *The core of the South Tower survived the collapse.*

**Misleading:** While a section of the core did survive the collapse, video evidence appears to show that the remaining core of the South Tower included neither north nor west columns.<sup>11</sup> You should make this clear in your video, as it contradicts the official explanations since the South Tower initially collapsed to the east.

### **9/11 Debunked: Flight 77's Pilot not a Terrorist**

Claim 1: *Members of the 9/11 Truth Movement have accused Charles Burlingame of being "some kind of terrorist."*

**False:** Of all your videos, this is the only one I have a particular personal problem with. Although it may be implied in Loose Change (which I don't really think it is), it is incorrect of you to imply in your video that members of the truth movement in general believe this. You are right in saying Charles Burlingame did not work in the Pentagon when Loose Change claims he did. I have nothing against that. But the claim that he was actually one of the conspirators has never been a direct claim of any prominent member of the movement, and I would ultimately ask that you either remove this video entirely, or redo it.

---

<sup>10</sup> Darcy Wearing and Richard Gage, "Explosive Evidence at WTC Cited by Former CDI Employee," *AE911Truth*, 24 June 2010, at <http://www1.ae911truth.org/news/41-articles/315-explosive-evidence-at-wtc-cited-by-former-cdi-employee.html>.

<sup>11</sup> See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UTtQ52TRTzA>. Further analysis has shown that the Tower's outer 24 core columns were missing in total. See Gordon Ross, "How the Towers were Demolished (n.d.)," at <https://gordonssite.tripod.com/id2.html>.

## 9/11 Debunked: WTC 7's Collapse Explained

Claim 1: *Building 7 was "less than 300 feet from the North Tower."*

**False:** The distance between the north face of WTC 1 and the south face of WTC 7 was actually about 107 meters, or 350 feet. You should correct this as it is a false statement and therefore also misleading to those who watch your video.

Claim 2: *The structural damage to Building 7 contributed to the collapse.*

**False/Misleading:** Although you do not specifically state in your video that the damage contributed to the collapse, you do, at the very least, imply it very strongly. But the official NIST report on the collapse of WTC 7 states that the structural damage played no role in initiating the collapse of the building.<sup>12</sup> What's more, new evidence has been presented which shows that the damage to Building 7 was not as severe as previously thought.<sup>13</sup> There is nothing wrong with you showing pictures of damage to Building 7, but you should make it clear in your video that the official explanation states that this damage did not contribute to the collapse. Otherwise, your video will mislead those do not know what the actual explanation is for Building 7's collapse.

Claim 3: *The fires in Building 7 were fed by a series of diesel generators.*

**False:** Again, according to the official investigators at NIST, the diesel tanks did not play a role in the collapse. NIST states they found no evidence that the fuel lines contributed to the collapse, and that the building had only normal office fires.<sup>14</sup> You need to clarify this, as it is simply not the official story for what happened to the building.

Claim 4: *The collapse of Truss 1 initiated the collapse of WTC 7.*

---

<sup>12</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 618, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/structural-fire-response-and-probable-collapse-sequence-world-trade-center-building-7>.

<sup>13</sup> Adam Taylor, "25% Scooped Out?... I THINK NOT!," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 15 March 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/03/25-scooped-out-i-think-not.html>.

<sup>14</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 619.

**False:** According to the NIST report, Building 7's collapse was initiated by the failure of a girder connecting column 44 to column 79, which led to the collapse of column 79, and then the rest of the building. NIST does mention the collapse of the trusses in their report, but they do not claim that any of them failing initiated the "progressive collapse."<sup>15</sup> As you state in your video, this led to a "vertical" collapse to the roof. NIST claims it was an "east to west" progressive collapse.<sup>16</sup> You should replace your current claim about the trusses with the official explanation about column 79.

Most of the claims you make in this video are incorrect, but admittedly this was before the report was released. However, now that the official report has been released, you should remove this video entirely, as it will undoubtedly give people unfamiliar with 9/11 the wrong ideas about what is supposed to have caused the building to collapse.

### **9/11 Debunked: "Molten Metal" Explained**

Claim 1: *The "aluminum" from Flight 175 could have been heated to 1800°F.*

**Most likely false:** The idea that the fires in the South Tower could have reached 1800°F is extremely unlikely. It is very difficult for a diffuse hydrocarbon fire to reach these sorts of temperatures. Thomas Eager, who supports the official story and therefore cannot be accused of being a "conspiracy theorist," has written that:

In combustion science, there are three basic types of flames, namely, a jet burner, a pre-mixed flame, and a diffuse flame. [...] A fireplace flame is a diffuse flame burning in air, as was the WTC fire. Diffuse flames generate the lowest heat intensities of the three flame types. [...] The maximum flame temperature increase for burning hydrocarbons (jet fuel) in air is, thus, about 1,000°C [1832°F]. [...] But it is very difficult to reach this maximum

---

<sup>15</sup> According to NIST, "Neither the transfer elements (trusses, girders, and cantilever overhangs) nor the 'strong' floors (Floors 5 and 7) played a significant role in the collapse of WTC 7." Quoted from *ibid.*, p. 618.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 625.

temperature with a diffuse flame. There is nothing to ensure that the fuel and air in a diffuse flame are mixed in the best ratio.<sup>17</sup>

One thing that we must agree on is that the fires in the South Tower were clearly weaker than the fires in the North Tower. Also, NIST has no evidence for these kinds of temperatures in either building.<sup>18</sup> The idea that the fires in WTC 2 could have reached 1800°F is extremely unlikely which, as we will see, essentially refutes the entire notion of your video.

Claim 2: *Aluminum glows “light orange” at 1800°F.*


**Misleading:** Although aluminum does glow light orange at 1800°F, the color of the material at the front indicates that, if it was aluminum, it was heated to temperatures higher than this.



---

<sup>17</sup> Thomas Eagar and Christopher Musso, “Why Did the World Trade Center Collapse? Science, Engineering, and Speculation,” *JOM* (2001), at <https://www.tms.org/pubs/journals/JOM/0112/Eagar/Eagar-0112.html>.

<sup>18</sup> See Jim Hoffman, “Building a Better Mirage,” *911 Research*, 8 December 2005 (Section “Imagined Heat”), at <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/nist/index.html>.



So even if this material was aluminum, it would still need to be explained what heated it to over 2000°F to get to glow that bright. You should make this clear in your video.

### 9/11 Debunked: World Trade Center’s Collapse Explained

Claim 1: *The fires burned up to 1800°F.*

**Most likely false:** See Claim 1 for “9/11 Debunked: Molten Metal Explained.”

### 9/11 Debunked: WTC - Zero Hallmarks of Controlled Demolition

Claim 1: *Controlled demolitions create bright flashes in a building.*

**Misleading:** Bright flashes do not always occur in controlled demolitions, as shown by multiple examples.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, I would ask you to either add a disclaimer to your video, or remove this claim entirely.

Claim 2: *The demolition waves are explained by pancaking floors.*

---

<sup>19</sup> Videos of demolitions lacking flashes available at <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLF740EB584F45FBEB>.

**Most likely false:** See Claim 1 for “9/11 Debunked: Controlled Demolition Not Possible.”

Claim 3: *Cameras did not pick up any sounds of explosions.*

**False:** See Claim 3 for “9/11 Debunked: Controlled Demolition Not Possible,” and also this video.

Claim 4: *The South Tower’s core survived the collapse.*

**Misleading:** See Claim 1 for “9/11 Debunked: World Trade Center - No Free-Fall Speed.

Claim 5: *The initial antenna drop of WTC 1 as seen from the north was actually an optical illusion caused by the rotation of the antenna to the south.*

**Most likely false:** A video taken from a more westward view of the North Tower’s collapse puts this in better perspective. The antenna did rotate south seconds later, but the initial motion was almost entirely vertical.<sup>20</sup> You should clarify this in your video.

Claim 6: *Building 7’s collapse started with the failure of its three large trusses.*

**False:** See Claim 4 for “9/11 Debunked: WTC 7’s Collapse Explained.”

Claim 7: *Explosives would have caused the buildings to collapse at free-fall speed.*

**Most likely false/Misleading:** In fact, it has been a misconception by both sides of the argument that controlled demolitions cause a building collapse at the rate of free-fall. Explosives rarely, if ever cause, a building to collapse at free-fall acceleration. The question that should really be asked is, “did the buildings fall in time intervals consistent with buildings

---

<sup>20</sup> See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zGzJxDSVRTA&t=353s>.

destroyed with explosives?” And it turns out that they did.<sup>21</sup> You should either add a disclaimer to your video or remove this statement entirely.

Claim 8: *Controlled demolitions cause a building to collapse into its own footprint.*

**Misleading:** Although demolitions usually do this, it is not strictly true that it always happens. As for Building 7, the fact that it fell somewhat outside its footprint may have been caused by the simple fact that it was a particularly large building. No demolition company had ever demolished a building the size of WTC 7 before, so who’s to say how compact the debris pile would be if the building were brought down in a classic demolition fashion? The buildings it damaged were quite close to it. But the fact is, the debris from WTC 7 was almost entirely within the footprint of the previously standing building.<sup>22</sup>

### **9/11 Debunked: Thermate Chemical Signatures Disproven**

Claim 1: *The elements noted by Dr. Jones were found in common materials in the WTC.*

**Misleading:** Although the elements you list were abundant at the WTC, what you fail to note is that these elements were found in the iron-rich microspheres found in the dust, not the dust itself. The spheres show that the chemicals were formed due to melting and/or vaporization, which is due to surface tension. This indicates that the various chemicals found in the spheres were melted at the same time, forming spheres. The spheres found had the chemical signature of FE, AL, K, SI, and various additives

---

<sup>21</sup> See Chapter 4 of this present work.

<sup>22</sup> According to the FEMA report, “the collapse of WTC 7 had a small debris field” [...] “the average debris field radius [of WTC 7] was approximately 70 feet.” Quoted from FEMA WTC Report, Chapter 5, pp. 31, 24, at [https://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403\\_ch5.pdf](https://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_ch5.pdf). Also, according to NIST’s interim report on Building 7, “The debris of WTC 7 was mostly contained within the original footprint of the building.” Quoted from June 2004 Progress Report on the Federal Building and Fire Safety Investigation of the World Trade Center Disaster (NIST SP 1000-5), p. L-33, at [https://www.nist.gov/publications/june-2004-progress-report-federal-building-and-fire-safety-investigation-world-trade?pub\\_id=860567](https://www.nist.gov/publications/june-2004-progress-report-federal-building-and-fire-safety-investigation-world-trade?pub_id=860567).

and variations of thermate. Different aluminothermic reactions have different properties; some are faster reacting, like sulfur which reduces the melting point of steel. The idea of the spheres forming from an office fire is virtually impossible. Iron cannot melt in office fires and the melting points of these metals are so different that there would be a sizeable time delay from heating WTC common materials. Then they also have to cool together at the same time to form a sphere. Thermate, however, provides the solution to this question because the reaction is very fast. No other mechanism is known to provide spheres such as these. You should therefore clarify your statements about the elements that Dr. Jones has found.

Claim 2: *The elements were not found in their correct quantities.*

**Misleading:** In this case you are confusing Steven Jones arbitrary usage of the word thermate with military grade Thermate-TH3, which is 68.7% thermite, 29.0% barium nitrate, 2.0% sulfur.<sup>23</sup> There are a wide variety of different types of thermite, thermate, and other aluminothermic reactions. So your figure of sulfur making up 2% of thermate is based on only one specific type of thermate. Also, it should be noted that the sulfur likely did not come from the gypsum wallboard.<sup>24</sup> You should correct this statement or add a disclaimer.

Claim 3: *Barium nitrate and aluminum oxide needed to be found but weren't.*

**False:** As I have already explained, barium nitrate does not have to be found. And as for the aluminum oxide, oxides of aluminum are common in the environment, and probably a major form of the aluminum found in the WTC dust. Because the thermite reaction generates aluminum oxide as an aerosol, it tends to disperse rather than clumping with the iron-rich initially-liquid residues. Note that the composition of residues of known thermites is a good match for the ignition residues that Jones *et al*

---

<sup>23</sup> See the Wikipedia entry for Thermate at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thermate>.

<sup>24</sup> Jon Cole, "9/11 Experiments: The Mysterious 'eutectic steel,'" *911 Blogger*, 13 July 2010, at <http://911blogger.com/news/2010-07-13/911-experiments-mysterious-eutectic-steel>.

examined from the red-gray chips.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, aluminum oxide also does not need to be found. You should correct these claims in your video.

**Update:** As it turns out, the USGS apparently did report finding traces of aluminum oxide in the WTC dust.<sup>26</sup> Therefore, the claim that aluminum oxide was not present in the dust should be removed entirely from your video.

### **9/11 Debunked: WTC - No Pools of Molten Steel**

*Claim 1: The molten metal would have solidified and would not have still been molten 6 weeks later.*

**Misleading:** The presence of the pools of molten metal after a thermate reaction would seem to indicate a continuous chemical reaction occurring in the pile, as documented by the peer-reviewed paper “Environmental Anomalies at the World Trade Center: Evidence for Energetic Materials.”<sup>27</sup> You should clarify this in your video.

*Claim 2: Temperatures of up to 1342°F were recorded in the debris piles.*

**False:** Actually, the NASA thermal images show that temperatures of about 1377°F were recorded in the debris.<sup>28</sup> But there are other studies which indicate even higher temperatures than this. According to the R. J.

---

<sup>25</sup> As shown in Jim Hoffman, “Explosives Found in World Trade Center Dust,” *911 Research*, 9 April 2009, at [http://911review.com/energeticmaterials/09/911research/explosive\\_residues.html](http://911review.com/energeticmaterials/09/911research/explosive_residues.html). (See in particular the section titled “Ignition Residue Analysis.”)

<sup>26</sup> Roger Clark *et al*, “Environmental Studies of the World Trade Center area after the September 11, 2001 attack,” *USGS*, 27 November 2001, at <https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2001/ofr-01-0429/#Contents>. See in particular Table SEM-1 at <https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2001/ofr-01-0429/sem1>.

<sup>27</sup> Kevin Ryan, James Gourley, and Steven Jones, “Environmental anomalies at the World Trade Center: evidence for energetic materials,” *The Environmentalist*, 4 August 2008, at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10669-008-9182-4>.

<sup>28</sup> See Roger Clark *et al*, “Images of the World Trade Center Site Show Thermal Hot Spots on September 16 and 23, 2001,” *USGS* (2001), archived at [http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/wtc/evidence/usgs\\_hotspots.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/wtc/evidence/usgs_hotspots.html).

Lee report, lead had apparently become hot enough to volatilize (boil) and vaporize.

The presence of lead oxide on the surface of mineral wool indicates the existence of extremely high temperatures during the collapse which caused metallic lead to volatilize, oxidize, and finally condense on the surface of the mineral wool.<sup>29</sup>

Although the word “vaporize” was not used in the final version of the report, the 2003 version of this passage explicitly referred to temperatures “at which lead would have undergone vaporization.”<sup>30</sup>

Lead does not boil and vaporize until it reaches temperatures of 1749°C (3180°F). As the report indicates, therefore, the temperatures must have been not merely high, but *extremely* high. Other evidence also indicates the temperatures were far hotter than anything normal fires could cause.<sup>31</sup> You should address these issues in your video or delete the claim entirely.

Claim 3: *The initial fires were burning at 1800°F.*

**Most likely false:** See Claim 1 for “9/11 Debunked: Molten Metal Explained.”

Claim 4: *Pictures show glowing metal not flowing and is therefore not molten.*


**False:** Close-ups of the crane shot show that molten metal is flowing off.

---

<sup>29</sup> R.J. Lee, “Signature Assessment 130 Liberty Street Property: Expert Report - WTC Dust Signature,” *RJ Lee Group, Inc.*, May 2004, p. 12, at [http://www1.ae911truth.org/documents/WTC\\_Dust\\_Signature\\_Expert\\_Report.051304.1646.mp\\_.pdf](http://www1.ae911truth.org/documents/WTC_Dust_Signature_Expert_Report.051304.1646.mp_.pdf).

<sup>30</sup> R.J. Lee, “Signature Assessment 130 Liberty Street Property: WTC Dust Signature Report - Composition and Morphology,” *RJ Lee Group, Inc.*, December 2003, p. 21, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/cache/nyenvirolaw\\_WTC\\_Dust\\_Signature\\_Composition\\_And\\_Morphology.pdf](http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/cache/nyenvirolaw_WTC_Dust_Signature_Composition_And_Morphology.pdf).

<sup>31</sup> Andrea Dreger, “Sources related to exceptionally high temperatures, and/or to persistent heat at Ground Zero,” at [http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dreger/GroundZeroHeat2008\\_07\\_10.pdf](http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dreger/GroundZeroHeat2008_07_10.pdf).



Claim 5: *The pools of molten metal seen by the first responders and clean-up workers were pools of molten aluminum.*

**Most likely false:** This argument is contradicted by the fact that pools of molten metal were also found in the debris of Building 7. Building 7 was not hit by a plane, and it was also not clad in aluminum like the Towers were. But what’s more, the fact that the molten metal remained reddish-orange six weeks after the attacks indicates that the metal had fairly low heat conductivity and relatively large heat capacity. Therefore, it is more likely that the metal was steel or iron rather than aluminum. You should remove this claim and correct it in your video.

### 9/11 Debunked: The “First Time in History” Claim

Claim 1: *The planes that hit the Towers were travelling at 490 and 590 miles per hour.*

**Misleading:** The speeds you claim the planes were going at seem to come from the FEMA report.<sup>32</sup> However, the NIST report states that the planes

---

<sup>32</sup> FEMA WTC Report, Chapter 1, p. 4, at [https://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403\\_ch1.pdf](https://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_ch1.pdf).

were travelling closer to 440 and 540 miles per hour.<sup>33</sup> You should reevaluate this claim and fix it.

Claim 2: *Building 7 was heavily damaged by falling debris.*

**False/Misleading:** See Claim 2 for “9/11 Debunked: WTC 7’s Collapse Explained.”

Claim 3: *There are many examples of steel-framed buildings collapsing from fires.*

**Misleading:** As I’ve demonstrated elsewhere, your comparison of the WTC buildings with smaller steel structures is highly misleading.<sup>34</sup> All I have ever seen debunkers compare the WTC buildings to are smaller steel structures that have collapsed from fire, but never other skyscrapers that have not collapsed from fire. You do feature the Windsor Tower, but ultimately its partial collapse supports our side of the argument.<sup>35</sup> Others have attempted to show that other skyscraper fires are not comparable to the fires in the WTC, but I have shown these claims to be incorrect and unfounded.<sup>36</sup> Unless you can make better arguments, I would recommend removing the entire video, as it is highly misleading.

### **9/11 Debunked: On WTC’s Design to Withstand 707 Impact**

Claim 1: *The Twin Towers were designed to withstand the impact of a Boeing 707 travelling at 180 mph, being also low on fuel.*

**Most likely false:** For this particular statement, you offer no link or source. As shown elsewhere, there were numerous pre-9/11 studies which showed that the buildings were built to withstand a 707 travelling at 600mph and

---

<sup>33</sup> See Table E-8 in NIST NCSTAR 1-2, p. 1xxiii, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/baseline-structural-performance-and-aircraft-impact-damage-analysis-is-world-trade-1>.

<sup>34</sup> See Chapter 1 of this present work.

<sup>35</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “The Windsor Building Fire,” *911 Research*, last updated 20 March 2013, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/compare/windsor.html>.

<sup>36</sup> See pp. 197-208 of this present work.

filled with fuel.<sup>37</sup> Even the Port Authority stated that the buildings could withstand a 707 going at 600mph. From the NIST report:

An additional load, stated by the Port Authority to have been considered in the design of the Towers, was the impact of a Boeing 707, the largest commercial airliner when the Towers were designed, hitting the building at its full speed of 600mph.<sup>38</sup>

Claim 2: *The planes were travelling at 490 and 590 mph.*

**Misleading:** See Claim 1 for “9/11 Debunked: The ‘First Time in History’ Claim.”

Claim 3: *Because the wingspan of a 767 is greater than that of a 707, a 767 would have severed more columns.*

**Most likely false/Misleading:** Admittedly, the wings of a 767 are longer. However, there is another difference between the wings of these two planes, which are the engines attached to them. A 707 has four engines, while a 767 only has two. The engines of an airplane are undoubtedly the most solid part of the plane. The wings themselves are merely made of aluminum, and once they impacted the perimeter columns, it would have been more difficult to sever the thicker core columns. The planes’ engines would do quite a bit more damage than the wings once they started impacting core columns. Even if the wingspan of a 767 is larger than a 707, I think we can agree that a plane with four steel and titanium engines will do more damage than a plane with only two.

Claim 4: *Fires were not taken into consideration when the Towers were built.*

**Most likely false:** To back up this claim, you provide a quote from Leslie Robertson, who you incorrectly state was the chief structural engineer for

---

<sup>37</sup> Arabesque, “The World Trade Center Building Designers: Pre-9/11 claims strongly implicate that the Towers should have remained standing on 9/11,” *Arabesque: 9/11 Truth*, 3 May 2007, at <http://arabesque911.blogspot.com/2007/05/world-trade-center-building-designers.html>.

<sup>38</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1, p. 6, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/federal-building-and-fire-safety-investigation-world-trade-center-disaster-final-report>.

the WTC. In fact, John Skilling is more likely to have been the lead engineer for the Towers.<sup>39</sup> Skilling stated that the buildings could have survived severe fires from a plane crash.

Our analysis indicated the biggest problem would be the fact that all the fuel (from the airplane) would dump into the building. There would be a horrendous fire [but] the building structure would still be there.<sup>40</sup>

You should address these facts and correct your statements about the WTC design parameters and Leslie Robertson's position in the construction of the buildings.

### **9/11 Debunked: WTC - No Small or Oxygen-Starved Fires**

*Claim 1: Roughly 7000 gallons of fuel remained in each of the Towers after the initial impacts.*

**Misleading:** This appears to only be true of the North Tower, as NIST claims that approximately 6947 gallons of fuel remained in WTC 1, while only 5932 was in WTC 2. However, the idea that all this fuel remained within the impacted areas is contradicted by the FEMA report. In NIST's most detailed quantitative report, NCSTAR 1-5F, the jet fuel estimates are provided for each of the impact floors, supposedly accurate to the gallon. In the report, it is stated that NIST used FEMA's assumption that half of the fuel that remained within the Towers flowed away from the impact zones. It states:

Tables 5-3 and 5-4 present the predicted fuel distributions from the impact analysis. Of the total amount of fuel distributed to each floor, only 40 percent was used in the simulations. The reasoning behind this estimate followed that of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) study (McAllister 2002). It has been estimated by various forms of analysis (Zalosh 1995; Baum and Rehm 2002) that roughly 20 percent of the jet fuel was consumed in the

---

<sup>39</sup> Gregg Roberts, "Jones v. Robertson: A physicist and a structural engineer debate the controlled demolition of the World Trade Center," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 20 May 2007, p. 3, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/Roberts\\_AnnotatedJones-RobertsonTranscript.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/Roberts_AnnotatedJones-RobertsonTranscript.pdf).

<sup>40</sup> Quoted from Eric Nalder, "Twin Towers Engineered To Withstand Jet Collision," *The Seattle Times*, 27 February 1993, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/wtc/analysis/seattletimes\\_withstandjet.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/wtc/analysis/seattletimes_withstandjet.html).

fireballs that were observed outside of the buildings within seconds of impact. The authors of the FEMA report suggested that half of the fuel not consumed in the fireballs could have flowed away, presumably down the elevator shafts and stairwells based on eyewitness accounts. Some additional discussion of the fireballs may be found in NIST NCSTAR 1-5A.

Table 5-3 Jet Fuel Distribution, WTC 1  
(North Tower, impacted at 8:46 a.m.)

Floor	Liters	Gallons
92	739	195
93	1,531	405
94	8,864	2,342
95	7,216	1,906
96	7,500	1,982
97	5,853	1,546
98	909	240
99	256	68

Table 5-4 Jet Fuel Distribution, WTC 2  
(South Tower, impacted at 9:02 a.m.)

Floor	Liters	Gallons
78	3,125	826
79	7,841	2,072
80	3,069	811
81	7,556	1,996
82	5,681	1,500
83	795	210

The jet fuel consumption estimate put forth by the FEMA team was used in the model because (1) no evidence or analysis emerged that significantly altered the FEMA estimate, and (2) the simulations were insensitive to both the amount and distribution of the jet fuel. Sensitivity studies showed that the amount of fuel spilled in the simulation only influenced the results of the first few minutes; the long-term behavior of the simulated fires was unaffected.<sup>41</sup>

So, ultimately NIST assumes that half of the fuel in each of the buildings flowed away from the impact points, and therefore did not contribute to the fires that supposedly caused the buildings to collapse. That leaves 3474 gallons of fuel contributing to the fires in WTC 1 and 2966 gallons of fuel contributing to the fires in WTC 2. Of course, even considering that all the fuel NIST claims remained in the buildings stayed at the impact points, the amount of fuel in either Tower would have fit into an above ground swimming pool, hardly a large amount in ratio to the rest of the buildings.<sup>42</sup> You should clarify these facts in your video and fix your statements.

---

<sup>41</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-5F, p. 56, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/computer-simulation-fires-world-trade-center-towers-federal-building-and-fire-safety-0>.

<sup>42</sup> See Anon, “Non-animated Visualization Aids to Assist in Understanding the Demolitions of the World Trade Center Twin Towers,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 27 November 2007, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/e/VisualizationAidsWTCTowers.pdf>.

Claim 2: *Photographs show that Building 7 was almost totally engulfed in fire.*

**Most likely false:** The pictures you show of WTC 7 show a large amount of smoke on Building 7's south face. But this smoke was likely caused by a negative low air pressure acting on the building's south side. This had the effect of drawing smoke up from the still burning WTC complex and causing it to cling to Building 7.<sup>43</sup> Photos show that the exact same thing happened to the North Tower after the South Tower collapsed.<sup>44</sup> Therefore, I would ask you to remove this claim from your video, as it is most likely incorrect. Also, it should be noted that, regardless of how big the fires were, there is serious doubt that the floors had enough combustible fuel and energy to reach the temperatures NIST claims the fires reached. Dr. Frank Greening, another supporter of the official story, has written that:

NIST's collapse initiation hypothesis requires that structural steel temperatures on floors 12/13 significantly exceeded 300°C [570°F] – a condition that could never have been realized with NIST's postulated 32 kg/m<sup>2</sup> fuel loading.<sup>45</sup>

In light of these errors, I would strongly encourage you to keep your promise and fix them. As the anniversary of 9/11 approaches, it would be best to keep your other promise that you will not allow the history of 9/11 to be “distorted or rewritten.” Real progress has been made in the name of 9/11 truth, and it would be regrettable if the errors in your videos misrepresented this progress.

With all due respect,  
Adam

---

<sup>43</sup> As even acknowledged by NIST: “Due to the wind direction, it was common for smoke to “bank up” against the south face [of WTC7]. For this reason, it was usually not possible to differentiate different types of smoke or to identify smoke source locations on the south face.” Quoted from NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 196.

<sup>44</sup> See <https://tinyurl.com/8w5vux2z>.

<sup>45</sup> F. R. Greening, “Comments on the Draft Report NIST NCSTAR 1-9: ‘Structural Fire Response and Probable Collapse Sequence of World Trade Center Building 7’, issued by NIST August 21st, 2008,” 11 September 2008, p. 5, <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/greeningcommentsscstar1-9.pdf>.

*After sending my letter to Mr. Owens, he later wrote me a response, which he stated I could use and reproduce however I wanted. Below is his response, followed by my comments. There's not much here that wasn't already addressed in my original letter. Still, we'll address his comments here for the sake of completeness. Quotes from Mr. Owens appear in Arial font, my comments appear in Times font.*

Well this thing surely turned out to be a lot longer than I had expected (nearly 8 pages), which is why it took so long to finally get back to you. Right off the bat, I'll admit that there were some things in the letter you were correct about, like information about WTC7 being based on early hypotheses which later turned out to be incorrect, which I plan to make a note of in the videos with one of the little bubble box things as soon as I figure out how to do that and get a chance to. But for about 95% of the things you said, it seemed to me like you were just repeating the same old 9/11 truther speaking points when they try to "debunk the debunkers."

Given the fact that, as we will see, you did not respond to the full 100% of my letter, I don't see that as being a fair or accurate statement.

I tried not to sound like too much of a dick in my responses, but some of the things were just too ridiculous. Anyway, here's the letter. Feel free to use any quotes from it (or the whole thing) however you want.

### **9/11 Debunked: Controlled Demolition not Possible**

Claim 1: Concerning the puffs of air being ejected several floors below the pancaking floors, this is something I DO address IN the video. The floor slabs extended across the open office space areas, but there was a massive core in each tower which contained three stairwells, over a dozen elevator shafts, and numerous air shafts for ventilation throughout the building. This accounts for the puffs of air several stories below the actual pancaking floor slabs. Furthermore, actual controlled demolitions set off their explosives BEFORE the building begins to collapse (since, of course, it is the explosives that CAUSE the collapse). The fact that 100% of the puffs of air you refer to are seen only AFTER the collapse has clearly already started proves that the collapse caused the puffs, the puffs didn't cause the collapse.

In fact, some of the ejections have been shown to occur before the collapse, as I discussed in my letter.

Finally, remember that not a single one of the video cameras recorded the resulting tremendous explosion that would had [sic] been clearly audible if these puffs of air were indeed explosions.

If the explosions were continuous and rapid, then distinct explosions would have been nearly impossible to hear.<sup>46</sup>

Only a percentage of the concrete per floor pulverized, with that percentage growing greater and greater the further into the collapse. Additionally, much of the dust was composed not only of pulverized concrete but also by the pulverized drywall. NIST's collapse theory is not contradicted by this, it merely demonstrates a misunderstanding among most 9/11 truthers of what NIST's collapse theory IS.

A few things you did not address:

1) Calculations done by Dr. Crockett Grabbe show that the horizontal ejection rate of the squibs is disproportional to their vertical fall rate. And 2) David Chandler has shown that some of these ejections came from the steel corner columns, making it impossible that they were the result of air pressure.

Claim 2: There are no squibs "shooting" out of the north side of Building 7. This is the clearest video of what you refer to, so your readers can watch for themselves:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AsJQKpnkZ10>

What I see are a series of windows breaking due to the stress as the outer shell of WTC7 begins to descend downward. The outward rush of air caused by the descending shell then pushes the intense smoke with had filled every floor at that point out through those broken windows.

According to NIST, there were fires mainly on the lower floors only, not the upper ones. And according to the FEMA report:

---

<sup>46</sup> See pp. 45-49 of this present work for more information about that.

Concrete floor slabs provided vertical compartmentalization to limit fire and smoke spread between floors (see Figure 5-11). Architectural drawings indicate that the space between the edge of the concrete floor slab and curtain wall, which ranged from 2 to 10 inches, was supposed to be filled with firestopping material.<sup>47</sup>

Therefore, it seems unlikely that the smoke from the lower floors could have traveled up to the upper floors.

I see no flashes of light indicating an explosion, nor did any of the video cameras pick up any tremendously deafening explosions which would have been picked up if these were indeed explosions. Furthermore, whether you believe that these are breaking windows or “squibs”, we can both agree that they occur near the TOP of the building (about 10 floors from the roof), whereas we can also agree that the building began collapsing from the BOTTOM. So what would possibly be the reason for setting off explosions near the roof when the collapse initiates from the base?

Perhaps to weaken the building throughout, as is done in other demolitions. In one video, explosions can be seen going off at the upper sections even after the building has started to fall.<sup>48</sup>

Claim 3: Where do I begin? With regards to the many videos in and around Ground Zero following the collapses in which random explosions are heard... well, duh, that's because stuff was exploding! The collapses damaged underground gas lines, setting off random explosions all throughout the day. Hundreds of vehicles were also set on fire, setting off random explosions. An explosion in the pile AFTER the collapses of the towers (or literally hours and hours before the collapse of WTC7) is not evidence of explosive charges placed inside the buildings.

You'll note my claim was in regards to explosions happening when the Towers collapsed, not in the pile after the collapses. There were explosions heard and recorded after the Towers collapsed but before Building 7 did. As for how these explosions might have played a role in Building 7's collapse, I'm not sure. But it has been suggested that perhaps the building

---

<sup>47</sup> FEMA WTC Report, Chapter 5, p. 11.

<sup>48</sup> Landmark Implosion, available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=79sJ1bMR6VQ>.

was supposed to be demolished much earlier than it was, and that these explosions are indicative of this.<sup>49</sup>

Kevin McPadden, the only person claiming to have heard explosions preceding the collapse of WTC7, was a well-known 9/11 truther who gave speeches at rallies and never once made any mention of having heard explosions prior to the collapse of WTC7. He only “remembered” this detail and began making the claim in September 2007, a full 6 years after 9/11! He is also contradicted by the many firefighters who say that they never heard any explosions preceding the collapse of WTC7 as well as the many video cameras which were present and recording at the exact intersection where McPadden claims to have been standing, in which no explosions are heard.

McPadden is not the only person to have heard explosions from WTC 7. First responder Craig Bartmer, reporter Gigi Woods, and an unnamed medical worker also testified to hearing explosions as Building 7 collapsed, which corroborates McPadden’s account.<sup>50</sup>

If you hear an explosion in the NBC video of WTC7’s collapse, then you are making yourself hear something which is not there. Even just a single explosion needed to sever even one column in WTC7 would have created an audio level of about 140 dB at a distance of half a mile, equivalent to the audio level created by a jet engine.

I am not making myself hear anything. I can clearly here loud booms occurring right before the collapse. Here, you are using NIST’s strawman argument, assuming that RDX, which produces those sound levels, was the only explosive that could have been used. There are other substances, such as incendiaries, that could have been used. It’s worth pointing out that very few of the prominent controlled demolition advocates have ever suggested that RDX alone was used. Why you and NIST would rule out demolition based on this argument is puzzling. But the fact remains is that,

---

<sup>49</sup> See a full discussion of this in David Ray Griffin, *The Mysterious Collapse of World Trade Center 7: Why the Final Official Report about 9/11 is Unscientific and False* (Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press, 2009), pp. 261-66.

<sup>50</sup> See pp. 73-74 of this present work.

according to official investigation standards, the “sounds” are not what defines an explosion anyway.<sup>51</sup>

Also, remember that this would be only one explosion, whereas controlled demolitions traditionally use hundreds of explosives. The video of 1WTC's collapse, in which you claim explosions are heard, contains nothing of the sort. The constant "crashing" sound is the normal sound of the building collapsing. What should a collapsing 110 story skyscraper sound like?

You are missing the point in that sounds consistent with demolition can be heard, something you and other debunkers have said did not occur.

Should it not make any sound at all? Also, the roaring/crashing sound is heard only AFTER the building begins to collapse. If this were controlled demolition, you would hear sharp - BANG, BANG, BANG - sounds, following by the collapse of the building. The video PROVES that there AREN'T any such explosions.

If these were traditional demolitions, I would agree. But if these were supposed to be deceptive demolitions, then they would obviously be modified.

I note that here you completely ignored Claim 4, which is your video's assertion that explosives would have left behind remnants such as det cord. I clearly demonstrated that Brent Blanchard and yourself are incorrect about this claim, and I still recommend you put a disclaimer in your video.

### **9/11 Debunked: World Trade Center - No Free-Fall Speed**

Claim 1: Don't understand your reasoning. The upper section did tilt 23 degrees to the east, but the floor slabs of the floors below pancaked pretty much straight downward.

The core of the South Tower was missing its 24 outer core columns. If the top tilted to the east, we would expect at least the west outer core columns to survive.

### **9/11 Debunked: Flight 77's Pilot not a Terrorist**

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., pp. 39-44.

I'm glad you don't believe Flight 77's pilot, Charles Burlingame, was in some way in on 9/11. I'm also aware that not every 9/11 truther has the exact same beliefs about 9/11 as every other 9/11 truther. In fact, I'm sure no two 9/11 truthers have the exact same beliefs. In my videos I don't say that all 9/11 truthers believe in the particular claim being debunked. I'm just saying, "Here is a theory, and now here's why it's false." I'm also well aware that not all 9/11 truthers believe it was a missile that hit the Pentagon, but I still have videos debunking this theory because there are plenty 9/11 truthers who DO believe this. The theories about Burlingame somehow being involved in 9/11 were put forth by Loose Change 2nd Edition, which was reportedly the most viewed internet video at one point, so surely a lot of people knew of this theory even if not all of them believed it.

It would still help if you added some sort of disclaimer to make clear that few truthers believe that theory.

### **9/11 Debunked: WTC 7's Collapse Explained**

Claim 1: Correct, the original WTC7 was 350 feet from the North Tower, not "less than 300 feet" as I said in the video. If I remember correctly, when I was making the video I used the distance bar on a satellite photo of Ground Zero post-9/11 via Google Maps, which it turns out is not the most accurate technique. At the time I also assumed the southern edge of the original WTC7 was perfectly flush with the edge of the Vesey Street sidewalk as the new WTC7 is, but it turns out that the original building was pushed back (northward) about 20-30 feet to allow for the loading docks. However, whether 300 feet or 350 feet, this is still nothing with compared to the vertical height of the North Tower (1368 feet). The horizontal distance between the buildings was only about 1/4th the height of the tower.

Though to be fair, most of the large debris appeared to be heading towards building 7 when the North Tower was at about half its original height.

For comparison, we know that debris from the North Tower fell as far away as to crush the eastern edge of the Winter Gardens, which is about 500 feet away.

Yes, and why was this debris flung so far?

Still, I will add a message in the video saying it should be 350 feet.

Claims 2, 3, and 4: I made and uploaded this video in September 2007, which was over a year before the official investigation had released its final report. Hence, everything in the video was based off of NIST's working hypothesis at that time. The investigation found that the diesel generators did not help to feed the fires and that it was the failure of Column 79, not Truss 1, which initiated the collapse. Also, the report does not say that the structural damage to the building played no role in the events leading to WTC7's collapse, it found that it played only a minor role.

They did say, however, that the building would have collapsed even with no structural damage.

However none of these three findings by the investigation changed the overall hypothesis for the collapse as presented in their early reports and in the video.

Yes, the hypothesis of fire, which was the only hypothesis they seriously looked into.

Still, I'll note either in the video or in the description that the video was made several years ago and based on the findings at the time.

### **9/11 Debunked: "Molten Metal" Explained**

Claim 1: I usually don't like to just tell people "Read the report", since most of them won't bother to, but this is such a complicated area that you really need to at least just read the section of the official report dealing with the temperature simulations and how they calculated the temperature of the fires. It was different on every floor. It was also different as time passed. Hydrocarbon fires can burn as hot as over 2000 degrees F, but NIST calculated that based on the available oxygen entering the building, the fires in the hottest parts of the building were generally burning at about 1832 degrees F. This was also backed up based on analysis of steel beams in WTC7 by FEMA that showed that they maximum temperature they had reached was 1832 degrees F.

Interesting that you would bring this up. You are referring to the eutectic steel.<sup>52</sup> You have such strong faith in NIST's calculations, and yet this steel actually contradicts NIST's WTC7 report more than it supports their report on the Towers. After all, nowhere in NIST's WTC7 report do they claim that any of the steel in Building 7 was heated to 1800°F. At most, they claim the steel in Building 7 was heated to about 600°C, or 1112°F.<sup>53</sup> So, the WTC7 steel may support the WTC collapse report, but it raises more problems for the Building 7 report. In any case, I cannot say how accurate NIST's calculations are until they release their modeling data for peer review.<sup>54</sup>

Of course, this beam was from WTC7 (not the Twin Towers), but the fires in the towers and WTC7 were very similar and fed by the same material, the same type of normal office contents.

My key point is that the maximum temperatures for the fires would have been about 1832°F. But I have seen no empirical evidence to support the assertion that the fires in the South Tower were that hot only minutes before its collapse.

The page you linked to completely misrepresents NIST (or at the least, misleads the reader). The fires in the towers took place over 8 floors in 1WTC and 6 floors in 2WTC. That's 14 floors and literally hundreds of columns and hundreds of floor trusses. The hottest zones in the towers were at the floor trusses (IE, the ceilings, remember heat rises), not the core columns or perimeter columns. NIST was only able to analyze core and perimeter columns. They weren't able to test the floor trusses I THINK because they needed to actually test the paint and the floor trusses were not painted. In any case, details about the temperatures the columns reached tell us nothing about the temperatures the floor trusses reached.

---

<sup>52</sup> J.R. Barnett, R.R. Biederman, and R.D. Sisson, Jr., "An Initial Microstructural Analysis of A36 Steel from WTC Building 7," *JOM* (2001), at [www.tms.org/pubs/journals/JOM/0112/Biederman/Biederman-0112.html](http://www.tms.org/pubs/journals/JOM/0112/Biederman/Biederman-0112.html).

<sup>53</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1A, pp. 19, 48.

<sup>54</sup> Alan Miller, "Former Chief of NIST's Fire Science Division Calls for Independent Review of World Trade Center Investigation," *OpEdNews*, 21 August 2007, at [https://www.opednews.com/populum/page.php?f=genera\\_alan\\_mil\\_070820\\_former\\_chief\\_of\\_nist.htm](https://www.opednews.com/populum/page.php?f=genera_alan_mil_070820_former_chief_of_nist.htm).

Regardless, any speculation that the trusses were heated far hotter than the core or perimeter columns is just that – pure speculation backed by no empirical evidence.

Claim 2: This is grasping at straws when you consider than [sic] the color of any metal is going to vary with the lighting even if the temperature remains the same,

True, but the picture I reference shows the south side more in shadow than the other sides, meaning that less natural light would have altered the color.

and also there are dozens of videos showing the molten metal, and at many angles the molten metal is even a much darker orange.

Also true, but the fact remains that the metal clearly did attain this high temperature at some point. Molten aluminum should not remain that bright for very long.<sup>55</sup>

### **9/11 Debunked: World Trade Center’s Collapse Explained**

Claim 1: See above.

### **9/11 Debunked: WTC - Zero Hallmarks of Controlled Demolition**

Claim 1: Not always but generally. The reason no flashes are seen in that video is because the demolition team wrapped heavy protection around the blast zones to prevent the explosives from sending debris flying.

Regardless, flashes can obviously be prevented in a controlled demolition, based on how the explosives are set up or what type of explosives are used. You should still add a disclaimer that bright flashes do not have to occur for it to be a demolition. Flashes in the South Tower’s collapse have been found.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> For more on this point, see “Debunking Molten Aluminium Flow From South Tower,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 12 February 2009, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2009/02/debunking-molten-aluminium-flow-from.html>.

<sup>56</sup> E.g., see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xPB9MHgHWBQ>.

You ignore the deafening explosions in that video.

No, I don't. As I've shown, explosions are present in videos of the Tower collapses.

Claim 2-4: See above.

Claim 5: Wrong, it leans exactly as it starts to collapse. Also, something I don't even see you truthers talk about is why you think the buildings leaned AT ALL. The fires in the South Tower at the moment of collapse were on the east side of the building, and the building leaned to the east when it started to collapse. A controlled demolition would have caused a straight down symmetrical [sic] collapse, with nothing to cause such a sharp lean.

So by your standards, demolitions resulting in leans must not be a controlled demolitions then.

Even if for some unfathomable reason it would have caused a lean, the odds of it just "coincidentally" leaning in the exact direction where the fires were is 1 in 4. But wait, the exact same thing happened in the North Tower. The fires at the time of collapse were on the south side of the building, and the building leans to the south as it collapses. The odds of this happening by coincidence: 1 in 4. The odds of it happening in both towers is 1 in 4 multiplied by 1 in 4, or 1 in 16.

Unless they were engineered to do that, much like how the demolitions would had to have started near where the planes impacted the buildings.

Claim 5: The antenna falls at exactly the same time as the rest of the building, even in that video.

Wrong. Again, the antenna does rotate south at one point, but the initial motion was entirely vertical and happened before the main collapse.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> This can be seen clearly by the fact that a wire connected from the antenna to the roof loses tension right as the antenna moves. (See <http://i1199.photobucket.com/albums/aa476/adamtaylor132342/losttension.gif>.) This could only have happened if the antenna is sinking in to the roof of the building.

Also, the fact that huge sections (as much as 70 stories tall)

NIST says 60 stories for WTC1 and 40 for WTC2.<sup>58</sup>

of the North Tower's core remained standing for about 20 seconds after the rest of the building has collapsed proves that the core did not fall first.

This assertion relies on the idea that the core would start to fail at the bottom like a conventional demolition. However, the demolition clearly had to start at the top, meaning that only the upper part of the core had to fail for the antenna to fail first.

Claim 6: See above.

Claim 7: Agreed 100%. But the claim that the buildings fell at or near free-fall acceleration is one of the KEYSTONE claims of the 9/11 truth movement, it's even 1 of the top 10 claims of Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth. Many argue that explosives were placed on every column on every floor, which caused a free-fall collapse. Of course, this is completely ridiculous and even if you wanted to take a building down in a controlled demolition, you wouldn't need to put explosives on every single column and on every floor. So, their ideas about how controlled demolitions work is laughable in the first place, but the point of my video is to prove that they didn't fall at free-fall anyway.

That's fine, but my main point was that you explicitly state in your video that explosives "would have caused the buildings to collapse at free fall speed." I showed this to be most likely incorrect. Basically, you should think about rephrasing that particular comment.

Claim 8: Again, the claim that the buildings fell into their own footprints is one of THE LEADING claims of the 9/11 truth movement. The point of my video was to prove that none of the buildings fell even remotely into their own footprints.

---

<sup>58</sup> "Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC Towers Investigation," 14 September 2012 (last updated 2 June 2021), question 11, at <https://www.nist.gov/disaster-failure-studies/faqs-nist-wtc-towers-investigation>.

That may apply to the Towers, but to claim that Building 7 did not “even fall remotely into” its footprint is stretching the truth, don’t you think?

Panels from the North Tower radiated outwards as far as 600 feet outside the building’s footprint. 30 W. Broadway, which was entirely across the street from WTC7, was so badly damaged by debris from WTC7 that it had to be demolished. Only within the past couple months did they start constructing the new 30 W. Broadway.

“Entirely across the street” makes it sound like it was blocks away. As I said before, the fact that Building 7 damaged other buildings was probably due to the fact that it was a very large building. A building the size of WTC7 would never have been legally demolished with explosives with neighboring buildings that close, hence why they demolished the Deutsche Bank Building beam by beam.

### **9/11 Debunked: Thermate Chemical Signatures Disproven**

The video was made in December 2007 (and was actually just an updated version of the one I’d made about 6 months prior), which was based on a 204 page/slide PowerPoint presentation that Steven Jones had been giving, when he was still claiming it was thermate. In that presentation he wasn’t talking about microspheres or red chips at all, it was all about thermate and chemicals found in the dust.

From what I can gather, Dr. Jones did not obtain samples of the dust that contained the iron microspheres until late 2006,<sup>59</sup> and first published about them in May of 2007.<sup>60</sup> Indeed, he spoke about them during the “Rebuilding America’s Senses” event,<sup>61</sup> a clip of which you show in your



---

<sup>59</sup> See Niels Harrit *et al*, “Active Thermitic Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe,” *The Open Chemical Physics Journal* (2009), pp. 8-9, at <https://benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOCPJ/TOCPJ-2-7.pdf>.

<sup>60</sup> Steven Jones, “Revisiting 9/11/2001 – Applying the Scientific Method,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, May 2007, pp. 76-81, <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/JonesWTC911SciMethod.pdf>.

<sup>61</sup> Paul Joseph Watson, “9/11 Debunkers Hide From Slam Dunk Evidence Of Controlled Demolition,” *Prison Planet*, 22 May 2007, at <http://files.meetup.com/519107/SlamEvidence.pdf>.

video! In December of that same year (the same year and month of your video), he reported on his discovery of the red-gray chips.<sup>62</sup> In other words, he reported on findings as they were made.



9/11 Debunked: Thermate Chemical Signatures Disproven  
78,244 views • Dec 13, 2007

<sup>62</sup> “Steven Jones, “Announcing a discovery: Red/gray bi-layered chips in the WTC dust,” *911 Blogger*, 22 December 2007, at <http://911blogger.com/node/13090>.

It was only later that he changed his version of the truth (for the third time) and started talking about nanothermite and microspheres (which, by the way, form completely naturally in ordinary office fires and the EPA had already released a lengthy report explaining the microspheres in December 2003, literally years and years before Jones had ever even heard of them).

Again, he reported on new findings as they were made. That's all anyone can do, so I don't understand why you have a problem with this, unless you want to dismiss all updates and discoveries scientists make as "changing the truth." And, by the way, Dr. Jones discussed the possibility of using nanothermite in the 2006 version of his paper "Why Indeed did the WTC Buildings Completely Collapse?"<sup>63</sup> I think your timeline of events is very confused.

As for spheres reported on by the EPA, they actually discussed using the spheres as one of the signature components to distinguish WTC dust from so-called "background" dust (i.e., common office-building dust).<sup>64</sup> The spheres discussed by Dr. Jones are *not* natural byproducts of normal office fires.<sup>65</sup>

By that time I felt no need to keep making videos debunking every new version of the truth that Steven Jones came up with. First, it was thermite (which I debunked). Then, "No no, it was thermate!" (which I debunked). Then, "No no, it was nanothermite!" Even more recently, he seems to have changed his story yet AGAIN and now claims that it was traditional explosives all along, and if nanothermite was involved at all then it was just to be used as a detonator to set off the explosives (which, by the way, it a completely ridiculous theory since there are already detonators for

---

<sup>63</sup> Steven Jones, "Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Completely Collapse?," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, September 2006, pp. 16-17, 42, at [www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why\\_Indeed\\_Did\\_the\\_WTC\\_Buildings\\_Completely\\_Collapse\\_Jones\\_Thermite\\_World\\_Trade\\_Center.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why_Indeed_Did_the_WTC_Buildings_Completely_Collapse_Jones_Thermite_World_Trade_Center.pdf).

<sup>64</sup> James Smith and Andrea Dreger, "Billions of Previously Molten Iron Spheres in WTC Dust, Reveal Use of Thermic Materials," *AE911Truth*, 24 August 2010, at <http://www1.ae911truth.org/en/news/41-articles/348-previously-molten-iron-spheres-were-in-wtc-dust-reveal-use-of-thermitic-materials>.

<sup>65</sup> Discussed at length in "He oughta know better: Mark Roberts and the iron spherules," *New York City activist*, 3 January 2008, at <https://activistnyc.wordpress.com/2008/01/03/he-oughta-know-better-mark-roberts-and-the-iron-rich-spherules>.

explosives which work perfectly well and reliably and there would be no need to invent “nanothermite detonators”... but, that’s Steven Jones for ya).

This is utter nonsense. Again, your timeline of events is seriously confused. For the record, here’s what Dr. Jones actually said with regards to hypothesizing about “nanothermite ignitors”:

During the discussion, I briefly expressed my hypothesis that nanothermite served as an igniting agent, as in the “super-thermite matches” described in our paper, to ignite more conventional explosives such as C4 or HMX, in the destruction of the WTC buildings. [...] The “working hypothesis” above is a scientific hypothesis, that is, subject to change as further research data emerge. It is also possible (for example) that explosive nanothermite (not an incendiary) could have been used in SHAPED CHARGES, to cut through steel explosively [...]<sup>66</sup>

This is also why such “super-thermite matches” would be used, because according to the relevant literature, they can be made to “resist friction, impact, heat, and static discharge through the composition, thereby minimizing accidental ignition.”<sup>67</sup> Thus it would not be “completely ridiculous” to use such technology – indeed, it is exactly the type of devices one would want to use for this type of covert demolition.

Ultimately, none of this changes the fact that the current information in your video is incorrect. Your claims about thermate have long been debunked, and I highly recommend that you either add disclaimers to your video or remove it entirely.

### **9/11 Debunked: WTC - No Pools of Molten Steel**

Claim 1: Ugh, sorry to be blunt but please tell me you're joking. You're basically saying that the reason the molten metal was still molten 6 weeks later is because the thermite/thermate continued to burn for 6 weeks.

---

<sup>66</sup> “Steven Jones and Frank Greening (and others) correspond - April-May, 2009,” *911 Blogger*, 14 May 2009, at <http://911blogger.com/node/20094>.

<sup>67</sup> Quoted from “R&D Awards - Super-Thermite Electric Matches” (2003), at [http://s3.amazonaws.com/nasathermalimages/public/images/Super-Thermite\\_Electric\\_Matches\\_2003.pdf](http://s3.amazonaws.com/nasathermalimages/public/images/Super-Thermite_Electric_Matches_2003.pdf).

No, what I claim (or rather, what the peer reviewed scientific article I cited claims) is that there was an abundance of odd chemicals and chemical reactions occurring at Ground Zero which lasted for weeks because the chemicals were largely present and continued to react. This has been discussed by both Dr. Jones and Jim Hoffman.<sup>68</sup>

In one of my videos I show that the amount of molten metal flowing from the South Tower in the final 7 minutes before its collapse can be estimated at about 30 tons, which would require 60 tons of thermite, which is equivalent to about 10 full dump truck loads of thermite. The idea of sneaking that much thermite onto one office floor with no one noticing is so absurd that anyone seriously entertaining the idea that the molten material flowing from the South Tower is molten iron from thermite should have their sanity card revoked.

Right. Because it sounds tricky to do, we can just throw out the theory entirely. Gotcha.

But wait, this is only one building. You say molten steel was found below all three buildings. For both towers and WTC7, it would require, say, 180 tons or 30 full dump trucks of thermite! And this is 180 tons of thermite for a 7 minute burn. Now if you want to go so far as to say that the burn lasted not for 7 minutes but for 6 WEEKS... then this calculates out to not 180 tons of thermite but 1,555,200 tons of thermite! Equivalent to about 259,200 full dump truck loads of thermite! I defy you to sneak even ONE dump truck load of thermite into the World Trade Center (or any other office building).

At this time, we don't know how much thermite would have been used in the demolitions. Thus your "calculations" are pure speculation.

Claim 2: Oxidize does NOT mean vaporize! Oxidation of lead will start at normal room temperatures.

Yes, but it has to boil before it oxidizes. And lead does not boil until temperatures of 3180°F. And, as I pointed out originally, RJ Lee made it

---

<sup>68</sup> See "Dr. Steven Jones Q&A Part 1 - 01 May 2009 UC Davi[s]" (minute 6:52), at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nlOOfmJJPXk>.

clear in their 2003 report that they talked about temperatures “at which lead would have undergone vaporization.”

Claim 3: See above.

Claim 4: Glowing does not mean molten. Anyway there’s no question there was molten metal in the debris pile (aluminum, lead, and copper were all abundant in the debris pile and all have melting points at or below the range of fires known to exist in the pile).

Yes, but if a metal such as copper or aluminum were glowing that bright it would be completely liquid.<sup>69</sup> And as I’ve already pointed out, because the molten metal remained glowing for as long as it did, it indicates a metal with fairly low heat conductivity and high heat capacity, which is not the characteristics of any of the metals you mentioned.

Even if the flakes falling from the glowing beam were molten (meaning, liquid) as opposed to glowing embers, that doesn’t automatically indicate that it was molten steel.

It does if the other metals are ruled out.

Claim 5: As stated above, copper and lead were also present through the complex (used in pipes and wiring and other electrical devices).

But they do not have the heat conductivity/capacity characteristics I mentioned.

### **9/11 Debunked: The “First Time in History” Claim**

Claim 1: It is from the FEMA report and I’ll point out in the video NIST’s estimation.

Claim 2: See above.

---

<sup>69</sup> Steven Weathers (SpookyOne), “Molten Steel in the Rubble of the World Trade Centre Collapse = Inside Job,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 26 May 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/05/molten-steel-in-rubble-of-world-trade.html>.

Claim 3: When I show examples of those steel-framed buildings collapsing from fire, I didn't claim they were skyscrapers! I even say that the Kader Toy Factory collapses were all 4-story buildings, and I certainly don't imply that the Dogwood Elementary School was a skyscraper.

I never stated that you claimed they were skyscrapers. I simply pointed out that you compare them to the Towers, which is obviously misleading.

How would the partial collapse of the Windsor Building possibly support your side? The building was designed differently than the WTC in that it had a concrete core from the bottom of the building all the way to the roof and concrete floor columns up to around the 21st floor. Only the top 11 floors had a steel-frame, and that was only the FLOORS (meaning the office space, not including the core which was concrete). All 11 of these steel-framed floors collapsed to the ground from fire. The only part of the building that didn't collapse was the concrete core and the bottom 21 concrete floors. Fire affects steel differently than concrete. 100% of the Windsor Building which had a steel-frame design collapsed. 100% of the World Trade Center had a steel-frame.

The link I provided should have clarified that. The partial collapse of the building demonstrates, at most, a high-rise can experience a partial collapse, spread out over a gradual period of time. This is in contrast to the rapid and complete collapse of the Towers and Building 7.

You laughably attack us debunkers for not comparing the World Trade Center to other fires in skyscrapers which did not collapse. Maybe the reason we don't compare the WTC to these other skyscraper fires is as simple as this: Of every single other skyscraper fire (you know, the ones you truthers love to talk about), not a single one of them had a hijacked 767 crash into them.

True, but the fires are blamed more for the collapses than the damage.

Nearly all of them were also made of concrete and not a steel-frame like the WTC.

Wrong. The One Meridian Plaza and the First Interstate Bank were in fact tube-within-tube steel-framed designs like the Towers were, although not quite the same.

Even WTC7, although not hit by a plane, was completely different than these other fires in that it had a steel-frame, it was designed completely differently than these other buildings, it [sic] no sprinklers working to suppress the fires, and it was abandoned by the FDNY and allowed to burn unchecked for 7 hours (whereas most other high-rise fires had firefighters in the building fighting the fires).

If you would bother to read what NIST said about the fires in WTC7, then you would see that they claim that “[I]n each of the other referenced buildings, the fires burned out several floors, even with available water and firefighting activities (except for WTC 5). Thus, whether the fire fighters fought the WTC 7 fires or not is not a meaningful point of dissimilarity from the other cited fires.”<sup>70</sup> Ultimately, NIST says the fires in other steel-framed buildings were, at the very least, just as severe as the fires in WTC7. They claim the crucial differences had to do with differences in design, but this has already been found to be problematic as well.<sup>71</sup>

We don't compare the WTC to these other buildings because they are nothing alike, and you shouldn't either.

So you apparently think it's okay to compare the Towers to elementary schools and badly built toy factories? Just because they collapsed from fire? But comparing them to other actual skyscrapers is invalid. The double-think here is astounding.

Lastly, I would just like to point out that even if an event is the first time in history that it's happened, that doesn't mean it's impossible for it to ever happen. In 1912, for the first time in history a luxury liner sank after hitting an iceberg. In 1937, for the first time in history a passenger airship burst into flames while in the air. In 1969, for the first time in history man walked on the moon. In 2003, for the first time in history a Space Shuttle exploded on reentry into the atmosphere due to damage to its heat shield. In 2008, for the first

---

<sup>70</sup> “Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation,” question 9.

<sup>71</sup> Chris Sarns, “NIST fraud - WTC 7 Shear Studs,” *OpEdNews*, 9 November 2008, at <https://www.opednews.com/Diary/NIST-fraud--WTC-7-Shear-S-by-Chris-Sarns-081109-134.html>.

time in history the United States elected its first African-American president. Just because something happens “for the first time in history”, that doesn’t mean it’s impossible for it to happen.

True, but one must look at the bigger picture in these matters. Say, for example, three Titanic-like ships, all designed to cope well in extreme situations, all sank after all three had hit icebergs within hours of each other. Three ships all sinking for the same reason within a few hours. If that had happened in 1912, I’m sure most people would find that incredibly suspicious and very well could have caused people to cry “conspiracy.”

### **9/11 Debunked: On WTC's Design to Withstand 707 Impact**

Claim 1: Leslie Robertson passionately rejects this claim by the Port Authority. Even if it were true, which it may well be, the towers on 9/11 DID survive the plane impacts. The stripping of the fireproofing and the long-term fires were another matter entirely. Oh and you conveniently left off that part from the NIST report which expresses doubt over which of the speeds was considered.

I am fully aware of NIST’s doubt, but I have yet to see any pre-9/11 documentation showing that the speeds considered were really 180mph. But I have seen plenty of pre-9/11 material saying otherwise.<sup>72</sup>

Claim 3: Again, the towers did remain standing after the planes hit.

Again, your argument is obviously misleading.

Claim 4: When you truthers quote John Skilling, you always leave off the most important part of his quote: “However, back in those days people didn't think about terrorists very much.” He was still considering it being an accident, not a plane being deliberately crashed into the building at full speed with 10,000 gallons of jet fuel.

---

<sup>72</sup> For more on this discussion, see John-Michael Talboo and Adam Taylor, “Debunking 9/11 Debunking: On WTC’s Design to Withstand 707 Impact,” 3 October 2020, at <https://911docs.files.wordpress.com/2020/10/debunking911debunkingwtcwithstand707impact2.pdf>.

But he clearly stated that he fires were taken into account. Also, your claim about Robertson being the chief engineer is still wrong. Skilling was clearly the head engineer.

### **9/11 Debunked: WTC - No Small or Oxygen-Starved Fires**

Claim 1: I don't know if this is 9/11 truthers' attempt at a straw-man argument or just a complete misunderstanding of what the official explanation for what the collapse is, but the NIST report says that the jet fuel burned off within the first 10 minutes and had, essentially, nothing to do with the fires in the buildings. The jet fuel acted like a match: It started the fires, but then the jet fuel itself burned off almost immediately, leaving normal office fires to burn, much like a match lighting a fireplace. The jet fuel was gone in 10 minutes, yet the fires in 1WTC burned for 102 minutes! 7WTC did not have one drop of jet fuel in it at any point, and yet it burned out of control for nearly 7 hours.

What I pointed out, however, is that your citation of NIST saying that 70% of the fuel remained in the Towers is wrong, and that they clarify this much more accurately in NCSTAR 1-5F. They even go as far as saying that half the fuel in the buildings did not even stay within the impact points and that it flowed away from where the planes hit. So you should clearly rethink your statements about how much fuel was in the Towers, as they obviously played a role in how the fires were spread throughout the buildings.

9/11 truthers very commonly assume that the fires were fed entirely (or mostly) by jet fuel, when in fact the official report makes it clear that the jet fuel had very little to do with anything. And in the case of WTC7, it had nothing to do with anything.

I never claim jet fuel was the only source of fuel for the fires. What I claim is that you are clearly wrong about how much fuel was in the Towers.

Claim 2: This claim is better addressed by NYPD videographer Steve Spak who, in the documentary "The Truth Behind the Third Tower", responding to Richard Gage's claim that the smoke pouring out of WTC7 was actually being drawn over to WTC7's south side from WTC6, says that that's absurd and that he was there on the scene that day and that the smoke was clearly coming FROM

WTC7. It then cuts to a video clearly showing the smoke coming out of WTC7, not being drawn TO WTC7 and then rising up its side.

I'm sorry, but pictures and videos show that clearly the same thing happened to WTC1,<sup>73</sup> meaning this phenomenon is possible (unless you want to claim every floor of WTC 1 was on fire at some point). And, as I pointed out, NIST themselves acknowledged this phenomenon took place at Building 7. As for Steve Spak's comments, it's important to keep in mind that when he actually references photographs that depict fire coming from Building 7, he shows one that clearly shows fire on the east side, not the south side where the smoke was.<sup>74</sup> Furthermore, officials with Consolidated Edison (Con Ed) of New York actually entered Building 7 on 9/11, and they reported "there was a fire, but they did not think the building would collapse."<sup>75</sup>

Mr. Owens, I hope you will take these points into consideration and keep your promise.

Regards,  
Adam

---

<sup>73</sup> For videos that clearly show this phenomenon, see [https://archive.org/details/911/day/20010911#id/NHK\\_20010911\\_140000\\_Japan/start/14:00:00UTC/chan/NHK](https://archive.org/details/911/day/20010911#id/NHK_20010911_140000_Japan/start/14:00:00UTC/chan/NHK).

<sup>74</sup> See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vZbMfTtHkYM&t=2405s>.

<sup>75</sup> Memorandum for the Record, 26 February 2004, p. 2, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20110309231802/https://media.nara.gov/9-11/MFR/t-0148-911MFR-00174.pdf>.

## The World Trade Center WAS a Controlled Demolition: A Response to Mark Roberts

Originally published 8 March 2011 at *Debunking the Debunkers*  
 Minor revisions by Adam Taylor

Back in February of 2009, debunker Mark “Gravy” Roberts announced that the “9/11 ‘truth’ movement has dried up and blown away,” and that he wouldn’t be adding anything new to his site “unless big news arises.”<sup>1</sup> Some of the “big news” Roberts last added was an honest mistake made by a contributor to the *Debunking the Debunkers* blog.<sup>2</sup> Roberts had not added anything since March of 09, which is odd considering that two years’ worth of big news had occurred in the 9/11 truth community.<sup>3</sup>

Well, after almost two years, Roberts finally added something new to his site – an old video he made back in 2007 called “WTC Not a Demolition,” which is currently available at 911myths.com.<sup>4</sup> He claims that his video “shows how absurd those claims (about controlled demolition) are from an audiovisual standpoint.” After reviewing his video, I have found that this claim is not even remotely true. Many of the arguments Roberts makes in his video are addressed in my extensive

---

<sup>1</sup> Archive of Roberts’ site available at <https://web.archive.org/web/20200626122134/https://sites.google.com/site/wtc7lies/home>.

<sup>2</sup> John-Michael Talboo, “Honest Mistakes Are ‘Big News’ to Mark Roberts,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 28 February 2009, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2009/02/honest-mistakes-are-big-news-to-mark.html>.

<sup>3</sup> Adam Taylor and John-Michael Talboo, “9/11 Truth Movement: Year in Review (2009-2010),” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 11 September 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/08/911-truth-movement-year-in-review-2009.html>.

<sup>4</sup> At the time, the video was hosted at [http://www.911myths.com/index.php/WTC\\_Not\\_A\\_Demolition](http://www.911myths.com/index.php/WTC_Not_A_Demolition), but has since been deleted. The only copy I was able to locate online is available at <https://www.dailymotion.com/video/xuj32d>.

critique of the 9/11 Mysteries Viewer's Guide.<sup>5</sup> His video presents itself as offering sound refutations to controlled demolition theories. Here I will show that his video amounts to nothing more than petty insults and half-baked arguments. To address each section, I will use the video's online index.<sup>6</sup>

- 01:10 South tower inward bowing of exterior wall, no smoke-disturbing detonations precede collapse

The first section of Roberts' video deals with the inward bowing of the South Tower's perimeter columns. He claims that the ejections of debris we see coming from the building only appear after the collapse began. Based on this, he asserts that this proves the ejections are being caused by the collapse and not vice versa.

First of all, we now have videos of what appears to be ejections coming from the WTC before the collapse begins.<sup>7</sup> Second, this argument about the inward bowing highlights a fundamental error Roberts constantly makes throughout his video: he assumes that the Towers would have been set up and executed like a traditional demolition. This shows his obvious ignorance of the possibilities of a covert demolition scenario that may have been set up for the buildings. Jim Hoffman has outlined a scenario where the inward bowing of the Towers' columns would not only have been part of the demolition, but also would have been an essential element:

During Stage 1, extending from up to 10 minutes before T-0, thermate coatings on key parts of the core structure steelwork are ignited via the wireless ignition control system. The two areas attacked are: the core columns on a few floors below the crash zone, just above where most of the columns transition from box columns to wide-flange beams; and the inner portions of the hat truss that connect it to the core.

---

<sup>5</sup> Adam Taylor, "A Critical Review of the '9/11 Mysteries Viewer's Guide,'" at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/a-critical-review-of-the-911-mysteries-viewers-guide.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> "WTC Not a Demolition Index to Scenes," archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20100327004722/http://sites.google.com/site/wtc7lies/wtcnotademolitionlinkstoscenes>.

<sup>7</sup> See for example <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ne1FJBVkh4s> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oTuvo4b4E9Y#t=1m15s>.

The thermal/corrosive attack on these two portions of the structure leaves the entire block of the core structure above the upper mechanical equipment floor “floating”, with no major steel members to transfer its gravity loads to the lower portion of the core or to the perimeter walls: it is now supported by the web-trussed floor diaphragms. The upper core block now exerts massive inward forces on the perimeter walls due to the high degree of leverage involved in the translation of the core block's gravity loads into pulling on the perimeter walls. It is these forces that produce the inward bowing of portions of perimeter walls that NIST claims are due merely to the sagging of floor diaphragms still supported by the core.<sup>8</sup>

As Hoffman also writes in his essay, “A key objective is get[ting] the top of the Tower to move before explosive action is clearly evident to onlookers outside the building.” Thus, engineered in the correct way, the inward bowing of the Towers’ perimeter columns could very well have been an essential element in initiating the collapses.

- 01:53 South tower fake collapse audio promoted by truthers as real

The next section of Roberts’ video deals with the audio of the South Tower’s collapse. He shows a video of the collapse with fake audio and claims truthers have used this video as evidence. While the audio in that video is clearly fake, new videos of the WTC collapses have been released through FOIA requests, and show that explosive sounds are clearly audible.<sup>9</sup>

- 02:32 What actual explosive demolitions look and sound like

Roberts then proceeds to show a long series of demolitions to emphasize how loud traditional demolitions are. Again, Roberts makes the error of assuming that the Towers were set up as traditional demolitions. The “sounds of explosions” issue has been raised by numerous debunkers. Before addressing the sound of the Towers’ collapses, let’s first look at how relevant the sound issue actually is.

---

<sup>8</sup> Jim Hoffman, “A Hypothetical Blasting Scenario,” ver. 1.2, *911 Research*, 9 April 2009, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/blasting\\_scenario.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/blasting_scenario.html).

<sup>9</sup> “Audible Explosion at South Tower Collapse,” at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9fNLz8zWwAM>.

According to the NFPA 921 Guide, the actual “sound” of an explosive does not define an explosive event.

Although an explosion is almost always accompanied by the production of a loud noise, the noise itself is not an essential element in the definition of an explosion. The generation and violent escape of gases are the primary criteria of an explosion.<sup>10</sup>

Therefore, by the standards of the National Fire Protection Association, the “sound” of an explosion does not define an explosion. This of course makes sense, as sound evidence would technically fall under the category of witness evidence, as sounds have to be attested to by witnesses in an investigation. What should be tested for is the forensic evidence for explosives. NIST has admitted numerous times that they never tested for residues of explosives or incendiaries, and they dismissed the idea of explosives being used based on the “sound” argument.

NIST did not test for the presence of explosive residue and such tests would not necessarily have been conclusive.<sup>11</sup>

If other investigations were carried out by NIST and Roberts’ standards, then the police would have to rule out being shot as a cause of death if nobody hears a gunshot, even if the person has a very obvious bullet wound.

Even with videos that have the clearest audio from 9/11, it is probably still hard to appreciate just how loud the Towers’ collapses really were without actually being there. Although we cannot be sure of exactly how many types of explosives were used, we have evidence of one explosive: nanothermite. The authors of the Active Thermic Material paper mention that in April 2001, the American Chemical Society held a symposium on the defense applications of nanomaterials in which they stated:

At this point in time, all of the military services and some DOE and academic laboratories have active R&D programs aimed at exploiting the unique

---

<sup>10</sup> NFPA 921: Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations, 2004 Edition, section 21.1.4, archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20140720031104/http://www.sierragal.com/252\\_stuff/NFPA\\_921.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20140720031104/http://www.sierragal.com/252_stuff/NFPA_921.pdf).

<sup>11</sup> Quoted from: “Sept. 2007 Response to April 2007 RFC, from NIST,” 27 September 2007, p. 4, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2007/NISTResponseToRequestForCorrectionGourleyEtal2.pdf>.

properties of nanomaterials that have potential to be used in 11 energetic formulations for advanced explosives [...] nanoenergetics hold promise as useful ingredients for the thermobaric (TBX) and TBX-like weapons, particularly due to their high degree of tailorability with regards to energy release and impulse management.<sup>12</sup>

From this, the authors of the nanothermite study point out that:

The feature of “impulse management” may be significant. It is possible that formulations may be chosen to have just sufficient percussive effect to achieve the desired fragmentation while minimizing the noise level.<sup>13</sup>

In other words, these materials, in any form that they are used, are perfect for covert demolition in which one would want to reduce the loud pops of conventional demolitions.

Of course, other types of explosives could have been used, and explosive sounds would probably not have been 100% preventable. However, Jim Hoffman has suggested a way that the demolitions would not have produced distinct explosive sounds.<sup>14</sup> Regardless of what Roberts believes, the collapse of the Towers produced explosive sounds that could be heard miles away.<sup>15</sup>

- 06:17 North tower audio deception in Loose Change

Roberts then proceeds to take issue with a video of the North Tower’s collapse in the film Loose Change. While I agree that the shaking was not

---

<sup>12</sup> Andrzej W. Miziolek, “Nanoenergetics: An Emerging Technology Area of National Importance,” *The AMPTIAC Newsletter* 6.1, Spring 2002, pp. 43-44, at <https://www.darksideofgravity.com/nanosolgels.pdf>.

<sup>13</sup> Niels Harrit *et al*, “Active Thermite Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe,” *The Open Chemical Physics Journal* (2009), p. 26, at <https://benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOCPJ/TOCPJ-2-7.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> See Jim Hoffman’s discussion at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EseUt2LUan4#t=11m1s>. See also pp. 45-49 of this present work.

<sup>15</sup> For example, one witness who heard the sounds produced as the Towers collapsed described them as “explosions,” and was located on the News Corp. Building in Manhattan, which is nearly four miles away from the WTC complex (via Google Maps: <http://goo.gl/maps/wSHTu>). See: “Fox News 9/11 Coverage: 11:08 a.m. - 11:23 a.m.” at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uw7vaGYZKfk>.

caused by some pre-collapse explosion, explosive sounds can be heard in videos of the North Tower's collapse.<sup>16</sup>

- 07:24 “I heard a bomb” – witnesses using figures of speech to describe loud sounds. Includes interview with Hursley Lever, witness to the north tower elevator shaft fireball.

Roberts' video next goes on to examine the issue of the witness testimony of explosions on 9/11. He claims that out of all the testimonies he's examined, only 11% described the Towers' collapses as explosions. However, Graeme MacQueen has estimated a higher percentage:

I do not know whether the FDNY witnesses constitute a representative sample of 9/11 witnesses, but it is possible that they do. Certainly, there is no lack of testimony to explosions from those outside the FDNY, and I see no obvious reason why firefighters and medics would be more prone than others to feel that they were witnessing explosions. If they constitute a representative sample, then a minimum of 23% of all witnesses to the Towers' collapses appear to have perceived, or thought they perceived, explosions that brought down the Towers.<sup>17</sup>

The common objection to MacQueen's analysis is that he has taken numerous testimonies out of context. However, MacQueen has addressed these objections.<sup>18</sup> Roberts also shows the testimony of Hursely Lever to demonstrate that truthers use some testimonies of witnesses who are using a figure of speech. Still, this is only one person's testimony, and numerous other witnesses are quite clear about what they heard. He also shows a

---

<sup>16</sup> See “9/11 WTC Detonations Finally Revealed,” at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ECr5sqc-1oo>.

<sup>17</sup> Graeme MacQueen, “118 Witnesses: The Firefighters' Testimony to Explosions in the Twin Towers,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 21 August 2006, p. 56, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Article\\_5\\_118Witnesses\\_WorldTradeCenter.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Article_5_118Witnesses_WorldTradeCenter.pdf). Dr. MacQueen has since expanded his list of witnesses. See Graeme MacQueen, “156 Eyewitnesses Whose Statements Are Suggestive Of Explosions In The Twin Towers,” at <http://www.1ae911truth.org/downloads/156eyewitnessaccounts.pdf>.

<sup>18</sup> See John-Michael Talboo, “Oh, How Typical! Arch Debunker Pat Curley Grossly Misrepresents Firefighter Testimony and then Wrongly Accuses 911 Truthers of the Same Thing,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 6 June 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/05/oh-really.html>.

crane collapse as evidence that non-explosive events can produce explosive sounds. Again, none of the objections Roberts has raised warrants refusing to test for explosive residues. As stated at [firefightersfor911truth.org](http://firefightersfor911truth.org):

Explosion sounds can be explained away. But, only after a thorough investigation. When there is this much witness testimony, evidence, and explosive use by terrorists on this very same complex, there is no excuse for refusing to test for explosive residue.<sup>19</sup>

- 09:35 Use and effects of steel cutter charges.

The next section of the video deals with how conventional demolitions are set up. Again, the Towers were obviously far from conventional demolitions. The demolitions of the Towers could have been set up in any way needed. That's why it's called a CONTROLLED demolition.

- 11:55 A few pounds of cutter charges = huge boom and flash.

Roberts then expands on this point by showing how explosive demolitions create loud explosions and bright flashes. We have already covered how the sound levels could have been decreased, and that witnesses did report enormous explosions that could be heard for miles. And the fact of the matter is that flashes have been found in videos of the South Tower's collapse.<sup>20</sup> But this is an irrelevant point, as bright flashes do not always occur in controlled demolitions.

Roberts also raises the point about how many pounds of explosives would have been needed to demolish the Towers. However, as civil engineer Jonathan Cole has demonstrated, a minimum amount of thermite/thermate could have been used, even when it has not been formulated to be explosive.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> "NFPA 921-18.1 Chapter 18 Explosions," *Fire Fighters for 9/11 Truth*, 15 December 2009, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20101023205930/http://firefightersfor911truth.org/?p=841>.

<sup>20</sup> See "WTC 2 Explosive Flash Anomaly," at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xPB9MHgHWBQ>.

<sup>21</sup> Jon Cole, "9/11 Experiments: The Great Thermate Debate," *911 Blogger*, 10 November 2010 at <http://911blogger.com/news/2010-11-10/911-experiments-great-thermate-debate>.

- 13:16 Structural Engineer, collapse expert, and Weidlinger Associates WTC investigator Matthys Levy on conspiracy theories

Roberts then decides to reference Matthys Levy and the Weidlinger Associates investigation. This may not be the wisest decision, as the Weidlinger report strongly contradicts the NIST report on the collapse of the WTC.<sup>22</sup>

Roberts also claims that truthers have misrepresented the size of the fires in the Towers. Roberts claims “Conspiracists like to claim that the fires were almost out just before collapse.” For someone who accuses people of misrepresenting others’ claims, Roberts does a fine job of doing that himself. What most in the Truth Movement claim is that the fires in the SOUTH Tower were almost out before collapse. And videos and photographs confirm this.<sup>23</sup> Roberts believes the explosives wouldn’t have been able to survive the plane impacts and the fires. This is also false.<sup>24</sup>

- 14:37 North tower “squibs” compared to explosive blasts

The next section of Roberts’ video deals with the squibs from the Towers. He asserts the dubious claim constantly repeated by debunkers and NIST – that these squibs were simply air pressure ejected from the Towers. He points to one squib and claims that it is not blasting out, but flowing out of the building. However, squibs can eject from buildings at varying speeds, depending on how the gases are ejected from the explosives.<sup>25</sup> Also, this one squib should not be representative of all the squibs from the Towers, as physicist David Chandler has shown that several of these ejections did

---

<sup>22</sup> Michael H., “Report on Weidlinger Simulation,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, August 2007, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/h/Report\\_on\\_Weidlinger.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/h/Report_on_Weidlinger.pdf).

<sup>23</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “The Fires’ Severity,” *911 Research*, last updated 20 March 2013, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/fires/severity.html>.

<sup>24</sup> Adam Taylor, “FAQ #10: Wouldn’t the planes slamming into the Twin Towers have disturbed the demolition devices?,” *AE911Truth* (n.d.), at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/faqs/352-faq-9-wouldn-t-the-planes-slamming-into-the-twin-towers-have-disturbed-the-demolition-devices>.

<sup>25</sup> See for example this comparison: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xan1fW6sda0>.

shoot out of the building the exact way explosives behave, starting out strong and then losing speed.<sup>26</sup>

Also, calculations done by Dr. Crockett Grabbe show that the horizontal ejection rate of these squibs is disproportional to their vertical fall rate.

The video frame in Figure 4 of the World Trade Center North Tower taken by KTLA channel 5 news shows a “squib” – a line of ejecting material from the tower – right before it collapsed. Such squib ejections are driven by massive overpressure inside the building relative to the atmospheric pressure outside, and that overpressure is created by explosions. A number of squibs were observed coming from all 3 of Buildings 1, 2, and 7 a short second or 2 after each one started to collapse, and there are several websites that show photograph of them on all 3 buildings. The one displayed as Figure 4 shows ejecting material (bits of material large enough to have little air resistance) streaming out of the North Tower, which has traveled a distance from the tower in the horizontal direction, whereas the distance it has descended in the vertical direction because of gravitation pull is small.

Note the quantitative information that can be gathered from the ejection photograph in Figure 4. We can estimate that, at the front end, the ejecting plume has apparently fallen no more than roughly 3 feet (an estimate that might have up to a factor of 2 in error), whereas the horizontal distance of the front from building is about 1/3 the width of the North Tower, or about 70 feet. If we neglect air friction resistance over the length of the streamer, from fall distance  $s=0.5gt^2$ , where  $g=32 \text{ feet/sec}^2$  is the gravitational acceleration, we estimate 0.43 sec as the time since the front end first ejected from the building. That means that material in that squib is traveling horizontally at roughly 163 feet/sec, which means the squibs are effectively “bullets” of bits of material produced by the explosions.<sup>27</sup>

Roberts also references calculations done by Dr. Zdenek Bazant *et al* to explain away the squibs. Kevin Ryan, in his comprehensive analysis of the squibs, has this to say about Dr. Bazant’s calculations.

---

<sup>26</sup> David Chandler, “South Tower: Explosive Reality,” 6 January 2008, at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N\\_UeLXfI37s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N_UeLXfI37s).

<sup>27</sup> Crockett Grabbe, “Direct Evidence for Explosions: Flying Projectiles and Widespread Impact Damage,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, August 2007, pp. 2-3, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/GrabbeExplosionsEvidence.pdf>.

Bazant, Le, Greening and Benson estimated the velocity of escaping air to be as high as 340 m/s, or 1100 fps. Of course they were trying to establish an argument for the bursts having reached the speed of sound, in order to explain away the witness testimony to explosions.<sup>28</sup>

Several refutations of Bazant's work have been published by members of the Truth Movement.<sup>29</sup>

- 16:52 Explosive demolitions eject debris, sometimes dangerously

At this point Roberts asserts that explosives would have caused shrapnel to be ejected everywhere out of the Towers at high speeds. He claims that explosives powerful enough to destroy the Towers would have done this. However, as even his video shows, there are ways of preventing that from happening. One of the ways this could have been prevented is by limiting the areas attacked by explosives in the Towers. Mechanical engineer Tony Szamboti has suggested that the two main sections of the Towers that were attacked were the outer core columns and the corner perimeter columns:

[T]he demolition was accomplished [...] by taking out the outer core columns every third floor and the corners of the perimeter. The molten metal found in the rubble was probably from use of thermite in the fire affected areas, used to initiate the collapses. After the collapses started explosives would have been used on the core columns to break the welds to ensure the collapse continued reliably and the sounds would be masked by the collapse itself. Most of the discharges would have been contained within the perimeter and those that weren't would be masked by the debris falling outside. However, it wasn't a perfect job and we do see some ejections.

---

<sup>28</sup> Kevin Ryan, "High Velocity Bursts of Debris From Point-Like Sources in the WTC Towers," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 13 June 2007, p. 8 n4, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2007/Ryan\\_HVBD.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2007/Ryan_HVBD.pdf).

<sup>29</sup> E.g., Graeme MacQueen and Tony Szamboti, "The Missing Jolt: A Simple Refutation of the NIST-Bazant Collapse Hypothesis," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 22 April 2009, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2008/TheMissingJolt7.pdf>; Gregory Szuladzinski *et al*, "Some Misunderstandings Related to WTC Collapse Analysis," *International Journal of Protective Structures*, June 2013, at <https://911speakout.org/wp-content/uploads/Some-Misunderstandings-Related-to-WTC-Collapse-Analysis.pdf>; Ansgar Schneider, "The Structural Dynamics of the World Trade Center Catastrophe," *IABSE Congress* (2019), at <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1910/1910.10801.pdf>.

The amount of explosive needed to provide a concussion powerful enough to break the welds on the core columns is significantly less than that needed to cut through them. These charges could have been tamped to cause most of the energy to go into the column and reduce the noise level.

The arguments made by debunkers like Mark Roberts, that the sound levels would be much higher if explosives were used, are simply bare assertions. Roberts and others like him do not consider methods like tamping and breaking the welds to accomplish the demolition. They don't do the calculations which show it is feasible to minimize the percussive noise to a level consistent with that of the collapsing material, while still generating more than enough force to remove the column by breaking the weld.<sup>30</sup>

This could very well have limited the amount of small debris ejected far and fast. Regardless, Dr. Grabbe has shown evidence that much of the debris from the Towers was ejected great distances, as much as ¼ of a mile away.<sup>31</sup>

- 18:05 Les Robertson, Twin Towers head engineer, on conspiracy claims

Roberts proceeds to quote WTC engineer Leslie Robertson and his objections to the idea that the Twin Towers were demolished. Gregg Roberts has addressed Robertson's statements:

ROBERTSON: [...] I've not participated in the NIST Report directly, although of course I've read it, as have thousands of other structural engineers and other interested persons.

GR: Robertson offers no evidence to support this claim about how many people have read the NIST report. NIST published about 10,000 pages about the tower collapses. The Summary Report itself took up 248 pages plus 43 pages of front matter. Jim Hoffman's critique of the Report notes that the Summary Report flatly contradicted some of the most important evidence presented deep in the 10,000 pages. Whistleblower Kevin Ryan calls all this the TiNRAT approach: "They'll Never Read All This."

---

<sup>30</sup> Comments from Tony Szamboti at <http://911blogger.com/news/2008-10-11/angled-cut-column-explained#comment-199053>.

<sup>31</sup> Grabbe, "Direct Evidence for Explosions," pp. 4-5.

Note the compound category, in which the relative numbers for the two categories of people who have read the Report are not provided. Maybe it's three structural engineers and thousands of 9/11 skeptics! But as usual throughout the interview, we're supposed to believe this because of who Robertson is and because he speaks confidently, rather than because of evidence and logic.

He is clearly implying that if only a few engineers have publicly challenged the official story, they are unlikely to be right. The idea of taking a majority vote of experts appeals to Americans' sense of democratic values, but it has absolutely nothing to do with who is more likely to be right. [...]

ROBERTSON: But the collapse mechanism of the Trade Center is as we had anticipated it would be when we first designed it. It was not – please don't misunderstand me – it was not designed to collapse. But any prudent engineer looking at the future has to think about, what are the mechanisms that cause collapse, and how to go about strengthening the building so as to minimize that circumstance. So sure, we spent time looking at that kind of event, and that which was observable from the photographs and so forth is reasonably consistent with that which we thought would be the case.

HOST: Why did it fall so straight down?

ROBERTSON: Well, that's kind of the nature of that kind of failure.

GR: This statement is reminiscent of the pre-scientific Aristotle: "It's in the nature of things to fall." Throughout this response (continued below) Robertson says "uh" and makes other stuttering sounds and false starts more than in any other statement during the show. He misspeaks, saying that burning a sofa creates smoke capacity.

Robertson offers no examples of "that kind of failure" of which he speaks so confidently.<sup>32</sup>

- 19:35 WTC 7: deceptive claims made by conspiracists, collapse expected by media

---

<sup>32</sup> Gregg Roberts, "Jones v. Robertson: A physicist and a structural engineer debate the controlled demolition of the World Trade Center," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 20 May 2007, pp. 5-6, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/Roberts\\_AnnotatedJones-RobertsonTranscript.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/Roberts_AnnotatedJones-RobertsonTranscript.pdf).

After almost 20 minutes, Roberts finally addresses the issue of World Trade Center 7. He starts out by showing a clip from Loose Change that compares the collapse of WTC7 with a controlled demolition. Roberts criticizes this part of the film because the audio of the demolition was omitted. Again, we have already addressed the sound issue. And as it turns out, David Chandler has found evidence of explosive sounds preceding WTC7's collapse in the very video Roberts uses to claim that no explosions were heard.<sup>33</sup>

Roberts then criticizes Dr. Steven Jones and his claims about squibs ejecting from the building. While I agree that the southwest corner of WTC7 showed no ejections, the north side of the facade clearly exhibited ejections of dust and debris.<sup>34</sup> Of course, Roberts simply hand waves away any ejections from the building, claiming that it was due to... you guessed it. Air pressure. However, any pulverized debris would not have been formed until the building had already collapsed to that level. And the ejections could not have been smoke from the fires since, according to the NIST report on WTC7, the fires never reached that level of the building and the sprinklers were working on the upper floors.<sup>35</sup> Also, the smoke from the lower floors could not have reached that level of the building, according to the FEMA report.<sup>36</sup>

Roberts also makes issue of the east penthouse collapsing into WTC7, not realizing that the collapse of the penthouse is problematic enough on

---

<sup>33</sup> David Chandler, "WTC 7: Sound Evidence for Explosions," 5 July 2010, at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ERhoNYj9\\_fg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ERhoNYj9_fg).

<sup>34</sup> See "(Unseen Footage) Tower 7 blasted into rubble from NEW angle!," at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=972ETepp4GI>.

<sup>35</sup> "The fires were ignited on at least ten floors; however, only the fires on Floors 7 through 9 and 11 through 13 grew and lasted until the time of the building collapse." Quoted from: NIST NCSTAR 1A, p. xxxvi, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/final-report-collapse-world-trade-center-building-7-federal-building-and-fire-safety-0>. "[T]he sprinklers and standpipes on the building's middle levels (21st floor through 39th floor) and upper levels (40th floor through 47th floor) received water from two large overhead storage tanks on the 46th floor, and used the city's water mains as a backup." Quoted from: "FAQs - NIST WTC 7 Investigation," question 23, last updated 20 November 2019, at <https://www.nist.gov/topics/disaster-failure-studies/faqs-nist-wtc-7-investigation>.

<sup>36</sup> "Concrete floor slabs provided vertical compartmentalization to limit fire and smoke spread between floors." Quoted from: FEMA Report, Chapter 5, p. 11, at [https://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403\\_ch5.pdf](https://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_ch5.pdf).

its own.<sup>37</sup> By simply selecting these few issues concerning WTC7, Roberts conveniently ignores several other characteristics of the building's collapse that point to demolition, including:

- The collapse started from the bottom.
- The onset of the collapse was sudden.
- The collapse was total.
- The building fell in a near-symmetrical fashion.
- Its acceleration approximated that of a free-falling object.
- The debris from the building ended up in a fairly small pile almost entirely within its footprint.

These are all standard features of a demolition that Roberts makes no mention of.

- 22:48 FDNY Chief Daniel Nigro on conspiracist claims

This next part of Roberts' video is simply a statement from Chief Daniel Nigro concerning his thoughts on conspiracy theories. This merely a person's opinion, and addresses none of the scientific evidence which points to demolition.

- 23:00 Collapse of WTC 7 expected by all. On-scene account by FDNY firefighter Miller of Ladder 15, says building leaning, no way to fight fires, pull back from WTC 7

At this point, Roberts chooses to address the issue of the foreknowledge of WTC7's collapse. He asserts that because the firefighters expected the building to collapse, the collapse was not unusual. However, Dr. Graeme MacQueen has demonstrated that the foreknowledge of the buildings collapse is extremely suspicious.<sup>38</sup> Also, any structural damage Building 7 might have sustained is irrelevant, as NIST claims that the fires alone

---

<sup>37</sup> "Clarifying the Collapse Time of WTC 7," *911 Blogger*, 6 September 2008, at <http://911blogger.com/node/17563>.

<sup>38</sup> Graeme MacQueen, "Waiting for Seven: WTC 7 Collapse Warnings in the FDNY Oral Histories," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 11 January 2008, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200701/MacQueenWaitingforSeven.pdf>.

brought the building down and that it would have collapsed even with no damage.<sup>39</sup>

- 25:08 Brent Blanchard of Protec, who spoke with demolitions experts on the scene and documented the clean-up process, on conspiracist claims

Roberts then features a statement by Protec employee Brent Blanchard. Several of Blanchard's claims about the collapse of the WTC have long been refuted by Jim Hoffman.<sup>40</sup>

- 25:45 WTC 7 structural engineer Irwin Cantor on conspiracist claims

At this point of Roberts' video, he shows a statement from Irwin Cantor, WTC7's structural engineer. It's important to note that Cantor makes no mention of "conspiracist claims." Others have studied NIST's claims about what caused the collapse and have found numerous problems.<sup>41</sup>

- 26:00 New WTC 7: safety and structural features

---

<sup>39</sup> "FAQs - NIST WTC 7 Investigation," questions 21 and 22.

<sup>40</sup> Jim Hoffman, "Reply to Protec's A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE COLLAPSE OF WTC TOWERS 1, 2 & 7 FROM AN EXPLOSIVES AND CONVENTIONAL DEMOLITION INDUSTRY VIEWPOINT," *911 Research* (n.d.), at <http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/blanchard/index.html>.

<sup>41</sup> E.g., Kevin Ryan, "The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science reaches its peak," *911 Review*, 10 September 2008, at [http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST\\_WTC7.html](http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST_WTC7.html); F. R. Greening, "Comments on the Draft Report NIST NCSTAR 1-9: 'Structural Fire Response and Probable Collapse Sequence of World Trade Center Building 7'," issued by NIST August 21st, 2008," 11 September 2008, at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/greeningcommentnstar1-9.pdf>; Ronald Brookman, "The NIST Analyses: A Close Look at WTC 7," *AE911Truth*, March 2010, at [https://www.ae911truth.org/images/The\\_NIST\\_Analyses\\_-\\_A\\_Close\\_Look\\_at\\_WTC\\_7.pdf](https://www.ae911truth.org/images/The_NIST_Analyses_-_A_Close_Look_at_WTC_7.pdf); Chris Sarns, "Fraud Exposed in NIST WTC 7 Reports," *AE911Truth*, 14 December 2016, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/317-fraud-exposed-in-nist-wtc-7-reports-series>.

Roberts then shows us a video about how the new WTC7 is being constructed. Regardless of whatever upgrades were given to the new WTC7, no building like the original WTC7 had ever collapsed from fire.<sup>42</sup>

- 27:47 “Architect for 9/11 truth” Richard Gage gives presentation including audio deception

The video proceeds to criticize Richard Gage for using a video of a demolition with no audio. Again, we have already covered that the sound issue is explainable. If this is greatest flaw Roberts can find in Gage’s presentation, then he’s a long way away from debunking anyone.

- 28:36 AE911Truth and STJ911truth member and mechanical engineer Tony Szamboti claims Silverstein said WTC 7 was brought down for safety reasons, and claims the towers showed upward explosions

Roberts then goes on to criticize Tony Szamboti for his claims about Larry Silverstein and the ejections of debris from the Towers. While there does appear to be no upward ejections from the Towers, there are outward and even downward ejections that are clearly smoking guns.<sup>43</sup> As for Silverstein, I have never seen the program Szamboti is referring to, but we now have conformation that Silverstein did discuss demolishing Building 7 on 9/11.<sup>44</sup> Roberts addresses none of Szamboti’s scholarly technical essays on the collapse of the Towers,<sup>45</sup> and decides to simply attack some of his lesser claims.

---

<sup>42</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “Other Skyscraper Fires,” *911 Research*, last updated 20 March 2013, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/compare/fires.html>. See also pp. 197-208 of this present work.

<sup>43</sup> John-Michael Talboo, “Intellectual Rigor Mortis Sets In Early for ‘Debunkers’ in 2011,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 2 January 2011, at [911debunkers.blogspot.com/2011/01/intellectual-rigor-mortis-sets-in-early.html](http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2011/01/intellectual-rigor-mortis-sets-in-early.html).

<sup>44</sup> John-Michael P. Talboo and ScootleRoyale, “Possible Confirmation of ‘Pull It’ - In A Hitpiece!,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 22 April 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/04/possible-confirmation-of-pull-it-in.html>.

<sup>45</sup> See for example: Tony Szamboti, “The Sustainability of the Controlled Demolition Hypothesis for the destruction of the Twin Towers,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 17 February 2008, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/SzambotiSustainabilityofControlledDemolitionHypothesisForDestructionofTwinTowers.pdf>.

- 29:49 Leading conspiracists claim pyroclastic flows resulted from use of mysterious explosives.

Roberts next criticizes members of the Truth Movement for claiming the huge dust clouds from the collapse of the Towers were “pyroclastic flows.” Again, here is an instance where I agree with Roberts. The dust clouds were clearly not pyroclastic flows, but they were extremely reminiscent of the types of dust clouds produced by controlled demolitions. As David Ray Griffin points out in his book *Debunking 9/11 Debunking*:

This is a common feature of collapses produced by explosives, as can be seen in videos of controlled demolitions of structures such as Seattle’s Kingdome and the Reading Grain Facility, which are available on the Web. The dust clouds produced at the Twin Towers differ only by being much bigger, which is what could have been predicted, given the fact that these buildings were much larger, so they would have required more powerful, and a greater number of, explosives.<sup>46</sup>

It would perhaps be more accurate to call the dust clouds “hot density currents,” a label which has sufficient evidence in support and is still indicative of demolition.<sup>47</sup> Furthermore, several members of the movement have only referred to the clouds as “pyroclastic-like,” including Richard Gage on his updated AE911Truth website.

- 32:49 Was all or most of the WTC tower concrete turned to a fine powder?

Roberts goes on to address one of the more controversial issues about the collapse of the WTC: the pulverization of the concrete. Admittedly, the pulverization of the concrete has been exaggerated by members of the movement. However, although the concrete was not completely

---

<sup>46</sup> David Ray Griffin, *Debunking 9/11 Debunking: An Answer to Popular Mechanics and Other Defenders of the Official Conspiracy Theory* (Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press, 2007), p. 188.

<sup>47</sup> See the webpage “The Destruction Of Each World Trade Center Tower Generated A Hot Density Current,” archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20151129153818/http://911encyclopedia.com/wiki/index.php/The\\_Destruction\\_Of\\_Each\\_World\\_Trade\\_Center\\_Tower\\_Generated\\_A\\_Hot\\_Density\\_Current](https://web.archive.org/web/20151129153818/http://911encyclopedia.com/wiki/index.php/The_Destruction_Of_Each_World_Trade_Center_Tower_Generated_A_Hot_Density_Current).

pulverized, the concrete at Ground Zero appears to be very similar to concrete after a controlled demolition.<sup>48</sup>

- 34:55 Conspiracists claim tons of explosives – or a sci-fi mystery weapon was used. Video of 100-ton TNT blast

Roberts then takes issue with the fact that the types of explosives Dr. Jones and others have suggested were used would not have pulverized the concrete anyway. However, this is not necessarily true. Given the moisture content of concrete, heating it to a high enough temperature would cause explosive spalling. If large quantities of aluminothermics such as thermate and nanothermite were used to destroy structural members, the excess heat could have caused such spalling. As Jim Hoffman observes:

One of the critiques of theories that thermite was used to destroy the World Trade Center skyscrapers asserts that thermite preparations don't have sufficient explosive power to account for the observed features of the buildings' destruction. This criticism seems to be uninformed by knowledge of some of the aluminothermic preparations known to exist – particularly those being researched for military applications.<sup>49</sup>

- 36:02 Steven Jones, David Ray Griffin, and Richard Gage can't make up their minds: explosives, thermate, or super-secret mystery weapons?

Roberts next proceeds to criticize members of the movement for claiming different types of explosives were used in the demolition of the Towers. As Roberts puts it, they “can't make up their minds.” However, Richard Gage has responded to these weak criticisms.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> See further discussion of this in Adam Taylor, “A Response to Chris Mohr's Respectful Rebuttal of Richard Gage's *9/11 Blueprint for Truth*,” pp. 64-71, at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/responsetochrismohr4-1.pdf>.

<sup>49</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “Aluminothermic Technology,” *911 Research*, last updated 8 December 2009, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/theories/thermitetech.html>.

<sup>50</sup> John-Michael Talboo, “Controlled Demolition Not Possible?,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 5 February 2009, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2009/02/controlled-demolition-is-possible.html>.

- 37:51 Tons of TNT equivalent were stored in the towers – gravitational potential energy

Roberts' video then goes into the fact that there was already an enormous amount of energy in the buildings to begin with: gravitational potential energy. He claims that because the Towers fell at less than the rate of free fall, the buildings actually absorbed a huge amount of energy. However, this is the case in any controlled demolition. Buildings brought down with explosives rarely, if ever, fall at the rate of free fall and their collapses clearly absorb a large amount of energy. But according to the official reports, no explosives were used to demolish the Towers, so how did they collapse in time intervals consistent with controlled demolitions?<sup>51</sup>

- 38:27 Mysteriously-expanding dust clouds? Alex Jones accuses, Jim Hoffman investigates.

The next part of Roberts' video deals mainly with Jim Hoffman's calculations about the expansion of the North Tower's dust clouds. He claims that Hoffman did not take air pressure into account in his analysis. While Hoffman has acknowledged that his calculations are not perfect, he did in fact take air into account in his analysis.

Given that the Twin Towers' dust clouds behaved like pyroclastic flows, with distinct boundaries and rapidly expanding frontiers (averaging perhaps 35 feet/second on the ground for the first 30 seconds), it is doubtful that mixing with ambient air accounted for a significant fraction of their volume.<sup>52</sup>

Note that Hoffman claims the clouds only behaved like pyroclastic flows, not that they actually were pyroclastic flows. The idea that the falling debris could have caused the expansion of the clouds seems unlikely, as videos show that most of the debris hit the ground before the dust reached the ground.

- 41:05 So what caused THESE dust clouds?

---

<sup>51</sup> See Chapter 4 of this present work for further discussion of this.

<sup>52</sup> Jim Hoffman, "The North Tower's Dust Cloud," ver. 3.1, *911 Research*, 16 October 2003, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dustvolume/volumev3\\_1.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dustvolume/volumev3_1.html).

Roberts next claims that the expansion of the clouds was not unusual because they happen in other controlled demolitions. Really. His point of course is that explosives are not needed to produce such clouds – that the collapse of a building could cause them. Regardless, as we have already seen, this characteristic appears to be very consistent with explosive demolition, and warrants further investigation.

- 43:05 Conspiracist papers published in engineering journals

This small section of Roberts' video simply makes fun of the Truth Movement for not having any papers published in any science journals. However, the Truth Movement now currently has nearly a dozen such papers published in peer-reviewed journals, with several being published in engineering journals, including the *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*.<sup>53</sup>

- 43:26 The conspiracists' best and brightest run from a tour guide

At this point, Roberts simply makes fun of the fact that members of the movement have not debated him. First of all, Richard Gage has debated Roberts.<sup>54</sup> But perhaps the reason that many in the movement aren't debating with Mr. Roberts is because they've been busy debating with actual scientists.<sup>55</sup>

- 44:34 AE911truth & STJ911truth website statistics graphed

Here Roberts ridicules AE911Truth and STJ911Truth for their low statistics online. This clearly is in no way representative of how many

---

<sup>53</sup> John-Michael Talboo, "Peer-Reviewed 9/11 Truth," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 10 October 2014, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2012/10/peer-reviewed-911-truth.html>.

<sup>54</sup> "Richard Gage, AIA, debates Mark Roberts, Tour Guide: NY TV: 'HardFire,'" *911 Blogger*, 8 July 2008, at <http://911blogger.com/node/16545>.

<sup>55</sup> Shawn Hamilton, "Taming the Beast: A Short History of the AE911Truth Debates," *AE911Truth*, 25 July 2010, at <http://www1.ae911truth.org/en/news/41-articles/319-taming-the-beast-a-short-history-of-the-ae911truth-debates>.

people question the official story of 9/11. Polls show a broad skepticism among Americans of the official story of 9/11.<sup>56</sup>

- 44:55 Structural engineer and WTC investigator Gene Corley on conspiracist methods – or lack thereof.

Roberts then shows a video of Gene Corley claiming that the Truth Movement has no “engineering basis for its conclusions.” Nothing could be further from the truth. There are currently over 3000 architects and engineers from around the world who agree we need a new investigation into the collapse of the three WTC skyscrapers. And, as noted previously, many have published articles in peer-reviewed engineering journal.

- 45:40 Suggestions for study: Bazant, Greening, Mackey, Rogers

The last part of Roberts’ video simply suggests that people read the works of debunkers such as Dr. Bazant, Ryan Mackey, and Dr. Frank Greening, all of whom have been responded to.<sup>57</sup>

As I said at the beginning, Roberts’ video provides nothing more than half-baked arguments and petty insults. His video does nothing to answer the question of why those buildings really collapsed. Ultimately, I would say Roberts wasted his time putting this video back online, and that this misguided tour guide should really try to rethink his position.

---

<sup>56</sup> “Polls show broad skepticism among Americans of official 9/11 narrative,” *911 Blogger*, 5 August 2009, at <http://911blogger.com/news/2009-08-06/polls-show-broad-skepticism-among-americans-official-911-narrative>.

<sup>57</sup> For responses to Dr. Bazant, see note 29. For Ryan Mackey, see Jim Hoffman, “A critique of Ryan Mackey’s essay: ‘On Debunking 9/11 Debunking,’” ver. 0.9, *911 Research*, 18 May 2008, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/mackey/index.html>. For Dr. Greening, see Gordon Ross, “Sorry Dr. Greening et al” (n.d.), at <https://gordonssite.tripod.com/id4.html>; Frank Legge, “Frank Greening versus Isaac Newton,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, May 2009, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2009/FGvsNewton.pdf>; David Chandler, “Greening vs. Chandler and Newton’s Laws,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, June 2009, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2009/ChandlerResponseToGreening.pdf>; Andrea Dreger, “Sources related to exceptionally high temperatures, and/or to persistent heat at Ground Zero,” (n.d.), pp. 113-44, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dreger/GroundZeroHeat2008\\_07\\_10.pdf](http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dreger/GroundZeroHeat2008_07_10.pdf).

## Not so Noble: Debunking Joseph Nobles' Criticisms of AE911Truth

Originally published 28 June 2010 – 2 September 2010 at  
*Debunking the Debunkers*  
 Revisions by Adam Taylor

*The following is a response to the various claims made by Joseph Nobles (also known as boloboffin online) at his website AE911Truth.info. The site is now defunct, but links to archives of the site are provided. Also includes responses to his original responses to this critique. –Adam Taylor*

### Freefall Speed

This is a response to the AE911Truth.Info page titled “Freefall Speed.”<sup>1</sup> Here, I will examine the arguments made by Joseph Nobles and see if they are justifiable.

#### *The Difference Between “Speed” and “Acceleration”*

The first point Mr. Nobles makes is one I happen to agree with. It is clearly more appropriate to say “acceleration” rather than “speed” when discussing the issue of free fall. However, I have often felt that trying to determine if the WTC fell at free fall acceleration is itself somewhat misleading. If we are trying to establish whether or not the buildings were controlled demolitions, then the question really should not be “did the buildings fall at free fall?” The question should be “did the buildings fall in time intervals consistent with controlled demolitions?” That of course raises the question of whether or not buildings destroyed through

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Nobles, “Freefall Speed,” *AE911Truth.info*, 31 May 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20100607075604/http://www.ae911truth.info/tiki-index.php?page=Freefall+Speed>.

controlled demolition fall in free fall. More on this will be discussed below.

### *Rate of Collapses*

Mr. Nobles features this photo to demonstrate how the debris coming off from the Towers is falling faster than the Towers themselves.



While the debris is certainly falling faster than the actual collapse, the wave of destruction appears to be keeping up with the majority of the debris. David Chandler has outlined this characteristic of the collapses very accurately.<sup>2</sup> What's more, the rate of fall for some of the pieces of steel has itself been shown to be a smoking gun.<sup>3</sup> And it has already been established that the total time for the Towers to come down was approximately 15 seconds in either case.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See David Chandler's videos "Race With Gravity," 18 December 2007, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eXSHm3CdHf4>, and "Acceleration + Serendipity," 12 February 2010, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AJf7pWVyvIw>.

<sup>3</sup> See ScootleRoyale, "The beam that fell too fast...", *Debunking the Debunkers*, 27 September 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/09/beam-that-fell-too-fast.html>.

<sup>4</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), "Speed of Fall," *911 Research*, last updated 20 March 2013, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/collapses/freefall.html>.

Mr. Nobles then presents a video to demonstrate that Building 7 actually took close to 16 seconds to collapse.<sup>5</sup> This is an issue that has been addressed several times already,<sup>6</sup> but many debunkers still think the fall of the east penthouse invalidates the idea that WTC 7 was a demolition. Furthermore, Dr. Frank Greening has shown that the fall of the penthouse is problematic enough on its own.<sup>7</sup> And it is not impossible that roof elements can collapse in a demolition before the main structure.<sup>8</sup>

Clearly, the idea of sections of the roof falling in a demolition before the main structure is not unheard of. Oddly, Mr. Nobles refers to the main structure of WTC 7 as a “portion” of the collapse. That makes it sound like it was a very small part of the building that collapsed. The east penthouse could be more accurately described as a “portion.”

### *Measurements of the Fall Rates*

Mr. Nobles attempts to demonstrate that the rate at which the buildings fell has already been well accounted for by several sources. He first cites a statement made in NIST’s FAQ on the WTC, ignoring the fact that nowhere in NIST’s report do they explain the actual total collapse of the buildings. As Jim Hoffman points out:

NIST’s assertion that the Tower’s intact structure was “unable to stop or even to slow the falling mass” is absurd:

- It requires us to believe that the massive steel frames of the towers provided no more resistance to falling rubble than air.
- It ignores the fact that most of the rubble fell outside the towers’ footprints, and hence could not contribute to crushing.

---

<sup>5</sup> Joseph Nobles, “How Fast Did WTC 7 Fall?,” 11 April 2007, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G86yuunRBIw>.

<sup>6</sup> “Clarifying the Collapse Time of WTC 7,” *911 Blogger*, 6 September 2008, at <http://911blogger.com/node/17563>.

<sup>7</sup> Specifically, Dr. Greening has shown that the fall of column 79, which led the fall of the east penthouse, occurred far too quickly to be accounted for by a loss of supports in the building. See F. R. Greening, “Comments on the Draft Report NIST NCSTAR 1-9: ‘*Structural Fire Response and Probable Collapse Sequence of World Trade Center Building 7*’, issued by NIST August 21st, 2008,” 11 September 2008, p. 6, at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/greeningcommentsncstar1-9.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> See one such example at <https://www.dailymotion.com/video/xdutk5>.

- It is unsupported by any calculation or logical argument.<sup>9</sup>

Mr. Nobles then cites the work of Dr. Bazant *et al.* He refers to Bazant's work as providing "more rigorous calculations," and that his papers have been published in "respected scientific journals." However, several refutations to Bazant's work have been written over the years.<sup>10</sup> As of writing this, three of these refutations have even been peer reviewed and published in the same journal Bazant's papers have been published in.<sup>11</sup>

Although Mr. Nobles portrays NIST and Bazant as having explained that "the acceleration of their descent was not mathematically unusual," there are phenomenon in the collapses of both buildings that neither NIST nor Bazant account for. One of which is the instant acceleration of the

---

<sup>9</sup> Jim Hoffman, "NIST's World Trade Center FAQ," *911 Research* (2006), at [http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/nist/WTC\\_FAQ\\_reply.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/nist/WTC_FAQ_reply.html).

<sup>10</sup> E.g., Graeme MacQueen and Tony Szamboti, "The Missing Jolt: A Simple Refutation of the NIST-Bazant Collapse Hypothesis," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 22 April 2009, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2008/TheMissingJolt7.pdf>; Gregory Szuladziński *et al.*, "Some Misunderstandings Related to WTC Collapse Analysis," *Int. J. of Protective Structures*, June 2013, at <https://911speakout.org/wp-content/uploads/Some-Misunderstandings-Related-to-WTC-Collapses-e-Analysis.pdf>; Tony Szamboti and Richard Johns, "ASCE Journals refuse to correct fraudulent paper they published on WTC collapses," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 3 September 2014, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/resources/2014SepLetterSzambotiJohns.pdf>; Ansgar Schneider, "The Structural Dynamics of the World Trade Center Catastrophe," *IABSE Congress*, September 2019, at <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1910/1910.10801.pdf>.


<sup>11</sup> James Gourley, "Discussion of 'Mechanics of Progressive Collapse: Learning from World Trade Center and Building Demolitions' by Zdenek P. Bazant and Mathieu Verdure," *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, March 2007, at <http://www.civil.northwestern.edu/people/bazant/PDFs/Papers/D25%20WTC%20Discussions%20Replies.pdf> (see also <http://911blogger.com/node/18196>); Anders Björkman, "Discussion of 'What did and did not Cause Collapse of WTC Twin Towers in New York' by Bazant, Le, Greening and Benson," *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, October 2008, at <https://heiwaco.tripod.com/JEMdiscussion.pdf> (see also <https://web.archive.org/web/20100901183724/https://heiwaco.tripod.com/blgbclose.htm>); Crockett Grabbe, "Discussion of 'Why the Observed Motion History of World Trade Center Towers is Smooth,' by Jia-Liang Le and Z.P. Bazant," *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, January 2011, at <http://www.sealane.org/writings/Bazantrpy.html> (see also <http://www.sealane.org/blog/Bazantegg.shtml>).

upper section of WTC 1.<sup>12</sup> Debunkers have yet to provide any rational explanation for this event.<sup>13</sup>

Another phenomenon is the disintegration of the upper section of WTC 2 as it collapsed. As pointed out at the site 911 Research:

It is clear that that the top section itself must be disintegrating. Otherwise the top section would have extended far into parts of the building that are clearly as yet unaffected by the collapse.<sup>14</sup>

And video evidence confirms this.



---

<sup>12</sup> David Chandler, “Destruction of the World Trade Center North Tower and Fundamental Physics,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, February 2010, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2010/ChandlerDownwardAccelerationOfWTC1.pdf>.


<sup>13</sup> Specifically, debunkers have argued that the initial tilt of the upper section of WTC 1 can explain the lack of deceleration. However, it has been shown that the initial fall of the Tower’s upper section was not tilted to the degree as claimed by NIST. See Adam Taylor, “Distorted Tilt Confirmed,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 23 June 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/06/distorted-tilt-confirmed.html>. See also the following analysis: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oTuvo4b4E9Y>.

<sup>14</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “South Tower Collapse Video Frames,” *911 Research*, last updated 21 June 2009, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/videos/stc\\_frames.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/videos/stc_frames.html).

Mr. Nobles makes some mention of the fact that portions of the cores of both Towers remained standing after the collapses. However, analyses show that the core of the South Tower lacked the 24 outer core columns, indicative of a demolition scheme.<sup>15</sup> Despite Mr. Nobles' claims to the contrary, the rate at which the Towers fell is greatly at issue.

### *The Fall of WTC 7*

Mr. Nobles lastly attempts to refute many arguments made about the collapse of WTC 7. Mr. Nobles believes that the main structure of WTC 7 also did not fall in 6.5 seconds. He features this diagram to illustrate this point.



I've never particularly liked using pictures to track the fall of any of the buildings. I feel that the videos speak for themselves, and show that the fall of the building did indeed occur in approximately 6.5 seconds.<sup>16</sup>

Mr. Nobles makes quite a remarkable statement in regard to the collapse of the building.

As shocking as it may be to our inexperience in large buildings falling, this is how quickly buildings of this size fall when they begin to collapse.

---

<sup>15</sup> See Gordon Ross, "How the Towers were Demolished (n.d.), at <https://gordonssite.tripod.com/id2.html>.

<sup>16</sup> See two such videos at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zvJ669fWTRw> and [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j\\_9JpgDCT8Q](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j_9JpgDCT8Q).

Oh really? If that's the case Mr. Nobles, then why do buildings that are known controlled demolitions take as long and even longer to fall than Building 7?<sup>17</sup> Controlled demolition clearly doesn't always cause a building to fall at free fall.

Finally, Mr. Nobles attempts to explain the period of free fall Building 7 underwent in its collapse. And like all other debunkers, he attributes this to the alleged buckling of eight of the lower floors. Yet I have explained in other writings that this buckling cannot account for this.<sup>18</sup>

### *Conclusions*

Mr. Nobles has clearly not explained the collapse anomalies of the Twin Towers and Building 7. Nothing will ever accurately explain what happened to those buildings until a new, proper investigation is finally launched. One thing is for sure though: fire cannot cause a steel framed building to fall at the incredible rate at which the WTC fell.

### **7 Problems With 7 Responses**

Debunker Joseph Nobles has recently made a new version of his site, although it is still very much incomplete. In his latest post he has decided to address the newest site on WTC 7 made by former NASA engineer Dwain Deets.<sup>19</sup> Unlike Pat Curley, who decided to examine only a few of Mr. Deets' points, Mr. Nobles has attempted to address all seven. Guess how many mistakes I found with his response?

#### *One*

*No plane struck the 47-story World Trade Center skyscraper  
(Building 7).*

---

<sup>17</sup> See Chapter 4 of this present work.

<sup>18</sup> Adam Taylor, "Debunking the Debunkers' Free Fall Fallacies," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 6 June 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/06/debunking-debunkers-free-fall-fallacies.html>. See also Adam Taylor, "A Response to Chris Mohr's Respectful Rebuttal of Richard Gage's 9/11 *Blueprint for Truth*," pp. 174-82, at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/responsetochrismohr4-1.pdf>.

<sup>19</sup> Joseph Nobles, "7 Non-Problems with Building 7," *AE911Truth.info*, 23 July 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20100731175753/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/wtc7/7-non-problems-with-building-7>.

His Response:

Who cares? A meteor didn't hit it, either. King Kong didn't use the building to attack Cloverfield. That's not how the building fell down. And while no plane struck the building, debris from the collapsing 110-story WTC 1 did.

It shouldn't have to be pointed out anymore, but since they keep bringing it up... No, according to NIST, the structural damage played no significant role in the collapse of WTC 7, only the fires.<sup>20</sup> Even so, the damage has been shown to be less severe than previously thought.<sup>21</sup> I'm sure Mr. Nobles is well aware that the official story is that fire alone brought the building down, but its' still misleading to try to use the damage as a viable excuse.

*Two*

*No evidence of fires in Building 7 for the first 100 minutes after being struck by debris from Tower 1. (Yet fire from the debris is the official explanation for building collapse.)*

His response:

And then there was plenty of evidence of fires for the next 321 minutes the building burned.

I agree on this to an extent, but the question is if the fires were severe enough to cause collapse in the first place. And truthers and debunkers have said NIST is simply wrong on their temperature calculations.

[R]aising those five floor beams to a temperature of 600°C would require an enormous amount of energy, far more than was available from the burning of the office furnishings underneath the floor beams. –Kevin Ryan<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 618, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/structural-fire-response-and-probable-collapse-sequence-world-trade-center-building-7>.

<sup>21</sup> Adam Taylor, "25% Scooped Out?... I THINK NOT!," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 15 March 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/03/25-scooped-out-i-think-not.html>.

<sup>22</sup> Kevin Ryan, "The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science reaches its peak," *911 Review*, 10 September 2008, at [http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST\\_WTC7.html](http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST_WTC7.html).

NIST's collapse initiation hypothesis requires that structural steel temperatures on floors 12/13 significantly exceeded 300°C [570°F] – a condition that could never have been realized with NIST's postulated 32 kg/m<sup>2</sup> fuel loading. –Dr. Frank Greening<sup>23</sup>

Mr. Nobles closes this argument with the following: “If Mr. Deets has an alternative hypothesis for the sources of these fires, he has yet to posit it.” Mr. Nobles, if you have better evidence than NIST that the fires were severe enough to cause the building to collapse, you have yet to posit it. He also mentions Barry Jennings’ testimony about explosions in this part too, and falsely states that he and Michael Hess got out of the building at 12:10 to 12:15. In fact, it’s been determined the interview they were rescued before 11:57am.<sup>24</sup> The evidence is quite definitive that the explosion that trapped them occurred before the North Tower collapsed.<sup>25</sup>

### *Three*

*A free-fall drop of 2.25 sec. is finally officially acknowledged. NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) lead investigator explained months earlier that, had there been free fall, there would have been no structural components below.*

His response:

Yes, and this period of free fall acceleration confirmed the computer modeling already performed by NIST. The building had lost structural integrity over eight floors at that point of the collapse.

I have already responded to this. The buckling over eight floors cannot account for the period of free-fall.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Greening, “Comments on the Draft Report NIST NCSTAR 1-9,” p. 5.

<sup>24</sup> David Ray Griffin, “Michael Hess, Barry Jennings: The 9/11 Interview with Evidence that NIST Lied about When Michael Hess and Barry Jennings Were Rescued,” *WanttoKnow.info* (n.d.) at [http://www.wanttoknow.info/008/hess\\_jenningswtc7explosiontvbroadcast](http://www.wanttoknow.info/008/hess_jenningswtc7explosiontvbroadcast).

<sup>25</sup> See pp. 75-80 of this present work.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 186, cf. n18.

#### *Four*

*Mainstream media quickly transitioned coverage of the building collapse to a “feel good” spin, focusing on the building being vacant when it came down. Dan Rather and Peter Jennings were more candid with their immediate comments, relating it to the familiar demolition of buildings we all well know.*

His response:

So? Isn't it a good thing no one was in the building when it collapsed, Mr. Deets?

Um... I don't think he was suggesting there was something wrong with no people in the building. His point is that the building appeared to be a demolition to several people on the day itself.

#### *Five*

*No mention of the collapse of Building 7 in The 9/11 Commission Report.*

His response:

There's plenty of mention of the collapse of Building 7 in the NIST Final Report on the Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7. That's the actual scientific paper coming from the government on this matter. Furthermore, the 9/11 Commission Report was about how the attacks took place and the official response to these attacks. Building 7 fell seven hours after WTC 1. Why should the 9/11 Commission Report have mentioned this event? So again, who cares?

Quite a lot of people care about this and other related issues Mr. Nobles.<sup>27</sup> The Commission Report was not an engineering report, but they didn't know that fire was the official explanation for its collapse yet. Again, it goes back to assuming that fire brought the building down, which fire had never done before.

---

<sup>27</sup> “Polls show broad skepticism among Americans of official 9/11 narrative,” *911 Blogger*, 5 August 2009, at <http://911blogger.com/news/2009-08-06/polls-show-broad-skepticism-among-americans-official-911-narrative>.

### Six

*The New York Times* characterized as “perhaps the deepest mystery in the investigation,” a FEMA-report appendix about a steel specimen recovered from Building 7, rather like Swiss cheese, a product of extraordinarily high temperatures.

His response:

And that mystery has been solved. The specimen is currently at the Worcester Polytechnic Institute. The scientists there have examined the specimen. Its corrosion is due to a eutectic mixture. As the Wikipedia article makes clear, when you hear the term “eutectic” you begin to think “lower temperatures than normal for physical changes,” because that’s what eutectic systems do.

No, this mystery has not been solved, because experiments done to test whether sulfur-bearing debris at Ground Zero could cause this effect have failed to do so.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, chemical engineer Jerry Lobdill has explained how a thermate mixture could account for the temperatures observed in the steel, based on the amount of sulfur used in the mixture.<sup>29</sup>

### Seven

*No mention in the NIST Building 7 Final Report of this mysterious steel specimen.*

His response:

There was no way to ascertain where in the building the piece had come from, if it had come from Building 7 at all. NIST had all the specifications for the steel that was used in building WTC 7, and used that extensive documentation to calibrate its computer modeling. Others have studied the actual piece and are on record as saying the damage suffered by this piece was not a factor in the fall of the building.

---

<sup>28</sup> Jon Cole, “9/11 Experiments: The Mysterious ‘eutectic steel,’” *911 Blogger*, 13 July 2010, at <http://911blogger.com/news/2010-07-13/911-experiments-mysterious-eutectic-steel>.

<sup>29</sup> Jerry Lobdill, “Some Physical Chemistry Aspects of Thermite, Thermate, IronAluminum-Rich Microspheres, the Eutectic, and the Iron-Sulfur System as Applied to the Demise of Three World Trade Center Buildings on 9/11/2001,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 15 June 2007, pp. 6-7, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/JLobdillThermiteChemistryWTC.pdf>.

Actually, it was confirmed that the steel came from Building 7, because Jonathan Barnett pointed out that “They didn’t use this particular type of steel in Towers 1 or Towers 2, so that’s why we know its pedigree.”<sup>30</sup> Who the “others” are that studied this steel is unclear, especially since NIST completely failed to address this in their Building 7 report. This was despite the fact that according to the FEMA report, “A detailed study into the mechanisms of this phenomenon is needed,” as they suggested it was “possible that the phenomenon started prior to collapse and accelerated the weakening of the steel structure.”<sup>31</sup>

Mr. Nobles closes with the following:

Mr. Deets would do best to find another hobby for his retirement years.

Mr. Nobles would do best to find something better to do than try to outwit a NASA engineer.

### **Response #1**

Mr. Nobles decided to address a few points I raised here.<sup>32</sup>

AdamT from the website Debunking the 9/11 Debunkers addressed my post on Deet’s website and wrote a nice post about it. Well, what he didn’t skip over, that is. It would be nice if he looked at the actual words I used and tried to deal with them.

It would also be nice if Mr. Nobles elaborated a little. I’m all ears to whatever points I may have gotten wrong, but I’m not a mind reader Mr. Nobles. As we’ll see, the only one of my points he addresses is one he acknowledges *I got right*. But anyway, he’s apparently grateful for the attention.

---

<sup>30</sup> Quoted from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vZbMfTtHkYM&t=2875s>.

<sup>31</sup> FEMA WTC Report, Appendix C: Limited Metallurgical Examination, p. 13, at [https://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403\\_apc.pdf](https://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_apc.pdf).


<sup>32</sup> Joseph Nobles, “Michael Hess Interview Discovered!,” *AE911Truth.info*, 30 July 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20100819124833/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/wtc7/michael-hess-interview-discovered>.

Anyway, I'm grateful for the attention because I was able to track down an interview with Michael Hess following his rescue from Building 7 [...]

As David Ray Griffin points out in his August 2009 revision [sic] began at 11:57, so my citation of the NIST 12:10-12:15 rescue time for Hess and Barry Jennings couldn't be right. So, mea culpa!

However, the time is not that far off, and the interview certainly isn't the death blow to the official timeline it's imagined to be. The interview is "off Broadway by City Hall." The general area is three blocks or so from Building 7. And Hess says that the fire department "just came and got us out." His inflection is clear. He's talking about having been rescued not long before the interview. An hour and a half before noon is about 10:30, which is consistent with the "explosion" being the WTC 1 debris hitting the building.

I personally don't think Hess's "inflection is clear," but I do know that there are still flaws in the official timeline. First off, the interview occurred "off Broadway *by City Hall*." While Broadway itself is fairly close to Building 7, City Hall is quite a bit farther.



Also, Hess's estimation that they were trapped for "about an hour and a half" may have been somewhat conservative, as Barry Jennings stated in his Loose Ferries interview that he was "trapped in there for several

hours.”<sup>33</sup> In any case, if they were trapped for an hour and a half, then they most likely were trapped since 10:00 AM. That is, if they were trapped for an hour and a half and were rescued at 11:30 AM, this would have given Hess enough time to make his way all the way across town to City Hall to give his interview just before noon. (A more detailed analysis of the timeline is given elsewhere in this work.<sup>34</sup>)

Thanks, AdamT, for keeping me honest!

I’m glad you appreciated my mention of you Mr. Nobles. I will be doing that quite a bit more.

### **Three Big Issues Indeed**

Joseph Nobles of ae911truth.info has put together a critique of what he considers three of AE911Truth’s biggest mistakes, which he calls “The Big Three.” According to him, these are three issues AE911Truth claims that debunkers never address. Here are my thoughts on it.

#### *The Big Three, Part One: Free Fall*<sup>35</sup>

Since I have already responded to these particular arguments, readers are referred to that section for discussion.<sup>36</sup> We will now address his other two points.

---

<sup>33</sup> Quoted from “Barry Jennings Uncut” (min. 4:40), at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9e6rYzcAjog>.

<sup>34</sup> See pp. 75-80 of this present work. See also David Ray Griffin, *The Mysterious Collapse of World Trade Center 7: Why the Final Official Report about 9/11 is Unscientific and False* (Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press, 2010), pp. 84-110.

<sup>35</sup> Joseph Nobles, “The Big Three, Part One: Free Fall,” *AE911Truth.info*, 13 July, 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20100731175743/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/arguments/the-big-three-part-one-free-fall>.

<sup>36</sup> See pp. 180-86 of this present work.

### *The Big Three, Part Two: Collapse Symmetry*<sup>37</sup>

This section deals with the symmetry of the buildings' collapses. Mr. Nobles makes the astounding claim that "there is no actual symmetry observable in the collapses of the three WTC buildings." As we will see, this is simply not true.

He first points out the slight lean that Building 7 exhibited in its collapse. Although this has already been addressed,<sup>38</sup> it is worth noting that slight leans often happen in controlled demolitions.<sup>39</sup> He also claims there was no "east to west" symmetry to Building 7's collapse either, pointing out that the kink is not in the exact center of the building.



---

<sup>37</sup> Joseph Noble, "The Big Three, Part Two: Collapse Symmetry," *AE911Truth.info*, 15 July 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20100731120123/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/twintowers/the-big-three-part-two-collapse-symmetry>.

<sup>38</sup> John-Michael Talboo, "Does New Footage of WTC 7's Collapse Disprove Controlled Demolition Theories?," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 12 November 2008, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2008/11/does-new-footage-of-wtc-7s-collapse.html>.

<sup>39</sup> See one such example at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PTMyzz8vqmQ>.

However, kinks also often occur in controlled demolitions, and are not always in the center.



Sheraton Hotel demolition. Image from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VtmwJvMbvXg>.

The key thing is that the center of Building 7 began to fall before its perimeter, which is a classic characteristic of demolitions.

He next moves on to the Twin Towers. He claims that since both of the upper sections of the Towers initially tilted, their collapses were not symmetrical. This is absurd. Debunkers have often made special points about the tilts of both WTC 1 and WTC 2. While the tops did initially tilt, it is important to note what happens to the bottom sections of the buildings. As soon as the collapses begin, all four sides of the lower sections of the Towers are wiped out symmetrically in a top-down fashion. The tilts therefore create a problem for the official story. The collapses started out asymmetric, but what followed was a top-down symmetrical collapse of the lower structures. In other words, the collapses became more symmetrical as they progressed. A natural collapse would have become less symmetric as it progressed. To claim that no symmetry was observable in the collapses of these three buildings is simply nonsensical.

### *The Big Three, Part Three: Total Destruction*<sup>40</sup>

In his third part, he claims that the destruction of the three WTC buildings was not total. He starts out by trying to say that Zdenek Bazant's papers have not been refuted, and that Bazant himself has refuted the peer reviewed responses to his work, specifically those produced by James Gourley and Anders Bjorkman. Bjorkman has responded to Bazant's reply,<sup>41</sup> and Gourley has documented how the *Journal of Engineering Mechanics* apparently showed favoritism towards Bazant, preventing him from properly responding.<sup>42</sup> Also, as of writing this, several more refutations of Bazant's work have been produced, some in peer-reviewed journals.<sup>43</sup>

In any case, the three points Mr. Nobles makes in regard to the destruction of the buildings are:

1. Large sections of the Twin Tower's core structures were left standing after the main portions collapsed (before they themselves collapsed).
2. Sections of perimeter columns were still standing above the rubble for several floors.
3. The majority of WTC 7's still-assembled northern façade was draped over the rest of its debris pile.

(1) While parts of the cores of both Towers remained standing, analyses show that only the 23 outer columns were present. The 24 outer core columns were missing which, as explained by Gordon Ross, indicates a specific process of demolition had taken place.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Joseph Nobles, "The Big Three, Part Three: Total Destruction," *AE911Truth.info*, 31 July 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20100819124823/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/arguments/the-big-three-part-three-total-destruction>.

<sup>41</sup> See Anders Bjorkman, "Closure to 'What did and did not cause Collapse of WTC Twin Towers in New York on 9/11' and final Comments," *Heiwa, Co.* (n.d.), at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210605002537/https://heiwaco.tripod.com/blgbclose.htm>.

<sup>42</sup> "James Gourley Published in 'The Journal of Engineering Mechanics,'" *911 Blogger*, 19 October 2008, at <http://911blogger.com/node/18196>.

<sup>43</sup> See p. 183 nn10, 11 of this present work.

<sup>44</sup> See "Gordon Ross investigation into WTC collapse," at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RZjOMkieVaw>.

(2) I'm not sure why he considers the sections of perimeter columns standing are worth using as proof the collapses were not total. These sections would have made up something like maybe 5% of each of the Towers, so it seems hardly significant.

(3) The fact that part of Building 7's facade was still assembled to an extent is a small detail in light of the fact that all of the building's structural supports were totally destroyed in the collapse.

Regardless, Mr. Nobles concludes that the buildings "were not totally totally [sic] destroyed." I would agree with this somewhat. However, the buildings and their structural supports were almost totally destroyed, which is an occurrence that rarely occurs outside of controlled demolition.

Ultimately, the points Mr. Nobles has raised here do not disprove the notion that the buildings were demolished. Everything he's cited can occur in other demolitions, so it is misleading to suggest that the observed characteristics of the collapses are not consistent with demolition.

### **Other Buildings**

Mr. Nobles' latest addition to his website is a page attempting to show how other skyscraper fires are not comparable to the Twin Towers and Building 7.<sup>45</sup> He focuses on the skyscraper fires featured in the AE911Truth power point.<sup>46</sup> Because Mr. Nobles uses similar arguments for more than one of the listed buildings, here I will list an argument, state which buildings it applies to, followed by my response.

**A quick note:** I will be citing NIST several times in this response to refute many of Mr. Nobles' arguments. Some may criticize this, saying things like "but if you disagree with NIST, why do you cite them?" I cite them because there are parts of their investigation that do seem to be backed up by empirical data and common sense. And this is supposed to be the official explanation for what happened to the buildings, so if anyone disagrees with NIST, they should complain to NIST and not me. I will also

---

<sup>45</sup> Joseph Nobles, "Other Buildings," *AE911Truth.info* (n.d.), archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20101207191420/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/ae911truths-case/other-issues/other-buildings>.

<sup>46</sup> AE911Truth online slide show presentations, available at [http://www2.ae911truth.org/ppt\\_web/ppt\\_selection.php](http://www2.ae911truth.org/ppt_web/ppt_selection.php).

be pointing out several things that NIST gets wrong. But if anyone thinks they're right, then explain how.

- *No structural damage*: East Tower, First Interstate Bank, One Meridian Plaza, Mandarin Oriental

**Response:** This detail can be seen as least significant, as NIST mostly blames the collapse of the Twin Towers on fire, and entirely blames the collapse of WTC 7 on that.<sup>47</sup> Although it can be argued that the plane impacts greatly damaged the buildings, NIST seems to have exaggerated the amount of damage the buildings actually took.<sup>48</sup> And given the fact that the initial tilts of both Towers were not in the direction of where most of the structural damage was, the loads the buildings had to take as they collapsed would not have been a major factor.

- *Lower floors were not on fire*: East Tower, One Meridian Plaza, One New York Plaza

**Response:** This argument obviously applies more to Building 7 than the Twin Towers, as the fires were on the upper floors of Towers. While there were fires on the lower floors of WTC 7, the question is if these fires were severe enough to cause collapse in the first place. More on this will be discussed below.

- *Fires were fought by firefighters and/or sprinklers*: East Tower, First Interstate Bank, One Meridian Plaza, One New York Plaza, Mandarin Oriental

**Response:** To some, the severity of the fires has been based on how much they were being fought. This, however, did not appear to be an important

---

<sup>47</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 618.

<sup>48</sup> See Jim Hoffman, ““Building a Better Mirage: NIST’s 3-Year \$20,000,000 Cover-Up of the Crime of the Century,” *9/11 Research*, 8 December 2005, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/nist/index.html> (Section “Altering Flight 175’s Path), and Eric Douglas, “The NIST WTC Investigation – How Real Was The Simulation?,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, December 2006, pp. 9-11, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200612/NIST-WTC-Investigation.pdf>.

factor to NIST. NIST, in reference to the First Interstate Bank Building, One Meridian Plaza, One New York Plaza, and WTC 5, stated that:

[I]n each of the other referenced buildings, the fires burned out several floors, even with available water and firefighting activities (except for WTC 5). Thus, whether the fire fighters fought the WTC 7 fires or not is not a meaningful point of dissimilarity from the other cited fires.<sup>49</sup>

Many debunkers have suggested that the partial collapse of WTC 5 supports the idea that fire could have brought down Building 7. In fact, if anything, it does just the opposite.<sup>50</sup> They also point to the firefighters' testimony regarding severe fires and damage to WTC 7. This issue has also been addressed thoroughly.<sup>51</sup>

- *Fire was always in "one place"*: East Tower, First Interstate Bank, One Meridian Plaza, One New York Plaza

**Response:** Again, NIST doesn't seem to feel the floor locations of the fires were a huge point of dissimilarity to fires in other buildings, stating that:

The differences in the fires were not meaningful for the following reasons. By the time that WTC 7 collapsed, the fires in WTC 7 had advanced well beyond the likely points of origin on multiple floors (i.e., south and west faces) and originating points of fire origin had no bearing on the fire conditions when the building collapsed (i.e., in the northeast quadrant).<sup>52</sup>

It is often claimed by debunkers that these photos show Building 7 was almost totally engulfed with fire.

---

<sup>49</sup> "Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation," 19 September 2011 (last updated 20 November 2019), question 9, at <https://www.nist.gov/topics/disaster-failure-studies/faqs-nist-wtc-7-investigation>.

<sup>50</sup> See pp. 16-19 of this present work.

<sup>51</sup> Graeme MacQueen, "Waiting for Seven: WTC 7 Collapse Warnings in the FDNY Oral Histories," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 11 January 2008, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200701/MacQueenWaitingforSeven.pdf>.

<sup>52</sup> "Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation," question 9.



But as others have pointed out, the large amount of smoke on Building 7's south face was most likely caused by a negative low air pressure, which caused smoke from the burning WTC complex to cling to Building 7. Multiple photographs show that the same thing happened to WTC 1.



Figure 1-31. This cropped photograph shows the dust cloud created by the collapse of WTC 2 at 9:58:59 a.m. The image was shot from the west at 10:03:56 a.m. WTC 7 can barely be seen above the cloud. The intensity levels of the photograph have been adjusted.

NIST itself acknowledges this phenomenon happened at WTC 7.<sup>53</sup> They also state that there were 10 fires in Building 7, with only 6 of them being out of control.<sup>54</sup> Also, although the Mandarin Oriental did not burn as long as Building 7, the building was completely engulfed in flames, which meant it would have had an extremely low amount of thermal conductivity. Dr. Vytenis Babrauskas, an expert on fire temperatures, has written that:

It is common to find that investigators assume that an object next to a flame of a certain temperature will also be of that same temperature. This is, of course, untrue. If a flame is exchanging heat with an object which was initially at room temperature, it will take a finite amount of time for that object to rise to a temperature which is 'close' to that of the flame. Exactly how long it will take for it to rise to a certain value is the subject for the study of heat transfer. Heat transfer is usually presented to engineering students over several semesters of university classes, so it should be clear that simple rules-of-thumb would not be expected. Here, we will merely point out that the rate at which target objects heat up is largely governed by their thermal conductivity, density, and size. Small, low-density, low-conductivity objects will heat up much faster than massive, heavy-weight ones.<sup>55</sup>

Although steel has somewhat lower heat conductivity than that of other metals, compared to non-metallic materials its conductivity is extremely high. If a fire does not consume the entire structure, the structure will conduct the heat away from the main source of the fire. This would not have applied to the Mandarin Oriental, as its entire structure was almost

---

<sup>53</sup> "Due to the wind direction, it was common for smoke to 'bank up' against the south face [of WTC7]. For this reason, it was usually not possible to differentiate different types of smoke or to identify smoke source locations on the south face." Quoted from NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 196.

<sup>54</sup> "The fires were ignited on at least ten floors; however, only the fires on Floors 7 through 9 and 11 through 13 grew and lasted until the time of the building collapse." Quoted from NIST NCSTAR 1A, p. xxxvi. NIST also lists the number of fire floors in WTC 7 as six in Table 8-1 of NCSTAR 1-9, p. 340.

<sup>55</sup> Vytenis Babrauskas, "Temperatures in flames and fires," *Fire Science and Technology Inc.*, 28 April 1997 (revised 25 February 2006), at <https://doctorfire.com/temperatures-in-flames-and-fires>.

totally engulfed by massive flames. NIST did not even include thermal conductivity as a factor in the collapse of WTC 7.<sup>56</sup>

In any case, NIST accepts that fires in other buildings were, at the very least, just as severe as the fires in WTC 7, stating on their FAQ page that:

There are more similarities than differences between the uncontrolled fires that burned in WTC 7 and those that occurred in the following buildings: First Interstate Bank Building (1988), One Meridian Plaza Building (1981), One New York Plaza (1970), and WTC 5 (2001).<sup>57</sup>

And even in their report, they state that:

NIST therefore concluded that the fires in First Interstate Bank and One Meridian Plaza were at least as severe, and probably more severe, than the fires in WTC 7.<sup>58</sup>

Ultimately, while blaming the fires in WTC 7 for the collapse, NIST claims that the significant difference between Building 7 and other high-rises has more to do with the differences in design than the severity of the fires. This is discussed below.

- *Different design and construction:* East Tower, One Meridian Plaza, One New York Plaza, Mandarin Oriental

**Response:** Admittedly, these buildings were designed and built quite differently than the Twin Towers and Building 7. However, this does not necessarily mean they were stronger buildings. In particular, the East Tower and the Mandarin Oriental had the hollowness that the 9/11 Commission deceptively attempted to attribute to the Twin Towers.<sup>59</sup> One

---

<sup>56</sup> See Kevin Ryan, “The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science reaches its peak,” *9/11 Review*, 10 September 2008 (see the section titled “Highly exaggerated temperatures leave beams rigid”), at [http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST\\_WTC7.html](http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST_WTC7.html).

<sup>57</sup> “Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation,” question 9.

<sup>58</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 341.

<sup>59</sup> Although the core of each Tower was in fact an interconnected assembly of 47 steel box columns, the 9/11 Commission wrote the following: “The interior core of the [Twin Towers] was a hollow steel shaft, in which the elevators and stairwells were grouped.” Quoted from *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final*

of the main differences between the Towers and Building 7 and these other buildings is that many of these buildings had a concrete structure. But again, this does not necessarily mean the buildings were better. As 911research.wtc7.net points out:

- Steel is a good conductor and concrete is a poor conductor of heat. Thus in a fire, a steel frame will conduct heat away from the hotspots into the larger structure. As long as the fire does not consume the larger structure, this heat conductivity will keep the temperatures of the frame well below the fire temperatures. The same is not true of steel-reinforced-concrete structures, since concrete is not a good thermal conductor, and the thermal conductivity of the rebar inside the concrete is limited by its small mass and the embedding matrix of concrete.
- Fires can cause spalling of concrete, but not of steel. This is because concrete has a small percentage of latent moisture, which is converted to steam by heat. Thus, a large fire can gradually erode a concrete structure to the point of collapse, whereas a fire can only threaten a steel-framed structure if it elevates steel temperatures to such an extent that it causes failures.<sup>60</sup>

NIST discusses the differences in design of WTC 7 and other building fires. One of the most crucial differences they claimed was the fact that Building 7 had no shear studs. According to NIST, shear studs would have provided lateral restraint to the girders in WTC 7. In discussing the differences between Building 7 and three other buildings – the First Interstate Bank, One Meridian Plaza, and the Cardington Test Building – NIST stated in their draft report that:

Non-composite girders in WTC 7 rather than composite girders (presence or absence of shear studs) in the other three buildings.<sup>61</sup>

At first, this argument seems justifiable. The three buildings listed by NIST all had shear studs and none of them collapsed. Building 7 had no

---

*Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2004), p. 541 n1.

<sup>60</sup> Quoted from Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “The Windsor Building Fire,” *911 Research*, last updated 20 March 2013, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/compare/windsor.html>.

<sup>61</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, Vol. 1, Draft for Public Comment, p. 341, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/structural-fire-response-and-probable-collapse-sequence-world-trade-center-building-7-0>.

shear studs and it did collapse. It sounds like a good correlation. However, in NIST's Final Report, released in November of 2008, this passage was altered. It now states:

Non-composite girders in WTC 7 rather than composite girders (presence or absence of shear studs) in two of the other three buildings.<sup>62</sup>

So, NIST now admits that one of the three listed buildings also did not have shear studs, but it did not collapse. This greatly decreases the credibility of NIST's arguments.

But there are even more problems with NIST's shear stud argument. In 2004 – before NIST had developed a theory around the idea of girder failures – it stated that shear studs did connect girders to the floor slabs. In its 2004 Interim Report on WTC 7, NIST stated:

Most of the beams and girders were made composite with the slabs through the use of shear studs. Typically, the shear studs were 0.75 inches in diameter by 5 inches long, spaced 1 ft to 2 ft on center. Studs were not indicated on the design drawings for many of the core girders.<sup>63</sup>

As this passage points out, many of the core girders in WTC 7 did not have shear studs. But the critical girder NIST claims failed – the one connecting column 44 to column 79 – was not a core girder. Rather, it was in the building's eastern region. Therefore, according to NIST's Interim Report, this girder would have been anchored to the floor slab with shear studs. And because NIST stated that the studs were placed from one to two feet apart, and the girder was 45 feet long, there would have been at least 22 shear studs connecting the girder to the floor. However, NIST rewrote this passage for their Final Report, now stating that:

Most of the beams were made composite with the slabs through the use of shear studs. Typically, the shear studs were 0.75 inches in diameter by 5 inches long, spaced 2 ft on center. Studs were not indicated on the design drawings for the girders.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 341.

<sup>63</sup> NIST Interim Report on WTC 7, pp. 6-7, archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20050512042820/http://wtc.nist.gov/progress\\_report\\_june04/appendix1.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20050512042820/http://wtc.nist.gov/progress_report_june04/appendix1.pdf).

<sup>64</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 15.

It appears, therefore, that NIST, having developed a theory that would seem plausible only if the girders were not connected to the floors with shear studs, simply made those studs vanish. Any significant differences in the design of WTC 7 and other fire engulfed buildings that NIST and Mr. Nobles claim would seem to exist because of NIST's falsifying of data.<sup>65</sup>

### *The Towers And These Buildings*

Mr. Nobles then makes an amazing statement:

Clearly there is no fruitful comparison that Richard Gage can make between these buildings and the WTC buildings.

This statement is quite rich, considering that debunkers have tried to compare the WTC to things like elementary schools and badly constructed toy factories.<sup>66</sup> To debunkers, if it's made of steel and collapses from fire, it's comparable to the WTC. This is complete nonsense. Even if there were some differences in design, if we can't compare the WTC **skyscraper** fires with other **skyscraper** fires, then what can we compare them to?

Mr. Nobles offers three arguments for why the Towers were doomed to fail, reproduced below, followed by my comments.

- **The fires were never fought by any means in either building.** The task of simply arriving at the floors proved to be too much for first responders to accomplish before the towers had fallen

Perhaps, but given the fact that neither of the Towers burned for even two hours, it is questionable how significant this would have been.

- **The fires were started over several floors simultaneously.** Office buildings are designed to resist a slow-moving fire in one location. Fires were started in the WTC Towers simultaneously over several floors and over immense areas of these floors. And the floors, by the way, were the size of city blocks. Pictures show these fires burning entire lengths of the building in places.

---

<sup>65</sup> For more on this issue, see Chris Sarns, "Missing Shear Studs," *AE911Truth*, 28 December 2016, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/fraud-exposed-in-nist-wtc-7-reports-series/319-fraud-exposed-in-nist-wtc-7-reports-part-3>.

<sup>66</sup> See Chapter 1 of this present work (esp. pp. 12, 20).

While this may have been true for the North Tower, the fires in the South Tower appeared to be going out shortly before its collapse.<sup>67</sup> The fires did not even spread to the other side of the South Tower. Furthermore, NIST states the fires in the North Tower did not even reach the side of the building where the fires initiated the collapse until around an hour after the fires started.<sup>68</sup>

- **The fires were ignited with jet fuel as an accelerant.** A large portion of jet fuel was consumed in the initial fireball on impact, but hundreds of gallons were left to help feed the fires in their first few minutes. The pictures you might have seen of weak or non-existent fires in these buildings were taken in the first few moments, when the fireball had robbed the fires of much oxygen. The heat energy remained, however, and as oxygen returned through the immense holes left by the airplanes, the fires found plenty of jet fuel to reignite and start the massive office fires that resulted.

My thoughts on these points:

1. The amount of fuel that actually remained in each building would have fit inside a mid-sized U-Haul truck, or above-ground swimming pool.<sup>69</sup>
2. Again, as we established, very few flames were visible in the minutes before the South Tower's collapse.

---

<sup>67</sup> A fact even NIST seems to acknowledge: "When WTC 2 collapsed at 9:58:59 a.m. the only significant flames pushed out of open windows on the south face came from the fire area to the west of the aircraft impact cavity on the 80th floor. This supports the conclusion, based on visual observation, that this was the only extensive fire burning on this face at the time of the collapse." Quoted from NIST NCSTAR 1-5A, Appendix C, p. 396, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/visual-evidence-damage-estimates-and-timeline-analysis-chapters-9-appendix-c-federal>. See further analysis at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/fires/severity.html>.

<sup>68</sup> "The fires in WTC 2 reached the east side of the building more quickly, within 10 to 20 minutes, than the 50 to 60 minutes it took the fires in WTC 1 to reach the south side." Quoted from NIST NCSTAR 1-6, pp. 322 and 338, at [https://www.nist.gov/publications/structural-fire-response-and-probable-collapse-sequence-world-trade-center-towers-0?pub\\_id=101279](https://www.nist.gov/publications/structural-fire-response-and-probable-collapse-sequence-world-trade-center-towers-0?pub_id=101279).

<sup>69</sup> Anon, "Non-animated Visualization Aids to Assist in Understanding the Demolitions of the World Trade Center Twin Towers," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 27 November 2007, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/e/VisualizationAidsWTCTowers.pdf>.

3. Regardless of how “massive” the fires appeared, NIST has no evidence of high temperatures in either building.<sup>70</sup>

*World Trade Center 7's (Alleged) Unrecognized Design Flaw*

To show that WTC 7 was also doomed to fail, Mr. Nobles refers to a series of computer simulations NIST did of WTC 7.

It's not well known, but NIST did four different runs of their Building 7 computer modeling. One was done, of course, with all the available evidence of damage and fires that could be gleaned from the videos and pictures of the building. The building, of course, fell down.

They then did a second run where all damage data was applied, but a lesser degree of fire damage was. The building did not fall down.

Next was a run where all fire data was applied, but none of the damage was. The building fell down (though in a different manner than the first run).

Finally they did a run where the building was left intact and no fire information was applied. They then removed a small part of Column 79, just between the 11th and 13th floor, and sat back to watch how the building would react.

It fell down. In the words of NIST, this demonstrates that “WTC 7 was prone to classic progressive collapse associated with the local failure of Column 79.” (NCSTAR 1-A, p. 42 (pdf 84))

Perhaps these other five buildings have design flaws of their own. WTC 7's is demonstrated in the NIST modeling.

Of course. When all else fails, use a computer model! NIST's assertion that the failure of column 79 would have led to the total collapse of the whole building isn't backed up by any independent verification. Furthermore, NIST has never released their modeling data, so it's not open to peer review.<sup>71</sup> As I've already shown, NIST has clearly distorted the data in their report. What's more, NIST's data shows that column 79

---

<sup>70</sup> See Anonymous and Franke Legge, “Falsifiability and the NIST WTC Report: A Study in Theoretical Adequacy,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, March 2010, pp. 6-8, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2010/Falsifiability.pdf>.

<sup>71</sup> “NIST Denies Access to WTC7 Data,” *911 Blogger*, 12 July 2010, at <http://911blogger.com/news/2010-07-12/nist-denies-access-wtc-collapse-data>.

collapsed and accelerated at an extremely fast rate within only a fifth of a second, even though it was still supported by more than 30 floors of restraints.<sup>72</sup> This would have been virtually impossible. The only evidence we have that column 79 was an “unrecognized design flaw” comes from NIST. Does that sound credible?

In conclusion, Mr. Nobles believes there is no comparison between the WTC and other building fires. This is ridiculous. When one looks at things in perspective, it becomes obvious that the Twin Towers and Building 7 should never have collapsed because of the fires in them.

## Response #2

Mr. Nobles later addressed my critique of his “Other Buildings” page.<sup>73</sup> Yet again, he doesn’t seem to think I’m addressing all that I should.

AdamT over at Debunking 9/11 Debunkers has written up a nice post about the latest page. Once again, he shows a promising ability to skip over things being said, and thus holds great promise in the 9/11 Truth world. This time he’s done it to NIST as well as myself, so he’s moving on up!

As we will see, Mr. Nobles has a talent for addressing one point out of a huge argument and acting as if it is the central point to the whole argument. Thus, he holds great promise in the debunking community. He apparently thinks I don’t have good reasons to distrust NIST.

Differences in the design of the structural system, says NIST. I’ll bet that’s one of the place [sic] where NIST just can’t be trusted, right, AdamT? Because that seems to point to the unrecognized design flaw they discovered in their modeling.

Well, given that I demonstrated NIST falsified the data in their report about the lack of shear studs in WTC 7 (a point which, by the way, was supposed to be a reason that other steel skyscrapers had not collapsed from fire), and that NIST failed to factor in any thermal conductivity in their models, I’d say I have very good reason to distrust them. Given the fact

---

<sup>72</sup> Greening, “Comments on the Draft Report NIST NCSTAR 1-9,” p. 6.

<sup>73</sup> Joseph Nobles, “Hi, AdamT!,” *AE911Truth.info*, 10 August 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20100819015601/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/shoutout/hi-adamt>.

that NIST obviously didn't factor in these parameters in their models, I'm not surprised their models found a "design flaw" in Building 7. I guess it also doesn't bother Mr. Nobles that NIST's report states that column 79 failed and accelerated at an extremely fast rate in 1/5 of a second, a virtual impossibility. To listen to Mr. Nobles, you'd think I didn't address NIST's report as much as I obviously did.

And he neatly avoided dealing with the ARUP study of the WTC collapses that they conducted before designing a single joint of the Mandarin Oriental building! Yes, a building is designed specifically to avoid the problems with the 9/11 collapses, and lo and behold, it doesn't fall down when it becomes engulfed in flames! How about them apples? Ah, well, to be young again...

I am well aware of the ARUP study.<sup>74</sup> But, as you made clear in your original post Mr. Nobles, it is not impossible for steel buildings to collapse from fire, whatever their construction. But in any case, we are just talking about one building out of several buildings that all had more severe fires than the Twin Towers and Building 7.

Mr. Nobles, you constantly claim I ignore important points. And yet you don't address the points I do bring up in great detail. If you want to just take NIST at their word, then fine. But please try to point out anything that I get wrong, or else this will get quite repetitive.

### **Thermal Conductivity and Corroded Steel**

Joseph Nobles' newest additions to his site – "FEMA Steel"<sup>75</sup> and "Wick The Heat Away"<sup>76</sup> – attempt to address some of the issues of how the steel in the WTC was affected by heat. As we will see, Mr. Nobles' assertions are, once again, either false or misleading.

---

<sup>74</sup> Archived online at [https://web.archive.org/web/20120301210842/https://www.arup.com/\\_assets/\\_download/download582.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20120301210842/https://www.arup.com/_assets/_download/download582.pdf).

<sup>75</sup> Joseph Nobles, "FEMA Steel," *AE911Truth.info* (n.d.), archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20101217194055/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/ae911truths-case/thermite/fema-steel>.

<sup>76</sup> Joseph Nobles, "Wick The Heat Away," *AE911Truth.info*, 13 August 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20100818151911/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/wtc7/wick-the-heat-away>.

### *Wick The Heat Away*

One of the primary faults of NIST's reports on the WTC is that they did not properly include the factor of thermal conductivity in their modeling. Mr. Nobles, however, has a different opinion on this.

Some actually believe that NIST did not include as part of their modeling the thermal conductivity of the various materials in the building's structure. Certainly if you scan for the word "conductivity" in the report, you will hardly ever find it. However, I believe this is because the inclusion of this information is so elemental to the idea of modeling that NIST never thought they would need to mention putting it in specifically.

Right. Because they say nothing about steel conducting and transferring heat throughout the building, obviously it's in the report. He continues:

There are places where conductivity is shown to have occurred in the computer modeling. On page 394 of NCSTAR 1-9 Vol. 2 (pdf 56), the low thermal conductivity of concrete is mentioned as the reason behind a sharp temperature gradient through the thickness of the slab on Floor 7. So the modeling could pick up the concrete slab's resistance to heat through a floor slab, but 9/11 controlled demolition advocates ask us to believe the modeling didn't take steel thermal conductivity into account? That seems unlikely.

Amazing that thermal conductivity would be so important, but at the same time NIST offers no detail about it in their report. They would do it for concrete, but not the steel.

So I would invite anyone who believes the structural steel could have "wicked away" the bulk of heat energy in its thermal response to do this: put numbers to your assertion. The exercise will likely do you good.

Actually, someone already has put numbers to this assertion. Kevin Ryan, in his critique of the NIST report on WTC 7,<sup>77</sup> wrote that:

Structural steel has a thermal conductivity of 46 W/m/K, which means that any heat applied is easily wicked away. But if that value were set to zero, or near zero, any heat applied would allow the temperature to rise dramatically at the point of application.

---

<sup>77</sup> Ryan, "The NIST WTC 7 Report."

Here is what NIST's report on WTC 7 had to say about their fire simulations of WTC 7.

The major fires on floors 7 through 9 and 11 through 13 in WTC 7 were simulated using the Fire Dynamics Simulator (FDS), version 4, in a manner similar to the simulations conducted for WTC 1 and WTC 2 (NIST NCSTAR 1-5F).<sup>78</sup>

And what did NIST say about their fire simulations of the Twin Towers?

"The steel was assumed in the FDS model to be thermally-thin, thus, no thermal conductivity was used." NCSTAR 1-5F, page 20

"The interior walls [including insulated steel columns] were assumed to have the properties of gypsum board [0.5 W/m/K]." NCSTAR 1-5F, page 52

"Although the floor slab actually consisted of a metal deck topped with a concrete slab [...] the thermal properties of the entire floor slab were assumed to be that of concrete [1.0 W/m/K]." NCSTAR 1-5F, page 52

It's apparent that NIST went out of their way to include virtually no thermal conductivity in their modeling. Now let us turn to Mr. Nobles' section on the corroded steel from WTC 7.

### *The Pieces of Steel*

Mr. Nobles presents what he considers to be conclusive proof that the steel was not attacked by thermate.

Appendix C of the FEMA report also excites the curious mind. Here the microstructures of two samples of corroded WTC steel are examined. The first (Sample 1) appears to be from WTC 7, the second from one of the Twin Towers. Both have been attacked by some eutectic solution, causing the severe corrosion seen in the pictures and the intergranular melting seen under the microscope. However, the temperature of the eutectic in both cases was easily determined by the properties of the two pieces of steel. Sample 1's eutectic approached 1,000°C (meaning it did not go over that limit), and Sample 2's stayed within a range of 700-800°C. Both are extremely high temperatures, but since thermite burns far hotter than even this, thermite is conclusively ruled out as a source for this corrosive attack.

---

<sup>78</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 4.

What Mr. Nobles seems to forget is that 1000°C is far hotter than the temperatures NIST claims were in WTC 7. Nowhere in their report do they claim any of the steel in WTC 7 had been heated to 1000°C. Their most extreme claim is that the steel had been heated up to 675°C. And, as we already discussed, NIST has no evidence that any steel in the WTC had been heated up to 700-800°C.

As to why the steel was only heated to 1000°C, I cannot say for sure. But it's important to remember that, although thermate burns at temperatures much hotter than 1000°C, the steel would not necessarily have been heated to the exact temperature of whatever corroded it. For example, the NIST report on WTC 7 claims that the fires in the building were as hot as 2012°F (1100°C), but that the steel only reached temperatures as hot as 1364°F (740°C).<sup>79</sup> It is possible the thermate that melted the piece of steel cooled somewhat as it reacted. But the main point is this: If nothing natural inside the building could have corroded the steel, then something unnatural must have been planted inside the building. This is the subject of the next part of Mr. Nobles' page.

### *Where Did The Sulfur Come From?*

Like other defenders of the official story, Mr. Nobles offers several possible sources for the sulfur found in the WTC 7 steel, including rubbers, plastics, water, and gypsum wallboard. Wallboard has been cited most often by debunkers due to the fact that sulfur-based drywall was the third most used ingredient in the construction of the WTC complex. But as others have pointed out, calcium is also in drywall, and the sulfur and calcium are tightly bound into calcium sulfate.<sup>80</sup> Because the piece of steel was found to be intergranularly melted, it means that the sulfur chemically entered into the steel. But calcium was found nowhere in the steel. Also, because it is calcium sulfate and not pure elemental sulfur, it could not have reacted in such a way that it would actually corrode the steel. Mr. Nobles closes this section with the following:

---

<sup>79</sup> See Table 8-1 of NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 340.

<sup>80</sup> Andrea Dreger, "Sources related to exceptionally high temperatures, and/or to persistent heat at Ground Zero," p. 131, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dreger/GroundZeroHeat2008\\_07\\_10.pdf](http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dreger/GroundZeroHeat2008_07_10.pdf).

Until these common-sense sources of sulfur for the eutectic have been ruled out, there is no need to consider more exotic sources like thermate, especially since the forensic science rules this substance out.

Unfortunately Mr. Nobles, these sources HAVE been ruled out, by experiments carried out by civil engineer Jonathan Cole.<sup>81</sup>

In the last two parts of Mr. Nobles' page on the corroded steel, he acknowledges that the piece actually did come from WTC 7 (something that I, in fact, pointed out to him). But he claims that this piece has no real importance to NIST in their investigation, since a) it could not be determined where in the building it came from, and b) it could not be determined if the attack took place before or after the collapse. With regards to a), since NIST never actually analyzed the piece, it is difficult how to understand how they concluded this. With regards to b), contrary to what Mr. Nobles claims, the investigators did suggest it was "possible that the phenomenon started prior to collapse and accelerated the weakening of the steel structure."<sup>82</sup> This is precisely why they suggested further investigation of it. As such, Mr. Nobles' insistence that "There is no scientific reason, forensic or otherwise, to look beyond the conditions of the debris pile to explain the damage observed" in the steel is utter nonsense.

### Response #3

After posting my debunking of his posts on the thermal conductivity of the WTC steel and the corroded steel samples, Mr. Nobles wrote a response,<sup>83</sup> along with a request to me that I correct myself.<sup>84</sup> I'll be doing some correcting, but not of me.

First up, Mr. Nobles claims that Kevin Ryan cherrypicked information in his critique of NIST's WTC 7 report.

---

<sup>81</sup> Cole, "9/11 Experiments: The Mysterious 'eutectic steel.'"

<sup>82</sup> FEMA WTC Report, Appendix C, p. 13.

<sup>83</sup> Joseph Nobles, "Sigh. Le sigh. Le whatever.," *AE911Truth.info*, 17 August 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20100819043319/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/shoutout/313>.

<sup>84</sup> Joseph Nobles, "Hey, AdamT?," *AE911Truth.info*, 24 August 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20111103075244/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/shoutout/hey-adamt>.

Kevin Ryan has sorely led you astray in his cherrypicking quotes from the NIST Twin Towers report. He's quoting from NIST NCSTAR 1-5F, "Computer Simulation of the Fires in the World Trade Center." If he'd wanted to know about the thermal reaction of the structural steel to those fires, he would have quoted from NIST NCSTAR 1-5G, "Fire Structure Interface and Thermal Response of World Trade Center Towers." 1-5F was simulating the fires, AdamT.

Well obviously this upset me quite a bit. How dare Kevin Ryan cherrypick his info and trick me like that. Fortunately, I managed to get a message from Kevin Ryan to clear this matter up. Here is what he wrote:

If the question here is referring to my "Bush Science Reaches Its Peak" article on the WTC 7 report, and I think it is, then note that I did not say that NIST didn't "include a factor of thermal conductivity" in its model. You only have to read the article to see that the NIST manipulation I referred to had the set the thermal conductivity to zero, which is quite different than omitting it altogether. The fact that NIST set the thermal conductivity to zero in that instance is very clear and supported by the references given in my paper. As an analogy, if someone sets your thermostat to zero, that doesn't mean there is no temperature in your home, correct? Even if they set it to zero Kelvin (absolute zero), temperature would still be a factor (quite a substantial factor for you actually).<sup>85</sup>

So yes Mr. Nobles, NIST did include thermal conductivity as a factor. But because they set the conductivity to zero or near zero, they might as well have not included it at all.

Further distortions in the NIST report on thermal conductivity are also noted by Jim Hoffman in his critique of the NIST's report on the Twin Towers:

NIST apparently ignored thermal conduction within its model of the steel structure. Since steel is a good conductor of heat, and the steel in the Twin Towers' structures was well connected, their massive steel structures would have drawn heat away from the parts that were exposed to fire. The Report describes a model of "The Fire-Structure Interface", and describes the computation of heat transfer between the air and the steel structure, but it does not mention the conduction of heat along spans of the steel structure. (p 131-2/181-2) The suspicion that NIST simply ignored the conduction of heat

---

<sup>85</sup> Quoted from email correspondence with Kevin Ryan, August 2010.

within the steel is corroborated by the Report's disclosure that they used heat transfer tests on isolated steel elements to calibrate their model. (p 134/184)<sup>86</sup>

As for the corroded steel, Mr. Nobles barely offered any reasonable response at all.

What AdamT seems to forget is I don't care how hot the temperatures in the building got when I'm claiming the eutectic attack happened in the debris pile after the collapse of the building! NIST not getting temperatures that high in WTC 7 is actually evidence that the eutectic corrosive attack did not happen before the collapse! But AdamT doesn't seem to be able to recognize that.

That's the problem Mr. Nobles. You *claim* that it was corroded after the collapse. But as I already pointed out, the people who actually examined the steel stated that it was "possible that the phenomenon started prior to collapse and accelerated the weakening of the steel structure."

Mr. Nobles continually makes the argument that since whatever corroded the steel only approached 1000°C, it could not have been thermate, since thermate burns much hotter. What Mr. Nobles doesn't realize is that thermate can be formulated to burn at varying temperatures based on the quantity of the elements in it. A calculation for how the eutectic mixture could have approached 1000°C has been worked out by Jerry Lobdill in discussing the molten metal flowing out of WTC 2:

Now consider the problem of the molten metal flowing from the 82nd floor of WTC 2. Some have suggested that this metal was the eutectic mixture of Fe and S. Let's discuss that possibility. We assume that the steel that is cut from the columns is essentially pure Fe. It is melted and mixes with the thermate reaction products and then flows away by gravity. As the mixture cools, if the original molten mix was at S less than 31.4%, Fe begins to crystallize out. This increases the S% in the remaining mix. As the cooling continues, the S% increases until it reaches 31.4%, and this remaining molten eutectic mixture solidifies at 994 C (or 988 C, depending on which measurement you believe). So unless the original S% was 31.4%, the molten mass is crystallizing out solidified Fe as it flows downhill and cools. When, in the cooling process, the molten mass reaches the eutectic composition, it also reaches the eutectic temperature. At that temperature the remaining liquid gives up its latent heat of fusion and crystallizes as a microscopically heterogeneous solid with a

---

<sup>86</sup> Hoffman, "Building a Better Mirage" (section titled "Ignored Conduction?").

(macroscopically) 31.4% S, 68.6% Fe composition. Once all the material has solidified the entire mass resumes cooling. We thus have a plausible explanation of why the material flowing from WTC 2 was orange-hot liquid (~1000 C).<sup>87</sup>

There are clearly many variations of thermite, thermate, and other incendiaries that can be formulated to reach higher and lower temperatures. As pointed out by Dr. Steven Jones, “Of course, there is a straightforward way to achieve 1000°C temperatures (and well above) in the presence of sulfur, and that is to use thermate.”<sup>88</sup>

At the end of Mr. Nobles’ response, he offers a very obvious non-response to my other points.

AdamT then produces the Mysterious Eutectic Steel video as proof the sulfur could not have come from the normal sources of sulfur in a building fire. That and AdamT’s incredible assertion that he had to remind me that Sample 1 likely came from WTC 7 will have to wait. AdamT has enough homework for now. (Hint: go back to my original quote, AdamT. Your inability to understand my words is not my problem.)

First of all, yes, I did have to point out to you that the steel came from Building 7. Your first post on the topic mentioned nothing about Jonathan Barnetts’s statement. I responded to that post (a response that I know you read), and quoted Jonathan Barnett as saying that, “They didn’t use this particular type of steel in Towers 1 or Towers 2, so that’s why we know its pedigree.” And in your post written after mine, you then included his quote. You can call the fact that I had to point this out to you an “incredible assertion,” but it’s the truth.

Mr. Nobles is apparently unimpressed by Jonathan Cole’s experiment, but others aren’t, including other debunkers.

I’m out of town most of the time of late so I have not been doing much 911 research these days. However, I did have a look at the video. I must say that I’m very impressed with Mr. Cole’s experiment – nice job! It certainly looks

---

<sup>87</sup> Lobdill, “Some Physical Chemistry Aspects of Thermite,” pp. 6-7.

<sup>88</sup> Steven Jones, “Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Completely Collapse?,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, September 2006, p. 19, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why\\_Indeed\\_Did\\_the\\_WTC\\_Buildings\\_Completely\\_Collapse\\_Jones\\_Thermite\\_World\\_Trade\\_Center.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why_Indeed_Did_the_WTC_Buildings_Completely_Collapse_Jones_Thermite_World_Trade_Center.pdf).

convincing with regard to how the experiment was carried out and I'm very happy to see someone test something I suggested a few years ago.

I am prepared to admit that my initial proposal as to how steel was sulfided during the 911 events needs to be modified. Certainly it looks like diesel fuel, gypsum, concrete and aluminum alone are not going to do it.

–Dr. Frank Greening<sup>89</sup>

Dr. Greening has suggested other natural causes of the sulfidation, but he acknowledges that his previous theories have been refuted.

This is the point I keep trying to get across to Mr. Nobles. If nothing natural inside the building could have corroded the steel, then obviously something unnatural must have been placed inside the building to cause it. Debunkers have presented several explanations for the corrosion of the steel. Well, the explanations have been put to the test. The experiment has been done. The burden of proof is now on the debunkers to show that something natural could have melted and corroded the steel.

Well, I corrected the errors Mr. Nobles, just like you wanted. But of course, it turned out I wasn't the one needing correcting.

(Side note: Special thanks to John-Michael Talboo and his contacts for their help in writing this.)

Update: Joseph Nobles has responded to the above (sort of).<sup>90</sup> He still insists that NIST adequately included thermal conductivity in their reports. I still see evidence of fraud in the reports, but this matter could be completely resolved if NIST would release their modeling data for review. And he ignored my sections on the eutectic steel, except for his claim that I didn't correct him about where the steel came from. Decide for yourself:

“Also, my original post on Sample 1 said that it could not be determined ‘where in the building’ the sample had come from, not that it could not be determined if the sample came from WTC 7 at all. People who believe they

---

<sup>89</sup> Comments quoted from <https://www.tapatalk.com/groups/the911forum/sulfidation-experiment-on-i-beam-doesn-t-support-n-t391.html?sid=72198ec2bb6cb1df0dad299ada978ad6#p11680>.

<sup>90</sup> Joseph Nobles, “For The Record,” *AE911Truth.info*, 26 August 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20111103035719/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/shoutout/for-the-record>.

have corrected me on this matter are sadly mistaken.” (Joseph Nobles, 26 August 2010)

“There was no way to ascertain where in the building the piece had come from, if it had come from Building 7 at all.” (Joseph Nobles, 23 July 2010)

### **Building What?**

According to Joseph Nobles, “there may be a lie on every page”<sup>91</sup> of the site BuildingWhat.org.<sup>92</sup> I’ve looked through the website myself, and while I admittedly have some differences with it, Mr. Nobles seems to think that almost everything on it is either false or misleading. Mr. Nobles’ responses to the evidence pages at Building What? are, as we will see, very misleading and false.

#### *Free Fall Collapse*

Mr. Nobles claims that NIST actually explained what caused the period of free fall in Building 7’s collapse.

NIST’s modeling had already shown how this short time period of virtual free fall could happen. It occurred right after all remaining columns had buckled over an 8-floor span of Building 7. NIST did not go on to explain how the free fall could have occurred because *they already had*. (Emphasis in the original)

It has been demonstrated several times why this explanation is complete nonsense. NIST merely implies that the alleged buckling of the floors caused the free fall, without offering any sort of analysis into exactly how the buckling caused it in the first place. Basically, we are being told that “NIST said 8 floors buckled, and it fell in free fall for 8 stories, so the buckling must have caused the free fall.” That is a lot like saying “2 is a number. 1 is a number. Therefore, 2=1.”

---

<sup>91</sup> Joseph Nobles, “Building What is Up!,” *AE911Truth.info*, 2 September 2010, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20111101185354/http://ae911truth.info/wordpress/2010/wtc7/building-what-is-up>.

<sup>92</sup> Website archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20110104094158/http://buildingwhat.org>.

Dr. Shyam Sunder himself admitted that free fall means an object has “no structural components below it.”<sup>93</sup> And yet now NIST is telling us that buckled columns led to free fall. Buckled supports is a long way from “no supports.”

### *NIST Collapse Model*

According to Mr. Nobles, NIST's computer models accurately simulate the collapse of the building.

The modelling with all observable fire and building damage is very much like the collapse of the building, but doesn't include the stiffening effect of the curtain wall.

If Mr. Nobles had bothered to pay attention to the video posted on that page, he would have seen that both models – the one with and without structural damage – are very different from the actual collapse.<sup>94</sup> Even assuming that the “curtain wall” would have added some stiffness, the models still show the building collapsing in a different manner in terms of direction and rate. Neither of NIST's simulations even show the entire collapse, so how can it be possibly determined if they are accurate or not? Again, this matter could be easily resolved if NIST were to release their modeling data for review.

### *Sulfidated Steel*

This topic is especially interesting, as I've already addressed this issue in great detail. He offers his own sentiments about how sulfur evaporates at 445°C.

Apart from the other false statements on this page, the citation of sulfur evaporating at 445°C is no point at all, since the hypothesis is that Sample 1 corroded because of high temperatures in a sulfur-rich atmosphere. For sulfur to be in the atmosphere, it would have to have evaporated – i.e., turned into a gas. Evaporated doesn't mean disappear, folks.

---

<sup>93</sup> Quoted from “WTC7: NIST Finally Admits Freefall (Part I),” available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rkp-4sm5Ypc>.

<sup>94</sup> See “WTC 7 NIST Model vs. Reality,” at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FuyZJ19YleY>.

Given the fact that it has been determined that the steel was attacked by a liquid slag containing iron, oxygen, and sulfur, it would seem to indicate that the sulfur was chemically mixed into whatever corroded the steel, rather than just evaporating in the air. Mr. Nobles once again avoids the issue of there being no plausible natural explanation for the sulfur in the building, as evidenced by his omission of the next part of this page, which reads:

The fact that sulfur evaporates at a low temperature, 445° C, **along with the very low levels of elemental sulfur in office buildings** appears to preclude the possibility that the eutectic could have formed as a result of a slow sulfidation process in the debris pile.<sup>95</sup> (Emphasis added)

### *Explosive Residues*

This section is quite remarkable, as Mr. Nobles offers a now very old explanation for the red/gray chips.

Independent researchers have actually misidentified *paint chips* as thermite. Seriously. Paint chips. (Emphasis in the original)

Mr. Nobles fails to acknowledge that this has been refuted SEVERAL times.<sup>96</sup> I would be very interested if someone could find me a can of exploding primer paint. I asked my local Home Depot if they had any, but they said they didn't. Guess they must have been out of stock.

Regardless, Mr. Nobles features this comparison picture as evidence.

---

<sup>95</sup> Quoted from Steven Jones *et al*, "Extremely high temperatures during the World Trade Center destruction," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, January 2008, p. 7, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/WTCHighTemp2.pdf>. (Quoted in <https://web.archive.org/web/20110123041041/http://buildingwhat.org/sulfidated-steel>.)

<sup>96</sup> For the most extensive summary of why the chips are not primer paint, see John-Michael Talboo and Ziggi Zugam, "9/11: Explosive Material in the WTC Dust," at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/911explosive-materialv1-3.pdf>.

## Where Did This Chip Come From?



From the NIST documentation  
of peeling paint...

...or from Dr. Jones'  
red/gray chips?



Source: NIST

Figure D-4. Formation of a black scale between paint and steel after exposure greater than 650 °C. Paint readily spalled.




Fig. D2. Photomicrographs of red/gray chips from sample 1.4 of the WTC dust analyzed in this study, shown as (a)-(d) respectively. The image in (a) shows the chip edge on which we note the gray zone. The red/gray chips are mounted on an aluminum pinhead, using a carbon conductive ink, for viewing in a scanning electron microscope (SEM).

By this logic, one would be totally justified in thinking a firecracker is actually a candle. They're both small, thin, and have a lightable end – never mind that one of them explodes, they're clearly both candles! Furthermore, notice that his picture shows paint from the WTC was heated to over 650°C. The chips Dr. Jones found ignite at around 430°C.<sup>97</sup>

### *Eyewitnesses*

According to Mr. Nobles, even if there were witnesses to explosions, it doesn't matter because there are apparently no explosions in any of the collapse videos.

Any actual explosive device used to cut core columns would have been distinctly heard on videotapes of the collapse.

---

<sup>97</sup> Niels Harrit *et al*, "Active Thermite Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe," *The Open Chemical Physics Journal*, 2009, p. 25 (Fig. 29), at <https://benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOCPJ/TOCPJ-2-7.pdf>.

First of all, the actual “sounds of explosions” are not necessary to warrant an investigation into if they were used.<sup>98</sup> But regardless, the fact is that sound evidence for explosions has been found.<sup>99</sup>

### *Foreknowledge*

Mr. Nobles then criticizes the page on the foreknowledge of Building 7’s collapse.

The building was expected to fall down. Firefighters made the decision to pull people away from the building around 2:30 that afternoon, based on perfectly rational reasons.

As Graeme MacQueen points out in the abstract of his essay, “Waiting for Seven”:

The majority of FDNY members did not rationally conclude, on the basis of direct perception of damage to the building, that it was in danger of collapse; they accepted that it would collapse on the basis of what they were told.<sup>100</sup>

And this assertion is backed up by not only the information in his essay, but other sources as well.<sup>101</sup>

### *Destruction of Evidence*

Mr. Nobles lastly claims that there was nothing suspicious about the rapid clean-up of the WTC debris.

This is not a reason to believe controlled demolition. You must prove controlled demolition before this item comes into play!

I’m sorry if the removal of the debris doesn’t bother you Mr. Nobles, but it bothered others, including even people who don’t think the buildings were demolished.

---

<sup>98</sup> See pp. 40-43 of this present work.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

<sup>100</sup> MacQueen, “Waiting for Seven,” p. 1.

<sup>101</sup> See Taylor, “A Response to Chris Mohr’s Respectful Rebuttal,” pp. 164-67.

*When there is a car accident and two people are killed, you keep the car until the trial is over [...] If a plane crashes, not only do you keep the plane, but you assemble all the pieces, take it to a hangar, and put it together. That's only for 200, 300 people, when they die. In this case you had 3,000 people dead. You had a major machine, a major manmade structure. My wish was that we had spent whatever it takes, maybe \$50 million, \$100 million, and maybe two years, get all this steel, carry it to a lot. Instead of recycling it, put it horizontally, and assemble it. You have maybe 200 engineers, not just myself running around trying to figure out what's going on. After all, this is a crime scene and you have to figure out exactly what happened for this crime, and learn from it. But that was my wish. My wish is not what happens.*

–Abolhassan Astaneh-Asl, civil engineering professor<sup>102</sup>

**Q:** *Would you agree it was wrong that they just took the debris and shipped it off?*

*Yeah, it was horrible! [...] That's forensic data, you know. Should have been collected, and it wasn't. [...] It is getting rid of evidence. I mean, I don't think anyone was looking at it that way at the time. I can't say one way or the other. But certainly, if I were a part of the FEMA investigation, you know, I would have said this steel should be kept.*

–Craig Beyler, fire protection engineer<sup>103</sup>

*We pressed early on for a full-scale investigation. And of course, one of the issues was, while we were doing that, the evidence from the buildings was being destroyed as we were talking about it. [...] there was no real need for speed, basically, to get the steel cut up into small pieces and shipped overseas for scrap. [...] We were concerned about that, and we understood early on that those who are going to hold the keys to knowing exactly how the buildings came down. And unfortunately, we were not successful in getting the elected officials and the powers-that-be to do that. When it was all said and done, we only had relatively a very, very small portion of the steel from those buildings.*

–Glenn Corbett, professor of fire sciences<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Quoted from David Kohn, “Culling Through Mangled Steel,” *CBS News*, 7 March 2002, at <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/culling-through-mangled-steel>.

<sup>103</sup> Quoted from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CoJUBRxmRSE&t=2647s>.

<sup>104</sup> Quoted from “911 Truth: Rudy Giuliani & the Feds Destroyed WTC Evidence,” at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GxycV4fNPnQ>.

While the destruction of the steel may not be *direct* evidence of demolition, it is certainly highly suspect and prevented a proper analysis to determine if that is actually what took place.<sup>105</sup>

Mr. Nobles closes with saying that the videos of Building 7's collapse featured on BuildingWhat? don't feature the penthouse collapse or audio. Well, the collapse of column 79 and the penthouse is problematic enough itself,<sup>106</sup> and there's videos of the collapse that do feature audio, and they don't exactly sound quiet.<sup>107</sup>

## Conclusion

As we have shown here, the arguments put forth by Joseph Nobles do not hold up under critical scrutiny. The case for controlled demolition, made by AE911truth and others, stands. For this and many other reasons, a new investigation into the destruction of the three WTC buildings is still sorely needed.

---

<sup>105</sup> For more on this topic, see Ted Walter, Tony Szamboti, and Dennis McMahon, "Documenting the Destruction of Physical Evidence at the World Trade Center, *AE911Truth*, 11 April 2018, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/446-documenting-the-destruction-of-physical-evidence-at-the-world-trade-center>.

<sup>106</sup> See p. 182 n7 of this present work.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74.

## **Speaking Truth to Power: Myles Power's Case Against the Truth Movement**

Originally published 1 December 2012 – 9 March 2013 at  
<http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com>  
Minor revisions by Adam Taylor

Science blogger Myles Power has recently uploaded a series of videos to YouTube documenting his interaction with several members of the 9/11 Truth Movement at Ground Zero for the 11-year anniversary.<sup>1</sup> He claims in these videos that he “debunks” several points made by the Movement. Here I will address his arguments and show why they fall well short of debunking the Movement’s case for the WTC being destroyed with controlled demolition.

### **WTC buildings built to withstand airplane strikes**

The first issue Mr. Power addresses is the fact that the Towers were originally built to withstand airplane strikes. However, he disputes the specifics of this issue, arguing that the circumstances on 9/11 were far more severe than what was expected by the original designers. Specifically, he claims that the Chief WTC engineer Leslie Robertson only designed the Towers to take the impact from a Boeing 707, which would be flying at only 180 mph, and low on fuel. Since the planes that hit the Towers were Boeing 767s, travelling much faster and contained more fuel, he argues it’s not surprising the Towers collapsed. But his points are all shown to be either false or misleading.

1. *Leslie Robertson, the Chief WTC engineer.* It first needs to be pointed out that Leslie Robertson was not the head engineer for the Towers.

---

<sup>1</sup> Myles Power, “Debunking 9/11 Conspiracy Theorists,” 14 November 2017 at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4ml6r7cuKe8>.

John Skilling was clearly the lead engineer on the project, while Robertson was his subordinate.<sup>2</sup>

2. *Speed of the aircraft.* That being the case, records show that calculations carried out by John Skilling and his team indicated that the Towers were actually built to withstand the impact of a 707 flying at its cruising speed of 600 mph.<sup>3</sup> The planes that hit the Towers were only travelling at approximately 440 and 540 mph, respectively.<sup>4</sup>
3. *Fuel load.* Furthermore, John Skilling indicated that he anticipated the fuel load for a plane that might crash into the buildings, saying that:

We looked at every possible thing we could think of that could happen to the buildings, even to the extent of an airplane hitting the side [...] Our analysis indicated the biggest problem would be the fact that all the fuel (from the airplane) would dump into the building. There would be a horrendous fire. A lot of people would be killed. [But] the building structure would still be there.<sup>5</sup>

And of course, this makes perfect sense when one considers the circumstances. Power argues that only planes low on fuel would have been considered by the designers because they would have only anticipated planes seeking to land at an airport. But as 911research.wtc7.net correctly points out, “if you take into consideration planes that are landing at an airport, then you must

---

<sup>2</sup> Gregg Roberts, “Jones v. Robertson A physicist and a structural engineer debate the controlled demolition of the World Trade Center,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 20 May 2007, p. 3, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/Roberts\\_AnnotatedJones-RobertsonTranscript.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/Roberts_AnnotatedJones-RobertsonTranscript.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> James Glanz and Eric Lipton, *City in the Sky: The Rise and Fall of the World Trade Center* (New York: Times Books, 2003), p. 131.

<sup>4</sup> Though Mr. Power says in his video that the plane speeds were 470 and 590 mph, the NIST report gives the speeds as approximately 443 and 542 mph, respectively. See NIST NCSTAR 1-2, p. 1xxiii, at <https://www.nist.gov/el/final-reports-nist-world-trade-center-disaster-investigation>.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted from: Eric Nalder, “Twin Towers Engineered To Withstand Jet Collision,” *The Seattle Times*, 27 February 1993 at <https://archive.seattletimes.com/archive/?date=19930227&slug=1687698#loop>.

consider planes that are taking off, and such planes are fully laden with fuel.”<sup>6</sup>

4. *Wingspan.* Power also claims that because the wingspan of a 767 is longer than that of a 707, the planes that hit the Towers would have done more damage. However, it can be argued that the wings from a 707 would actually cause more damage than a 767’s wings. A 707 has four engines – two on each wing – compared with a 767, which only has two engines – one on each wing. The engines are without a doubt the strongest part of an airplane. Wings with two engines each rather than one each would undoubtedly cause more damage. The fact of the matter is that the planes that hit the Towers were well within the design parameters expected by the original designers.<sup>7</sup>

### **The Fires at the WTC**

Mr. Power then argues that the fires in the Towers would have been hot enough to heat the steel to the point of failure, causing them to collapse. He also explains that dark smoke is not an indication that the fires were cool or oxygen starved. While I agree with his points regarding the color of the smoke, there are several other features of the fires that indicates they were not particularly severe.<sup>8</sup> The greatest piece of evidence that the fires were not severe enough to cause collapse is the simple fact that the official investigators, NIST, have no evidence of high temperatures in the buildings in the first place.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from: [http://911research.wtc7.net/mirrors/guardian2/wtc/WTC\\_ch1.htm](http://911research.wtc7.net/mirrors/guardian2/wtc/WTC_ch1.htm).

<sup>7</sup> For more information on this subject, see: Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “Towers’ Design Parameters,” *911 Research*, last updated 9 August 2011 at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/design.html>; and “FAQ #2: Were the Twin Towers designed to withstand the impact of the airplanes?,” *AE911Truth* (n.d.), at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/faqs/360-faq-2-were-the-twin-towers-designed-to-withstand-the-impact-of-the-airplanes>.

<sup>8</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “The Fires’ Severity,” *911 Research*, last updated 20 March 2013, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/fires/severity.html>.

<sup>9</sup> Anonymous and Frank Legge, “Falsifiability and the NIST WTC Report: A Study in Theoretical Adequacy,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, March 2010, pp. 6-8, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2010/Falsifiability.pdf>.

## Inward Bowing

From this point we get a discussion of the inward bowing seen happening in the videos of the Towers. Mr. Power parrots the explanations provided by NIST; that the fires in the buildings caused the floor trusses to sag downward, causing the exterior columns to bow inward and eventually breaking, initiating the collapse. The inward bowing of the Towers' perimeter columns has been a subject of much debate regarding the controlled demolition of the Towers. As we have already established, NIST has no evidence of high temperatures in the buildings in the first place, and this sort of phenomenon has never caused the total collapse of a steel-framed high-rise before.<sup>10</sup> All NIST has is evidence that the columns bowed inward, but they have no evidence that fire alone is what caused it.

Though Mr. Power asserts that controlled demolition cannot cause this event either, those in the Movement have proposed ways it can be done.<sup>11</sup> As noted by mechanical engineer Tony Szamboti:

It is instructive that the first visible signs of failure on the North Tower are when the antenna mast moves downward by ten to twelve feet before the perimeter roof line moves. This is indicative of the central core suddenly and completely failing first. If you haven't seen this watch it frame by frame at the link below.

[http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/videos/wtc1\\_close\\_frames.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/videos/wtc1_close_frames.html)

---

<sup>10</sup> For example, Jim Hoffman notes that: "The idea that fires could have caused floors to sag is not unreasonable, since it has been observed in fire tests and in cases of severe fires in steel-framed buildings, such as the One Meridian Plaza fire. What is not reasonable is the degree of sagging NIST used in its computer models compared with the amounts its physical tests showed. Whereas the 35-foot floor model sagged only a few inches in the middle after two hours in a high-temperature furnace, NIST's computer model showed a sagging of 54 inches." Quoted from: Jim Hoffman, "Review of 'A New Standard For Deception: The NIST WTC Report,'" *911 Research*, 15 October 2006, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/kevin\\_ryan/newstandard.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/kevin_ryan/newstandard.html).

<sup>11</sup> See for example Jim Hoffman, "A Hypothetical Blasting Scenario," ver. 1.2, *911 Research*, 9 April 2009, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/blasting\\_scenario.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/blasting_scenario.html).

These frames don't show slow creep, they show sudden failure of the central core itself. They certainly don't show the perimeter walls failing first. If the central core failed first it would cause the floor trusses, not to sag, but to follow them downward. In this situation the other end of the floor trusses would apply a tremendous force and bending moment to the perimeter wall columns, causing them to bow inwardly and ultimately to fail. Some of the NIST photos of WTC1, showing inwardly bowed perimeter columns, are frozen frames taken from video. In these photos the roof of the building and antenna mast are not shown. It would be interesting to see these videos, without cropping of the roofline and antenna mast, to determine if the bowing of the perimeter columns occurs after the antenna mast starts moving downward.<sup>12</sup>

The inward bowing of the Towers' columns in no way disproves the notion that they were destroyed through controlled demolition.<sup>13</sup>

### **Free-fall speed**

The next issue Mr. Power discusses is the fall rates of the Towers. He explains that the Towers did not collapse at free-fall rate, noting that a) the collapses took longer than 10 seconds; b) parts of the cores were still standing after the collapses; and c) the debris falling outside the footprint of each building fell faster than the actual structure.

- a) Here I actually agree with Mr. Power, as more accurate measurements indicate that the Towers collapsed in approximately 15 seconds in either case.<sup>14</sup> While the Towers clearly did not collapse at free-fall, this is the case for most controlled demolitions as well. It has been established that the fall times for the Towers is consistent with the fall times of other controlled demolitions, and had the buildings really

---

<sup>12</sup> Tony Szamboti, "The Sustainability of the Controlled Demolition Hypothesis for the destruction of the Twin Towers," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 17 February 2008, pp. 5-6, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/SzambotiSustainabilityofControlledDemolitionHypothesisForDestructionofTwinTowers.pdf>.

<sup>13</sup> For more on this topic, see John-Michael Talboo, "WTC Pre-Collapse Bowing Debunks 9/11 'Controlled Demolition' Theory?," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 11 July 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/07/wtc-pre-collapse-bowing-debunks-911.html>.

<sup>14</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), "Speed of Fall," *911 Research*, last updated 20 March 2013, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/collapses/freefall.html>.

collapsed through natural causes, their collapses should have taken much longer.<sup>15</sup>

- b) Although parts of the cores of each Tower were standing after the collapses, analyses done by mechanical engineer Gordon Ross demonstrate that the cores were attacked first in the collapses, and that critical sections of them collapsed along with the rest of the structures.<sup>16</sup>
- c) It's true that the debris fell faster than the actual structure. However, close inspection of the videos show that the debris actually falls at around the same rate as the wave of ejections seen travelling down the faces of each building.<sup>17</sup>

Mr. Power also questions why truthers count the full height of the Towers when timing the collapses instead of counting only where the collapses started at the plane-impact areas. The reason for counting the full height of each building is rather simple. The videos show that the lower sections of the Towers do not even begin to start collapsing until the upper sections are completely destroyed.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Kenneth Kuttler, "Collapse Time Calculations for WTC 1," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, May 2007, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/ProfKuttlerWTC1CollapseTimeCalculations.pdf>; Gregory Szuladziński, "Temporal considerations in collapse of WTC Towers," *Int. J. Structural Engineering* (2012), at [http://aneta.org/911experiments\\_com/articles/IntIJStructuralEng\\_TemporalConsiderationsInCollapseOfWTCTowers.pdf](http://aneta.org/911experiments_com/articles/IntIJStructuralEng_TemporalConsiderationsInCollapseOfWTCTowers.pdf); Ivan Němec *et al*, "A Contribution to Analysis of Collapse of High-Rise Building Inspired by the Collapses of WTC1 and WTC2," *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Physics*, December 2018, at <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=89496>. See also chapter 4 of this present work.

<sup>16</sup> Gordon Ross, "How the Towers were Demolished" (n.d.), at <https://gordonssite.tripod.com/id2.html>.

<sup>17</sup> David Chandler, "Race with Gravity," 18 December 2007, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eXSHm3CdHf4>.

<sup>18</sup> See the following images at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2012/11/wtc1uppersection1.jpg> and <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2012/11/wtc2uppersection1.jpg>. See also the following video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9wkzkP2FJWY>.

## **Basement/lobby explosions**

The last subject discussed in part 1 Mr. Power's video series is one of the most debated topics of the demolition issue; the explosions reported in the basement and lobby of WTC1. My personal beliefs regarding the basement and lobby explosions are somewhat agnostic. As I have explained in another article I've written on this topic:

Although viewpoints differ in the 9/11 Truth movement regarding the cause of these explosions, some features of the lobby damage indicate that they were not due to a fireball explosion from the jet fuel. For example, the white marble walls show no signs of being exposed to fire, and the plants next to the blown-out windows show no signs of burning either.

And at least one explosives expert has stated that he does not believe the damage was caused by the jet fuel traveling down the elevator shafts, based on the appearance of the lobby. Whether or not the lobby damage is indicative of explosives, however, is essentially irrelevant to the discussion of the Towers' demolitions, as the collapse sequence started above the plane impact zone, not at the lower levels. The lobby damage is not necessary to prove the Twin Towers were destroyed by controlled demolition [...]<sup>19</sup>

## **Thermite and Nanothermite**

Mr. Power continues his criticisms by discussing the issue of thermite and nanothermite being used to demolish the WTC buildings. Like other debunkers, Mr. Power believes not only was nanothermite not used to demolish the Towers, but that it can't be used in a demolition anyway. We will discuss this latter point later on. For now, we'll examine his issues regarding the study carried out by Dr. Steven Jones *et al* documenting that unreacted nanothermite was found in the WTC dust.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Adam Taylor, "Debunking the Real 9/11 Myths: Why Popular Mechanics Can't Face Up to Reality" (Part 1), *AE911Truth*, 15 February 2012, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/436-debunking-the-real-9-11-myths-series>.

<sup>20</sup> Niels Harrit *et al*, "Active Thermite Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe," *The Open Chemical Physics Journal* (2009), at <https://benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOCPJ/TOCPJ-2-7.pdf>.

## **Background**

For some reason, Mr. Power seems to have a problem with how much detail Dr. Jones *et al* discussed in their paper regarding how the dust samples were collected. He apparently finds it all unnecessary. The reason for the large amount of back-story was obviously done to ensure that they established a clear chain of custody. This makes perfect sense, and shows that these scientists were indeed practicing careful scientific research when collecting the dust.

This is also why the fifth sample was not included in their study, since they could not give the original owner's name. Had they included this sample in their study, debunkers would likely have cried foul, demanding to know who this person is. Debunkers have often criticized members of the Movement for failing to provide adequate details of their work. Now Mr. Power seems to have a problem with there being too much detail. Is there no way to make debunkers happy?

## **Thermite components**

Mr. Power is also unimpressed with the findings of the paper due to the fact that the components of thermite are very common, and could have simply come from prosaic sources in the buildings. But other members of the Movement have explained why this argument is complete nonsense. As explained by mechanical engineer Gordon Ross:

[I]f I leave margarine, flour, sugar and fruit in a cupboard, when I next open the cupboard I will not find a fruit crumble. Some mechanism is required to convert the ingredients. Similarly, if I take these same ingredients, set them alight and throw them out the window, I still will not get my fruit crumble. The mechanism must have some order.<sup>21</sup>

Similarly, as Jim Hoffman explains in more technical detail:

Although these elements – aluminum, iron, oxygen, and silicon – were all abundant in building materials used in the Twin Towers, it is not possible that such materials milled themselves into fine powder and assembled themselves

---

<sup>21</sup> Gordon Ross, "Sorry Dr. Greening et al," 6 December 2006, at <https://gordonssite.tripod.com/id4.html>.

into a chemically optimized aluminothermic composite as a by-product of the destruction of the Twin Towers.<sup>22</sup>

Simply put, these elements did not just randomly assemble themselves into a high-tech incendiary through a building fire and collapse.

### Peer-review

Like so many other debunkers, Mr. Power then calls into question the validity of the peer-review process the paper went through at the *Bentham Open Chemical Physics Journal*. In order to discredit the paper's peer-review process, Mr. Power cites the fact that fake science papers were submitted to Bentham and were ultimately accepted for publication. He feels this is sufficient grounds to call the journal's standards into question. However, this incident in no way demonstrates that Bentham does not practice sound peer-review for their journals. As explained by Erik Larson:

[It] has not [been] proven that even the single journal that has been shown to have accepted a hoax paper is a "vanity publication" where ANYONE can publish; so far a single instance of a failure to conduct a proper peer-review has been documented. Perhaps there are other incidents, and perhaps NONE of the papers published were legitimately peer-reviewed, but the experiment conducted by Scholarly Kitchen does not document that, and the authors don't claim it does. In addition, the problem has only been documented at a SINGLE journal among the hundreds published by Bentham- as Scholarly Kitchen notes, another Bentham journal rejected the hoax paper for publication. They say this incident only proves the peer-reviewed process is applied inconsistently.<sup>23</sup>

Mr. Power also notes (again, like many other debunkers) that the editor at Bentham disputed the paper and quit over it since it apparently was published without her permission. However, a closer look at this incident reveals far more. The editor, Marie-Paule Pileni, claimed to have resigned

---

<sup>22</sup> Jim Hoffman, "Thermitic Pyrotechnics in the WTC Made Simple," ver. 1.0, *911 Research*, 26 April 2009, at [http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/thermitics\\_made\\_simple.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/thermitics_made_simple.html).

<sup>23</sup> Erik Larson, "Dr. Moffett Smears 'Active Thermitic' Paper by Association-Again," *911 Blogger*, 16 June 2009, at <http://911blogger.com/news/2009-06-17/dr-moffett-smears-%E2%80%98active-thermitic%E2%80%99-paper-association-again-erik-larson#comment-210288>.

because she was not told about the paper. But she also did not present any scientific criticisms of the paper, claiming that the topic of it lied outside here area of expertise. However, this is patently untrue, as demonstrated by Dr. Niels Harrit:

Her List of Publications reveals that Professor Pileni has published hundreds of articles in the field of nanoscience and nanotechnology. She is, in fact, recognized as one of the leaders in the field. Her statement about her “major advanced research” points out that, already by 2003, she was “the 25th highest cited scientist on nanotechnology” (<http://www.sri.jussieu.fr/pileni.htm>). Since the late 1980s, moreover, she has served as a consultant for the French Army and other military institutions. From 1990 to 1994, for example, she served as a consultant for the Societe Nationale des Poudres et Explosifs (National Society for Powders and Explosives). She could, therefore, have easily read our paper, and she surely did. But by denying that she had read it, she avoided the question that would have inevitably been put to her: “What do you think of it?”<sup>24</sup>

Because her claims about not being qualified to review the paper are evidently untrue, her story ultimately does not add up. It’s obvious that neither of these points diminish the validity of the journal’s peer-review process, and only serve to cast doubt rather than to address the science discussed in the paper. As Dr. Steven Jones explains:

This paper was thoroughly peer-reviewed with several pages of tough comments that required of our team MONTHS of additional experiments and studies. It was the toughest peer-review I’ve ever had, including THREE papers for which I was first author in NATURE. (Please note that Prof. Harrit is first author on this paper.) We sought an established journal that would allow us a LONG paper (this paper is 25 pages long) with MANY COLOR IMAGES AND GRAPHS. Such a scientific journal is not easy to find. Page charges are common for scientific journals these days, and are typically paid by the University of the first or second author (as is the case with this paper) or by an external grant.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Niels Harrit, “Professor Pileni’s Resignation as Editor-in-Chief of the Open Chemical Physics Journal,” *911 Blogger*, 12 July 2009, at <http://911blogger.com/node/20614>.

<sup>25</sup> Steven Jones, “What you need to know about ‘Peer-review,’” *911 Blogger*, 7 April 2009, at <http://911blogger.com/node/19780>.

## Dr. James Millette

We then get a discussion of Dr. James Millette's study of the WTC dust, and how his study came to opposite conclusions to Dr. Jones' *et al.* Millette's study ultimately determined the material found was likely paint from the Towers.<sup>26</sup> However, a detailed essay by researchers John-Michael Talboo and Ziggi Zugam shows many flaws in Millette's study, and that further research needs to be done.<sup>27</sup> His article quotes Dr. Jones as saying in response to Millette:

James Millette did NOT do DSC analyses at all for his report MVA9119. What a shame, really [...]

When Dr Farrer burned epoxy paint in the DSC, it gave a very broad thermal trace, NOT at all like the spiked exothermic DSC peak in our Fig 19. This is one of the many tests he did to check things.

Also, we checked the electrical resistivity of several paints – consistently orders of magnitude higher than that of the red material. We reported the resistivity of the red material in our paper, page 27 in the Journal. Millette did not report any electrical resistivity measurements. This measurement is rather easy to do so I was surprised when he failed to do this straightforward test. There is a lot of red material of various types in the WTC dust, so one must be careful to make sure it is the same as what we studied, and not some other material.<sup>28</sup>

We also note with puzzlement Mr. Power's claim that the red/grey chips are not explosive. He argues that burning similar material will cause the

---

<sup>26</sup> James Millette, "Progress Report on the Analysis of Red/Gray Chips in WTC Dust," *MVA Scientific Consultants*, 1 March 2012, archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20160306020844/https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/64959841/9119ProgressReport022912\\_rev1\\_030112webHiRes.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20160306020844/https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/64959841/9119ProgressReport022912_rev1_030112webHiRes.pdf).

<sup>27</sup> John-Michael Talboo and Ziggi Zugam, "9/11: Explosive Material in the WTC Dust," ver. 1.3, at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/911explosivematerialv1-3.pdf>. See also Wayne Coste, "Red/Gray Chips, 10 Years Later," *Truth Action Project*, 27 April 2019, at <https://www.911tap.org/10-publications/news-releases/802-red-gray-chips-10-years-later>.

<sup>28</sup> Steven Jones, "Letter regarding red/gray chip analyses," *911 Blogger*, 8 September 2012, at <http://911blogger.com/news/2012-09-08/letter-regarding-redgray-chip-analyses>.

kind of bright flash seen in the ignitions of these chips.<sup>29</sup> But this is demonstrably false, as paint chips would not react this way. As Talboo and Zugam note in their essay:

According to Harrit et al., when they heated paint samples as well as the thermitic red chips with an oxy-acetylene torch, the paint samples “immediately reduced to fragile ashes” while the active red/gray chips ignited and “the high-speed ejection of a hot particle was observed under the hand of the person holding the torch.”<sup>30</sup>

Millette’s paper far from debunks the findings of the Active Thermitic Material paper. But even if that were the case, the evidence of demolition for the Twin Towers and Building 7 would still be substantial, as well as other non-demolition issues.<sup>31</sup>

### **Core columns again**

Mr. Power next discusses the placement of the explosives inside the buildings. I agree with his assertion that the explosives would not be placed all throughout the cores, since large portions of the cores remained standing after the collapses. But as we previously discussed, the core evidently was attacked by explosives during the demolition, and it was only the 24 outer core columns that were taken down in the demolition. This fact greatly contradicts the idea that the Towers were destroyed by being crushed by the upper sections. As explained by Tony Szamboti:

The fact that 50 to 60 story high portions of the central core remain standing for several seconds, in the collapses of both twin towers, does pour cold water on the crush down (pile driver) theory of Bazant and the NIST. What many don’t know is that it was only the 23 inner core columns which remained standing, and none of the significantly larger outer 24 core columns. This was brought to light by Muhammad Columbo in 2007 and enabled mechanical engineer Gordon Ross [...] to be the first to fully dissect just how the towers

---

<sup>29</sup> See the video “9/11 Nanothermite - Red Chip Ignition” at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4eLuyOqWER4>.

<sup>30</sup> Talboo and Zugam, 9/11: Explosive Material in the WTC Dust,” p. 15.

<sup>31</sup> John-Michael Talboo, “What Does it Mean for the 9/11 Truth Movement if James R. Millette Proves Nano-thermite Wasn’t Used to Take down the WTC Towers on 9/11?,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 5 February 2012, at [911debunkers.blogspot.com/2012/01/what-does-it-mean-for-911-truth.html](http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2012/01/what-does-it-mean-for-911-truth.html).

were demolished. The reality is that the 24 outer core columns and the corners of the perimeters were taken out to [affect] the demolitions of the twin towers.<sup>32</sup>

The fact of the matter is that the Towers could very well have been accessed to place explosives in them, and it could have been done secretly.<sup>33</sup>

### **Explosives surviving the plane impacts**

Mr. Power briefly questions how the explosives placed in the Towers could possibly have survived the plane impacts. However, I have already written on this topic extensively and shown that – using the right kind of explosives and placing them in just the right way – they could indeed have survived the planes impacts and ensuing fires.<sup>34</sup>

### **Molten Aluminum**

Next, Mr. Power addresses the issue of the molten metal seen flowing out of the South Tower shortly before its collapse. Many in the Movement have cited this as direct evidence of thermite being placed in the Tower. However, Mr. Power argues that this material is actually molten aluminum, and that molten aluminum can glow bright orange, rather than just silver as others have asserted. Again, this is an issue I have already addressed extensively in my other writings. I as explained in one of my articles:<sup>35</sup>

Some still may argue that the material was molten aluminum and that it was heated to high enough temperatures to get it to glow that brightly. Below is a

---

<sup>32</sup> Comment from Tony Szamboti at <http://911blogger.com/news/2009-05-14/steven-jones-and-frank-greening-and-others-correspond-april-may-2009#comment-208196>.

<sup>33</sup> Kevin Ryan, “Demolition Access to The WTC Towers,” *911 Review*, 9 August 2009, at [http://www.911review.com/articles/ryan/demolition\\_access\\_p1.html](http://www.911review.com/articles/ryan/demolition_access_p1.html).

<sup>34</sup> Adam Taylor, “FAQ #10: Wouldn’t the planes slamming into the Twin Towers have disturbed the demolition devices?,” *AE911Truth* (n.d.), at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/faqs/352-faq-9-wouldn-t-the-planes-slamming-into-the-twin-towers-have-disturbed-the-demolition-devices>.

<sup>35</sup> Taylor, “Debunking the Real 9/11 Myths,” (Part 5).

chart showing temperature-dependent colors of metals. At about 980°C (1800°F), most metals begin to glow “light orange.” PM asserts throughout the book that this is how hot the fires could have been in the Towers. However, we previously noted that NIST has no evidence that the fires did reach these temperatures in the buildings. However, even if we accept that the fires did reach those temperature levels, the material still could not have been aluminum because of how long it was heated. As explained by physicist Jerry Lobdill:

*The problem with concluding that the liquid flowing from the tower’s 82nd floor could have been aluminum [...] is that the liquid in the tower was not confined in a container so that more heat could be applied to raise the temperature of the liquid above its melting point. Instead, as soon as the metal liquefied it flowed away from the heat source under the force of gravity. Therefore, the color of the liquid flowing from the 82nd floor [indicated that it] was at approximately the melting point of the metal. And therefore, it was molten iron from steel.<sup>36</sup>*

Perhaps the most important reason why the material could not have been molten aluminum is that the material actually became white hot. Regardless of what kind of material was glowing, nobody has explained what would have heated it to over 2000°F to get it to glow that brightly.

In addition, there is simply little chance the material could have been molten aluminum, based on the fact that the material glowed for as long as it did. As Dr. Jones summarizes:

*[F]alling liquid aluminum, which due to low emissivity and high reflectivity appears silvery-gray in daylight conditions, after falling through air 1-2 meters, regardless of the temperature at which the poured-out aluminum left the vessel. Aluminum does incandesce (glow) like other metals, but faintly, so [...] falling liquid aluminum [in bright daylight] will appear silvery-gray.<sup>37</sup>*

While molten aluminum can be ruled out because of the reasons stated above, there is a known substance that easily could account for the observations: thermate, which is thermite with added sulfur. The thermite reaction produces

---

<sup>36</sup> Jerry Lobdill, “Molten What?,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 29 March 2007, p. 2, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/MoltenWhat2.pdf>.

<sup>37</sup> Steven Jones, “Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Completely Collapse?,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, September 2006, p. 7, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/why-indeed-did-the-world-trade-center-buildings-completely-collapse>.

temperatures in the white-hot range up to 4500°F, and the added sulfur lowers the melting point of iron significantly.

### **Thermate debate**

We then hear Mr. Power's arguments regarding controlled demolitions and how loud they are. He correctly points out that one of the reasons the Movement cites thermate and nanothermite being used is because they are quieter than normal explosives. But he then shows a video of civil engineer Jon Cole cutting through steel with thermate,<sup>38</sup> and notes that it makes a large bang. He also argues that thermate and nanothermite do not have the ability to demolish steel structures.

In regards to his first point, though thermate can be loud when set off, it obviously is not as loud as the 130-140 decibels given off from regular explosives. And with nanothermite, it can indeed be formulated to be quiet as well.<sup>39</sup> His second point is rather odd, as he shows Jon Cole's video, which demonstrates that thermate can be used to cut through structural steel. And research shows that it has even been used in the demolition of large steel structures.<sup>40</sup>

Mr. Power also makes mention of the fact that barium nitrate is a component of thermate, but none of it was found in the debris after 9/11. But this claim is somewhat misleading. Barium nitrate is only used in one very specific form of thermate known as thermate-TH3, which is the military patented form of thermate.<sup>41</sup> There are different varieties and formulations of thermite and thermate, so finding barium nitrate is not at

---

<sup>38</sup> Jon Cole, "9/11 Experiments: The Great Thermate Debate," *911 Blogger*, 10 November 2010 at <http://911blogger.com/news/2010-11-10/911-experiments-great-thermate-debate>.

<sup>39</sup> Adam Taylor, "Magic, Mythology or Science?," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 18 March 2011, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2011/03/magic-mythology-or-science.html>.

<sup>40</sup> Eli Rika, "Popular Mechanics Ignores Its Own Historical Records of Thermite Demolition: Destruction of Skyride Towers, Reichstag Dome Set Incendiary Precedent," *AE911Truth*, 4 November 2011, at <http://www.ae911truth.org/en/news-section/41-articles/575-popular-mechanics-ignores-its-own-historical-records-of-thermite-demolition-destruction-of-skyride-towers-reichstag-dome-set-incendiary-precedent>.

<sup>41</sup> See the Wikipedia entry for Thermate at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thermate>.

all necessary. It certainly does not need to be found in nanothermite, as explained by Dr. Jones:

Thermate (sulfur plus thermite and possibly the form thermate-TH-3) was ALSO in evidence and probably intended to weaken critical steel members (e.g., residue/ material flowing with orange glow from the So. Tower just minutes before its collapse and the sulfidation of WTC steel reported in the FEMA report but ignored by NIST). Thermite incendiary without sulfur is not in evidence at the WTC to date. But sulfur is NOT needed for the function of explosive nanothermite and would not be expected to appear in the red/gray chips.<sup>42</sup>

### **Cut Columns**

Mr. Power next turns his attention to the cut core columns seen in some photographs of Ground Zero. Many in the Movement have cited these as evidence of the columns being cut by the explosives placed in the buildings. But Mr. Power disagrees, noting that these cuts could simply have been caused by the clean-up operations. I happen to agree with this assessment, but Gordon Ross has also examined photos of core columns in the debris, and notes that their appearance is consistent with explosives attacking them.<sup>43</sup> Finally Mr. Power asserts that the pieces of debris seen being ejected from the Towers was not steel sections, but rather aluminum cladding. However, videos show that indeed several multi-ton steel sections of the Towers were ejected from the buildings.<sup>44</sup>

### **Building 7 Overview**

Mr. Power next presents us with a number of rude and disrespectful comments he's gotten from people on YouTube, but then gives an overview on why Building 7 supposedly collapsed. Essentially, he just presents a rehashing of NIST's assertions in their report on why the

---

<sup>42</sup> Steven Jones, "Steven Jones and Frank Greening (and others) correspond - April-May, 2009," *911 Blogger*, 14 May 2009, at <http://911blogger.com/node/20094>.

<sup>43</sup> See "Gordon Ross investigation into WTC collapse" at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RZjOMkieVaw#t=8m01s>.

<sup>44</sup> Videos of these ejections available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kcd6PQAKmj4#t=49m55s>.

building collapsed.<sup>45</sup> But we shall see that neither NIST nor Mr. Power are correct in their assessments of the building's collapse.

### **The 9/11 Commission Report**

Though it has been a concern for many in the Movement that Building 7's collapse was not mentioned in the 9/11 Commission Report, Mr. Power sees nothing wrong with it, reasoning (like many other debunkers) that the Commission Report was not an engineering report, so it would have had no reason to make mention of it. However, the Commission's choice to not include Building 7's collapse simply reflects their unjustified pre-conceived conclusions on why the building came down. As I explained in my response to Joseph Nobles on this same issue:

The Commission Report was not an engineering report, but they didn't know that fire was the official explanation for its collapse yet. Again, it goes back to assuming that fire brought the building down, which fire has never done before.<sup>46</sup>

And contrary to what Mr. Power claims, Building 7 apparently was considered a possible terrorist target on 9/11, according to Richard Rotanz, the Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Management.<sup>47</sup> For the Commission to have omitted Building 7's collapse from their report was totally unjustified. Mr. Power also mentions that WTC Building 3 collapsed on 9/11 as well, but was also not mentioned in the Commission Report. However, Building 3's collapse was dramatically different from Building 7's, as videos and photos clearly show the building being crushed by falling debris from the Towers. The building showed none of the characteristics of explosive demolition which, as we shall see, were all present in the collapse of Building 7.

---

<sup>45</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1A, at [https://www.nist.gov/publications/final-report-collapse-world-trade-center-building-7-federal-building-and-fire-safety-0?pub\\_id=861610](https://www.nist.gov/publications/final-report-collapse-world-trade-center-building-7-federal-building-and-fire-safety-0?pub_id=861610).

<sup>46</sup> See p. 189 of this present work.

<sup>47</sup> "It could have been a target, I felt at the time because of where we were, it could have been a serious target. And plus the other federal agencies in that building." Quoted from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vZbMfTtHkYM&t=530s>.

## The “Official” Explanation

We then get a discussion from Mr. Power on what the NIST report claims was the cause of the building’s collapse. Mr. Power correctly notes that normal office fires were said by NIST to be the official cause of collapse, with no contributions from the diesel tanks or the structural damage from fall of the North Tower. He explains that falling debris from WTC1 did ignite the fires in the building, and that the critical fires grew and lasted on floors 7 to 9 and 11 to 13. However, Mr. Power then discusses how even though the north side of the building was essentially undamaged, the south side of the building “show[s] a very different story.” He shows us photos taken from the south side of the building, which show a large amount on smoke and some damage on the building’s south face. He evidently does this to imply that Building 7 had severe fires and structural damage which compromised the building.

However, he previously noted that only six floors in the building had severe fires which contributed to the collapse. The large amount of smoke on Building 7’s south face was likely due to negative pressure, which drew the smoke from the burning WTC complex.<sup>48</sup> Videos and photos show that the exact same thing happened to WTC1 after WTC2 collapsed.<sup>49</sup> As for the structural damage, NIST makes it clear that the damage did not help to initiate the collapse,<sup>50</sup> a fact that Mr. Power has acknowledged.

Though Mr. Power would agree with NIST that the fires in the building were severe enough to cause the building to collapse, other scientists have argued just the opposite. Scientists on both sides of the argument have noted that NIST evidently exaggerated the temperatures of the fires which initiated the collapse. Kevin Ryan, in response to NIST’s assertion of fires in the 600 °C range, wrote:

---

<sup>48</sup> A phenomenon even acknowledged by NIST: “Due to the wind direction, it was common for smoke to ‘bank up’ against the south face [of WTC7]. For this reason, it was usually not possible to differentiate different types of smoke or to identify smoke source locations on the south face.” Quoted from NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 196, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/structural-fire-response-and-probable-collapse-sequence-world-trade-center-building-7>.

<sup>49</sup> See Adam Taylor, “A Response to Chris Mohr’s Respectful Rebuttal of Richard Gage’s *9/11 Blueprint for Truth*,” pp. 133-36, at <https://citizenfor911.truth.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/responsetochrismohr4-1.pdf>.

<sup>50</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-9, p. 618.

[R]aising those five floor beams to a temperature of 600 °C would require an enormous amount of energy, far more than was available from the burning of the office furnishings underneath the floor beams.<sup>51</sup>

Likewise, Dr. Frank Greening, a physical chemist who does not believe WTC7 was demolished, wrote in his letter to NIST:

NIST's collapse initiation hypothesis requires that structural steel temperatures on floors 12/13 significantly exceeded 300 °C - a condition that could never have been realized with NIST's postulated 32 kg/m<sup>2</sup> fuel loading.<sup>52</sup>

So, while Kevin Ryan has asserted that the fires in WTC7 could not have reached 600°C, Dr. Greening rejects the idea the fires could have reached even 300°C. Furthermore, researcher Chris Sarns has demonstrated that the critical fires that were supposed to have caused the collapse were burned out before the time of collapse.<sup>53</sup>

### The Collapse

Mr. Power then proceeds to discuss the collapse sequence espoused by NIST in their report. Thermal expansion of the girders on floor 13 are said to have caused the collapse of this floor, initiating the buckling and failure of column 79, which in turn caused columns 80 and 81 to fail, which then led to a chain reaction that caused the rest of the interior columns to collapse. This left the outer perimeter of the building a hollow shell, which eventually collapsed now that it was unsupported by the interior. But this entire scenario has been shown to be extremely problematic. For starters, we now know that the girders in Building 7 would have been much more

---

<sup>51</sup> Kevin Ryan, "The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science reaches its peak," *911 Review*, 10 September 2008, at [http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST\\_WTC7.html](http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST_WTC7.html).

<sup>52</sup> F. R. Greening, "Comments on the Draft Report NIST NCSTAR 1-9: *Structural Fire Response and Probable Collapse Sequence of World Trade Center Building 7*," issued by NIST August 21st, 2008," 11 September 2008, p. 5, at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/greeningcommentsncstar1-9.pdf>.

<sup>53</sup> Chris Sarns, "NIST fraud - WTC 7 Shear Studs," *OpEdNews*, 9 November 2008, at <https://www.opednews.com/Diary/NIST-fraud--WTC-7-Shear-S-by-Chris-Sarns-081109-134.html>.

secure than previously asserted by NIST.<sup>54</sup> Being more secure would have made them much more resistant to the effects of thermal expansion, and thus would not have helped to initiate the collapse.

Second, the description of Building 7's collapse given by NIST is totally at odds with what we actually see in the videos of the building's destruction. After discussing NIST's explanation of how the interior columns collapsed, Mr. Power asserts that "the effects of this can clearly be seen in the video, as the east penthouse was directly above column 79." Note that he says that the effects of this event are seen in the video. He does not say that the event itself can be seen, which it obviously cannot. In other words, Mr. Power assumes that the fall of the penthouse was a result of NIST's scenario, which requires him to already take NIST at their word. But others have pointed out that the videos of Building 7's collapse strongly contradict NIST's explanation of events.<sup>55</sup> As noted by Dr. Frank Greening:

According to NIST, the global collapse of WTC 7 began 6.9 seconds after the East Penthouse collapse or about 23 seconds into the simulation. Now consider NIST's Figures 12-66, 12-67 and 12-69 and in particular the images showing the alleged state of the core 17.5, 19.5, 20.7, 21.8, 24.1, 26.8 and 28.8 seconds into the collapse simulation. These images represent NIST's view of what the core looked like at ~1-2 second intervals following the collapse of the East Penthouse. What is most significant about these images is that around the time of global collapse initiation NIST's simulation shows that the eastern half of the core had completely collapsed while the western half of the core remained standing and relatively undamaged. This is quite remarkable since videos of the collapse of WTC 7 show that up to and well beyond the moment that the roofline of WTC 7 exhibited its first downward movement, the exterior of the building revealed absolutely no signs of NIST's proposed partial collapse of the core even though the core was connected to the exterior walls of Building 7 by dozens of horizontal beams on every floor.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> See discussion of this in the video "NIST Lies: Final Report on World Trade Center Building Seven," at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cgOGmUo9O2Y>.

<sup>56</sup> Frank Greening, "Additional Comments by F.R. Greening on NIST's Global Collapse Analysis in Chapter 12 on NCSTAR 1-9," in "Public Comments Received by NIST on DRAFT Reports," p. 315, at <https://www.nist.gov/system/files/documents/2017/05/09/combined2008publicComments-2.pdf>. Note that the figures Dr. Greening refers to, Figures 12-66, 12-67, and 12-69 in NIST's draft

Dr. Greening ultimately concludes that such extensive interior destruction prior to the perimeter collapse “would have caused the eastern facade to buckle well before global collapse ensued,” and that “this buckling would have been visible as a bowing of the northeast corner of the building.” But as Dr. Greening rightly observes, “such pre-collapse buckling or bowing of WTC 7 was not observed.”<sup>57</sup> Though NIST asserts that the strength of the exterior enabled it to avoid deforming during the collapse,<sup>58</sup> this still leaves open the question of how Building 7 was therefore able to collapse as fast as it did. In other words, defenders of the official story cannot have it both ways; either the exterior was strong enough to avoid deforming during interior collapse, or it was weak enough to allow the building to collapse at the rate it did.

Mr. Power also notes the apparent “dishonesty” of truthers for failing to show the east penthouse collapse “in the majority their videos.” However, many in the movement have discussed the fall of the east penthouse in great detail, and several of the professionally made movies and presentations by the Movement show and discuss the penthouse.<sup>59</sup> They have also explained why the penthouse cannot justifiably be included in the total collapse time of the building. As mechanical engineer Tony Szamboti explains:

The WTC 7 East penthouse had columns on its perimeter and none in its interior. On three sides these columns mounted near the edge of the roof of WTC 7. It is unlikely that a collapse of any core columns of the main building could have pulled them completely down without the roof beams breaking completely loose from the exterior columns and moving down completely also. It is unlikely that the roof beams were severed from the exterior columns,

---

report, now appear in the final report as Figures 12-67, 12-68, and 12-70, respectively

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 315-16.

<sup>58</sup> “Questions and Answers about the NIST WTC 7 Investigation,” 19 September 2011 (last updated 20 November 2019), question 29, at <https://www.nist.gov/topics/disaster-failure-studies/faqs-nist-wtc-7-investigation>.

<sup>59</sup> E.g., [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BS8vktP0I\\_Y#t=49m39s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BS8vktP0I_Y#t=49m39s), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1gYgg8Ig-Gc&t=7190s>, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kcd6PQAKmj4#t=27m58s>.

which is what would be necessary for a core collapse to cause the penthouse to collapse.<sup>60</sup>

In other words, had the initial collapse of the penthouse been caused by a collapse of the core of the main building, then the rest of the roof would have collapsed at the same time as the penthouse. Because it didn't, this is strong evidence that the collapse of the penthouse and the collapse of the main building were wholly separate events.

### **Free-Fall**

The issue of Building 7's 2.25 second period of free-fall is then discussed, and like many other debunkers Mr. Power asserts that this was caused by the buckling of the building's exterior columns between floors 7 and 14. However, in my previous writings<sup>61</sup> I have given four reasons to dispute this:

1. We have no visual evidence of this buckling occurring, so the claim is only based on NIST's word.
2. All of NIST's models show the buckling occurring only on the west side of the building. However, the free fall occurs over the entire width of the building. We know this because the roofline remains essentially straight through the period of free fall. Other than the slight kink, the roofline remains essentially straight for the first 4-5 seconds of its collapse.
3. Even if the buckling did occur, there is no evidence supporting that it would even cause the building to free fall in the first place. We would only be looking at warped and twisted steel, but not zero steel.
4. NIST's own simulations show that this buckling would cause the building to fall in a different manner than what was observed in the videos.

It is for these reasons that I reject the notion that the buckling of any of the perimeter columns could have caused the building to fall at free-fall. As Tony Szamboti explains regarding all three buildings:

---

<sup>60</sup> Quoted from "Clarifying the Collapse Time of WTC 7," *Washington's Blog*, 6 September 2008, at <http://georgewashington2.blogspot.com/2008/09/clarifying-collapse-time-of-wtc-7.html>.

<sup>61</sup> Adam Taylor, "Debunking the Debunkers' Free Fall Fallacies," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 6 June 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/06/debunking-debunkers-free-fall-fallacies.html>.

The minimum resistance during buckling is a function of the plastic moment and the unsupported length of the column. In a one-story unsupported length of the Twin Tower box columns, it was approximately 25% of the yield strength of the column. For the wide-flange columns in the core it was lower, at about 14% of yield. The wide-flange core columns at the 98th floor of the North Tower had a minimum factor of safety against gravity of 3 and the perimeter box columns a minimum factor of safety against gravity of 5. The core columns would have to buckle over one story with their moment connected beams at each floor, so they would provide a minimum resistance during buckling of about 42% of their load. A case could be made that the perimeter columns initially buckled over two stories and thus their resistance would be 12.5% of yield, so they would have still provided a resistance of 65% of their load. The load split between the core and perimeter was 42% core and 58% perimeter. The resistance during buckling would thus be  $(0.42)(0.42) + (0.58)(0.65) = 0.55$ . So the resistance to the actual load during buckling would have been a minimum of about 0.55g [...] Additionally, WTC 7 could not come down in freefall while its columns were buckling for the reasons I showed above, and it didn't start to tilt over until it was about 60% of the way down and well beyond that initial 8-story (100-foot) freefall.<sup>62</sup>

### Other Evidence

Mr. Power finishes up this section by re-asserting that there was no chemical evidence of explosives/incendiaries found in the debris of Building 7. But as I already explained earlier, the study that supposedly disproved that there was any chemical evidence of explosives has been shown to be unreliable. Mr. Power also makes mention of the fact that there were evidently no sounds of explosions heard when Building 7 collapsed. But this argument is wrong for several reasons. For starters, there were several eyewitnesses who did report hearing explosions when the building collapsed. For example, first responder Craig Bartmer has testified that:

I was real close to Building 7 when it fell down [...] That didn't sound like just a building falling down to me [...] There's a lot of eyewitness testimony down there of hearing explosions [...] I think I know an explosion when I hear it.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Comment from Tony Szamboti at <http://911blogger.com/news/2011-10-18/pacifica-radio-twin-towers-debate-9112011#comment-253951>.

<sup>63</sup> "WTC Building 7 Explosions First Responder Craig Bartmer Interview," at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-IfgYhjQ9fE>.

A New York University medical student also claimed that he and others “heard this sound that sounded like a clap of thunder” right before the building collapsed.<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, there are recordings from 9/11 in which loud explosions can be heard (which were recorded after the Towers collapsed, but before Building 7 collapsed).<sup>65</sup> There is at least one video of Building 7’s collapse in which a sharp explosive noise can be heard as it collapses.<sup>66</sup> And physicist David Chandler has analyzed one video of Building 7’s collapse and has found sound evidence for explosions in the building.<sup>67</sup> But this whole point about hearing explosions occur from the building is moot anyway, as sound evidence is seen as insignificant according to official fire/explosive investigation guidelines. According to the NFPA 921 Guide, section 21.1.4:

Although an explosion is almost always accompanied by the production of a loud noise, the noise itself is not an essential element in the definition of an explosion. The generation and violent escape of gases are the primary criteria of an explosion.<sup>68</sup>

So, as stated by the official NFPA 921 Guide, the actual sound of an explosive is not essential in determining if an explosive event took place. The very characteristics of all three building collapses should have been reason enough to believe that they were destroyed with explosives. The NFPA 921 guide also notes that explosives should be considered whenever there is “high-order damage, which is defined as:

High-order damage is characterized by shattering of the structure, producing small, pulverized debris. Walls, roofs, and structural members are splintered

---

<sup>64</sup> “WTC7 eyewitness 2 PFC,” at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zkuXQtPzNEA>.

<sup>65</sup> “World Trade Center on 9/11 - Sounds of Explosions,” at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_A9X\\_8fIGeM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_A9X_8fIGeM).

<sup>66</sup> “WTC7 collapse (rare video),” at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SIbqaybkbWI>.

<sup>67</sup> David Chandler, “WTC 7: Sound Evidence for Explosions,” 5 July 2010, at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ERhoNYj9\\_fg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ERhoNYj9_fg).

<sup>68</sup> NFPA 921 *Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations*, 2004 ed., Section 21.1.4, archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20140720031104/http://www.sierragal.com/252\\_stuff/NFPA\\_921.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20140720031104/http://www.sierragal.com/252_stuff/NFPA_921.pdf).

or shattered, with the building completely demolished. Debris is thrown great distances, possibly hundreds of feet.<sup>69</sup>

The first two sentences of this description would apply to Building 7, and the entire description would apply to the Twin Towers. Mr. Power's rejection of the evidence of controlled demolition for WTC7 is therefore totally unjustified.

### **Other Steel-Framed Building Collapses**

Mr. Power starts off his next section by discussing other steel-framed structures that have collapsed due to fire. He cites these as examples in order to add validity to the idea that fire could also have caused the WTC buildings to collapse. But his argument is problematic and very misleading. First off, he misstates the Truth Movement's arguments regarding fires in other buildings, saying that the Movement believes that the three WTC buildings "were the first steel-framed structures to collapse because of fire." This is not the position that the majority of the Movement holds. Rather, the Movement maintains that the three WTC buildings were, up to that point, the first *steel-framed high-rise skyscrapers* to ever collapse due to fire, which is a definite fact.<sup>70</sup> Most in the Movement gladly accept that steel can be weakened and fail due to fire. But what is not accepted is that fire would cause the total, complete, and explosive collapse of the buildings on 9/11. As noted by Joseph Plummer:

For the record, few in the scientific community doubt that it's theoretically possible for a building to experience failure if it is subjected to devastating heat for a sufficient period of time. And additional factors like no fire-proofing, no sprinkler systems, insufficient steel to "bleed off" heat or inferior construction greatly increase the possibility. However, what is "doubted" (or more accurately; considered downright impossible) is that such a failure would resemble anything like what was witnessed on 9/11. Gradual, isolated, asymmetrical failures spread out over time...perhaps. Simultaneous

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., Section 21.3.2.

<sup>70</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), "Other Skyscraper Fires," *911 Research*, last updated 20 March 2013, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/compare/fires.html>.

disintegration of all load bearing columns (leaving a pile of neatly folded rubble a few stories high)...no way.<sup>71</sup>

Mr. Power then goes on to discuss some of the examples he cites as evidence that steel can fail due to fires. He focuses particular attention on WTC5, which suffered a partial collapse on 9/11 due to fires. However, all of the examples he cites have already been addressed in another article of mine, and I encourage readers to view that in order to understand why these smaller steel structures cannot justifiably be used as fair comparisons to the Towers and Building 7.<sup>72</sup> In the case of WTC5, I give the following reasons why its partial collapse is not even remotely comparable to the other buildings:

- It was not a total building collapse.
- The fires in the building were far more severe than the fires in the Twin Towers and Building 7.
- The building was constructed differently than the Towers and Building 7.<sup>73</sup>

Mr. Power also briefly mentions Judy Wood's nonsense theory regarding Directed Energy Weapons, a theory discredited and disproven by other members of the Movement.<sup>74</sup> We then get a discussion of the BBC's early report of Building 7's collapse on 9/11. Mr. Power dismisses this anomaly, rationalizing (like most debunkers) that the BBC simply made a mistake. To back up this assertion, he provides a short list of other false reports given on 9/11 as evidence that the media was making mistakes that day.

However, this argument completely misses the point. The BBC's mistake was not like the other mistakes Mr. Power mentions, as the BBC

---

<sup>71</sup> Joseph Plummer, "Freeway Collapse," at <https://www.joeplummer.com/freeway-collapse>.

<sup>72</sup> See Chapter 1 of this present work.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 16-19.

<sup>74</sup> Jonathan Cole, Richard Gage, and Gregg Roberts, "FAQ #13: What is AE911Truth's assessment of the directed energy weapon (DEW) hypothesis?," *AE911Truth* (n.d.), at [www.ae911truth.org/evidence/faqs/353-faq-12-what-is-ae911truth-s-assessment-of-the-directed-energy-weapon-dew-hypothesis](http://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/faqs/353-faq-12-what-is-ae911truth-s-assessment-of-the-directed-energy-weapon-dew-hypothesis). See also Chapter 10 of this present work, and the relevant papers published by Dr. Greg Jenkins, James Gourley, Tony Szamboti, and Dr. Crockett Grabbe in the *Journal of 9/11 Studies* (<http://www.journalof911studies.com>).

was *not wrong* about what they reported. It's that they reported the event too early. But the event did in fact happen. The overall question the Truth Movement has asked in regards to this issue is who reported to the BBC that Building 7 had collapsed. Though it has been revealed that this was reported to the BBC by Reuters,<sup>75</sup> the question still remains why Reuters had the official explanation of Building 7's collapse – fire and damage – seven years before NIST released their report. As noted at 911review.com:

The question still remains as to the actual source of the report! The only thing the BBC can say is that it was an erroneous local story – but of course that day EVERY story from New York City was a local news story! Therefore the source of the report is still left unanswered. Why can't the BBC simply investigate the matter with the supposed due diligence they are famed for? Simply track down the original source - who it was and where it came from. This is exceedingly simple – and yet the inability of anyone to take any responsibility is amazing.<sup>76</sup>

Personally, my own views on the BBC's early report of Building 7's collapse are agnostic. However, I find Mr. Power's dismissal of this incident to be extremely disingenuous. Mr. Power questions why the BBC would be given this information by the conspirators, as he finds this unlikely to happen. Mr. Power is not the first to make this sort of argument, and it once again highlights the absurd circular logic that so many debunkers use. The early report of Building 7's collapse, if it did play some role in the conspiracy, was likely a mistake on the part of the conspirators. But debunkers often dismiss this possibility, claiming (as Mr. Power essentially claims here) that the conspirators wouldn't have made mistakes like that. However, we often also hear from debunkers that the events of 9/11 could not have been some sort of "inside job" because the conspirators would have made mistakes and let things slip! In other words, debunkers are trying to have it both ways; 9/11 couldn't have been an inside job because the conspirators would have made mistakes, and that incidents like the BBC's early report are not evidence of a conspiracy because the conspirators wouldn't have made mistakes like that.

Mr. Power then discusses Larry Silverstein and his infamous "pull it" quote. Many in the Truth Movement have interpreted this statement as an

---

<sup>75</sup> See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vZbMfTtHkYM&t=2628s>.

<sup>76</sup> "The Third Tower: A Critical Examination," *911 Review* (n.d.), at <http://911review.com/articles/richard/thirdtower.html>.

admission from Silverstein that he ordered Building 7 to be demolished. However, defenders of the official story insist that he was actually talking about pulling the firefighting efforts. While there is strong evidence to suggest that Silverstein was referring to the firefighting efforts when he spoke of the decision to “pull,”<sup>77</sup> there are several points to keep in mind:

- Silverstein claims to have spoken with the fire department commander on 9/11, which would have been Chief Daniel Nigro. However, Chief Nigro has denied that he spoke with Silverstein,<sup>78</sup> and has confirmed that the FDNY would have no reason to contact him about pulling the firefighting operations.<sup>79</sup>
- When Silverstein was asked who he conversed with on 9/11 about the decision to “pull,” he refused to answer.<sup>80</sup> To this day, no one from the FDNY has corroborated Silverstein’s story.
- Regardless of what Silverstein really meant by “pull it,” we now have confirmation that he did in fact discuss demolishing Building 7 on 9/11.<sup>81</sup>

Mr. Power finishes his discussion of Building 7 by questioning how the building itself is even evidence of a conspiracy in the first place. As far as he’s concerned, there was no logical reason for the conspirators to bring the building down in the first place. However, the building did contain a number of suspicious tenants, and financial records stored in the building have been cited as reason to bring the building down to destroy said

---

<sup>77</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), “Owner’s Admission?,” *911 Research*, last updated 29 April 2015, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/pullit.html>.

<sup>78</sup> “I am well aware of Mr. Silverstein’s statement, but to the best of my recollection, I did not speak to him on that day and I do not recall anyone telling me that they did either. That doesn’t mean he could not have spoken to someone from FDNY, it just means that I am not aware of it.” Quoted from <http://www.international skeptics.com/forums/showpost.php?p=3440364&postcount=1>.

<sup>79</sup> See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vZbMfTtHkYM&t=1338s>.

<sup>80</sup> See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EtPC0W4HII8#t=2m38s>.

<sup>81</sup> John-Michael Talboo and ScootleRoyale, “Possible Confirmation of ‘Pull It’ - In A Hitpiece!,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 22 April 2010, at [911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/04/possible-confirmation-of-pull-it-in.html](http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/04/possible-confirmation-of-pull-it-in.html).

records.<sup>82</sup> Of course, Mr. Power rejects this assumption, arguing that simply shredding the documents would have been far more efficient. This issue could be debated forever, but I would argue that just having the documents shredded and having them disappear all of a sudden would have caused an investigation into why the documents went missing. However, since the building collapsed on 9/11 (supposedly) due to a terrorist attack, there was no question of why the documents went missing, so an investigation into their disappearance was not needed.

But Mr. Power's focus on the issue "why" is severely fallacious. Regardless of why Building 7 would have been demolished, the important question here is whether or not it was a demolition in the first place. This is a scientific question, and the science ultimately decides what happened to the building that day. The "whos" and "whys" simply delve into the speculative politics of the matter, which are clearly secondary to the issue at hand. As a scientist Mr. Power should understand this, and his failure to do so is very troubling.

### **The Pentagon**

The issue of the Pentagon is then discussed, and here is one area where I agree with Mr. Power for the most part. While many in the Movement still maintain to this day that a plane did not crash into the Pentagon, the evidence definitively indicates otherwise.<sup>83</sup> However, I do maintain that the alleged pilot of the plane, Hani Hanjour, was not experienced enough to perform the maneuvers Flight 77 pulled off that day.<sup>84</sup> Having now finished his (mostly) scientific discussion of the WTC building collapses, Mr. Power then treats us to a different kind of discussion.

### **Psychology of Conspiracy Theorists**

In what is probably his weakest video, we are given a discussion of the psychology of conspiracy theorists by Mr. Power's friend Dave, who is a

---

<sup>82</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), "What Was In Building 7?," *WTC7.net*, last updated 27 February 2007, at <http://www.wtc7.net/background.html>.

<sup>83</sup> For useful collection of essays on the Pentagon, see <http://www.scientificmethod911.org/pentagon.html>.

<sup>84</sup> See discussion of this in John-Michael Talboo, "Knee Deep in Crap," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 18 December 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/12/knee-deep-in-crap.html>.

Ph.D. psychology researcher. Instead of examining any more of the evidence provided by the Truth Movement, this section is meant to examine the psychological reasons people in the Movement have for believing what they believe. In other words, it's another rehashing of the stereotypes leveled against anyone who happens to believe in a "conspiracy theory." To address this particular section, I'll mostly be quoting from the excellent article posted at Gatecreepers.com (now defunct) titled *Debunking Myths on Conspiracy Theories*.<sup>85</sup> Each assessment presented by Dave will be paraphrased based on arguments discussed in the Gatecreepers.com article, but each one will have a timestamp corresponding to each claim so that the full context of his statements can be seen. Each point quoted from the Gatecreepers.com article will be assigned to an assessment made by Dave based on how well it matches to the particular issue he's discussing. Dave's claims are all made in the following video, where the timestamps correspond to.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0TELiWR00Ik>

**[1:31] Myth #21 CONSPIRACY THEORISTS FEEL POWERLESS AND BLAME THE ESTABLISHMENT FOR THEIR FAILURES**

This is not logical. Powerlessness alone does not cause people to question their leaders. However, observation and study of the political and economic causes of powerlessness can lead to acceptance of conspiracy theory. In other words, it is not the powerlessness of the individual which enables suspicion, but rather the systemic causes of that powerlessness.

The same goes for claims that conspiracy theorists distrust their friends, which conflates suspicion of government with paranoid delusion. Suspicion is targeted specifically towards the political elite, while in many cases friendships may be strengthened out of solidarity in its opposition. Likewise, whether the conspiracy theorist will fight against the system or use the knowledge as an excuse to justify their apathy depends on the personality of the subject.

**[7:48] Myth #32 CONSPIRACY THEORISTS SELECT EVIDENCE AND FIX IT ACCORDING TO PREDETERMINED CONCLUSIONS**

---

<sup>85</sup> "Debunking Myths on Conspiracy Theories" (n.d.), archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20110305120102/http://www.gatecreepers.com/entries/exclusive-debunking-myths-on-conspiracy-theorie>.

Contrarily to media-spread stereotypes, conspiracy theorists don't make up theories just for fun. They are prompted by the existence of important evidence that contradicts the official story, or points at actors other than the ones being accused. Although they believe that all things presented as facts by the establishment should be questioned and taken with a healthy dose of skepticism, it does not mean that they will cling to the first theory they encounter. Often times they judge other alternative theories involving different actors and eliminate them when they cannot be sustained with evidence.

Pro-government researchers themselves may start from the conclusion because they are under pressure to prove the government's story. In these cases, the scope and methods of their investigations are pre-decided and faulty - this can result in the creation of alternate theories which include evidence and research not carried out by official representatives.

#### Myth #34 CONSPIRACY THEORISTS ONLY LOOK AT EVIDENCE THAT CONFIRMS THEIR THEORIES

This phenomenon is called confirmation bias. While systemic bias can be found in any area of research, especially when dealing with politically charged subjects, it is not a feature particular to conspiracy theories. This claim assumes that conspiracy theorists have an inherent motive to predetermine the outcome of their research, a falsehood addressed in Myth #32.

Furthermore, this claim wrongly assumes that because there may be omitted evidence, that this evidence is both relevant and damaging enough to confront the conspiracy theory.

#### [9:27] Myth #12 CONSPIRACY THEORIES ARE BASED ON FAITH

...Another reason this argument is made is because atheists believe that conspiracy theorists are absorbed in their beliefs in the same way that religious people believe in their religion based on faith rather than reason. Such cases are not specific to belief in conspiracy theories; rather they are an ego reaction inherent to the underdog status of conspiracy theories conferred by the media.

Most conspiracy theorists do not feel emotional attachment to their theories; only some of them do after being marginalized for promoting an alternative view. Ridicule targets the theorist personally, by attributing the silly aspects of the theory to him, and thus the ridicule defines his relationship toward the proponents of the status-quo. The theorist, on some level, links the ridiculed theory to his integrity and honesty and so strives to prove its validity, in order to clear his smeared name.

Similar irrationality can also be seen with official story proponents who are unwilling to believe that authority figures may conspire to harm their

citizens, and would have much to lose from realizing that the world they are living in is far more corrupt than they want to believe.

**[11:22] Myth #22 CONSPIRACY THEORIES ARE REASSURING BECAUSE THEY GIVE A SENSE OF ORDER**

The claim that conspiracy theorists crave order is based on the erroneous belief that conspiracy theorists suffer from a perceived absence of central authority. In fact, the majority of theorists prize individuality and freedom more than the average person, and will therefore be more sensitive to systemic abuse.

Furthermore, reassurance isn't possible because most conspiracy theories refer to corrupt dishonest leadership, and/or semi-secretive criminal activities which are damaging to society.

**Myth #30 CONSPIRACY THEORIES GAIN ACCEPTANCE BECAUSE THEY MAKE SENSE OUT OF TRAUMATIC EVENTS BY DESIGNATING SCAPEGOATS**

While this theory sounds very academic, it is a carefully crafted spin. It is true that people need to make sense of traumatic events, but in a state of panic people will usually cling to the first explanation they hear, which is the reason why such events are so often and easily exploited (and in many cases staged) by governments for their own agendas. Hence, it is the government theory, which, often being itself a conspiracy theory and designating scapegoats, accomplishes the role of making sense out of the traumatic event, while alternate theories are shut out of the debate, and only gain acceptance much later when the shock effect settles down.

**[11:41] Myth #14 CONSPIRACY THEORISTS ARE ANTI-SEMITIC**

Most conspiracy theorists are not interested in the conspirator's origins or religion at all. They wish to study and expose a corrupt system. They do this by pointing out special and suspicious relationships, not culture. This is an important difference. Many of the organisations mentioned in conspiracy theories lack any religious or cultural identity. They are corporate, military, financial or petroleum-based. That being said, Jews engage in conspiracies like other people, and are not immune from criticism.

While a minority of conspiracy theorists do believe that there is a specifically Jewish elite, most conspiracy theorists are far more concerned by political agendas, such as Zionist and Israeli influences in national governments, than Jewish cultural and racial issues. Many conspiracy theorists are not concerned with Jews or Zionism at all, but are accused of anti-semitism

because they denounce the excessive power held by international bankers (which is claimed by organisations like the ADL to be ‘code’ for Jews).

In turn, the stereotype is used by some people as an ad hominem attack on conspiracy theorists and critics of Zionism, as well as a straw man, much like the Jewish conspiracy originated as an ad hominem attack on communists, as many of them were Jews at the time. Disinformation agents can also publicly pose as anti-semitic conspiracy theorists in order to get all conspiracy theorists smeared with these characteristics.

It is up to the accusers to prove the presence of anti-semitism in specific relevant cases, and furthermore to prove the theory wrong. Pointing out anti-semitism does not render a theory false.

#### **[12:52] Myth #4 CONSPIRACY THEORISTS BELIEVE IN UFOS / ALIENS / APOLLO MOON / HOLOCAUST DENIAL**

This is a straw man and an ad hominem fallacy. Not all conspiracy theorists believe in the same things, nor does believing in aliens invalidate their arguments on other theories. The only thing linking these things is that they are all perceived to be conspiracy theories. Each should be evaluated on its own merits.

However, if a theorist bases their beliefs on poor argumentation, then other conspiracy theorists may want to distance themselves from him/her or question that theorist’s ability to support their own ideas. Many such people are accused of being deliberately planted to discredit other theories, a technique called the ‘poisoned well’. The media then proceeds to discredit an entire investigative movement based on a few silly theories - a strawman attack.

When the media lumps anybody who doesn’t trust the government version of 9-11 into the category of flat earthers and holocaust deniers, any real conspiracy there might have been is given the ultimate defense. Namely, a pre-emptive, universal ad hominem on anyone who would dare talk about it publicly, the archetypal ‘tin foil hatter’.

#### **[14:55] Myth #36 CONSPIRACISM RESULTS IN AN EXCESSIVELY DIVERSE SET OF DIFFERENT NARRATIVES BASED ON DIFFERENT ASSUMPTIONS**

This is usually argued as opposed to the idea that so-called ‘scientific’ process would lead to a streamlined or ‘united’ theory. In fact, there are many examples in the domain of scientific research that show that this is not necessarily the case.

As in any ongoing investigation, a number of hypotheses are formulated and, over time, some are disproven whilst others are strengthened or proven.

Of particular importance is the slow, ongoing release of evidence which helps or terminates these investigations. It is unscientific to demand the removal of narratives before evidence is found to prove or disprove them.

Indeed, the motivation behind this myth may be a dishonest one: to convince theorists to narrow the set of narratives until what remains is easily disprovable or dismissible due to lack of supporting evidence, or due to vagueness.

### **[17:29] Myth #13 CONSPIRACY THEORISTS ARE PARANOID AND ENGAGE IN FEARMONGERING**

The news media engages in far more fearmongering than do conspiracy theorists, by making people believe that criminals and terrorists are out to get them. The difference is that conspiracy theorists say that the government is usually the cause, and not the solution to those problems.

Politicians use fearmongering to make people accept their rules about how society should be controlled, and the mainstream media helps them do this. Conspiracy theorists have no such goals of control, nor the means to achieve those goals.

Paranoia is a mental disorder - and so this myth suggests that conspiracy theorists are inventing enemies and tormentors, when in fact many theories arise as challenges to perceived impossibilities or inaccuracies in an official story, rather than non-existent entities.

This myth by itself neither proves nor disproves any proposed theories. This myth also contradicts the idea that people use conspiracy theories to assuage their fears of social problems (Myth #5).

These are all the assessments I could see. In light of this, I encourage Mr. Power, Dave, and anyone else to read the full article at Gatecreepers.com to understand why all these psychological evaluations are insignificant. I would also encourage them to listen to the evaluations of other psychologists on how these psychological roadblocks apply just as much to people who believe the government's stories.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Dennis P. McMahon, "Psychology Experts Speak Out: 'Why is the 9/11 Evidence Difficult for Some to Accept?,'" *AE911Truth*, 19 July 2012, at <http://www1.ae911truth.org/en/news-section/41-articles/645-psychology-experts-speak-out-why-is-the-911-evidence-difficult-for-some-to-accept->.

## Flight 93 and Final Thoughts

The last section of Mr. Power's rebuttal is simply a rehashing of the feedback he's gotten on all his previous videos. This feedback includes comments he's received on YouTube, video responses, and the first part of my critique. His brief mention of my rebuttal is astoundingly weak, and I've addressed his comments and his attempts to defend his comments elsewhere.<sup>87</sup>

He also speaks briefly about Flight 93, which is a highly disputed issue in the 9/11 Truth Movement.<sup>88</sup> As we've established, Mr. Power's video series falls well short of refuting the Truth Movement's case. Though he seems right on a number of small issues, he has failed at refuting the Movement's overall premise; that the attacks of 9/11 were some kind of inside job, and that a new investigation is still needed. While Mr. Power acknowledges that he doesn't expect to change anyone's mind with his series, I sincerely hope my critique of his series will make him rethink his position, and see that the evidence just might be as strong as the Movement asserts. I encourage him to evaluate the claims of the official investigators, such as NIST, just as thoroughly as he has evaluated the claims of the Movement. Doing anything less would be inconsistent, and represents bad reasoning and bad science.

One final thing I'd like to mention, Mr. Power has an interesting post on his blog titled "Debunking 9/11 Conspiracy Theorists [sic] Claims with Simple Google Searches."<sup>89</sup> There's nothing he discusses in it that I haven't already addressed here, so I won't bother critiquing any arguments he makes. Rather, I note with amusement that he thinks debunking conspiracy theories regarding 9/11 takes nothing more than a simple Google search. However, if Mr. Power's research into this subject is any

---

<sup>87</sup> Adam Taylor, "Speaking Truth to Power," *Adam Taylor's Blog*, 26 January 2013, at <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2013/01/speaking-truth-to-power.html>.

<sup>88</sup> For a balanced take on this topic, see John-Michael Talboo, "A 9/11 Debunking Video Worth Considering," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 6 August 2009, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2009/08/debunking-video-worth-considering.html>.

<sup>89</sup> Myles Power, "Debunking 9/11 Conspiracy Theorists [sic] Claims with Simple Google Searches," *MP Blog*, 17 September 2012, at <https://mylespower.co.uk/2012/09/17/debunking-911-conspiracy-theorists-claims-with-simple-google-searches>.

indicator, it is going to take far more than just Google searches to debunk the case for controlled demolition of the WTC skyscrapers. And on that note, I finish with a quote from one of the greatest scientists who ever lived, and hope that Mr. Power will consider his words as much as I have.

*A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on both sides of each question.*

–Charles Darwin

## **Rebels without a Case: A Failed Debunking Attempt by Ron Craig and Rebel Media**

Originally published 16 September 2015 at  
<http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com>  
 Minor Revisions by Adam Taylor

For the 14th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, David Menzies of Rebel Media interviewed explosives expert Ron Craig,<sup>1</sup> resulting in the umteen-thousandth time a so-called “expert” tried (and failed) to debunk the evidence for controlled demolition of the WTC. Mr. Menzies discusses seven “myths” raised by members of the Truth Movement, to which Ron gave his opinion of each. Let’s see what Ron has to offer this year, shall we?

### **Myth 1: Scientific Evidence Explosives Were Used**

According to Ron, the Movement’s case for controlled demolition rests “basically on two things: photographic evidence [...] and personal testimonials.” Yes Ron, that’s all our case is “basically” based on. It couldn’t be that our case is also based on peer-reviewed data,<sup>2</sup> discussing topics such as the forensic evidence at Ground Zero,<sup>3</sup> or detailed mathematical models and analyses of the collapse mechanics of the buildings.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “9/11 conspiracies debunked by explosives expert,” 11 September 2015, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ktfnyC5IR3U>.

<sup>2</sup> John-Michael Talboo, “Peer-Reviewed 9/11 Truth,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 10 October 2014, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2012/10/peer-reviewed-911-truth.html>.

<sup>3</sup> Niels Harrit *et al*, “Active Thermite Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe,” *The Open Chemical Physics Journal* (2009), at <https://benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOCPJ/TOCPJ-2-7.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> Gregory Szuladziński *et al*, “Some Misunderstandings Related to WTC Collapse Analysis,” *Int. J. of Protective Structures*, June 2013, at <https://911>

No, it must just be what the buildings looked like and what people said about them. Straw, meet man. But dealing with the points Ron does raise, the physical characteristics of the buildings' collapses, while not definitive proof, are nonetheless evidence for demolition, given that no building collapse in history has exhibited every feature shown by the WTC Towers outside of controlled demolitions.<sup>5</sup>

Ron's second point is in regards to the sounds of explosions attested to by eyewitnesses at Ground Zero. And we're given the oh-so original rebuttal that "there are lots of noises that are unexplainable, but that doesn't mean it was explosives." Well, he might have a point, except that, again, we're not basing our case only on what people said. Does he honestly think we haven't considered this argument before? As we've explained in detail, prosaic explanations for these sounds can be ruled out once factors such as physical effects, location, and energy levels are taken into account and examined.<sup>6</sup>

## **Myth 2: Thermite Cut Steel Columns**

The second "mythology" about 9/11 Ron takes a crack at is thermite being used to demolish the structures. Amusingly, he doesn't even address the issue actually being raised by David Menzies; whether or not thermite could have been used to demolish the Towers. Perhaps it's because Ron is well aware of thermite's explosive capabilities when formulated correctly, a fact that is well documented.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps he's also aware that even ordinary un-explosive thermate can effectively cut through steel beams.<sup>8</sup>

Regardless, the point he focuses on instead is over whether or not there could have been rivers of molten steel at Ground Zero. Ron thinks not, since, according to him, "for steel to melt there has to be a constant heat." In essence, he argues that there couldn't "possibly be a river of material running for thirty days under the WTC buildings," since it would have

---

[speakout.org/wp-content/uploads/Some-Misunderstandings-Related-to-WTC-Collapse-Analysis.pdf](http://speakout.org/wp-content/uploads/Some-Misunderstandings-Related-to-WTC-Collapse-Analysis.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> See Chapter 1 of this present work.

<sup>6</sup> See pp. 65-67 of this present work.

<sup>7</sup> Kevin Ryan, "The Explosive Nature of Nanothermite," *Physics 911* (n.d.), at <http://physics911.net/the-explosive-nature-of-nanothermite>.

<sup>8</sup> Jon Cole, "9/11 Experiments: The Great Thermate Debate," *911 Blogger*, 10 November 2010, at <http://911blogger.com/news/2010-11-10/911-experiments-great-thermate-debate>.

solidified early on in the debris. I can buy that Ron's a fine explosive expert (maybe), but he's a lousy chemist. The argument isn't that the metal continued to be molten without a heat source. Rather, the residues from the thermite reactions continued reacting underneath the debris piles, in effect creating a "witch's brew" of ongoing chemical reactions which created the molten metal and continued to heat it. There is indeed evidence for energetic materials and reactions at Ground Zero, documented in some more of that pesky peer-reviewed scientific literature Ron apparently doesn't know about.<sup>9</sup>

Despite actual forensic evidence,<sup>10</sup> numerous photographs, and a sizable number of eyewitnesses to the molten pools at Ground Zero,<sup>11</sup> Ron says that our "proof" of molten metal is actually a photo of firefighters looking into a hole, filled not with molten metal, but simply being lit by a search light. Yes, Ron actually thinks we still use the photo Steven Jones mistakenly thought was a photo of molten metal.<sup>12</sup> Welcome to 2015 Mr. Craig. Maybe you haven't read Steven Jones' latest edition of his paper that lacks this photo.<sup>13</sup> Do try and keep up Ron. In that same paper, Dr. Jones explains that the length of time the metal continued to glow is consistent with molten iron:

[T]he observed surface of this metal is still reddish-orange some six weeks after 9-11. This implies a large quantity of a metal with fairly low heat

---

<sup>9</sup> Kevin Ryan, James Gourley, and Steven Jones, "Environmental anomalies at the World Trade Center: evidence for energetic materials," *The Environmentalist*, 4 August 2008, at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10669-008-9182-4>.

<sup>10</sup> Jim Hoffman (webmaster), "Forensic Metallurgy," *911 Research*, last updated 28 July 2007, at <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/metallurgy/index.html>.

<sup>11</sup> For photos and eyewitness accounts of molten metal at Ground Zero, see the webpage "World Trade Center Hot Spots," archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20150103073728/http://911encyclopedia.com/wiki/index.php/World\\_Trade\\_Center\\_Hot\\_Spots](https://web.archive.org/web/20150103073728/http://911encyclopedia.com/wiki/index.php/World_Trade_Center_Hot_Spots).

<sup>12</sup> Steven Jones, "Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Collapse?" (2006), archived at <http://web.archive.org/web/20060826001818/http://www.physics.byu.edu/research/energy/htm7.html>.

<sup>13</sup> Steven Jones, "Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Completely Collapse?," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, September 2006, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why\\_Indeed\\_Did\\_the\\_WTC\\_Buildings\\_Completely\\_Collapse\\_Jones\\_Thermite\\_World\\_Trade\\_Center.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why_Indeed_Did_the_WTC_Buildings_Completely_Collapse_Jones_Thermite_World_Trade_Center.pdf).

conductivity and a relatively large heat capacity (e.g., iron is more likely than aluminum) even in an underground location. Like magma in a volcanic cone, such metal might remain hot and molten for a long time – once the metal is sufficiently hot to melt in large quantities and then kept in a fairly-well insulated underground location. Moreover, as hypothesized below, thermite reactions may well have resulted in substantial quantities (observed in pools) of molten iron at very high temperatures – initially above 2,000 °C (3,632 °F). At these temperatures, various materials entrained in the molten metal pools will continue to undergo exothermic reactions which would tend to keep the pools hot for weeks despite radiative and conductive losses.<sup>14</sup>

Kidding aside, I find it very hard to believe Ron isn't aware of any of this. The evidence for molten metal pools and extreme heat at Ground Zero has been thoroughly documented by members of the Movement,<sup>15</sup> and for him to think we rely on that one photo is baffling to me. Remember, this man claims to have debunked the case for WTC demolition, meaning that he supposedly studied the Movement's arguments and is thus up-to-date with what those arguments are. But no, he's here instead addressing points which are now over nine years old. It's either a case of sloppy research, or willful deception on his part. Get our arguments right Ron, or don't bother addressing them at all.

### **Myth 3: People Inside Towers Were Blown Off Their Feet**

Next, we move on to people inside the buildings experiencing explosions, which Ron tries to say was actually just the result of the planes impacting the buildings. In a moment that made me seriously question if he's actually read the NIST report on the Towers, Ron suggests that the planes were travelling at 700 mph when they struck the buildings. Well, that'd be news to NIST, who puts the plane speeds at around 440 mph for Flight 11 and 540 mph for Flight 175.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, Ron argues that no one at the WTC experienced injuries and effects consistent with the occurrence of explosives, when in fact numerous individuals, both inside and outside the buildings, did experience just that, effects which fit the description of

---

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>15</sup> Andrea Dreger, "Sources related to exceptionally high temperatures, and/or to persistent heat at Ground Zero," at [http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dreger/GroundZeroHeat2008\\_07\\_10.pdf](http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dreger/GroundZeroHeat2008_07_10.pdf).

<sup>16</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1-2, p. lxxiii, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/baseline-structural-performance-and-aircraft-impact-damage-analysis-world-trade-1>.

explosive events perfectly.<sup>17</sup> Likewise, we know from the testimony of Barry Jennings that he and Michael Hess experienced at least one explosion in Building 7, and while critics have attempted to explain away this event as just debris from WTC1, such claims have been found to be groundless.<sup>18</sup>

#### **Myth 4: Clouds of Dust Prove Explosives Were Used**

We're then treated to a discussion of the ejections of dust and debris from the Towers, and here I'm now wondering not only if Ron's read the NIST reports, but also if he's even bothered to watch videos of the collapses. He correctly notes that the buildings contained an enormous amount of drywall, which could account for the dust being crushed at the collapse front. However, this does nothing to explain the horizontal ejections of dust multiple stories below where the buildings are collapsing.<sup>19</sup> If the collapsing mass at the collapse front is producing the dust up top, then what's producing the dust further down twenty to forty stories?

He also asserts that "explosives would have ejected out three or four hundred feet past the pattern that we saw, which was just dust coming down and debris." I'm honestly at a loss here. Videos and photographs of the Tower collapses show that large sections of steel were thrown hundreds of feet away from the Towers.<sup>20</sup> Even NIST acknowledges this much, writing that "fragments [from WTC1] were forcibly ejected and traveled distances up to hundreds of meters."<sup>21</sup> Is the point he's making supposed to be that the debris didn't travel out past the dust clouds? What we see in the videos is the debris shooting out and trailing dust as it moves outside the buildings' perimeters. Which is what happens when explosives are set off. Remember Ron, explosives? Those things you're supposed to

---

<sup>17</sup> See pp. 65-67 of this present work.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 75-81.

<sup>19</sup> Kevin Ryan, "High Velocity Bursts of Debris From Point-Like Sources in the WTC Towers," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 13 June 2007, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2007/Ryan\\_HVBD.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2007/Ryan_HVBD.pdf).

<sup>20</sup> David Chandler, "High Speed Massive Projectiles from the WTC on 9/11," 27 April 2010, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eHnLlwqiu0A>. For other videos of this phenomenon, see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kcd6PQAKmj4&t=2995s>.

<sup>21</sup> NIST NCSTAR 1A, p. 16, at <https://www.nist.gov/publications/final-report-collapse-world-trade-center-building-7-federal-building-and-fire-safety-0>.

be an expert on? Likewise, analyses show that smaller debris from the Towers were ejected out as much as 1/4 of a mile away from the buildings.<sup>22</sup>

### **Myth 5: Building 7 Had No Damage But Still Collapsed Proves Explosives Were Used**

Up next we get a discussion of our so-called “Holy Grail” of conspiracy topics, World Trade Center 7. I should mention that the titles I’ve been giving these sections are from Mr. Menzies’ video, not my wording. It’s another nice little straw-man strategy employed, since you won’t find any informed truther tell you that Building 7 had no structural damage. Of course the building was damaged, but the question is whether or not that damage was sufficient to cause collapse. We in the Movement say no, but Ron thinks otherwise, noting that “new photographic evidence” shows that there was “considerable damage [...] to the rear of the building that we didn’t see before.” As to what photos he’s referring to, your guess is as good as mine, since we’re not shown them. Instead, we get a (not new) photo of Building 7 covered in smoke which, as I’ve explained before, is most likely coming from the still burning WTC complex, not the building itself.<sup>23</sup>

I can only assume he’s referring to the photos that were released back in 2010, which did indeed show some new shots of Building 7 from the south side.<sup>24</sup> What Ron doesn’t mention is that these photos actually showed the building’s south side was *less* damaged than previously thought.<sup>25</sup> An important detail to overlook, but whatever.

---

<sup>22</sup> Crockett Grabbe, “Direct Evidence for Explosions: Flying Projectiles and Widespread Impact Damage,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, August 2007, pp. 3-5, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/GrabbeExplosionsEvidence.pdf>.

<sup>23</sup> See Adam Taylor, “A Response to Chris Mohr’s Respectful Rebuttal of Richard Gage’s *9/11 Blueprint for Truth*,” pp. 133-36, at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/responsetochrismohr4-1.pdf>.

<sup>24</sup> Pat Curley, “New WTC-7 Photos Released,” *Screw Loose Change*, 13 March 2010, at <http://screwloosechange.blogspot.com/2010/03/new-wtc-7-photos-released.html>.

<sup>25</sup> Adam Taylor, “25% Scooped Out?... I THINK NOT!,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 15 March 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/03/25-scooped-out-i-think-not.html>.

Ron then informs us that “conspiracy theorists will tell us that office fires are not very hot.” Yes, “conspiracy theorists” will say that. Never mind that some of these people are also fire protection engineers.<sup>26</sup> Or chemists like Kevin Ryan and Frank Greening, who have written that:

[R]aising those five floor beams [in Building 7] to a temperature of 600 °C would require an enormous amount of energy, far more than was available from the burning of the office furnishings underneath the floor beams. –Kevin Ryan<sup>27</sup>

NIST’s collapse initiation hypothesis requires that structural steel temperatures on floors 12/13 significantly exceeded 300 °C - a condition that could never have been realized with NIST’s postulated 32 kg/m<sup>2</sup> fuel loading. –Frank Greening<sup>28</sup>

You see Ron, our argument is not that the fires were not hot, but that they weren’t hot enough to cause collapse. And given that more severe fires in other skyscrapers had never caused them to collapse,<sup>29</sup> it doesn’t sound that far-fetched to assume the fires in Building 7 shouldn’t have caused it to collapse either. Again, this would all go so much smoother if you actually framed our arguments correctly Ron.

### **Myth 6: No Steel Frame Building Has Ever Collapsed From Fire**

The interview continues with Ron addressing the issue of no steel-framed high-rise skyscrapers ever collapsing from fire. Oh wait, I’m sorry, that’s

---

<sup>26</sup> See comments from fire protection engineers Scott Granger and Ed Munyak in the following videos: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HvAJQnUJUVY&t=469s>, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c0QEutd1Unc>.

<sup>27</sup> Kevin Ryan, “The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science reaches its peak,” *911 Review*, 10 September 2008, at [http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST\\_WTC7.html](http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST_WTC7.html).

<sup>28</sup> Frank Greening, “Comments on the Draft Report NIST NCSTAR 1-9: ‘Structural Fire Response and Probable Collapse Sequence of World Trade Center Building 7’, issued by NIST August 21st, 2008,” 11 September 2008, p. 5, at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/greeningcommentsncstar1-9.pdf>.

<sup>29</sup> Chris Sarns, “A Record of Major High-Rise Fires Worldwide,” *AE911Truth*, 10 March 2020, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/648-a-record-of-major-high-rise-firesworldwide>.

the *correct* version of our argument, not the straw-man version cooked up by Mr. Menzies and Mr. Craig. My mistake. No, instead these gentlemen decide to frame the argument as no steel buildings in general have ever collapsed from fire, to which Ron offers the rebuttal that “steel-framed buildings collapse all the time.” One of the reasons I’ve already written so much on these topics is that I hoped I wouldn’t have to keep repeating myself. But alas, no such luck. Our argument is not “steel can’t collapse from fire.” As I’ve written elsewhere:

A common misconception about this argument regarding other steel skyscrapers not collapsing is that it implies that steel cannot under any circumstances fail from being weakened by fire. But this idea is incorrect. Steel, while very strong, is not immune to the effects of fire, which is why fire-proofing is applied to many steel structures. The main argument that is really being presented is this: other steel-framed high-rise skyscrapers have never collapsed from fires that, upon careful examination, appear to be far more severe than the fires exhibited in the WTC buildings. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the WTC buildings should not have collapsed from the types of fires that were seen on 9/11.<sup>30</sup>

And as I also pointed out:

When one examines the list of other steel structures that have collapsed from fire that are often cited by critics of the 9/11 Truth Movement, one thing immediately catches the eye: almost none of them are high-rise skyscrapers. [...] If we are to draw comparisons between the WTC skyscrapers and other structures, then we would logically want to compare them to other skyscrapers.<sup>31</sup>

To be fair, Ron almost corrects himself by noting that “they [truthers] are really saying large steel-framed buildings.” Close, but not quite. Say it with me Ron: high-rise steel-framed *skyscrapers*. By generalizing the examples as “large steel buildings,” Ron can point to practically any building he wants as a counter example. And indeed, he does just that by citing one of the debunker favorites; the Faculty of Architecture Building in the Netherlands. Debunkers like this example so much because it shows a top-down collapse due to fire. Yet they, like Ron, overlook a number of

---

<sup>30</sup> See p. 7 of this present work.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 8.

important details, which I've outlined in my previously mentioned "Other Collapses" article:

- The building burned much longer than either of the Towers.
- The collapse was localized, leaving most of the main structure standing.
- The building was constructed very differently from the Towers.
- The collapse took approximately 10 seconds. Unlike many of the other structures referenced, we have several videos of this collapse, and they show that the collapse of the 13-story section took roughly 10 seconds from start to finish. However, the Twin Towers, which were each 110-stories tall, each collapsed in approximately 15 seconds. Building 7, a 47-story building, collapsed in less than seven seconds. This contrasts strongly with the collapse of the Faculty building. If the Towers and Building 7 were truly gravity driven collapses, as was the case for this incident, then we would expect them to have taken far longer to totally collapse than they actually did.<sup>32</sup>

And, of course, this building wasn't a skyscraper. I've said it many times, and I'll say it again: the argument the Truth Movement is presenting is that fires in other steel-framed high-rise skyscrapers have never caused those buildings to collapse, and since the fires in the Twin Towers and Building 7 appeared to be less severe than the fires in these other skyscrapers, it's reasonable to judge that the Towers and Building 7 should not have collapsed either. That's the argument Ron. Either learn it, or don't bother addressing it if you can't.

### **Myth 7: Stream of Sparks Prove High Energy Event Took Place Outside of Fire**

We finally finish up this series of strawmen with a discussion of the stream of molten metal seen flowing out of the South Tower. Silly me, I forgot this is supposed to be David and Ron's version of the Truth Movement's argument. So as Ron puts it, "we see sparks being ejected from one of the floors of the building." Yes, that's right, sparks. Not, as the videos show, glowing molten metal (i.e. liquid metal).<sup>33</sup> That's a tad bit different than

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., pp. 21-22.

<sup>33</sup> See one such video at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nbzdO0EPOGg>.

just “sparks.” Details, but important. And Ron’s explanation for these so-called “sparks” is that “whenever there’s a fire you’ll see mysterious things [...] but, in fact, as a firefighter I can tell you there are many things that will eject streams.” And as to what those things are, we’re given one example of a heated metal suitcase handle reacting to water being sprayed on it. Again, this might have produced sparks, but I doubt this produced a stream of liquid metal that stayed molten and glowing after falling almost a hundred stories.

As for what type of metal was pouring out of the Tower, I’ve heard only two suggestions that have any viability: aluminum and lead, neither of which would have resembled what we saw coming out of the building under those circumstances.<sup>34</sup> Ron is technically right that it hasn’t been proven that the material was produced by thermite, but that’s the whole reason we’re calling for a new investigation; so that it can be investigated what that material most likely was, not simply hand-waved away as something “mysterious.” And wouldn’t you know it, the NFPA 921 *Guide for Fire and Explosive Investigations* just happens to mention that thermite should be tested as a possible accelerate in a building fire.<sup>35</sup> Perhaps, as a firefighter, you should know this too Ron.

### One Last Question

After finishing up his “debunking,” Ron is asked by Mr. Menzies what he thinks it is that motivates us to hold the beliefs we do. His answer is rather typical of debunkers who can’t see anything past the label of “conspiracy theorist.”

Every conspiracy theorist is emotionally invested in the argument that the United States government caused it. And if you scratch any 9/11 conspiracy site with a coin, what you’re going to find are people that have a deep dislike for the United States, the policies of the United States, and particularly the

---

<sup>34</sup> For why the material could not be aluminum, see Adam Taylor, “Does Molten Aluminum Glow?,” at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/doesmoltenaluminumglow1.pdf>. For why it could not have been lead, see comment from Dr. Franke Legge at <http://911blogger.com/news/2008-04-19/publication-peer-reviewed-civil-engineering-journal#comment-183650>.

<sup>35</sup> NFPA 921 *Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations*, 2004 ed., Sections 18.4.5 and 22.2.4, archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20140720031104/http://www.sierragal.com/252\\_stuff/NFPA\\_921.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20140720031104/http://www.sierragal.com/252_stuff/NFPA_921.pdf).

president of the time, George W. Bush. So they keep working tirelessly to try and find evidence that indicates that the government was involved. But there's no scientific proof whatsoever that explosives or thermite brought those buildings down, and yet they keep insisting that they did. It's quite incredible to me.

Well, there you have it folks, the typical stereotyping laid out for us. We hate America, its policies, and the president. Nothing more needs to be said apparently. It never seems to occur to these people that maybe, just maybe, we actually do care deeply about the thousands of people who lost their lives that day, and want to get to the bottom of one of the worst crimes ever committed on United States soil. But for the close-minded types like Ron and Dave, that can't be a possibility. It also can't be a possibility that we actually do have good scientific evidence that those buildings were demolished with explosives. But I suppose if you employ Ron's strategy of ignoring and misrepresenting the opposition's side, then you can pretty much refute anything you want. Of course, by no means is Ron the first to use this strategy. He's just particularly bad at it.

## **Part 3: Correcting Disinformation**

## How to Debunk Directed Energy Weapon Arguments

Originally published 16 December 2013 at

<http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com>

Revisions by Adam Taylor

One of the most frustrating claims I hear from Directed Energy Weapon (DEW) supporters is that “you need to read Judy Wood’s book before you can critique her arguments.” Of course, they ignore the fact that she’s had her arguments debunked over and over again for the past several years, and to the best of my knowledge these critiques of her work have gone unrefuted. But DEW supporters seem to think that if you don’t debunk Dr. Wood’s book, you haven’t debunked Dr. Wood. This would only be true if there was some kind of new phenomenal evidence presented in her book that has never been discussed elsewhere by her in her online articles. I’ll freely admit that I haven’t read the book, partly because I doubt there’s anything substantially new in it that hasn’t already been refuted by others. And I have good reason to think this.

When I debated DEW supporter “Emmanuel Goldstein” (whose real name is Thomas Potter<sup>1</sup>) on Amazon, he listed off 41 points that supposedly show that the Towers were “dustified.” He’s obviously read her book (given that he defends it so passionately; and if he hasn’t, then who’s he to criticize others for not reading it?), and supposedly based his arguments off of information from said book. And I was able to immediately respond to every single one of them, because I had heard them all before. I saw nothing new in any of his arguments, and had an answer ready to go for each of them. So there are really only two possibilities: either there’s nothing new in Judy Wood’s book, or there’s some new ground-breaking evidence presented in the book that DEW supporters don’t feel like sharing with the rest of us. Either way, I still

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://web.archive.org/web/20150220200003/http://mrthomaspotter.com/index.html>.

have no incentive to buy her book.<sup>2</sup> I may someday if I feel like wasting a chunk of my cash (her book currently sells anywhere from 45 to 60 dollars, and there's no preview for it on Amazon).

Below I've reproduced Mr. "Goldstein's" arguments, followed by my response to each. I hope this will help others in dealing with this absurd disinformation.

1. *The Twin Towers were destroyed faster than physics can explain by a free fall speed "collapse."*

Agreed. But this does not automatically mean that DEWs were used. And Dr. Wood's own calculations on the collapse rates of the Towers have been shown to be ludicrous.

In an attempt to analyze the collapse times of the WTC towers (what she calls the "billiard ball" analysis), the conservation of momentum and energy are flagrantly violated. She assumes that with each collision, all momentum in the problem is obliterated. Her underlying assumptions are left unstated and the reader is left to ponder this egregious violation of physical law.

Quoted from: Greg Jenkins and Arabesque, "A Brief Analysis of Dr. Judy Wood's Request for Correction to NIST: the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, May 2007, p. 4, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/NISTRFCWoodRebuttalGBU.pdf>.

Better calculations of the collapse times of the Towers can be found here:

- Kenneth Kuttler, "Collapse Time Calculations for WTC 1," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, May 2007, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/ProfKuttlerWTC1CollapseTimeCalculations.pdf>.
- Gregory Szuladziński, "Temporal considerations in collapse of WTC Towers," *Int. J. Structural Engineering* (2012), at <http://aneta.org/911>

---

<sup>2</sup> Fortunately, science blogger Myles Power has read the book, and provides useful critiques of it, all of which can be read at <https://mylespower.co.uk/category/dr-judy-wood>. See also my review of his critique here: <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2016/02/myles-powers-review-of-where-did-towers.html>.

experiments\_com/articles/IntlJStructuralEng\_TemporalConsiderationsInCollapseOfWTCTowers.pdf.

- Ivan Němec *et al*, “A Contribution to Analysis of Collapse of High-Rise Building Inspired by the Collapses of WTC1 and WTC2: Derivation of Simple Formulas for Collapse Upper Speed and Acceleration,” *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Physics*, December 2018, at <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=89496>.
2. *They underwent mid-air pulverization (dustification) and were turned to dust before they hit the ground.*

Specifically, the concrete and other non-metallic materials were pulverized. NONE of the steel from the Towers was “dustified.” See <https://citizenfor911truth.wordpress.com/the-wtc-was-not-destroyed-with-directed-energy-weapons>.

3. *The protective bathtub was not significantly damaged by the destruction of the Twin Towers.*

False. The bathtub was significantly damaged. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z59XXi2Q8Fw&t=2471s>

4. *The rail lines, the tunnels and most of the rail cars had only light damage, if any.*

Another source of data that is cited by proponents of the ‘missing debris’ hypothesis relates to the non-catastrophic damage to the Bathtub, the ground zero region which was encircled by subterranean walls to hold back water from the Hudson River. No credible analysis or quantitative measurements have been offered by the proponents of the ‘missing’ debris hypothesis to support the claim that the Bathtub should have been catastrophically damaged.

The measured seismic activity explains why there was no catastrophic damage to the Bathtub:

*Earthquakes of ML 2.3 are not known to cause any structural damage in buildings. In the eastern U.S. that threshold is believed to be close to or above ML 4 to 4.5.*

From a paper by James Gourley, the Bathtub survived much more substantial seismic activity in the past:

*Additional credible data is available that indicates NYC is located in an active seismic zone. A search of the Advanced National Seismic System catalog of earthquakes from 1970 to 2005, inside an area between 38N and 43N Latitude, and between 71W and 76W Longitude (an area that runs from just south of New Jersey north to the middle of New York state, and from just west of New Jersey east to Rhode Island) reveals that at least 21 earthquakes having a magnitude greater than 3.0 occurred in that area during those 34 years.*

Quoted from: Gregory Jenkins, "The Overwhelming Implausibility of Using Directed Energy Beams to Demolish the World Trade Center Towers," *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 12 April 2007, pp. 4-5, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200702/Implausibility-Directed-Energy-Beam-Demolish-WTC-by-Gregory-Jenkins.pdf>.

5. *The WTC underground mall survived well, witnessed by Warner Bros. Road Runner and friends. There were reports that "The Gap" was looted.*

See points 3 and 4 above.

6. *The seismic impact was minimal, far too small based on a comparison with the Kingdome controlled demolition.*

See James Gourley, "Scientific Critique of Judy Wood's Paper 'The Star Wars Beam Weapon,'" *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, January 2007, pp. 2-6, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/b/scientific-critique-of-judy-woods-paper-star-wars-beam-weapons-by-james-gourley.pdf>; See also Jenkins, "The Overwhelming Implausibility," p. 3.

7. *The Twin Towers were destroyed from the top down, not bottom up.*

Buildings have been demolished this way with explosives. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VZ1E2NPI-s8> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OW9z08ml230>.

8. *The demolition of WTC7 was whisper quiet and the seismic signal was not significantly greater than background noise.*

No, it was not “whisper quiet.” See David Chandler, “WTC 7: Sound Evidence for Explosions,” 5 July 2010, at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ERhoNYj9\\_fg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ERhoNYj9_fg).

9. *The upper 80 percent, approximately, of each tower was turned into fine dust and did not crash to the earth.*

This is absolutely false. Steel was everywhere at Ground Zero. See <https://citizenfor911truth.wordpress.com/the-wtc-was-not-destroyed-with-directed-energy-weapons> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tqcM-B-pFuc>.

10. *The upper 90 percent, approximately, of the inside of WTC7 was turned into fine dust and did not crash to the earth.*

Evidence for this? And why only the inside? How would a DEW do that?

11. *One file cabinet with folder dividers survived.*

Not conclusive proof of DEWs.

12. *No toilets survived or even recognizable portions of one.*

Yes, because porcelain survives so well in building demolitions.

13. *Windows of nearby buildings had circular and other odd-shaped holes in them.*

They were blown in by the massive pressure waves of the collapses.

14. *In addition to the odd window damage, the marble facade was completely missing from around WFC1 and WFC2 entry, with no other apparent structural damage.*

I think they were damaged by the STEEL from the Towers. See <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/photos/gzap6.html>.

15. *Fuzzballs, evidence that the dust continued to break down and become finer and finer.*

See Gregory Jenkins, “Supplemental: Miscellaneous Topics – DEW-Demolition Contrary Evidence,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, October 2007, pp. 13-15, at <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2007/Jenkins-Fe-DustSupplemental.pdf>.

16. *Truckloads of dirt were hauled in and hauled out of the WTC site, a pattern that continues to this day.*

See Jenkins, “Supplemental: Miscellaneous Topics,” pp. 15-17.

17. *Fuming of the dirt pile. Fuming decreased when watered, contrary to fumes caused by fire or heat.*

See Point 16.

18. *Fuzzyblobs, a hazy cloud that appeared to be around material being destroyed.*

See Point 15.

19. *The Swiss-Cheese appearance of steel beams and glass.*

Could have been caused by the collapse and the explosives.

20. *Evidence of molecular dissociation and transmutation, as demonstrated by the near-instant rusting of affected steel.*

There was no “instant rusting.” See Jenkins, “Supplemental: Miscellaneous Topics,” pp. 7-10.

21. *Weird fires. The appearance of fire, but without evidence of heating.*

No evidence of heating? I don’t think so. See Andrea Dreger, “Sources related to exceptionally high temperatures, and/or to persistent heat at

Ground Zero,” at [http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dreger/GroundZeroHeat2008\\_07\\_10.pdf](http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dreger/GroundZeroHeat2008_07_10.pdf).

22. *Lack of high heat. Witnesses reported that the initial dust cloud felt cooler than ambient temperatures. No evidence of burned bodies.*

The dust clouds were reported to be hot. See [https://web.archive.org/web/20151129153818/http://911encyclopedia.com/wiki/index.php/The\\_Destruction\\_Of\\_Each\\_World\\_Trade\\_Center\\_Tower\\_Generated\\_A\\_Hot\\_Density\\_Current](https://web.archive.org/web/20151129153818/http://911encyclopedia.com/wiki/index.php/The_Destruction_Of_Each_World_Trade_Center_Tower_Generated_A_Hot_Density_Current).

23. *Columns were curled around a vertical axis like rolled-up carpets, where overloaded buckled beams should be bent around the horizontal axis.*

The columns could be bent in any direction in the collapse. And I thought the columns were supposed to be dustified, not bent.

24. *Office paper was densely spread throughout lower Manhattan, unburned, often along side [sic] cars that appeared to be burning.*

See Jenkins, “Supplemental: Miscellaneous Topics,” pp. 10-11.

25. *Vertical round holes were cut into buildings 4, 5 and 6, and into Liberty street in front of Bankers Trust, and into Vesey Street in front of WTC6, plus a cylindrical arc was cut into Bankers Trust.*

This does not support DEWs. See Tony Szamboti, “Why the damage to WTC Bldgs. 3 and 6 does not support the beam weapon hypothesis and some correspondence with Dr. James Fetzer about it,” *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, 20 March 2007, at [http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/Szamboti\\_The\\_Damage\\_to\\_WTC\\_Bldg\\_s\\_3\\_and\\_6\\_and\\_the\\_debate\\_between\\_the\\_controlled\\_demolition\\_and\\_beam\\_weapon\\_theories.pdf](http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/Szamboti_The_Damage_to_WTC_Bldg_s_3_and_6_and_the_debate_between_the_controlled_demolition_and_beam_weapon_theories.pdf).

26. *All planes except top secret missions were ordered down until 10:31 a.m. (when only military flights were allowed to resume), after both towers were destroyed, and only two minutes (120 seconds) after WTC 1 had been destroyed.*

Interesting and good points to raise concerning the lack of air defense on 9/11. But not evidence of DEWs.

27. *Approximately 1,400 motor vehicles were towed away, toasted in strange ways, during the destruction of the Twin Towers.*

See Jenkins, "Supplemental: Miscellaneous Topics," pp. 1-5.

28. *The order and method of destruction of each tower minimized damage to the bathtub and adjacent buildings.*

Perhaps, but this still is not proof of DEWs. The collapse of the Towers damaged several buildings hundreds of feet away.

29. *More damage was done to the bathtub by earth-moving equipment during the clean-up process than from the destruction of more than a million tons of buildings above it.*

See points 3 and 4.

30. *Twin Tower control without damaging neighboring buildings, in fact all seriously damaged and destroyed buildings had a WTC prefix.*

The other WTC buildings were obviously closer to the Towers, so that makes sense.

31. *The north wing of WTC 4 was left standing, neatly sliced from the main body which virtually disappeared.*

Yes, it was crushed by the falling STEEL.

32. *For more than seven years, regions in the ground under where the main body of WTC4 stood have continued to fume.*

See point 15.

33. *The WTC1 and WTC2 rubble pile was far too small to account for the total mass of the buildings.*

Wrong. See Jenkins, “The Overwhelming Implausibility,” pp. 1-2.

34. *The WTC7 rubble pile was too small for the total mass of the building and consisted of a lot of mud.*

So you think WTC7 was demolished with DEWs? If the columns in the building were cut, the pile could fold and fit into the footprint. Which, by the way, is the point of demolitions with explosives.

35. *Eyewitness testimony about toasted cars, instant disappearance of people by “unexplained” waves, a plane turning into a mid-air fireball, electrical power cut off moments before WTC 2 destruction, and the sound of explosions.*

Evidence for any of this? Explosions would be consistent with demolition with explosives.

36. *Eyewitness testimony of Scott-pack explosions in fire trucks and fire trucks exploding that were parked near the WTC.*

Many of the trucks were on fire. Of course things in them would explode.

37. *There were many flipped cars in the neighborhood of the WTC complex near trees with full foliage.*

The collapse of two 110 story buildings can do that you know.

38. *Magnetometer readings in Alaska recorded abrupt shifts in the earth’s magnetic field with each of the events at the WTC on 9/11.*

How is this evidence of DEW? Also, see Jenkins, “The Overwhelming Implausibility,” p. 6.

39. *Hurricane Erin, located just off Long Island on 9/11/01, went virtually unreported in the days leading up to 9/11, including omission of this Hurricane on the morning weather map, even though that portion of the Atlantic Ocean was shown on the map.*

Maybe it wasn't talked about on 9/11 because the worst terrorist attack in history was happening?

40. *Sillystring, the appearance of curious cork-screw trails.*

Not sure what that's supposed to be. Elaborate please.

41. *Uncanny similarities with the Hutchison Effect, where the Hutchison Effect exhibits all of the same phenomena listed above.*

None of which was caused by this effect or DEWs. See "The 'Hutchison Effect' vs. Real Science," archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20150311113334/http://www.alienscientist.com/hutchison.html>.

## **Lying for 9/11 Truth: On the Pentagon and the Deceptions of Craig McKee**

Originally published 14 June 2014 – 17 March 2016 at  
<http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com>  
 Minor Revisions by Adam Taylor

### **Part 1**

Researcher Craig McKee has recently posted an article claiming to show evidence that one of the five frames showing the Pentagon strike was deliberately doctored.<sup>1</sup> His conclusions are taken from the film “September 11 - The New Pearl Harbor.”<sup>2</sup> The maker of the film, Massimo Mazzucco, has already been strongly advised to revise this particular section of the film, as it does not take into consideration the work produced by others in the Truth Movement which shows that a Boeing 757 did impact the building.<sup>3</sup>

The McKee article contains a number of bizarre and false claims, such as:

[O]ther key evidence (including the nature of the damage to the building, the lack of debris outside the building, and the on-camera accounts of credible witnesses who put the plane on a different flight path that the one required to produce the damage path), proves that the Pentagon was the scene of a faked plane crash and that 9/11 was an inside job.

---

<sup>1</sup> Craig McKee, “Doctored Pentagon Video Proves 9/11 Cover-Up and Inside Job,” *Truth and Shadows*, 13 June 2014, at <https://truthandshadows.com/2014/06/13/doctored-pentagon-video-proves-911-cover-up-and-inside-job>.

<sup>2</sup> Full film available online at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rq9nUPs2RAk>.

<sup>3</sup> David Chandler, Frank Legge, and John Wyndham, “The Pentagon Segment in Your New Film,” 24 October 2013, archived at [https://web.archive.org/web/20150224144454/http://www.scientistsfor911truth.org/docs/Mazzucco\\_letter\\_Oct2013.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20150224144454/http://www.scientistsfor911truth.org/docs/Mazzucco_letter_Oct2013.pdf).

Each of these claims have been refuted numerous times. There was a considerable amount of debris recovered from the Pentagon that clearly came from a Boeing 757.<sup>4</sup> The damage to the building is perfectly consistent with the impact of a Boeing 757 (not a bomb or a missile).




Image from <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pentagon/index.html>

And I'll let the eyewitnesses speak for themselves.<sup>5</sup>

But the key point of Mr. McKee's article is his insistence that one frame from the Pentagon footage was doctored, which as far as he's concerned is proof 9/11 was an inside job. There's certainly evidence the official story is false (even in regards to the Pentagon<sup>6</sup>), but the conclusions reached by both Mr. McKee and the film regarding the Pentagon footage are demonstrably false. The frame in question is the one pictured below, which according to Mr. McKee and the film shows only the tip of the incoming plane, rather than the main body of the plane.

---

<sup>4</sup> Images of such debris archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20130524011136/https://sites.google.com/site/wtc7lies/PentagonDebrisMontagecopy1-full.jpg>.

<sup>5</sup> Arabesque, "9/11 and the Pentagon Attack: What Witnesses Described," *Arabesque: 9/11 Truth*, 2 April 2007, at <http://arabesque911.blogspot.com/2007/04/911-and-pentagon-attack-what.html>. See also "9/11 Pentagon Witnesses - They Saw the Plane Hit!," at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FfQEwxxVyKY>.

<sup>6</sup> See John-Michael Talboo, "Knee Deep in Crap," *Debunking the Debunkers*, 18 December 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/12/knee-deep-in-crap.html>.



Frame taken from “September 11 - The New Pearl Harbor.” The arrow points to what the narrator calls the nose of the plane.

This, says Mr. McKee and the film, is inconsistent with a frame taken from the second video showing the Pentagon strike, which does show what at least appears to be the tail and horizontal stabilizer of the plane. And thus, at least one of these videos must have been doctored. However, this conclusion is based from a misrepresentation of the footage used in the film, which is of very low quality. What Mr. McKee and the film identify as the “tip” of the plane is actually the leading edge of the white smoke produced from the plane, likely caused by damage the plane sustained when it impacted the light-poles.<sup>7</sup> A higher quality version of the footage shows that a plane can reasonably be made out and seen. The plane is in fact in front of the smoke trail.<sup>8</sup>

As much as I sympathize with Mr. McKee and others in the Movement in calling for a new investigation, we must do so on the grounds of solid evidence. And the idea that no plane hit the Pentagon simply doesn't fit that criteria.

---

<sup>7</sup> Visualization of this shown in Mike Wilson, “911 Case Study: Pentagon Flight 77,” 29 June 2006, at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YVDdjLQkUV8>.

<sup>8</sup> See Adam Taylor, “Flight 77 frame analysis,” 14 June 2014, at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M0\\_dvxU0HjQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M0_dvxU0HjQ).

## Part 2

One thing I'd hope we'd be done with at this point in the 9/11 Truth Movement is the bickering over what really happened at the Pentagon. For me, the evidence is clear that a plane really did hit the building, and that it was Flight 77. But some people just won't let this topic die, and insist the ludicrous idea that no plane hit. One of those people is Craig McKee, a "researcher" in the movement who recently posted another long, rambling complaint over why people think he's full of it.<sup>9</sup> Like most Pentagon no-planers (or just no-planers in general), Craig is fond of pretending that anyone who disagrees with him is out to get him and push some sort of agenda. Of some of these people he writes:

The team of researchers I mentioned – which includes Chandler, Jenkins, Frank Legge, John Wyndham, Jonathan Cole, Jim Hoffman, Victoria Ashley, and others – keeps repackaging the same discredited ideas about the Pentagon into one "scholarly paper" after another. They repeat frequently how they are using "the scientific method" while those who disagree are suffering from "confirmation bias" (which means favoring information that confirms existing beliefs).

Personally, I suspect folks like Hoffman, Legge, Cole, Chandler, etc. are probably just getting bored with the issue at this point. So am I. Craig goes over what fantastic evidence he has that no plane hit the Pentagon, but has he done anything with this evidence? That is, is he ever going to try and use this "evidence" to help get us a new investigation, or just post his ramblings on his blog and pretend like he's beaten everyone else in a debate? I'm not holding my breath.

Craig brings up ten questions that **MUST** be answered to show a plane hit the building. I'll put aside the fact that these questions have doubtless been answered before, but let's be nice and give it another go.

- *Why would more than a dozen highly credible witnesses describe a virtually identical north of Citgo flight path unless this is what they saw?*

---

<sup>9</sup> Craig McKee, "Pentagon Debates Expose Emptiness of Large-Plane-Impact Scenario," *Truth and Shadows*, 16 March 2016, at <https://truthandshadows.com/2016/03/16/pentagon-debates>.

I don't know, why would eyewitnesses say the Titanic split in two as it sank, but others say it sank in one piece?<sup>10</sup> Why would thousands of people say they saw the sun zig-zag throughout the sky, when no one else in the world saw that?<sup>11</sup> Could it possibly be because eyewitness evidence is known to be unreliable?<sup>12</sup> Craig wants to put so much emphasis on evidence that is literally the leading cause of most wrongful convictions. Besides, other eyewitnesses noted earlier contradict these dozen or so witnesses, and the vast majority of them – even the ones cited by Craig – say they saw the plane hit the building.

- *Since we know the wings did not penetrate, why weren't they lying on the lawn? Same for the tail section and horizontal stabilizers.*

I would honestly like any Pentagon no-planer to explain to me what airplane wings should look like after they've hit a reinforced masonry building at over 500 mph. How big do you think the pieces should be? Care to calculate how much force will be applied to the wings and work out what sort of state they'd be in afterwards? Please, draw it out for me if you need to. I'm fine accepting the idea that maybe, just maybe aluminum wings are not going to stand up very well to a building like the Pentagon at over 500 mph.

- *How could the plane have entered through a hole much smaller than required without leaving large pieces of wreckage outside?*

It didn't enter a hole "much smaller than required." Perhaps you missed the fact that there was a plane-shaped hole in the wall after the plane hit.

---

<sup>10</sup> Bill Wormstedt, "The Facts - What Did the Survivors See of the Breakup of the Titanic?" (2011), at [https://wormstedt.com/titanic/The\\_Facts.html](https://wormstedt.com/titanic/The_Facts.html).

<sup>11</sup> Specifically, the so-called "Miracle of the Sun" in Fatima, Portugal, supposedly witnessed by an estimated 70,000 people. See Joe Nickell, *The Science of Miracles: Investigating the Incredible* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2013), pp. 249-55.

<sup>12</sup> Gary Wells, Amina Memon, and Steven Penrod, "Eyewitness Evidence: Improving Its Probative Value," *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* (2006), at <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00027.x>.



Images from <http://therightbloggerbastard.blogspot.com>

As for this “no large pieces” claim, please buy a decent pair of glasses Mr. McKee, and then look at this:



Pentagon Wheel    757 comparison wheel    Diffuser Case    Cockpit Voice Rec.    Engine Rotor    Landing Gear

- *Why was there no significant damage to the wall or even to windows that would have been hit by the tail and stabilizers?*

Guess you might have missed this too.



Images from <http://therightbloggerbastard.blogspot.com>

Seriously Craig, glasses aren't that expensive these days. Oh, and if you think that's not enough damage, maybe remember the Pentagon was built to be a wee bit stronger than a normal building.<sup>13</sup>

- *How could the fuselage penetrate 310 feet into the building if the wings and tail section were turned to confetti on impact?*

Because there's more fuselage than wing mass and tail mass. Yes, the *front* of the fuselage may not be able to do much, but there's tons more plane behind it coming in. And the Pentagon had quite a bit of open space, so once it got through the front wall there wasn't much left to stop it.

- *How could the tiny amount of unidentified debris around the helipad possibly represent thousands of pounds of aircraft wreckage?*

Who said it was "thousands of pounds" of debris outside? Again, pretty sure much of the larger, heavier debris found its way inside the building. That's what we should expect to happen. Small debris outside, large debris inside. Repeat that and maybe it will sink in eventually.

---

<sup>13</sup> Esther Schrader, "Pentagon, a Vulnerable Building, Was Hit in Least Vulnerable Spot," *Los Angeles Time*, 16 September 2001, archived at [http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/pentagon/analysis/latimes\\_leastvulnerable.html](http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/pentagon/analysis/latimes_leastvulnerable.html).

- *What happened to the virtually indestructible engine cores, and why didn't they create two exit holes?*

They were found inside the Pentagon, after they penetrated the building.<sup>14</sup> Through, again, the plane-shaped hole the plane left in the building.

- *Given that the plane would have completely lost structural integrity halfway to the rounded C ring hole, what can account for the hole?*

Gee, couldn't possibly be all that plane debris right in front of the hole, could it?



Images from <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pentagon/index.html>

---

<sup>14</sup> Jeff Scott, "Pentagon & Boeing 757 Engine Investigation," *Aerospaceweb*, 6 May 2006, at <http://www.aerospaceweb.org/question/conspiracy/q0265.shtml>.

The hole might look odd at first, but it's consistent with damage from a plane strike.<sup>15</sup>

- *Why were all synchronized frames from the two camera views identical except for the single frame that is supposed to show a plane?*
- *Why would the government fake video of the crash if an actual crash took place?*

I'm including these last two together for a reason. You might have wondered why I titled this essay calling Craig a liar. Well, his last bit of "evidence," like all the rest, is wrong, but the fact is that he knows it's wrong. And he knows it's wrong because *I pointed out to him that it's wrong*. The point about the two video frames being out of sync is in reference to this point Craig made earlier in his post:


In September 11: The New Pearl Harbor we see video frames from two Pentagon cameras that were synchronized using a "multiplexer" system. About 100 frames were common to both sets and matched each other perfectly as confirmed by comparing the shape of the smoke cloud. <http://luogocomune.net/site/modules/sections/index.php?op=viewarticle&articleid=167> All except one. Just one of these 100 frames does not match, and that is "frame 23," the very one that allegedly shows a 757 crossing the Pentagon lawn. There is no doubt that frame 23 was doctored either in one set of frames or both.

I wrote about this earlier, but apparently I have to go over it again. What is claimed in the film is that the two frames featured below are out of sync and that one camera shows the whole plane and the other shows only "the tip of the plane."




---

<sup>15</sup> Jim Hoffman, "The Pentagon Attack: What the Physical Evidence Shows," *911 Research*, 28 March 2006, at <https://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pentagon/index.html>. (See especially the section titled "Interior Damage is Consistent With a 757 Crash.")



What the film says is the tip of the plane is actually the leading edge of the smoke trail left by one of the plane's engines.



The fact that this video shows a plane is all the more clear when higher resolution images are used. Of course, some will probably say this is “enhanced” or “manipulated footage” (as I was accused of using by some of Mr. McKee’s ilk<sup>16</sup>). However, a recent study by David Chandler and Nathan Flach uses video footage from the original sources, and they are also of high quality and show the plane.<sup>17</sup>

Now I pointed this out in my previously mentioned post, and a second time to Craig over Facebook. How did he respond?

---

<sup>16</sup> See for example <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2014/06/contra-craig-mckee-boeing-757-did.html?showComment=1402878210585#c2978708117269562551>.

<sup>17</sup> David Chandler and Nathan Flach, “Pentagon Surveillance Camera Video Frames,” *911 Speak Out* (n.d.), at <https://911speakout.org/plane-at-the-pentagon-b>.



Craig McKee Adam, the key point in the Mazzucco analysis is that the two camera views are irreconcilable when the alleged plane is in frame.

5 mins · Like · 1

That's right, with more denial. The frames are clearly not out of sync, and the film is wrong to call that the tip of the plane. To my knowledge, Craig has never acknowledged this. And I'm willing to bet he never will. Craig spends some time talking about confirmation bias, but if there ever was someone to have it, it's him. He basically gives the whole game away when he answers the question "Can't it be an inside job even if we support an impact?" by saying this: "Yes, but when we discard some of the most powerful evidence we have, the case against the official story is much weaker." A translation for those who might not have gotten it: Yes, we might be wrong about this, but it's more important for us to use this to make our case, rather than being factually accurate.

The ends justify the means. This tells me Craig really doesn't care if this is factually correct or not. He just wants to prove 9/11 was an inside job, and since this would really convince people, he's just gonna run with it. This is standard religious apologetic logic, not objective research. I am convinced more and more that Craig is just willing to lie if he thinks that will get us a new investigation.<sup>18</sup> So Craig, I've now told you not once, not twice, but THREE times the film is wrong about this. Are you ever going to admit this? You've "responded" twice, and I'm giving you one more shot. But strike three and you're out pal. What's it gonna be?

For more information about the Pentagon, see the following collection of essays at <http://www.scientificmethod911.org/pentagon.html>.

---

<sup>18</sup> Indeed, he later lied *yet again*, as documented here: <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2016/03/craig-mckee-still-lying-about-pentagon.html>.

## Links to Original Writings

Each chapter of this book originally appeared as an essay posted online by the author. The versions presented here are all revised in one way or another, either to update certain information, rephrase and/or better word certain statements, correct typos, or just accommodate the overall format of the book. The original writings are all still available online, and links to them are included here for the sake of historical preservation.

If for whatever reason any of the links below no longer work or appear altered, please utilize the online Internet Archive to access archived versions of them: <https://archive.org/web>.

**Chapter 1** originally appeared as “Other Collapses in Perspective: An Examination of Steel Structures Collapsing due to Fire and their Relation to the WTC,” *Scientific Method 9/11*, April 2013, at [http://www.scientificmethod911.org/reviewpages/taylor\\_other\\_collapses.html](http://www.scientificmethod911.org/reviewpages/taylor_other_collapses.html).

**Chapter 2** originally appeared as “Collapse or Explosion? A Discussion of the WTC ‘Sounds of Explosions’ Issue,” 31 January 2021, at [https://911docs.files.wordpress.com/2021/01/adam\\_taylor\\_explosion\\_collapse2-2.pdf](https://911docs.files.wordpress.com/2021/01/adam_taylor_explosion_collapse2-2.pdf).

**Chapter 3** originally appeared as “Observations on NIST’s WTC Fireproofing Loss and Collapse Scenario for the WTC Towers” (2020), at [https://911docs.files.wordpress.com/2020/09/nist\\_wtc\\_fireproofing\\_observations1.pdf](https://911docs.files.wordpress.com/2020/09/nist_wtc_fireproofing_observations1.pdf).

**Chapter 4** originally appeared as “Clarifying the Question of Collapse Times on 9/11,” 23 February 2021, at <https://911docs.files.wordpress.com/2021/02/clarifyingcollapsetimes1.pdf>

**Chapter 5** originally appeared as “An Open Letter To Ryan Owens,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 7 September 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/09/open-letter-to-ryan-owens.html>; and “A Response from Ryan Owens,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 31 October 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/10/response-from-ryan-owens.html>.

**Chapter 6** originally appeared as “The World Trade Center WAS a Controlled Demolition,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 8 March 2011, at [http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2011/03/world-trade-center-was-controlled\\_08.html](http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2011/03/world-trade-center-was-controlled_08.html).

**Chapter 7** originally appeared as “Debunking Joseph Nobles: Freefall Speed,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 28 June 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/06/debunking-joseph-nobles-freefall-speed.html>; “Debunking Joseph Nobles: 7 Problems With 7 Responses,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 23 July 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/07/debunking-joseph-nobles-7-problems-with.html>; “Responding to a Response to my Response,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 31 July 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/07/responding-to-response-to-my-response.html>; “Debunking Joseph Nobles: Three Big Issues Indeed,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 31 July 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/07/debunking-joseph-nobles-three-big.html>; “Debunking Joseph Nobles: Other Buildings,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 8 August 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/08/debunking-joseph-nobles-other-buildings.html>; “Hello Joseph Nobles,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 10 August 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/08/hello-joseph-nobles.html>; “Debunking Joseph Nobles: Thermal Conductivity and Corroded Steel,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 16 August 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/08/debunking-joseph-nobles-thermal.html>; “Actually, no Mr. Nobles...,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 26 August 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/08/actually-no-mr-nobles.html>; and “Building What? is up...,” *Debunking the Debunkers*, 2 September 2010, at <http://911debunkers.blogspot.com/2010/09/building-what-is-up.html>.

**Chapter 8** originally appeared as “Taylor Contra Power - Part 1: The Twin Towers,” *Adam Taylor’s Blog*, 1 December 2012, at <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2012/12/taylor-contra-powers.html>; and “Taylor Contra Power - Part 2: World Trade Center 7 (and other issues),” *Adam Taylor’s Blog*, 9 March 2013, at [http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2013/03/taylor-contra-power-part-2-world-trade\\_9.html](http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2013/03/taylor-contra-power-part-2-world-trade_9.html).

**Chapter 9** originally appeared as “David Menzies and Ron Craig Debunk WTC Demolition,” *Adam Taylor’s Blog*, 16 September 2015, at

<http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2015/09/david-menzies-and-ron-craig-debunk-wtc.html>.

**Chapter 10** originally appeared as “How to Debunk DEW Arguments,” *Adam Taylor’s Blog*, 16 December 2013, at <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2013/12/how-to-debunk-dew-arguments.html>.

**Chapter 11** originally appeared as “Contra Craig McKee: A Boeing 757 Did Strike the Pentagon,” *Adam Taylor’s Blog*, 14 June 2014, at <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2014/06/contra-craig-mckee-boeing-757-did.html>; and “Craig McKee: Liar for 9/11 Truth,” *Adam Taylor’s Blog*, 17 March 2016, at <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com/2016/03/craig-mckee-liar-for-911-truth.html>.

## Other Works by the Author

- “FAQ #7: What is nanothermite? Could it have been used to demolish the Twin Towers and WTC 7?,” *AE911Truth*, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/faqs/359-faq-6-what-is-nanothermite-could-it-have-been-used-to-demolish-the-twin-towers-and-wtc-7>.
- “FAQ #10: Wouldn’t the planes slamming into the Twin Towers have disturbed the demolition devices?,” *AE911Truth*, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/faqs/352-faq-9-wouldn-t-the-planes-slamming-into-the-twin-towers-have-disturbed-the-demolition-devices>.
- “Debunking the Real 9/11 Myths: Why Popular Mechanics Can’t Face Up to Reality,” *AE911Truth*, 15 February 2012, at <https://www.ae911truth.org/evidence/technical-articles/articles-by-ae911truth/436-debunking-the-real-9-11-myths-series>.
- “A Response to Chris Mohr’s Respectful Rebuttal of Richard Gage’s *9/11 Blueprint for Truth*,” at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2014/09/responsetochrismohr4-1.pdf>.
- “A Critical Review of the ‘9/11 Mysteries Viewer’s Guide,’” at <https://citizenfor911truth.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/a-critical-review-of-the-911-mysteries-viewers-guide.pdf>.
- (With John-Michael Talboo) “Debunking 9/11 Debunking: On WTC’s Design to Withstand 707 Impact,” 3 October 2020, at <https://911docs.files.wordpress.com/2020/10/debunking911debunkingwtcwithstand707impact2.pdf>.

## About the Author

Adam Taylor has been an activist and researcher in the 9/11 Truth Movement since August of 2007. During his years of research, he primarily worked as a contributor to the site *Debunking the Debunkers of the 9/11 Truth Movement* (at [911debunkers.blogspot.com](http://911debunkers.blogspot.com)). He has also contributed essays to sites such as [AE911Truth.org](http://AE911Truth.org) and [ScientificMethod911.org](http://ScientificMethod911.org). He has appeared on numerous online programs, such as Pump It Out Radio, 9/11 Free Fall, Tales from the Rabbit Hole, and Truth Teller's Radio. His personal (yet discontinued) blog can be found at <http://adamtaylor42.blogspot.com>.



World Trade Center 1 under construction (left), and World Trade Center 7 (right), 11 September 2011. Photo by the author.



The author in New York, 11 September 2011.